



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—Wednesday, July 30, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Wondrous God, angels bow before You, heaven and Earth adore You.

As the days pass swiftly, we pause to thank You for surrounding us with the shield of Your favor. Your anger is only for a moment, but Your favor is for a lifetime.

Today, lead our lawmakers to greater maturity and wholeness in You. May they grow in grace and in a deeper knowledge of You, becoming better prepared to be Your ambassadors, reconciling the world to You. May they continue to be controlled by Your Spirit, always walking on the road that leads to life. Give them, O God, a common commitment to the crucial cause of keeping America strong.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations supplemental act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, there will be 1 hour for debate equally divided prior to a cloture vote on S. 2569, the Bring Jobs Home Act. If cloture is not invoked, there will be an immediate cloture vote on the motion to proceed on S. 2648, the emergency supplemental appropriations act.

Following those votes, there will be voice votes on confirmation of the Akumteh, Moritsugu, and Kennedy nominations.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the time from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. be under the control of the Republicans and the time from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2685

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2685 is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2685) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings with respect to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wisely noted: "It takes less time to do a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong."

In about 1 hour, Senators will be on the floor and have an opportunity to follow what Longfellow said; that is, to

do the right thing. We have a bill that protects American jobs. The Bring Jobs Home Act tackles the growing problem of American jobs being shipped overseas. It is called outsourcing, shipping jobs overseas.

We Democrats are lined up against outsourcing. The Bring Jobs Home Act would protect about 21 million jobs in our country.

Today in the United States, anytime an American company closes a factory or a plant in America and moves operations to another country, American taxpayers pick up part of that moving bill. It is hard to believe, but it is true. A company moves from America, and American taxpayers help them with the move. If they want to move, American taxpayers shouldn't help them at all.

The Bring Jobs Home Act ends senseless tax breaks for these outsourcers. It ends the ridiculous practice of American funding outsourcing of their own jobs.

The Bring Jobs Home Act doesn't just fight to keep jobs here in America, it also brings jobs back.

This bill provides a 20-percent tax credit to help American companies with the costs of moving operations back to the United States. The Bring Jobs Home Act will protect 150,000 jobs in Nevada. It could potentially save as many as 325,000 at-risk jobs in Kentucky and jobs all over the country.

Economically speaking, what else could be more important than ensuring our working Americans' jobs are protected. Regardless of what Republican leaders said and what the Republican leader has opined, helping our constituents stay employed is our duty as a Senator.

Frankly, a vote against this bill is a vote against American jobs. There is absolutely no excuse, no justification, for any Member of this body to vote against this legislation. But as of late, Senate Republicans have repeatedly blocked legislation, such as the Bring Jobs Home Act, which is good for the American people.

Remember, the Longfellow quote that I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks: "It takes less time to do

a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong.”

The wisdom of Longfellow’s quote is there, and each time another good bill is blocked by the Senate Republicans we must think of Longfellow and what he said: “It takes less time to do a thing right than it does to explain why you did it wrong.”

Each time after Republicans have voted against legislation that is good for working families, an odd scene has developed on the Senate floor. A procession of Republicans makes it way to the floor and individually Senators begin to explain why they voted against a good bill, trying to explain why Americans don’t deserve a fair shot. For example, after voting against an increase in the minimum wage, after voting against equal pay for women, after voting against cost-cutting energy efficiency, and after voting against student loan refinancing, after all of these votes, the same spectacle unfolds immediately after. The Republicans come through that door and try to make their case.

All the American public wants is a fair shot at a good life. Instead of voting for a good piece of legislation that would benefit folks back home, they spend time explaining why they did the opposite.

Maybe our vote today will be different. Maybe Senate Republicans will finally focus on the many families depending on the jobs we are trying to protect. If they do, they will vote to bring jobs home. This legislation is important and necessary. If they do, they will vote to keep American jobs from going overseas.

Those of us who do the right thing and vote for this will not need to explain because we have done the right thing; and that is because our constituents know we work to give them a fair shot at good, secure jobs.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The minority leader is recognized.

EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Obama White House likes to pretend that its war on coal is about protecting the planet. Yet his newest regulations would hardly do a thing to impact global carbon emissions.

The President’s own EPA Administrator basically admitted it when she said a few years back that U.S. action alone won’t meaningfully impact global CO₂ levels.

They don’t seem to care that their regulations would devastate the lives of whole families in my State, working-class Kentuckians who just want to put food on the table and give their children a better life.

They don’t seem to care that their regulations threaten to undermine Kentucky’s traditionally low utility rates, splinter our manufacturing base,

and shift well-paying jobs overseas. They don’t seem to care that the people who stand to be hurt most by their regressive policies are those who can afford it the least.

As a candidate President Obama wasn’t just open about his plan to make American energy bills skyrocket, he was pretty cavalier about it too. For him it was a necessary sacrifice to achieve an ideological aim.

But for a working mom in Ashland, KY, a skyrocketing utility bill can mean the difference between an annual trip to Lake Cumberland and a tearful apology to her kids. It can mean choosing which bills to pay this month and which to put off just a little longer. It can mean birthday disappointments and missed credit card payments.

These types of consequences may not be a big deal to the President, but for many people in the country and many in Kentucky, they are a very big deal. Families have had to put up with enough in nearly 6 years that this administration has been in power: higher medical costs, stubborn unemployment, and the feeling of less opportunity.

What I am saying is middle-class families deserve a break. They deserve to have Washington battling in their corner instead of against them. That is why I keep fighting this war on coal.

Later this morning I will take my message to one of the administration’s so-called listening sessions on these extreme energy regulations. The Obama administration may have been too afraid to hold a hearing anywhere near coal country, but that doesn’t mean they will be able to ignore the voice of my constituents. I will be joined by Kentuckians who have had to travel hundreds of miles just to get here.

One of them is Jimmy Rose, the former coal miner from Pineville who rose to national attention with his song: “Coal Keeps the Lights On.” As Jimmy puts it: “Coal keeps the bills paid, clothes on the backs, and shoes on the feet.” And that is true for so many in our State.

I will note the irony that the administration’s so-called listening session in Atlanta had to switch locations due to a significant power outage.

As one person put it, the power outage is either cruel irony or a glimpse of coming cruel reality; that is, of course, if the Obama administration and the EPA are successful in their quest to end the use of affordable, reliable coal. It is hard to disagree.

The point is the President’s extreme energy regulations are little more than a political turnout strategy masquerading as a serious environmental policy. Not only could they end up making the environment worse rather than better but they threaten to hurt countless middle-class families in the process while shipping American jobs overseas.

So they need to be stopped. The administration needs to be stopped. Kentuckians aren’t going to take this lying down. We are going to keep fighting back.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2569, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2569) to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 3693, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3694 (to amendment No. 3693), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 3695, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3696 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 3695), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 3697 (to amendment No. 3696), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I am going to be joined shortly on the floor by Senator JOHN WALSH of Montana and Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan, who are going to speak to the bill that is pending before us.

Until they arrive I wish to set the context here. We are trying to create incentives in the Tax Code to bring good-paying manufacturing jobs back to the United States, to incentivize companies that will bring jobs from their overseas facilities back into our country and put Americans to work. How we pay for it is we reduce the current subsidies which we give to American companies to ship jobs overseas. Pretty simple.

So the vote really comes down to the question of whether Democrats and Republicans in the Senate want to create an incentive in the Tax Code to keep jobs—good-paying jobs—in America, to build the workforce in America so that they have a future, and to discourage shipping American jobs overseas. I don’t know what the debate is about. I don’t know what Republican can go to a town meeting in any State in the Union and argue that this is not a good idea. It is a very important idea, and it is one that we want to use to repopulate the United States with good-paying jobs and hard-working families getting the kind of money they deserve.

We are in the midst of a debate now—a national debate that has touched the State of Illinois—about something called inversion. Most people are not familiar with that term. It is a situation where, at least on paper, an American company moves its headquarters and operations to a foreign country to avoid paying American taxes. We have major companies that are doing that. Some are considering making that move. The President spoke to it last week, and I think the President hit the nail on the head. It isn't a question of whether it is legal; it is a question of whether it is right.

Is it right for a pharmaceutical company that is dependent on the Federal Government to build their company, build their products, and build their profitability, to walk away from their tax responsibilities in America? You don't put a successful drug on the market unless it starts with research, and most research begins with our government. The National Institutes of Health, for about \$30 billion a year, does basic research that leads to new discoveries, new drugs. Those efforts of basic research are converted into pharmaceuticals and drugs that are then developed by these private companies.

When the private companies think they have finally found the right combination, they have to submit their drug to the Food and Drug Administration, which is a regulatory agency in Washington that tests their drug to make sure that it doesn't harm people and that it performs as promised. It takes some time. It takes a lot of taxpayer money. But when the Food and Drug Administration then hands down its decision that your drug is safe to go on the market, you have just received the most amazing endorsement possible in the world for a drug—that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has approved it for sale in the United States of America. That is a ticket to success and profitability, but that isn't the end. You have to protect your right in that drug, and to protect it you go to the U.S. Patent Office and make sure there is a registration that protects your legal right to make a profit on that drug and keep others from duplicating it at your expense.

Look at the process that led to the profitability of these blockbuster drugs—National Institutes of Health research, taxpayer funded; Food and Drug Administration approval, taxpayer funded; Patent Office protection, taxpayer funded.

Now major pharmaceuticals are saying: Well, it sure would be nice to stay in America, but what we are going to do is move our corporate headquarters to a European country or perhaps to the island of Jersey—which I am not sure I could find on the map—and in doing so, we won't have to pay as much in Federal taxes to America.

Is that ingratitude? It certainly is. You have used all these Federal agen-

cies to become profitable, and now you walk away from your Federal tax responsibility.

There is another side to this coin. When these companies invert and move overseas, the tax they don't pay is a burden shifted to other American companies and other American taxpayers. They are getting off the hook for American taxes, but they are pushing the burden on to others.

We have to come to grips with the reality that many major companies are using global commerce and global opportunities at the expense of America. We have to encourage good-paying jobs in this country and companies that stay in this country. In our Tax Code we need to reward American-based companies headquartered in America, with their jobs in America, paying a good wage, good benefits, and veteran preferences. Give them a break in the Tax Code. Don't subsidize companies that want to move their jobs overseas.

The bill before us gets to that basic question: Should our Tax Code incentivize bringing jobs back from overseas or should it incentivize and encourage shipping jobs overseas? It is a simple vote, and I hope it is overwhelmingly positive and bipartisan when it comes before us.

We know our country can grow with the right encouragement because we are lucky. For those of us who were born here, we were born into one of the strongest democracies in history. We were born into an economic system that creates opportunity for those who are educated and trained and strive to improve themselves. We also know we have a responsibility here in the Senate, in the House, and in the White House to create a tax climate and an economic climate for that kind of growth. That is what we are trying to do with this bill—give a fair shot for American companies so they can bring jobs home and be incentivized and rewarded to do it and discourage the companies that do just the opposite.

I think this is a front-and-center issue. Good-paying jobs are the key to restoring the middle class in America—something I think is long overdue to create an incentive for people who are struggling to see at the end of that rainbow the chance to raise a family in a good neighborhood and a good church and parish and a good State that really helps America.

I will be supporting this measure before the Senate this morning.

I yield the floor and suggest that during the quorum call the time be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETURNING AUSTIN TICE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks about the ongoing humanitarian crisis that is occurring on our southern border in Texas. I have spoken on this subject a number of times. Before I do that, I would like to say a word about a decorated U.S. Marine Corps veteran, an award-winning journalist, and a courageous seventh-generation Texan by the name of Austin Tice.

In 2012 Austin went to Syria as a civilian. He went to report on the brutal civil war that has now claimed the lives of more than 170,000 Syrians, caused a huge refugee crisis in Turkey, Lebanon, and in other countries in that region and has destabilized that entire region. Austin was a strong believer in the freedom of the press and the importance of letting his fellow countrymen know what was happening in the Syrian civil war.

During his time in Syria his works were published in The Washington Post and the McClatchy News, among other news outlets.

On August 14, 2012, he was kidnapped and no one has heard from him since. His family is understandably concerned about his well-being and his whereabouts. It has been nearly 2 years and his family and friends still have no idea where he is, who is holding him or what they might want in exchange for his freedom.

I once again call on the Obama administration to do whatever they can, through the resources the Federal Government has, to locate and safely return Austin Tice to his family.

I say once again to Austin's family: We have not given up. We will never give up until we find your son and bring him safely home.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 1 month ago President Obama gave an interview with ABC News in which he was asked about the massive influx of unaccompanied minors—mainly from Central America—who are crossing the southwestern American border, most notably into Texas where we have seen 57,000 unaccompanied children since October.

Unless any of my colleagues think this problem will just go away, let me remind everyone some of the projections are that if we don't do anything to deal with the causes or deal with the remedy to this growing humanitarian problem, it will get worse. Indeed, some estimates are that as many as 90,000 unaccompanied minors will come this year alone, and the number could well rise to 145,000 next year. That would tend to track the historical trend we have seen—both the combination of the impression that the Obama

administration is less than serious about enforcing our immigration laws, as well as this loophole in the 2008 human trafficking law that is being exploited by the cartels which is helping them make money. This is part of their business model because they charge by the head, by the child, by the person, and then they bring them through these smuggling corridors from Central America, through Mexico, into South Texas. It is a great business model for them.

The problem is it is a horrific experience for the immigrants who subject themselves to the tender mercies of the cartels that care nothing about them as human beings. They rape the women, kidnap the migrants, and then hold them for ransom. We know—because of the perils of that journey on the top of that train called *The Beast*—that many immigrants are severely injured, some losing limbs, and others are killed or die from exposure as a result of the process from Central America.

I say to my colleagues who think doing nothing is an option that people are losing their lives, people are being injured, and women are being assaulted. These migrants are being held for ransom and kidnapped. It is not compassionate to allow this to continue, but that is what illegal immigration looks like in 2014.

For those people who come into the country legally, they obviously don't have to turn themselves over to the cartels—these transnational criminal organizations that traffic in drugs and people. These drug cartels are despicable and they will prey on these migrants and those who want to come to the United States. As long as it happens outside of the legal system, they are going to continue to be victimized.

About 1 month ago the President said: "The problem is that under current law, once these kids come across the border, there's a system in which we're supposed to process them, take care of them, until we can send them back."

That is what the President of the United States said 1 month ago. Of course he was referring to a 2008 law that I referenced earlier and has been talked about a number of times. This was a law that was passed by essentially unanimous consent and acclimation. It was a human trafficking law, but unfortunately what we didn't know at the time is that the creative minds of the cartels would learn to exploit a loophole in the law, which treats migrants, particularly unaccompanied children, from contiguous countries differently than we treat migrant children coming from Mexico.

Specifically what happens is they are released after being processed by the Border Patrol, and they are given a notice to appear at a future court date. They are then released into the cus-

tody of a family member, many of whom are not legally present in the United States themselves. What we have seen from experience is that many of them don't show up for their court hearings. We don't have sufficient resources committed to make sure people do appear, so they melt into the great American landscape and have essentially succeeded in coming to the United States—outside of our legal immigration system—and staying here. As long as this loophole continues to exist, they will keep coming.

The President was referring to this human trafficking statute that has become an effective magnet for illegal immigration, and it is not just children who are taking advantage of it. I talked to the Secretary of Homeland Security yesterday morning. We have seen a huge surge in parents with young children as well. They are exploiting the same loophole because we don't have adequate detention facilities to keep them safe pending any court hearing and pending repatriation back to their country of origin unless they have a valid claim for asylum or some other claim for immigration relief.

The loophole that is in the 2008 law is effectively part of the cartel business model. We have colleagues who believe the compassionate response is to do nothing to close that loophole, and I hope they will come to understand it is the opposite of compassion to allow this loophole to exist and allow the cartels to continue to use these children and other migrants as a commodity by smuggling them into the United States.

This situation has also overloaded the capacity of many of our local communities that have big hearts and want to treat these migrants, particularly the children, with compassion, but they have become overwhelmed. We have seen, as these children have been warehoused in other parts of the country, many communities are starting to feel the backlash. While people have big hearts and believe we ought to try to help people in need, particularly children, they realize that ultimately they are the ones who will have to pick up the tab for health care, education, and the like.

They are also concerned about whether they will actually be able to assimilate these immigrants, which has always been the American way, and the way we have done that is through legal immigration and an orderly immigration process which complies with the rule of law.

We are a nation of immigrants and we should be proud of that, but we should not be proud of this uncontrolled flow of people coming into the country, exploiting this gap in the 2008 law, making money for the cartels, and exposing these migrants to horrific treatment, some of whom don't even

make it here. We should not consider that compassion; it is not. It is the opposite of compassion. We ought to try to do something to fix it, and we have it within our capacity to do so.

Earlier this week the White House Domestic Policy Council Director Cecilia Munoz said the administration was "absolutely interested" in reforming this law to create an efficient repatriation process for the unaccompanied minors. Good for them. I hope that is the case, but unfortunately I get the sense that the people who understand this gap in this 2008 law—this flaw or this loophole—have not been able to win the argument with the political folks at the White House who don't want to be seen repatriating these children back to their home country because they are worried about the upcoming election.

Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson has repeatedly emphasized to me in private as well as publicly the need to change this law and to establish a more efficient system of removal to one's home country.

To be sure, there are going to be valid claims for asylum. If someone is a victim of human trafficking, they can get a T visa, they call it, so they can cooperate with law enforcement in the United States. If you are like the young boy whom I saw in McAllen, TX, 2 weeks ago—I asked him where his parents were. He said they were dead. That young boy could qualify for a special immigrant visa as a minor child having been abandoned or who is an orphan. So there are ways valid claims for relief can be processed, but right now these claims are not being made because people are just melting into the great American landscape, and they keep coming.

So Jeh Johnson understands this, Cecilia Munoz said she understands this, and the President has said he understands it, and it has also had bipartisan support. The senior Senator from Missouri Mrs. MCCASKILL has acknowledged this issue, the senior Senator from Delaware, who happens to be chairman of the Homeland Security Committee Senator CARPER, and the junior Senator from West Virginia Mr. MANCHIN have all publicly acknowledged it, as well as Democratic representatives in the border district in Arizona, and the No. 3 Member of the House Democratic leadership. All of them have acknowledged what the problem is and what we need to do to fix it.

Let's review: President Obama described the border situation as a crisis, and I agree with that; it is. He described the 2008 law, which I have talked about, as a problem, which it is. Some leading Republicans and leading Democrats and senior members of the administration believe that reforming this 2008 law is part of the solution and would help resolve the crisis, which it

would. They called upon Congress to make the necessary changes, which we should.

At a time of intense political gridlock in Washington, we actually do have some bipartisan agreement on what we need to do to help address the problem. Yet none of these critical reforms can happen in the Senate unless the majority leader allows a vote on the bill I anticipate will come over from the House which will contain a solution to this problem. We have seen a bipartisan group of political leaders contend it is necessary, if we are actually going to address it, but so far my impression is the majority leader is not going to allow us to have that vote.

Indeed, the majority leader, the majority whip, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee have all said they reject the need for changing this 2008 law that I have described. The majority leader has gone so far as to say the border is secure. It may look secure from Nevada, where he is from, but it is not secure in Texas, where I live, and it just defies reality.

I wish the majority leader and the President would actually come visit the border. I wish they would visit these processing centers, meet these children, and congratulate the Border Patrol for doing a great job under very difficult circumstances, but so far they have declined. I hope they will reconsider.

Ms. COLLINS, the Senator from Maine, is getting a bipartisan codet to go down to McAllen on Friday, and I look forward to accompanying her on that trip. But if people can make that one trip—at least one trip—they would learn for themselves that the border is not secure.

This isn't a trick. Sometimes I get the feeling that some of my friends in the Senate think we are going to always claim the border is insecure, so we are never going to do the other parts of immigration reform that they want to do or that need to be done. As a matter of fact, in 2011 the President notably said: Well, people won't be satisfied until we create a moat and fill it full of alligators. He ridiculed those who said the border is not secure. Yet last year alone 414,000 people were detained on the southwestern border, 414,000 from 100 different countries—100 different countries—most of them admittedly from Mexico and Central America and South America.

But people should come visit in Falfurrias, TX. They have a Border Patrol stop there where many migrants are let out of the vehicle by their coyote, which is a human smuggler, and forced to walk around this checkpoint in 100-degree-plus weather. Colleagues will find that some of them die from exposure. People can imagine coming from Central America or South America and coming in that hot weather under those conditions. Some of them

literally die. So the Border Patrol has established rescue beacons, they call them, where if the immigrant says "I have to get some help," they can actually hit the button on this rescue beacon, and the Border Patrol will come and find them and make sure they get some medical care. Those rescue beacons are in English, they are in Spanish, and they are in Chinese. I assure my colleagues there are not many native Chinese speakers in Brooks County, TX.

The point is, to anybody who will listen, the border is not secure. It is a national security challenge in addition to our other issues.

I ask people to talk to GEN John Kelly, who is head of Southern Command, who says right now 75 percent of the illegal drug traffic coming from Central and South America into the United States—they have to sit and watch because they don't have the adequate resources to stop it. It is the same cartels that are smuggling those drugs that are the criminal organizations that are smuggling the people. They are trafficking in human beings, and they will transport any commodity, any weapon, any person, anything into the United States as long as they can make money off of it. It is just the way they do business.

It is enormously frustrating to hear the majority leader declare the border is secure in spite of the facts and in spite of the bipartisan acknowledgment that we need to fix this 2008 loophole in order to help solve this problem. But there are people who have shown some courage, people such as Secretary Johnson and others, other Democrats who have said, despite the majority leader's pronouncement that we should actually do something, we should actually solve the problem, and we have it within our ability to do that.

I wish to particularly acknowledge the courage of my friend and colleague HENRY CUELLAR from Texas. He is a proud blue dog Democrat, as he reminds me almost every time I see him, and he has partnered with me in bipartisan bicameral legislation that would actually fix this flaw in the 2008 law. If we could just get a vote on it here in the Senate, maybe we would have a chance to fix the problem and do what the President acknowledged was the problem in the first place.

I am hopeful we can achieve a breakthrough, but we have about 2 more days that we will be in session before the August recess. My constituents back home don't understand why in the world we would leave without fixing this problem, without addressing this humanitarian crisis, because they see the numbers as we see the numbers. They are going to continue to grow and the crisis will get worse unless we act in a sensible way.

The only way we are going to get that breakthrough is if we get some

leadership here in the Senate and the majority leader allows a vote on either what the House is going to send us on Thursday or allow an amendment, which I am proud to offer, which has broad support here in the Senate.

But leadership requires more than just giving a speech or an interview and then heading off to the next fundraiser. It requires thoughtful, persistent engagement and a willingness to spend political capital.

We know all of this is controversial. We get that. But it strikes me that when you are getting attacked from the right and the left, that means you are probably doing something that could at least have the potential for being a bipartisan consensus, which, as we know, is the only way anything gets done here because none of us get everything we want. I would love it if I could get everything I want, but that is not democracy. That is not our system. That is not our constitutional form of government.

I hope the President would tell the majority leader that he believes this 2008 law is a problem, as he said a month ago on ABC News, and I hope he will offer support for his own Secretary of Homeland Security, who I know understands the nature of the problem, but unfortunately I fear he is being outvoted by the political advisers at the White House, not the people making public policy.

The folks in my State and particularly in the region of South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley are watching and waiting and hoping that Washington will act to resolve this ongoing crisis. But we can't act unless the majority leader allows us to act. That is the nature of this institution. He won't allow a vote unless President Obama steps up and leads in order to do what he has acknowledged is the right thing to do and what we must do in order to address this problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MEDICARE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly about Medicare.

Before 1965, as the Presiding Officer and many others in the Chamber know, nearly half of America's seniors had no health insurance at all. Medicare made certain that seniors had access to affordable health care, and it has lifted millions out of poverty in this country.

Seniors earn their Medicare benefits; they are not given to them. Seniors earn their Medicare benefits through a lifetime of hard work because, as we know, for all of our working lives a portion of every single paycheck is deposited and is guaranteed for benefits for when we turn 65. This is a bedrock commitment. We pay into it and it should be there for all of us when we reach the age of 65.

Today we celebrate the 49th anniversary of Medicare, but I encourage my

colleagues to hold the balloons and cake because over the past few years what we have seen down the hall in the House of Representatives is a group of House Members who try to continually chip away at the promise of Medicare. They want to turn Medicare into a voucher system. They even tried to raise the eligibility age.

These proposals in effect shift the cost on to those who can least afford to pay it. They will increase out-of-pocket expenses for our seniors on benefits such as wellness visits, cancer screenings, and lifesaving drugs. These plans will allow insurance companies to cherry pick who they want to cover, setting off a premium spiral that would leave sicker seniors with higher premiums and higher costs, leaving many American seniors without the care they need and the protection they have earned.

These proposals we see coming out of the House of Representatives undermine the integrity of the program. I think it is important for us in the Senate to not allow them to put the health and financial security of our seniors in jeopardy. That is why I have introduced the Medicare Protection Act. It is a responsible commonsense solution. It prevents budget schemes that would reduce Medicare benefits and restrict eligibility, and it sends a strong message that Medicare should not be dismantled, privatized, or turned into a voucher system.

The promise of Medicare is one we must keep. The Senate should pass the Medicare Protection Act. I ask that we keep Medicare strong and affordable for today's seniors and for future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I applaud and commend my friend the Senator from Arkansas. This is very visionary legislation. I support what he is doing, and we are going to do everything we can to move forward on this legislation. We would do it more quickly except we have a few problems with people over here. So we are going to do our best.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JILL A. PRYOR TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United

States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell, Jack Reed, Bill Nelson, Elizabeth Warren, Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Barbara Boxer, Tom Harkin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senators COONS, SESSIONS, STABENOW, and WALSH be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the cloture vote on S. 2569, with Senator COONS being the first to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

PARTNERSHIP WITH AFRICA

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have never been more optimistic about Africa and about the potential for a U.S. partnership with Africa than I am today.

Every year I host a conference in my home State of Delaware called "Opportunity: Africa" that brings together Delawareans and Africans, leaders from across our country and from the continent interested in building and strengthening new ties. Every year it has grown in participation, in the scope of issues we have looked at, and in the number of Delaware businesses interested in the opportunities in this continent of 54 countries. At this past March's conference, President Clinton delivered the keynote.

The hunger to build new relationships between business, government,

the faith community, and those in the African diaspora is undeniable. What is required of us is to think anew and dedicate ourselves to building partnerships of mutuality and that last. In this Chamber that will mean passing a reauthorized African Growth and Opportunity Act that does more to encourage and facilitate real two-way trade than the current law and to take up and pass the bipartisan Power Africa law that will strengthen investment in infrastructure and in electricity across the continent.

Next week it means coming together with Africa's government and business leaders to forge new relationships built on mutual respect and the opportunities we share.

I urge my colleagues and my friends throughout the business community to seize this opportunity and focus on the bright future it could create. An Africa that trades with us, that can defend itself, that can secure itself, and that empowers its citizens is the Africa we see, and that is an Africa which we in the United States are uniquely suited to help its people build. We have already built a powerful foundation for partnership through our investments in public health and education, clean water, democracy, and good governance.

After 50 years in the Peace Corp and more than a decade of PEPFAR—President Bush's groundbreaking commitment to combating HIV and AIDS—we are better regarded in Africa than in anywhere else in the world. From our universities, to our businesses, to our military training and partnerships, to the vibrant Africa diaspora community spread throughout this land, we have tools no other Nation has. The opportunity for progress is extraordinary. By helping to build a broad and sustainable middle class across this continent, American workers and businesses will have more people to sell their products to and more markets in which to invest. The more we partner with African businesses, the stronger they will become.

Genuine partnerships such as this must be the foundation for our relationships with Africa going forward, and we have a lot to gain as well.

As many have commented, in the last decade 6 out of 10 of the fastest growing economies in the world have been in Africa, and that number will only rise. Other countries have noticed the opportunity. China's exports to Africa, for instance, have outgrown ours 3 to 1 since 2000, and 5 years ago China eclipsed us as Africa's largest trading partner. So it is no surprise that since 2000, China has hosted five summits with African heads of state. Let's be clear, the Chinese, in seeking opportunities for this century, will not miss the "next China." So we have a lot of ground to make up.

It is also critical we recognize that we should not just mimic the ways in

which the Chinese are seeking opportunity in Africa. They bring a policy of nonintervention in domestic affairs. We bring American values—a focus on democracy, on governance, on human rights, as well as the attractiveness of our technology, our resources, and the relationship with our diaspora community.

This week we have had remarkable opportunities for our President, our Secretary of State, and several of us from this Chamber to meet with young African leaders as part of a program that brought 500 inspiring young African leaders to Washington.

Next week we will welcome more than 40 heads of state from across the continent—a summit that I hope signals the next big step in building strong and sustainable partnerships throughout the continent.

President Obama, leaders from this Chamber, leaders from the Cabinet, and from across America's corporate community will join for 3 days to allow us to refocus our efforts on the continent, to seize this moment, and to move forward. It is my hope that this Chamber, this Congress, will take advantage of the opportunity to enact the African Growth and Opportunity Act on a longer reauthorization and to open it to truly balanced trade, and pass the bipartisan Power Africa Act to significantly improve our investment in infrastructure.

The opportunities are limitless. It is my hope that we will but seize them.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today's Wall Street Journal has an article that should send shivers through every Member of this body. The article reports on what the President is planning to do with regard to executive amnesty, using Executive orders to do that which Congress has refused to do.

The article says this:

For months, President Barack Obama said there were limits to his power to protect people living illegally in the U.S. from deportation. Now, he is considering broad action to scale back deportations that could include work permits for millions of people, according to lawmakers and immigration advocates who have consulted with the White House.

The President has been meeting regularly with immigration activists and he has been promising them things that he has no power to promise. He has promised them things that constitutionally he is not able to do, and this Congress needs to say no to that. We can do that by simply barring the expenditure of money in the future to execute such a scheme.

Congressman BLACKBURN in the House has offered legislation, and Senator CRUZ in the Senate has offered legislation, which would do just that.

But it is not in the bill we are being asked to provide cloture on that will come up in a few minutes.

The article goes on to say—just to stress the stark nature of what is being considered—

The shift in White House thinking came after House Republicans said they wouldn't take up immigration legislation. . . .

So the President is saying: I have legislation and the House will not pass it, therefore, I am going to do it myself. It is one of the most pathetic excuses for abuse of power by a court or a President that you can imagine. Congress considered his legislation. He promoted it strongly. Members of both parties have advocated for it. But the House considered it and rejected it. That is an action. That is a decision by the House of Representatives. The President has no power to go beyond that, and I think this Congress—this Senate—has a responsibility to speak to that question and to avoid an issue. The Wall Street Journal goes on to say:

An announcement is expected soon after Labor Day, an administration official said.

They are going to announce this within weeks. The article goes on to say that it could involve 5 million people or more, and the President said himself he would "fix as much of our immigration system as I can on my own, without Congress"—without Congress. I will just use my pen. I will just order my officers, who work for me, you know. The Border Patrol, the ICE officers, they work for me. I will just tell them to do A, B, and C. We will just not pay any attention to the fact that plain law, section 274 of the INA, says that a person in the country unlawfully is not entitled to work.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. He will just do that on his own.

So we are now being asked to move forward on legislation that provides no opportunity to even get a vote on this issue. Certainly its text does not fix this problem.

Let me be plain, colleagues. There are times when we have to rise above politics. Maybe somebody believes in amnesty, and they would like to see this happen, but we cannot acquiesce in having the President unilaterally do so in an unlawful fashion.

The truth is that the people who are refusing to bring language up of this kind and fix it—what they want is to see the President do this. They are for it, they are supporting it, and they have rejected any action, so far at least, to defend the rule of law, defend the Senate, defend the entire Congress's legitimate powers. It is just breathtaking to me.

So let me again say, colleagues, we need to take action. This Congress

needs to speak. We cannot allow Executive orders to be issued by a President who eradicates plain law. To do so is wrong. The American people are watching this. They are not going to be happy that the Congress did not take action. Expressions of concern among Senators are not enough. We need to bring this up.

But Senator REID, I predict, is not going to allow that to happen, and he is going to be supported by every Member of his Democratic Conference. And every Member of the Democratic Conference, every Member who supports him in this plan, will be, in fact, involved and supportive of the President's plan.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first I would ask the Presiding Officer if he could notify me after I have spoken for 4 of my 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Presiding Officer.

In a few moments we are going to be voting on a very fundamental principle and a very important bill that is literally about bringing jobs home to America. The question before us is, Are we going to begin to change the incentives in the Tax Code where instead of incentivizing jobs being shipped overseas, we are going to support our companies that are bringing jobs home?

This is a no-brainer. I think anybody listening to this debate, anyone across America who is focused in, would say: Why were you not even just having a voice vote and everybody voting yes and then go on to the next tax policy, like inversion, that we need to be dealing with that will keep jobs in America?

Unfortunately, we have had to go through a lot of procedures, motions to proceed. We are now having to go through a supermajority vote here to get to the final bill. I hope colleagues will join us in a bipartisan way to vote to get to the final vote on this bill so we can make it very clear we are on the side of American workers and American businesses.

Here is what we have seen in the last few years, as shown on this chart. In the last decade we have lost 2.4 million jobs being shipped overseas. Now that, by the way, does not count the ones that are leaving on paper right now, which is a whole other story. That is something we need to be deeply concerned about and speaking out about and calling people out on it. But these are the jobs where they are packing up shop and moving overseas.

To add insult to injury, not only does a worker lose their job, the community loses the factory or the business, but we as American taxpayers foot the bill for the move.

Now, that is shocking. When you explain to people that is in the Tax Code—yes, when you pack up shop, you do all the moving, you ship your jobs overseas, you can write that off on your taxes and we all pay for it—they probably look at us like we are crazy. And they are right. We have been trying to close this now for the last few years. This is the opportunity in just a few moments to have that vote to get it done.

What are we going to be voting on specifically? It is very simple: end the taxpayer subsidies that pay for moving costs of corporations to ship jobs overseas. On the other hand, if you want to bring your jobs home, we will gladly allow you to write off the costs of bringing jobs home. On top of that, we will give an additional 20-percent tax credit for the costs of moving production back to the United States.

The good news is we actually have companies, for a variety of reasons, that are moving jobs home. We want to applaud them. There are a lot of reasons for that in a global economy: shipping costs, low natural gas costs that we want to keep low so we have affordable energy and we continue to bring manufacturing back. We have the most productive, skilled workforce in the world. There are a lot of reasons why companies now are bringing jobs home.

But a lot of companies are right on the edge. They look at the Tax Code, and they are making decisions about whether they are going to move overseas or stay, whether they are going to bring jobs home. The bill we are voting on—and I want to thank Senator WALSH for his leadership. He has been a passionate advocate in talking about it from a Montana perspective. And the two great M States are involved here—Montana and Michigan. We both understand deeply about the fact that you are not going to have a middle class unless you make things in America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has now consumed approximately 4 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, thank you very much.

We have to make things and grow things, and this is about making sure it is in America when we make things and grow things so we have a middle class. But the reality is we have to start in the Tax Code by making it clear we are not going to incentivize moving your jobs overseas. We are not going to incentivize somebody packing up—and, by the way, oftentimes those workers end up having to train their replacement. We have many stories in Michigan where the replacement workers in another country are flown into our country and trained by our people, to take their jobs; and then, to add insult to injury, they pay for the move through the Tax Code. So it is very simple.

I am going to turn to Senator WALSH to close off this debate. But we have a

very simple message. If you want to bring your jobs home, we are all in. You can write off the cost of that move and we will give you an extra 20-percent tax cut. But if you want to ship your jobs overseas, you are on your own.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I rise today to thank my Senate colleagues for joining with American workers and voting overwhelmingly to consider the Bring Jobs Home Act. I want to particularly thank my colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, for her tremendous leadership and work on behalf of America's working families.

The vote last week was a procedural vote, but it was an important signal that job creation here at home can be a bipartisan issue. I am a strong believer in reaching across the aisle to promote good ideas. We are not here to represent our parties, we are here to represent our constituents. I made a promise to Montanans that I will support good ideas from anyone and any party as long as they grow our economy and create jobs.

Unfortunately, since I joined the Senate 5 months ago, what I have mostly seen in Washington is the opposite. What I have seen in Washington are people playing games. Washington is not broken because there are not good ideas out there; Washington is broken because not enough people reach across the aisle to find common ground. I have insisted from the start that the Bring Jobs Home Act is a bill that both Republicans and Democrats can get behind. We must not let partisan politics and gamesmanship jam up the process.

The American economy is recovering from the long and deep recession. Many Americans are still out of work and are desperately seeking the stability and security that comes with a job and a reliable paycheck. I am committed to leveling the playing field for American workers.

It is time for us to come together and show American workers we are fighting for them, for their jobs, for their families, and for a better economy.

I have heard from some of my colleagues who have commented on the floor that we should only consider the Bring Jobs Home Act in the context of comprehensive tax reform. That is not good enough. The answer to disagreements is not to do nothing, the answer is to start with manageable, common-sense reforms that everyone can get behind.

Montanans understand this. They know it is wrong that American workers subsidize corporations' decisions to pack up businesses in the United States and send our jobs packing. Imagine an American worker whose final task before being laid off is to

help shut down operations so his job or her job can be sent overseas. That is baloney. If Congress cannot come together to end that subsidy, then we deserve the low approval ratings we are receiving.

Millions of American jobs have been sent overseas in recent decades. Too many large corporations have opened factories in countries such as China or Mexico while closing factories right here in the United States. We need to do what we can to stem the tide and reward companies that bring jobs back to America.

The Bring Jobs Home Act will help do that. My bill closes the loophole that some multinational corporations use to claim a tax deduction for the cost of moving jobs overseas. It also creates a new 20-percent tax credit for companies that bring jobs back to the United States. These two parts complement each other. The first ends the incentive for shipping jobs overseas. The second encourages the return of jobs we have already lost.

Our Tax Code should not reward outsourcing. What we need is more insourcing. Many companies are considering bringing jobs back home today. This is especially true in the manufacturing sector. The Bring Jobs Home Act could make a difference for some of those companies to reinvest in America and American workers. So today I urge my colleagues to stand with America's workers and pass this bill. Now is the time for leadership to embrace good ideas that help create jobs in Montana and all across America.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

Harry Reid, John E. Walsh, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Kay R. Hagan, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bill Nelson, John D. Rockefeller IV, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jeff Merkley, Mazie Hirono, Tom Harkin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42 as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Landrieu	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Walsh
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Ayotte	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Begich	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Roberts
McCain	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bill Nelson, John D. Rockefeller IV, Mazie Hirono, Tom Harkin, Bernard Sanders, Richard Blumenthal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Grassley	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Heller	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Rubio
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Corker	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—33

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Hagan	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Landrieu	Toomey
Enzi	Lee	Vitter
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Roberts
McCain	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 63 and the nays are 33. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CYNTHIA H. AKUETTEH, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE GABONESE REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

NOMINATION OF ERIKA LIZABETH MORITSUGU TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NOMINATION OF RICHARD A. KENNEDY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nominations of Cynthia H. Akuetteh, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United State of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe; Erika Elizabeth Moritsugu, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and Richard A. Kennedy, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority for a term expiring May 30, 2016.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all available debate time with respect to the nominations in this series be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AKUETTEH NOMINATION

Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Cynthia H. Akuetteh, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and

Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MORITSUGU NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Erika Lizabeth Moritsugu, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON KENNEDY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard A. Kennedy, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority for a term expiring May 30, 2016?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Maryland.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to speak on the pending business before the Senate.

The Senate just achieved cloture on the motion to proceed to the emergency supplemental funding bill. Let me explain to the people who are watching this either in the gallery or on C-SPAN.

The Senate has creaky rules, and these creaky rules are to make sure we can cool the passions that may be raging in the Nation at any given time so we can duly give consideration, that debate can be diligent and we won't be gripped by the fire of the moment or the passion of the motion. I appreciate that. However, now these rules require us to take a lot of time to get to the meat of the matter.

We are now debating a motion to proceed to legislation related to supplementing existing funding to meet new emerging crises. The Senate votes on a motion to proceed not to the bill itself but on whether we should even go to the bill. So what we are de-

bating now is whether we should proceed to the emergency supplemental funding bill. I want to say yes. Yes, vote on the motion to proceed. Let's get on with it. Let's have a real debate on real issues. Thirty hours has been set aside to debate whether we should proceed. I am here to say let's proceed, let's yield back our time, and let's get on the bill. We have a lot of things we need to get done in the next 48 hours. I want to see this emergency supplemental funding bill debated and voted on.

We have three elements in this bill that meet compelling needs—need for our neighbors in our country; need for our treasured ally, the State of Israel; as well as need for a crisis at the border where children literally are marching across Central America in search of refugee status. We need to deal with all three of these issues.

This emergency funding bill is about neighbor helping neighbor.

First of all, it is about our own country. Wildfires are raging in the West. Over the last year 39 States have faced wildfires. Right this very minute eight Western States are coping with unbelievable wildfires, some of the largest fires in their history. What happens? Vast amounts of territory are going up in smoke. We are losing towns, businesses, homes. Our firefighters are worn out, as well as our first responders, and they need help. This legislation will provide \$615 million to the States facing this horrific Armageddon-like emergency.

In addition, this legislation includes \$225 million to replenish the rockets that are being used by Israel, deploying technology called the Iron Dome. The Iron Dome is a missile defense system that is destroying the rockets being sent into Israel by Hamas. The technology is working, but they are using up the rockets and they need to be replenished.

Then there is the humanitarian crisis at our border. We have \$2.7 billion to meet the needs of children seeking refuge, in order to be able to deal with placing them while we determine their legal status but also being able to fight the crime of the narcotraffickers and the human traffickers who are creating this surge of children.

This is a total emergency funding level of \$3.57 billion. Why do we call it an emergency? Well, because under the law we can't just say this is an emergency. In order to get emergency funding, we have to meet the criteria of the Budget Control Act of 2011. The need has to be urgent. It has to be temporary. It has to be unforeseen. It is either to prevent the loss of life or in the interests of our national security. All three of these areas of funding meet this need.

Under emergency funding, there are no offsets. That means we don't take from another important program being

funded by the U.S. Government to meet that need. So in order to meet the needs of Iron Dome, we don't take from other national defense money. It will replenish that. When we help with wildfires, we don't take from other important areas, such as agriculture or interior or from other bills. This will help to not only meet the need but also not place an additional burden on other communities.

Now I wish to speak about the urgency. This firefighting help is really needed now. We listened to the Senators from Western States. We see the photographs literally showing parts of our country going up in smoke. The Forest Service—the agency that actually is in charge of dealing with this—will run out of money in August. As I said, last year these wildfires burned in 39 States.

Then we look at Iron Dome. Hamas—this violent terrorist organization that actually rejects Israel's right to even exist—from its tunnels is showering Israel with rockets. Iron Dome, Arrow Head, and David's Sling are missile defense systems designed to help them. The up-close missile defense system is Iron Dome. This bill will make sure we replace the interceptor rockets that are being used to protect them against this showering of rockets. The Israeli Embassy spoke to my staff yesterday. There have been over 2,000 Hamas rockets fired in the last week. Israel needs to replenish these rockets.

Then there is the issue of the surge of unaccompanied children presenting themselves at our border, asking for refugee status. In order to really be able to meet this crisis—and they are coming in by the thousands; 59,000 kids have come this year. We know the immigration and customs service, if we don't meet this emergency funding, will run out of money in August. Border Patrol will run out of money in early September. That doesn't mean the Border Patrol agents or the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents will stop working; it means the Department of Homeland Security—22 agencies—will take money out of existing funds to fund this. So it means they could take money out of Federal emergency management just as we are going into hurricane season, just as we are in high tornado season. We could be taking money out of FEMA to put it in Border Patrol unless we do this emergency funding. We have to do it.

Health and Human Services runs out of money in August. They are the ones in charge when the children present themselves while their legal status is being determined. The children must be taken care of in a humane way, the American way. We don't treat children in an abusive manner. It means we will feed them, we will clothe them, we will shelter them, we will meet any emergency health needs they have, and we need to do that while we determine their legal status.

My bill—the supplemental I am presenting—helps accelerate the determination of their legal status. My legislation and this supplemental spending actually provide more immigration judges and legal representation for the children. That is so we can quickly determine if they have a right to asylum while we are also taking care of them. We need to be able to do that.

I hope others will get the briefings that I had and visit the border the way I did to find this out. The reason we have a crisis at the border is because we have a crisis in Central America. This legislation provides the money to do this. People say root causes such as poverty have been going on for years. This doesn't only deal with poverty. We want to work with the governments of Central America to really go after the narcotraffickers, the human traffickers, and the coyotes engaged in smuggling.

Why do we want to do that? If we ask these children where are the home towns they are from, they will give us the names of little cities and little towns, and when we look at their poverty rate, we find the poverty rate in these communities has been consistent for a number of years. That is a sad circumstance. But when we look at the crime rate, the murder rate, the recruitment into violent gangs, the recruitment into human trafficking, with the threat of death or torture—that is where these kids are coming from.

We have to go after the criminals in Central America and not treat these children as though they are criminals. We cannot treat children in this country as though they are the criminals. We need to go after the real criminals in Central America using our assets and working with the assets in Central America. They have programs and they have plans. Honduras is a great example of what they are trying to do. They need our help. If we don't want the crisis at our border, we need to deal with the crisis in Central America.

That also deals with our insatiable, unending, vociferous appetite for drugs. The drugs have created the narcoterrorists. Once people start selling drugs, they are willing to sell women and children like commodities, and if they are willing to sell women and children like commodities, then that is where the vial, repugnant practice of human trafficking and human smuggling and even a new form of slavery—sexual slavery—begins.

These children are on the march. And when we talk to these children, we learn they are terrific children. They are brave and gutsy. When we talk to the boys, we learn they don't want to be part of the gangs. They want to get out. They want to get out, so they start this long march from their home country to Mexico to make it on the Rio Grande on rafts and by swimming and so on so they can make it to our

border. When we talk to the girls, we learn the girls want to go to school and get an education. They don't want to be recruited into these vial circumstances. These are earnest, hard-working children who want to have safety, who want to have a future, and we want to be able to see, by interviewing them, if they qualify for refugee status. If they don't, they will have to go back home, but if they do, they get to stay here. So they deserve the protection under law. We need to pass this legislation.

This bill is a funding bill. It does not include immigration legislation. We say those kinds of things can either be brought up in another way or another method, but this is a clean funding bill. When I say “clean,” it means it has no legislative language on it related to immigration. So I hope we can pass this legislation.

Now, I have listened to my own constituents, and many of them are saying to me: Hey, BARB, we are not against these kids. In fact, recent polling says 69 percent of the American people say if they are refugees, we should take care of them and they have a right to determine their legal status. But many of my constituents say: Hey, BARB, what about us? What does this mean? You are going to spend more money? What about my schools? When do we get help? My kids need help. They need schools; they need health care. You talk to families now. They are getting ready to go back to school. Many parents cannot wait for sales-tax-free day in Maryland, where you can get your backpack and your school supplies and your little clothes and shoes. My God, the cost of kids' shoes now is a small fortune, and they will outgrow them by the time they get to Thanksgiving. Parents are looking for bargains, for deals, to be able to do this. They are not hostile, but they wonder about them.

I want to say to them, I hear you. I was touched by a very poignant story over the weekend about how we have a food bank at Steelworkers Hall in Baltimore. Bethlehem Steel closed. It will never, ever, ever come back. The steelworkers of America, who contributed to the United Way, were always the first in line if a blood bank was necessary. Now many of those who lost their job are using the very food bank that they once donated to.

That story was so moving because we have lost our manufacturing. We have just lost a bill earlier today on bringing jobs back home—something I know the Presiding Officer is for, I sure am for, and so on. So I know American families are hurting. Yes, they are. But I want to bring out that the cost of this bill is the same amount of money as we are going to spend on training the Afghan National Security Forces. Did you know that? So we are going to spend \$4 billion—that is “billion” as in

“Barb,” not “million” as in “Mikulski”—\$4 billion to train the Afghan National Security Forces. I am not going to debate the merits of that. But we can spend money all over like that and we cannot spend money at our border and also for threats to our border because of narco terrorism that breeds other vile, repugnant, heinous behavior? I think we have to get real here.

The reason I want a supplemental—that is urgent and meets that criteria—is that we do not have to take the money from other important programs that do help America's families in education, in health, in job retraining in order to bring our jobs back home.

So I really do hope we pass this bill. Not spending money will not save money. It means we will just take out of existing programs and the American people will pay for it doubly. They will pay for it through inaction, which will ultimately cost more. They will pay for it because they will lose programs they thought they were going to have access to or there will be limited availability.

We have a chance here now to help our neighbors in our Western States. I know Wisconsin has been hit by it terribly, and we are so sorry for the loss of property and the danger to that community. It will help a treasured ally, Israel, which we must. Also, we will help our own country. The way to protect our border is two ways: fight it in Central America and also show what we stand for. If children are applying for refugee status, they should have their day in court and under the law proceed.

So, Madam President, we are now on this motion to proceed. Let's get on with it. Let's yield back our time. Let's get to the bill. Let's get the job done. I hope at the end of the day the vote will be “yes.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I want to talk principally in the next few minutes about a bill that Senator BOXER and I have introduced this week on Israel and talk about what is going on in Israel, but on the work that is the bill before us right now, I am always hesitant to disagree with the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, my chairwoman, my good friend, Senator MIKULSKI. I just think we are headed in the wrong direction here.

Providing money, and not trying to solve this problem, not sending the right message, I think is a mistake. People are leaving these dangerous countries—if they are dangerous to be in, they are also dangerous to travel through, they are dangerous to leave.

One of the concerns I have had during this whole debate is how many kids leave their home country and never get to the American border? What happens

to those kids? We have heard stories in briefings that were not classified about kids who never get here because they get sold into some sort of terrible situation, even kids whose organs are harvested and sold that way. This cannot be something we need to continue to encourage.

In fact, if you do qualify for asylum in the United States, there is a way to do that. That is why we have embassies. That is why we have consulates. Surely, it is safer for someone in Guatemala City to go to the American Embassy in Guatemala City than it is to leave Guatemala City and try to come through their country, through other countries, through Mexico to get here, under the control of people who have tried to make the most of the President's announcement that if you get here, you can stay here.

This is not the Red Cross bringing kids here. This is not some altruistic group bringing kids here. These are people who are taking advantage of misinformation in their country about what happens if you get here. And some of these kids do not get here. Doing this in this way—money without policy; acting like somehow it does not cost anything if it is an emergency, and so we can continue to do everything the chairwoman mentioned that needs to be done in the United States, but we can also do this because it is a supplemental, it is an emergency, and it is more money we borrow from somebody else—life is full of choices, and for our government we have choices.

There are things that need to be done right now to send a message: Do not leave your home country. The door is not wide open, no matter what the President's announcement in 2011 led people to believe.

The law needs to be changed so that immigrants from all countries coming to our borders are treated just like immigrants from Mexico and Canada coming to our borders. They have an immediate hearing within 7 days or so. Almost all of them are told: You have to go back. Once that happens, almost all of them stop coming.

It would be a mistake to do this in this way, and I believe this bill never winds up on the President's desk. The House of Representatives does not share this view, even if a majority of the Senate does.

We need to send a message to Guatemala, to El Salvador, to every other country that the door is not open. Just getting here is not enough. This is not a safe "Disneyland-type" ride to the United States of America. This is a very, very dangerous thing for you to try to do, and you should not try to do it. When you get here, it is not going to be successful.

Again, let me say, if you have a case that you should have asylum in this country, there is a way you do that which is much safer than showing up at

the border. We should not encourage the danger that these kids go through. I think the case is very dramatic on the side that cares for the lives of these kids. We should send the message strongly and now: Do not come the way you are coming now. The kids who get to the border—we are concerned about what happens to them as a country because of who we are. We should be equally concerned about the kids who never get to the border because of this false message we have sent.

U.S.-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

But, Madam President, let me spend a few minutes talking about a bill that Senator BOXER and I introduced this week, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014. This is an updated version of legislation we first introduced in March 2013.

This bill that was introduced this week is already backed by more than three-quarters of the Senate. I am hoping we figure out how to get this done and get this done this week. There has never been a more important time to send a message to the world and to Israel about this relationship, about what it means to us, about how committed we are to it.

This legislation reaffirms our unwavering commitment to Israel's security and the strong relationship that goes back to the founding of Israel. It supports deepened U.S.-Israel cooperation on defense, including continued U.S. assistance for the Iron Dome. By the way, the Iron Dome assistance in the Defense appropriations bill that the Appropriations Committee approved, that is the way to fund the Iron Dome. Do the work for the fiscal year that begins October 1. We are 2 months and a couple days from the time this fiscal year is over. We should be having bills on the floor that talk about the Iron Dome, but it should be the Defense bill. It should not be some bill that we are talking about because we are unwilling to go through the regular process.

But we do in this bill talk about the Iron Dome. We reiterate our support to negotiating a settlement, a political settlement that the Government of Israel is for where you would have two states, but both of those states have to recognize each other. You cannot have two states where Hamas and others that are significant parts apparently now of the coalition on the other side deny that Israel has a right to exist. But we do support the Israeli concept that we want to have two states peacefully coexisting. That is reiterated here. But it is also clearly understood that you cannot have one of those states say the other one does not have a right to exist.

We have a longstanding relationship here. Really it dates back to the very moment that Israel was founded. My fellow Missourian, President Truman, in great leadership, decided we would immediately recognize Israel, and that

moment, that decision, that commitment from the United States continues today through security, through energy, through trade. We would like to make that clear and make that clear this week.

What does the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act do?

First of all, it authorizes an increase of \$200 million in the value of U.S. weapons held in Israel, to a total of \$1.8 billion. What does that mean? Does that mean we are spending \$200 million more? No. It means we are putting more of our equipment in Israel, with the clear understanding that it is there for us to use in the time of a crisis. It is also there for Israel to have access to when they need it. And when they use it, they pay us back and replenish that stockpile that we have strategically placed in Israel for our future use and for an immediate challenge to Israel where they may need to look at that stockpile of our weapons there.

It requires the administration to take steps to include Israel in the top-tier category for license-free exports. The top-tier category of looking at the technologies we share with any other country we would suggest you should also be able to share with Israel. If they are uniquely held in our country, technologies that we do not want to share with anybody, they are not considered in that category.

It authorizes the President to carry out cooperation between the United States and Israel on a range of policy issues. They include defense; water, things like the water salinization efforts that Israel is, frankly, ahead of us in and we need to understand, as we look forward to water needs; homeland security, alternative fuel technologies, more cooperation in cyber security. All those things are authorized in this bill.

There is new language that encourages the administration to work with Israel to help the country gain entry status in the Visa Waiver Program, which would make it easier for Israeli citizens to travel to the United States without first having to get a waiver, but it would also make it easier for people in our country to go there.

It requires the administration to provide more frequent and more detailed assessments of the status of a qualitative military advantage that we have committed that Israel would always have. This bill that Senator BOXER and I have introduced just says we are going to check that even more often and in more detail to be absolutely sure in that troubled part of the world that Israel's adversaries look at Israel and can clearly understand that Israel has an advantage that makes up for the difference in its size.

It strengthens the collaboration between the United States and Israel on energy development. It encourages increased cooperation in academic, business, and governmental sectors.

This legislation amends previous legislation related to how people can travel between our two countries. We do have a unique situation. In the recent fighting in Israel, two American citizens, members of the Israeli Defense Forces with dual citizenship in this country and in Israel, were killed in that fighting. This is one of the unique relationships we have in the world where people actually leave our communities, go to another country they also care about, fight in the uniform of that country, because this country is our ally. We need to look for ways to continue to emphasize that.

It authorizes but does not require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to waive the nonimmigration refusal rate requirement for Israel, but only if Israel meets all of the other program requirements, and then it is still authorized but not required.

This is a particularly important time to send this message. This is an important time to send this message of continued support between our two countries. Israel—we see, looking at the Gaza situation today, during recent months uncertainty in Egypt, support from terrorist groups all over the world, weaponry, missiles taken into Gaza, money that could have been spent on concrete that could have been used to build houses, schools, hospitals, and places for jobs, was used to build tunnels so that people could come into Israel and attack Israel.

Certainly the Government of Israel and the citizens of Israel look at this moment and think: No time to quit now with this job partially done. Some of the messages that have been sent from our country have not been helpful and encouraging in regard to what has to happen in the middle of this conflict.

But this kind of legislation sends a message, the message we should send. I hope we can get to it this week. I am pleased that three-quarters of our colleagues—I think that number is right at 80—have cosponsored this legislation. The legislation was just introduced this week. So if there is any question to our friends in Israel, and maybe more importantly others around the world, where the Senate, and hopefully by the end of the week the Congress, stands, this action sends that message. I cannot think of a more critical time to send that message. I hope we see this bill on the floor and send that message this week.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, I rise today to speak in favor of a critical issue for Coloradans; that is, fighting, mitigating, and recovering from wildfire. Recent history has shown my State that there is no greater threat to our communities, water

supplies, and our special way of life than wildfire. Successive megafires over the past few years have broken records faster than they can be written down.

Even today's flash floods in recently burned areas are a reminder that after the embers of wildfires have cooled, their destruction lingers for months and years. I used to joke that Coloradans were strong and prepared for anything, come hell or high water. But I had no idea that the past several years would bring both, with modern megafires and floods devastating thousands of households and businesses. We have endured these tests, and we have communities all over the State, such as Black Forest, that are rebuilding. But these recent disasters and the fires burning today in Colorado, California, Washington, and across the West show that the status quo is unacceptable. The cost of inaction for homeowners and first responders alike is too high to not act. That is why I have come to the floor today to speak in favor of a few smart, bipartisan, and fiscally responsible bills that are in front of our Congress right now.

These bills, taken together, address wildfires in a comprehensive way by attacking the problem before, during, and after a fire. So if I might, I want to share some of the elements in these important pieces of legislation.

First, I want to focus on what we can do before a wildfire at the individual and community level to reduce risk. There are many studies, numerous studies, that single out the most important factor in protecting homes. That is, if you do mitigation work. You involve yourself with ignition-resistant construction techniques. You reduce hazardous fuels around your home.

That is one of the reasons I introduced the commonsense legislation that is entitled the Wildfire Prevention Act of 2013. It will help homeowners in communities better reduce the risk of wildfire damages upfront. I am very pleased that the bill is moving forward in a bipartisan fashion. I am working with Senator INHOFE as my Republican partner. In the House, two Members of our delegation from Colorado, Congressmen POLIS and TIPTON, have joined with their California colleagues to lead this bill through the House. That is what Coloradans expect from their elected representatives, collaboration for the good of our State and country.

This bill is a game changer, not just in my State but across fire-prone communities in the West and increasingly in other parts of our country, the upper Midwest, the Northeast, Florida. You name it, wildfire has continued to be a threat more broadly across our country.

What this act will do, the Wildfire Prevention Act, is it will allow the Federal Emergency Management Agen-

cy, FEMA, to provide hazard mitigation grants to States and localities to implement these mitigation projects. These mitigation projects will help put Colorado communities and public lands managers on the offensive. We put our communities and our public lands managers in front of the threat of megafires. We can head them off before they even start. It is an idea that came from Colorado. It is more than just a commonsense idea; it is a fiscally responsible approach to dealing with the threat of wildfire.

Why do I say that? Well, studies show that for every dollar you put on hazard mitigation upfront, it saves an average of \$4 down the line if you have to fight a fire. For that reason, and the other ones I mentioned, I am going to keep doing everything I possibly can to move this bipartisan bill to the President's desk this year.

The second point I want to make and discuss with colleagues is that we must fundamentally change and modernize how the Federal Government funds wildfire-suppression operations. That is another way of saying fighting fires, wildfire-suppression operations. The rising severity of modern fires has caused land management agencies to divert resources away from the critical fire prevention efforts I just described to fight fires that are already burning. This is a vicious self-perpetuating cycle that is called "fire borrowing," which then only increases the risk of catastrophic fires later.

It is a backwards way of budgeting. It is classic robbing Peter to pay Paul and leaves us all to bear much larger costs, most notably our communities in Colorado. That is why I joined Senators Wyden and Crapo on their bipartisan bill that would finally separate wildfires like other natural disasters and help make sure that we are not fighting fires that could have been prevented. This is a sensible approach for many reasons. It has been cosponsored by 120 Members of Congress in the House and the Senate. It has been endorsed by over 150 groups, ranging from the timber industry, to the environmental community. That speaks volumes about the utility of this and the broad support, obviously.

My hometown State newspaper, the Denver Post, put it this way earlier this month, "Using disaster fund money for wildfires could solve a lot of problems long-term, and we hope Congress sees it that way." I also hope my colleagues see it that way. If we are serious here about helping prevent future wildfires and reducing the threats to lives and property, we all join together and pass this legislation.

Proper wildfire budgeting and the use of disaster relief funds would help break this vicious cycle of fire borrowing and allow our natural resource agencies to manage healthy forests, instead of fighting megafires. I have the

great privilege of chairing on the energy committee, which the Presiding Officer serves on, the National Parks Subcommittee. I know all too well the problems this bill could solve. If we adopted this measure, this new way of wildfire budgeting, we could ensure that the resources are available for our national forest supervisors to reduce hazardous fuels, provide quality recreation experiences, and provide the timber supply to sustain a diverse forest products industry. It would be there for the uses we need them to be there for.

We could do this also while upgrading our safe, modern air tanker fleet in such a way that would keep our communities and firefighters safe. So this legislation I just described is in the emergency supplemental appropriations measure before the Senate here today. We really need to pass it. It is crucial. It is an opportunity we have to grab. In the supplemental appropriations act before this body, there is \$615 million to prevent fire borrowing this year, get resources on the ground fighting these blazes, and help our resource agencies plan unto the future.

I know House Appropriations Chairman ROGERS. The Presiding Officer and I both know Chairman ROGERS. He did say that he did not include wildfire funding in their supplemental because, in his words, "there is no urgency for such money." I have to respectfully disagree with my friend Chairman ROGERS. I know Coloradans, as well as people in Washington State, California, and many States across the West would not only disagree, they would strenuously disagree. I would invite Chairman ROGERS to come out to the West and see firsthand how urgent the situation is for our communities.

Let me finish with a couple of remarks about other elements in this supplemental.

My colleague Senator BLUNT from Missouri, just spoke of the Iron Dome system. The supplemental includes emergency funding for Israel's Iron Dome system. It has intercepted hundreds of Hamas rockets targeting civilian areas over the last several weeks. It has literally been a lifesaver for our Israeli allies many times over.

I chair the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, which has responsibility for the Iron Dome and working with Israel and the Israeli Defense Forces. I heard today from an Israeli who said the system is miraculous. As Hamas continues to rain rockets down, we need to ensure that this system continues to protect our friends and allies in Israel.

Finally, this supplemental includes critical resources to help address the root causes that have led to the humanitarian crisis at our southern border. So, in summary, I am glad we have moved forward on debating this crucial supplemental appropriations bill. Let's move to an up-or-down vote as soon as

we possibly can. This is a timely debate. Passage of this bill is too important to allow partisan gridlock to interfere. So let's come together, let's show the American people we can meet our obligations and rise above partisanship.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

POLICIES FOCUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the disturbing leadership failure we are seeing out of the White House. Over the past year the President and his administration have seemed increasingly out of touch with the many challenges facing our country at home and abroad. Two weeks ago the President's spokesman told reporters, "I think that there have been a number of situations in which you have seen this administration intervene in a meaningful way that substantially furthered American interests and substantially improved the tranquility of the global community." Let me repeat that. "Substantially improved the tranquility of the global community."

Well, fighting is going on right now in Israel and the Gaza Strip. Russia is actively involved in a war in Ukraine and recently played a role in bringing down a Malaysian airliner with 298 people onboard.

Iraq is virtually in chaos. Much of the country is under the control of a terrorist organization considered by al Qaeda to be too extreme.

Those are just some of the most serious trouble spots that we face right now. Yet the President's spokesman claims that "there have been a number of situations in which you have seen this administration intervene in a meaningful way that have substantially improved the tranquility of the global community."

Not only can I not think of a number of situations in which the President's action has substantially improved tranquility, I find it hard to think of one. We are actually looking at more points of serious instability than we have seen in decades.

Writing in the Washington Post over the weekend, the paper's editorial page noted that during the President's administration: "we have witnessed as close to a laboratory experiment on the effects of U.S. disengagement as the real world is ever likely to provide."

Disengagement is a good description of the President's attitude because right now the President doesn't even seem to be paying attention. Obviously America can't fix all of the world problems, but strong American leadership can help, as we have seen many times over the past century.

Strong American leadership, however, requires a President who is fully

engaged and this President is anything but.

Tens of thousands of children are arriving at our southern border. The President is playing pool. When a plane is shot down in Ukraine, the President keeps right on with his campaign schedule.

Earlier this month, as thousands of unaccompanied children were making their dangerous trip across the southern border—because of the President's statement if they got here they could stay—the President traveled to Texas, but he didn't go to assess the situation himself. He was, as the Associated Press reported, "primarily in Texas to raise money for Democrats."

Weeks later, despite taking multiple trips to fundraise for Democrats, the President still hasn't visited the border, despite calls to visit from members of his own party. Indeed, the President has largely stopped even discussing the crisis. This is the same President whose spokesman described him as having substantially improved the tranquility of the global community.

Our world is facing a number of very serious crises now, and the President seems completely unaware of it. Unfortunately, when it comes to domestic issues, the President seems equally out of touch.

The President has recently taken to telling his audience that "by almost every economic measure, we're doing a whole lot better now than we were when I came into office."

Try telling that to the American families who are doing worse. Average household income has dropped by nearly \$3,000 on the President's watch. Meanwhile, prices have risen. Food prices are higher. The price of gasoline has almost doubled. College costs continue to soar.

Health care premiums which the President promised would fall by \$2,500 have increased by almost \$3,000, and they are still climbing.

Combine high prices with declining income and we get a whole lot of families who were once comfortably in the middle class are now struggling to make ends meet. The Obama administration's economy provides few opportunities for these families to improve their situation.

In 2009 the President's advisers predicted that the unemployment rate would fall below 6 percent in 2012. Two years later unemployment still hasn't fallen below 6 percent. The only reason the unemployment rate is as low as it is is because so many Americans have given up looking for work and dropped out of the labor force altogether. If the labor force participation rate were as high today as it was when the President took office, our unemployment rate would be about 10 percent.

Even when jobs do become available, too often they are low-paying jobs, not

the kinds of jobs that help middle-class families achieve financial security or move low-income families into the middle class.

Take the most recent jobs report. Under the President's policies, the economy lost 523,000 full-time jobs and gained 799,000 part-time jobs last month, which is the largest 1-month jump in part-time employment in 20 years.

I will give the President this, he does talk. He talks about helping middle-class families, but he has steadily opposed measures to help them.

Republicans have proposed numerous measures to create good-paying jobs and increase opportunity. We have urged the President to approve the Keystone Pipeline and the tens of thousands of jobs it would support. In fact, Democrats have urged the President to approve it too. The President said no.

Republicans have proposed fixing the 30-hour workweek provision in ObamaCare, which is cutting workers' hours and wages. The President has said no.

Republicans have proposed repealing the medical device tax, which has already eliminated thousands of jobs in the medical device industry and will eliminate many more if it isn't repealed. A lot of Democrats agree with that position. The President said no.

The President hasn't just said no to measures that would help the middle class, he has implemented policies that have hit the middle class with tremendous financial burdens. Chief among the President's burdensome policies of course is ObamaCare. The President told an audience in Wilmington, DE, the other day that thanks to his administration, millions more now have the peace of mind of having quality, affordable health care if they need it.

Try telling that to the Americans who lost their health care plans as a result of the President's law and were forced to replace them with plans that cost more and offered less. Try telling that to the Americans who obtained health care plans under the Affordable Care Act only to discover their plan didn't cover the doctor they wanted it to cover. Tell it to the families paying thousands of dollars more each year in premiums, deductibles, and copays thanks to the President's health care law. That does not even mention the drag the health care law is having on the economy.

Part of the reason there are so few opportunities for American families to get ahead is because the President's health care law is making it more difficult for businesses to afford to hire new workers.

Now the President is piling up his budget-busting health care law with a national energy tax that will drive up energy bills for American families and put hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work.

Nero may have fiddled while Rome burned, the President fundraises.

The Washington Post reports:

In his two presidential terms combined, Bush hosted 318 fundraisers. Obama has already smashed that number with 393 events to date.

And he still has 2½ years to go in his administration.

Instead of urging the President to focus on crises at home and abroad, Democrats have taken a leaf from the President's book and spent the past several months focused on elections. Rather than taking up legislation to provide real help for struggling middle-class families, Senate Democrats have spent months—months—on political show votes and designed-to-fail legislation they hope will win them a few votes in November.

Our country is facing challenges at home and abroad. Campaigning has its place, but in Washington Members of Congress and the President should be focused on solving the problems facing our country, supporting middle-class families, and restoring America's economic vitality.

It is time for Democrats and the President to stop focusing on politics and start focusing on the policies we need to create jobs, to grow the economy, and support freedom and opportunity at home and around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Next week, between August 4 and August 6, the United States will welcome leaders from across the African Continent to Washington, DC.

I first wish to acknowledge the work of our colleague Senator COONS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, Foreign Relations Committee, for the work he has done on behalf of the Senate to make this opportunity a real chance to strengthen the economic ties, to strengthen the strategic ties between the countries of Africa and the United States.

We expect there will be robust discussions that will be encouraging economic growth, unlocking opportunities, and fostering greater ties between our country and Africa.

One of the areas that I hope will get some debate and discussion during next week's meetings will be a key government trade initiative that makes these ties possible; that is, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, AGOA.

AGOA provides qualifying sub-Saharan countries duty-free access to the U.S. market for a wide variety of products. It was first signed into law in 2000 by President Clinton and has been strengthened and extended by Congress and both President Bush and President Obama.

AGOA enjoyed broad bipartisan support throughout the years because its

advocates recognize the crucial role Africa plays in the global economy.

The African Continent is one of the world's fastest growing regions. For instance, by 2035, it is estimated that Africa will have a larger working-age population than China. I mention that because it is certainly in our interest to have stable partners who develop their economy and can work in strategic partnership with the United States, but it also means we are going to have stronger markets for U.S.-produced goods and products. As we have a growing middle class in Africa, it represents a market for U.S. manufacturers, producers, and farmers, which creates more jobs in the United States.

AGOA allows the United States and Africa to both take advantage of this dynamism. Since the act was fully implemented in 2001, U.S. imports under AGOA have tripled. Nonoil AGOA trade has increased fourfold.

Some of the sectors that AGOA has helped open are apparel, textiles, jewelry, handicrafts, and electronics. AGOA has created hundreds of thousands of jobs in those sectors, most of those in the apparel sector, where women comprise 75 to 90 percent of the industry.

In sub-Saharan Africa women are at the highest risk of being poor. AGOA has tackled barriers to poverty reduction by eliminating tariffs on goods that come from many sectors in which women are employed.

Modern trade agreements and initiatives are much more than just lowering tariffs. It also involves dealing with good governance practices.

In an increasing global economy, we can no longer consider issues such as labor rights, human rights, and good governance as issues that are separate from trade.

Trade with our country is a benefit with deserving nations that share our values. Strong commitments to the rule of law and human rights are an essential part of those values and level the playing field between the United States and our partners in the global marketplace.

AGOA is no exception. The Act has been encouraging these commitments since it was first enacted. In other words, this is not only an opportunity by lowering barriers to our markets, it is also about expectations and enforcement that the African countries will improve their good governance and their labor rights so we have a more level playing field.

To qualify for AGOA benefits, countries must establish or make continual progress on measures that promote good governance and a fair economic system. These include fundamental rights, the rule of law, a system that combats corruption, and policies that increase access to health care, education, and expand physical infrastructure. In other words, the African countries involved that take advantage of

AGOA must have continuing progress on the good governance key issues.

For example, as part of the annual AGOA review process, the U.S. Department of Labor examines AGOA countries' efforts to implement and enforce workers' rights, including the right of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, prohibitions on forced or compulsory labor, a minimum age for the employment of children, and acceptable conditions of work.

These are the International Labour Organization standards. The ILO standards are very much a part of the progress we made under AGOA in the African countries. Improvements in these areas have been shown to foster the kind of inclusive economic growth and opportunities that raise families and nations out of poverty.

We understand that by developing stronger economies in African countries, we are building more stable African countries, countries that are more reliable to be partners with the United States in dealing with global issues.

We understand that by doing that we are going to have a stronger partner sharing U.S. values. This is just one of the tools we use. We also use our transparency initiatives. We included in the Dodd-Frank legislation transparency on extractive industries that operate globally but also in Africa so we could find and make sure the wealth of a country is actually going to its people. That requires good governance. AGOA is one of our tools to accomplish that good governance.

So these countries that have mineral wealth, the wealth is not a curse but truly benefits the people of that country.

AGOA helps, the transparency initiatives that we passed help, but this is the issue: The current authorization of AGOA expires on September 30, 2015. Once again, Madam President, as you know, as you worked so hard, we need predictability in our law. Short-term extensions don't do much good. What we need is a long-term economic commitment with the continent of Africa.

A bipartisan effort in Congress to extend and improve this important legislation is already underway. The U.S. Trade Representative has been reviewing AGOA's successes as well as the areas that can be improved. Later today in the Senate Finance Committee we will be holding a hearing on AGOA, and Ambassador Froman will be one of the witnesses at that hearing. So we will have a chance to work together, bipartisan members of Congress with the administration.

One of the areas we are looking at is strengthening the eligibility criteria to further incentivize improvements in human rights, and I will be talking about that in the Finance Committee. Another area is providing coordinated technical assistance and capacity

building. This is very important. Too often trade and development policies operate on separate tracks. Granting trade preference means little without providing countries with the ability to take advantage of those benefits. We have development assistance that we provide to countries. We have trade that we do. Let's combine it and recognize that these trade opportunities can only be taken advantage of if the country has the capacity to deal with the issues we are talking about.

Capacity building is already underway in Africa. For instance, the Department of Labor provides capacity-building assistance to AGOA countries to improve workers' rights through partnerships with a broad range of organizations, from NGOs, to health organizations, to social and economic researchers. By providing this aid in a more efficient and clearly measurable fashion and seeking more input from local cooperatives and groups, we can help foster more sustainable growth in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The time to develop consensus on AGOA improvements is now. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting and strengthening the AGOA Act so we can maintain this important tool to increase the trade relations between the United States and Africa and fight global poverty. I look forward to seeing the results of next week's meetings with the African leaders. It is my sincere expectation that these meetings will produce concrete ways we can improve the ties between Africa and the United States, and I certainly expect it will help us lead to the improvement and reauthorization of AGOA.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the transparency provisions in the USA FREEDOM Act. I am a proud cosponsor of Chairman LEAHY's bill, and I am particularly proud to have written its key transparency provisions with my friend Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada. As I said yesterday, both of us are indebted to Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this issue.

For over a year now there has been a steady stream of news stories about the National Security Agency's surveillance programs. Yet right now, by law, Americans still cannot get very basic information about these programs.

Americans understand that we need to give due weight to privacy on the one hand and national security on the other. But when they lack an even rough sense of the scope of the government's surveillance programs, they have no way to know if the government is getting that balance right. There needs to be more transparency.

The controversy unleashed by Edward Snowden's disclosures has been going on for over a year. Yet Americans still don't know the actual number of people whose information has been collected under these programs. They don't even know how many of these people are Americans, and they have no way of knowing how many of these Americans had their information actually looked at by government officials as opposed to just being held in a database. This lack of transparency is pretty breathtaking.

I believe the provisions Senator HELLER and I wrote will go a long way toward addressing and fixing this. It will give Americans the information they need to judge the government's surveillance programs for themselves.

Three programs are at the center of this debate: the telephone call records program, the collection, through 2011, on Americans' Internet communications records, and the so-called PRISM Program that targets the communications of foreigners abroad.

Our provisions would require detailed annual reports for each program. The government will have to tell the public how many people have had their information collected and how many of those people are likely American. For the call records program and the PRISM Program, the government will also have to say how many times it has run a specific search for an American's data.

By creating these reporting requirements, the government will have an incentive to also disclose the number of Americans who have actually had their information reviewed by government officials, and we give the government authority to do that too.

We don't just require the government to issue more detailed transparency reports. We are also helping American Internet and phone companies tell their customers about the government requests for customer information they are receiving. For years those companies have been under gag orders. As a result, people around the world think the American Internet companies are giving up far more information to the government than they likely are. Those companies are losing billions of dollars because people think they are handing over all of their customers' data to the NSA.

Our provisions expand the options that companies have to issue their own transparency reports, and they let companies issue those reports more quickly. Our provisions give the public

two ways to check on the government—government transparency reports and company reports as well.

Like all major bills, this bill is a compromise, and we didn't get everything we wanted, but our provisions will go a long way toward giving the American people the information they need to evaluate the government's surveillance program.

After 9/11, our Nation faced a security crisis. Most Americans had never lived through anything like that. We are now experiencing a crisis of trust where a big part of the American public now thinks our intelligence agencies are out to spy on them, not on foreign countries.

The administration has committed to end the bulk collection of Americans' data, and Congress has written a bill to ban the bulk collection of Americans' data. But unless we pass these transparency provisions, Americans have no way to know if the government is making good on those promises. Our transparency provisions will force the government to prove annually and publicly that bulk collection is over. This is an unprecedented level of transparency and accountability which will allow the American people to decide for themselves whether the government is striking the right balance between privacy and security.

We should take up this bill as soon as possible so that Americans are not in the dark a single day longer. We should take it up so that American companies stop losing business because of misperceptions about their role in domestic surveillance. We should take this bill up so that Americans can get the information they need to hold their government to account.

TRIBUTE TO ALVARO BEDOYA

Before I yield the floor, I wish to take a moment to recognize and thank Alvaro Bedoya, my chief counsel, who is to my left. This is Alvaro's last week on my staff. Alvaro has been a member of my team since my very first day in office, and I have relied on and trusted his counsel on so many things in the 5 years since.

He has been instrumental in helping me launch and set the agenda for the Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law that I chair, and we would not have reached this point in working to make the NSA more transparent and accountable to the American people if it were not for Alvaro.

Alvaro's counsel has also been crucial as we have sought to improve our Nation's broken immigration system, as we fought for marriage equality and LGBT rights, including the right of all children to be free from bullying in schools, and as we work to ban apps that allow domestic abusers to stalk their victims.

Alvaro was even at my side during my very first week in office when the Judiciary Committee held confirma-

tion hearings for Sonia Sotomayor to serve on the Supreme Court. That was my fifth day in the Senate, and I remember pulling some late nights preparing for that.

Alvaro's departure is bittersweet for me. I am, of course, sad to see Alvaro leave, but I am very excited for him as well. He will soon become the founding executive director of Georgetown Law School's new Center for Privacy and Technology. I have no doubt the folks at Georgetown soon will learn what I already know—that Alvaro is one of the most talented, intelligent, hardest working, decent, good-guy lawyers I know.

Thanks, Alvaro.

And I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORPORATE INVERSIONS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, our Tax Code is tilted toward the rich and the powerful. Huge corporations hire armies of lobbyists and lawyers to create, expand, and protect every last corporate loophole. That is how we end up with a tax code that makes small businesses and restaurants and construction companies pay, that makes teachers and truckdrivers and nurses pay, but that allows huge American corporations to make billions of dollars in profits and not pay a single dime in taxes.

The Tax Code is rigged. Apparently, even this rigged game does not go far enough for some corporations. Those companies are taking advantage of a new move—a loophole that allows them to maintain all their operations in America but claim foreign citizenship so they can cut their U.S. taxes even further.

Here is how the loophole works. An American company merges with a much smaller company located in a foreign country, usually a tax haven such as Ireland or Bermuda. As long as the shareholders of the foreign company own 20 percent of the newly merged company, our tax laws allow that new company to claim foreign citizenship. That means American companies can hire a bunch of Wall Street bankers and a bunch of lawyers, fill out some paperwork, keep everything the same in their operations, and dodge their U.S. taxes.

Tax lawyers call this process a corporate inversion, but do not let that bland name fool you. These companies are renouncing their American citizenship, turning their backs on this country simply to boost their profits. They

are taking advantage of all the good things our government helps provide—educated workers, roads and bridges, a dependable court system, patent and copyright protections—and then running out on the bill.

If a person did that, we would call them a freeloader. We would insist that they pay their fair share. That is exactly what our tax laws do for people who renounce their American citizenship. Even if they do not sell their property in the United States, when they renounce their citizenship, we treat them as if they had sold it. If they try to send money back to a U.S. citizen, we tax that amount too. And if someone attempts to evade their tax obligations by renouncing their American citizenship, we bar them from coming back to this country.

For a person who does not want to pay a fair share, our message is clear: You can renounce your citizenship but do not come back and expect the rest of us to pick up the tab. But we do not do that for corporations. Corporations can renounce their American citizenship—and make absolutely clear in legal documents that they are doing it to avoid their U.S. tax obligations—and not suffer any consequences.

In this corner of the Tax Code we have gone way past treating corporations as people. In this corner of the Tax Code we are treating corporations better than people. That is not right. That is why I have teamed up with Senator LEVIN and more than a dozen of our Democratic colleagues to introduce the Stop Corporate Inversions Act. The bill is simple. It allows American corporations to renounce their citizenship only if they truly give up control of their company to a foreign corporation and truly move their operations overseas. The bill would help protect \$17 billion in tax revenue—money we could spend on Head Start Programs, on fixing our roads and bridges, on investing in medical research.

President Obama and Secretary Lew have spoken in favor of the proposal. I commend their leadership, and I join them in urging the Senate to pass this bill right away.

Some say wait. They say we should address this loophole in the context only of broader tax reform. I am all for a major overhaul of our tangled tax system, but make no mistake, more and more companies are rushing to renounce their citizenship to take advantage of this inversion loophole before we can get to full tax reform. We cannot allow the larger fights over tax reform to stop us from holding these freeloaders accountable.

I believe the Senate should act on this, but I am also realistic. Even if the Senate passes this bill today, we know that, like so many good Senate bills before it, it will face a tough road in the House. If we have learned anything

from the past few years, it is that House Republicans will claw, scratch, whimper, beg or do whatever else it takes to defend every last corporate tax loophole.

But the administration does not need to wait for Congress. It can use its existing authority to slow down and reduce the attractiveness of these sham inversions right now. According to a paper published this week by Steve Shay, a Harvard Law School professor and former senior tax policy official at the Treasury Department, the administration could take action today to reduce the tax benefits of corporate inversions.

It could use its authority under section 385 of the Tax Code to prevent companies that renounce their citizenship from using any other loopholes to shield themselves from additional taxes that they would otherwise be required to pay. This will not totally solve the problem, but it would significantly reduce the benefits of corporate inversion. It would be an important first step toward treating companies that renounce America the same way we treat people who renounce America—as freeloaders who get cut off from other benefits.

America is a great place to do business because of the investments we have made together. In Massachusetts and across this country, we invest in public education, and our colleges and universities produce millions of skilled workers. We invest in infrastructure, in our roads and bridges and ports, making it easier for our companies to move their products across the country and beyond. We invest in scientific and medical research, giving our companies access to the most innovative and cutting-edge technology. We invest together to make America a place where any kid will have a chance to come up with an idea and turn it into the next great American corporation.

The companies that are pursuing these corporate inversions know all of this. That is why they are not actually leaving America behind. They just do not want to pay for it. Our achievements are not magic. They did not simply happen on their own or through dumb luck. America works, our government works, our democracy works because we all pitch in and do our part to build that which none of us can build alone, giving everyone a chance to succeed.

If these companies want to leave all of that behind, well, that is their right. But if they exercise that right, if they leave America behind, then they should not get to turn around and claim all of the privileges of being an American company. We have had enough of rich corporations taking whatever they want and expecting everyone else to pick up the pieces. The time for free-loading is over.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAEL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it has been 22 days now since Hamas began its most recent campaign of terrorist attacks against the innocent citizens of Israel. Since the operation began, 32 tunnels have been uncovered that would have been used to attack Israel. On Saturday and Sunday—this past Saturday and Sunday alone—almost 100 rockets were fired at Israel. In the Gaza strip, since the beginning of Operation Protective Edge—that would have been July 8—there have been over 2,000 Hamas rockets fired into Israel, with Tel Aviv and Jerusalem both targets.

Israel has responded, as any nation protecting its people would, with air strikes and ground troops to silence these Hamas terrorists. Israelis are tough. I have to remind people all the time that since their independence back in the 1940s, they have been attacked—Israel has been attacked—six different times.

Remember how they were outnumbered in the Six-Day War in 1967. They won. They prevailed. Then again, the same thing in Yom Kippur—that was in 1973. Again, they prevailed. I have often kidded with them—I have told Prime Minister Netanyahu this, that the Israelis consider a fair fight being outnumbered two to one. So they are a great bunch of people. We have got to continue to support them.

The Hamas terrorists are not only killing Israelis; they are killing their own people too because they place their rocket launchers—we see this is happening, just yesterday we saw a picture of this—in the middle of their own population centers. We are talking in homes, in hospitals, in mosques. Like the cowards they are, they use civilians as human shields. Despite Israel's extensive precautionary behavior and measures to avoid collateral damage, casualties, unfortunately, have occurred. Hamas bears complete responsibility for the civilian deaths.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: Israel is using missile defense to protect our citizens, and Hamas is using their civilians to protect their missiles. To date, the Israeli missile defense system, called the Iron Dome, has successfully intercepted over 400 Hamas rockets headed toward the populated areas in Israel. I was just in Israel last month. I visited the Iron Dome battery. You see, there has to be a place where they initiate these protective devices. Here they are over there. I was so impressed with the young Israeli troops who operate it in

the southern city of Ashkelon. The same battery you see on TV every night intercepting Hamas rockets comes from the Gaza Strip, 13 kilometers away.

I have a picture here I want the Presiding Officer to look at. This beautiful young first lieutenant in the Israeli Army I met. She is the one in charge of the Ashkelon battery down there. She is doing her duty right now as we speak, bravely protecting her fellow citizens. Her name is Lee Shmulevitch. I salute her.

It gives people an idea of the commitment that is being made by the Israeli people and the successes they are having. As ranking member, which I am, of the Armed Services Committee, I am proud to say I have been a constant supporter of the Iron Dome, which we have done on a nonpartisan basis. We have put in the authorization for \$175 million in this last authorization bill. Then we added another \$176 million that would take care of not just the Iron Dome but also other systems that we have such as David's Sling and Arrow 3.

These are jointly developed by the United States and Israel. I think it is important that people understand. I have heard people say: Well, you are just sending all this stuff over from us to Israel. If that were true, it would be worth doing it anyway, because they are looking out after our interests. Those things which they are not able to do in the Middle East we would have to be doing with our equipment, with your young people.

This is not the case. They have a lot of brave people over there. In the case of the Iron Dome, of David's Sling, of Arrow 3, and of a lot of the UAVs, their technology is technology that we use. So it is not something that we are doing for them. We are doing it mutually for each other.

I think it is important also to note at this point that—and nobody seems to put this together—Hamas would not have the rockets and capability of trying to kill all of these Israelis if it were not for Israel's greatest threat, and that is the country of Iran. Quite frankly, I think Iran is the greatest threat to the United States also. A lot of people do not realize this, but back in 2007 our—at that time it was classified—Our intelligence said that by 2015, Iran would have the weapon and a delivery system. Well, that is only 6 months from now.

That has been reconfirmed in our unclassified intelligence starting in about 2010. So right now it is really Iran that is responsible for what Hamas has been able to do. I might ask the question: What is President Obama doing? His rush to reach a nuclear agreement with Iran has undermined years of bipartisan sanctions that were working. We have sanctions, not just by us but by European countries and other countries that have really brought Iran

down—not to their knees, because they are still developing their weapons. But nonetheless, they were working.

As part of the President's agreement—this is what he is doing right now. His agreement is to reduce Iran's sanctions, as he announced in January. He has endorsed Iran's right to enrich uranium. So let's stop and think about it. This is a deal he has cut. He said: All right. We will pull off our sanctions so you will be able to receive the benefit of that. At the same time we are going to let you go ahead and continue to enrich uranium.

He has allowed Iran to keep 19,000 centrifuges while unlocking \$7 billion in assets. These are assets that were held which they can now use to their benefit. He has just extended the deal by agreeing to provide Iran with an additional \$2.8 billion in frozen assets. That brings the \$7 billion up to almost \$10 billion. While Iran is building a bomb, Obama is releasing sanctions.

I believe the Iranians are using negotiations to buy time as they are developing their nuclear weapon. Again, Netanyahu called the President's agreement a "historic mistake" that is making the world a much more dangerous place. History is going to prove that he is right. Obama should demand Iran dismantle its nuclear program, but he will not do it. We should reinstate full sanctions now and consider additional sanctions. But President Obama will not do it.

Does anyone really believe Iran is not involved with Hamas and its attacks?

Today, Obama is rewarding Iran by releasing more financial assets to Iran, funding that will be used to support more terrorism against Israel. There is little to show for the administration's reckless gamble for Israel. President Obama is negotiating with an Iranian regime that has repeatedly deceived us and concealed its nuclear program for over 2 decades.

I see nothing different in this deal. Israel lives in a dangerous neighborhood, surrounded by terrorists who refuse to even acknowledge the Jewish state's right to exist. They need all the friends they can get. I keep hearing people talk about the two-state solution. The two-state solution between Hamas and Israel is kind of interesting because Hamas does not consider Israel to be a state. So how can you have a two-state solution if you only have one state? That is the situation.

That is why I want to salute the country of Egypt. There are some other friends that we have over there. I have been upset with some of the Members here in this body because they do not have an appreciation for what Egypt does and the part they play in the Middle East and their support for Israel. Let me tell you, this started a long time ago. The Camp David Accords was in 1979. In the Camp David Accords

they made a deal with Israel. Now, you have to keep in mind that this was the military of Egypt. It is hard for people in this country to see that sometimes there is a difference between the administration in a country and the military.

So it is the military here that has said: We will be protecting Israel. We had, not too long ago, an effort from this body to try to stop the shipment of some F-16s that Egypt had already bought. Now, granted, that was back during President Morsi and his radical Muslim Brotherhood. But nonetheless, these were going not to him but to the military. The newly elected President Sisi has destroyed—he is working right along with the Israelis. He has been involved, and his people and his military, in destroying over 90 percent of the tunnels that are going from the Sinai to Gaza.

So I only mention this because those individuals who do not understand this might consider punishing Egypt. If you punish Egypt, you are punishing, to the same degree, Israel.

The turbulent times we face serve as a reminder why the United States and Israel have to continue to work together. The same enemies that threaten the existence of Israel also want to destroy America. Over the years the United States has greatly benefited from the cooperation with Israel on missile defense technologies. We have to continue that critical partnership. Israel is our most faithful ally, our most critical partner in the region, and acts as a roadblock against terrorism, terrorism that would be hitting the United States of America.

The United States stands shoulder to shoulder with Israel and supports its right to defend itself.

Since his first budget, President Obama has been degrading our military while also making the world more dangerous through an apologetic and reactive foreign policy of appeasement. I often quote Hiram Mann, who said:

No man escapes
When freedom fails,
The best men rot in filthy jails;
And they who cried: "Appease, Appear!"
Are hanged by men they tried to please.

We have to get out of that system. We have to stand by Israel and hang tough with our best friend. We can't survive without them.

I often look back wistfully at the days of the Cold War. That was back when they had two superpowers in the world, the USSR and the United States. We knew what they had, and they knew what we had. We knew what their capacities were, they knew ours.

They had a system called MAD, mutually assured destruction. It meant: You shoot at you, we will shoot at you. You die, we all die, and everyone is happy.

That doesn't work anymore. Now we have these rogue elements out there

that are developing weapons that can wipe out an entire U.S. city. I am about not just the Middle East but about North Korea also.

So we are looking at the Middle East. We are looking at our only way of defending our allies there and working to stop the capabilities of countries such as Iran to have a weapon that would reach the United States of America. So we have to hang tough with our best friend Israel, and I pray that we do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

49TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise in honor of a birthday.

Forty-nine years ago, Medicare was signed into law. Every year, the trustees prepare a report about the fiscal health of Medicare and Social Security, and that report was issued earlier this week. On this 49th birthday of Medicare, I wish to talk about Medicare's health because there is some good news.

The 2014 trustees' report released earlier this week looks at the trust fund financing for Medicare hospital coverage and indicates that trust fund, under current projections, will remain solvent until 2030. Last year the 2013 report indicated that solvency period would go to 2026. So in 1 year the fiscal projections for Medicare and Medicaid improved by 4 years—solvency until 2030.

In addition, the projected Part B premiums, the Part B portion of Medicare, which is the prescription drug premium program for seniors, for the second year in a row the premiums will not increase one penny.

This improved health of Medicare is significant. The health of it has improved dramatically, even in the last year. But where the improvement truly looks significant is if we compare the 2014 report with the 2009 report, the report that was done on Medicare's 44th birthday 5 years ago. The 2009 report said the hospital insurance trust fund was not adequately financed for the next 10 years, and it would be exhausted in 2017.

Again, just to compare, 2009 Medicare trustees' report, the trust fund will be exhausted by 2017; 2014 Medicare trustees' report, the trust fund will be solvent all the way through 2030. There is a difference of 13 years of additional solvency in Medicare, according to the projections and the change just from 2009 to 2014.

I think we know where I am going with this subject. What explains the improving solvency of the Medicare trust fund? Why would it have changed so dramatically from the 2009 to the 2014 projection and added 13 years of solvency to the trust fund?

The Congressional Budget Office and others have indicated it was not the 2009 recession that was the primary driver for Medicare spending reduction.

Instead, the CBO and others are indicating that a large part of the improved solvency of Medicare is because of the reforms that were included by Congress when Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010. When it comes to reducing costs, bending the cost curve, the Affordable Care Act is working.

That is not the only reason Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. Coverage is expanding. Certain health care indicators are improving. More people have access because they are not denied insurance because of preexisting conditions. Kids can stay on family policies. Businesses can get tax credits if they are small.

But one of the areas—and that was why the first day the ACA was affordable. It was to try to do things that would control health care costs.

This Medicare trustees' report on Medicare's 49th birthday shows on cost reforms the ACA is working. The innovative systems of changing the payment model from pay-for-procedure to pay for quality, paying for value over volume, for reducing costs and improving health care delivery systems are extending the solvency of Medicare.

Not only is this cost containment good for the Federal Government, for the Federal Treasury, it is also good for Medicare recipients: 8.2 million Medicare recipients saved more than \$11.5 billion on prescription drugs thanks to closing the Medicare Part D doughnut hole.

In Virginia, people with Medicare saved \$254 million on prescription drugs because the Medicare Part D doughnut hole was closed just since the ACA was enacted—\$254 million since the 2010 enactment. In 2013 alone, 37.2 million Medicare recipients received free preventive benefits, including more than 900,000 in Virginia, because of the Affordable Care Act.

The work obviously needs to continue to bend the cost curve the right way, but the trustees' report from Monday is not the only evidence of the improving health of our fiscal expenditures.

Just this month CBO again revised downward its 10-year estimate for spending on Medicare and our Nation's major health care programs. Since 2010 CBO has lowered its estimates for Medicare and Medicaid and other health care programs by \$1.23 trillion—lowered projections of health care spending since the Affordable Care Act was passed.

The CBO said in a recently issued long-term budget outlook that the government will spend 1.6 percent of GDP less on health care programs than estimated in 2010 before the ACA was passed. A report released this week by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at HHS reported essentially no growth in Medicare expenditures on a per capita basis last year.

That report also said Medicare spending between 2009 and 2012—for beneficiaries in the traditional program—was approximately \$116 billion lower than it would have been if the average growth rates from years 2004 to 2008 had been projected forward.

So there are many reasons we should be thankful the Affordable Care Act passed, that we should be absolutely committed to maintaining it, and that we should also be committed to maintaining it wherever we can. But as we celebrate the 49th anniversary of Medicare today, one of the reasons we should be thankful is it is clear that the ACA is helping us make health care more affordable.

To conclude, the report that was issued this week was not all good news because it also had challenges with respect to Social Security. The Social Security trust fund will be exhausted in 2033, and that represents no change from last year. The solvency of the trust fund was not changed at all in the interim year.

But in the area of Social Security disability income, that insurance program—at current projections—will be completed by 2016.

Secretary Lew indicated this week that measures need to be taken to make sure that program—which is of critical importance to millions of Americans who are on disabilities—requires that we take action to fix that program so they can count on it.

So what we see is when Congress in the Affordable Care Act acted in a smart way to deal with Medicare, we have improved the area of Medicare costs and we are saving money. Congress has not acted with respect to Social Security and the Social Security disability insurance program, which is critical to folks with disabilities. It is going to need some quick fix.

I conclude and just say it is good for Congress to act. We can filibuster. We can debate. We can consider nominations. We can do a bill in one House and send it over and wait—as with immigration reform for 1-year-plus—for the other House to do something about it. None of that is action. None of that will fix any of the challenges that face us.

But when we do act and we are willing to tackle tough problems such as Medicare cost growth, we do it in both Houses and take the risk, we will find we will be better off than if we don't act. Social Security needs to have the same kind of focused and careful attention to it, especially the disability insurance program, as we paid to Medicare in 2010.

Medicare is one of the best programs this Nation has ever embraced. I wish it a happy 49th birthday today and congratulate those who were in the Senate in 2010 for being willing to risk action and thereby found a way to save costs and make Medicare work better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I rise to speak on the urgent supplemental bill, and I rise as the chair of the full Committee on Appropriations that is actually trying to move the urgent supplemental.

"Supplemental" is an important word. It means it is in addition to fiscal year 2014 funding. There are elements where we make requests for an urgent supplemental because of unexpected emergencies, either within our own country or affecting a treasured ally—such as the State of Israel—or the crisis at our border because of what is going on in Central America. Remember, it is the crisis in Central America that is creating the humanitarian surge at our border.

Although I rise now to speak about one element. I have spoken about the fires in our Western States and later today I will speak about the children and actually try to paint a picture for people about what is going on in Honduras, El Salvador, and other countries that are also affected, but now I am going to speak about Israel.

Israel is under attack, and it is under attack by a terrorist group that denies its very right to exist. It is under attack by an organization called Hamas that is sending thousands of rockets to Israeli cities and towns targeting innocent civilians. Its very survivability is being defended by missile defense technology. The most crucial for short-range missiles is a technology called Iron Dome. This missile defense technology has saved hundreds of lives.

I can speak to this—when I say personally, not because I am in Israel and see the horrific attacks, but because I have a classmate from college, a very dear friend, and we have stayed in contact over a number of years. She is a psychiatric nurse. When she married, they made aliyah and moved to Israel, where she has taught at Hebrew University and her husband is a distinguished psychiatrist. They live in a town called Ashkelon.

She sent me the most poignant of emails. I will not read it to my colleagues, but she did tell me what is going on. Every day there are these rockets going on. They spend their lives going to shelters. They can only move around in a small patch because they have to be, under safety rules, within 2 or 3 minutes from a shelter. She said in her email to me that it is literally Iron Dome that is saving their lives.

Iron Dome is a technology that needs to be replenished. It needs to be replenished, and the State of Israel has discussed this with our government. Secretary Chuck Hagel wrote to our committee asking that this be in the supplemental essentially because of this war or terrorist attack against Israel.

The committee has responded by placing \$225 million in there, but in

order to replenish it. There are many who say: I don't know if I am going to vote for this. What is Iron Dome, and is this an attack technology?

Let me say what Iron Dome is.

Iron Dome is a high-tech defensive system. It is not an offensive system. It is used as a missile defense system. How does it work? Approximately 10-foot-long missiles intercept rockets. Their rockets aren't designed to shoot out; they are designed to shoot rockets at rockets that are being fired on Israel from a range of between 2.5 and 43 miles. Each interceptor missile—remember, they intercept another rocket—costs about \$50,000. Stunning, isn't it? Israel has invested over \$1 billion of its own money in Iron Dome. Our government has worked with them on Iron Dome so they can maintain their qualitative edge. But just think. In order to protect themselves, every rocket going off costs \$50,000.

As of July 30, over 2,730 rocket launches have been directed at Israel itself. Iron Dome has sent over 515 interceptions; 9 batteries have been deployed; more than 4,100 targets were attacked since the beginning of the operation.

But remember, over 2,700 rockets have been directed at Israel. Iron Dome has deployed 515 at the cost of \$50,000 apiece. Now what they are saying is, help us replenish our interceptor rockets because we are using them up. Essentially, it is bullets—not directed at people—it is rockets in the air.

Israel has a 90-percent success rate in intercepting these rockets coming from the Gaza. What they are asking for is help from us, the ability to replenish these rockets. I hope we do this in order for them to continue to be able to defend themselves. It is absolutely crucial that Israel has the opportunity to defend itself while others are working on cease-fires or political solutions. Those are excellent diplomatic and humanitarian goals, but right now we have to make sure that Israel can defend itself.

This is important because Israel is a treasured ally. It is important that we enable them to guard themselves against a terrorist organization.

We all know that the long-range solution is that the Hamas infrastructure must be eliminated. That is absolutely so. These so-called—well, they are not so-called. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have had many briefings on this. I can't go into detail, but there are tunnels that go right through Gaza and into the edge or, actually, in some instances into Israel itself. During this conflict Israel has discovered 31 tunnels. This is extremely disturbing. And they are big. When we think of a tunnel—this isn't like a little pipe for water. This is a tunnel where as many as two people could cross side-by-side going through and, in some instances, actually weap-

ons being able to be put through. These tunnels are a very threat to Israel's existence.

In addition to the tunnels, the rockets that are pummeling Israel continue to be fired every single day.

We believe, for our allies, in the right to self-defense. We have signed memorandums of agreement to enable them, with their missile defense system, to maintain their qualitative edge.

Now, when they are in the very struggle for their safety and perhaps their future, we need to be able to pass this important legislation.

We also know that when we pass this legislation, Iron Dome should stand alone. Many people who support the Iron Dome legislation, such as myself, want to also support those people who are also under threat.

That takes me to the children, because right now the children in Central America are under threat. And what are they under threat of? Well, I will talk more about that around 5:00. But what are they under threat of? They are under threat because of the narco drug dealers who have created the most vicious and violent gangs that have now almost taken over some of these Central American countries. They want to recruit the young men to be part of the gang, part of the drug trade, part of the couriers, part of what is involved in doing a drug trade. Then, when they refuse, they either threaten them with death or the most grisly and ghoulish of torture.

There are reported incidents, not in our classified briefings but in public media, of children being tortured to death because they refused to join a gang. They are literally fighting for their lives. These children coming to our border are fighting for their lives, and the way they fight for their life is to flee. They are fleeing the violence.

I know people are dismissive of some of this and they say: Oh, there you go. You are a soft-hearted social worker, you are a liberal, you love children. The answer is: Yes. Yes to all that. Yes, you betcha, I claim it; I own it; that is who I am.

But I don't do this because of some "gushy-poo" feeling here. I am doing this because of the actual documented violence in these countries, and I believe we need to respond to the needs of the children. Let them tell their case not only to a social worker—which is a good step, in my mind—but also to an immigration judge, and using the laws of our country, the legal criteria for asylum and refugee status, let's listen to the stories of the children. And if those children qualify for asylum and refugee status, then they should remain in this country. If they don't, there are other avenues for them to return home. But for gosh sakes, could we stop punishing the children for the crimes of the drug dealers and the human traffickers? Don't punish the children.

There are those who want to further militarize our border by calling out the National Guard. Well, what are they going to do when the children present themselves with little strips of paper saying what their name and their hometown is, and where their aunt is living in Langley Park, MD? That is not the job of the National Guard.

And if we want to use guns at the border, yes—don't use them about the children, use them about the drug dealers. And by the way, it is our insatiable, vociferous desire and appetite for drugs that has fueled this whole economy in these countries.

I am going to say more about this, but I do want to say that what is in this supplemental is the tools for people to defend themselves. For our friends in the Western States, this is money to protect themselves; and for firefighters—and gosh knows our local communities need that help; it is for a great nation such as Israel, our treasured ally, to continue to have the interceptor rockets to be able to defend itself; and it is also here that we take a look at the border, we honor our law in terms of determining refugee status for those fleeing from violence in their home country; and then we go after what is creating the violence which is right there in Central America against the narcotraffickers, because remember—and the Presiding Officer is very knowledgeable in this—if someone is willing to trade in drugs, they are also willing to view everything like a commodity. So they view drugs as a commodity and they view women and children, girls and boys, as a commodity, and they are then moved into human trafficking in the most vile, repugnant sexual trafficking.

We need to get some of our darker appetites under control, and we need to be able to fight. If we want to fight with guns, join with Central America and fight against the narcotraffickers.

I hope that clarifies the intellectual underpinnings of this bill, the compelling financial necessity, and humanitarian issues that are facing people in our own country, at our own border, and with a treasured ally.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON DISABILITY RIGHTS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I come before the Senate to call again for the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

I would like to give a little history. We passed the Americans with Disabilities Act here in 1990. It was signed into law by President George Herbert Walker Bush on July 26, 1990—24 years ago last Saturday. That changed the face of America. Anywhere you go, you can see ramps and curb cuts and automatic door openers and accessible bathrooms and in education kids being integrated fully into schools under the IDEA and ADA. It really did change accessibility and also opportunity in the workplace, for example, for people with disabilities.

Some years after the Americans with Disabilities Act was passed, the United Nations set up a committee to study whether there should be a treaty, an international convention on the rights of people with disabilities. That committee drafted it after consultation with us here in the Senate. In looking at the ADA, in fact—I was told by one of the persons instrumental in this that the Americans with Disabilities Act, which we refer to as ADA, informed them on what they needed to put into the convention. That convention was sent out to member states for ratification in 2008. Since that time, 148 nations have ratified it, with one exception—well, there has been more than one exception, but one glaring exception is the United States.

Under our constitutional system, this treaty was sent to the President. The President sent it to all of his Departments to find out what laws we had that needed to be changed. So it goes to the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture perhaps, and everywhere else to see what laws we would have to change to comply with this treaty. Well, it came back after about a year, and because the Americans with Disabilities Act was so good, we didn't have to change any of our laws—none—because we are the best in the world on it. It was sent to OMB to see if there would be any budget implications, and OMB said there were no budget implications either.

After that, the President sent it to the Senate for ratification under our Constitution. It was sent to the Committee On Foreign Relations. Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts was then the chairman of the committee. They had hearings. In fact, the first two witnesses at the hearings were Senator JOHN MCCAIN and I. There were a lot of other people who testified, both Republicans and Democrats, disabilities leaders, disability rights advocates, and others. This was in 2011.

Then it was brought to the floor in December of 2012, and that was a lame-duck session. It turned out that 38 Senators—all on the Republican side—had signed a letter that we should not vote on a treaty in a lame-duck session. There were some other issues raised, but that was the big one. So we

brought it up for a vote. In the Constitution, a treaty requires a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, and so we fell five votes short.

That Congress ended, so the treaty had to be resubmitted from the administration to the Senate. It went through another hearing process. I spoke with the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee about what we could do to advance it, and they wanted more hearings. So we did that. Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey is now the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he had more hearings on it.

Thanks to the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ, the bill was reported out of the committee last week and it was put on the Executive Calendar yesterday. There has to be 3 days before they can send it to the floor. They sent it to the floor on Monday, 24-hour layover, and it is now on the Executive Calendar ready to be brought up.

I understand we have a busy week this week and there are a lot of things happening. I suppose people could look around and say: What? There is not much happening around here today.

But we are in postcloture, and under the rules there is 30 hours of postcloture time unless time is yielded back, and evidently—I don't know if that is going to happen. I am hopeful that sometime today or late today maybe or tomorrow, we will have a unanimous consent request in terms of bringing up this treaty, this convention on the rights of people with disabilities.

So that is what I wanted to talk about today, but I wanted to give a brief history of where we are and why we are at this point.

During the past week we have seen extraordinary efforts to move forward with this treaty. As I said, Senator MENENDEZ, the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, has marked up the treaty and brought it out with a 12-to-6 bipartisan vote. The committee added new reservations, understandings, and declarations that thoughtfully addressed the concerns that have been raised, including the matter of a parent's right to decide how their children are schooled as well as issues related to federalism and sovereignty.

This week we are hearing from disability advocates from across the country. Yesterday afternoon there was a big rally on the Mall calling for passage of the treaty. Many of our offices have been flooded with calls and visits from people with disabilities, veterans groups, and business leaders asking us to vote on and pass this treaty. Businesses such as Walmart, AT&T, Sprint, and Coca-Cola have urged passage of this treaty. In the days ahead we will hear from many more calling for its passage.

Now let me talk about a few of the issues that have been raised. First, I

will talk about the issue of sovereignty. Some of our colleagues continue to express concern about some aspects, particularly with regard to sovereignty and reproductive health. Let me talk about sovereignty first, but I want to say this first of all: It is important to address these issues thoughtfully and respectfully. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a bipartisan fashion did so last week when it approved a series of new reservations, understandings, and declarations.

For those who don't know what that means, every treaty we adopt has what are called RUDs—reservations, understandings, and declarations. What are those? Those inform other free nations on how we will adopt this treaty, how under our laws and the Constitution we will comport with that treaty. Just about every treaty we have has some reservation or understanding or declaration.

So the Foreign Relations Committee adopted new reservations, declarations, and understandings, but concerns remain.

Last week my good friend the senior Senator from Utah spoke eloquently about his genuine concerns about the loss of or possible loss of U.S. sovereignty. In answering my question as to why this convention is different from the Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor treaty, he expressed his fear that the disabilities convention would "threaten American sovereignty and self-government." The Senator from Utah stated that the child labor convention we passed in 1999 is the Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor. The Senate adopted it in 1999. So the Senator from Utah says that convention gives authority to ratifying countries to determine whether they are in compliance with the convention while under the disabilities convention—the CRPD, as it is known—the U.N. determines whether ratifying countries are in compliance with their treaty obligations. On the Senate floor, my good friend from Utah stated that "the Disability Treaty gives the last word on whether a nation is in compliance to the UN, the child labor treaty leaves that entirely up to each nation."

Well, the fact is that the review process of compliance is essentially identical in both the Worst Forms of Child Labor treaty that we adopted in 1999 and the CRPD that we are discussing right now.

Let me further explain that. When an ILO member—that is the International Labor Organization, under which that treaty was signed—when an ILO member state ratifies this convention, it is required to submit regular reports. Those reports are reviewed by the ILO's independent committee of experts. Keep that phrase in mind—"committee of experts." It is reviewed by

them on the application of conventions and recommendations, and they are known as the committee of experts. The task of the committee of experts is to assess the extent to which the ratifying member's legislation and practices are in conformity with the ratified treaty. This is an external review committee, and the United States has always supported this type of review. The process guarantees fairness and openness in the implementation of treaty obligations.

While it has been suggested that the United States should conduct its own compliance with treaty obligations, I ask my colleagues, would we be comfortable with all countries assessing their own compliance with important international standards? I don't think so.

For example, take any treaty—take the START treaty, the arms control reduction treaty. Would we be content to say to Russia “Tell us how you are in compliance with that” and just accept their word for it? We wouldn't do that. We wouldn't do that with any country with which we have a treaty. That is why there is always an external review process to see whether country A, B, C or D that has signed on to any treaty is in fact in compliance with it. You wouldn't make a treaty and say: OK, Country X, tell us whether you are in compliance and we will just accept that. No one would do that. It goes back to Ronald Reagan's phrase: Trust but verify. We will trust, but we want verification.

The Worst Forms of Child Labour treaty, the one we adopted here in 1999, has the same conclusions and recommendations as this committee of experts as far as external reviews. It is the same in the CRPD, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and sets up a “committee of experts,” just as it is under the Worst Forms of Child Labour treaty, to review whether a country is basically in compliance. Are they really implementing the treaty as they said in the treaty?

Again, we have the two committees of experts—the one in the CRPD and in the Worst Forms of Child Labour treaty, which was adopted here unanimously in 1999. The Senator from Utah supported that. The recommendations and conclusions of that committee of experts under the Worst Forms of Child Labour treaty that was set up in 1999 are not legally binding on the United States or any other country. Although these recommendations often have great moral weight and persuasive value, the findings cannot be imposed on any government. It is up to each ratifying member to determine whether and to what extent it will act upon those recommendations. That is the same as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

This committee of experts will certainly go in and do external reviews of

whether a country is in compliance or working to be in compliance. They may issue findings and conclusions and recommendations, but they are not binding on any country. They are not binding on the United States. Let me repeat: It is up to each ratifying member to determine whether and to what extent it will act upon those recommendations.

A review of practices is common whenever a nation undertakes an international obligation, whether it is by treaty or any other international agreement. This does not equate to forfeiture by the American people of our right to govern or of our sovereignty. It does not relate to any abandonment of our cultural and social values in America.

In terms of this external review of compliance, there is no substantive difference between the child labor convention we passed in 1999 and the U.N. disabilities convention that we hope to bring up. Both treaties have much the same reporting requirements, oversight mechanisms, recommendation process, and “committee of experts.” And just as in 1999 with that earlier treaty, the United States is in no danger of losing any of its sovereignty with the disability treaty—none whatsoever. If we weren't before, we aren't now. These are recommendations.

Why should we be afraid of an external review by a committee of experts to see whether we are in compliance with this treaty on the rights of people with disabilities? It was modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act, for crying out loud, and we were already in compliance. We are far ahead, quite frankly, of any other country. Why should we be afraid of any review of our laws and practices in terms of people with disabilities? We should not be. We ought to be proud of it. In fact, we ought to be proud of exporting the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Given these facts, I ask my colleagues: Why is it acceptable to have sufficient reservations to protect our sovereignty for a treaty about the worst forms of child labor and a treaty on torture and a treaty on degrading punishment and not be able to have sufficient reservations that protect our sovereignty when it comes to a treaty regarding people with disabilities? What is the difference? From my review of this issue, and the review of legal experts, there is no substantive difference to the threat to our sovereignty. As I have stated previously here, scores of Republican policymakers agree with me.

I have heard that some of my fellow Republicans are concerned about losing our sovereignty under this treaty. I will point out that former President George Herbert Walker Bush, who signed the Americans with Disabilities Act, is in strong support of this treaty. Are you telling me he doesn't care

about our sovereignty? I don't think so. Former President Bush was a strong supporter. I kind of think he cares about our sovereignty. Since the Americans with Disabilities Act was passed, every former Republican leader of this Senate—I am talking about Senator Dole, Senator Lott, and Senator Frist—supported this treaty. I kind of think they care about our sovereignty a lot too. I know every one of them.

Dick Thornburgh, former Attorney General of the United States under George Herbert Walker Bush, is in strong support of this treaty. Don't tell me he doesn't know what is in the treaty. He knows every legal part of it. He cares deeply about our sovereignty, and he says this is no threat to our sovereignty whatsoever.

The American Legion is a big supporter. Are you telling me the American Legion commander and all of those veterans are not concerned about our sovereignty? You bet they are. They know this treaty and have read the treaty, and they said it doesn't affect our sovereignty. Every veterans group supports this bill, and they do care about our sovereignty.

I hope we can lay that issue aside. This does not impinge or threaten our sovereignty any more than other treaties. Every treaty we have signed has a reservation that basically says a treaty shall be applied in the United States in accordance with the Constitution as interpreted by the United States. That is in every treaty we sign, and it says, basically, we are sovereign and our Constitution is sovereign.

There was a court case called the Bond case which was recently decided, I think in May, by the Supreme Court. A lot of people wondered whether that would affect this treaty. It was a case that was brought up by the United States against a woman for violating the chemical weapons ban treaty because she had been trying to poison one of her husband's lovers or something like that. The Supreme Court said: That is nonsense. Get out of here. Those laws are covered by the State of Pennsylvania, not by a treaty. So that kind of put to rest any idea that somehow this treaty overrode our Constitution—our federalism—and the fact that these criminal laws are State laws. That just happened in May.

The other issue that has come up is reproductive health. Some of our colleagues have also voiced concern regarding the provision on sexual and reproductive health of women with disabilities as it was mentioned in article 25 of the treaty. For those not familiar with this provision, the treaty simply says “persons with disabilities have the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health without discrimination on the basis of disability.”

The article goes further and says that those countries ratifying the treaty shall “provide persons with disabilities with the same range, quality and standard of free or affordable health care and programmes as provided to other persons, including in the area of sexual and reproductive health . . .”

Critics of the treaty say this phrase “creates and expands rights to abortion.” That is not correct. This phrase has nothing to do with abortion. What it is about is equality and access.

Historically, people with disabilities have been disproportionately discriminated against when it comes to health care—especially women with disabilities around the world—because they are blind or have cerebral palsy or autism or any number of physical or mental impairments. They were often viewed as not being able to be mothers or wives or partners in a family.

In fact, because of this prejudiced attitude—which still exists in so many places around the world, and probably some places here in America too—women with disabilities were, and in many cases still are, denied such vital services as Pap smears, gynecological exams, breast cancer screenings, and cervical cancer screenings simply because they are disabled. Denying women with disabilities the same health prevention, screening, and intervention services that are provided to women without disabilities is blatant discrimination, prejudicial, and unethical.

The entire purpose of article 25 of the U.N. convention is to address this prejudiced view of the world that has led to thousands of unnecessary deaths of women because they have not been afforded the same access to reproductive health care as women without disabilities. That is why that was put in there. It has nothing to do with abortion. Article 25 simply reflects the underlying principles of the treaty: equality and access for all. These same principles are the bedrock of our own Americans with Disabilities Act. It has nothing to do with abortion, but some people have whipped it up and said it does.

In some countries women with disabilities have been the most preyed upon. It is women with disabilities—physical and intellectual disabilities—who are the subject of maltreatment, mistreatment, and sexual abuse. All we are saying is they have to be treated the same as any other woman without a disability under the laws of that country. So if a country banned all abortions, that is their right to do so. They cannot then say: Oh, you may have an abortion if your unborn child is disabled. They can't do that. They can't make exceptions.

If they provide any kind of services, they can't say to one woman: Because you are not disabled, you get this service, but if you are disabled, you don't get it. No, no. Equality of access.

There are 71 countries that have absolute prohibitions, or significant restrictions on abortion, that have signed the treaty without reservations about reproductive health. Imagine that—71. They felt no harm would come from a reservation because they correctly determined that the treaty is no threat whatsoever to their sovereignty and their national laws limiting access to abortion.

Poland, a country with strict abortion limitations, was not going to sign this treaty because they were concerned about article 25. I will read the exact language of the reservation put in by the Nation of Poland:

The Republic of Poland understands that Article 23.1(b) and Article 25(a) shall not be interpreted in a way conferring an individual right to abortion or mandating state party to provide access thereto, unless that right is guaranteed by the national law.

Well, when they adopted that reservation, Poland signed it on the treaty. Poland's reservation states exactly what this treaty is about, a guarantee that women with disabilities will have access to the same health care services guaranteed to all other citizens by their national law. To say the treaty is about creating and expanding abortion rights is just plain wrong, and to make such a claim is utterly unfounded and unfair. It is unfair to women with disabilities around the globe. It is creating a false claim out of thin air with no other purpose but to prevent ratification of this important treaty.

Most of the concerns raised by my colleagues are serious concerns. They are also concerns that can be addressed by thoughtful reservations, understandings, and declarations to the treaty. Indeed, they have been addressed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They have acted, and now it is time for the full Senate to act.

Let us bring the treaty to the floor of the Senate. Listen to Senators' concerns, address those concerns, and then vote on the treaty. We owe this to millions of Americans with disabilities—our veterans and others who want the same rights and access afforded by our own Americans with Disabilities Act. They want it to apply to the globe. We owe this to our veterans who want to be able to travel and pursue opportunities in other countries, knowing they can enjoy the same rights and access they have here in America.

Senator MARK KIRK from Illinois said it very eloquently in a press conference we had with the veterans groups last week. He said: “Our veterans fought for freedom around the globe. They ought to be able to move freely around the globe.”

We owe this to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, and countless companies that know that not only is this the right thing to do for veterans, it is the right thing to do for business. There are all kinds of

markets opening all around the world for people with disabilities—new software, new kinds of equipment, new devices that are helping people with disabilities live more full and meaningful lives. A lot of that was developed here in America. I know our businesses would like to be involved with this treaty, to be able to be involved in raising the level of accessibility and opportunity for people with disabilities around the globe. Scores of religious groups want to see this treaty ratified.

In closing, it is time to bring this to the floor. As I say, I know Members have serious concerns and those concerns should be addressed. I believe the Foreign Relations Committee has addressed them. If not, then let's have a discussion about how we meet those reservations. We shouldn't just say I don't like the U.N., so therefore we shouldn't adopt it.

I think there are some people who maybe don't like the U.N. OK, fine. I remember when we passed the convention on the worst forms of child labor. I was in Geneva with President Clinton when he signed it. We came back, re-submitted it to the Senate, and I went to see Senator Jesse Helms to ask him to move this. There was probably no one in my 30 years of history in the Senate who disliked the United Nations more than Jesse Helms of North Carolina. So he went on to tell me just how bad the United Nations was but he would bring the treaty to the committee and have hearings and a markup. He called me as the first witness. I always appreciated that.

So Senator Helms, the chairman of the committee—the Republicans were in charge of the Senate at the time—brought the convention to the committee and reported it out. I remember him saying one time he didn't like the United Nations, but if this makes them do something good for a change, he would be all right with it, and it passed the floor unanimously.

I say to those who maybe don't like the United Nations: Fine, that is their right; perhaps they have good and sufficient reasons not to like the United Nations. I have some problems with the United Nations myself at certain times with some of the things they do or don't do. But I see this in the same light as the convention on the worst forms of child labor. This makes countries change for the better through persuasion, not through mandate. No country has to change their laws because of what the committee on experts says, but through moral weight, through persuasion, through working with other countries under this umbrella on the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. If this causes countries to change their policies and make life better for people with disabilities around the globe, shouldn't we do it, even though we may not like the United Nations? As Jesse

Helms said, if this makes them do something good for a change, we ought to be for it.

So I hope colleagues will listen to the veterans groups who are for it. All business groups I have met with support it strongly. Religious groups and disability groups are united behind this. Listen to our former Republican leaders, including former President George Herbert Walker Bush, President Bush; former Senator Bob Dole, the majority leader of the Senate, worked his heart out on this. He cares about sovereignty. He knows this is not going to take away our sovereignty. Every former Republican leader of the Senate—Senator JOHN MCCAIN—colleagues tell me Senator JOHN MCCAIN doesn't care about our sovereignty? I happen to think he cares a lot about our sovereignty. He gave a lot of his life protecting our sovereignty. MARK KIRK, Senator KELLY AYOTTE, Senator JOHN BARRASSO, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator COLLINS are all strong supporters of this.

I have been involved in disability policy since I first got here in 1975, starting in the House. Everything I have ever worked on, including Education of All Handicapped Children Act, the Television Decoder Circuitry Act, the Rehabilitation Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the ADA Act Amendments later on in 2008—these were all nonpartisan. They didn't devolve into any kind of partisan issue. Now, that didn't mean that everybody voted for it, but it passed overwhelmingly with both Republican and Democrat support. That ought to be the case with this too. Yes, we should address the legitimate and honest concerns people have about home schooling, abortion, and sovereignty. I believe we can do that with reservations, but I want every Senator to know that nothing this committee on experts will ever do under the CRPD takes precedence over our Constitution or over our laws. It does nothing to take away our sovereignty, and we can spell that out just as we have in every other treaty we have signed in the past.

So I hope we can bring this to the floor, and I hope we can have a discussion. I hope we can work these areas out and have strong support from both sides to pass this treaty and help change the face of the globe as we have changed the face of America for people with disabilities.

I see the Senator from Wyoming is on the floor. I was listing all the people who support the treaty, and one of the strongest supporters of this treaty from the very beginning has been Senator JOHN BARRASSO from Wyoming. I inadvertently, going through the names, left it off, but I see him here, and I apologize because he has been such a strong advocate for people with disabilities in this country and a strong advocate for people with disabili-

ties in the world. I personally want to publicly thank Senator BARRASSO for his great leadership on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank my colleague from Iowa for his kind comments. We have worked on this issue, and I do this as a physician who has taken care of patients in Wyoming for a quarter of a century. I have so many friends and there are so many folks who have had extra challenges in life, and I was happy to stand with Senator Dole and Senator MCCAIN and others in this effort. So I thank my colleague for his comments.

HEALTH CARE

As a physician, I come to the floor today as I have week after week since the President's health care law was passed because I have many concerns about the way this health care law is impacting families in my home State of Wyoming, as well as across the country—people who find out their rates are going up, they are paying higher deductibles, higher copays, higher premiums. They feel the government is in control, Washington is in control rather than them, when Washington decides if the insurance policy they have had and that worked for them is something they will be able to keep, and many times they weren't because the President's law said no, it wasn't good enough for them, even though the families in Wyoming are better able to make the decision about what is better and more important for them. They don't like it when the President tells them they need to buy insurance they don't want or need or can afford, in many ways, with a long list of provisions that Washington mandates be included.

I hear every week, as I did last weekend in Wyoming, from folks who have had work hours cut, resulting in lower take-home pay because of the impact of part of the law that resulted in bipartisan opposition that says the work week is 30 hours. So people who are working part-time have had their hours cut to below 30 hours and have lower take-home pay.

I talked to ER doctors at home and around the country where I have trained and where I have gone to medical school. The Wall Street Journal even wrote about it last month: "ER visits rise despite the law. Health act isn't cutting volume." On the front page the lead paragraph said: "Early evidence suggests that emergency rooms have become busier since the Affordable Care Act expanded insurance coverage this year, despite the law's goal of reducing unnecessary care in ERs." It says: Democrats who designed that law hoped it would do the opposite, but that hasn't been the case.

I heard last weekend in Wyoming the story about all of these fake applications that—actually I guess the Gov-

ernment Accountability Office said let's see how well this works; is the Obama health care law working? So they made up 10 fake applications, sent them in, and they found out that actually a dozen fictitious applicants, online or by phone, using invalid or missing Social Security numbers—this is the Washington Post writing about this, but it was in stories across the country—invalid or missing Social Security numbers, inaccurate citizenship information—all but one of the fake applicants ended up getting subsidized coverage.

So here we are, a health care law that is supposed to provide a number of things, including integrity, and we find out that when the Government Accountability Office says, let's just put in a number of applications and see what happens, it is not working.

The administration set up the Health Insurance Marketplace in ways—we are hearing from the Government Accountability Act—that leave it vulnerable to fraud and a waste of taxpayer money. That is what we are dealing with in this health care law.

I know many Senators are preparing to head home, and they will be traveling around their home States in the month of August. I expect every Senator who goes home will hear from people in their State about very damaging side effects that so many people across America are feeling from the President's health care law. I hear it every weekend, but I hear it when I travel as well. As chairman of the Republican policy committee, one of my responsibilities is to study how policies that come out of Washington, such as the President's health care law, affect people all across America, and that is what I try to look at. So in looking around the country, here is what I found in Louisiana.

Last month, the Shreveport Times in Louisiana had an op-ed written by a Dr. Regina Fakner. The headline was: "Washington ties doctors' hands"—not the doctor, not the hospital, not the patients—"Washington ties doctors' hands." The doctor who wrote this op-ed says she has practiced pediatric medicine in Shreveport since the early 1990s.

We need pediatricians. We need people to take care of children. We need primary care physicians. There is a gross shortage of nurses, of physicians, of additional health care personnel.

She says health care was and is impossible to navigate because it is wrapped in layers of red tape and government regulations. This doctor knows America's health care system needed reform. We needed to do something.

That is what Republicans here in the Senate have been saying too: We need to do something. The American people wanted reform that gave them access to high-quality, affordable care. That is not what people got.

As this doctor writes in the Shreveport Times: ObamaCare only adds to the mess, she said. This is a pediatrician who takes care of lots of children. She says “patients and health care providers suffer for it.” The government does not suffer. The Senate Democrats who voted for it do not suffer. Patients and health care providers are suffering. She puts patients first, which is what doctors do.

The President’s health care law has added tens of thousands of pages of red-tape and Washington mandates—thousands of pages of redtape and mandates. The doctor says in her op-ed that “this one-size-fits all approach limits patient freedom, while picking their pockets.” This is a doctor who talks to her patients every day. She says she has seen for herself in Louisiana how Washington is standing between her and her patients. Nothing should be between a patient and that person’s doctor—nothing—not a government bureaucrat, not an insurance company bureaucrat, no one. The doctor-patient relationship is one that is sacred.

This doctor’s experience is typical of what I am hearing and what we are hearing from all across the country from doctors.

Every Democrat in the Senate voted to pass this terrible health care law. President Obama says Democrats who voted for the health care law should, as he said, “forcefully defend and be proud of” the law.

Is the President proud that patients and health care providers such as this pediatrician are suffering because of his health care law and all of its dangerous side effects? Where are the Democrats ready to forcefully defend standing between Louisiana doctors and their patients? Where are they? I do not see them coming to the floor.

Democrats in Washington were so eager to pass the President’s health care law that they made a lot of promises, and they were not true. They said people could keep their insurance. That was not true. It seems as though 5 million people received letters saying their insurance had been canceled, in spite of what the President had promised them.

People in Wyoming, people in Louisiana, people all across the country lost the insurance they had because it did not include all the unnecessary coverage the President’s health care law mandated.

Democrats said people could keep their doctor. That was not true. People in Wyoming, Louisiana, all across America lost their doctor because the new, narrow provider networks made people lose the doctor they had worked with, who treated them, who treated members of their family, whom they knew and trusted.

The President said the American people would save \$2,500 per year, per fam-

ily on insurance premiums. Democrats in the Senate who voted for the law promised the same. I remember them standing here. I can see one after another saying that. It was not true.

People all across America are paying more than ever because of the health care law. Well, people in Louisiana specifically, where this pediatrician lives and works and takes care of patients, are paying a lot more.

There is an article from the Associated Press newspaper in Lake Charles, LA, last Thursday: “Health insurance price increases could top 10 percent for thousands in Louisiana.” That was the headline on the front page above the fold.

According to the article, Blue Cross—that is the largest health insurer in Louisiana—is planning to raise rates by more than 18 percent next year.

Is President Obama ready to forcefully defend these premium increases because of the law? He is the one who said premiums were going to go down. The American people see what has happened. The President did not say, well, they are just not going to kind of go up as fast. He said they were going to go down \$2,500 per year, per family. So we are seeing large increases all across the country.

Are the Democrats in the Senate proud that families in Louisiana are getting hit with another 18-percent premium increase in some locations? Higher premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles—all to pay for coverage that people do not want, do not need, cannot afford, but were mandated to have.

People in Louisiana were already paying more because of the President’s health care law. There is a recent study which found that health insurance premiums for an average 27-year-old man in Louisiana are over 100 percent higher this year than last year—double, double this year from last year. That is before they were forced into the ObamaCare exchange. Premiums for an average 64-year-old woman are \$2,000 more this year than they were last year. These are very expensive side effects for families in Louisiana as a result of the President’s health care law.

What does the President have to say about these outrageous rate hikes that he caused because of his health care law? What does he have to say to the people suffering from the costly side effects of the health care law?

Well, the President went to Kansas City, MO, in the last couple days. I think when he travels outside of Washington, the President should actually meet with doctors who live in those communities, doctors such as this woman, this pediatrician, who practices in Louisiana. He should sit down with the women whose children are patients of doctors such as this one, talk to the parents of these children about

what the impact of his health care law has been on them.

The President should hear directly—directly—from these people about the devastating side effects of his health care law and how it is hurting them and hurting their families.

Every Democrat in the Senate voted for this health care law—every one of them.

Where are the Democrats willing to forcefully defend these costly and damaging side effects of their health care law? Democrats do not want to defend this terrible law and all of its devastating side effects.

Republicans are going to keep talking about this law. We are going to keep standing for American families who are being hurt by this law. We are going to continue to come to the floor to talk about stories that we hear from back home, what we hear from families in our home States, people who have lost their insurance and end up having to get insurance they do not need or do not want or are never going to use that is much more expensive than what they had before because the insurance that worked for their families the President said was not good enough.

We are going to continue to come and talk about the families who have seen their take-home pay go down because instead of being able to take that money home and working the hours they want, they have had their hours cut, not because they were not needed at work, not because there was not a demand for their services, but because of the health care law that says anybody working over 30 hours a week is then considered full time, and by the President’s mandate, they have to be supplied with health insurance at work.

So what happens? Businesses—and it is not just businesses—what we are seeing are school districts, counties, county governments, the whole State of Virginia—the different governing bodies—as to any part-time workers, they are saying: Well, we have to keep them below 30 hours because we cannot afford the insurance for these folks. So these folks are saying: Well, I lose my take-home pay. And the reason is the President’s health care law. School districts are having to say: Well, we can keep them above 30 hours and then have to pay for their insurance, but then we are going to have to fire a number of reading teachers, fire the coach, fire the bus driver, fire someone else who works in the school.

That is not a way to help people in a community. That is not good for anybody’s health. But those are the side effects of the President’s health care law—a bill that so few people actually read before they voted for it because, as NANCY PELOSI famously said: First you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it.

So we are going to continue to talk about patient-centered reforms, reforms that get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost. We are going to talk about restoring people's freedom, freedom to buy health insurance that works for them and their families because they know what is best for them. It is not Washington controlled; it is local decisions, families making decisions for themselves. And we are going to talk about giving people choices, not Washington mandates. Republicans are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these tragic side effects.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, there is a long list of items on the Senate agenda that are important to our country, including reforming the VA health system, addressing the crisis at our border, and ensuring funding is available for improvements to our roads and bridges.

While it may seem as though other issues are on the back burner, they are not. I want Arkansans to know I hear you loudly and clearly about your dislike for ObamaCare. Recent court rulings confirm ObamaCare is unworkable. Americans understand how the law infringes on our rights. The Supreme Court reserved the right for business owners to object to overbearing government mandates that would violate our religious beliefs.

The promises that were made were not true—like the law will lower our premiums. The reality is ObamaCare drives up health insurance premiums and copays, and that is what hurts our wallets.

Sean from Hackett, AR, wrote to me about a blood test his fiancée needed to help diagnose her illness. In the past, she had a copayment and the rest of the bill was paid by her insurance. But Sean wrote:

Normally it would only cost \$25 for a copayment. Now she received a \$200 bill.

You remember the other promises, such as you can keep your doctors and Medicare will not be cut.

Cyndi, who lives in rural Arkansas, detailed the problem she is having with Medicare because of ObamaCare. The changes made through ObamaCare have cost her both time and money. "Not everyone lives in the big city where clinics, doctors and hospitals are easily available," she wrote. "Many of these facilities have closed their doors or the doctors are not accepting Medicare patients."

Connie, a registered nurse in Arkansas, told me that she is sick of ObamaCare and sees the problems her patients and family have to deal with under the law, which includes losing their doctors and the use of the local hospital. She wrote that the cost of the

insurance payments increased and customers have to pay such high deductibles that they cannot afford to go to the doctor.

These failed promises are negatively impacting Arkansans. The ugly reality is people are struggling under this law. Amanda's story is what so many middle-class families are experiencing. Her family is already trying to make ends meet, but she says ObamaCare is not affordable. "There is no way humanly possible that my family can afford a monthly fee of \$654," she wrote.

ObamaCare costs American taxpayers more than \$2 trillion, but like in the case with Amanda's family, health care is more unaffordable.

I believe we need to start over by creating real reforms that lower costs, increase choice, and eliminate Washington's control of our health care. We need health care reform, but ObamaCare is not the answer. We need to transition the employer-based private insurance market toward one that allows for flexibility, choice, portability, and fairness.

Let's allow small business owners to pool together to purchase group insurance. Let's allow individuals to purchase insurance across State lines to increase competition. Let's expand health savings accounts and flexible savings accounts. Let's address medical malpractice reform and prevent lawsuit abuse.

I want you to know that unraveling ObamaCare and starting over is at the top of my agenda because health care needs to be much more affordable than it currently is under ObamaCare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues here to talk about some of the stories we are hearing from the people we work for. I have been to the floor many times talking about the stories we are getting from families, from moms, from people trying to get that first job, from people who suddenly are no longer working the 40 hours they used to work because of the impact this has had on the 40-hour workweek.

Let me mention, as I am here between Senator BOOZMAN and Senator JOHANNIS, just two recent contacts we have had. We have had one from Joanne in Fulton, MO. She said her premiums went up from \$110 a month to \$311 a month—an increase of \$201 a month. She said:

Our monthly premium has gone up to \$311 a month. It is a large increase for us—it is nearly triple of what we paid before my husband's retirement. It really takes a bite out of our budget.

She believes this would not have happened without what is happening in our health care system. I had a list of employees from one of our counties in Missouri the other day. Because it is a

small county, they rate their employees. Each one of them pays a different premium, even though the county helps some with that premium. Everybody who is over 50 had their premium—that is going to be the premium next year—at least doubled. If you were 19, 20, 21, your premium was about what it had been the year before. If you were 51 or 61, your premium was twice what it had been before.

Then we got a letter from Jerrold of Kansas City, who said he has seen significant increases in his out-of-pocket costs, both for what he pays in premiums and what he pays for prescriptions. Jerrold said that instead of retiring at 65, he has had to keep working to help pay for his medical and prescription costs. Jerrold says:

I started paying \$131.00 a month for health and \$31 for prescriptions. As soon as ObamaCare was phased in my premiums went up to \$149.00 for health coverage and my prescription plan went to \$49.

Like many other people, he expects his plan to go up even more next year.

So these are real impacts on the lives of families, people who are paying more for the care they get and finding the choices they have as to where they get their care are less than they have ever been before. These stories keep coming. This is affecting the health care needs and the health care of individuals and families. We need to do something about it.

I thank Senator JOHANNIS for letting me tell those two stories before he took time to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I was here during the days when the Affordable Care Act was being debated, if you could call it that. I was here during the time when the effort of Senate Democrats was simply to keep 60 together so they could pass this bill under any circumstances. There were all kinds of promises made as to what this bill was going to do.

President Obama himself, when he talked about his plan for health care, said: My plan is going to reduce your premiums by \$2,500 a year.

But I could go on and on. I could spend the whole afternoon talking about the promises that were made. Now it is time though to take stock and determine whether those promises were in fact kept. The people of our States tell that story. A Nebraskan from the central part of the State wrote to me recently and said this: He and his wife are losing the health insurance they have had for over 21 years. Their premiums had doubled, threatening their retirement savings.

He went on to say, "ObamaCare has ruined the lives we planned and we worked so hard for." So let me compare what this gentleman from Central Nebraska has seen with the promises that were made. Remember that promise the President made over and over

again. Members on the Democratic side of this body made the same promise. The promise was, if you like your plan, you are going to get to keep it—and the promise that your health insurance premiums would go down.

This gentleman from Central Nebraska is living proof that those promises were not kept.

Another Central Nebraskan wrote to me about the effect of the health care law on his wife's job and on his family: "Because of the ACA she was cut back to less than 25 hours a week and lost our health insurance."

He went on to say that their new premium is twice as much as the plan they liked and the one they lost because of ObamaCare.

So you see again we have a situation where we can compare reality with the promises that were made. The promises that your premium would go down, that you could keep the plan you had if you liked it went out the window for those two families.

A small construction company from the western part of Nebraska shared this with me: They will be paying an additional \$5,000 in ObamaCare fees this year. They expect to dedicate over 52 hours to report and comply. To them this is incredibly frustrating because these fees and hours of compliance have no direct benefit on their employees, their employees' benefits or their business mission. It is just the Federal Government has now taken this small company and forced upon them additional costs and additional compliance requirements.

One of the most compelling stories comes from the mother of a family in Omaha, NE. She explained in her letter that they qualify for a subsidy on the exchange, but the options on healthcare.gov were still unaffordable for this family. The lowest cost plan had a \$9,600 deductible. Does the Presiding Officer know what a \$9,600 deductible means to most Americans and to most Nebraskans? It means that if they have the kind of illness or accident or whatever it is that requires significant medical care and if they have to eat through a \$9,600 deductible, that means bankruptcy.

When considering this massive deductible, she wrote to me and said, "It makes more sense to put more money away in savings and just pay for the whole doctor's visit." Due to the high cost of plans and their other expenses, she said, "We are forced to make the choice to go with no insurance."

I was on the floor during this debate. Democrat after Democrat promised: You are going to have insurance now, promised that premiums would go down, promised that if you liked your plan, you got to keep it. Unfortunately, that has not been the case.

With the new enrollment period on the horizon, the stories will of course continue to roll in. The supporters of

ObamaCare, just as when this bill was being debated, would like us to believe their train wreck has been cleaned up, the train cars are no longer lying next to the tracks, and this law is finally on track. But that is not consistent with recent headlines, reality, court decisions, inspectors general reports or just the average American who takes the time to write to us.

Politico reported earlier this month: "Most state health insurance rates for 2015 are scheduled to be approved by early fall, and most are likely to rise."

This law should have never been passed, but now it is time to scrap this law and its Washington-knows-best mandates; instead, work toward solutions that truly do address the cost of care and give Americans the flexibility to choose a plan that makes sense for their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we are now several months into the implementation of ObamaCare. The dust has settled. People from my State, Hoosiers, continue to see the reality of this law. Unfortunately what they see is not what they had hoped for. Earlier this month a news report revealed that health insurance rates will increase fairly dramatically in "most States"—not just a few, not some but most. They said they are likely to rise in the coming year.

Unfortunately, my State is one of those States. Unfortunately, "likely to rise" is an understatement. "Dramatic increase" would be a better phrase. The recent headline from the Indianapolis Business Journal reads, "Indiana's ObamaCare rates for 2015 are all over the map." The first sentence of the article states, "Initial 2015 premiums filed for the ObamaCare exchanges in Indiana range from as high as a 46-percent hike to as low as a 9-percent cut."

The article continues: "Those are the average changes in premiums proposed by the four health insurers that sold plans on the ObamaCare exchanges for 2014." One of those insurance companies providing health care to the State exchange we now learn is requesting rates that range from a 31-percent to a 59-percent increase in premiums. So the picture ahead for those who have been incorporated into ObamaCare in my State is the shock of double-digit and significant double-digit increases in their health care costs, not to mention that under their current plans they are paying higher deductibles, which result in higher costs they first have to put out before they are reimbursed. But now there is an increase of significance for their premiums going into next year.

I know the majority leader said all the stories we have been telling about real people and their reactions to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, are

fiction. I was on the floor when he said that. We all did a double take because we have been receiving thousands—literally thousands—of emails, physical mail, and phone calls. The phones are ringing off the hook about people alarmed over what they were experiencing signing up for ObamaCare, and, secondly, what the terms were going to be.

So we collected all of these. We have hundreds if not thousands of real live examples, not made up, not fiction, basically describing the impact on them and their families as ObamaCare was put in place. Let me state one of those incidents. I will use just the first name. I do not want to put this person at risk for some kind of pushback. But Charles from Auburn, IN, emailed me and shared that his wife had just received a cancellation notice from her insurance provider. Charles said the notice indicated that the wife—he said:

They said my wife's policy did not comply with the requirements of ObamaCare and the replacement policy—

Which she would have to take if she wanted the coverage.

—would be \$695.38 a month as compared to her current policy premium of \$316 a month.

By my math, that is over a 100-percent increase. That is more than a doubling of what he had paid before. Also, the notice said, "Your deductible will be \$6,000." That is every medical expense that she has will have to be paid for before Charles and his wife can get any reimbursement. Now I wish these stories were fiction, but unfortunately I receive emails such as this on a regular basis.

Thousands of Hoosiers have lost their coverage that they liked, that they chose and relied on because of the implementation of ObamaCare.

We have been talking about replacing this act with something far more sensible and something far more reasonable. Yet we have been denied the opportunity to go forward with offering any kind of amendments, modifications, repeal or any other process. That is unfortunate but not just for us. It is unfortunate for the country and unfortunate for all of those people whom we represent who would like to see modifications and a much more affordable and much better range of choices for the provisions of health care.

The 2,000-page ObamaCare law was sold to the American people on what now has turned out to be false pretenses. I believe we owe it to them to replace this law with some common-sense solutions that increase access to quality care without increasing costs. It is doable if we had the opportunity to do it. Unfortunately, we have been denied that, but the American people are speaking. I think they will continue to speak about the need for those reforms that will have to take place if we are going to provide affordable care for Americans.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILDFIRE DISASTER FUNDING

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today there are wildfires burning across the West. I wish to speak for a few moments about some very important work that Chair MIKULSKI and her colleagues have done on the Appropriations Committee that is really built on a bipartisan proposal that Senator CRAPO, our colleague from Idaho, and I, with a large group of bipartisan Senators, are proposing to change the way in which forests are managed and reduce the likelihood of some of—what I call—these infernos. These are fires that are bigger, hotter, more damaging, and they act like a wrecking ball pounding at the rural West.

What has happened over the years is that the preventive efforts in the West in terms of our forests are underfunded. There isn't enough effort that goes to hazardous fuels management and thinning and programs that reduce the huge load of fuels on the forest floor.

Just this past weekend I was in Medford in rural southern Oregon and in Portland, meeting with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. They told me about the problems that Senator CRAPO and I are trying to address in bipartisan legislation that Chairman MIKULSKI has included in her appropriations bill.

The heart of the problem is that these prevention efforts are underfunded. When it gets very dry and very hot, and particularly when there is a lightning strike or a series of lightning strikes, what we have is an enormous fire in a hurry. All through the West there is an effort to try to share resources, and communities work together and try to share efforts—airial resources and others—but the reality is there is not enough money in the agency's budgets to put out those huge fires.

What happens then is the bureaucracy borrows from the prevention fund in order to have funds to put the fire out. Then we are on our way to two bigger problems. We are on our way again to a lack of preventive dollars because of this fire borrowing. Some of our colleagues call it fire robbery, but I am trying to be diplomatic. It is fire borrowing, I guess, if we want to be diplomatic. But we underfund prevention. Then, of course, we don't have enough money needed for suppression as well.

This trend that I have described is getting more and more pronounced and

more and more serious. So what Senator CRAPO and I are proposing to do in order to put the focus on wildfire prevention is in effect to say that the most serious fires, especially in the West—the kind of fires that are dominating our TV screens night after night—1 percent of those infernos ought to be treated like the major natural disasters they are and would be funded in the same way as other natural disasters, such as floods and hurricanes.

Specifically, the legislation that Senator CRAPO and I and others are advancing would move any spending above 70 percent of the 10-year rolling average for fire suppression outside of the Agency's baseline budget by making these additional costs eligible to be funded under a separate disaster account.

So far this year, more than 33,000 fires have burned a total of 1.6 million acres nationwide, and the numbers are growing by the minute.

Just this past weekend, visiting with our wonderfully talented folks at the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management in Medford, they were telling me that their concern is that in southern Oregon it is very hot and very dry and there can be lightning strikes. They were concerned about the prospect of another Biscuit Fire, which we had at the beginning of the century and which burned 500,000 acres—really, our most destructive fire ever. That was what was on the mind of the firefighting professionals when I visited with them in Medford last Friday.

This year the administration already expects to exceed its firefighting budget by more than \$600 million, and that isn't going to surprise anybody in the West. In 8 of the past 10 years, the Forest Service has spent more than its wildfire suppression budget, requiring the Agency to engage in what I have just called "fire borrowing" to cover these wildfire suppression costs. The reality is that, in many cases, the borrowed monies are not repaid. In the cases where the funds are repaid, it is only through costly supplemental spending bills that Congress has to enact or by taking money out of future years' budgets.

So what we have is this kind of borrowing that is extraordinarily disruptive to the ongoing work the Forest Service and their contractors are in the middle of performing. And, I might add, what all this does is it makes it more expensive in the future and makes it less likely that we are going to get the important prevention work that is so necessary.

In our part of the world, I think it is fair to say that westerners are coming to consider that the Forest Service charged with managing the Nation's forests for multiple uses and users has really become something that more appropriately should be called the U.S.

Fire Service, because in effect that is what this agency is month after month using more of its resources on.

What I was told in Portland last Saturday, having visited rural Oregon on Friday and Portland on Saturday—the specialists in Portland on Saturday told me that the fire season is 70 days longer than it was until recently.

So we have this challenge of more fuel load built up on the forest floor, drier conditions, lightning strikes, and fire seasons lasting longer. That is a prescription for trouble in the rural West, and in fact that is what we are seeing.

My hope is that, as a result of the work that Senator CRAPO and I and others are seeking to do, we can have more hazardous fuel treatment, more preventive work that will be effective at reducing fire risks and lowering costs.

A fire in central Oregon this year slowed to a halt when it reached treated areas outside the city of Bend. I saw that when I was in Bend looking at the difference between treated areas—this preventative kind of approach—and areas that were untreated.

A study published by Northern Arizona University's Ecological Restoration Institute concluded that treatments "can reduce fire severity" and "successfully reduce fire risk to communities."

Based on Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture analysis, 1 percent of wildland fires represents 30 percent of firefighting costs. That is what Senator CRAPO and I want to address in our bill.

What we are saying is, for that 1 percent, the 1 percent that is really driving up costs, let's handle those fires as what they are, which are natural disasters. And then, instead of raiding the prevention money to put the fires out, we will be able to cause less problems in the future because we will have the kind of preventive work that is so effective that I saw in Bend and elsewhere.

It seems to me, as we see in a lot of parts of government, there is a choice. We can spend modest sums up front on prevention in order to generate significant savings down the road. If we have \$1 to spend, we ought always to try to put it in prevention and then target scarce resources to fight fires. To the greatest extent possible, we must target disaster money on those infernos that are bigger and hotter and more damaging and cost about 30 percent of the overall budget.

In summary, the legislation that Senator CRAPO and I and others are pursuing would fund the true catastrophic fire events under separate natural disaster programs. Routine wildland firefighting costs would be funded through the normal budget and appropriations process.

Oversight hearings, letters, and numerous discussions with the administration and colleagues helped to

produce the approach that Chairman MIKULSKI has included. I remember not long ago being in Idaho, being hosted by our colleagues Senator CRAPO and Senator RISCH. We had Members from across the political spectrum. Congressman LABRADOR from the other body was there. We had progressive Members. This is something that is common sense. It just makes sense to make sure that the small number of fires, these infernos which are dominating our news accounts, that we handle them from the natural disaster fund. Then let's put most of the money and allow the Forest Service, BLM, and professionals to put their focus and their resources where we can prevent as much of the problem as possible—and prevent it early on.

That is the point of our legislation. We are very grateful to Chairman MIKULSKI for her effort. I thank Senator CRAPO for his support. He and I have been at this with Senator RISCH, Senator MERKLEY, Senator CANTWELL, Senator MURRAY, Senator BENNET—Western Senators and others such as Senator BALDWIN and MANCHIN that understand the importance of national forests. Senator UDALL has been doing important work on this in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. All of the Western Senators are of like mind here. Chair MIKULSKI recognizes what we are looking at and the prospect that we would be leaving this week without this change to make better use of our resources. I call it legislative malpractice because we have an opportunity in a bipartisan way to make a real difference here. If our colleagues are outside the West, I would say it is a chance to spend scarce dollars more effectively. For us in the West, it is nothing short of survival.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Oregon, his leadership, along with Senator CRAPO, on this firefighting budgeting and fire borrowing issue—that is really what it is—is critical to all of us in Western States. Every single one of us has seen communities touched by these catastrophic wildfires as our climate is changing and we see fires get bigger and bigger. But we have solutions, and the solutions are bipartisan and common sense.

I can only hope that we are able to move quickly to make these budget changes. They will make a real difference for all of us up and down in the Intermountain West.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues who have been vocal about their commitment to address the Central American refugee crisis along our southern border.

We have heard the stories of unimaginable violence, of corruption, of

instability in places such as Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—factors that are driving many children to the United States and to other neighboring countries in Central America. In some cases these children are literally fleeing for their lives.

Our Nation has responded with a spectrum of attitudes toward immigrants ranging from hostile to downright hospitable. It is my hope that our attitude as a nation continues to be defined by the image of the Statue of Liberty and not by shouting protesters holding signs labeled “Return to Sender” as they stand in front of buses full of Central American children.

I recently received a letter from a constituent in my home State of New Mexico whose grandmother, as a result of extreme poverty, left her family and emigrated by herself to the United States from Ireland at the age of 14 at the end of World War I. Brendan said that when he was growing up, his grandmother frequently shared this Irish proverb with him. She said, “Courage is the trust that your feet will bring you to where your heart is.” Brendan asked that I continue to remind my colleagues that the immigrants who arrive at our borders come by foot following their hearts and do so in the hope of building a better life.

Last week I sat down with Ambassadors from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, and we discussed how our Nation's approach to stemming the influx of unaccompanied children to the United States must be collaborative and get at the root cause of the dire situation in these countries. With out-of-control drug cartels and nearly 90 murders for every 100,000 persons annually, Honduras now has the highest murder rate in the world. Similarly, El Salvador and Guatemala have the world's fourth and fifth highest murder rates. There is no easy solution to these problems, but Congress has an opportunity and a responsibility to act on pragmatic measures before time and resources run out.

Secretary Johnson has warned that Immigration and Customs Enforcement will run out of money in August and Customs and Border Protection will run out of money in mid-September if nothing is done. With resources already running scarcer by the day, Customs and Border Protection won't have any other choice but to direct border agents away from other sectors of our southern border and into the Rio Grande Valley.

So let's be clear. Those who would choose not to support this emergency supplemental are putting our border security at risk. New Mexico, California, Arizona, and West Texas will all see fewer agents and fewer resources on our border if the House and Senate do not act.

This is no way to address a crisis. We must pass the Senate's emergency sup-

plemental funding bill introduced by Senate Appropriations Committee chairwoman BARBARA MIKULSKI. This emergency funding bill includes important resources to help stem the current refugee crisis while continuing to treat these refugee children humanely as required by the law. This situation is an emergency, and we need emergency funding.

Passing the emergency supplemental would also allow the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice to deploy additional enforcement resources, including immigration judges, Immigration and Customs Enforcement attorneys, and asylum officers, as well as expanding the use of the alternatives to detention program.

Instead of ensuring that we provide these necessary resources to address this crisis on our border, some of our colleagues are actually proposing that the solution is to actually weaken Federal child trafficking law and to roll back protections for unaccompanied child refugees seeking asylum. The proposal introduced by our colleague from Texas Senator CORNYN would weaken the 2008 William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Act and short-circuit justice in order to deport refugee children faster and without the due process afforded under our law.

According to a poll released Tuesday by the Public Relations Research Institute, 69 percent of those surveyed believe that U.S. authorities should treat the children as refugees and allow them to stay in the country if it is determined it is not safe for them to return to their home country.

Some would use this crisis to eliminate crucial child trafficking protection, punish some of our Nation's brightest DREAM Act students, and promote a narrow border-enforcement-only agenda. I believe we are a better nation than that, frankly.

Let's step back and remember that just 1 year ago the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill that included provisions to further strengthen the border but that would also protect refugee children and crack down on smugglers and transnational criminal organizations. Notably, the bill was widely supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate. Public support and good economics have not been enough to convince House Republican leaders to hold a vote on immigration reform, but they cannot turn a blind eye to the current humanitarian crisis along our southern border.

The bipartisan Senate bill that passed more than a year ago includes provisions for family reunification and for the protection of children who have been the victims of human trafficking. The bill also includes measures that would address refugee and asylum laws.

The public, including faith-based organizations, educators, local elected officials, small businesses, and many others, overwhelmingly supports this balanced approach to immigration reform. However, here we are more than 1 year later, and House Republicans are still unwilling to even hold an up-or-down vote on the Senate's proposal. Each day the House fails to act on serious solutions to our broken immigration system is another day our Nation and our economy suffer.

The Congressional Budget Office reported that last year's bipartisan immigration reform bill that passed this body would reduce the budget deficit by \$197 billion—billion with a “b”—over the next decade and about \$700 billion in the second decade. In a companion analysis, CBO also estimated that fixing our broken immigration system would increase our country's GDP—our economic output—by 3.3 percent in 10 years and 5.4 percent after 20 years.

The evidence is clear. Immigration reform is good for our economy, good for our workforce, and it is good for the future of the American middle class.

I am familiar with the promise America represents to its families. My father fled from Nazi Germany in the 1930s as a young boy. As the son of an immigrant, I know how hard immigrants work and how much they believe in this country and how much they are willing to give back to our Nation. Those of us who represent border communities understand the difficult challenges we face, but there are solutions before us that are pragmatic, bipartisan, and that uphold rather than compromise our American values.

In the short term we must approve the Senate's emergency supplemental bill, and in the long-term we should partner with Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador to stabilize their nations and end the cycle of gang violence we see there. A key part of our long-term solution is for House Republicans to finally put the Senate's immigration reform bill on the floor for an up-or-down vote.

We in Congress have a historic opportunity to pass comprehensive immigration reform and to address root causes rather than just symptoms for a change. I believe we will have failed if the only immigration legislation we pass as a body in this Congress is to weaken legal protections for refugee children. With this in mind, I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure that we address this humanitarian crisis and fix our immigration system once and for all. Let's seize this opportunity.

Mr. President, I see that I have been joined on the floor by the Senator from Florida, and I would ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Senator NELSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his leadership, and I wish to ask my colleague if he is aware of the testimony the commanding general of U.S. Southern Command, General Kelly—a marine four-star general—gave to the Armed Services Committee and to the Foreign Relations Committee recently, in the last couple of weeks?

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I am aware of the testimony of General Kelly, but given his role at SOUTHCOM and in particular its location in Florida and the fact that the Senator from Florida was there for the testimony, I would ask him to remind us exactly what General Kelly had to say about how we are or in some cases are not interdicting and dealing with the flow of narcotics and particularly cocaine that has been at the root of so much of the instability and violence we see in these three Central American countries today.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has put his finger on exactly the root cause of the problem. It is the substantial loads of cocaine that are coming into these three Central American countries; that because of the violence, because of the killing, the parents have three choices when their child gets on up toward their teenage years. Their first choice is to let their kid join the gang.

These gangs are criminal gangs, and they are tied in with the drug lords. The drug lords have taken over the country because of all the money that is being made from these big shipments that come in.

The parents have three choices: No. 1, let their kid join the gang; No. 2, go to their child's funeral; or No. 3, they become subject to the subtle and direct plea by the coyotes: Oh, for \$1,500, \$5,000, we can get your kid to the border and your child will be safe in America.

Why those three countries? Why are the children who have been showing up in the last several months at the border not coming from Belize, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama? They are coming from three countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—because that is where the big shipments of drugs are coming from—from South America into those areas in a boat with 1 to 3 tons of cocaine. Once they get on land, they break them down into small packages, and they go through a very efficient distribution system that is drugs and criminal elements—they can distribute just about anything they want, including trafficking in humans. And they are going north.

So if Honduras is the murder capital of the world and if El Salvador and Guatemala are not far behind, how do you get at that immediately to stop the flow of children going north? You

more effectively interdict the drug shipments. That is why the United States has been so successful.

General Kelly, the commanding general of Southern Command, tells us that sadly he has to sit there with his Joint Interagency Task Force—all the agencies of the U.S. Government arrayed together and headquartered in Key West—and they have to watch 74 percent of primarily these boats—not so much the flights; primarily boats because they can carry big loads of cocaine—get through.

If it gets to the point of voting for the supplemental, I would certainly vote for it, but it doesn't get to the root cause of the problem. What we have done—and I have shared this with as many people as I can, consulting with General Kelly. They boiled this down to \$122 million out of the President's request of \$3.7 billion, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has pared that down to \$2.7 billion.

This Senator is asking for \$122 million, and it will cover such things as \$31 million for U.S. Government interagency task force maritime patrol craft; \$40 million for maritime patrol requirements to deploy U.S. Coast Guard law enforcement detachments; \$15 million for intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance by putting up contractor-owned Predators 24 hours a day, 5 days a week. That contract is being drawn up. If we did this, General Kelly could execute that contract immediately, and then you would start to see some results.

Mr. HEINRICH. If I understand the Senator from Florida correctly, General Kelly simply does not have the resources to do the job we have done historically in terms of interdicting cocaine moving north for the market that, frankly, is in North America—

Mr. NELSON. That is correct.

Mr. HEINRICH. —in the United States and Canada. They have to literally sit there and watch these narcotics go by without having the resources to stop them in their tracks.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct. Whereas General Kelly—and I am just using him as the symbol since he is a four-star general. It is the Joint Interagency Task Force in Key West that is actually headed by a Coast Guard admiral. They can interdict, and do interdict, about 25 percent of those big shipments coming from South America. They go through the Caribbean on the east and also through the Pacific on the west. And because they have been effective at 25 percent of the shipments, what we are seeing is a shifting of those shipments. They are now actually sending more of them to the east—not only to the Dominican Republic and Haiti, but now to Puerto Rico, which is a U.S. territory. When they get those drugs into Puerto Rico—and that is American territory—they can ship them by mail from there to the

rest of the United States and avoid detection.

Mr. HEINRICH. My understanding is that the resource situation in Southern Command has changed so dramatically in recent years that not only is this interagency task force limited, but they have literally canceled more than 200 engagement activities and multilateral exercises with our partners in the region who can multiply that effect and interdict even more narcotics as they are moving forward.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, with whom I have consulted, is very familiar with the great operation of the Joint Interagency Task Force to go after these drugs. As the Senator from New Mexico said, you can imagine their frustration when they know about the boat shipment, and sometimes they can watch it from their overhead assets, and they can't do anything about it.

As a result, look at what has happened over the last several months. We are trying to solve the problem on the border. We have all of these children showing up at the border. We ought to solve that problem. We need to go back to the very beginning and stop what is causing this problem.

Mr. HEINRICH. The Senator from Florida also brought up another issue that I think is worth exploring. It is my understanding that he was recently briefed on the relationship that exists between these drug cartels and the entities that are actually engaging in human trafficking and moving people, for a fee, through Central America and Mexico and to the U.S. border. Can the Senator tell us a little bit about the nature of that relationship?

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct on how all of these things are interlocked. You can imagine how a sufficient quantity of drugs, which is worth so much, is a corrupting influence on any kind of law and order. As a result, the systems of governments—and Senator KAINE and I both met with the President of Honduras. He is trying as hard as he can. He has a bounty on his head by these drug lords because he is opposing them. The judicial system is corrupted. The local police are corrupted. When that happens, then you can imagine when other criminal activities occur, in addition to other drug activities, such as human trafficking, and terrorists potentially being utilized in these efficient delivery networks, then it is all the more a threat to the national security interests of the United States.

I think the U.S. Congress and the U.S. administration better wake up to the fact of what is happening right under our nose and get at this, in addition to solving the problems that we see that are a symptom, ultimately, of the root cause—the creation of a whole

criminal network that is, in large part, fueled by the drug trade.

Mr. HEINRICH. If the Senator from Florida will yield for a minute, the sad thing is it didn't used to be that way in this part of Central America, and I know that for a fact because my wife and I traveled there 15, 16 years ago. We traveled extensively in Honduras, and at that time these gangs simply did not have the influence. They did not have this level of destabilization and they did not have this murder rate.

I always joke about trying to drive into Tegucigalpa, and I would not recommend it to anybody who has not had time to acclimate to the speed and crush of cars in that capital city, but it was a completely different country at the time. We traveled extensively in urban areas in San Pedro Sula and rural areas such as Santa Rosa de Copan, and it was an economically challenged country.

For those folks who have claimed that all of these immigrants are simply heading north out of economic desperation, the economic situation has not changed all that much. It is worth looking at the rest of Central America. The surrounding countries, such as Belize and Costa Rica and other countries in Central America, are also seeing refugees from these countries.

Nicaragua, which has substantial economic challenges right now, is losing economic immigrants, and those immigrants are not making it to our southern border in any substantial numbers. In fact, less than a year ago, I was in Costa Rica and many Nicaraguans are working in Costa Rica because the economy is better there. Yet we don't see them showing up—especially the unaccompanied minors, 7, 8, 12-year-olds—at our border by themselves. They are not being driven out by the extreme violence we have seen in these three nations where the drug cartels have such a disproportionate influence on their country's stability.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will yield, to underscore his point, we can look at the extraordinary success of Plan Colombia. Outside of Central America—if you go a little further south, you are on the continent of South America. And lo and behold, 15, 20 years ago, a large part of Colombia was controlled by elements that were controlled by the drug lords. With the assistance of the United States and extraordinary heroism on the part of the Government of Colombia, we have seen the Government of Colombia take back control of most of its country. Even though cocaine is still grown there and the FARC is still operating, their criminal element is a diminished insurrection of what it used to be. If you visited a place like Bogota, the capital city, it was not safe to go out alone and walk on the streets. Now you can easily walk on the streets. The situation there has changed.

We are seeing the same replicated now in Central America where the drug lords have basically taken over by buying off people with considerable money, and therefore it makes it very difficult to have the rule of law in those struggling governments, as it is for the President of Honduras, who is trying so hard to bring back his country.

Mr. HEINRICH. If the Senator from Florida will yield for a moment, having formerly served on the House Armed Services Committee, I know the Department of Defense budget is somewhere in the order of \$550 billion. Surely SOUTHCOM must have a substantial amount of resources to be able to meet this, right?

Of that \$550 billion, does the Senator from Florida know how much actually goes to Southern Command?

Mr. NELSON. What this Senator knows is that before the sequester started hitting the defense budget—even though we were conducting a war in two countries, Afghanistan and Iraq—with all of the multiplicity of threats that are around in the region, including what we see now with ISIS between Syria and northern and western Iraq, the Department of Defense had to make some hard choices. They had to cut back because of this mindless budgetary meat ax called the sequester, and as a result they had to set their priorities.

When they came down to it, they had to support the troops out in the field and had to cut back on other commands. The U.S. Southern Command is one of those commands that was cut back. But now we are seeing the lack of wisdom to these budgetary policies—sequester—and the scarcity when you cannot allocate the defense resources to other agencies. Remember, this is a Joint Interagency Task Force. We are now seeing the effects of that in what has been on the front pages of the newspapers which is reporting all of the children coming to the border.

By the way, the children are just a diminutive percentage of the total people still coming to the border. I can't remember if it is 20 percent or 40 percent, but it is something well less than half of all of the people who are still coming to the border. But, of course, the children, because of the humanitarian crisis for them, are the ones who have received the attention.

If we know there is a problem, how do we fix the problem? Well, we need to go back to the root cause, and that is the case I have been making on that side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle. Yet we are at this point of impasse, and needless to say, it is very frustrating to this Senator.

Mr. HEINRICH. I thank the Senator from Florida for continuing to be an advocate for this cause. I know that Southern Command's annual budget now is about \$1 billion—literally \$1 billion out of \$550 billion in the Department of Defense. Given the necessity of

engaging with Central and South America on these issues, I think it is time to reevaluate, in terms of resources but also in terms of priorities, how we look at Central and South America, to reengage with our neighbors and try to address some of these issues at the root level instead of always at the symptom level.

I see we have been joined by our esteemed chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland. So I thank the Chair for allowing the Senator from Florida and I to indulge in this colloquy. And, once again, I wish to say how much I hope we take this opportunity to do something, not just about the symptoms of the current crisis which has to be dealt with, but also the underlying causes of this crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think we have just heard something really interesting and I think—excuse me. The way the Senator from New Mexico concluded—was the Senator from California scheduled to speak next?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I believe so.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thought I was at 4:52. I didn't mean to jump the line. I really do want to hear from the Senator from California, the chair of the intelligence committee, as well as the chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and Border Security of the Judiciary Committee. She is a Senator with a lot of experience, and I look forward to her remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator. I wish to begin by saying the Appropriations Committee is in very good hands. Chairman MIKULSKI has done an excellent job, and I strongly support this supplemental that she has put together.

I wish to give my colleagues just some brief background of my involvement in the unaccompanied alien children issue. It began around 1999. On Thanksgiving Day, a 5-year-old in an inner tube off the coast of Florida, 3 miles out, was picked up by a fisherman. His name was Elian Gonzalez. The fisherman rescued him and he was taken to a hospital, but his mother and 11 others on the raft had drowned in their attempt to come to the United States from Cuba. That launched in this country a major debate about an unaccompanied alien child, whether he goes back to his father or whether he remains with his uncle in Miami.

Then, secondly, I am home one day and I turn on the television set, and I see a 15-year-old Chinese girl who had been placed on a container ship from China by her parents to flee China's rigid family planning laws. She came to this country. She was alone. She was desperate. She was picked up.

I saw her asylum hearing. She was unrepresented. She was shackled, her wrists were bound, and big tears were rolling down her face. She couldn't understand a single word that was spoken. She was held in a jail cell for eight months and in another detention facility for another four months after that. She eventually received asylum in our country, but she unnecessarily faced an ordeal no child should undergo.

At the time, she was only one of 5,000 other foreign-born children who were apprehended in the United States in need of protection. I remember thinking that that such treatment was terrible, and I had to do something.

In 2000, I introduced the Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act. I also pushed for the change in the Homeland Security Act of 2002, which successfully transferred the responsibility for the care of unaccompanied alien children from the former Immigration and Naturalization Service to the Department of Health and Human Services.

However, that change by itself was not enough to ensure that unaccompanied children were properly treated. Therefore, over the next 6 years, I continued to consult with relevant Federal agencies, children's advocates, immigration attorneys, House Members such as ZOE LOFGREN on the House Judiciary Committee, and fellow Senators.

Finally, in 2008 the legislation was included, amazingly enough, by voice vote in both Houses, as part of a larger trafficking bill, the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. It was signed into law by President Bush on December 23, 2008. It took effect 6 months later. That year, the number of children was in the vicinity of 8,000. It provided the framework for how unaccompanied children would be treated while in the United States and for their safe and orderly return to their home countries without undue delay if they did not qualify to stay.

We now have a dramatically escalated situation that was not foreseeable at that time. Last fiscal year 2013, 24,000 unaccompanied children arrived in our country. This year more than 62,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in our country, and the Department of Homeland Security is preparing for as many as 90,000 such children to arrive in the country by the end of this year.

The numbers are so great and so unprecedented that our Federal agencies understandably are having difficulty carrying out the procedures and timelines in place. I have sent members of my staff in California to every Office and Refugee Services shelter in the State, and they have sent me photos and their impressions. I wish to take a moment to thank all our people,

whether it is Border Patrol or ICE of Homeland Security or anybody else—such as Health and Human Services—for the excellent job they are doing. I saw 8 to 10 facilities through pictures and reports, where children were in bright rooms, had beds with covers, and a day program. So, every effort has been made.

But the numbers are so great and unprecedented that the difficulties continue. When we run out of money, there is going to be a different story.

But we must remember that the children at issue, who are unaccompanied, are primarily from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, three Central American countries which are deeply troubled. Many have entered as victims, I am sorry to say, of rape, abuse, poverty, and above all, violence.

They are alone, subject to abuse and exploitation. Many are young and unable to articulate their fears, their views, or testify about their needs as accurately as adults can. Considering this, there is no other option but for us to help and continue to treat them humanely, with compassion and due process. That is what this supplemental does.

I have met with Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson, and the head of the Department of Health and Human Services, Sylvia Burwell, and both tell us their agencies run out of funds by September. We must responsibly fund these agencies, for not only are they managing the current humanitarian crisis at our border, but they are also charged with protecting human life and our homeland security.

With this funding, not only can we preserve our commitment to treat children as the children that they are, we can improve the way that the current law is being administered and more efficiently put our resources to work.

Earlier today, I met with immigration judges from the U.S. Department of Justice's Executive Office of Immigration Review. They informed me they are desperate for increased resources with which to handle not only the influx of children's cases but also a current backlog of 375,000 cases. Due to there being only 243 immigration judges across the country, immigrants today wait 587 average days for a hearing. That is one year and 7 months before they have the opportunity to come before an immigration judge.

With adequate funding from this supplemental, which provides for immigration judge teams, legal representation and services, government immigration litigation attorneys and courtroom equipment, among other things, this crisis can be managed and make the processing of children more efficient.

One of the judges who sits in Miami told me that through her court where a child has representation, a voluntary return to the country of origin was able to be achieved in a majority of her

cases. So the majority of children actually took voluntary departure and returned to their countries. A judge can't make a phone call, but a counsel can—the attorneys could make the calls to do the necessary preparation and see that a safe home could be arranged. Because of this representation, cases are processed more quickly and children could safely return.

I understand there has been concern that unaccompanied children will not appear for their immigration court proceedings. That is simply not true. The fact is, whether represented or not, 60.9 percent do appear, and the number increases to 92.5 percent when represented by counsel. So these children do get before a judge—60.9 percent of them, and if they have a lawyer, 92 percent.

With this supplemental funding, the immigration courts, with help from legal representatives, would be able to hear more quickly immigration cases and determine with justice who may stay and who must go.

I was contacted recently by Winston Lord, a former U.S. Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State, who is all too familiar with managing situations of international crises while preserving our national interest. In reflecting on the current crisis, he acknowledged the need for effective border control and immigration enforcement to ensure national security and a comprehensive solution. However, he also identified the heart of the matter here: "These challenges . . . need not be met by using ineffective and indiscriminate approaches that harm innocent children."

He is right.

We are a great Nation, capable of safeguarding our national security while simultaneously proceeding with humanity in addressing this crisis, and any future challenges that this country faces. This problem demands action now to provide these agencies with the funds they need to meet this crisis.

Now, if we don't pass this, and if these departments run out of money, and if facilities have to be closed, and if there is nowhere for these children to go, let us think for a moment what happens to them. Should they experience the same thing in this country they have back home? What will they do? And what does that do to our conscience?

I think this supplemental is well put together. The chairman of our committee has gone through it with a fine tooth comb. She has reduced it in size. I think it is well representative of the situation that dramatically needs funding. So I really hope there is a heart in this body and that this supplemental appropriation is approved.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, to the Senator from California, I thank her for her excellent statement. She brings such experience and expertise. It is very much appreciated. Has the Senator looked at my supplemental recommendations where we have actually added money for judges and then support to pro bono lawyers willing to represent children?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, that is exactly right. The chairwoman's supplemental does that. That is really what makes the difference for the child. If a child can't speak the language and if a child is held in a jail cell and if a child is shackled and handcuffed before a judge, and a child has nobody to help them and no one they know in this country, what can they do except cry? That is what I saw directly myself, and that is what sort of awakened me then to a problem, which was just 5,000 a year in the start of this. Now we are at 54,000, and probably 90,000 before the end of the year.

Ms. MIKULSKI. That is right.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. So I thank the Senator for her support and her energy and effort that she has put forward.

I hope this body does the right thing.

REMEMBERING ADMIRAL CHUCK LARSON

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would like to continue the discussion on the urgent supplemental. But before I do, I want to say that the senior Senator from Arizona is on the floor, and I want to say something heartwarming to my colleague. I say to the Senator from Arizona, you are a graduate of the Naval Academy, class of 1958. We both have a very dear friend who has passed away, ADM Chuck Larson.

Admiral Larson served with distinction in the Navy. He did many tours of duty in the defense of our country but also did two tours of duty at the U.S. Naval Academy, where I came to know him, and then subsequent to that there was the wonderful role that he played in education and transformational leadership.

I know he was a good friend of the Senator from Arizona too. So I would like to express my condolences to you and to the—of course, then it was guys only at the Naval Academy—class of 1958. I was the class of 1958 at Mount Saint Agnes College. We probably saw each other at a tea dance or two. I was the chunky one over there, not in the corner, though. But I just wanted to express my condolences. What a great class that seems to be. I hope we can work together on something that would truly recognize Chuck Larson and the great transformational leader he was.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a colloquy with the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say first of all to the Senator from Maryland, on behalf of all Naval Academy graduates and all of us who love the Naval Academy, your support of the Naval Academy has been consistent, unswerving. You have been probably the staunchest supporter of the U.S. Naval Academy I have ever had the privilege of encountering. I want to also tell the Senator that the devotion she has extended to the Naval Academy is reciprocated by the Naval Academy and its graduates to her. I thank her for that.

Yes, Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Maryland, a dear and beloved friend, ADM Chuck Larson passed away. I would be honored to join with her in any way that we could to honor his memory. I would just like to point out that the Senator from Maryland was heavily involved when there was a very serious cheating scandal at the Naval Academy. Senator MIKULSKI led the investigation and demand for correcting that situation, and Admiral Larson was called back from retirement to be the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, on the recommendation of the Senator from Maryland—the only naval officer in history who served as Superintendent twice. And he put the Naval Academy back on the right track.

I would like to say, again, that he mentioned to me often the consistent support for reform, for the institution, and they are incredibly proud of her representation not just of the people of Maryland but specifically of that wonderful institution. I know I speak for Chuck Larson when I say that.

I thank you.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator very much. I love our U.S. Naval Academy. But when you have great leaders, we want to in some way be able to memorialize them in a way that they inspired this ongoing, this next generation, and the generations to come about really what a great leader is and what value-driven leadership is all about.

So I look forward to working with the Senator from the Naval Academy and the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, I would also like to continue the discussion on the urgent supplemental and the crisis—many people call it the crisis—at our border. Well, we have a surge of children at our border because of the crisis in Central America. The crisis is in Central America, creating a surge of children desperately coming across our borders to seek political asylum.

I would hope that when we look at this urgent supplemental, we understand what we are trying to do. Yes, provide humane care for the children, real support for judges and other legal assistance to determine their legal and asylum status and, at the same time, to do the prevention in Central America, by going after what the surge is all

about. The surge is about the escalating narco criminal-driven violence in these countries.

People will say: Well, what does that mean? It means that when you look at where the children are coming from, they are not coming from every country in Central America. They are coming from three countries in Central America. They are coming from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, but they are not coming from Nicaragua and they are not coming from Panama and they are not coming from Costa Rica. Why is that? The reason is because the violence rate is not as high. Yes, in these countries, particularly in Nicaragua, the poverty rate is the same as the other three. So why are they coming? They are coming because of the violence, and this is what we need to be able to deal with.

Last week, along with many Senators, I met with the Ambassadors from the three countries of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. At the invitation of Senator MENENDEZ, the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, I met with the President of Honduras, the President of Guatemala, and the President of El Salvador to talk about these issues, to say: What is it that we need to do to deal with these issues?

This is what they talked about. They talked about the violence coming from the drug cartels and organized crime—organized crime—drug cartels fueled by America's insatiable demand for drugs. They have worsened in these three countries.

Then there is the recruitment. The narco criminals have gone after the children to recruit them, either for their profit or for their pleasure. I have to talk about this in a way that civilized people should not have to hear that this is going on against children in our own hemisphere. This is our own hemisphere. When I talk about the recruitment of children for profit or for pleasure, that is exactly what they are talking about—to recruit the children to be part of gangs, violent gangs, gangs to engage in narco trafficking, to engage in extortion, to engage in murder, to engage in intimidation. This is the particular targeting of boys—the particular targeting of boys to recruit them for the gangs. And if the boys do not want to join the gang and they resist, they hide, they try to run away, they are often grabbed, many sometimes are kidnapped, threatened with torture or their mother or their grandmother or their sister is threatened with either death or violent sexual attack. All sexual attack is violent, but they talk about it in ways that I will not discuss on the Senate floor.

Then there is the recruitment for profit—yes, to make sure that maybe they are couriers for the drug trade, but also to recruit, nab or force young children to be involved in human trafficking and sexual slavery.

But we have to deal with this. We have to stop the violence with a tough battle. We have to go after the cartels, and we have to also really begin to deal seriously with our addiction to cocaine and to heroin.

When you talk to the President of Honduras about the drugs in his own country bound for the United States, he talks about how they smuggle drugs, and they smuggle children along the same trade routes. It is good trade to traffic in drugs and it is also good trade to traffic in women and children. You see, to the drug dealers, to the narco traffickers, to the seven organized crime units—and, yes, we know who they are and where they are; we just need to marshal the resources of our country and the hemisphere to go after them. We know who they are, where they are, what they do, and how they do it. They look at women and children, boys, as well as girls, as commodities to be sold across countries and across borders. My God. And we want to blame the children?

We hear: Let's send them back. Send them back to what? This is why these children are on the go. This is why these children are on the march. And the children do not care how they get here, as long as they escape the violence.

This is why we have included money of over \$112 million to the Department of Homeland Security for enforcement—no, not National Guard at our border, but really moving assets to Central America to deal with law enforcement, to strengthen the courts, and to be able to deal with the issues of narco trafficking and organized crime in their own country.

We also know that while we are doing this type of intervention down there to go after the smugglers, coyotes, and human traffickers, we also need to deal with the fact that when these children are here, they have the right to seek legal asylum. Now, as Senator FEINSTEIN pointed out, there are only 240 immigration judges in the country. The fact is there is a backlog of over 100,000 cases. These kids move to the front of the line, but even if they move to the front of the line, it could be as much as 2 or 3 years before their cases are heard. This is not right. It is not right for them and it is not right for our country.

So I have more money in this bill for more immigration judges to resolve the asylum cases, additional legal representation for the children, including bilingual representation, and the kind of backup and support where pro bono lawyers are coming to the aid to be able to do this.

I hope we pass this supplemental so we can do this.

Second, I made the trip to the border. I will talk about this on another day. I know my time is exceeded, but what I wanted to emphasize today is why

these children are coming, the legal services we need to present here, and I look forward to talking more about this. I know my time is up, and I do want to be courteous to my colleague from the other side of the aisle.

So let's pass this bill. Let's do the interdiction in Central America. And let's enforce our laws here and provide the legal representation the law requires.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, quite often—on numerous occasions—I have come to the floor of the Senate to talk about the ongoing tragedy of Syria, not in the belief that any action may be taken of any real impact, although it has always been my hope and prayer, but because my conscience dictates that I come to the floor of the Senate and discuss one of the great and unfortunate and shameful chapters in our history.

Last February I came to the floor to appeal to the conscience of my colleagues and fellow citizens about the mass atrocities that the Assad regime is perpetuating in Syria. I brought with me at that time a series of gruesome images that documented the horrors the Assad regime has committed against political prisoners in its jails across that country. Those images were smuggled out of the country by Caesar—Caesar—a Syrian military policeman who risked his life and the lives of his family and friends to show the world the real face of human suffering in Syria today.

At the time I had hoped that those images would cry out to our national conscience and compel our great Nation to help end the suffering and genocide of the Syrian people. How could anyone—how could anyone—look at those pictures and not press for immediate accountability and an end to those mass atrocities?

In the months since those images were first made public, United States and European investigators have pored over the images and concluded that not only are these images genuine but they are evidence of an industrial-scale campaign by the Assad regime against its political opponents. According to the State Department, these photographs are evidence of systematic atrocities not seen since Hitler's Nazi regime exterminated millions during World War II.

Stephen Rapp, the State Department's Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes, stated that:

This is solid evidence of the kind of machinery of cruel death that we haven't seen frankly since the Nazis. It's shocking to me.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Samantha Power, after a briefing to the U.N. Security Council members, stated, "The gruesome images of corpses bearing marks of starvation, strangulation and beatings and today's chilling briefing indicate that the Assad regime has carried out systematic, widespread and industrial killing."

Despite the statements from these and other senior officials, the administration has yet to finish its investigation. Perhaps when the administration does complete its forensic analysis of the evidence provided by Caesar, President Obama will decide it is finally time to take action in Syria and prevent the continuation of mass atrocities that according to his Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities is "a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States."

I have to tell my colleagues I am not hopeful. In the time that the investigation to prove what we all know to be true has been underway, approximately 40,000 more people have died, another 1 million people have been forced from their homes, and over half of Syria's population is now believed to be in dire need of food, water, and medicine.

The Assad regime continues to bomb northern Syria, using crude cluster munitions known as barrel bombs with the sole purpose of terrorizing and killing as many people as possible when indiscriminately dropped from Syrian Government aircraft on schools, factories, and mosques. It continues to raze entire neighborhoods for no military purpose whatsoever, simply as a form of collective punishment of Syrian civilians.

It continues its "surrender or starve" famine campaign, starving people to death by denying entire neighborhoods any access to food or water. Just last month the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which has been tasked with destroying Syria's chemical stockpiles, announced there is credible evidence that toxic chemicals are still being used in a systematic manner in Syria.

Indeed, this kind of inhumane cruelty is a pattern of behavior for the Syrian government. As early as August 2011, a damning 22-page report was issued by the United Nations human rights office, which concluded that Syrian Government forces had committed crimes against humanity by carrying out summary executions, torturing prisoners and harming children, the evidence of which we now see clearly in those images.

The report prompted President Obama to issue a statement calling for President Assad to step down. The President declared:

We have consistently said that President Assad must lead a Democratic transition or get out of the way. He has not led. For the

sake of the Syrian people, the time has come for President Assad to step aside.

That was 2 years ago. The President ended this statement by saying, "It is clear that President Assad believes that he can silence the voices of his people by resorting to the repressive tactics of the past, but he is wrong."

Following the President's statement, there was no shortage of administration officials publicly professing that President Assad's days were numbered. In December 2012, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton told a NATO gathering that Assad's fall was "inevitable." She later repeated, "It is time for Assad to get out of the way." That was from our then-Secretary of State.

That same month White House spokesman Jay Carney echoed Clinton's proclamation stating:

Assad's fall is inevitable. As governments make decisions about where they stand on this issue and what steps need to be taken with regards to brutality of Assad's regime, it is important to calculate into your consideration the fact that he will go.

He went on to say, "The regime has lost control of the country and he will eventually fall." In May 2012, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey told FOX News that "escalating atrocities would likely trigger a military intervention following a massacre that left more than 100 dead."

One hundred dead—that was back when we were talking about Syria's dead in hundreds rather than thousands and tens of thousands. One month later, in June 2012, then-Secretary of Defense Panetta stated:

I think it's important when Assad leaves—and he will leave—to try to preserve stability in that country . . . I'm sure that deep down Assad knows he's in trouble, and it's just a matter of time before he has to go. I would say, if you [Assad] want to be able to protect yourself and your family, you better get the hell out now.

That was in June of 2012 by our Secretary of Defense.

Where are we now? Three years after President Obama and his administration rightly decided it was time for him to go, President Assad remains in power, and I know of no one who believes Bashar Assad is going to negotiate his departure. In fact, he just orchestrated another "reelection." I remember when an American President said that a foreign leader must go, it conveyed a commitment to doing something about it. But instead of taking decisive action in support of the President's declared policy, the administration has simply moved away from calls for Assad to step down over the past year.

In fact, instead of being forced to step down, Assad has continuously gotten the administration to treat his regime as a central interlocutor, first with the chemical weapons agreement through which Assad forced the United States into acknowledging its legit-

imacy and ensuring that he would remain in place until the agreement was carried out, then by serving as the sole authority on distribution of aid within the country, and now by presenting himself as critical to the fight against terrorism and the Al Qaeda-affiliated Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

So as it turns out, President Obama was right that Assad's violence and repressive tactics could not silence the voices of the Syrian people who even in the worst imaginable conditions have continued to fight for freedom and a Democratic Syria. Instead, it has been the voice of President Obama and other administration officials that President Assad has managed to silence. We cannot be silent, but we cannot allow words to replace action either.

What has become exceedingly clear in the wake of recent events is that even if we can ignore the moral imperative to act, the growing threat to American national security interests means that doing nothing is now out of the question. The conflict in Syria is largely to blame for the resurgence of Al Qaeda in Iraq, which has grown into the even more dangerous and lethal Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham, commonly referred to by the acronym ISIS or ISIL.

Top officials testified in last week's Foreign Relations Committee hearing that ISIS represents a threat that is "worse than Al-Qaeda."

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Iraq and Iran Brett McGurk stated that ISIS is no longer simply a terrorist organization but "a full blown army seeking to establish a self-governing state through the Tigris and Euphrates Valley in what is now Syria and Iraq."

The Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the FBI, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Attorney General have all warned repeatedly about the threat posed by ISIS's state-like sanctuary in Syria and Iraq and the largest safe haven for global terrorism in the world.

If the September 11 attack should have taught us anything, it is that global terrorists who occupy ungoverned spaces and seek to plot and plan attacks against us can pose a direct threat to our national security. That was Afghanistan on September 10, 2001. That is what these top officials are now warning us that Syria is becoming today.

Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson said, "Syria is now a matter of homeland security." FBI Director James Comey recently warned Congress that the terrorist threat from Syria against the United States is "metastasizing." Their assessments were confirmed earlier this month by Attorney General Eric Holder, who said that recent intelligence reports of terrorists from Syria partnering with Yemeni bombmakers are "more frightening than anything I think I've seen

as attorney general. It's something that gives us really extreme, extreme concern."

He added:

If they—

Meaning ISIS—

are able to consolidate their gains in that area, Iraq and Syria, I think it's just a matter of time before they start looking outward and start looking at the West and at the United States in particular. So this is something that we have to get on top of and get on top of now.

It is clear President Assad's strategy is to convince the administration that we only have two options, him or Al Qaeda-linked terrorists. It is a sad testament to the administration's leadership on Syria that Assad's strategy seems to be working. According to a report by the Daily Beast, administration officials are debating whether to abandon the President's goal of toppling Assad and enter into a de facto alliance with the Assad regime to fight ISIS or other Sunni extremists in the region.

Such a decision would represent the height of folly. Nobody—nobody—should believe Assad is an ally in the fight against terrorism. Former Ambassador to Syria Robert Ford, who resigned in May after asserting that he could no longer defend American policy in Syria, made it clear how foolish such thinking is. He said:

The people who think Bashar Assad's regime is the answer to containing and eventually eliminating the Islamic-based threat do not understand the historic relationship between the regime and ISIS. They do not understand the current relationship between Assad and ISIS and how they are working on the ground together directly and indirectly inside Syria.

He added,

If this administration wants to contain the Islamic State on the ground, they are going to have to help the Free Syrian Army.

After more than 3 years of horror and suffering and devastation and growing threats to our national security, the conflict in Syria continues to get worse and worse, both for Syria and for the world, but the United States has no effective policy to bring this conflict to a responsible end. The outcome of the administration's disengagement has been a consistent failure to support more responsible forces in Syria when that support would have mattered.

The descent of Syria into chaos and growing regional instability, the use of Syria as a training ground for Al Qaeda affiliates and other terrorist organizations, the ceding of regional leadership to our adversaries, and the shameful tolerance of war crimes and crimes against humanity—in short, all of the horrible things the critics said would happen if we got more involved in Syria—have happened because we have not gotten more involved. Now President Obama finds himself in a position where the United States will have to do far more today to stave off disaster in

Syria than we would have needed to do in 2012. The administration seems to have finally come around to the idea that we must arm, train, and equip the moderate opposition in Syria. But arming moderate FSA units is only one element of what must be done for a much broader strategy that includes both Syria and Iraq.

I will be the first to admit there are no good options left, if good options ever existed to begin with. But as bad as our options are, we still have options to do something meaningful in Syria.

The conflict in Syria is reaching a critical point. Government forces are advancing on Aleppo, effectively cutting off routes into and out of the city from the south and west, exercising a stranglehold on the people of Aleppo. More than 6 months of punishing daily air strikes have killed thousands of residents and forced tens of thousands more to flee. But at least 500,000 residents remain in Aleppo, and they are being slowly asphyxiated by Assad's forces as they brace for Aleppo's upcoming siege.

Meanwhile, disillusioned fighters, starved of the resources and equipment they need, have been drifting from the front lines and, in some cases, joining the better funded and equipped extremist groups.

It is a moral outrage to watch the destruction of what remains of Aleppo and refuse to do more to help those fight against our enemies in the region. Worse still, the government's campaign has been aided and abetted by ISIS, which is attacking the Free Syrian Army from the northeast in an attempt to take control of two vital supply lines from Turkey and forcing the moderate opposition to fight simultaneously on two fronts.

Such activists are suggesting that the fall of Aleppo could be the nail in the coffin for the modern opposition, and the situation for civilians still living in Aleppo has become so disastrous that the United States recently authorized the delivery of cross-border humanitarian aid without prior approval from the Assad regime.

These efforts are a bandaid on a bullet wound. It will not be enough to mitigate the dire crisis unfolding in the city, and we must offer quick support to the moderate opposition as they battle the Assad regime and extremists from the Islamic state before it is too late.

The rise of ISIS, combined with the events in Gaza and Ukraine, has placed Assad's assault on Aleppo safely outside of the headlines. With the international community distracted by these disturbing events in other parts of the world, Assad will again manipulate time and terror in his favor.

President Obama, who spent much of his time in recent weeks at fundraising events, said nothing about Syria or

Iraq during recent appearances to discuss Gaza and Ukraine.

Worse still, details of the sole initiative proposed by the administration on Syria since the collapse of the Geneva peace talks reveals a plan that would train less than a battalion-sized unit of 2,300 individuals and wouldn't begin until the middle of next year. By that time Aleppo may be lost and there may be no more units left in Syria to support.

The conflict in Syria is a threat to our national interests, but it is more than that. It is an affront to our conscience. Images such as these should not just be a source of heartbreak and sympathy, they should be a call to action. For the sake of our national security we must move quickly to help the moderate opposition now before it is too late. For the sake of our national conscience, we must do more to help the 150,000 political prisoners who remain in Assad's prisons and put an end to the suffering of the Syrian people.

It is with great sadness that I met with Caesar yesterday and had to tell him the truth: that although our great Nation could have done more to stop the suffering of others, that we could have used the power we possess—limited and imperfect as it may be—to prevent massive atrocities and the killing of innocents, it is with everlasting shame that we have not.

Shame on all of us for our current failure. If there ever was a case that should remind us that our interests are indivisible from our values, it is Syria, and we cannot afford to go numb to this human tragedy.

I have seen my fair share of suffering and death in the world, but the images and stories coming out of Syria haunt me most. But it is not too late. The United States is still the most powerful Nation in the world today, and we have the power and capabilities to act when brutal tyrants slaughter their people with impunity. No one should believe that we are without options even now. I pray that we will finally recognize the costs of inaction and take the necessary actions to end Assad's mass atrocities and to help the Syrian people write a better ending to this sad chapter in world affairs.

I note the presence of our distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I urge my colleagues—among many reasons—to support him in his effort to bring the National Defense Authorization Act before this body. Part of that act also authorizes for the training and equipping of the Free Syrian forces.

I thank my friend and colleague the Senator from Michigan and the chairman of our committee, whose unstinting effort has made this National Defense Authorization Act something that deserves the attention, debate, amending, and passage from the Senate.

I thank my colleague from Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement on the National Defense Authorization Act following the remarks of Senator LEVIN and Senator INHOFE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LEVIN. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. May I inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania how long he intends to speak?

Mr. CASEY. About 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. After the Senator from Pennsylvania concludes, I would ask that the Senator from Oklahoma and I be recognized for 20 minutes, evenly divided, to talk about the need to get the Defense authorization bill to the floor, and each one of us would control 10 minutes under this unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. CASEY. I rise to speak about a topic that we don't talk about enough, which is what is happening in Afghanistan with regard to women and girls.

I know the senior Senator from Arizona was speaking about Syria before I had recognition, and I am grateful to him for the work we have done together. He is working with me and others on the best way forward for us to have a constructive impact on what is happening, working to get more dollars and more efforts in the direction of supporting the well-vetted Syrian opposition. I am grateful to him for his compassion and his commitment on this issue, and we look forward to working with him going forward.

I rise today to talk about an issue that we don't focus on enough here and that is the outlook for Afghan women and the children who have grown up during the past 13 years of war in Afghanistan. Children all too often are the innocent victims of the conflict.

According to a recent report by the U.N. Secretary General to the Security Council in Afghanistan, child casualties increased by 30 percent between 2012 and 2013.

While reporting was limited by the security environment, there were at least 790 documented incidents in which 545 children were killed and 1,149 were injured. That is just a snapshot of the horror that so many children have suffered in Afghanistan. Armed opposition groups such as the Taliban are responsible for a majority of the recorded child casualties.

I have spoken on the floor a number of times about the substantial im-

provements that have been made in Afghanistan, with significant United States support. Our tax dollars, our people, and our government have helped enormously to get greater numbers of Afghan children, especially girls, into school. Where there were once only a few educational opportunities, now more than 8.3 million children are in school, boys and girls. By one assessment, up to 40 percent of those 8.3 million children are girls.

The security situation and persistent Taliban aggression in Afghanistan continue to threaten this progress. According to the same U.N. report, there were at least 73 reported attacks on schools. In some especially horrifying incidents, improvised explosive devices—we know them as IEDs—were planted inside school premises. The American people should be proud of the sacrifices that have already been made by our fighting men and women and our diplomats who have served in Afghanistan and the progress—which I have just mentioned—that has been made. As the political transition approaches and we prepare for a full security transition, this issue merits continued focus.

In 2013 and 2014, I led a bipartisan effort with Senator AYOTTE to include language in the National Defense Authorization Act that highlights the security issues Afghan women and girls face and promotes the recruitment and retention of women in the Afghan National Security Forces.

I focused on the issue because I believe the future of women and girls is critical, essential, to the stability of Afghanistan going forward and consequently our own national security interests in the region. According to the Institute for Inclusive Security: "There is evidence that women in uniform are more likely than their male colleagues to de-escalate tensions and less likely to use excessive force."

Some improvements have been made to recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces. For example, earlier this month, 51 women graduated from the Afghan National Police Academy. These women defy the Taliban's threats by serving as police officers.

During the elections earlier this year, female police officers and searchers helped secure polling stations for women, and their effect was tangible: significant turnout by female voters despite serious security threats.

Although significant progress has been made in women's rights and security, there are still far too many horrific incidents of violence against women and children.

I was particularly disturbed, as I know many women were, by an article that ran in the New York Times on July 19 entitled: "Struggling to Keep Afghan Girl Safe After a Mullah is Accused of Rape." That is the name of the article dated July 19.

The article describes how a 10-year-old Afghan girl was raped by a mullah in a mosque. A local women's shelter took in the young girl after the attack to protect her from her own family, who were planning to carry out an honor killing. The activists at the shelter received death threats in addition to the threats to the girl.

Once the young girl recovered, she was returned to her family. However, as the article concludes: "Those caring for the girl said she had been terribly homesick and wanted to return to her family, but no one had the heart to tell her they had been conspiring to kill her."

To say that this story is heart-breaking doesn't begin to translate the horror of what some young girls have to face in Afghanistan and other parts of the world as well. Extremists will no doubt continue to threaten women leaders and target innocent children in an effort to terrorize the Afghan people during this transition. We should send an unequivocal message that the United States continues to stand with Afghan women and children and that we see them as an important part of building a stable and secure Afghanistan.

In an effort to honor the sacrifices of the American people and our service men and women, and to make sure those sacrifices are remembered, we have to make sure that we take steps in the Senate. I filed an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, and I am grateful again for the work Senator AYOTTE has done with me. We were joined most recently by several cosponsors, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator WARNER, and Senator BOXER.

This amendment will address three main issues:

No. 1, continue to prioritize recruitment and retention of women in the Afghan National Security Forces.

No. 2, Support police units that are specially trained to work with female or adolescent victims and increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence. This would include ensuring Afghan National Police's Family Response Units have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan.

No. 3, Finally, emphasize the need to maintain the female searcher capabilities that were established in the April 2014 Presidential elections and for the 2015 parliamentary elections.

We must ensure that the gains made by Afghan women in every sector of society are preserved in a post-2014 Afghanistan. It is in our national security interests to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism.

We have seen from the recent events in Iraq what happens after a security transition if some groups are

marginalized. As we approach transition in Afghanistan, women and young people should not just be the target of Taliban violence; they should be full partners in building a stable Afghanistan.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, along with Senator INHOFE—Senator MCCAIN was here before—to express the hope that the Senate will be able to take up the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 during our September work period.

In June Senator INHOFE and I came here to urge Senators to begin the process to file amendments to our bill, and many amendments have been filed. We have been working to clear as many amendments as possible in preparation for Senate consideration of our bill. The amendment described just a few moments ago by the Senator from Pennsylvania is the type of amendment that we believe we can clear and would strengthen our bill and strengthen the position of our Nation.

When the Defense authorization bill is brought to the floor, our goal is first to be in a position to offer a package of cleared amendments. Our second goal—probably as important, perhaps more important than our first—is to see if we can identify specific relevant amendments that could be included in a unanimous consent agreement ready to be debated and voted on or, in the alternative, to craft the unanimous consent agreement with a limited number of relevant amendments, leaving it to the managers and the leaders to identify which relevant amendments would be brought to a vote.

Given the small number of days that are left for legislative action in this Congress, we must all—all of us individually and as a body—pull together if we are going to get our Defense bill completed. In my judgment, the course I have outlined will facilitate that conclusion.

I know there is a backlog of important nominations the Senate must still address, and these nominations have been taking up much of the Senate's time. But we have enacted a national defense authorization act every year for 52 years.

The bill this year—S. 2410—was reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the 2nd day of June with a strong bipartisan vote of 25 to 1. It provides critical authorities, funding, assistance, and guidance for our military, for our men and women in uniform and their families, at a time when they face a wide array of threats around the world.

In our national defense authorization bill, we enact authorities and programs that would create important initiatives

that would be unnecessarily delayed if we do not adopt this bill.

If we fail to enact this bill, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines will not receive many important special pays and bonuses. These include the critical skills retention bonus; enlistment and reenlistment bonuses; bonus and special pays for health professions, including those in critically short wartime specialties; and many other bonus and special pays that enable the military services to shape the force as we draw down that force.

If we fail to enact this bill, we will not be able to slow the growth of military personnel costs and the Department will not be able to use the savings, as planned, to make up for readiness shortfalls that undermine our military's ability to respond to emerging national security crises. The committee-reported bill includes over \$1.8 billion in savings in 2015 and over \$20 billion in savings over the Future Years Defense Program. If this bill doesn't pass, those savings will not be achieved and the readiness and modernization accounts will be even further depleted.

If we fail to enact this bill, we will risk delaying the implementation of programs to address the mental health of our Armed Forces by developing a standard method for collecting, reporting, and assessing suicide and attempted suicide data for members of the National Guard and Reserves. Our Presiding Officer is very active in that particular area, in trying to address the suicide problems we have in our Armed Forces.

If we fail to enact this bill, we will delay a much needed reorganization of the Department's prisoner of war/missing in action community to enable the Department to more effectively accomplish its mission of accounting for POWs and MIAs.

If we fail to enact this bill, school districts all over the United States that rely on our supplemental impact aid to help them educate military children will no longer receive that money.

If we fail to enact this bill, we are unlikely to authorize the National Commission on the Future of the Army—a critical step to enable the Army to ensure that its forces—including its Active-Duty, Reserves, and Army National Guard components—are properly structured and supported to meet current and future threats.

If we fail to enact this bill, no new military construction projects will be authorized for fiscal year 2015 and our Armed Forces will too often continue to live, train, and work in substandard facilities.

Previous years' national defense authorization acts have been strengthened and enhanced through a debate on the Senate floor, and that includes the opportunity for Members to offer amendments. Debating and enacting

those authorizations are critical not only to our national security but to ensure that our Nation keeps its sacred vow to provide for our armed servicemembers and their families.

Senator INHOFE and I will do our part, but we urge our colleagues to continue to file amendments colleagues would like to see in the bill, and we will do our best to clear them. We will also do our utmost to draft a unanimous consent agreement for consideration by our leadership that would provide for some contested relevant amendments so that we can show our leaders we can deal with this bill in a day or two.

We will do all that we can, but we need 98 other Senators to help us. So we urge our colleagues, please continue to bring amendments to us. Please help us craft a unanimous consent agreement that would allow for a reasonable number of contested relevant amendments to be debated and voted on. This is the best way we are going to be able to persuade our leaders and our colleagues that we can bring the bill to the floor, have a reasonable period for debate, dispose of at least some relevant amendments, and pass the critically needed National Defense Authorization Act.

Our troops and their families deserve maximum effort on the part of all of us. I hope that will be forthcoming so we will not miss in the 53rd year a passage of a bill that is so critical to our national security.

Before I yield, I wish to thank my good friend from Oklahoma, our ranking member, who has worked so closely with me. Our staffs worked so hard on this bill. Together, as partners, we have been able to bring this bill to the floor. I thank him for the very strong leadership he has shown in the security area and on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the committee, Senator LEVIN.

It is true that we have worked so closely together—not just the two of us but our staffs directly, the minority and majority staff. It is rare that we have a difference of opinion. When we do, we sit down and work things out, debate, and get things done. So there is a reason, as Senator LEVIN said, that we have passed this bill for 52 consecutive years.

There are a lot of bills that hit the floor, and some are important, some are not. Some are more important to different Members than others. This is important to everybody. There is not one Senator here who doesn't want to pass a defense authorization bill. When Senator LEVIN mentioned that it passed by 25 to 1—we have been ready to go since that time. That is why we are encouraging people and have been

encouraging people to bring amendments down.

Let me mention that I personally went—as did Senator LEVIN—to both the majority and the minority leader.

They said: Well, go ahead. You have our go-ahead to get these people to bring down their amendments.

This is very important. And I have to say that one of the problems we had last year was there are a lot of Republicans—and I am on the Republican side. A lot of Republicans had amendments that they didn't think were going to be able to get heard. Well, this is their chance to do that right now.

The count as of today is that 94 amendments have been filed. Of that, 73 are Democratic amendments and only 21 are Republican amendments. So I appeal now to the Republicans because what I don't want to happen is for us to come back and maybe go into some type of lameduck session and find ourselves in the same position we were in last year. Now is the time to preclude that from happening by getting their amendments down. I think we can do it. We have 4 or 5 weeks during this August recess for our staff to work on these. As the chairman said, a lot of these are going to be put together and are going to be accepted and be in the manager's amendment—but not unless Members get them down right now.

We know that right now we are probably in the most perilous situation we have ever been in as a country. I sometimes say that I look wistfully back to the days of the Cold War when we had two superpowers and we knew what they had and they knew what we had and we assured certain destruction if they did anything to us. Now there are places led by people with certainly questionable character and abilities. We have North Korea, Iran, and all these countries developing nuclear weapons. Our intelligence is good but not good enough to be able to know when it is going to come our way. So we have to be ready. That is the primary function of this committee.

We rely on all the people making our Nation safe right now, and they are looking at what we are doing. We need to take care of them in training, readiness, pay, benefits. These are things that are going to happen.

The other day the President came out with the OCO request for \$59 billion. In there, he mentioned two programs that—frankly, I have never heard of—either one of them. One was \$4 billion to go to the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund, and the other was \$1 billion for the European Reassurance Fund. I don't know what these are.

This is the forum we will use when we start debating the NDAA. It is going to be to get to all these programs that are new on the horizon, to see whether we really want to devote any of our scarce resources to some of these programs. We don't know. When we get the bill on the floor, we will know.

It is too important to our troops to do what we did last year. Not passing it will send a terrible signal to them. But I think it is more important to realize how close we came last year to not having the bill by December 31. If we didn't have it by December 31, just think of what would have happened. If we could not have corrected the situation, we would have had combat pay stopping. We would have had incentive pay for some of the doctors and all that come to a conclusion.

We also would have reenlistment bonuses. Looking at some of our airmen who are flying sophisticated equipment, people don't realize that to train a new person to get to the level of an F-22 costs about \$15 million. However, a reenlistment bonus is about \$250,000.

So we look at what we can do by doing the right thing and passing the bill.

We have a lot of serious questions we need to debate on problems in Syria, as Senator MCCAIN was talking about a few minutes ago, and Iraq and Ukraine and Afghanistan. That is why we need to have the NDAA tended to, hopefully as soon as we get back from this recess. The later we put it into the year to act, the more likely many of these provisions could be rolled into one massive Omnibus appropriations bill. We all know how that would play out. It would be rammed through the Senate without amendments and open debate. We want transparency. We want people to have an opportunity to bring their amendments out, and the more we can get between now and when we go into this recess, the more it can be worked out by the staff because they are going to be working all during the recess to get this done. We have all these people risking their lives on our behalf. They certainly deserve to have this bill in a well-thought-out manner.

Right before we came on, Senator CASEY was talking about the Afghan women and girls, some of the real tragedies that are taking place right now over there. These are things, the language of which we can correct in this bill. So there is no reason to put it off. We don't want to go through what we went through last time, and now is the time to prepare for that, and all we have to do is get the amendments in. No one should complain later on in November or December about not being able to have their amendments heard if they are not out there right now, bringing their amendments now.

With that, it is my understanding that Senator MCCAIN was going to participate in this plea we are making, but he has a statement he will be submitting for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today to urge the majority leader to bring to the floor for de-

bate one of the most important pieces of legislation that comes before this body each year—the National Defense Authorization Act.

The Senate Armed Services Committee version of the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act provides \$514 billion for national defense in Fiscal Year 2015. This includes \$496 billion for the Department of Defense, DOD, base budget and \$17.7 billion for national security programs.

This bill contains several important provisions. It includes a provision to keep the A-10, a vital close air support combat aircraft. This provision would strictly prohibit the U.S. Air Force from retiring A-10 airplanes for 1 year and fully fund the flight hours, pilot training, fuel, maintenance, and operations for all A-10 pilots and crew through 2015.

Additionally, this bill contains three different provisions that would improve the prospects of competition for military space launch and help move the Pentagon away from using taxpayer dollars to purchase rocket engines from Russia.

Finally, this bill includes a provision that would eliminate wasteful spending in Department of Defense, DOD, IT systems. Before DOD is allowed to spend millions of dollars on new IT projects, the department must identify and eliminate old IT systems first.

These are just a few of the important provisions that have been included in this year's NDAA.

The Senate Armed Services Committee began consideration of the defense authorization bill immediately after the President submitted his fiscal year 2015 budget request. Over the course of 4 months, the committee conducted several hearings, held countless briefings, and then met for 3 solid days in markup to produce this legislation. The bill was approved by the committee on May 22 and is ready to be debated, amended, and passed so that we may conference with the House on their version of the bill.

I strongly urge the majority leader to bring this important bill to the Senate floor for debate. A failure to move to the defense authorization bill as soon as possible is a failure to recognize the critical national security importance signified through the strong bipartisan support this bill has enjoyed in this Chamber over the past five decades.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I filed with the Highway and Transportation Funding Act. While my amendment did not get a vote, the issue it addresses is very important to my home State so I want to take a minute today to talk about the issue and the need to address a situation that was created when we passed the MAP-21 conference report in 2012.

The conference report undid a carefully constructed compromise on the Abandoned Mine Land Program that was put together in 2006. It took apart the work that we had done by limiting the total annual payments of AML funds to \$15 million per year. That is a change that only affected the State of Wyoming. We usually don't do legislation that only affects one State when a number of them receive funds.

What was worse, the provision was not in the House or Senate highway bill. It was added in the dead of night without consulting anyone from the Wyoming congressional delegation. I was extremely disappointed that the provision was included in the conference report because Senators from other coal-producing States and I spent years working on this issue.

When the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act was passed in 1977, a tax was levied on each ton of coal that was produced. The purpose of that tax was to reclaim the coal mines that had been abandoned before the enactment of the reclamation laws. Half of that tax was promised to the States where the coal was mined. That was known as the State share. The other half went to the Federal Government to administer the reclamation program and to provide additional funding to the States with the most abandoned coal mines.

It was a simple enough concept. Unfortunately, like many things in Washington, while the concept was good, clear, and well-intentioned, its implementation was a nightmare and the program did not work as Congress intended. For years States were shortchanged and the reclamation work was not done or the States did it themselves at their own expense, expecting to get reimbursed. That is the case in Wyoming. At one point the Federal Government owed the States more than \$1.2 billion, while more than \$3 billion in reclamation programs remained incomplete and unfinished.

The issued pitted the East against the West and the debate was always the same. When Members from the East would argue that we should send more money to the States to support reclamation efforts, my colleagues from the West were just as certain that we needed to keep the Federal Government's promise to the States to provide the revenue they were entitled to under the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act.

In 2006, a bipartisan coalition of Senators—including me—fixed the broken AML structure. It started with Senator Santorum approaching me with a proposal that had the support of a number of local coal companies, also the United Mine Workers of America, several environmental groups, and other businesses. After listening to the proposal, I laid out a set of principles that had to be included in their proposal if they were going to gain my support.

First I wanted to see the return of the money owed to the States, which included \$550 million owed to my State. Because Wyoming is a certified State, I also wanted to see the money that came from the Federal Government with no strings attached. The legislation accomplished that goal by guaranteeing that Wyoming was to receive the money owed from the Federal Government over a 7-year period.

This is money in a trust fund. Trust funds are kind of interesting to the Federal Government. We put money in the drawer and then we take money out and put bonds in the drawer. Think about that in Social Security. It is another one of our trust funds, and I am one of the protectors.

This was a trust fund but there were only bonds in there, so it was difficult for us to get any money. I wanted to guarantee that future moneys would be paid to States such as Wyoming where significant amounts of coal were produced. We are where most of the Federal half of the tax comes from.

Third, it was important that more money be directed toward reclamation in the States where it was needed. More money was needed.

And fourth, there had to be a provision for orphan miners' health. Sometimes that is kind of overlooked, but Senator Byrd and Senator ROCKEFELLER were very adamant on that.

What is an orphan miner? That was a miner who was promised health care and then their mine went out of business. So there is no company to pay in anymore so they can get their health care, and we made a provision to take care of that.

The legislation that we put together accomplished all four of those goals. We continued our efforts as a bipartisan group, and in December 2006 we passed the AML reauthorization as part of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006. The coal industry and the United Mine Workers of America supported the bill. Members from certified States less Wyoming supported the compromise, as did members from uncertified States such as Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

As a Senator, President Obama voted in favor of the legislation that included this compromise. From all signs it appeared we had finally fixed our problem and helped strengthen our State economies at the same time. Unfortunately, appearances are often deceiving.

By limited AML payments in the MAP-21 conference report, Congress once again made clear that taxpayers could not count on a Federal trust fund to meet its obligations to administer the tax dollars it collected each year in a proper and legislatively mandated manner. This has been contested and successfully defended year after year to preserve this money, and it was supported by a supermajority from this body until—until—it was included in this highway bill and included in the highway bill in the conference report, not when we had an amendment on the floor that we could once again successfully defeat with a supermajority. It came in the middle of the night, and the next day we had an opportunity to vote for the highway bill.

The highway bill is probably one of the most crucial bills to any State in the Nation, and if all you get to do is vote yes or no, you are not going to take a look at a little portion of the bill where we steal a trust fund from one State—Wyoming—and that is exactly what happened, and it passed.

My amendment to the highway bill this time will address the problem and put things back together the way they were meant to be. Simply put, it will ensure that when a State has been promised it will receive AML funds, it will receive them. Fortunately, I have the intent of Congress and the support of many colleagues on this matter of such great concern to Wyoming and to all the coal-producing States.

I want to particularly thank Senators HATCH and WYDEN for their commitment to address this issue created by the MAP-21 conference report. This isn't just a problem for Wyoming, because the next time a conference committee goes looking for some money, they can steal it from another AML State.

My amendment also encouraged the production of energy right here at home by opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling. The Congressional Budget Office estimates such an effort will increase gross Federal receipts by \$5 billion over 10 years. That is more than we need to make this payment. There are other possibilities for offsets as well, but that is one that is rather meaty, and that is more than enough to pay the funds that were stolen from Wyoming over 10 years and to pay for 2 years' worth of transportation projects, not just a short-term fix on transportation.

I know my colleagues will see the importance of this matter for Wyoming and to all the coal-producing States. It is important we take a look at this and protect the validity of trust funds that we set up and not redo them without adequate debate or an actual vote on the trust fund that we are violating. We have done that on a couple of other trust funds as well.

One of the ones that we also did was to impose an additional tax on those

companies that have private pension funds, because we have a Pension Benefit Guaranty trust fund that is designed so that if a company goes out of business a worker who works for one of those businesses will get at least 60 percent of what they were supposed to get in their retirement. That is why it is called the Pension Benefit Guaranty trust fund. We increased the amount that had to be put in by \$80 per employee for each of the companies involved, and that was going to the trust fund to make sure those funds would be available. But we diverted those funds before they got to the trust fund because the actual money could be replaced by bonds in the drawer of the trust fund. That money went to highways, and that is just another example of how we are taking money from 10 years' worth of trust funds and using it for 2-year projects. We have to change that, and my amendment will be one of the ways of making that change.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Does the distinguished Senator from Utah seek recognition?

Mr. HATCH. I was told 6 p.m.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The Senator from Utah may proceed, if he wishes.

Mr. HATCH. How long will the Senator from Rhode Island take?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I will take approximately 20 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized after the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my gracious colleague. He is one of the better people here, and I have a great friendship with him as well. I appreciate it.

PATENT TROLLS

Mr. President, I rise to speak about the importance of our patent system and how it continues to be abused by patent trolls.

Most Members in this body are fully aware of the crippling effect patent trolls are having on innovation and growth upon all areas of our economy—ranging from Main Street businesses to America's largest technology companies. Through abusive and meritless litigation, patent trolls—often shell companies that do not make or sell anything—extort settlements from innovators throughout the country.

How do they do it? Take, for example, the small coffee shop down the street that provides Wi-Fi service to its customers. The shop owners are using a technology exactly as it is intended to be used, but thousands of miles away a patent troll purchases broad patents previously issued to someone else. Next, the patent troll sends vague and hostile demand letters to the coffee shop, and thousands of similar busi-

nesses, accusing them, often improperly, of infringing their questionable patents.

Many trolls target small businesses that they hope will agree to settle even though they have done nothing wrong simply because they do not have the resources to defend themselves in court. These settlements divert capital that could otherwise be used for research and development or to create jobs. In many cases, it costs around \$2 million to fight one of these cases. So they are forced into settling with whatever they can pay rather than doing what they would hope to do; that is, prove that there was an unmeritorious claim.

The sad reality is that many businesses often have little choice other than to settle rather than to expend the far greater resources required to fight them in court. Those who do fight back are forced to spend millions in litigation costs, often with no chance of enforcing a court-ordered award against a judgment-proof plaintiff.

How big of a problem is this? Mr. James Bessen, writing in the *Harvard Business Review*, confirms that “the economic burden of today’s patent lawsuits is, in fact, historically unprecedented. Research shows that patent trolls cost defendant firms \$29 billion per year in direct out-of-pocket costs; in aggregate, patent litigation destroys over \$60 billion in firm wealth each year.”

Mr. Bessen further cites three studies on patent lawsuits currently in the works by researchers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rutgers, Harvard, and the University of Texas. Based upon preliminary findings, Mr. Bessen states:

A consistent picture is emerging about the effects of patent litigation: it costs innovators money; many innovators and venture capitalists report that it significantly impacts their businesses; innovators respond by investing less in R&D; and venture capitalists respond by investing less in startups.

I agree with Mr. Bessen. The evidence from these studies cannot be ignored. Patent trolls do hurt innovation, and it is past time for Congress to do something about it.

For the better part of a year, Congress worked toward a legislative solution to combat patent trolls. In December we overcame the first legislative hurdle when the House of Representatives passed the Innovation Act by a vote of 325 to 91. The White House endorsed the bipartisan legislation by stating: “The bill would improve incentives for future innovation while protecting the overall integrity of the patent system.”

Here in the Senate, I worked closely with a bipartisan group of Senators to craft a compromise bill that could pass the Senate. Countless hours of negotiation yielded encouraging results on key litigation reform provisions, including

fee shifting, heightened pleading and discovery standards, and a mechanism to ensure that recovery of fees will be possible against shell companies.

In the spirit of bipartisanship, my Republican colleagues and I were willing—albeit very reluctantly—to lower the bar on fee shifting if we maintained strong litigation reforms elsewhere. I continue to believe mandatory fee shifting is the best way to discourage patent litigation in cases where a plaintiff's or defendant's case is so weak it should never have been brought or defended in the first instance. That is why I included mandatory fee shifting in the Hatch-Leahy Patent Reform Act of 2006 and why I will insist on its inclusion in future legislation.

Fee shifting alone gives a prevailing party little relief against patent trolls who litigate in the name of shell companies while their financial backers or interested parties purposefully remain beyond the court's jurisdiction.

Thus, there must be a mechanism to ensure that recovery of fees will be possible even against judgment-proof shell companies. The recovery of award provision I drafted is intended to ensure that shell companies primarily in the business of asserting and enforcing patents and litigation cannot escape potential liability for attorneys fees if they are found to have pursued an unreasonable case. Those deemed interested parties may either voluntarily submit to the court's jurisdiction and become liable for any unsatisfied fees awarded in the case or opt out by renouncing sufficient interest related to the litigation or do nothing.

In my view fee shifting without such a recovery provision is akin to writing a check on an empty account. You are purporting to convey something that is not there. Fee shifting, coupled with this recovery provision, would stop patent trolls from litigating and dashing—dashing away, I might say.

There is no question that America's ingenuity fuels our economy. We must ensure that our patent system is as strong and vibrant as possible, not only to protect our country's premier position as a world leader in innovation but also to secure our own economic future. Patents encourage technological advancement by providing incentives to invent, invest in, and of course develop new technology.

It bears repeating that the governance of patents and copyrights is one of the essential, specifically enumerated powers given to the Federal Government and our Nation's founding. In my view it is one of the most visionary, forward-looking provisions in the entire U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, at least in the 113th Congress, it is unlikely that this body will act to end the abuses by patent trolls.

It is shameful that even intellectual property bills are now among the latest

casualties of our current partisan gridlock.

As Senators prepare to return to their home States for the August recess, I hope they will hear from people who represent the hotel, restaurant, retail, real estate, financial services, and high-tech industries—just to mention a few—about the urgent need to pass patent troll legislation.

I hope Senators will be reminded about the opportunity the Senate abandoned to pass important bipartisan, bicameral legislation that was supported by the White House but pulled from the Senate's agenda by the majority leader.

I hope Senators will recognize we must end the multibillion-dollar assault on American businesses and workers—because that is what it is.

Through commonsense reforms to our patent laws, we can ensure that American resources are used to innovate and create jobs and not wasted to settle or litigate frivolous claims.

I am disappointed that during the 113th Congress the Senate has failed to act to address this critical challenge. Legislation to combat abusive patent litigation will be among my top priorities in the next Congress. I intend to do everything in my power to get such legislation passed for the good of the economy and the good of this country.

ISRAEL

Mr. President, I rise to speak out in strong support of Israel's right to self-defense. This is not a partisan issue. Whether Republican or Democrat, we should all stand behind America's loyal ally as it faces Hamas's cowardly terrorism. In this time of frequent domestic political division, it is encouraging to witness the remarkable degree of unanimity among my colleagues on this issue.

The wide support for Israel's self-defense here in Congress reflects the unique bond between the United States and Israel. It is an interest we share for many reasons, including our kinship with Israel as a free society and a democracy, our close economic and cultural ties, especially for those of us who consider support for Israel a deeply spiritual matter, our respect for the many virtues of the Israeli society—from its industriousness to its tolerance—our appreciation for Israel's unique stability in an unstable region full of failed and stressed states, and our recognition that Israel wants nothing more than to live in peace with its neighbors.

When Hamas fires constant rocket barrages indiscriminately at Israel's cities and seeks to infiltrate Israel with teams of murderers and kidnappers, Israel has every right to defend itself against this terrorist threat.

In the realities of urban warfare against a guerrilla opponent, some civilian casualties are unavoidable. But in its military actions, Israel has acted

with admirable and unprecedented concern for Palestinian civilians—making phone calls, sending text messages, dropping leaflets to warn of impending attacks against military targets, aborting critical airstrips to avoid civilian casualties, and undertaking numerous other measures to protect Palestinian civilians, even at the expense of Israeli military objectives.

While the Israeli Defense Forces act with great courage not only to protect Israeli civilians but also to avoid harming Palestinian civilians, what does Hamas do?

Similar to all terrorists, they hide behind civilians—building bunkers and tunnels to protect its fighters but refusing to shelter civilians; using civilian buildings, including schools, hospitals, and places of worship, to launch rockets and hide other weapons; and even ordering civilians to ignore Israeli warnings and instead turning them into human shields.

In the face of this barbarism, Israel deserves our strongest support as it seeks to root out the infrastructure of terror Hamas has built in and around Gaza. The Israeli people have a right to live free from fear of constant rocket attack. While we should applaud the success of the Iron Dome system in protecting Israeli citizens from the Hamas rocket threat, Israel is acting responsibly by seeking to eliminate the means by which Hamas perpetuates that threat.

Above all else, we must recognize that supporting Israel is truly about supporting peace in the Middle East. Israel wants peace—not peace at any price but a just, secure, and enduring peace. As long as Hamas terrorists hate Israel more than they love their own children—to paraphrase Golda Meir—Israel must occasionally resort to force of arms in self-defense. In this endeavor our ally deserves our strongest support.

I thank my dear colleague from Rhode Island for allowing me to proceed on these two short but very important sets of remarks. I appreciate that and wish him well in every way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The distinguished Senator from Utah is one of the most distinguished and ablest lawyers ever to serve in this Senate, and his comments about the patent trolls and patent litigation are entitled to great weight.

I thoroughly agree with him that the use of these shell corporations is something we could and should act quickly to get rid of. I think the protection of an end user, such as a coffee shop or a florist or somebody who is not a competitor with a manufacturer or the patent holder, is something we could and should address. I think policing these often extortionate demand letters is

something we could and should address. I look forward to working with the distinguished Senator in those areas.

I think when it comes to fee-shifting, that is a very significant step. The principle in the American system of justice that a party pays his or her own lawyer is so deeply engrained in our system of justice that it is actually known as the American rule. To depart from that is something that I think we should do only with a very—let's put it this way. It is a very grave step and I am not sure it is justified in this case. But certainly we could move on the bill that got rid of shell corporations, that protected end users, and that went after these demand letters, and get into conference and, with any luck, something could be done there. But I very much appreciate Senator HATCH's long and sincere interest in this issue.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to thank my colleague for those comments.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today for the 76th time to urge my colleagues that it is time for us to wake up to the growing threats of climate change. Not a single State remains unaffected by the unprecedented changes we are already seeing, driven by the excessive carbon pollution we continue to dump into our oceans and atmosphere.

Yet in Washington, our Republican colleagues either parrot the polluter line that climate change is just a hoax, or stay silent. No one will step forward.

It was not always this way. Environmental protection was once a top priority of the Republican Party. It seems remarkable now, but it is true. In the early 1970s, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act were all passed with broad bipartisan support and signed by a Republican President. In the 1980s and 1990s, bipartisan majorities voted to strengthen those laws, led by Rhode Island's Republican Senator, John Chafee, who served as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee and whose seat I now have the honor to hold.

Conservation and stewardship were once fundamental principles of American conservatism. From seminal thinkers of the conservative movement to great Republican leaders of the 20th century, the conservative ideal included a commitment to the interests of future generations. Today, under a relentless barrage of unlimited corporate spending in our elections, much and perhaps most of it by polluters, the interests of future generations have taken a backseat to the interests of the oil companies and coal barons.

The disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision let polluters cast their dark shadow over Republicans in Congress who might otherwise work with Democrats on curbing their carbon pollution.

Edmund Burke, an Irish-born member of the British Parliament, is considered by many the father of modern conservatism. Sir Winston Churchill called him “a foremost apostle of liberty.” Burke was a staunch defender of our American Colonies and his statue stands here in Washington today. His 1790 conservative manifesto, “Reflections on the Revolution in France,” cautioned that we are but “temporary possessors” of our society. If individuals are “unmindful of what they have received from their ancestors or of what is due to their posterity,” he wrote, “no one generation could link with another. Men would become little better than flies of summer.”

In our case, flies of a carbon-fueled summer.

Russell Kirk was a distinguished scholar at the Heritage Foundation who none other than President Ronald Reagan dubbed “the prophet of American conservatism.” He wrote a 1970 piece for the *Baltimore Sun*: “Conservation Activism Is a Healthy Sign.” Kirk wrote: “Nothing is more conservative than conservation.”

The noted essayist and Kentucky farmer Wendell Berry, known for what the *American Conservative* magazine called his “unshakeable devotion to the land, to localism, and to the dignity of traditional life,” wrote in 1993:

Our destruction of nature is not just bad stewardship, or stupid economics, or a betrayal of family responsibility; it is the most horrid blasphemy.

Berry would also remind us in this Chamber that “[w]hether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is a party to all our deals and decisions, and she has more votes.”

No figure in American history embodied the conservative value of conservation more than President Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt resented the “malefactors of wealth,” as he called them, the timber and mining interests whose “selfish and shortsighted greed seeks to exploit our natural resources in such fashion as to ruin them and thereby to leave our children and our children’s children heirs only to an exhausted and impoverished inheritance.” To Roosevelt, this great land of ours was the birthright of all Americans—past, present, and future—to be used, to be sure, in achieving our destiny, but not wasted.

He wrote to Congress in 1907:

To waste, to destroy our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them.

That is a sentiment echoed by Republican Presidents throughout our history, including President Dwight Eisenhower, whose 1961 farewell address invoked this national legacy. Here is what he said:

As we peer into society’s future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the

impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage.

Republican President Gerald Ford, who once worked actually as a National Park ranger, said this in 1975:

We have too long treated the natural world as an adversary rather than as a life-sustaining gift from the Almighty. If man has the genius to build, which he has, he must also have the ability and the responsibility to preserve.

And, of course, no one is more revered by today’s Republican Party than Ronald Reagan. His conservative credentials are unassailable and GOP candidates for elected office strive mightily to out-Reagan each other at every turn. In 1984, Reagan put this question to his fellow Republicans:

What is a conservative after all but one who conserves, one who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live? . . . And we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live—our countryside, our rivers and mountains, our plains and meadows and forests. That is our patrimony. That is what we leave to our children. And our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

President Ronald Reagan’s words would make him a fringe liberal candidate in today’s extremist Republican Party.

In Congress, we have been boxed in by a barricade of special interest propaganda and we refuse to admit the plain evidence piling up before our eyes. We know with ever greater certainty what our carbon pollution is doing to the climate, what it is doing to our atmosphere, what it is doing to our oceans. And we know with ever greater certainty what that means for the planet and future generations. What do Republicans in Congress today have to say to our heirs, to our children and grandchildren?

“Catastrophic global warming is a hoax,” says one of my Republican colleagues.

“It’s not proven by any stretch of the imagination,” says another.

A third dismisses the issue altogether, saying, “A lot of this is condescending elitism.” That is the voice of today’s Republican Party.

But what does the next generation have to say back to these Republican voices of denial? More than half of young Republican voters said they would describe a politician who denies climate change is happening as ignorant, out of touch, or crazy—not my words, their words in the poll: ignorant, out of touch, or crazy. That is what the next generation says back to the Republican voices of denial.

Unfortunately, if one is a Republican in Congress today, it is more likely than not that one either holds that view or is afraid to say otherwise. According to one analysis, 58 percent of

congressional Republicans in the 113th Congress have denied or questioned the overwhelming scientific consensus that the Earth’s oceans and atmosphere are changing in unprecedented ways, driven by our carbon pollution. This includes, I am sad to report, every single Republican member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. And where there is not denial, there is silence.

Outside these barricaded walls, it is different. Outside Congress, more and more Republicans acknowledge the threat of climate change and call for responsible solutions. Former Members of Congress, free now from the polluters’ thrall, implore their colleagues to return to their conservative principles. Former Representative Bob Inglis, for example, invokes the tenets of conservative economics. Here is his quote:

If you’re a conservative, it is time to step forward and engage in the climate and energy debate because we have the answer—free enterprise. . . . Conservatives understand that we must set the correct incentives, and this should include internalizing pollution and other environmental costs in our market system. We tax income but we don’t tax emissions. It makes sense to conservatives to take the tax off something we want more of, income, and shift the tax to something we want less of, emissions.

Sherwood Boehlert and Wayne Gilchrest, former Republican representatives from New York and Maryland, also argue for a market-based approach to reducing carbon pollution. Here is what they said:

We could slash our debt by making powerplants and oil refineries pay for the carbon emissions that endanger our health and environment. This policy would strengthen our economy, lessen our dependence on foreign oil, keep our skies clean, and raise a lot of revenue.

Top advisors to former Republican Presidents have joined the chorus. William D. Ruckelshaus, Lee M. Thomas, William K. Reilly, Christine Todd Whitman all headed the Environmental Protection Agency during Republican administrations. They all recently testified before the Environment and Public Works Committee that it is time to get serious about climate change. Here is how they put it in a *New York Times* op-ed. They wrote:

As administrators of the EPA under Presidents Richard M. Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George Bush and George W. Bush, we held fast to common-sense conservative principles—protecting the health of the American people, working with the best technology available and trusting in the innovation of American business and in the market to find the best solutions for the least cost.

These former officials recognize both the wisdom of properly pricing carbon and the truculence of the opponents who stand in the way of progress. “A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions,” they say—“the best path”—“but that is

unachievable in the current political gridlock in Washington. . . .” I would interject that political gridlock is the product of big-spending polluters who profit from the gridlock that they create. But let me continue with what the EPA Administrators said: “But we must continue efforts to reduce the climate-altering pollutants that threaten our planet. The only uncertainty about our warming world,” they wrote, “is how bad the changes will get, and how soon. What is most clear is that there is no time to waste.” Four Republican EPA Administrators.

One day folks are going to look back at this time and we are all going to be judged very harshly with all the dread power that history has to inflict on wrong. The polluters and their instruments will be judged harshly, and the Republican Party will be judged harshly for letting itself be led astray by polluters from its most basic conservative values. Unless they step up, Republicans will leave—to borrow language from Russell Kirk—“[t]he principle of real leadership ignored, the immortal objects of society forgotten, practical conservatism degenerated into mere laudation of private enterprise, economic policy almost wholly surrendered to special interests.” That is about as good a description of where they are right now as I could muster, and it comes from the conservative Russell Kirk.

We cannot do this alone, not with the numbers that we have. Republicans and Democrats alike must approach this climate problem head on with the full conviction of our ideals, but working together, working in good faith, and working on a common platform of fact and common sense to protect the American people and our American economy from the looming effects of carbon pollution.

We must rise to our duty here and place our own natural resources, our own American international reputation, and our legacy to future American generations first, ahead of the poisonous influence of the polluters that so dominates this debate now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, thank you very much for recognizing me.

I also wish to thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership on environmental issues which are so immensely pressing and important for our country, and I am proud and honored to join

with him in that cause, which he has helped to lead so often on the floor, but also privately amongst our colleagues and in so many ways across the country. I hope to continue our work together on that issue, and I thank him for presiding now and for continuing that leadership.

Mr. President, I am speaking today, after listening to the people of my State, on an issue that perplexes and challenges us in so many ways. The situation on our southern border perplexes us because it is a problem without easy or ready solutions. It is a challenge to America in the resources that it requires and the spirit that it evokes. Our resources are scarce. Our spirit and our inner strength are boundless. Many have expressed to me in my State of Connecticut concerns about those resources, about the limits on those resources, in facing a seemingly endless challenge, as children come to our borders and stretch the capacity of this Nation to accept them. I am sympathetic with the folks who wonder whether we are capable, very simply, of caring for these children—but I know we can—the children who are coming here because of the humanitarian crisis they face in their countries.

Our supplemental legislation, so ably guided by Senator MIKULSKI, provides a path for providing the resources that are necessary. This supplemental is a thoughtful and significant document that addresses this situation without either breaking the bank or sacrificing American values.

I am immensely impressed and inspired by the spirit that has been evoked, again, among citizens of Connecticut in saying: We must care for those individual children who need asylum because returning them to the countries of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala would be a death sentence for many of them. And we must respect our law which provides for individual consideration and assessment of those children in whether they deserve and need asylum and that status of fleeing persecution and death that many of them, in fact, have faced in those lands.

We must place those individuals, according to law, with their families, if possible. Many of them have parents here, and the vast majority have some family, moms and dads, aunts and uncles. They need to be screened under the law. Their placement has to be in a safe and secure home with people, in my view, who are here legally. That screening has to be, as the law requires, to assure their safety and security as children. The United States has a responsibility to follow the law, and so do we as citizens and as lawmakers. As torn as we may be, as conflicted as we may feel, as vehement as those conflicting feelings may be felt and expressed by fellow citizens, let us uphold

the law and afford due process and individual consideration to those children who, under the law, deserve that individual assessment, individual treatment, individual consideration for the status of asylum in this Nation.

People speak about these children as if they were a mass, indistinguishable, a single societal challenge or problem. A Member of the House of Representatives even referred to them as an “invasion.” What I saw at the border when I visited there with two of my colleagues, Senator HIRONO and Senator MURKOWSKI, joined by a third, Senator CORNYN, all friends and distinguished colleagues, hammered home for me that these children are individuals and they should be treated as such.

The vast outpouring of spirit and generosity in this country is mirrored by countless organizations—we heard about them during our visit—that want to help these children, want to volunteer and give of themselves, their time, money, goods and services, everything from blankets, to furniture, to pizza, to you name it. America is pouring out its heart for these children.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Secretary Johnson and Commissioner Kerlikowske from Save the Children, a Connecticut organization that has offered, very generously, its help and support in very specific and concrete ways, along with a briefing note that outlines what it perceives the children’s needs at the border to be.

Let’s end one doubt: the need for and the urgent justification for individual due process consideration and the full and adequate screening of these children and a fair judicial proceeding. I would describe just a few stories.

Girls are fleeing sexual violence at the hands of gangs in Honduras and El Salvador. I will give just a few examples.

Ms. L was raped by more than a dozen gang members in Honduras. After reporting the gang rape to police, her family began to receive death threats.

There are only three shelters in Honduras for rape survivors, and two of them actually operate as brothels. The one remaining shelter declined to take Ms. L because it could not protect her or the other shelter residents from gang violence. She had no choice but to flee Honduras.

Carlita is a 13-year-old who fled gang violence in El Salvador. She was kidnapped by the Zetas in Mexico, used for sex, and forced to be a drug mule for them before escaping and ultimately reaching the United States.

Ms. H survived multiple rapes in Honduras. After she fled she was kidnapped by a Mexican gang and raped and tortured. She eventually reached the United States.

Ms. N and Ms. O, ages 15 and 8, fled El Salvador. Their older female cousins

had been forced to work as sex slaves for gang leaders. The gangs threatened to kill Ms. N and were placed in removal proceedings.

Ms. E fled El Salvador when she was 8 years old. Gang members had kidnapped her and two older sisters. The girl's mother did not want her 8-year-old daughter to suffer the same fate, so she arranged for her daughter to be brought to the United States.

Many gangs use sexual violence as a part of the price or rent demanded of girls.

Ms. X fled an area of El Salvador controlled by gangs. Her brother was killed for refusing to join a gang that forcibly tried to recruit him. She was raped by two men, became pregnant as a result, and then was required to pay "renta" to the rapists, which increased over time. She fled El Salvador and was attacked by Mexican robbers during her journey, before arriving in the United States.

Many of these girls are victims of forced prostitution and human trafficking. I have other stories that will be printed in the RECORD. These stories come from personal experiences of advocates and others who have interviewed them at length as well as our own officials. Many of these girls are sexually assaulted during the treacherous journey northward. Those stories are not imagined or fictionalized; they are graphic and dramatic. Rape is so prevalent that many girls begin the journey by taking birth control injections before they leave home from Central America as a precaution against pregnancy.

I refer to these stories because they illustrate and illuminate the need for a thoughtful humanitarian approach, especially to these young girls whose stories are so real and so inspiring, not just in the treacherous journey they overcome, not just in the torture and abuse they suffer, but in the dignity and self-worth and strength and resoluteness they continue to have. A thoughtful humanitarian approach is what is required. It is the approach that this supplemental exemplifies in providing resources.

There is an oath that doctors take: "First do no harm." Let that be the approach of this body in approving basic amounts of money, reduced by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, so that it meets appropriately and frugally the needs of these children to be placed in humane circumstances with families who are screened for their safety and security and their being here legally.

I will close with one last experience. In one interview I watched at the border, I saw a 7-year-old girl crying quietly as she tried to answer the questions of an armed border guard. The border guard did his best. He was obviously caring in his approach. But neither his training nor the experience of

any border guard equips them really to play this role with a 7-year-old girl. They are in uniform, a police uniform, which for this girl's whole life has meant fear, potential rape, bodily harm. These children have learned from hard experience that that fear is often justified. They are distrustful of adults generally and authority figures in particular.

Nobody could watch this scene without feeling a sense of compassion for those guards and, of course, most especially the girl, separated from her family, sitting on a bench, her legs swinging free because she was not big enough to reach the floor. The look on her face revealed not just terror but a fervent desire to please, inspired by fear. She could not communicate openly with the border guard.

What she needed was someone trained and equipped to elicit the facts of her background, the reason she had fled, the motivation for her escape, the facts and her feelings about it. That kind of individual assessment is the reason we have the law passed by Congress in 2008, unanimously. This Trafficking Victims Protection Act was designed for these girls and boys coming from noncontiguous countries facing those fears, those threatening conditions if they were to be returned. They face a near certain death, many of them, if they are returned without the individual assessment and consideration. Call it due process, call it judicial, call it humane questioning—the title matters less than what happens.

I know this Nation cannot be expected to rescue all of the children of the world from all of the harsh and inhumane conditions they may face. We are not limitless in our capacity to do good. But I know and I believe we have the resources to do what is just and right under the law considering every one of those children and every one of the potential threats they face if they are returned to their countries.

It is an American value that we follow the rule of law, that we grant asylum under the law to people who deserve it and need it. That much we can do. I know we have the resources to do it. I believe we have the will to do it. The heart of America and its citizens is big. We are a big country. We are not limitless in our resources, but we are boundless in our capacity for generosity and doing what is right.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE THE CHILDREN,
JULY 22, 2014.

DEAR SECRETARY JOHNSON AND COMMISSIONER KERLIKOWSKI: Like you and your team, we are deeply concerned about the thousands of unaccompanied minor children crossing our southern border. To address the humanitarian crisis, I am writing to offer our support and propose ways that Save the Children can be of immediate assistance to improve the conditions for children.

Save the Children has nearly a century of experience working with displaced children around the world and has responded to serve children in the face of every natural disaster in the US for the past decade. In the US, we have been a leading partner of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), supporting the needs of children. We have been operating for the past month in McAllen, TX serving children and mothers after their release from Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) custody and have trained more than 80 FEMA Corps members to begin offering basic child programming within the CBP detention and overflow sites. However, we know we can do more to improve the conditions and outcomes for these children.

Your Rio Grande Valley CBP Team, under the leadership of Chief Kevin Oaks, has been a great ally to us as we try to support and assist in this unprecedented situation, offering us tours and being open to dialogue about the needs of children in their custody. However, he has been unable to grant us permission to provide technical assistance and professional child programming onsite without higher authority—it is to you we appeal for this permission.

The conditions in which the children and mothers are being detained are designed for accused criminals, not mothers and children. Save the Children would like to work with you and your team to be a part of the solution. We have the expertise needed to give the children the unique support needed under the current difficult circumstances.

I am writing to propose that Save the Children work with you to immediately help improve conditions for children and address children's urgent needs for care and mental health supports. This would support the safety, protection and wellbeing of the children—and it would relieve stress on the CBP agents. All of these programs could be established at no cost to you—or, if required through DHS/CBP policies and procedures, Save the Children could be reimbursed for this support.

Here is what Save the Children is proposing:

1. Save the Children is offering to immediately provide care for the young children at the CBP detention sites, including the new McAllen overflow site, while their cases are being processed.

Save the Children would provide our Child-Friendly Spaces program, a signature program that we use to support children's mental health and safety in crisis in the U.S. and around the world. This care would be customized to fit the CBP space availability in each border detention site. We would be able to provide basic programs directly in the holding cells or in whatever space may be available. Our teams are trained to provide this program in the U.S. and in challenging, high-risk environments all over the world. For example, we are currently providing this program in Iraq, South Sudan, and the countries bordering Syria.

2. Save the Children is requesting your permission to provide professional staff at each site that has FEMA Corps members, whom we are now supporting to provide urgently needed programming for children in custody. Our professional staff would lead the work with children and provide ongoing support and guidance to the FEMA Corps members while they are in the CBP stations. This will help ensure that there is consistent quality and safety for the children while they participate in the program activities.

Through our partnership with FEMA, the Corporation for National and Community

Service and FEMA Corps, this week, Save the Children is training the FEMA Corps teams who are deployed to serve in the CBP stations. Until now, the FEMA Corps members were not trained to work with children and have not been supplied with materials or program activities, specifically activities that support children's emotional wellbeing. We know that many of the children had arduous journeys at the hands of smugglers and traffickers. The children need to receive psychosocial support from the moment of their arrival to ensure their wellbeing. Save the Children will be training and providing ongoing technical support to the FEMA Corps members to help them in their mission assignment to support the children in CBP custody.

3. Save the Children is also offering to provide psychosocial support programs to the CBP agents and their families to help relieve their stress and support their emotional wellbeing during this crisis. We know that many of the border agents are heavily stressed by this crisis. By supporting the psychosocial and mental health needs, and the needs of their families, you will help ensure their longer-term wellbeing. I am attaching a fact sheet about our Journey of Hope program.

4. Save the Children is offering to distribute comfort kits to the mothers and children. We have customized the kits to be age appropriate for mothers, infants and toddlers, young children and school-aged children. They include items such as pacifiers, wipes, baby blankets, plush toys, and bilingual storybooks. We would be happy to work with CBP to ensure that the items provided meet with CBP security regulations. We are ready to immediately provide 5,000 comfort kits for the children, 1,000 infant and toddler kits, and 2,000 kits for the mothers.

5. Save the Children is offering to conduct a multi-sector assessment of needs and provide ongoing monitoring to ensure the programs for children support CBP's mission and the children's needs.

Save the Children is uniquely qualified to address the needs of these children in collaboration with CBP and the U.S. government during this crisis. We are reaching out across all relevant federal and state agencies to both advocate for the needs of these children and to offer our support. Thank you again for your attention to this humanitarian crisis and I appreciate your review of our request to work with you and your team for the benefit of all.

I look forward to working together,

CAROLYN MILES,

President & CEO, Save the Children USA.

BRIEFING NOTE: MEETING THE NEEDS OF
CHILDREN ON THE U.S. BORDER
THE CRISIS

For years, children and minors from Guatemala, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras and other Central American nations have sought refuge in the United States. However, their numbers have increased dramatically since late 2013 because of violence, extreme poverty and other factors that make their and their families' lives untenable. Between October 2013 and May of this year, nearly 50,000 children, many unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, arrived at the U.S. border. This is a 92 percent increase from the prior year, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Projections suggest that the number of children arriving will increase to between 60,000 and 90,000 by the end of 2014.

THE IMPACT ON CHILDREN

Children are always among the most vulnerable in any emergency. Many of the chil-

dren arriving at the border are suffering from physical illnesses, diarrhea and dehydration, and some have been victimized during their long and arduous journey. They are in urgent need of protective adult care, supportive supervision, medical and hygiene care, and nutritious meals.

With intensive overcrowding at the border stations, reports about sanitation and living conditions for children are extremely disturbing. We have heard stories that children as young as age six are being separated from their mothers for days and kept in border detention sites that are ill-equipped to meet the basic needs of children. Our staff in Texas has also heard first-hand from women that they are fleeing communities because of threats that have been made by gangs to harm their families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The large influx of migrants poses huge challenges for local communities and Border Patrol agents charged with protecting the border. Despite these challenges, it is critical for local communities and U.S. government agencies to:

Provide adequate sanitary conditions, and basic needs such as food, water, blankets and places to sleep in the shelters, detention centers and transit centers housing children;

Prevent traumatic separation of mothers from young children where at all possible; and

Facilitate basic health services and mental health support for children who are in need of psychosocial support.

NGOs like Save the Children have decades of experience in addressing the needs of fleeing children in some of the hardest hit areas of the world. In order to ensure that children are receiving treatment and care that is up to international standards, we urge the U.S. government to:

Allow NGOs with expertise in child protection issues to gain access to border detention sites; and

Permit NGOs with expertise in child protection issues to assess the needs of children and their families to devise strategies that will ensure their well-being.

It is both important and obligatory under current U.S. and international law to uphold the legal rights of children, especially those with a possible claim to refugee status. To this end, we ask the U.S. government to:

Provide unaccompanied children with adequate screenings and a fair judicial process to ensure that they are not being returned to life-threatening situations;

Uphold provisions in existing laws that provide due process for unaccompanied children so that those with the right to stay are not short-changed and lost in the shuffle; and

Ensure children and their families are made aware of their legal protections and options.

Finally, any viable long term strategy must include a robust effort to address the root causes for the surge and not focus only on its symptoms. To this end, we request that the U.S. government:

Dedicate funding to address issues of violence and poverty that drive migration from the countries of origin and not only on border security and deterrence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILDREN IN NEED

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I am especially grateful to the senior Senator from Connecticut for his words tonight and the challenge those words present to us. We are grateful for his efforts to stand for children.

I rise tonight to speak about children here in the United States. I spoke earlier about issues that related to women and girls and children generally in Afghanistan. But I wanted to highlight a report that came out recently by one of the leading organizations in the country that charts the well-being of children over time and advocates on their behalf. The name of the organization that many here have heard of, I am sure, is the Annie E. Casey Foundation—no relation to me—a foundation that has made it its mission to advocate on behalf of children. We cannot be an effective advocate—none of us—unless we chart their progress and find out what is working. So I am going to briefly summarize tonight the findings of the 2014 Kids County Report by the Casey Foundation.

I have here at the lectern kind of a color-coded chart which I will not hold up because I do not have an enlarged version of it. I will not be able to have it printed in the RECORD.

I want to summarize it. Basically, what is in front of me is a summary of various categories that the Annie E. Casey Foundation has developed to chart the well-being of children. They separate the comparisons into four sections, and then they determine whether over time—whether it is over 4 or 5 years or over a longer period of time—whether for children the indicators have worsened or improved. It is a very basic set of metrics.

The categories they track for children are the following four categories: first, economic well-being, and I will talk about some of the indicators there; second, education; third, health; and fourth, a category they call family and community.

The basic indicators for the entire United States—of course, they have a breakdown for how the children in every State are doing on those indicators. For example, in terms of what is getting better, we should highlight and note when there are improvements made. I think the fact that we have improvements on these indicators for children over time indicates that public policy matters, what happens here in the Congress matters, what happens across the country in nonprofit organizations and advocacy organizations that fight every day for children and say over and over again, as the advocates tell us, that children are not small adults—we need specific strategies for children, whether it is for health care or for early education or to make sure they get enough to eat or to protect them from predators. Whatever the issue, we have to have specific strategies for children.

Let's go through a couple of areas where there has been improvement—not dramatic improvement, not enough improvement for us to say we have achieved a measure of success on one metric and we can move on.

In the area of education, just by way of example, eighth grade children—eighth graders not proficient in math, so it is kind of almost a negative indicator the way it is phrased. In 2005, across the United States, 72 percent of eighth graders were not proficient in math—a very high number, 72 percent. When they looked at it again in 2013, it was down to 66. So it has improved by 6 percentage points, but thankfully it is moving in the right direction. But we can't be satisfied with 66 percent of eighth graders not—not—proficient in math, but it is good news it is moving in the right direction.

Another bit of good news and maybe a more urgent issue in terms of what happens to very young children—in this case, low birth weight babies—there is an improvement there from 2005 to 2012. So over 7 years, the percentage of low birth weight babies, according to this data, has gotten better, but the unfortunate part is it only went from 8.2 percent to 8 percent—not much of an improvement but an improvement.

We have a long way to go in the greatest country in the world when we say that there has been an improvement but still 8 percent of babies are low birth weight. So there is an improvement, but there is a lot more work to do.

Maybe the best area indicator of improvement—and then I will move on to areas where there has been a worsening—children without health insurance. We hear a lot of discussion about health insurance, health care, and the Affordable Care Act in Congress, but in 2008 when that measurement was taken, 18 percent of children did not have health care. So in 2008 it was 10 percent, and as of 2012 it is down to 7 percent. So there is a substantial diminution or reduction in the number of children without health insurance. But if we do the math, 7 percent of the children of the country don't have health insurance. That is a big number. So it is getting better, substantially better, better than almost any other metric in terms of growth or progress, but we have to do a lot more to make sure that it is not 7 percent—that number should be zero—make sure that every child has health insurance. That has to be the goal, and that has to be what we are determined to achieve in the Senate.

I will go through a couple of areas that have worsened, but thankfully, of what is 16 categories, there are more improvement categories than worsening categories. Unfortunately, we have to go through some of the areas where it is worse.

One that is particularly disturbing is children in poverty. That has worsened between the years 2005 and 2012—19 percent in 2005 was the percentage of children in poverty. As of 2012 that went up to 23 percent. So prior to the great recession and then some time after the recession ended, the 2012 number was 23 percent. So that is a worsening number, and it should give us not just pause, but it should be an impetus to action to reduce that number—23 percent of the children in the country in poverty as of 2012. Children whose parents lack secure employment—that number got worse. Children living in households with high-housing-cost burden—that number got worse, unfortunately.

I will give two more, and then I will conclude my remarks. Children in single-parent families—that number got worse between 2005 and 2012. Finally, children living in high-poverty areas—that was measured over a different time period—2000 versus a time period between 2008 and 2012. That number got worse as well.

What this report indicates—and I won't go through the State numbers—is that first and foremost we have to keep records and we have to track progress. But it also indicates that even when there is an improving metric, when the numbers are getting better, say, for example, on low birth weight babies, that improvement is in many cases very slight and not nearly adequate or acceptable.

I think both on the worsening numbers and on the improvement numbers, it should be a call to action. I believe that if we are doing the right thing for our children, if we are living up to what the Scriptures tell us about justice, where the Scriptures talk about “Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for justice, for they shall be satisfied,” if we think of how we treat children as a measure or as an indicator of justice and our commitment to justice, we cannot say that these numbers are in any way acceptable, that our hunger and our thirst for that kind of justice cannot be satisfied with these numbers.

We should be committed to not just tracking and making marginal or incremental progress, we should be committed to the full measure of justice for our children.

Hubert Humphrey said—and he may have said it on this floor when he represented Minnesota—“It was once said that the moral test of a government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.” He said that was the moral test of a government.

So if we are talking about what Humphrey said about children in the dawn of their life, we have to reflect upon

and be motivated by the findings of the Annie E. Casey Foundation report. It is one of those reports that remind us how we can improve when it comes to the well-being of our children, but it also reminds us and I think alarms us about areas where we have not improved and we have a ways to go.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the President's emergency supplemental request of \$615 million to fight wildfires throughout the United States.

We have witnessed increasingly large and devastating wildfires over the last few decades.

Nationwide, the costs of fighting wildfires has increased from \$200 million in 1986 to \$1.7 billion in 2013. In that same time, the amount of acres burned has increased from 2.7 million acres in 1986 to 4.3 million acres in 2013.

In many parts of the U.S., fire seasons are now 60 to 80 days longer compared to three decades ago and in some places like Southern California, the fire season never ends.

This is leading to seasonal firefighters being hired several months earlier than normal and federal agencies spending more to make sure our firefighters are prepared and have the necessary resources available for the entire year.

So far this year, California has experienced a 35 percent increase in fire activity and a 16 percent increase in acres burned over an average year. These alarming statistics translate to more than 4,000 wildfires in my State already that have burned more than 52,000 acres since the beginning of the year.

Right now, brave firefighters in California are battling five different large fires. The largest is the Sand Fire, which has burned over 4,000 acres east of Sacramento. This fire has already destroyed 19 homes.

Although it has already been an unprecedented fire season in California, we are not at all out of danger yet as the significant wildland fire potential remains above normal for most of the State through October of this year. It is also above normal in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada, and parts of Arizona.

Adding to the difficulty of battling these enormous fires is the constrained fire suppression budget we are currently operating under.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior announced that wild-fire-fighting costs this summer are projected to run about \$400 million over budget.

In fact, since 2002, the United States has overspent its wildfire suppression budget every year except one—and in three of those years, went over the suppression budget by nearly \$1 billion. This chronic underfunding of our firefighting accounts cannot continue.

When we fail to budget for fire suppression, the Forest Service and the Department of Interior are forced to transfer money from fire prevention accounts to make up the difference. That makes no sense!

We are taking money from the very programs that help reduce the threat of wildfires—such as hazardous fuel removal programs.

In my State, plans to remove dry brush and dead trees in the Tahoe National Forest and the Plumas National Forest have been delayed because wildfire prevention funding is not available.

The President's supplemental request not only adds funding for fire suppression during this fiscal year, it solves the problem in the future by creating a Wildfire Suppression Cap Adjustment so that extraordinary fire costs are treated in the same way as destructive hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes are funded.

This means that money to fight the largest fires would not be subject to discretionary budget caps much like FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund.

As our fire seasons become longer, hotter, and endanger more communities, we must act now to change how wildfire suppression is funded so that we can reduce fire risk and increase the resiliency of the Nation's public lands, forests, and the surrounding communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this emergency supplemental funding and address the growing crisis of wildfires.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KELLOGG-HUBBARD LIBRARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, every time I go by the children's library at Kellogg-Hubbard Library in my hometown of Montpelier, VT, it brings back happy memories. I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article I wrote about the library and its wonderful librarian, Miss Holbrook.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times Argus, June 13, 1996]

MONTPELIER BOY REALIZES MISS HOLBROOK WAS RIGHT

(By Patrick Leahy)

The 100th anniversary of the Kellogg-Hubbard Library triggers memories for all of us who have lived in Montpelier. And they are great memories.

While I was growing up, Montpelier did not have television. We children did not have the advantage of cable TV with 10 channels giving us the opportunity to buy things we didn't need and would never use or another 10 offering blessings or redemptions for an adequate contribution.

Deprived as we were, we made do with the Lone Ranger and Inner Sanctum on the radio and Saturday's serials at the Strand Theater on Main Street. For a few minutes on Saturday afternoon, we could watch Hopalong Cassidy, Tarzan, Flash Gordon, Jungle Jim or Batman face death-defying predicaments that would guarantee you would be back the next Saturday, 14 cents in hand, to see how they survived (and I recall they always did).

Having exhausted radio, Saturday matinees, the latest comic books (I had a favorite) and childhood games and chores, we were left to our own imagination.

That was the best part.

We were a generation who let the genies of our imagination out of the bottle by reading. Then, as now, reading was one of my greatest pleasures.

My parents had owned the Waterbury Record Weekly newspaper and then started the Leahy Press in Montpelier, which they ran until selling it at their retirement. The Leahy family was at home with the printed word and I learned to read early in life.

At 5 years old I went down the stairs of the Kellogg-Hubbard Children's Library, and the years that followed provided some of the most important experiences of my life.

In the '40s and '50s, the Kellogg-Hubbard was blessed with a white-haired children's librarian named Miss Holbrook. Her vocation in life had to be to help children read and to make reading enjoyable. She succeeded more than even she might have dreamed.

She had the key to unlocking our imagination.

With my parents' encouragement, the Kellogg-Hubbard was a regular stop every afternoon as I left school. On any day I had two or three books checked out. My sister Mary, brother John and I read constantly.

In my years as U.S. senator, it seems I never traveled so far or experienced so much as I did as a child in Montpelier with daily visits to the library. With Miss Holbrook's encouragement I had read most of Dickens and Robert Louis Stevenson in the early part of grade school.

To this day, I remember sitting in our home at 136 State St. reading Treasure Island on a Saturday afternoon filled with summer storms. I knew I heard the tap, tap, tap of the blind man's stick coming down State Street and I remember the great relief of seeing my mother and father returning from visiting my grandparents in South Ryegate.

Miss Holbrook was right. A good and an active imagination creates its own reality.

In my profession, I read computer messages, briefing papers, constituent letters, legislation and briefings, the Congressional Record—and an occasional book for pleasure—in all, the equivalent of a full-length book each day.

Interesting as all this is, and owing much of my life to those earlier experiences at the library, the truest reading pleasure was

then. I worry that so many children today miss what our libraries offer.

During the past few years I have had many of my photographs published. DC Comics and Warner Brothers have also asked me to write for Batman or do voice-overs on their TV series. In each case, I have asked them to send my payment to the Kellogg-Hubbard Library to buy books for the Children's Library.

It is my way of saying: "Thank you, Miss Holbrook."

RECOGNIZING RONALD McDONALD HOUSE CHARITIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to commemorate the 30th anniversary for two excellent charities in my home State of Kentucky, the Ronald McDonald House Charities. The Ronald McDonald House Charities of Kentuckiana in Louisville and the Ronald McDonald House Charities of the Bluegrass in Lexington both first opened their doors to needy families in 1984.

Since then, each house has served more than 25,000 families. In the last year alone, more than 1,100 Kentucky families have spent nearly 15,000 nights in the two homes operated by these charities. The two homes operate thanks to the generosity of Kentucky's McDonalds' owners, a broad swath of Kentucky businesses, countless individual donors, and the hundreds of thousands of hours given by tireless volunteers.

For those of my colleagues who are not familiar with the Ronald McDonald House, it serves as a home away from home, at low or no cost, for the families of children who are hospital patients. At a time when a family is undergoing such a crisis as the illness of a child, infant, or newborn, the last thing these families need to worry about is finding housing near the hospital. The Ronald McDonald House eases that need by providing a home away from home for families of children receiving health care at area medical facilities while also lending support to other organizations that aid children. Today there are 125 local chapters in 55 countries.

The Ronald McDonald House Charities of Kentuckiana first opened in Louisville in September 1984. Since their most recent expansion in 2009, they feature 36 guest rooms, each accommodating up to four people.

In 1992, the Ronald McDonald House Charities of Kentuckiana helped pioneer one of the first Ronald McDonald Family Rooms in the world—a smaller version of a Ronald McDonald House located inside a hospital so a parent is only steps away from their seriously ill child. Today there are Ronald McDonald Family Rooms in three Louisville hospitals.

The Ronald McDonald House Charities of the Bluegrass in Lexington similarly opened their doors in 1984, and have since expanded to 20 rooms.

In 2005, through a partnership with the University of Kentucky, the Ronald McDonald House Charities of the Bluegrass began the Ronald McDonald Care Mobile to offer eastern Kentucky's children free professional dental care and education aboard a state-of-the-art mobile clinic. Centered in Hazard, KY, the Ronald McDonald Care Mobile cares for underserved children in their own neighborhoods and schools.

Together, the Ronald McDonald House Charities of both Kentuckiana and the Bluegrass have accomplished a great deal for the Commonwealth and helped thousands of Kentucky families. Kentucky residents and businesses are proud to have supported them for 30 years, and I know will continue to do so for many years more. I want to thank the Ronald McDonald House Charities of Kentuckiana and the Bluegrass for serving as the home away from home for distressed families with a child in the hospital for 30 years. Kentucky is proud of these institutions and the many people behind them who make them work.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY RUSSELL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and legendary Kentuckian, Wild Turkey Distillery's Master Distiller Jimmy Russell. This year marks the 60th year Jimmy has been making Bourbon for Wild Turkey, a fact that the distillery is rightfully proud to celebrate. As a 60-year Bourbon veteran, Jimmy is the longest tenured active spirits master distiller in the world.

Kentucky is, of course, the birthplace of Bourbon. The drink itself is named for Bourbon County, KY, in the heart of the Bluegrass State, where the product first emerged. Kentucky produces 95 percent of the world's Bourbon supply, and Kentucky's iconic Bourbon brands ship more than 30 million gallons of the spirit to 126 countries, making Bourbon the largest export category among all U.S. distilled spirits. Not only is Kentucky the overwhelming producer of the world's Bourbon, Bourbon gives much back to Kentucky. It is a vital part of the state's tourism and economy.

Jimmy grew up only 5 miles away from the Wild Turkey Distillery, located in Lawrenceburg, KY. His passion for Bourbon led him to study under whiskey luminaries, including Bill Hughes, Wild Turkey's second master distiller; and Ernest W. Ripy, Jr., great-nephew of distillery founder James Ripy and Wild Turkey's third master distiller. Jimmy recalls being taken under Bill's wing and learning everything about the business from the ground up. Since becoming master distiller in the mid-1960s, he has traveled the world as an unofficial ambassador of Bourbon, introducing people from as far and wide as Japan and Australia to American's native spirit.

Over the past 60 years, Jimmy has been responsible for the launches of several new Wild Turkey brands and expressions, such as Tradition, Tribute, 17-year-old Wild Turkey for Japan, Rare Breed, American Spirit, Kentucky Spirit and Russell's Reserve, which he cocreated with his son and distilling partner Eddie Russell. Jimmy broke new ground in 1976 with the first honeyed Bourbon, at the time called Wild Turkey Liqueur. The evolution of that product today is known as American Honey. Jimmy is also responsible for overseeing the production of Wild Turkey 101, the distillery's flagship brand. This fall, Wild Turkey released a commemorative Diamond Anniversary limited-edition Bourbon created by Jimmy's son, distilling partner and Bourbon Hall of Famer Eddie Russell. As for Jimmy himself, he is known to enjoy his Bourbon neat or with a touch of branch water.

As a legend in the distilled spirits industry, Jimmy is a member of the Kentucky Bourbon Hall of Fame. He is a member of the Whiskey Hall of Fame and a whiskey judge for the International Wine and Spirits Competition. He has been honored by the Commonwealth of Kentucky General Assembly, been anointed a Kentucky Colonel, and received the key to the city from the mayor of Lawrenceburg.

When not hard at work at Wild Turkey, Jimmy spends time with his wife Joretta. They have three children, Eddie, Mike, and Kathy, six grandchildren and one great-grandchild. An avid sports fan, Jimmy is a lifelong supporter of local Anderson County High School athletic programs for girls and boys.

I want to congratulate Jimmy Russell for reaching his 60th anniversary of work at Wild Turkey Distillery. His lifetime of achievement in the distilled spirits industry is certainly something to be proud of. I know my Senate colleagues join me in commending Jimmy for decades of success.

TRIBUTE TO MARCUS ADAMS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to SPC Marcus Adams. Adams hails from Magoffin County, KY, and proudly served his country on a tour of duty in Iraq.

Adams graduated from Magoffin County High School, and after his freshman year in college he decided to enlist in the U.S. Army. Because of the strong military tradition in his family—his father, grandfather, and two uncles all served—he felt it was an easy decision to carry on that legacy.

After completing his basic training and advanced individual combat training, Adams was assigned to the 555th Engineer Brigade. In September of 2008, he and his brigade were sent to Balad, Iraq, where they would remain for the duration of their yearlong tour of duty.

In Iraq, Adams was responsible for all of his brigade's technology. Managing the computer networks, servers, and radios were tasks that all fell under his purview.

Adams is now happily back in his old Kentucky home with his wife Ashleigh and his son Alistair and will soon be joined by his first daughter Hermione.

For his honorable service to this country, he is well deserving of praise from this body. Therefore, I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring SPC Marcus Adams.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Adams' service in Iraq. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

QUICK DECISION LEADS TO IRAQ

(By Heather Oney)

One "drop of the hat" decision took Marcus Adams all the way to Iraq.

Adams, a graduate of Magoffin County High School, was 19 years old and had completed one year of college when he came in one afternoon in February 2007 and told his wife, Ashleigh Nicole Prince Adams, he had joined the Army.

"There were no objections," Adams laughed. "She stayed in college at Morehead and I went to basic training."

Adams said given his family's history, with his dad, grandfather and two uncles serving in the military, it was a no-brainer.

"With 9/11, I felt because everyone else in my family had served, I felt the responsibility to at least do a minimum tour," Adams said. "I didn't feel productive in college and the Army could give me steady employment and healthcare."

Adams finished his basic training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, then his Advanced Individual Training (AIT) at Fort Gordon, Georgia. He was then assigned to the 555th Engineer Brigade, based out of Fort Lewis, Washington.

His primary job with the brigade, which he stayed in all through his enlistment, was to be the computer guy, Adams said. He was responsible for the computer networks, servers, radios—any technology—the engineers needed.

In September 2008, only seven years after 9/11, Adams and his brigade were sent to Balad, Iraq, where the team would stay a year.

"The War in the Middle East we have been engaged in for the past 10-plus years is opened by its very nature," Adams said. "In Vietnam, we had an actual bad guy, in uniform and everything. In Iraq and Afghanistan, when the enemy is terror, who is that? There's no way to define victory."

Despite recent developments in Iraq, Adams said, "I'm proud of the work we did. Less than 1 percent of U.S. Americans ever serve in any capacity. The importance of serving and the things I got from it turned me into the person I am."

Adams said the majority of the time he remained on base, which was a former Iraqi Army base where temperatures got up to 130 degrees in the day.

"It's hard to express how hot that is," Adams remembered.

He had one mission off-base, where he said he saw how big the gap was between the poor and the rich in Iraq.

"Here, the poorest people get food stamps and aid," Adams said. "I've seen Iraqi men walking around bare naked, picking up garbage, and the guys working with us are wearing suits and eating lobster. We saw people working at a dump in a junk-yard, building shelters out of it."

While their truck was armored with additional plates, he said a man threw a Russian RKG-3 anti-tank grenade between the truck and the plate, causing damage to the truck, but no one was hurt.

At one point Adams and a few other men received four-day passes and they went to Doha, Qatar, to unwind. Located on the Persian Gulf, Qatar is more of a tourist country, with only 30 percent of the people in the country at any given time actually being residents. Since they were there during Ramadan, when it is illegal to be caught eating or drinking during the daylight hours, Adams said they had to be careful to stay hydrated. They would pull the curtains on the bus they were traveling on and drank anyway in order to not dehydrate in the well over 100-degree temperatures.

In September 2009, he came back to the states, getting to travel all around the country. He worked in Fort Irwin, California, twice, Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Yakima Training Center, Washington.

The hardest part, he said, was reintegrating with his wife.

"It's weird when you leave that long when you've been the head of the household," Adams said. "You have to leave and hand it all over to her—the bills and all the decisions—and when you come back, you try to come back in the same role, but she's like, I've got this."

Adams said for the first month back, all the soldiers had to report for a daily briefing set up to help them with the reintegration process, but he saw many dealing with infidelity issues when they returned, as well as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

"People can get really messed up and they used to just tell us, 'Suck it up and deal with it,' but I think they are seeing now that's not the best policy."

Thankfully, for him, he said they never had to deal with either issue.

He could have gone to Afghanistan for another tour, however, his contract would have had to be extended past the usual six years. Since he was now the father of one, he took the Army's offer for an early honorable discharge, leaving three months early to be with his son. He was ranked as a Specialist, under the E4 pay grade.

Marcus and Ashleigh Adams have one son, Alistair Dean Adams, who is three years old, and one daughter on the way (at press time), Hermione Sue Adams.

CYPRUS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in 1974, 40 years ago this month, Turkish troops invaded the Republic of Cyprus. By August they had taken control of more than one-third of the island. Turkey's invasion had immediate consequences, such as the confiscation of property and the displacement of Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike.

The invasion has also had more enduring consequences—consequences that are still felt today. The so-called

green line, a demilitarized United Nations buffer zone, still cuts a jagged path across the island, dividing one part of the country from the other. It even bisects the capital city of Nicosia. In 1983, Turkish Cypriots declared a separate country in the northern third of Cyprus—a country recognized to this day by Turkey alone.

Vice President JOE BIDEN visited Cyprus in May, and he spoke of being called the White House optimist for his belief that the best days are yet to come. Well, by that standard, my colleagues here must think me the Senate optimist. But I really do believe that the future is bright for Cyprus and that most Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots want to put aside decades of division and move forward together.

I was pleased to read that leaders issued a joint declaration in February calling the status quo "unacceptable", and I am encouraged by the resumption of high-level negotiations on a comprehensive settlement. I think the United States, with its deep ties to Cyprus and Turkey, can play a productive role in facilitating these discussions. I also urge the Government of Turkey to step up and be a constructive partner throughout this process.

It has been my experience that intractable problems rarely have simple or easy solutions, so I am not under any illusions about this. But I have seen what folks can accomplish when they set ideology aside, and I remain a believer in a just settlement that brings an end to 40 years of division and reunites Cyprus.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I wish to draw attention to the fact that July 20 marked the 40th anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by a Turkish army. Sadly, this year also marks more than 50 years since a power-sharing arrangement between the two communities on Cyprus collapsed following independence from Britain. As the situation in the eastern Mediterranean and the wider Middle East is becoming more volatile and fragile, it is time to end the forcible division of Cyprus, which has endured for far too long.

The continued presence of Turkish troops in the northern part of Cyprus exacerbates a number of human rights concerns including property restitution, restrictions on freedom of worship, and damage to religious and archaeological sites. I have consistently raised these concerns and want to emphasize that all religious sites in the north must be protected.

It is gratifying that the Government of Cyprus remains fully committed to the U.N.-sponsored process to reach a sustainable and enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The joint statement agreed to by Greek Cypriot President Anastasiades and Turkish Cypriot leader Dervis Eroglu on the island in February of this year lays a solid foundation for results-oriented talks. The basic parameters for a solution laid out in the statement should be fully respected.

I applaud the efforts of both leaders to move this process forward. Following the signing of the joint statement in February, President Anastasiades called the chance for peace a "win-win situation." "I believe that a solution that would be accepted by the Greek Cypriots would create stability in the region. Greater cooperation with Turkish Cypriots will contribute to foster growth . . . to do that you have to have a settlement that is not at the expense of one community or to the benefit of the other," he said.

After meeting in April with U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, Turkish Cypriot leader Dervis Eroglu said that during negotiations with Greek Cypriot President Anastasiades, "we'll try to bridge our differences and find a comprehensive settlement in the shortest possible time." "We can finalize a settlement and take it to a separate simultaneous referenda in 2014."

Many observers believe the discovery of vast offshore oil and natural gas reserves in the eastern Mediterranean could be a game changer in pressing negotiations forward and could potentially also act as a stabilizing and unifying factor in the eastern Mediterranean. The cheapest and most expeditious way of exporting the reserves, discovered first by Israel and then by Cyprus, would be through an underwater pipeline to Turkey. I certainly hope this potential for economic empowerment for all of the people of Cyprus will help both communities to visualize and then implement a final settlement.

In keeping with the numerous U.N. resolutions on Cyprus and the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act, it is time for Turkey to remove its troops from the island. The people of Cyprus cannot wait another 40 years for reconciliation.

MONHEGAN, MAINE QUADRICENTENNIAL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in 1614, 6 years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, Captain John Smith—explorer, soldier, navigator, and adventurer—landed at Monhegan Island off the coast of Maine. I wish to commemorate the 400th anniversary of that discovery and to congratulate the people of a truly remarkable community as they celebrate their quadricentennial.

In the very first sentence of his remarkable journal of that voyage, Captain Smith names the "Isle of

Monhegan," the Wabanaki Indian word for "island of the ocean." In reference to the shared latitude with his home country, he coined the term "New England."

As the Wabanaki had known for centuries, the fish were plentiful. In addition, Captain Smith used the stands of timber to make small boats to explore the inlets and rivers on the mainland coast. So, Monhegan can rightly claim to be the birthplace of three industries that built the State of Maine—fishing, boatbuilding, and logging.

Certainly, there were disappointments. The whales proved elusive, and the gold Captain Smith sought was nonexistent. But the potential was everywhere.

In addressing the question of what it would take to settle the untamed region, the captain's log contains these lines that define Monhegan today. It would take, Captain Smith wrote, "the best parts of art, judgment, courage, honesty, constancy, diligence, and industry."

Maine's island communities are an essential part of our State's identity. They survive and thrive because of the qualities Captain Smith so wonderfully described.

The island's lobster industry is a shining example. More than 90 years ago, long before conservation was a watchword, Monhegan's lobstermen voluntarily established their own ban on harvesting small lobsters. To the list of Monhegan's firsts—fishing, boatbuilding, and logging—we can add lobster management.

By mutual agreement, rather than government edict, Monhegan lobstermen set trap limits to prevent overfishing. They established their own management zone to ensure that this generations-old fishery will sustain the generations to come. Most remarkable of all is the tradition of Trap Day, now October 1, when all boats, captains, and crews wait for each other and head to their fishing grounds together at the crack of dawn. The ethic that "no one goes until everyone goes" is the very definition of community.

For more than a century, Monhegan also has been a magnet for artists. In 1902, Samuel Triscott became the first artist to live there year-round, and he found the subject matter enticing enough to stay the rest of his life, nearly one-quarter century. From Rockwell Kent to Andrew and Jamie Wyeth, this singular place has inspired some of the best artists to create their greatest work.

There is no question that the magnificent scenery is part of the attraction. But as we look at the powerful works of art the island has inspired, it is clear that the people of Monhegan, their judgment, courage, honesty, constancy, diligence, and industry, enhance the natural beauty of the island so that it represents something more

profound than crashing surf on rocky shores.

Captain Smith concluded his journal of that voyage four centuries ago with these words: "We are not born for ourselves, but each to help the other. Let us imitate the virtues of our predecessors to be worthily their successors." Those words are fitting for a celebration of the past that looks with confidence to the future, and I congratulate the people of Monhegan, Maine, on this landmark anniversary.

CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President. I wish to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Roosevelt Campobello International Park. This beautiful and historic park preserves the summer home that Franklin Delano Roosevelt enjoyed both as a boy and as president. It was established by treaty between the United States and Canada and is the only memorial to an American president on Canadian soil.

The 2,800-acre park on Campobello Island, New Brunswick, was opened on August 20, 1964, by Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson and American President Lyndon Johnson. It is jointly owned and managed by both countries and is a beautiful and historic testament to a legacy of friendship. Like all true friendships, the friendship commemorated at Roosevelt Campobello International Park is based not upon expedience or self-interest, but upon shared values.

It is a legacy of friendship between two men: one of America's greatest presidents and one of Canada's greatest prime ministers. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Mackenzie King could not have been more dissimilar in personality—one gregarious and outgoing, the other reticent and intensely private—yet they saw beyond the superficial traits and into the depths of character. Together, they led their nations out of the Great Depression. Together, they led their nations through the Second World War and made North America the arsenal of democracy so crucial to victory. Although only one lived to see the peace, together they forged an alliance that has allowed that peace to endure.

It is a legacy of friendship between two communities. By land, Campobello Island is accessible only from Lubec, ME, our Nation's easternmost town, via the FDR Memorial Bridge, itself a stunning example of international cooperation and friendship. The people of eastern Maine and western New Brunswick share a past, a present, and the future. They are bound together by a rugged yet rewarding way of life, by personal and family ties, by commerce and by mutual assistance. They earn their livelihoods from the land and from the sea, and they care for this

special place so that those livelihoods may continue for generations to come.

It was at Campobello, his "beloved island," that young Franklin Roosevelt learned to guide a sailboat through the challenging Lubec Narrows and developed the inner strength and self-reliance that enabled him to meet any challenge. Among the proud and determined people on both shores of the narrows, he felt the power of committed individuals working together in common cause.

In 1933, during his first return visit as President, with First Lady Eleanor at his side, FDR recalled his happy childhood memories and again thanked the islanders who taught him to sail. Then, in words that still ring true today, he described the region as, "The finest example of friendship between Nations—permanent friendship between nations—that we can possibly have."

The United States and Canada share the world's longest undefended border, a common history and culture. In trade, we are each other's best customers. We are, as one of the park's permanent exhibits declares, "Good Neighbours—Best Friends."

George Washington wrote that, "True friendship is a plant of slow growth, and must undergo and withstand the shocks of adversity." The friendship between the United States and Canada is the hardiest of plants with the deepest of roots. The adversities are but minor shocks; they are no match for the values of freedom, human rights and the rule of law that bind us together.

Those values are the foundation of this legacy, and they are our guarantee that this friendship will endure. They are what make the 50th anniversary of Roosevelt Campobello International Park an event so worthy of celebration.

U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I wish to honor the U.S. Marshals Service on the occasion of the 225th anniversary of its founding. Since its establishment in 1789, the Marshals Service has distinguished itself as not only the oldest, but one of the most effective law enforcement agencies in the United States. In recent years, the Marshals Service has demonstrated its versatility through Operation FALCON, a nationwide fugitive apprehension initiative. In this program, resources of Federal, State, city, and county law enforcement agencies are combined to locate and apprehend criminals wanted for crimes of violence. Since its inception in 2005, Operation FALCON has made 91,086 arrests and cleared 117,874 warrants and is the single most successful initiative aimed at apprehending violent fugitives in

U.S. law enforcement history. Congratulations to the Marshals Service on 225 years of service to our Nation.

REMEMBERING ADMIRAL CHARLES R. LARSON

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today I want to pay tribute to an exceptional leader, public servant, patriot, and friend. Earlier this week, ADM Charles Larson passed away after a 2-year battle against leukemia. This morning, we said goodbye to him as he was memorialized and laid to rest at the U.S. Naval Academy Cemetery in Annapolis. Although it is always hard to lose a friend, and it is certainly proper to mourn, I also want to celebrate his life and his tremendous accomplishments and contributions to the Navy, Naval Academy, and Nation.

Chuck and I were good friends, flight school roommates, and both members of the Class of 1958. An Eagle Scout, brigade commander and class president, he continued his meteoric trajectory, becoming the first naval officer selected as a White House Fellow and the second youngest officer to be promoted to the flag rank. On top of his operational commands, he also served as naval aide to President Richard Nixon. Chuck was bright, extremely talented, and never shied away from a challenge. For instance, after earning his pilot wings and doing a tour aboard the USS *Shangri-la*, he decided to go to nuclear power school to become a submariner and be at the tactical tip of the Cold War. Similarly, instead of pursuing a lucrative civilian job after finishing his tour as the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Command, he took on what he considered his most challenging but rewarding job of his career, returning to his alma mater for a second tour as the superintendent.

A man of unparalleled character and vision, Admiral Larson wanted to refocus the academy to be “an ethical beacon for the nation.” He established the Character Development Division and implemented innovative ethical and character-enhancing programs and initiatives to both the curriculum and student life. His devotion to the academy and midshipmen went beyond his two tenures at the helm, serving as the chairman of the U.S. Naval Academy Foundation for nearly a decade after his retirement.

Chuck was more than a renowned four-star admiral; he was a friend to many, husband to Sally, father to Sigrid, Erica, and Kirsten, and grandfather to seven beautiful children. I join many past and present members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Class of 1958, the Naval Academy family, and thousands of military personnel who have served under and alongside Chuck in extending our most sincere gratitude for his legacy of excellence and ethical leadership.

Fair winds and following seas, Admiral Larson. You will be missed, but not forgotten.

REMEMBERING JEFFREY B. WESTERFIELD

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and honor the extraordinary service and ultimate sacrifice of Gary, IN police department officer Jeffrey B. Westerfield. Dedicated, loyal, and above all compassionate to those in need, Officer Westerfield served with the Gary Police Department, GPD, for 19 years.

On Sunday, July 6, 2014, Officer Westerfield was found shot and unresponsive in his patrol car. Sadly, despite the best efforts of his fellow officers, EMTs, and medical personnel, Officer Westerfield, 47, succumbed to his wounds.

A native of Owensboro, KY, Officer Westerfield joined the U.S. Army at the age of 18. Jeffrey was stationed in Georgia for basic training, where he earned the nickname “Rambo” after sustaining a leg injury and surviving alone in the wilderness for 2 days during a training maneuver.

After being honorably discharged from the U.S. Army, Jeffrey began his career in law enforcement. In August 1995, Jeffrey fulfilled his dream when he was sworn in as an officer with the Gary Police Department. Officer Westerfield served in various capacities during his career with the GPD, including with the patrol division, traffic division, K-9 handler, and as a field training officer.

Known for his quiet demeanor, Officer Westerfield was a man of few words and genuine in his actions. “He was very soft-spoken. He was like a huge teddy bear. [H]e was able to actually go to any situation, and calm the situation down immediately, just by his presence and his voice,” said Gary deputy police chief Gary McKinley.

Officer Westerfield is survived and deeply missed by his fiancée Denise Cather, and his five children: Allie, Katie, Cheyenne, Rachel and Brady.

Officer Westerfield loved his work, and he gave his life to serve and protect the citizens of Gary. He was a quintessential Hoosier and a true American hero. Let us always remember and treasure the memory of this stalwart, brave man and honor him for his selfless commitment to serving his fellow citizens. My thoughts and prayers, along with those of fellow Hoosiers, are with Jeff’s family and friends.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT BENJAMIN PRANGE

Ms. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and sacrifice of U.S. Army SSG Benjamin G. Prange, who was killed in action on July 24

while serving in Kandahar Province in Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Prange “Ben” to his friends and family—was a soldier in the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Carson, CO. He repeatedly answered the call to deploy, serving three tours in Afghanistan in 6 years.

Ben was born and raised in rural Nebraska south of Lincoln, near Hickman and Roca. He was no stranger to adversity early in life, overcoming the deaths of both of his parents before he turned 16. He was raised by his grandparents, Kent and Carolyn Prange, who live just west of Roca, NE.

Ben attended Norris High School, where he met his future wife Elizabeth. Ben is remembered as a “good, solid kid” by his high school superintendent Roy Baker. Liz and Ben married a year after his graduation. They would have celebrated their 11th wedding anniversary on July 26. He enlisted in the Army in January 2007 to fulfill a dream of becoming an infantryman. Liz is left to care for their two sons, Corbin and Dillon, who I hope will understand in time the tremendous debt of gratitude this Nation owes to their father for selfless sacrifice to protect all that we hold dear.

Ben served our country with distinction. He was a four time recipient of the Army Commendation Medal and a recipient of the Combat Infantryman Badge for service under direct enemy fire. He was also awarded an Army Achievement Medal, two Good Conduct Medals, a National Defense Service Medal, a Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, an Overseas Service Ribbon, and two NATO Medals, in addition to his Afghanistan Campaign Medal with three campaign stars for his tours of duty.

My thoughts and prayers remain with his family, friends, and his fellow soldiers who have lost a great father, soldier, and friend. His sacrifice will never be forgotten.

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on S. 1799, the Victims of Child Abuse Act Reauthorization Act of 2013, which recently passed the House of Representatives and is awaiting the President’s signature. In addition to the bill’s support for Child Advocacy Centers, it contains an important provision that bears mentioning. S. 1799 makes Congress’ intent clear that money from the Crime Victims Fund should only be used to assist victims of crime. Since the funds for the Crime Victims Fund are derived from fines collected from those convicted of Federal crimes rather than tax revenue, Congress directed the funds to only be used for crime victims. I offered the provision clarifying this intent as an amendment to the Justice For All Act, and it was accepted unanimously by

the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am pleased the sponsors of S. 1799 agreed to include it at my request.

Crime victims can face a confusing and sometimes overwhelming system, and so it is important for someone to explain their rights and address other victim-centered issues. Encumbering victim advocates with other non-victim-related tasks could delay or prevent the resources needed to meet victims' needs such as assisting victims with impact statements and collecting restitution information and associated receipts. It could also delay or prevent ongoing safety assessments for the victim. Victim specialists, also referred to as victim advocates, along with their supervisors, victim witness coordinators, should be improving services for the benefit of crime victims and not tasked with other duties, such as arranging travel for witnesses.

My amendment makes clear it is Congress' intent that the funds authorized for victims services are limited to those dedicated to victims services and their direct support staff. This will ensure that that none of the funds available is used for purposes that do not benefit crime victims.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING PATRICIA ZULKOSKY

• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Patricia Zulkosky for her outstanding years of service to the State of Alaska and congratulate her on the occasion of her retirement from the Department of Juvenile Justice.

Born into and raised by a large Polish family in northern Minnesota, Patricia moved to Alaska in 1978, making her home in the western tundra community of Bethel. After quickly falling in love with the Yup'ik Eskimo and rural Alaska lifestyle, she took to subsistence fishing and gathering. Patricia built lifelong friendships in Alaska. After 6 years, she began her family by welcoming the arrival of her first and only daughter, Tiffany.

Patricia started working for the State of Alaska in 1985 as a clerk typist for Alaska Public Health Nursing, but it wasn't until Patricia was hired by the Department of Juvenile Justice in December 1988 that she would come to know her passion for working with troubled youth and the families of rural Alaska. Hired as a youth counselor, Patricia's work ethic, commitment, and enthusiasm would quickly help her move up in the ranks. Not letting life get in the way, Patricia pursued her bachelor's degree in social work while being a single mom of a young daughter and working several other jobs to make ends meet.

After graduating in 1996, she returned to Alaska fulltime where she would

hold supervisory positions before becoming the Bethel Youth Facility superintendent. Under her leadership as superintendent, the Bethel Youth Facility has become an exemplary facility in Alaska for utilizing subsistence ways of life as a form of treatment. They have successfully hosted a community-based Cultural Heritage Week and begun to undergo a long-planned expansion. Patricia's love of community, culture, and hard work has resulted in a public service career that exemplifies the Alaska and American dream.

I would like to extend my deepest appreciation to Patricia for her many years of service to the people she has come to call family. I wish the absolute best for her and her family as they begin this next stage in their lives.●

RECOGNIZING MINNESOTA POLICE OFFICERS

• Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association, the largest association representing Minnesota's rank-and-file police officers, recently met for its annual conference in Alexandria, MN.

During that conference, MPPOA recognized several outstanding police officers: Sergeant Eric Kilian of the Hutchinson Police Department was named Police Officer of the Year, and Officer Mark Blumberg of the St. Paul Police Department and Officer Brian Hasselman of the Burnsville Police Department received Honorable Mentions. In addition, the Minnesota Association of Women Police, a wonderful organization that trains women police officers and promotes professionalism in law enforcement, recently honored Detective Alesia Metry of the Maplewood Police Department as Officer of the Year at its annual conference in Duluth.

I join MPPOA and MAWP in recognizing these brave public servants, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank both organizations and their members for the work they do every single day to keep our communities safe.●

CONGRATULATING JOHN STROUD

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Commander John W. Stroud from Hawthorne, NV, on being named the National Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for 2015. I am proud to honor a Nevadan who has dedicated his life to serving our country and is committed to ensuring that our Nation's heroes receive the care that they deserve.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I recognize the important role the Veterans of Foreign Wars plays for combat veterans and military servicemembers from the Active, Guard, and Reserve forces. This

distinguished national group of veterans has been a constant influence, furthering the voice of all of our Nation's heroes. On July 23, 2014, at the 115th National Convention, John Stroud was elected as VFW national commander. This is the second time in VFW history that a Nevadan has been elected commander. John has served the VFW in many leadership positions, and I have no doubt that he will work tirelessly in his new position as commander towards the VFW's mission to ensure that veterans are respected for their service, always receive their earned entitlements, and are recognized for the sacrifices they and their loved ones have made on behalf of this great country.

Graduating from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University with a bachelor of science degree in professional aeronautics, Commander Stroud decided to serve his Nation by joining the U.S. Air Force, where he went on to enjoy a distinguished career. Upon joining the Air Force, he was sent overseas for a tour in Korea with the 51st Fighter Wing at Osan Air Base as a flight operations superintendent. For his service, he was awarded four Meritorious Service Medals, three Air Force Commendation Medals, three Air Force Achievement Medals, the Korea Defense Service Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal. Commander Stroud's accomplishments extend far beyond his numerous commendations; he has also been recognized for his service to the community. He dedicates much of his time as a member of many volunteer organizations, like the American Legion and the Elks, and is a Life Member of the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Cootie, and the VFW National Home for Children.

I want to extend my deepest gratitude to Commander Stroud for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

I am both humbled and honored by Commander Stroud's service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Commander Stroud for all of his accomplishments and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING EDIE JOHNSTON AND ELDELTIDE LLC

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to commend Edie Johnston and her company, Eldertide LLC, for being named a 2014 Small Business Administration Tibbetts Award recipient. Located in Dresden, ME, Eldertide harvests and produces elderberries for medicinal purposes. Along with Eldertides sister company, Maine Medicinals, the business creates various herbal supplements with the elderberry product. Fueled by the belief that natural, native elderberries are nutritionally valuable, Eldertide has successfully marketed and sold their Maine-made supplements nationwide and around the world.

With just two employees and 6 years of business experience, the company is expanding vastly. Their antioxidant-rich elderberry juice concentrate is now being distributed nationally and internationally. Maine Medicinals, which serves as the retail branch of the company, recently reached an agreement with Whole Foods to sell their supplements.

Eldertide and Maine Medicinals not only represent a successful entrepreneurial spirit, but they also strive to impact Maine, the United States, and the world with an emphasis on innovation and education. The company has contributed to two university research initiatives through the University of Southern Maine and the University of Maine-Orono and has also engaged Kennebec Valley Community College students in valuable research to examine the health effects of phytochemicals from whole foods such as elderberries. Specifically, this research has examined the impact of elderberry juice on chronic diseases such as type 2 diabetes.

In addition, Mrs. Johnston founded the Elderberry School, an institution where family farmers interested in the science and business of herbal supplements can learn the process that has propelled Eldertide to where it is today. Some recent graduates have even gone on to own small businesses dedicated to the same core principles that Eldertide espouses.

We have many great small businesses in Maine, and 2014 Tibbetts Award recipient Mrs. Edie Johnston and Eldertide LLC is certainly one of them. Eldertide and its sister company Maine Medicinals represent the innovative, entrepreneurial spirit that defines the State of Maine. I am proud to join in recognizing their creativity and dedication to larger social and economic goals, and I expect they will continue to impress us—both in Maine and around the world with their superb nutraceuticals.●

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT GENERAL MARC C. REYNOLDS

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, On July 21, 2014, America lost one of her finest veterans. Lt. Gen. Marc C. Reynolds, U.S. Air Force, Retired, passed away with his family by his side after a life full of tremendous achievements and honors. I share a few of those achievements from his own recollections and from the recollections of those who knew him.

General Reynolds was not always a Utahn, although we have proudly claimed him as one for decades. He was born in Chamberlain, SD in 1928 to Morris and Ione Reynolds. He grew up during the Second World War, a time—as we sometimes forget—of tremendous sacrifice for our entire Nation. He observed that this experience shaped his entire life.

He graduated from Chamberlain High School in 1946 and subsequently moved to Colorado, where he attended the University of Denver. In 1950, the year after his graduation, North Korean forces invaded South Korea. Within 24 hours of hearing the news, Marc went to the Air Force recruitment office in downtown Denver and signed up for the aviation cadet program. He trained at Perrin and Vance Air Force bases and graduated from pilot training as a second lieutenant. He subsequently attended jet interceptor training at Moody and Tyndall Air Force bases.

All of General Reynolds' moving and training was part of the American Defense Command's initiative to build forces in response to the ever-growing threat of tyranny and oppression from the Soviet Union. In 1952, he was assigned to the 83rd Fighter-Interceptor Squadron and Hamilton Air Force Base and moved with the squadron to Paine Air Force Base.

In 1953, near the end of the Korean war, he was transferred to Okinawa, where he flew F-94Bs on fighter-interceptor missions. After the war was over, he was assigned to the 437th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron as the tactical flight commander out of Otis Air Force Base. He later became a maintenance officer with the 602nd Consolidated Maintenance Squadron, also at Otis.

General Reynolds then transitioned to reconnaissance, joining the 19th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron in Europe as flight commander. He served at various posts around the world and completed Air Command and Staff College in 1966.

During this time, war was being waged in Indochina and a proxy war between the United States and the Soviet and Chinese Communist regimes was beginning to form. General Reynolds was assigned to the 460th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing at Tan Son Nhut Air Base near Saigon in South Vietnam. He arrived on December 7, 1966. In reference to the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, he occasionally joked that it was “a good day to go to war.”

General Reynolds' achievements and endurance during this time are remarkable. Throughout his 10-month deployment to Vietnam, he flew 230 combat missions—a majority being flown at night. He also flew many missions over North Vietnam, which was heavily defended by Viet Cong radar, anti-aircraft guns, and surface-to-air missiles. Flying 10 of these missions up north would merit month off of the year-long deployment.

In an interview with KUED, he recalled his first mission in Vietnam:

I had one of these ten-mile squares that was probably 80 or 90 miles south of Saigon, so it was deep down in the south. It's flat down there with no mountains, so they put the starter guys down there, where they won't run into a mountain. I had an experienced navigator, but it was my first mission. We went down there, and we found the target area. We started running up and down these preplanned lines, and I noticed on the third line what I'd call—well, I'd seen a little bit of flak in my life, but this was obviously a .50 caliber or 20 millimeter gun. I'd see these tracers go over my head. So I did . . . three of these lines, and of course, the back-seater's got his head buried in the scope, and he's concentrating seriously on keeping the airplane in the right place in the target area. When I got the end of a line, I came around and I said, “Hey, why don't you pull your head out of the scope a minute and take a look at what's going on up here.” And he used immediately, a long series of four letter words to describe how he felt about what was going on, but the last thing he said is like, “Get outta here.” I said, “Well, he's been here longer than I have,” so we went back to Saigon, and we talked about it. But that was my first mission.

He subsequently served in Japan as a deputy chief of the Reconnaissance Division and then as a commander of the 16th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron. Upon his return to the United States in February 1971, he was assigned to Shaw Air Force Base, where he served as assistant deputy commander for operations in the 363rd Tactical Reconnaissance Wing. He graduated from the Naval War College in August 1973 and was subsequently assigned to Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill Air Force Base, initially as the director of distribution and later as director of maintenance.

In July 1976 he transferred to McClellan Air Force Base, CA, as director of materiel management, Sacramento Air Logistics Center. In March 1978 he became the center's vice commander. General Reynolds moved to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in May 1980 as vice commander of the Air Force Acquisition Logistics Division and took command of the division in October 1981. In July 1983 he was appointed commander of Ogden Air Logistics

Center. General Reynolds subsequently received his third star and was assigned as the vice commander of the Air Force Logistics Command at Wright-Patterson, where he served until his retirement.

General Reynolds logged over 5,200 (with 475 combat) flying hours in his career—most of which were spent in physically-taxing small fighter and reconnaissance jets. His military decorations and awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with 15 oak leaf clusters and Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters.

In this storied 36-year career, General Reynolds lived all over the world, but, according to those who knew him, one of his favorite places on earth was the Hill Aerospace Museum near Ogden, UT. After he retired from the Air Force, he became a member of the Utah Aerospace Heritage Foundation board, on which he served for 26 years. He was a driving force behind making the Hill Aerospace Museum one of the premier aviation museums in the country. He was appointed chairman of the board and served in that position for more than 20 years. General Reynolds' work in preserving Air Force history was awe-inspiring and will positively affect many generations to come.

Those who worked with General Reynolds describe his conduct and character as that of a perfect gentleman. His smile was infectious and he always treated those around him with tremendous respect and dignity. I have been told that he lifted everyone around him and was committed to excellence in all that he did.

I offer my deepest sympathies to his dear wife Ellie and to his children: Pam, Barbara, Scott, Lisa, Kristan, and Karine, and to his 15 grandchildren and 12 great-grandchildren. I was told that the date on which he passed turned out to be a bit ironic. This great patriot-statesman had a weakness, which I am sure many of us share, in that he had trouble remembering his and Ellie's anniversary date. However, in what seems to be coincidence, may have been an act of providence: Marc was able to show his love on this last mortal anniversary by his determination to hold on just one-half hour into the day of their 30th anniversary before passing. Whatever the case may be, the timing offers a sweet thought.

I praise Lieutenant General Reynolds' life as an example to all Americans. I pray that we constantly remember those who serve, who have served, and who have given all that we might maintain our rights and enjoy the blessings of liberty. As citizens of a nation made great by those who serve her, like Lieutenant General Reynolds, it is our duty to honor those who have gone before by living our lives with excellence today.●

RECOGNIZING rosieMADE LLC

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, it is imperative to distinguish the originality of women-owned small business owners who take a leap of faith and invest in an idea that not only awards their own creativity but also inspires other women throughout the Nation. Across the United States, women-owned companies employ 7.9 million people, generate \$1.4 trillion in sales, and are the fastest growing segment in our economy. Today, I am proud to recognize rosieMADE of Meridian, ID, a women-owned small business committed to selling products made in the U.S.A. by women.

In November 2012, Alicia Vanderschuere launched rosieMADE, an online marketplace that features vendors offering quality products made in the U.S.A. by women-friendly companies. After 15 years of experience in retail and corporate merchandising, Alicia Vanderschuere decided to follow her dreams in pursuit of owning her own business and reached out to the Idaho Women's Business Center, WBC, to help get started. The Small Business Administration's WBCs represent a nationwide network of educational centers designed to assist women entrepreneurs in starting and growing their own businesses.

Inspired by the iconic champion for women Rosie the Riveter, rosieMADE aims to increase the number of women engaged in entrepreneurship while supporting homegrown products. In addition, rosieMADE offers services beyond that of selling products. The business promotes business prosperity through opportunities including training and information sessions on leadership, balancing home and work life, and various elements of small business. The rosieMADE team strives to inspire women to pursue their own business ventures by featuring women-owned business leaders and sharing their stories. As a resource for women nationwide, women who have successfully overcome obstacles in the business environment are honored regularly in the "Real Life Rosies" section of the Web site. These success stories are aimed to encourage other women to take a risk and start their own businesses.

Within a few short years, Alicia Vanderschuere and rosieMADE have already achieved an outstanding reputation for quality, as well as that of a unique Idaho gem. It is not surprising that in 2013 Alicia Vanderschuere was featured on the cover of the Idaho Women's Journal and is currently listed as one of the Idaho Women's Journal's "Who's Who of Idaho Women." In addition, in February 2014 Alicia Vanderschuere received the Women of the Year Award from the Idaho Business Review. With rosieMADE's commitment to female small business owners, I hope they will inspire more women throughout the Nation to become entrepreneurs.

I would like to recognize rosieMADE on their mission to promote products made by women in the U.S.A. and their willingness to take a risk in inspiring future entrepreneurs. I congratulate the entire rosieMADE team and wish them great success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT AND JAMIE NAGY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Scott and Jamie Nagy of Brookings, SD, as my nominees for the 2014 Angels in Adoption Award. Since 1999, the Angels in Adoption program, through the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institution, has honored more than 2,000 individuals, couples, and organizations nationwide for their work in providing children with loving, stable homes.

In 2006, after being married 14 years, Scott and Jamie, along with their four children Nick, Tyler, TJ, and Natalie, adopted their daughter Naika from Haiti when she was 2½ years old. Jamie, who was adopted as an infant, found the process helped her better understand her own adoption story. Through their journey with Naika, the Nagys decided to help others understand adoption and the needs of children around the world. In 2009, Scott was one of the first coaches in the country to coach barefoot at a basketball game to help raise awareness for Samaritan's Feet, an organization that provides shoes to orphans and impoverished children in developing countries. Scott cites his interest in helping Naika's home country as a source of inspiration for participation in the program.

Scott and Jamie's story demonstrates how parents and families can foster patience, grace, and understanding as they grow their families and open their hearts and homes. Their desire to help others understand the effect of overwhelming change on both the child and the family and learn how to overcome those challenges speaks to their strength of character. I commend their efforts to assist other families navigate the adoption process and raise awareness of the needs of children around the world. It brings me great pride to honor South Dakotans Scott and Jamie Nagy, my nominees for the 2014 Angels in Adoption Award.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSH CURRY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Josh Curry, an intern in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Josh is a graduate of Elk Point-Jefferson High School in Elk Point, SD. Currently, Josh is attending Augustana College, where he is majoring in business administration and government. Josh is a dedicated worker who has

been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Josh Curry for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JASON HELLAND

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Jason Helland, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Jason is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD and Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, MN. Currently, he is attending the University of Denver Strum College of Law. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jason for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM HYDE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize William Hyde, a legal fellow in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

After graduating from the University of San Francisco in 2002, William joined the U.S. Army. He was stationed abroad multiple times and served a combat tour in Iraq. In 2009 William received his M.A. from Stanford University, earning summa cum laude distinction. Currently, William is attending Harvard Law School in Cambridge, MA and is serving as a Blackstone legal fellow through the Alliance Defending Freedom. William and his wife, Celeste, are the proud parents of a son William.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to William for his service to our country and the work he has done on behalf of the people of South Dakota. Bill is a consummate professional with excellent legal research, writing, and analytical skills. I wish him continued success in the years to come as he embarks on his legal career.●

TRIBUTE TO KYLEE KETTERING

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I recognize Kylee Kettering, an intern in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Kylee is a graduate of Mobridge High School in Mobridge, SD. Currently, Kylee is attending Augustana College, where she is majoring in government and communications. Kylee is a dedicated worker who has been committed

to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kylee Kettering for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN KLUMPP

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize John Klumpp, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

John is a graduate of Brandon Valley High School in Brandon, SD. Currently, he is attending Iowa State University and majoring in finance. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to John for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO RUTH LATTERELL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Ruth Latterell, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the state of South Dakota over the past several months.

Ruth is a native of Aberdeen and a graduate of Aberdeen Christian School. Currently, she is attending South Dakota State University, where she is pursuing a degree in human development and family sciences. She is a very hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ruth for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT MAH

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I recognize Scott Mah, an intern in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Scott is a graduate of Sioux Falls Christian High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Scott is attending Northwestern University, where he is majoring in economics. Scott is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Scott Mah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SAM REULAND

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I recognize Sam Reuland, an intern in my

Washington, DC office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Sam is a graduate of White Lake High School in White Lake, SD. Currently, Sam is attending University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in history and political science. Sam is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Sam Reuland for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE VEENIS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I recognize Katherine Veenis, an intern in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Katherine is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Katherine is attending Texas Christian University, where she is majoring in political science. Katherine is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Katherine Veenis for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KRISTIN WILEMAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Kristin Wileman, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the state of South Dakota over the past several months.

Kristin is a native of Aberdeen and a graduate of Aberdeen Central High School. Currently, she is attending North Central University, where she is pursuing a degree in journalism communications. She is a very hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kristin for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

PITTOCK MANSION CENTENNIAL

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to honor the centennial of a unique historical landmark in my home State. The Pittock Mansion in Portland, OR, educates Oregonians and tourists from around the world about the city's history and the legacy of the family who once owned it.

When Henry Pittock completed construction of the large 46-room house in the West Hills of Portland in 1914, there was nothing like it in the region—and arguably, there still isn't.

Henry came to Oregon by covered wagon with little in his pocket but grew to become a respected local businessman and the owner of our State newspaper, the *Oregonian*. His wife Georgiana was a philanthropist who was known for serving the needs of the elderly, women and children, and for her famous rose garden. Georgiana often hosted garden parties where she would showcase her famous roses and is credited with kick-starting the first Portland Rose Society and the tradition of the Portland Rose Festival, which now draws thousands of people from around the world each summer.

When Henry and Georgiana built their mansion, they hired Oregon craftsman and artisans and used northwest materials, helping their community and contributing to the burgeoning city in a variety of ways. They lived a long, happy life together and had 6 children and 18 grandchildren, including some who lived in the mansion up until it was put up for sale in 1958.

Today, the mansion serves as a historical museum. The interior of the house and the surrounding property are publicly owned and preserved by dedicated staff and volunteers. Tourists, locals, and schoolchildren are often seen wandering through the home and along the paths around the large property learning about the historic significance of the mansion and of Portland. The house represents an era of growth that was occurring throughout the Pacific Northwest at the time of its construction.

For its symbolism, history, and meaning, today we recognize the Pittock Mansion's Centennial Year. May it continue to serve as a place to learn and enjoy for many years to come.●

BENTON COUNTY FAIR AND RODEO ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week is the opening of the 101st Benton County Fair and Rodeo. For more than a century, the citizens of Benton County, OR, have come together to show off the literal and metaphorical fruits of their yearlong labor, display their talents, and enjoy a few diversions.

The roots of the Benton County Fair actually run as far back as those of the State of Oregon. Just 7 months after Oregon achieved statehood, the Benton Agricultural Society began holding small fairs. In the early 1900s, Benton County had an outstanding showing at the Oregon State Fair, handily winning the State fair's blue ribbon for its display of produce five times—in 1907, 1908, 1910, 1911, and 1912. In 1912, J.F. Yates, the mayor of Corvallis, announced a public holiday to celebrate Benton County's outstanding showing at the Oregon State Fair. The following year, the county had its own

celebration on the grounds of the Oregon Agricultural College, later to become Oregon State University. That year, the county brought out its finest produce, livestock, and technology, starting a tradition that will be continued this week.

The Benton County Fair and Rodeo found its current home in 1957, when the county purchased 20 acres of land for the fair in Corvallis. In 1958, the Future Farmers of America and 4-H joined the thriving county fair in its longstanding practice of showcasing the region's rich agricultural tradition. The fair has matured beyond its roots to include carnival festivities, rides, and concession stands in addition to live music. I know that folks in Benton County will enjoy a wonderful week as they take in the region's storied culture.

I would like to recognize Betty Malone, the Benton County Fair and Rodeo's committee chair, for proposing a quilt to be sewn to commemorate the fair's centennial last year, an important date in the county's history. I would also like to congratulate Dawn Wunder and Donna Johnson for leading the charge to make Betty's proposal a reality. The centennial quilt will be presented to the region's residents in a ceremony today. Dozens of community members decorated the patches that make up the quilt, a collective celebration of the county's history. It is a fitting tribute to folks in Benton County who for more than 100 years have graced the region with their strong spirit and hard work.

It is my pleasure to submit this statement in recognition of the Benton County Fair and Rodeo's 101st year. I look forward to the Fair's continued success for many more years.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

At 1:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3896. An act to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act.

H.R. 4315. An act to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4626. An act to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4709. An act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4809. An act to reauthorize the Defense Production Act, to improve the Defense Production Act Committee, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5062. An act to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege and confidentiality are maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with Federal and State financial regulators, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 4028. An act to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 5:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law.

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230) to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4315. An act to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 4709. An act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5062. An act to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege and confidentiality are maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with Federal and State financial regulators, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2685. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4626. An act to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2709. A bill to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6638. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense (DoD) intending to open the skill identifier associated with attending the Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle Commander's Course to women; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6639. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Domestically Nonavailable Articles-Elimination of DoD-Unique List" ((RIN0750-AI11) (DFARS Case 2013-D020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6640. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds in Countries Bordering the Arabian Sea" ((RIN0750-AI33) (DFARS Case 2014-D016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6641. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Application of Certain Clauses to Acquisitions of Commercial Items" ((RIN0750-AI13) (DFARS Case 2013-D035)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6642. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6643. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6644. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of HOPE for Homeowners Program Regulations" (RIN2501-AD68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6645. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Species: Designation of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Upper Columbia River Spring-run Chinook Salmon in the Okanogan River Subbasin, Washington, and Protective Regulations" (RIN0648-BD51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6646. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Basis of Indebtedness of S Corporations to their Shareholders" ((RIN1545-BG51) (TD 9682)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6647. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partnerships; Start-up Expenditures; Organization and Syndication Fees" ((RIN1545-BL06) (TD 9681)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6648. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation: Equal Employment and Affirmative Action for Veterans and Individuals with Disabilities" (RIN9000-AM76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6649. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation: Small Business Protests and Appeals" (RIN9000-AM46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6650. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6651. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6652. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-052); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6653. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Deep-Water Complex in the South Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XD351) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6654. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Lesser Amberjack, Almaco Jack, and Banded Rudderfish Complex" (RIN0648-XD350) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6655. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Trawl Limited Access Sector in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD348) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6656. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Other Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD372) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6657. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Fishing Year 2014" (RIN0648-BE16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6658. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens

Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Unused Catch Carryover; Emergency Action" (RIN0648-BE19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6659. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD358) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6660. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusty Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD360) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6661. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD359) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6662. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6663. A communication from the Chief, Policy and Directives Management Division, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addresses of Headquarters Offices" (RIN1018-BA52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6664. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Zuni Bluehead Sucker" (RIN1018-AY25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6665. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of Critical Habitat for Salt Creek Tiger Beetle" (RIN1018-AY56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6666. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wild-

life and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Distinct Population Segment of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle" (RIN1018-AY71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6667. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Compliance Certification Content Requirements for State and Federal Operating Permits Programs" ((RIN2060-AQ71) (FRL No. 9913-88-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6668. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: the 2014 and 2015 Critical Use Exemption from the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide" ((RIN2060-AR80) (FRL No. 9911-99-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6669. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Nitrogen Oxides Exemption Request" (A-1-FRL-9913-56-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6670. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds" (FRL No. 9914-44-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6671. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Money Market Funds and the Wash Sale Rules" (Rev. Proc. 2014-45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6672. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Branded Prescription Drug Fee; Procedural and Administrative Guidance" (Notice 2014-42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6673. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Branded Prescription Drug Fee" ((RIN1545-BJ39) (TD 9684)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6674. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure Guidance on Indexing Under Section 36B and

Section 5000A" (Rev. Proc. 2014-37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6675. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure Providing Guidance To Compute the Section 162(I) Deduction with Section 36B Credit" (Rev. Proc. 2014-41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6676. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 5000A National Average Premium for a Bronze Level of Coverage" (Rev. Proc. 2014-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6677. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "IRS Truncated Taxpayer Identification Numbers" ((RIN1545-BJ16) (TD 9675)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6678. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Information Reporting by Passport Applicants" ((RIN1545-AJ93) (TD 9679)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6679. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—August 2014" (Rev. Rul. 2014-19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6680. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1057); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6681. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1056); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6682. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 14-3942); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6683. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of the Interior's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6684. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 20-378, "Residential Real Property Equity and Transparency Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6685. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-376, "Fiscal Year 2014 Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S.J. Res. 19, A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections (Rept. No. 113-223).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2132. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-224).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Jessie Hill Roberson, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2018.

*Daniel J. Santos, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2017.

Air Force nomination of Col. Clarence Ervin, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Charles L. Gable, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Stephen L. Danner, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Patricia M. Anslow and ending with Brigadier General David C. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Brigadier General Matthew P. Beevers)

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark W. Palzer, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Neal G. Loidolt and ending with Col. Wallace N. Turner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Army nomination of Col. Robert J. Ulses, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Timothy J. Sheriff, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Timothy S. Paul, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Glenn A. Goddard, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Gregory C. Bacon and ending with Colonel David S. Werner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Army nomination of Col. Robert J. Howell, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Kerry M. Metz, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Gene F. Price and ending with Capt. Linnea J. Sommerweddington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nomination of Capt. Dawn E. Cutler, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jonathan Ackley and ending with Aaron Allen Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard Edward Alford and ending with Dylan B. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with William J. Annexstad and ending with David J. Western, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Robert P. McCoy, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael E. Coghlan and ending with Ajay K. Ojha, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 22, 2014.

Army nomination of Burton C. Glover, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Paul A. Thomas, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Aleksandr Baron and ending with Ryan D. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Carlo J. Alphonso and ending with Jordan E. Yokley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Army nomination of Desiree S. Dirige, to be Major.

Army nomination of Nealanjon P. Das, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Yong K. Cho and ending with Thomas A. Starkoski, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 22, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with John I. Atkinson and ending with Robert E. Zubeck II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher W. Acord and ending with Richard P. Zabawa, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Mate W. Aerandir and ending with Jacquelinemar W. Wrona, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christian G. Acord and ending with Brian P. Worden, which nominations were received by

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron N. Aaron and ending with Chelsey L. Zwicker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian F. Breshears and ending with David A. Ziemba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel J. Bradshaw and ending with Ross W. Peters, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Arlo K. Abrahamson and ending with Tiffani B. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with James C. Bailey and ending with Amanda J. Wells, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Eric S. Kinzbrunner and ending with Eric M. Zack, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jermaine A. Bailey and ending with Jeremiah J. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jemar R. Ballesteros and ending with Anne L. Zack, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nomination of Christopher A. Cegielski, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin C. Antonucci and ending with Joshua D. Weiss, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Ferdinand D. Abril and ending with Allen E. Willey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael D. Amedick and ending with Dennis M. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Kerry E. Baker and ending with Michael D. Winn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Kenneth R. Basford and ending with John P. Zalar, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian J. Ellis, Jr. and ending with Sylvaine W. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin S. Bailey and ending with Theodor A. Zainal, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with David L. Bell, Jr. and ending with Nathan J. Wonder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Ruben D. Acosta and ending with David M. You, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 17, 2014.

Navy nomination of Adam J. Rains, to be Commander.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Ann Elizabeth Dunkin, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Manuel H. Ehrlich, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

*Jane Toshiko Nishida, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*James C. Miller, III, of Virginia, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for the term expiring December 8, 2017.

*Stephen Crawford, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for the remainder of the term expiring December 8, 2015.

*David Michael Bennett, of North Carolina, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2018.

*Victoria Reggie Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2016.

*Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

*Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the extension of the tax collection period merely because the taxpayer is a member of the Armed Forces who is hospitalized as a result of combat zone injuries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2687. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2688. A bill to ensure labor organization transparency and accountability; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2689. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2690. A bill to amend the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 to ensure that student data handled by private companies is protected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2691. A bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our nation's social programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2692. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2693. A bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2694. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2695. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2696. A bill to require the Federal Reserve to make certain changes to the small bank holding company policy statement on assessment of financial and managerial factors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2697. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify the application of the qualified mortgage rule to rural lenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2698. A bill to provide regulatory easement for lending institutions that enable a vibrant economy; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2699. A bill to require the National Credit Union Administration to provide pass-through share insurance for the deposits or shares of any interest on lawyers trust accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2700. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to identify the persons who are eligible to request headstones or markers furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2701. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address certain inconsistencies between the self-attested information provided by an applicant in enrolling in a health plan on an Exchange and being determined eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions or in being determined to be eligible for enrollment in a State Medicaid plan or a State child health plan under the State Children's Health Insurance Program and the data received through the Federal Data Services Hub or from other data sources; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Social Security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2703. A bill to establish eligibility, assignment, training, and certification requirements for sexual assault forensic examiners for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. REED):

S. 2704. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2705. A bill to establish, within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an integrated and comprehensive ocean, coastal, Great Lakes, and atmospheric research and environmental information sharing program to support renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 2706. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2707. A bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equal access to

declaratory judgments for organizations seeking tax-exempt status; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2709. A bill to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2710. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain philanthropic enterprises which are independently supervised, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2711. A bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2712. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2713. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. Res. 529. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and commending its members for their courage and sacrifice in service to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 530. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 392, a bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to repeal a duplicative program relating to inspection and grading of catfish.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 758

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to establish a comprehensive literacy program.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest

Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1089

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to provide for a prescription drug take-back program for members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the individual mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1330

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to delay the implementation of the employer responsibility provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1397

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1397, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the

Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1710

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1710, a bill to require Amtrak to propose a pet policy that allows passengers to transport domesticated cats and dogs on certain Amtrak trains, and for other purposes.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1842, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for certain property under construction.

S. 2023

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2023, a bill to reform the financing of Senate elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2075

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2075, a bill to prohibit a reduction in funding for the defense commissary system in fiscal year 2015 pending the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2109

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2109, a bill to eliminate duplicative, outdated, or unnecessary Congressionally mandated Federal agency reporting.

S. 2115

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2115, a bill to provide for the establishment of a fund to provide for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 2133

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2133, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims.

S. 2301

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 2307

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2307, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2333

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2333, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for certain behavioral health treatment under TRICARE for children and adults with developmental disabilities.

S. 2359

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2359, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries have the opportunity to receive care in a home and community-based setting.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2631

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2631, a bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

S. 2655

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2655, a bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

S. 2673

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from

Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2673, a bill to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 517

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 517, a resolution expressing support for Israel's right to defend itself and calling on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel.

S. RES. 519

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 519, a resolution designating August 16, 2014, as "National Airborne Day".

S. RES. 526

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution supporting Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3677

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3677 intended to be proposed to S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the extension of the tax collection period merely because the taxpayer is a member of the Armed Forces who is hospitalized as a result of combat zone injuries; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2686

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wounded Warrior Tax Equity Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. PREVENTION OF EXTENSION OF TAX COLLECTION PERIOD FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE HOSPITALIZED AS A RESULT OF COMBAT ZONE INJURIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7508(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by

adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) COLLECTION PERIOD AFTER ASSESSMENT NOT EXTENDED AS A RESULT OF HOSPITALIZATION.—With respect to any period of continuous qualified hospitalization described in subsection (a) and the next 180 days thereafter, subsection (a) shall not apply in the application of section 6502.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxes assessed before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2689. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as the founder and co-chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I have learned a great deal about this devastating disease affecting nearly 29 million Americans. Fortunately, due to the Special Diabetes Program and increased investments in diabetes research, we have seen some encouraging breakthroughs and are on the threshold of a number of important new discoveries.

This is particularly true for the estimated 3 million Americans living with type 1 diabetes. Advances in technology, like continuous glucose monitors, are helping patients control their blood glucose levels, which is key to preventing costly and sometimes deadly diabetes complications. We are also moving closer and closer to our goal of an artificial pancreas, which would control blood glucose levels automatically and revolutionize diabetes care.

The National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration have been extremely supportive of these innovations in diabetes care. I was therefore surprised and extremely troubled to learn that insulin-dependent Medicare beneficiaries are being denied coverage for continuous glucose monitors, or CGMs, because the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, has determined that they do not meet the Medicare definition of durable medical equipment and do not fall under any other Medicare category. As a consequence, we are seeing situations—similar to what we saw with insulin pumps in the late 1990s—where individuals with type 1 diabetes have had coverage for their continuous glucose monitor on their private insurance, only to lose it when they age into Medicare.

A CGM is a physician-prescribed, FDA-approved medical device that can provide real-time readings and data about trends in glucose levels every five minutes, thus enabling someone with insulin-dependent diabetes to eat or take insulin and prevent dangerous low or high glucose levels. As demonstrated by extensive clinical evidence, adults using a CGM have had improved overall glucose control and

have reduced rates of hypoglycemia or low blood glucose levels. Professional medical societies, including the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and the Endocrine Society, recognize this clinical evidence and have published guidelines recommending CGM be used in appropriate patients with type 1 diabetes. Today, about 95 percent of commercial insurers provide coverage for CGM devices.

The ironic thing is that it is only because of advances in diabetes care like the continuous glucose monitor that people with type 1 diabetes can expect to live long enough to become Medicare beneficiaries. I am particularly concerned given the implications that this coverage decision will have for future decisions regarding artificial pancreas systems, which will combine a continuous glucose monitor, insulin pump, and sophisticated algorithm to control high and low blood sugar around the clock.

I am therefore joining my colleague from New Hampshire and my Co-Chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus in introducing the Medicare CGM Access Act of 2014 to create a separate benefit category under Medicare for the continuous glucose monitor and require coverage of the device for individuals meeting specified medical criteria.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2693. A bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, today I am joining with my colleagues to introduce legislation to empower women entrepreneurs and to help address the persistent challenges women face when trying to start and grow a business.

It was just 26 years ago that Congress enacted landmark legislation, the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 that eliminated requirements that women obtain the signature of their husband or other man to secure a business loan.

Between 1997 and 2013, the number of women-owned businesses in the United States grew by 59 percent, but significant barriers for women still exist and there is still much more work to do.

Last week, the Small Business Committee released a report entitled "21st Century Barriers to Women's Entrepreneurship" that assesses the current challenges faced by women-owned businesses. The report also makes policy recommendations to increase economic opportunity for women and help to put them on a level playing field with other business owners.

Our committee report makes four critical findings and includes policy

recommendations to help remedy the business climate for women entrepreneurs.

First, women business owners face challenges in getting access to capital. The report highlights a study by the Urban Institute finding that only 4 percent of the total value of all conventional small business loans goes to women entrepreneurs. That means only \$1 of every \$23 is being loaned to a women-owned business. The report also notes that women are forced to rely on personal savings, loans from family or friends, or high interest credit because they cannot get traditional small business lending from banks.

Second, the report finds that women business owners still face challenges in getting access to loans of the right size. Women-owned businesses have been very successful with the SBA's Microloan program, under which they can obtain loans of up to \$50,000 through intermediaries that also provide assistance in the development of business plans. However, this program has not been updated since 1991.

The report highlights the importance of reauthorizing the Intermediary Lending Program that expired in 2013 and provided capital for women business owners who were ready to take out loans that exceeded the \$50,000 provided by the SBA's Microloan Program, but were not yet able to take advantage of the SBA's 7(a) lending program.

Third, the report finds that women entrepreneurs face challenges obtaining relevant business training and counseling. Women's Business Centers provide specialized counseling and training designed to address the unique challenges women face in starting a small business. The report shows that the Women's Business Center program has not been re-authorized since the 1990s and is in need of a 21st century modernization.

Last, the committee report finds that women business owners face challenges getting access to Federal contracts. Despite the growing number of businesses owned by women, the Federal Government has never met its goal of awarding 5 percent of its contracts to women-owned small businesses. Our report notes that if the government met this goal, women-owned small businesses would have access to additional market opportunity worth up to \$4 billion a year.

That is why we are introducing the Women's Small Business Ownership Act. This legislation follows the policy recommendations made in the committee report and helps to address the glass ceiling many women entrepreneurs still encounter in the 21st century. While women-owned businesses as a whole continue to grow and succeed, to do so many women must overcome barriers men do not face.

The Women's Small Business Ownership Act increases the flow of capital

to women business owners by modernizing the SBA's Microloan program and reauthorizing the Intermediary Lending Program. Women have been particularly successful in using microloans, which are loans of under \$50,000, and receive about half of all SBA Microloans.

The Microloan program would be modernized by increasing the total amount lenders can loan, as well as allowing lenders to provide flexible terms and improved technical assistance to better suit the needs of borrowers.

The Intermediary Lending Program is also an important program, which this legislation reauthorizes to address a gap in lending options for small businesses, including women-owned small businesses that are unable to obtain financing from traditional lenders. The Intermediary Lending Program offers low-interest loans of between \$50,000 and \$200,000 and closes the gap that can exist for small businesses that have outgrown the SBA's Microloan program, but are not yet able to take advantage of SBA's other lending guarantee programs.

This legislation removes barriers to the federal contracting marketplace by allowing sole source contracts to be awarded to women-owned small businesses. Every other small business in a unique socioeconomic category, including HUB Zone firms, service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses, and small disadvantaged businesses, can receive a non-competitive or sole source contract, but women's small businesses cannot. Women-owned companies deserve parity with other programs and a fair shot to grow their businesses.

The Women's Small Business Ownership Act ensures that the SBA's Women's Business Centers are adequately and effectively meeting the needs of women entrepreneurs in the 21st century. It provides the resources for Women's Business Centers to provide the technical support and counseling tailored to the unique challenges for women-owned businesses.

Women make up 51 percent of the population and have tremendous potential as business owners and job-creators. We need to empower women to break through the glass ceiling so it will be easier for even more women to succeed in the 21st century, grow the U.S. economy and create more U.S. jobs.

When women have equal opportunity to access capital, obtain the right business counseling, and compete for federal contracts, the economy grows and the country moves forward.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Women's Small Business Ownership Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

In this Act—

(1) the terms "Administration" and "Administrator" mean the Small Business Administration and the Administrator thereof, respectively;

(2) the term "disability" has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

(3) the term "microloan program" means the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m));

(4) the term "rural small business concern" means a small business concern located in a rural area, as that term is defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(5) the terms "small business concern", "small business concern owned and controlled by veterans", and "small business concern owned and controlled by women" have the meanings given those terms under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF WOMEN'S BUSINESS OWNERSHIP.

Section 29(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "in the areas" and all that follows through the end of subclause (I), and inserting the following: "to address issues concerning the management, operations, manufacturing, technology, finance, retail and product sales, international trade, Government contracting, and other disciplines required for—

"(I) starting, operating, and increasing the business of a small business concern"; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking "Women's Business Center program" each place that term appears and inserting "women's business center program"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", the National Women's Business Council, and any association of women's business centers"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) **TRAINING.**—The Administrator may provide annual programmatic and financial examination training for women's business ownership representatives and district office technical representatives of the Administration to enable representatives to carry out their responsibilities.

"(4) **PROGRAM AND TRANSPARENCY IMPROVEMENTS.**—The Administrator shall maximize the transparency of the women's business center financial assistance proposal process and the programmatic and financial examination process by—

"(A) providing public notice of any announcement for financial assistance under subsection (b) or a grant under subsection (1);

"(B) in the announcement described in subparagraph (A), outlining award and program evaluation criteria and describing the weighting of the criteria for financial assistance under subsection (b) and grants under subsection (1); and

"(C) not later than 60 days after the completion of a site visit to the women's business center (whether conducted for an audit,

performance review, or other reason), when feasible, providing to each women's business center a copy of any site visit reports or evaluation reports prepared by district office technical representatives or officers or employees of the Administration."

SEC. 4. WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.

(a) WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (4);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) the term 'association of women's business centers' means an organization—

"(A) that represents not less than 51 percent of the women's business centers that participate in a program under this section; and

"(B) whose primary purpose is to represent women's business centers;

"(3) the term 'eligible entity' means—

"(A) a private nonprofit organization;

"(B) a State, regional, or local economic development organization;

"(C) a development, credit, or finance corporation chartered by a State;

"(D) a junior or community college, as defined in section 312(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1058(f)); or

"(E) any combination of entities listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D);"; and

(D) by adding after paragraph (5), as so redesignated, the following:

"(6) the term 'women's business center' means a project conducted by an eligible entity under this section.";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) by striking "The Administration" and all that follows through "5-year projects" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administration may provide financial assistance to an eligible entity to conduct a project under this section";

(C) by striking "The projects shall" and inserting the following:

"(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The project shall be designed to provide training and counseling that meets the needs of women, especially socially and economically disadvantaged women, and shall"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator may award financial assistance under this subsection of not more than \$250,000 per project year.

"(4) CONSULTATION WITH ASSOCIATIONS OF WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.—The Administrator shall seek advice, input, and recommendations for policy changes from any association of women's business centers to develop—

"(A) a training program for the staff of women's business centers; and

"(B) recommendations to improve the policies and procedures for governing the general operations and administration of the women's business center program, including grant program improvements under subsection (g)(4).";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "the recipient organization" and inserting "an eligible entity";

(B) in paragraph (3), in the second sentence, by striking "a recipient organization" and inserting "an eligible entity";

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking "recipient of assistance" and inserting "eligible entity";

(ii) by striking "such organization" and inserting "the eligible entity"; and

(iii) by striking "recipient" and inserting "eligible entity"; and

(D) by adding at end the following:

"(5) SEPARATION OF PROJECT AND FUNDS.—An eligible entity shall—

"(A) carry out a project under this section separately from other projects, if any, of the eligible entity; and

"(B) separately maintain and account for any financial assistance under this section.";

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "applicant organization" and inserting "eligible entity";

(B) by striking "a recipient organization" and inserting "an eligible entity"; and

(C) by striking "site";

(5) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

"(f) APPLICATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR INITIAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

"(1) APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity desiring financial assistance under subsection (b) shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains—

"(A) a certification that the eligible entity—

"(i) has designated an executive director or program manager, who may be compensated using financial assistance under subsection (b) or other sources, to manage the center;

"(ii) as a condition of receiving financial assistance under subsection (b), agrees—

"(I) to receive a site visit at the discretion of the Administrator as part of the final selection process;

"(II) to undergo an annual programmatic and financial examination; and

"(III) to remedy any problems identified pursuant to the site visit or examination under subclause (I) or (II); and

"(iii) meets the accounting and reporting requirements established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

"(B) information demonstrating that the eligible entity has the ability and resources to meet the needs of the market to be served by the women's business center for which financial assistance under subsection (b) is sought, including the ability to obtain the non-Federal contribution required under subsection (c);

"(C) information relating to the assistance to be provided by the women's business center for which financial assistance under subsection (b) is sought in the area in which the women's business center is located;

"(D) information demonstrating the experience and effectiveness of the eligible entity in—

"(i) conducting financial, management, and marketing assistance programs, as described in subsection (b)(2), which are designed to teach or upgrade the business skills of women who are business owners or potential business owners;

"(ii) providing training and services to a representative number of women who are socially and economically disadvantaged; and

"(iii) working with resource partners of the Administration and other entities, such as universities; and

"(E) a 5-year plan that describes the ability of the women's business center for which financial assistance is sought—

"(i) to serve women who are business owners or potential business owners by conducting training and counseling activities; and

"(ii) to provide training and services to a representative number of women who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

"(2) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR INITIAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

"(i) review each application submitted under paragraph (1), based on the information described in such paragraph and the criteria set forth under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and

"(ii) to the extent practicable, as part of the final selection process, conduct a site visit to each women's business center for which financial assistance under subsection (b) is sought.

"(B) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall evaluate applicants for financial assistance under subsection (b) in accordance with selection criteria that are—

"(I) established before the date on which applicants are required to submit the applications;

"(II) stated in terms of relative importance; and

"(III) publicly available and stated in each solicitation for applications for financial assistance under subsection (b) made by the Administrator.

"(ii) REQUIRED CRITERIA.—The selection criteria for financial assistance under subsection (b) shall include—

"(I) the experience of the applicant in conducting programs or ongoing efforts designed to teach or enhance the business skills of women who are business owners or potential business owners;

"(II) the ability of the applicant to begin a project within a minimum amount of time, as established under the program announcement or by regulation;

"(III) the ability of the applicant to provide training and services to a representative number of women who are socially and economically disadvantaged; and

"(IV) the location for the women's business center proposed by the applicant, including whether the applicant is located in a State in which there is not a women's business center receiving funding from the Administration.

"(C) PROXIMITY.—If the principal place of business of an applicant for financial assistance under subsection (b) is located less than 50 miles from the principal place of business of a women's business center that received funds under this section on or before the date of the application, the applicant shall not be eligible for the financial assistance, unless the applicant submits a detailed written justification of the need for an additional center in the area in which the applicant is located.

"(D) RECORD RETENTION.—The Administrator shall maintain a copy of each application submitted under this subsection for not less than 7 years."; and

(6) in subsection (m)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) APPLICATION AND APPROVAL FOR RENEWAL GRANTS.—

"(A) SOLICITATION OF APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator shall solicit applications and award grants under this subsection for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of the Women's Small Business Ownership Act of 2014, and every third fiscal year thereafter.

"(B) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains—

"(i) a certification that the applicant—

"(I) is an eligible entity;

“(II) has designated an executive director or program manager to manage the women’s business center operated by the applicant; and

“(III) as a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, agrees—

“(aa) to receive a site visit as part of the final selection process;

“(bb) to submit, for the 2 full fiscal years before the date on which the application is submitted, annual programmatic and financial examination reports or certified copies of the compliance supplemental audits under OMB Circular A-133 of the applicant; and

“(cc) to remedy any problem identified pursuant to the site visit or examination under item (aa) or (bb);

“(ii) information demonstrating that the applicant has the ability and resources to meet the needs of the market to be served by the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought, including the ability to obtain the non-Federal contribution required under paragraph (4)(C);

“(iii) information relating to assistance to be provided by the women’s business center in the area served by the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought;

“(iv) information demonstrating that the applicant has worked with resource partners of the Administration and other entities;

“(v) a 3-year plan that describes the ability of the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought—

“(I) to serve women who are business owners or potential business owners by conducting training and counseling activities; and

“(II) to provide training and services to a representative number of women who are socially and economically disadvantaged; and

“(vi) any additional information that the Administrator may reasonably require.

“(C) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

“(I) review each application submitted under subparagraph (B), based on the information described in such subparagraph and the criteria set forth under clause (ii) of this subparagraph; and

“(II) at the discretion of the Administrator, and as part of the final selection process, conduct a site visit to each women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought.

“(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall evaluate applicants for grants under this subsection in accordance with selection criteria that are—

“(aa) established before the date on which applicants are required to submit the applications;

“(bb) stated in terms of relative importance; and

“(cc) publicly available and stated in each solicitation for applications for grants under this subsection made by the Administrator.

“(II) REQUIRED CRITERIA.—The selection criteria for a grant under this subsection shall include—

“(aa) the total number of entrepreneurs served by the applicant;

“(bb) the total number of new startup companies assisted by the applicant;

“(cc) the percentage of clients of the applicant that are socially or economically disadvantaged; and

“(dd) the percentage of individuals in the community served by the applicant who are socially or economically disadvantaged.

“(iii) CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUED FUNDING.—In determining whether to make a grant under this subsection, the Administrator—

“(I) shall consider the results of the most recent evaluation of the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought, and, to a lesser extent, previous evaluations; and

“(II) may withhold a grant under this subsection, if the Administrator determines that the applicant has failed to provide the information required to be provided under this paragraph, or the information provided by the applicant is inadequate.

“(D) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of each deadline to submit applications, the Administrator shall approve or deny any application under this paragraph and notify the applicant for each such application of the approval or denial.

“(E) RECORD RETENTION.—The Administrator shall maintain a copy of each application submitted under this paragraph for not less than 7 years.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) AWARD TO PREVIOUS RECIPIENTS.—There shall be no limitation on the number of times the Administrator may award a grant to an applicant under this subsection.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “to award a contract (as a sustainability grant) under subsection (1) or”; and

(2) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “The Administration” and inserting “Not later than November 1 of each year, the Administrator”;

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (4);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration to carry out this section, to remain available until expended, \$26,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) CONTINUING GRANT AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—

“(A) PROMPT DISBURSEMENT.—Upon receiving funds to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable, promptly reimburse funds to any women’s business center awarded financial assistance under this section if the center meets the eligibility requirements under this section.

“(B) SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION.—If the Administrator has entered into a grant or cooperative agreement with a women’s business center under this section, the Administrator may not suspend or terminate the grant or cooperative agreement, unless the Administrator—

“(i) provides the women’s business center with written notification setting forth the reasons for that action; and

“(ii) affords the women’s business center an opportunity for a hearing, appeal, or other administrative proceeding under chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.”;

(4) in subsection (m)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (b) or (1)” and inserting “this subsection or subsection (b)”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by striking “or subsection (1)”;

(5) by redesignating subsections (m), (n), and (o), as amended by this Act, as subsections (1), (m), and (n), respectively.

(c) EFFECT ON EXISTING GRANTS.—

(1) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to receive the grant under the terms and conditions in effect for the grant on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, except that the nonprofit organization may not apply for a renewal of the grant under section 29(m)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)(5)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LENGTH OF RENEWAL GRANT.—The Administrator may award a grant under section 29(1) of the Small Business Act, as so redesignated by subsection (a)(5) of this section, to a nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, for the period—

(A) beginning on the day after the last day of the grant agreement under such section 29(m); and

(B) ending at the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. MATCHING REQUIREMENTS UNDER WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)), as amended by section 4 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “As a condition” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (6), as a condition”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) WAIVER OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE RELATING TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND COUNSELING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by a recipient organization, and in accordance with this paragraph, the Administrator may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this subsection for the technical assistance and counseling activities of the recipient organization carried out using financial assistance under this section for a fiscal year. The Administrator may not waive the requirement for a recipient organization to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph for more than a total of 2 consecutive fiscal years.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to waive the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph, the Administrator shall consider—

“(i) the economic conditions affecting the recipient organization;

“(ii) the impact a waiver under this clause would have on the credibility of the women’s business center program under this section;

“(iii) the demonstrated ability of the recipient organization to raise non-Federal funds; and

“(iv) the performance of the recipient organization.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not waive the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph if granting the waiver would undermine the credibility of the women’s business center program under this section.

“(7) SOLICITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a recipient organization may—

“(A) solicit cash and in-kind contributions from private individuals and entities to be used to carry out the activities of the recipient organization under the project conducted under this section; and

“(B) use amounts made available by the Administration under this section for the cost of such solicitation and management of the contributions received.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (2), and not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register proposed regulations by the Administrator to carry out the amendments made to section 29 of the Small Business Act by this Act; and

(B) accept public comments on such proposed regulations for not less than 60 days.

(2) EXISTING PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to the extent proposed regulations by the Administrator have been published on the date of enactment of this Act that are sufficient to carry out the amendments made to section 29 of the Small Business Act by this Act.

SEC. 6. STUDY AND REPORT ON ECONOMIC ISSUES FACING WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a broad study of the unique economic issues facing women's business centers located in covered areas to identify—

(1) the difficulties such centers face in raising non-Federal funds;

(2) the difficulties such centers face in competing for financial assistance, non-Federal funds, or other types of assistance;

(3) the difficulties such centers face in writing grant proposals; and

(4) other difficulties such centers face because of the economy in the type of covered area in which such centers are located.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study under subsection (a), which shall include recommendations, if any, regarding how to—

(1) address the unique difficulties women's business centers located in covered areas face because of the type of covered area in which such centers are located;

(2) expand the presence of, and increase the services provided by, women's business centers located in covered areas; and

(3) best use technology and other resources to better serve women business owners located in covered areas.

(c) DEFINITION OF COVERED AREA.—In this section, the term “covered area” means—

(1) any State that is predominantly rural, as determined by the Administrator;

(2) any State that is predominantly urban, as determined by the Administrator; and

(3) any State or territory that is an island.

SEC. 7. STUDY AND REPORT ON OVERSIGHT OF WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the oversight of women's business centers by the Administrator, which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the coordination by the Administrator of the activities of women's business centers with the activities of small business development centers, the Service Corps of Retired Executives, and Veteran Business Outreach Centers;

(2) a comparison of the types of individuals and small business concerns served by women's business centers and the types of individuals and small business concerns served by small business development centers, the Service Corps of Retired Executives, and Veteran Business Outreach Centers; and

(3) an analysis of performance data for women's business centers that evaluates how

well women's business centers are carrying out the mission of women's business centers and serving individuals and small business concerns.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study under subsection (a), which shall include recommendations, if any, for eliminating the duplication of services provided by women's business centers, small business development centers, the Service Corps of Retired Executives, and Veteran Business Outreach Centers.

SEC. 8. SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to a small business concern owned and controlled by women that meets the requirements under paragraph (2)(A) if—

“(A) the small business concern owned and controlled by women is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are underrepresented, as determined by the Administrator;

“(B) the contracting officer determines that the small business concern owned and controlled by women is a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(C) the anticipated award price of the contract, including options, is not more than—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a North American Industry Classification System code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.

“(8) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to a small business concern owned and controlled by women that meets the requirements under paragraph (2)(E) if—

“(A) the small business concern owned and controlled by women is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented, as determined by the Administrator;

“(B) the contracting officer determines that the small business concern owned and controlled by women is a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(C) the anticipated award price of the contract, including options, is not more than—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a North American Industry Classification System code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.”.

(b) REPORTING ON GOALS FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—Section 15(h)(2)(E)(viii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)(2)(E)(viii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VIII); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

“(V) through sole source contracts awarded under section 8(m)(7);

“(VI) through sole source contracts awarded under section 8(m)(8);

“(VII) by industry for contracts described in subclause (III), (IV), (V), or (VI); and”.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES ACCELERATED.—Section 29(o)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(o)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “5 years after the date of enactment of this subsection” and inserting “January 2, 2015”; and

(2) by striking “5-year period” and inserting “2-year or 5-year period, as applicable.”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “paragraph (2)(F)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (2)(E)”.

SEC. 9. SMALL BUSINESS INTERMEDIARY LENDING PROGRAM.

Section 7(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(l)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “pilot”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “3-year”; and

(B) by striking “pilot”;

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) LOAN LIMITS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No single loan to an eligible intermediary under this subsection may exceed \$1,000,000.

“(ii) TOTAL AMOUNT.—The total amount outstanding and committed to an eligible intermediary by the Administrator under the Program may not exceed \$5,000,000.”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

“(G) MAXIMUM AMOUNTS.—The Administrator may make loans under the Program—

“(i) during each of fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017, in a total amount of not more than \$20,000,000; and

“(ii) during fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter, using such amounts as are made available for the Program.”; and

(5) by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 10. ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) MICROLOAN PROGRAM.—Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “short-term.”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$7,000,000”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (E);

(4) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “short-term.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) REPORT TO COMMERCIAL CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES.—The Administrator shall

establish a process under which an intermediary that makes a loan to a small business concern under this paragraph shall provide to 1 or more of the commercial credit reporting agencies, through the Administration or independently, including through third party intermediaries, information on the small business concern that is relevant to credit reporting, including the payment activity of the small business concern on the loan.”;

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “PROGRAM” and all that follows through “Under” and inserting the following: “NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS.—Under”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B);

(6) in paragraph (8), by striking “such intermediaries” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “intermediaries that serve a diversity of geographic areas in the United States to ensure appropriate availability of loans for small business concerns in all industries that are located in metropolitan, nonmetropolitan, and rural areas.”; and

(7) in paragraph (11)(B), by striking “short-term.”;

(b) **GUARANTEE FEE WAIVER.**—During fiscal year 2016, the Administrator may not collect a guarantee fee under section 7(a)(18)(A)(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)(A)(i)) with respect to a loan guaranteed under section 7(a) of such Act, unless amounts are made available to the Administrator to subsidize the cost of guaranteeing such loans for fiscal year 2016.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Office of Capital Access of the Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on assistance provided by the Administration under—

(A) section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a));

(B) the microloan program;

(C) part A of title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681 et seq.); and

(D) section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696).

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

(A) for each type of assistance described under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of paragraph (1)—

(i) the number of loans made by the Administration;

(ii) the total amount of loans made by the Administration;

(iii) the percentage of the number and total amount of loans made by the Administration to—

(I) rural small business concerns;

(II) small business concerns owned and controlled by individuals with a disability;

(III) small business concerns owned and controlled by low-income individuals, broken down by each racial or ethnic minority group of which those individuals are members;

(IV) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans;

(V) small business concerns owned and controlled by women; and

(VI) small business concerns owned and controlled by members of a racial or ethnic minority group, broken down by each such racial or ethnic minority group; and

(iv) the number of jobs created and retained by borrowers as a result of such assistance; and

(B) for assistance described under subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1)—

(i) the number of investments made by small business investment companies;

(ii) the total amount of equity capital provided and loans made by small business investment companies;

(iii) the percentage of the number of investments and loans made and total amount of equity capital provided by small business investment companies to—

(I) rural small business concerns;

(II) small business concerns owned and controlled by individuals with a disability;

(III) small business concerns owned and controlled by low-income individuals, broken down by each racial or ethnic minority group of which those individuals are members;

(IV) small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans;

(V) small business concerns owned and controlled by women; and

(VI) small business concerns owned and controlled by members of a racial or ethnic minority group, broken down by each such racial or ethnic minority group;

(iv) the number of jobs created and retained by small business concerns as a result of investments made by small business investment companies; and

(v) the number of licenses issued by the Administration under section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act (15 U.S.C. 681(c)), including the percentage of licenses issued to entities headed by a woman or a member of a racial or ethnic minority, respectively.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) access to capital for small business concerns owned and controlled by women comes from a variety of sources, including important contributions and early investments from angel capital and other venture capital investors; and

(2) those investors should continue to work to develop small business concerns owned and controlled by women to expand the rate at which those women receive venture investment.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. REED):

S. 2704. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, earlier today I, along with Senator DICK DURBIN and Senator JACK REED, introduced the No Federal Contracts for Corporate Deserters Act. Our bill will put a stop to companies that renounce their U.S. citizenship but come back to try to seek taxpayer funded government contracts. There is an existing law on the books that is supposed to ban Federal contracts with inverted corporations, but just like with the tax code, after about a decade of lawyers looking for loopholes in the law, a number of corporations have found them. This bill would bring that ban up-to-date.

Over the last few months, there has been a growing rush of U.S. corpora-

tions seeking to swear off their U.S. citizenship and move their mailboxes, for tax purposes, to a low-tax jurisdiction. I don't think that is right, and it is time we put a stop to it, which we can do by passing the Stop Corporate Inversions Act I introduced 2 months ago with 22 cosponsors.

Most Americans agree with us that taxpayer dollars shouldn't be used for contracts with companies that move their addresses abroad to dodge U.S. laws. And because of that, Congress has passed a series of restrictions on contracting with inverted corporations over the last decade. We passed one in 2002, and another in 2006 and 2007. Since fiscal year 2008, a government-wide provision has been included in every annual appropriations bill banning contracts with inverted corporations.

Our bill would strengthen that ban by closing a number of loopholes in the current law. Those loopholes have allowed some inverted corporations to continue collecting revenue from American taxpayers, while at the same time, shifting their tax burden onto those same American taxpayers. Our bill also makes the existing ban, which has been included in annual appropriations bills, permanent.

Some may say that the real reason for inversions is that our tax rate is too high. It is true the top corporate rate is 35 percent. But the effective tax rate—what corporations really pay—is about 12 percent. When companies can go to places like Ireland or the Caribbean and negotiate sweetheart deals to pay little or no taxes, there will always be tax incentives for companies to abandon their country instead of paying their tax bill, no matter what our tax rate is.

Some may say that we should wait for tax reform to address this issue. There are two reasons why we shouldn't. First, if it happens at all, tax reform is months or years away; these inversions are happening now. Second, this is a bill about contracting. This bill doesn't amend the tax code. I expect it will be referred to the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, not to the Finance Committee. So even Senators who believe that fixing the tax inversions problem should wait until comprehensive tax reform should be able to support this bill.

In the past, in similar circumstances, Congress has chosen to act—overwhelmingly, and in a bipartisan fashion. This should not be a partisan issue. This is about fairness. It is simply unfair to businesses who don't invert to have to compete with companies that do invert. This is about putting American families who work hard and pay their share. We shouldn't sacrifice the interests of those families. We shouldn't ask them to send their hard-earned tax dollars to contractors who skip out on their tax obligations.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this bill forward.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2711. A bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, USCIRF, Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2014.

This legislation would reauthorize the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, also known as USCIRF, while making important reforms to the Commission to encourage bipartisanship, enhance coordination with the State Department, and improve Congressional oversight.

I strongly support USCIRF's mission of promoting and protecting international religious freedom. My legislation will help USCIRF to more effectively pursue this mission.

In 2011, I authored a number of reforms in the previous USCIRF reauthorization legislation, including term limits for Commissioners; a prohibition on employee discrimination; a requirement that Commissioners follow federal travel regulations; and maintaining nine Commissioners, rather than five Commissioners, as called for by the House-passed reauthorization. I have heard from USCIRF that these reforms have strengthened the Commission, and the legislation I am introducing today will build on these reforms.

The USCIRF Reform and Reauthorization Act is supported by a broad swath of religious and civic leaders and faith organizations, including, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good; the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; HIAS; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Cardinal Theodore E. McCarrick, Archbishop Emeritus of Washington and former USCIRF Commissioner; Dr. William J. Shaw, Immediate Past President of the National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc. and former USCIRF Commissioner; former Congressman and USCIRF Commissioner Sam Gejdenson; Sister Simone Campbell, Executive Director of NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby; Rateb Rabie, President of the Holy Land Christian Ecumenical Foundation; Dr. Azizah Al-Hibri, former USCIRF Commissioner and Founder and Chair of KARAMAH: Muslim Women Lawyers for Human Rights; Rev. Drew Christiansen, S.J., Distinguished Professor of Ethics and Global Development at Georgetown University; Dr. Alfred Rotondaro, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress; Dr. Laila Al-Marayati, former USCIRF Commissioner; and

Benjamin Palumbo, Board of Trustees, Catholics United.

There is bipartisan agreement about the need for our government to promote and protect international religious freedom. USCIRF is, by design, a bipartisan organization, with Commissioners appointed by the President and Congressional leaders, and USCIRF can most effectively promote religious freedom by doing so on a bipartisan basis. This issue is too important to be stymied by the excessive partisanship which too often leads to political gridlock in Washington.

It is to be expected that the members of a bipartisan Commission will not always reach consensus. However, I am troubled that some Commissioners have on occasion engaged in partisan rhetoric that is not conducive to USCIRF's bipartisan mission and does not represent USCIRF's official views.

For example, one Commissioner recently appeared on Fox News' Hannity program, and, after identifying himself as a member of USCIRF, claimed that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had failed to take steps to combat Boko Haram in Nigeria and accused the Obama Administration of having "no strategy" for combating terrorism. Mother Commissioner testified in Congress on behalf of USCIRF and said that the Obama Administration "sends a message to other countries that we don't care" about religious freedom.

The USCIRF Reform and Reauthorization Act will facilitate bipartisanship by taking a number of steps. First, the legislation will codify USCIRF's existing procedures for the election of a Chair and Vice Chair so that these positions rotate annually between Commissioners appointed by elected officials of each political party. This will help ensure continued bipartisan leadership at the Commission.

Second, this bill will establish a dedicated bipartisan staff as a complement to nonpartisan professional staff. The legislation permits Commissioners appointed by elected officials of each political party to appoint designated Staff Directors and three designated staff members. This will help foster a bipartisan environment at USCIRF.

Third, the bill will codify procedures for publishing the views of the Commission. The bill encourages Commissioners to reach consensus on statements on behalf of the Commission. When consensus is not possible, the bill requires a statement to be approved by at least six of the nine Commissioners. This supermajority requirement is current USCIRF policy for the approval of statements that are circulated electronically. Codifying this policy will ensure that at least one Commissioner of each political party supports every Commission statement.

USCIRF has noted that it is the only organization of its kind in the world. The Government Accountability Office,

GAO, recently issued a report on USCIRF which highlights some of the challenges inherent to USCIRF's unique mission.

The GAO notes that there are two governmental entities charged with promoting international religious freedom: USCIRF and the State Department's Office of International Religious Freedom. The GAO found that these overlapping missions and "the lack of a definition regarding how State and the Commission are to interact has sometimes created foreign policy tensions that State has had to mitigate." The GAO notes that State Department officials highlighted several instances "when the Commission's approach with foreign government officials created bilateral tensions."

The GAO's concerns about the overlap between State and USCIRF are serious enough that it included USCIRF in its annual duplication report. As my colleagues know, Senator COBURN authored legislation requiring GAO to issue this report to identify unnecessary duplication in the federal government.

I am concerned that the lack of coordination between the State Department and USCIRF may undermine our government's efforts to promote international religious freedom by sending mixed messages to foreign governments and human-rights activists who are fighting to defend religious freedom in their countries.

Consider another example. The State Department and USCIRF both produce an annual report on international religious freedom. Under current law, USCIRF is required to publish its report "[n]ot later than May 1 of each year," but the State Department's report is often not completed before May 1. This forces USCIRF to issue its report prior to publication of the State Department report, which leads to unnecessary duplication of efforts, saps USCIRF's limited staff resources, and prevents USCIRF from opining on the State Department report.

The USCIRF Reform and Reauthorization Act will enhance cooperation between USCIRF and the State Department with two measures. First, it clarifies that the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, as an ex officio member of USCIRF, is permitted to attend all Commission meetings. GAO's duplication report specifically highlights the failure to define the role of the Ambassador at Large as an ex officio member of USCIRF.

Second, this legislation requires USCIRF to publish its annual report after reviewing the State Department's annual report on International Religious Freedom. This division of labor takes advantage of the State Department's worldwide presence and much larger staff to draft a comprehensive report. It also takes advantage of

USCIRF's unique role to provide an independent and bipartisan commentary on the State Department report.

USCIRF is a part of the legislative branch and it is ultimately the responsibility of Congress to oversee USCIRF's work and ensure that it is effectively pursuing its mission. The need for greater Congressional oversight of USCIRF has been highlighted by concerns about USCIRF's practices, including, for example, the work environment at USCIRF for religious minorities, particularly prior to the 2011 reauthorization.

In the past, human rights advocates made allegations about financial improprieties at USCIRF, particularly that USCIRF Commissioners had made lavish travel arrangements. As a result, in 2011 I authored a provision clarifying that USCIRF Commissioners are subject to Federal travel regulations.

I was troubled to learn about more allegations of financial irregularities at USCIRF only a few weeks after the last reauthorization. In early 2012, USCIRF staff notified my office that USCIRF's office manager had been involved in embezzlement and fraud for several years. The office manager subsequently pled guilty and was sentenced to 20 months in prison for embezzling \$217,000 from 2007–2011. This is a significant amount of taxpayer money in any circumstance, but particularly for a small organization like USCIRF.

I am also concerned about unresolved claims that USCIRF, an organization charged with protecting religious freedom, discriminated against a former employee on the basis of her religion.

In 2011, I included language in the last USCIRF reauthorization providing anti-discrimination protections to USCIRF employees and allowing pending civil rights claims to proceed. The impetus for this provision was a lawsuit filed by a former USCIRF employee, who claimed that her permanent employment offer was rescinded after the Commissioners learned of her prior job with a Muslim civil rights organization. USCIRF did not deny the discrimination claim. Instead, they argued that USCIRF employees do not have federal civil rights protections.

Unfortunately, the lawsuit is still pending. I understand that USCIRF's lawyers have refused to enter into settlement negotiations with the Commission's former employee and instead are aggressively litigating the case.

As Christianity Today said, "the trial will be one of the most ironic in American history, with the congressional commission charged with monitoring religious freedom around the world defending its own employment practices in court."

In light of these concerns, the USCIRF Reform and Reauthorization

Act would improve Congressional oversight by reauthorizing the Commission for two years. A 2-year reauthorization period will allow the Commission to continue to pursue its important mission while Congress closely monitors USCIRF's activities to assure the reforms in this legislation are fully implemented.

I strongly support the mission of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom to protect and promote international religious freedom. I believe the reforms in my legislation will help USCIRF more effectively pursue this mission.

I urge my colleagues to support the USCIRF Reform and Reauthorization Act so that USCIRF can quickly be reauthorized with these important reforms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.

(a) **LEADERSHIP.**—Subsection (d) of section 201 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) **ELECTION OF CHAIR.**—At the first meeting of the Commission after May 30 of each year, a majority of the Members of the Commission present and voting shall elect the Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission, subject to the following requirements:

"(1) **INITIAL ELECTIONS.**—At the first meeting of the Commission after May 30, 2015, the Members of the Commission shall elect as Chair a Commissioner appointed by an elected official of the political party that is not the political party of the President, and as Vice Chair a Commissioner appointed by an elected official of the political party of the President.

"(2) **FUTURE ELECTIONS.**—At the first meeting of the Commission after May 30, 2016, the Members of the Commission shall elect as Chair a Commissioner appointed by an elected official of the political party of the President, and as Vice Chair a Commissioner appointed by an elected official of the political party that is not the political party of the President. Thereafter, positions of Chair and Vice Chair shall continue to rotate on an annual basis between Commissioners appointed by elected officials of each political party.

"(3) **TERM LIMITS.**—No Member of the Commission is eligible to be elected as Chair of the Commission for a second term, and no Member of the Commission is eligible to be elected as Vice Chair of the Commission for a second term."

(b) **ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS OF AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.**—Subsection (f) of such section (22 U.S.C. 6431(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Ambassador at Large shall be given advance notice of all

Commission meetings and may attend all Commission meetings as a non-voting Member of the Commission."

(c) **APPOINTMENTS IN CASES OF VACANCIES.**—Subsection (g) of such section (22 U.S.C. 6431(g)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 3. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

Section 203(e) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432a) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) **VIEWS OF THE COMMISSION.**—The Members of the Commission may speak in their capacity as private citizens. Statements on behalf of the Commission shall be issued in writing over the names of the Members. Members of the Commission shall make every effort to reach consensus on all statements on behalf of the Commission, including testimony, press releases, and articles by Commissioners or Commission staff. When a statement supported by all Commissioners is not possible, the Commission shall issue a statement only if such statement is approved by an affirmative vote of at least six of the nine Members of the Commission and each Member of the Commission may include the individual or dissenting views of the Member. The Commission shall in its written statements clearly describe its statutory authority, distinguishing that authority from that of appointed or elected officials of the United States Government. Oral statements, where practicable, shall include a similar description."

SEC. 4. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **STAFF DIRECTORS.**—Section 204 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6432b) is amended by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following new subsections:

"(a) **COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such staff personnel as it deems desirable. All decisions pertaining to the hiring, firing, and fixing of pay of personnel of the Commission shall be by an affirmative vote of at least six of the nine Members of the Commission, except that—

"(1) Members of the Commission appointed by an elected official of the political party of the President, by a majority vote thereof, shall be entitled to appoint, terminate, and fix the pay of a Majority Staff Director and shall have the authority to appoint, terminate, and fix the pay of three professional staff members who shall be responsible to the Members of the Commission of the political party of the President; and

"(2) Members of the Commission appointed by an elected official of the political party that is not the political party of the President, by a majority vote thereof, shall be entitled to appoint, terminate, and fix the pay of a Minority Staff Director and shall have the authority to appoint, terminate, and fix the pay of three professional staff members who shall be responsible to the Members of the Commission of the political party that is not the political party of the President.

"(b) **STAFF APPOINTMENTS AND COMPENSATION.**—All staff appointments shall be made without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5 relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the Majority Staff Director, Minority Staff Director, and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

"(c) **QUALIFICATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF.**—The Commission shall ensure that the professional staff of the Commission consists of persons with expertise in areas relevant to the issue of international religious

freedom, including foreign affairs, direct experience abroad, human rights, and international law.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (e) of such section (22 U.S.C. 6432b(e)) is amended by striking “The Executive Director” both places it appears and inserting “The Majority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director”.

SEC. 5. REPORT OF COMMISSION.

(a) REPORT PUBLICATION DATE.—Section 205(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6433(a)) is amended by striking “Not later than May 1 of each year” and inserting “Each year, not earlier than 30 days after, and not later than 90 days after, the publication of the Department of State’s Annual Report on International Religious Freedom”.

(b) CONSENSUS ON REPORTS.—Section 205(c) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6433(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) INDIVIDUAL OR DISSENTING VIEWS.—Members of the Commission shall make every effort to reach consensus on the report. When a report supported by all Commissioners is not possible, the report shall be approved by an affirmative vote of at least six of the nine Members of the Commission and each Member of the Commission may include the individual or dissenting views of the Member.”.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6435(a)) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION.

Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2712. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I introduced the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act, a bill that would make adjunct professors eligible to participate in the Public Service Student Loan Forgiveness Program.

Contingent faculty members are like full-time instructors. They have advanced degrees. They teach classes and spend many hours outside the classroom preparing for class. They hold office hours, grade papers and give feedback to students. They provide advice and write letters of recommendation. Students rely on them. Since most adjuncts have advanced degrees and, as almost 75 percent of graduate degree recipients have an average of \$61,000 in student loans, they are also among the 40 million Americans with student debt.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program is meant to encourage graduates to go into public service by offering student loan forgiveness for eligible federal loans after ten years of full-time work in government or the non-

profit sector. Public service fields like nursing, military service, and public health qualify. And many education jobs qualify, including full-time work at public universities and part-time work at community colleges in high-needs subject areas or areas of shortage. But other faculty members who work part-time are not eligible for loan forgiveness because the law requires an annual average of 30 hours per week to qualify for the program. For adjunct faculty working at several schools on a contingent basis, this requirement can be difficult or impossible to meet, even when they are putting in more than 30 hours of work each week.

The number of faculty hours given for each class is calculated differently at different schools. Some give one hour per hour in the classroom while others actually take into consideration the time required outside the classroom. So, even as these faculty members are working hard and as their options for tenured, full-time positions become slimmer, more of them are overworked and undervalued for their work in public service.

The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2014 would solve this by amending the Higher Education Act to expand the definition of a “public service job” to include a part-time faculty member who teaches at least one course at an eligible institution of higher education. They would still have to meet all the other requirements to qualify for the program, including making 120 on-time payments while employed at a qualifying institution, and they could not be employed full-time elsewhere at the same time.

This bill would benefit someone like David Weiss, an adjunct professor from St. Paul, Minnesota, who graduated with \$48,000 in student debt and, after 12 years of on-time payments, has \$35,000 left. Like most adjuncts, David has dealt with uncertain job security. In good years, he is able to teach 5 to 7 courses a year, but recently he has only been offered two to three courses. He supplements his income from teaching with other part-time work. This bill would ensure that David and many thousands like him, could obtain credit towards PSLF for payments made while teaching whether or not he was teaching one course or 7.

Unfortunately, for all their contributions to the college programs and the students they work with, adjunct faculty don’t have the same employment benefits or job security as their colleagues. The number of classes they teach every semester varies. To make ends meet, these professors often end up teaching classes at more than one school in the same semester, getting paid about \$3,000 per class and making an average annual income that hovers around minimum wage. This also means that, in some parts of the country, they spend as much time commuting as they do teaching.

Nationally, ⅓ of all higher education faculty work on a contingent basis, with low pay and little or no benefits or job security. In the past, these were a minority of professors who were hired to teach an occasional class because they could bring experience to the classroom in a specific field or industry. Over time, as university budgets have tightened and it has gotten more expensive to hire full-time, tenure track professors, higher education institutions have increasingly hired adjuncts.

From 1991 to 2011, the number of part-time faculty in the U.S. increased two and a half times from 291,000 to over 760,000. At the same time, the percentage of professors holding tenure-track positions has been steadily decreasing—from 45 percent of all instructors in 1975 to only 24 percent in 2011. The number of full-time instructors, tenured and non-tenured, now makes up only about 50 percent of professors on U.S. campuses. The other 50 percent of the 1.5 million faculty employees at public and non-profit colleges and universities in the U.S. work on a part-time, contingent basis.

Illinois colleges rely heavily on adjuncts. In 2012, 53 percent of all faculty at public and not-for-profit colleges and universities in the State, more than 30,400 faculty employees, worked on a part-time basis. This is a 52.6 percent increase in part-time faculty in Illinois compared to a 13 percent increase in full-time faculty since 2002.

Not surprisingly, in Illinois, 69 percent of all part-time faculty work in Chicago, where the cost of living is 16 percent higher than the U.S. average. Based on an average payment of \$3,000 per class an adjunct professor must teach between seventeen and thirty classes a year to pay for rent and utilities in Chicago.

They would have to teach up to 7 classes to afford groceries for a family of four and two to four classes per year just to cover student loan payments. Because they are part-time, they are not eligible for vacation time, paid sick days, or group health-care. So they would have to teach an additional two to three classes to afford family coverage from the lowest priced health insurance offered on Get Covered Illinois, the official health marketplace.

Even though these professors are working in a relatively low-paying field, teaching our students, their part-time status also means they aren’t eligible for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program.

This bill does not completely fix this growing reliance on part-time professors who are underpaid and undervalued. But it would ensure that members of the contingent faculty workforce are no longer excluded from the loan forgiveness program for public servants. I hope my colleagues will join me in the effort to provide this benefit

to faculty members who provide our students with a quality education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “teaching as” and inserting the following: “teaching—

“(I) as”;

(2) by striking “, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges, as determined by the Secretary.” and inserting “and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

“(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

“(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 529—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES AND COMMENDING ITS MEMBERS FOR THEIR COURAGE AND SACRIFICE IN SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TOOMEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 529

Whereas on September 17, 1914, members of the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the National Society of the Army of the Philippines merged their organizations and voted in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to adopt the name “Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States”;

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States remains active in communities at the international, national, State, and local levels with more than 2,000,000 members;

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States provides financial, social, and emotional support to members of the Armed forces, veterans, and their dependents throughout the United States;

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States works on behalf of service members of the United States by calling on Congress for better health care and benefits for veterans;

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States annually donates more

than 13,000,000 volunteer hours of community service; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has played an instrumental role in each significant veterans legislation passed since its founding and continues to play such a role: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on its 100th anniversary as a national organization with a mission to—

(A) foster camaraderie among United States veterans of overseas conflicts;

(B) serve veterans, the military, and communities across the United States; and

(C) advocate on behalf of all veterans;

(2) commends the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for their courage and sacrifice in service to the United States; and

(3) encourages all individuals of the United States to express their appreciation for the honor, courage, and bravery of United States veterans and for the service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 530—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CURRENT SITUATION IN IRAQ AND THE URGENT NEED TO PROTECT RELIGIOUS MINORITIES FROM PERSECUTION FROM THE SUNNI ISLAMIST INSURGENT AND TERRORIST GROUP THE ISLAMIC STATE, FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT (ISIL), AS IT EXPANDS ITS CONTROL OVER AREAS IN NORTHWESTERN IRAQ

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISC, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 530

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a surge of violence arising from an Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas, on June 29, 2014, ISIL leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi renamed the group the Islamic State and pronounced himself Caliph of a new Islamic Caliphate encompassing the areas under his control, and Mr. al-Baghdadi has a stated mission of spreading the Islamic State and caliphate across the region through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 people, with 97 percent

identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yazidis, Sabeen-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000, with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating that “no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy,” “no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution,” and “[this Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandaean Sabeans”;

Whereas over 1,000,000 people have been displaced by violence in Iraq, and reports have surfaced of targeted harassment, persecution, and killings of Iraqi religious minorities by the Islamic State with little to no protection from the Government of Iraq and other security forces;

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no Mass in that city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has not upheld its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States Government has provided over \$73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, “Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its commitment to promoting and protecting religious freedom around the world and providing relief to minority groups facing persecution;

(2) calls on the Department of State to work with the Kurdistan Regional Government, the Government of Iraq, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, and other key stakeholders to help secure safe havens for those seeking safety and protection from religious persecution in Iraq;

(3) respectfully requests the addition of a Special Representative for Religious Minorities to be included in Iraq's government; and

(4) urges the President to ensure the timely processing of visas for Iraq's minority groups fleeing religious persecution, in accordance with existing United States immigration law and national security screening procedures.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3706. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3707. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3708. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3709. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3710. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3711. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3712. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3713. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3714. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3715. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3716. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3717. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3718. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3719. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3720. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHANNES, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3721. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3722. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3706. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. REPORT ON POW/MIA POLICIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on policies and proposals for providing access to information and documents to the next of kin of missing service personnel, including under chapter 76 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 911.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of information and documents to be provided to the next of kin, including the status of recovery efforts and service records.

(2) A description of the Department's plans, if any, to review the classification status of records related to past covered conflicts and missing service personnel.

(3) An assessment of whether it is feasible and advisable to develop a public interface for any database of missing personnel being developed.

SA 3707. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 846. PROGRAM FRAUD CIVIL REMEDIES STATUTE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to provide the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with an effective administrative remedy to obtain recompense for the Department of Defense

and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for losses resulting from the submission to the Department or the Administration, respectively, of false, fictitious, or fraudulent claims and statements.

(b) **PROGRAM FRAUD CIVIL REMEDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Part IV of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 163 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 164—ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES FOR FALSE CLAIMS AND STATEMENTS

“Sec.

“2751. Applicability of chapter; definitions.

“2752. False claims and statements; liability.

“2753. Hearing and determinations.

“2754. Payment; interest on late payments.

“2755. Judicial review.

“2756. Collection of civil penalties and assessments.

“2757. Right to administrative offset.

“2758. Limitations.

“2759. Effect on other laws.

“2751. Applicability of chapter; definitions.

“§ 2751. Applicability of chapter; definitions

“(a) APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER.—This chapter applies to the following agencies:

“(1) The Department of Defense.

“(2) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

“(1) HEAD OF AN AGENCY.—The term ‘head of an agency’ means the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

“(2) CLAIM.—The term ‘claim’ means any request, demand, or submission—

“(A) made to the head of an agency for property, services, or money (including money representing grants, loans, insurance, or benefits);

“(B) made to a recipient of property, services, or money received directly or indirectly from the head of an agency or to a party to a contract with the head of an agency—

“(i) for property or services if the United States—

“(I) provided such property or services;

“(II) provided any portion of the funds for the purchase of such property or services; or

“(III) will reimburse such recipient or party for the purchase of such property or services; or

“(ii) for the payment of money (including money representing grants, loans, insurance, or benefits) if the United States—

“(I) provided any portion of the money requested or demanded; or

“(II) will reimburse such recipient or party for any portion of the money paid on such request or demand; or

“(C) made to the head of an agency which has the effect of decreasing an obligation to pay or account for property, services, or money.

“(3) KNOWS OR HAS REASON TO KNOW.—The term ‘knows or has reason to know’, for purposes of establishing liability under section 2752 of this title, means that a person, with respect to a claim or statement—

“(A) has actual knowledge that the claim or statement is false, fictitious, or fraudulent;

“(B) acts in deliberate ignorance of the truth or falsity of the claim or statement; or

“(C) acts in reckless disregard of the truth or falsity of the claim or statement, and no proof of specific intent to defraud is required.

“(4) RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL.—The term ‘responsible official’ means a designated debarring and suspending official of the agency named in subsection (a).

“(5) **RESPONDENT.**—The term ‘respondent’ means a person who has received notice from a responsible official asserting liability under section 2752 of this title.

“(6) **STATEMENT.**—The term ‘statement’ means any representation, certification, affirmation, document, record, or an accounting or bookkeeping entry made—

“(A) with respect to a claim or to obtain the approval or payment of a claim (including relating to eligibility to make a claim); or

“(B) with respect to (including relating to eligibility for)—

“(i) a contract with, or a bid or proposal for a contract with, the head of an agency; or

“(ii) a grant, loan, or benefit from the head of an agency.

“(C) **CLAIMS.**—For purposes of paragraph (2) of subsection (b)—

“(1) each voucher, invoice, claim form, or other individual request or demand for property, services, or money constitutes a separate claim;

“(2) each claim for property, services, or money is subject to this chapter regardless of whether such property, services, or money is actually delivered or paid; and

“(3) a claim shall be considered made, presented, or submitted to the head of an agency, recipient, or party when such claim is actually made to an agent, fiscal intermediary, or other entity acting for or on behalf of such authority, recipient, or party.

“(d) **STATEMENTS.**—For purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (b)—

“(1) each written representation, certification, or affirmation constitutes a separate statement; and

“(2) a statement shall be considered made, presented, or submitted to the head of an agency when such statement is actually made to an agent, fiscal intermediary, or other entity acting for or on behalf of such authority.

“§ 2752. False claims and statements; liability

“(a) **FALSE CLAIMS.**—Any person who makes, presents, or submits, or causes to be made, presented, or submitted, to the head of an agency a claim that the person knows or has reason to know—

“(1) is false, fictitious, or fraudulent;

“(2) includes or is supported by any written statement which asserts a material fact this is false, fictitious, or fraudulent;

“(3) includes or is supported by any written statement that—

“(A) omits a material fact;

“(B) is false, fictitious, or fraudulent as a result of such omission; and

“(C) is made, presented, or submitted by a person who has a duty to include such material fact; or

“(4) is for payment for the provision of property or services which the person has not provided as claimed,

shall, in addition to any other remedy that may be prescribed by law, be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each such claim. Such person shall also be subject to an assessment of not more than twice the amount of such claim, or the portion of such claim which is determined by the responsible official to be in violation of the preceding sentence.

“(b) **FALSE STATEMENTS.**—Any person who makes, presents, submits, or causes to be made, presented, or submitted, a written statement in conjunction with a procurement program or acquisition of the an agency named in section 2751(a) of this title that—

“(1) the person knows or has reason to know—

“(A) asserts a material fact that is false, fictitious, or fraudulent; or

“(B)(i) omits a material fact; and

“(ii) is false, fictitious, or fraudulent as a result of such omission;

“(2) in the case of a statement described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), is a statement in which the person making, presenting, or submitting such statement has a duty to include such material fact; and

“(3) contains or is accompanied by an express certification or affirmation of the truthfulness and accuracy of the contents of the statement,

shall be subject to, in addition to any other remedy that may be prescribed by law, a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each such statement.

“§ 2753. Hearing and determinations

“(a) **TRANSMITTAL OF NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—If a responsible official determines that there is adequate evidence to believe that a person is liable under section 2752 of this title, the responsible official shall transmit to the Attorney General, or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, a written notice of the intention of such official to initiate an action under this section. The notice shall include the following:

“(1) A statement of the reasons for initiating an action under this section.

“(2) A statement specifying the evidence which supports liability under section 2752 of this title.

“(3) A description of the claims or statements for which liability under section 2752 of this title is alleged.

“(4) An estimate of the penalties and assessments that will be demanded under section 2752 of this title.

“(5) A statement of any exculpatory or mitigating circumstances which may relate to such claims or statements.

“(b) **STATEMENT FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—(1) Within 90 days after receipt of a notice from a responsible official under subsection (a), the Attorney General, or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, shall transmit a written statement to the responsible official which specifies—

“(A) that the Attorney General, or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, approves or disapproves initiating an action under this section based on the allegations of liability stated in such notice; and

“(B) in any case in which the initiation of an action under this section is disapproved, the reasons for such disapproval.

“(2) If at any time after the initiation of an action under this section the Attorney General, or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, transmits to a responsible official a written determination that the continuation of any action under this section may adversely affect any pending or potential criminal or civil action, such action shall be immediately stayed and may be resumed only upon written authorization from the Attorney General, or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General.

“(c) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF CLAIM THAT MAY BE PURSUED UNDER THIS SECTION.**—No action shall be initiated under this section, nor shall any assessment be imposed under this section, if the total amount of the claim determined by the responsible official to violate section 2752(a) of this title exceeds \$500,000. The \$500,000 threshold does not in-

clude penalties or any assessment permitted under section 2752(a) of this title greater than the amount of the claim determined by the responsible official to violate such section.

“(d) **PROCEDURES FOR RESOLVING CLAIMS.**—(1) Upon receiving approval under subsection (b) to initiate an action under this section, the responsible official shall mail, by registered or certified mail, or other similar commercial means, or shall deliver, a notice to the person alleged to be liable under section 2752 of this title. Such notice shall specify the allegations of liability against such person, specify the total amount of penalties and assessments sought by the United States, advise the person of the opportunity to submit facts and arguments in opposition to the allegations set forth in the notice, advise the person of the opportunity to submit offers of settlement or proposals of adjustment, and advise the person of the procedures of the agency governing the resolution of actions initiated under this section.

“(2) Within 30 days after receiving a notice under paragraph (1), or any additional period of time granted by the responsible official, the respondent may submit in person, in writing, or through a representative, facts and arguments in opposition to the allegations set forth in the notice, including any additional information that raises a genuine dispute of material fact.

“(3) If the respondent fails to respond within 30 days, or any additional time granted by the responsible official, the responsible official may issue a written decision disposing of the matters raised in the notice. Such decision shall be based on the record before the responsible official. If the responsible official concludes that the respondent is liable under section 2752 of this title, the decision shall include the findings of fact and conclusions of law which the responsible official relied upon in determining that the respondent is liable, and the amount of any penalty or assessment to be imposed on the respondent. Any such determination shall be based on a preponderance of the evidence. The responsible official shall promptly send to the respondent a copy of the decision by registered or certified mail, or other similar commercial means, or shall hand deliver a copy of the decision.

“(4) If the respondent makes a timely submission, and the responsible official determines that the respondent has not raised any genuine dispute of material fact, the responsible official may issue a written decision disposing of the matters raised in the notice. Such decision shall be based on the record before the responsible official. If the responsible official concludes that the respondent is liable under section 2752 of this title, the decision shall include the findings of fact and conclusions of law which the responsible official relied upon in determining that the respondent is liable, and the amount of any penalty or assessment to be imposed on the respondent. Any such determination shall be based on a preponderance of the evidence. The responsible official shall promptly send to the respondent a copy of the decision by registered or certified mail, or other similar commercial means, or shall hand deliver a copy of the decision.

“(5) If the respondent makes a timely submission, and the responsible official determines that the respondent has raised a genuine dispute of material fact, the responsible official shall commence a hearing to resolve the genuinely disputed material facts by mailing by registered or certified mail, or other similar commercial means, or by hand

delivery of, a notice informing the respondent of—

“(A) the time, place, and nature of the hearing;

“(B) the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held;

“(C) the material facts determined by the responsible official to be genuinely in dispute that will be the subject of the hearing; and

“(D) a description of the procedures for the conduct of the hearing.

“(6) The responsible official and any person against whom liability is asserted under this chapter may agree to a compromise or settle an action at any time. Any compromise or settlement must be in writing.

“(e) RESPONDENT ENTITLED TO COPY OF THE RECORD.—At any time after receiving a notice under paragraph (1) of subsection (d), the respondent shall be entitled to a copy of the entire record before the responsible official.

“(f) HEARINGS.—Any hearing commenced under this section shall be conducted by the responsible official, or a fact-finder designated by the responsible official, solely to resolve genuinely disputed material facts identified by the responsible official and set forth in the notice to the respondent.

“(g) PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS.—(1) Each hearing shall be conducted under procedures prescribed by the head of the agency. Such procedures shall include the following:

“(A) The provision of written notice of the hearing to the respondent, including written notice of—

“(i) the time, place, and nature of the hearing;

“(ii) the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held;

“(iii) the material facts determined by the responsible official to be genuinely in dispute that will be the subject of the hearing; and

“(iv) a description of the procedures for the conduct of the hearing.

“(B) The opportunity for the respondent to present facts and arguments through oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required to resolve any genuinely disputed material facts identified by the responsible official.

“(C) The opportunity for the respondent to be accompanied, represented, and advised by counsel or such other qualified representative as the head of the agency may specify in such procedures.

“(2) For the purpose of conducting hearings under this section, the responsible official is authorized to administer oaths or affirmations.

“(3) Hearings shall be held at the responsible official's office, or at such other place as may be agreed upon by the respondent and the responsible official.

“(h) DECISION FOLLOWING HEARING.—The responsible official shall issue a written decision within 60 days after the conclusion of the hearing. That decision shall set forth specific findings of fact resolving the genuinely disputed material facts that were the subject of the hearing. The written decision shall also dispose of the matters raised in the notice required under paragraph (1) of subsection (d). If the responsible official concludes that the respondent is liable under section 2752 of this title, the decision shall include the findings of fact and conclusions of law which the responsible official relied upon in determining that the respondent is liable, and the amount of any penalty or assessment to be imposed on the respondent.

Any decisions issued under this subsection shall be based on the record before the responsible official and shall be supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The responsible official shall promptly send to the respondent a copy of the decision by registered or certified mail, or other similar commercial means, or shall hand deliver a copy of the decision.

“§ 2754. Payment; interest on late payments

“(a) PAYMENT OF ASSESSMENTS AND PENALTIES.—A respondent shall render payment of any assessment and penalty imposed by a responsible official, or any amount otherwise agreed to as part of a settlement or adjustment, not later than the date—

“(1) that is 30 days after the date of the receipt by the respondent of the responsible official's decision; or

“(2) as otherwise agreed to by the respondent and the responsible official.

“(b) INTEREST.—If there is an unpaid balance as of the date determined under subsection (a), interest shall accrue from that date on any unpaid balance. The rate of interest charged shall be the rate in effect as of that date that is published by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 3717 of title 31.

“(c) TREATMENT OF RECEIPTS.—All penalties, assessments, or interest paid, collected, or otherwise recovered under this chapter shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as provided in section 3302 of title 31.

“§ 2755. Judicial review

“A decision by a responsible official under section 2753(d) or 2753(h) of this title shall be final. Any such final decision is subject to judicial review only under chapter 7 of title 5.

“§ 2756. Collection of civil penalties and assessments

“(a) JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF CIVIL PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS.—The Attorney General shall be responsible for judicial enforcement of any civil penalty or assessment imposed under this chapter.

“(b) CIVIL ACTIONS FOR RECOVERY.—Any penalty or assessment imposed in a decision by a responsible official, or amounts otherwise agreed to as part of a settlement or adjustment, along with any accrued interest, may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Attorney General. In any such action, no matter that was raised or that could have been raised in a proceeding under this chapter or pursuant to judicial review under section 2755 of this title may be raised as a defense, and the determination of liability and the determination of amounts of penalties and assessments shall not be subject to review.

“(c) JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of any action commenced by the United States under subsection (b).

“(d) JOINING AND CONSOLIDATING ACTIONS.—Any action under subsection (b) may, without regard to venue requirements, be joined and consolidated with or asserted as a counterclaim, cross-claim, or setoff by the United States in any other civil action which includes as parties the United States, and the person against whom such action may be brought.

“(e) JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—The United States Court of Federal Claims shall have jurisdiction of any action under subsection (b) to recover any penalty or assessment, or amounts otherwise agreed to as part of a settlement

or adjustment, along with any accrued interest, if the cause of action is asserted by the United States as a counterclaim in a matter pending in such court. The counterclaim need not relate to the subject matter of the underlying claim.

“§ 2757. Right to administrative offset

“The amount of any penalty or assessment that has been imposed by a responsible official, or any amount agreed upon in a settlement or compromise, along with any accrued interest, may be collected by administrative offset.

“§ 2758. Limitations

“(a) LIMITATION ON PERIOD FOR INITIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.—An action under section 2752 of this title with respect to a claim or statement shall be commenced within six years after the date on which such claim or statement is made, presented, or submitted.

“(b) LIMITATION PERIOD FOR INITIATION OF CIVIL ACTION FOR RECOVERY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY OR ASSESSMENT.—A civil action to recover a penalty or assessment under section 2756 of this title shall be commenced within three years after the date of the decision of the responsible official imposing the penalty or assessment.

“§ 2759. Effect on other laws

“(a) RELATIONSHIP TO TITLE 44 AUTHORITIES.—This chapter does not diminish the responsibility of the head of an agency to comply with the provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, relating to coordination of Federal information policy.

“(b) RELATIONSHIP TO TITLE 31 AUTHORITIES.—The procedures set forth in this chapter apply to the agencies named in section 2751(a) of this title in lieu of the procedures under chapter 38 of title 31, relating to administrative remedies for false claims and statements.

“(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Any action, inaction, or decision under this chapter shall be based solely upon the information before the responsible official and shall not limit or restrict any agency of the Government from instituting any other action arising outside this chapter, including suspension or debarment, based upon the same information. Any action, inaction, or decision under this chapter shall not restrict the ability of the Attorney General to bring judicial action, based upon the same information as long as such action is not otherwise prohibited by law.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part IV of subtitle A, of such title are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 163 the following new item:

“164. Administrative Remedies for False Claims and Statements 2751”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3801(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “(other than the Department of Defense)” after “executive department”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B);

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), and (F) as subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E), respectively; and

(4) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (3), by inserting “(other than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration)” after “not an executive department”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Chapter 164 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), and the amendments made by

subsection (c), shall apply to any claim or statement made, presented, or submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3708. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 557. ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS IN MILITARY JUSTICE REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide that the matters considered by the Military Justice Review Committee in its current comprehensive review of military justice reform shall include the following:

(1) A recommendation as to the feasibility and advisability of specifying separately as an offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), each of the following offenses that are currently encompassed by general article section 934 of title 10, United States Code (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice):

(A) Assault with intent to commit murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, robbery, forcible sodomy, arson, burglary, and house-breaking.

(B) Child endangerment.

(C) Child pornography.

(D) Negligent homicide.

(E) Kidnapping.

(F) Obstruction of justice.

(G) Pandering and prostitution.

(H) Subordination of perjury.

(I) Soliciting another to commit an offense.

(J) Any other offense currently encompassed by general article section 934 of title 10, United States Code that the Military Justice Review Committee considers appropriate.

(2) A recommendation as to the feasibility and advisability of terminating the authority of the Courts of Criminal Appeals to overturn a finding of guilt based on factual insufficiency, including an assessment of any efficiencies that could be achieved in the appellate process by the termination of such authority.

SA 3709. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 567. APPLICABILITY OF ELIMINATION OF FIVE-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL TO OFFENSES INVOLVING SEX-RELATED CRIMES TO CERTAIN OFFENSES COMMITTED BEFORE ELIMINATION OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

Section 1703(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 958; 10 U.S.C. 843 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 26, 2013”; and

(2) by striking “that is committed on or after that date.” and inserting “that is committed as follows:

“(1) On or after December 26, 2013.

“(2) Before December 26, 2013, but only if such offense was committed on such a date that the statute of limitations on such offense, as in effect on December 25, 2013, had not expired as of the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

SA 3710. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 827 and insert the following:

SEC. 827. PROHIBITION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF CONTRACTORS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Section 4304(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(17) Costs incurred by a contractor in connection with any congressional investigation or inquiry.”.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Section 2324(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) Costs incurred by a contractor in connection with a congressional investigation or inquiry into an issue that is the subject matter of a proceeding resulting in a disposition as described in subsection (k)(2).”.

SA 3711. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 830. EXTENSION OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) CONTRACTORS OF DoD AND RELATED AGENCIES.—Subsection (e) of section 2409 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(e) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND IN-

TELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—(1) Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) with respect to an element of the intelligence community or an activity of an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)

“(2) Any disclosure described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to a court shall be treated by the court in a manner consistent with the interests of the national security of the United States, including through the use of summaries or ex parte submissions if the element of the intelligence community awarding the contract or grant concerned advises the court that the national security interests of the United States warrant the use of such summaries or submissions.”.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM ON OTHER CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—Subsection (f) of section 4712 of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(f) DISCLOSURES WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) MANNER OF DISCLOSURES.—Any disclosure under this section by an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, or grantee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) with respect to an element of the intelligence community or an activity of an element of the intelligence community shall comply with applicable provisions of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) and section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)

“(2) TREATMENT BY COURTS.—Any disclosure described in paragraph (1) of information required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interests of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs that is made to a court shall be treated by the court in a manner consistent with the interests of the national security of the United States, including through the use of summaries or ex parte submissions if the element of the intelligence community awarding the contract or grant concerned advises the court that the national security interests of the United States warrant the use of such summaries or submissions.”.

SA 3712. Mrs. McCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 864. DEFENSE BASE ACT INSURANCE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF GOVERNMENT SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR INSURANCE UNDER DEFENSE BASE ACT.—Section 1 of the Defense Base Act (42 U.S.C. 1651) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) TRANSITION TO GOVERNMENT SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On the effective date of this subsection, the requirements in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) imposed on contractors to secure the payment of compensation and other benefits under the provisions of this Act and to maintain in full force and effect such security for the payment of such compensation and benefits shall, for injuries sustained after such effective date, be satisfied through the Government Defense Base Act self-insurance program.

“(2) GOVERNMENT DEFENSE BASE ACT SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘Government Defense Base Act self-insurance program’ means a self-insurance program developed in the implementation strategy required by section 864(b) of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and under which—

“(A) compensation and benefits for injuries sustained are satisfied directly by the Federal Government, without action of the contractor (or subcontractor or subordinate contractor with respect to such contractor); and

“(B) compensation and benefits are funded by the agencies whose contracts are affected.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date of this subsection is the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR GOVERNMENT DEFENSE BASE ACT SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly develop and execute an implementation strategy for a self-insurance program for insurance required by the Defense Base Act (42 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.).

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The implementation strategy required under paragraph (1) shall address and provide a plan for the following:

(A) Appropriate administration of the self-insurance program, including appropriate program financing.

(B) Appropriate procedures for claims processing, claims adjudication, and benefits delivery, taking into consideration the unique circumstances of insuring overseas contractors.

(C) A timeline and strategy to transfer existing claims covered under the Defense Base Act (42 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.) and the War Hazards Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) by private carriers to a Federal Government self-insurance program.

(D) Recommendations for any additional statutory revisions necessary to carry out the strategy.

(3) REPORT AND DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation strategy.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly prepare a report on the implementation of this section and the amendment made by this section.

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The report shall cover, at a minimum, the following with respect to the Government Defense Base Act self-insurance program (as defined in the amendment made by subsection (a)):

(A) The cost savings from the use of the self-insurance program.

(B) The quality of administration of the self-insurance program.

(C) Whether the delivery of benefits to injured employees and their survivors (in the case of death) has improved under the self-insurance program.

(D) Recommendations for improvement of the self-insurance program.

(E) Such other matters as the Secretaries consider appropriate.

(d) DEFINITION OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(1) The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SA 3713. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 737. EXTENSION OF QUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELORS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR PRACTICE IN CERTAIN AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the termination of effect of section 199.6(c)(3)(iii)(N)(2) of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on August 18, 2014), any mental health counselor who meets the qualifications for a TRICARE certified mental health counselor under the TRICARE program and possesses a master's or higher-level degree from a mental health counseling program of education and training from a regionally accredited institution shall continue to qualify as a TRICARE certified mental health counselor on and after January 1, 2017, or any earlier termination date for qualification as specified by the Secretary of Defense, for purposes of providing mental health care to beneficiaries of the TRICARE program in each of the following areas:

(1) Areas—

(A) that are 300 miles driving distance or more from an institution of higher education that offers a mental health counseling program of education and training accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs; or

(B) in which veterans in such area do not have access to such an institution via road.

(2) Areas outside the United States.

(b) TRICARE CERTIFIED MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “TRICARE certified mental health counselor” has the meaning given such term in section 199.6(c)(3)(iii)(N) of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on August 18, 2014.

SA 3714. Mr. BEGICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department

of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 603.

SA 3715. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1213. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel, as well the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security has made firm commitments to support the human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that “the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies”.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's July 2013 1230 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan (in this section, the “1230 Report”), the United States Government “recognizes that promoting security for Afghan women and girls must remain a top foreign policy priority”. The November 2013 1230 Report also highlights this priority and further states, “A major focus of DoD and others working to improve the conditions of women in Afghanistan is now to maintain the gains made in the last twelve years after the ISAF mission ends.”

(4) According to the November 1230 Report, female recruitment and retention rates for the Afghan National Security Forces fell short of the Ministry of Defense (MoD) and Ministry of the Interior (MoI) female recruitment goals. In regards to women serving in the ANP, the November 1230 report also states, “Low female recruitment is due in part to the MoI's passive female recruitment efforts, which has no specific female recruitment strategy or plan.”

(5) According to the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction (SIGAR) April 2014 report, despite more women showing an interest in joining the security forces, women still make up less than 1 percent of the ANA and AAF. Also, according to the SIGAR report, “As in prior quarters, the number of women in the ANP is increasing,

but progress has been slow toward reaching the goal to have 5,000 women in the ANP by the end of 2014. This quarter, ANP personnel included 1,743 women—226 officers, 728 NCOs, and 789 enlisted personnel—according to CSTC-A. This is an increase of 539 women since August 22, 2011.”

(6) According to Shaheen Chughtai, Oxfam’s deputy head of policy and campaigns, “This lack of policewomen, and effective policewomen, is one of the main reasons why violence and threats against women and girls in Afghanistan are under-reported. It’s why prosecutions are so rare and it’s why the culture of impunity continues.”

(7) According to the Afghan Ministry of Women’s Affairs report released in January 2014, of 4,505 cases of violence against women in 2013, which include issues such as forced marriage, fewer than 10 percent were resolved through the legal process.

(8) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that “in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse.”

(9) FRUs are a core component of strategies for how to both strengthen the roles of women in the police force and ensure attention to crimes of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). However, FRUs have been under-resourced and under-utilized, making it difficult for them to fulfill their mandate.

(10) The Government of Afghanistan, with support from United States-led coalition forces, recruited, trained, and contracted over 13,000 female searchers for the 2014 presidential election thereby ensuring many women-only polling centers would be operational on election day.

(11) The Presidential election on April 5, 2014, saw unprecedented levels of female voter participation. According to the SIGAR quarterly report published on April 30, 2014, approximately 35 percent of those votes were cast by women.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the United States Government’s national security interests to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women’s concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations, such as the upcoming NATO summit and the Afghanistan Development Conference of 2014 in London;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women’s organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013; and

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to

recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO’s Resolute Support Mission.

(c) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1227—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the authority under section 1531 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 937), as extended by section 1523 of this Act, for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) TRAINING.—The Secretary of Defense, working with the International Security Force (ISAF) and NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A), should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) an evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police’s Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(iv) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for female recruits and male counterparts.

(D) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The \$25,000,000 allocated from the Afghan Security Forces Fund pursuant to section 1523(b) for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF, may be available for activities, including the provision of—

(i) appropriate equipment for female security and police forces;

(ii) modification and refurbishment of facilities to support the recruitment and retention of women within the forces;

(iii) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers;

(iv) mechanisms to address sexual harassment within the forces;

(v) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(vi) training to include literacy training for women recruits as well as gender awareness training for male counterparts.

(3) STAFFING AT POLLING STATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense should assist the Afghan MOD and MOI in maintaining the female searcher capabilities that were established for the April 2014 presidential elections, for the 2015 parliamentary elections, which may include—

(A) providing assistance in the development of a recruitment and training program for female searchers and security officers to staff voting stations during the 2015 parliamentary elections;

(B) working with the Ministry of Interior to ensure that female ANP officers and previously recruited searchers’ training is maintained and that those searchers already recruited and trained are reassigned to provide security for polling stations; and

(C) allotting the appropriate amount of funds from the funds allocated to the Afghan Security Forces Fund to hire any additional temporary female personnel required to staff polling stations.

SA 3716. Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on 16, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 23, line 10, and insert the following:

CHAPTER 2—FLAME ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 2201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) over the past 2 decades, wildfires have increased dramatically in size and costs;

(2) existing budget mechanisms for estimating the costs of wildfire suppression are not keeping pace with the actual costs for wildfire suppression due in part to improper budget estimation methodology;

(3) the FLAME Funds have not been adequate in supplementing wildland fire management funds in cases in which wildland fire management accounts are exhausted; and

(4) the practice of transferring funds from other agency funds (including the hazardous fuels treatment accounts) by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to pay for wildfire suppression activities, commonly known as “fire-borrowing”, does not support the missions of the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior with respect to protecting human life and property from the threat of wildfires.

SEC. 2202. FLAME ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 502(d) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “shall consist of” and all that follows through “appropriated to” in

subparagraph (A) and inserting “shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to”; and

- (B) by striking subparagraph (B); and
- (2) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5).

(b) USE OF FLAME FUND.—Section 502(e) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(e)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to a FLAME Fund, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902(b)(2)(E)), shall be available to the Secretary concerned for wildfire suppression operations if the Secretary concerned issues a declaration and notifies the relevant congressional committees that a wildfire suppression event is eligible for funding from the FLAME Fund.

“(2) DECLARATION CRITERIA.—A declaration by the Secretary concerned under paragraph (1) may be issued only if—

“(A) an individual wildfire incident meets the objective indicators of an extraordinary wildfire situation, including—

“(i) a wildfire that the Secretary concerned determines has required an emergency Federal response based on the significant complexity, severity, or threat posed by the fire to human life, property, or a resource;

“(ii) a wildfire that covers 1,000 or more acres; or

“(iii) a wildfire that is within 10 miles of an urbanized area (as defined in section 134(b) of title 23, United States Code); or

“(B) the cumulative costs of wildfire suppression and Federal emergency response activities, as determined by the Secretary concerned, would exceed, within 30 days, all of the amounts otherwise previously appropriated (including amounts appropriated under an emergency designation, but excluding amounts appropriated to the FLAME Fund) to the Secretary concerned for wildfire suppression and Federal emergency response.”.

(c) TREATMENT OF ANTICIPATED AND PREDICTED ACTIVITIES.—Section 502(f) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(f)) is amended by striking “(e)(2)(B)(i)” and inserting “(e)(2)(A)”.

(d) PROHIBITION ON OTHER TRANSFERS.—Section 502 of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) PROHIBITION ON OTHER TRANSFERS.—The Secretary concerned shall not transfer funds provided for activities other than wildfire suppression operations to pay for any wildfire suppression operations.”.

(e) ACCOUNTING AND REPORTS.—Section 502(h) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(h)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) ESTIMATES OF WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS COSTS TO IMPROVE BUDGETING AND FUNDING.—

“(A) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—Consistent with section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall include in each budget for the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior information on estimates of appropriations for wildfire suppression costs based on an out-year forecast that uses a statistically valid regression model.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The estimate of anticipated wildfire suppression costs under subparagraph (A) shall be developed using the best available—

“(i) climate, weather, and other relevant data; and

“(ii) models and other analytic tools.

“(C) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—The methodology for developing the estimates of wildfire suppression costs under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to periodic independent review to ensure compliance with subparagraph (B).

“(D) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the schedule described in clause (ii) and in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary concerned shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives an updated estimate of wildfire suppression costs for the applicable fiscal year.

“(ii) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary concerned shall submit the updated estimates under clause (i) during—

“(I) March of each year;

“(II) May of each year;

“(III) July of each year; and

“(IV) if a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service for the following fiscal year has not been enacted by September 1, September of each year.

“(3) REPORTS.—Annually, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that—

“(A) provides a summary of the amount of appropriations made available during the previous fiscal year, which specifies the source of the amounts and the commitments and obligations made under this section;

“(B) describes the amounts obligated to individual wildfire events that meet the criteria specified in subsection (e)(2); and

“(C) includes any recommendations that the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior may have to improve the administrative control and oversight of the FLAME Fund.”.

SEC. 2203. WILDFIRE DISASTER FUNDING AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION.—

“(i)(I) The adjustments for a fiscal year shall be in accordance with clause (ii) if—

“(aa) a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that—

“(AA) specifies an amount for wildfire suppression operations in the Wildland Fire Management accounts at the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior; and

“(BB) specifies a total amount to be used for the purposes described in subclause (II) in the Wildland Fire Management accounts at the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior that is not less than 50 percent of the amount described in subitem (AA); and

“(bb) as of the day before the date of enactment of the bill or joint resolution all amounts in the FLAME Fund established under section 502 of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a) have been expended.

“(II) The purposes described in this subclause are—

“(aa) hazardous fuels reduction projects and other activities of the Secretary of the Interior, as authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C.

6501 et seq.) and the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a); and

“(bb) forest restoration and fuel reduction activities carried out outside of the wildland urban interface that are on condition class 3 Federal land or condition class 2 Federal land located within fire regime I, fire regime II, or fire regime III.

“(ii) If the requirements under clause (i)(I) are met for a fiscal year, the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in the bill or joint resolution described in clause (i)(I)(aa) for wildfire suppression operations for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed \$1,000,000,000 in additional new budget authority in each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.

“(iii) As used in this subparagraph—

“(I) the term ‘additional new budget authority’ means the amount provided for a fiscal year in an appropriation Act and specified to pay for the costs of wildfire suppression operations that is equal to the greater of the amount in excess of—

“(aa) 100 percent of the average costs for wildfire suppression operations over the previous 5 years; or

“(bb) the estimated amount of anticipated wildfire suppression costs at the upper bound of the 90 percent confidence interval for that fiscal year calculated in accordance with section 502(h)(3) of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a(h)(3)); and

“(II) the term ‘wildfire suppression operations’ means the emergency and unpredictable aspects of wildland firefighting including support, response, and emergency stabilization activities; other emergency management activities; and funds necessary to repay any transfers needed for these costs.

“(iv) The average costs for wildfire suppression operations over the previous 5 years shall be calculated annually and reported in the President’s Budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year.”.

(b) DISASTER FUNDING.—Section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “and” and inserting “plus”; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; less”; and

(C) by adding the following:

“(III) the additional new budget authority provided in an appropriation Act for wildfire suppression operations pursuant to subparagraph (E) for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) Beginning in fiscal year 2016 and in subsequent fiscal years, the calculation of the ‘average funding provided for disaster relief over the previous 10 years’ shall not include the additional new budget authority provided in an appropriation Act for wildfire suppression operations pursuant to subparagraph (E).”.

CHAPTER 3—FOREST TREATMENT PROJECTS

SEC. 2301. DEFINITIONS.

In this chapter:

(1) COVERED PROJECT.—The term “covered project” means a project that involves the management or sale of national forest material within a Forest Management Emphasis Area.

(2) FOREST MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Forest Management Emphasis Area” means National Forest System land identified as suitable for timber production in a forest management

plan in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “Forest Management Emphasis Area” does not include National Forest System land—

(i) that is a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(ii) on which removal of vegetation is specifically prohibited by Federal law.

(3) **NATIONAL FOREST MATERIAL.**—The term “national forest material” means trees, portions of trees, or forest products, with an emphasis on sawtimber and pulpwood, derived from National Forest System land.

(4) **NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given the term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “National Forest System” does not include—

(i) the national grasslands and land utilization projects administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.); or

(ii) National Forest System land east of the 100th meridian.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2302. PROJECTS IN FOREST MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS AREAS.

(a) **CONDUCT OF COVERED PROJECTS WITHIN FOREST MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS AREAS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct covered projects in Forest Management Emphasis Areas, subject to paragraphs (2) through (4).

(2) **DESIGNATING TIMBER FOR CUTTING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 14(g) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(g)), the Secretary may use designation by prescription or designation by description in conducting covered projects under this chapter.

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—The designation methods authorized under subparagraph (A) shall be used in a manner that ensures that the quantity of national forest material that is removed from the Forest Management Emphasis Area is verifiable and accountable.

(3) **CONTRACTING METHODS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Timber sale contracts under section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall be the primary means of carrying out covered projects under this chapter.

(B) **RECORD.**—If the Secretary does not use a timber sale contract under section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) to carry out a covered project under this chapter, the Secretary shall provide a written record specifying the reasons that different contracting methods were used.

(4) **ACREAGE TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **TOTAL ACREAGE REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall identify, prioritize, and carry out covered projects in Forest Management Emphasis Areas that mechanically treat a total of at least 7,500,000 acres in the Forest Management Emphasis Areas during the 15-year period beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary assigns the acreage treatment requirements under subparagraph (B).

(B) **ASSIGNMENT OF ACREAGE TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL UNITS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and subject to clause (ii), the Secretary, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, shall assign the acreage treatment requirements that

shall apply to the Forest Management Emphasis Areas of each unit of the National Forest System.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding clause (i), the acreage treatment requirements assigned to a specific unit of the National Forest System under that clause may not apply to more than 25 percent of the acreage to be treated in any unit of the National Forest System in a Forest Management Emphasis Area during the 15-year period described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS FOR COVERED PROJECTS IN FOREST MANAGEMENT EMPHASIS AREAS.**—

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary shall comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) by completing an environmental assessment that assesses the direct environmental effects of each covered project proposed to be conducted within a Forest Management Emphasis Area, except that the Secretary shall not be required to study, develop, or describe more than the proposed agency action and 1 alternative to the proposed agency action for purposes of that Act.

(2) **PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.**—In preparing an environmental assessment for a covered project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide—

(A) public notice of the covered project; and

(B) an opportunity for public comment on the covered project.

(3) **LENGTH.**—The environmental assessment prepared for a covered project under paragraph (1) shall not exceed 100 pages in length.

(4) **INCLUSION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.**—The Secretary may incorporate, by reference, into an environmental assessment any documents that the Secretary, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, determines are relevant to the assessment of the environmental effects of the covered project.

(5) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary has published notice of a covered project in accordance with paragraph (2), the Secretary shall complete the environmental assessment for the covered project.

(c) **COMPLIANCE WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.**—To comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Secretary shall use qualified professionals on the staff of the Forest Service to make determinations required under section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1536).

(d) **LIMITATION ON REVISION OF NATIONAL FOREST PLANS.**—The Secretary may not, during a revision of a forest plan under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604), reduce the acres designated as suitable for timber harvest under a covered project, unless the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, that the reduction in acreage is necessary to prevent a jeopardy finding under section 7(b) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(b)).

SEC. 2303. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW; ARBITRATION.

(a) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—Administrative review of a covered project shall occur only in accordance with the special administrative review process established by section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515).

(b) **ARBITRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the Department of Agriculture a pilot program that—

(A) authorizes the use of arbitration instead of judicial review of a decision made following the special administrative review process for a covered project described in subsection (a); and

(B) shall be the sole means to challenge a covered project in a Forest Management Emphasis Area during the 15-year period beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary assigns the acreage treatment requirements under section 202(a)(4)(B).

(2) **ARBITRATION PROCESS PROCEDURES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person who sought administrative review for a covered project in accordance with subsection (a) and who is not satisfied with the decision made under the administrative review process may file a demand for arbitration in accordance with—

(i) chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code; and

(ii) this paragraph.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS FOR DEMAND.**—A demand for arbitration under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) be filed not more than 30 days after the date on which the special administrative review decision is issued under subsection (a); and

(ii) include a proposal containing the modifications sought to the covered project.

(C) **INTERVENING PARTIES.**—

(i) **DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION; REQUIREMENTS.**—Any person that submitted a public comment on the covered project subject to the demand for arbitration may intervene in the arbitration under this subsection by submitting a proposal endorsing or modifying the covered project by the date that is 30 days after the date on which the demand for arbitration is filed under subparagraph (A).

(ii) **MULTIPLE PARTIES.**—Multiple objectors or intervening parties that meet the requirements of clause (i) may submit a joint proposal under that clause.

(D) **APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATOR.**—The United States District Court in the district in which a covered project subject to a demand for arbitration filed under subparagraph (A) is located shall appoint an arbitrator to conduct the arbitration proceedings in accordance with this subsection.

(E) **SELECTION OF PROPOSALS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An arbitrator appointed under subparagraph (D)—

(I) may not modify any of the proposals submitted under this paragraph; and

(II) shall select to be conducted—

(aa) a proposal submitted by an objector under subparagraph (B)(ii) or an intervening party under subparagraph (C); or

(bb) the covered project, as approved by the Secretary.

(ii) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—An arbitrator shall select the proposal that best meets the purpose and needs described in the environmental assessment conducted under section 202(b)(1) for the covered project.

(iii) **EFFECT.**—The decision of an arbitrator with respect to a selection under clause (i)(II)—

(I) shall not be considered a major Federal action;

(II) shall be binding; and

(III) shall not be subject to judicial review.

(F) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a demand for arbitration is filed under subparagraph (A), the arbitration process shall be completed.

SEC. 2304. DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE.

(a) **PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter until the

termination date under section 206, the Secretary shall provide to each county in which a covered project is carried out annual payments in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amounts received for the applicable fiscal year by the Secretary from the covered project.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—A payment made under paragraph (1) shall be in addition to any payments the county receives under the payment to States required by the sixth paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

(b) **DEPOSIT IN KNUTSON-VANDENBERG AND SALVAGE SALE FUNDS.**—After compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall use amounts received by the Secretary from covered projects during each of the fiscal years during the period described in subsection (a) to make deposits into the fund established under section 3 of the Act of June 9, 1930 (commonly known as the “Knutson-Vandenberg Act”) (16 U.S.C. 576b), and the fund established under section 14(h) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a(h)) in contributions equal to the amounts otherwise collected under those Acts for projects conducted on National Forest System land.

(c) **DEPOSIT IN GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY.**—After compliance with subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall deposit into the general fund of the Treasury any remaining amounts received by the Secretary for each of the fiscal years referred to in those subsections from covered projects.

SEC. 2305. PERFORMANCE MEASURES; REPORTING.

(a) **PERFORMANCE MEASURES.**—The Secretary shall develop performance measures that evaluate the degree to which the Secretary is achieving—

(1) the purposes of this chapter; and
(2) the minimum acreage requirements established under section 2302(a)(4).

(b) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Annually, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives—

(1) a report that describes the results of evaluations using the performance measures developed under subsection (a); and
(2) a report that describes—

(A) the number and substance of the covered projects that are subject to administrative review and arbitration under section 2303; and
(B) the outcomes of the administrative review and arbitration under that section.

SEC. 2306. TERMINATION.

The authority of this chapter terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

CHAPTER 4—FOREST STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTING

SEC. 2401. CANCELLATION CEILINGS.

Section 604(d) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and
(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **CANCELLATION CEILINGS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief and the Director may obligate funds to cover any potential cancellation or termination costs for an agreement or contract under subsection (b) in stages that are economically or programatically viable.

“(B) **NOTICE.**—

“(1) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days before entering into a multiyear agreement or contract under subsection (b) that includes a cancellation ceiling in excess of \$25,000,000, but does not include proposed funding for the costs of cancelling the agreement or contract up to the cancellation ceiling established in the agreement or contract, the Chief and the Director shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a written notice that includes—

“(I)(aa) the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed for each program year in the agreement or contract; and

“(bb) the reasons for the cancellation ceiling amounts proposed under item (aa);

“(II) the extent to which the costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the agreement or contract; and

“(III) a financial risk assessment of not including budgeting for the costs of agreement or contract cancellation.

“(ii) **TRANSMITTAL TO OMB.**—At least 14 days before the date on which the Chief and Director enter into an agreement or contract under subsection (b), the Chief and Director shall transmit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a copy of the written notice submitted under clause (i).”.

SA 3717. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. REPLACEMENT OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF SERVING AT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, every supervisory position at a United States diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation shall be occupied by a citizen of the United States who has passed, and shall be subject to, a thorough background check.

(2) **EXTENSION.**—The Secretary of State may extend the deadline under paragraph (1) for up to one year by providing advance written notification and justification of such extension to the appropriate congressional committees.

(3) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on progress made toward meeting the employment requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) **PLAN FOR REDUCED USE OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with other appropriate government agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to further reduce the reliance on Locally Employed Staff in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation. The plan shall, at a minimum, include cost estimates, timelines, and numbers of employees to be replaced.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 3718. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. INCLUSION OF RESTRICTED ACCESS SPACES IN UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND ADJACENT COUNTRIES.

(a) **RESTRICTED ACCESS SPACE REQUIREMENT.**—Each United States diplomatic facility that, after the date of the enactment of this Act, is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation, any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation, or any country that is a former member of the Soviet Union shall be constructed to include a restricted access space.

(b) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—The Secretary of State may waive the requirement under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States and submits a written justification to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days before exercising such waiver.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 3719. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may expend funds or resources made available under this Act or any other Act to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as announced by Executive memorandum on June 15, 2012, or any successor memorandum.

SA 3720. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr.

LEE, Mr. JOHANNIS, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 1503. No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources—

(1) to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as authorized by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012, or by any other succeeding executive memorandum authorizing a similar program; or

(2) to issue a new work authorization to any alien who—

(A) was not lawfully admitted into the United States in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

(B) is not in lawful status in the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3721. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1647. PLAN FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION ON CYBER MATTERS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the continuing education of officers and enlisted members of the Armed Forces relating to cyber security and cyber activities of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A framework for provision of basic cyber threat education for all members of the Armed Forces.

(2) A framework for postgraduate education, joint professional military education, and strategic war gaming for cyber strategic and operational leadership.

(3) Definitions of required positions, including military occupational specialties and rating specialties for each military department, along with the corresponding level of cyber training, education, qualifications, or certifications required for each specialty.

SA 3722. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE OF DIVISION.

This division may be cited as the “Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “the date that is 5 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

“(K) the amendment made by section 2(a) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014;”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this division.

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “the date that is 5 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “June 30, 2014” and inserting “the date that is 11 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.**—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2014” and inserting “the date that is 11 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.**—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date that is 5 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “the date that is 5 months after the date of the enactment of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this division.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4004(c)(2)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Pub-

lic Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “through fiscal year 2014” and inserting “through fiscal year 2015”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

(b) **TIMING FOR SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4001(i)(1)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence:

“At a minimum, such reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities shall be provided to an individual within a time period (determined appropriate by the Secretary) after the date the individual begins to receive amounts under section 4002(b) (first tier benefits) and, if applicable, again within a time period (determined appropriate by the Secretary) after the date the individual begins to receive amounts under section 4002(d) (third tier benefits).”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply on and after the date of the enactment of this division.

(c) **PURPOSES OF SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.**—The purposes of the reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities under section 4001(i) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) are—

(1) to better link the unemployed with the overall workforce system by bringing individuals receiving unemployment insurance benefits in for personalized assessments and referrals to reemployment services; and

(2) to provide individuals receiving unemployment insurance benefits with early access to specific strategies that can help get them back into the workforce faster, including through—

(A) the development of a reemployment plan;

(B) the provision of access to relevant labor market information;

(C) the provision of access to information about industry-recognized credentials that are regionally relevant or nationally portable;

(D) the provision of referrals to reemployment services and training; and

(E) an assessment of the individual’s ongoing eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(A) by striking “June 30, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2014”; and

(B) by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this division.

(b) **CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.**—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover

the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this division.

(c) **FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Railroad Retirement Board \$250,000 for administrative expenses associated with the payment of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before June 30, 2014, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this division.

(b) **PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.**—Nothing in title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this division if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

SEC. 7. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used for payments of unemployment compensation under the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) to an individual whose adjusted gross income in the preceding year was equal to or greater than \$1,000,000.

(b) **COMPLIANCE.**—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify the individual's adjusted gross income was not equal to or greater than \$1,000,000 in the preceding year.

(c) **AUDITS.**—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the U.S. Department of Labor or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) **STATUS OF APPLICANTS.**—It is the duty of the States to verify the residency, employment, legal, and income status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining whether or not the prohibition under subsection (a) applies with respect to an individual.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this division.

SEC. 8. GAO STUDY ON THE USE OF WORK SUITABILITY REQUIREMENTS IN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the use of work suitability requirements to strengthen requirements to ensure that unemployment insurance benefits are being provided to individuals who are actively

looking for work and who truly want to return to the labor force. Such study shall include an analysis of—

(1) how work suitability requirements work under both State and Federal unemployment insurance programs; and

(2) how to incorporate and improve such requirements under Federal unemployment insurance programs; and

(3) other items determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(b) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this division, the Comptroller General of the United States shall brief Congress on the ongoing study required under subsection (a). Such briefing shall include preliminary recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

SEC. 9. DESIGNATION OF AMOUNTS.

Amounts made available in this division are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 4101 of this Act shall apply to such amounts.

SEC. 10. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) **PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this division shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.**—The budgetary effects of this division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, "Cramming on Wireless Phone Bills: A Review of Consumer Protection Practices and Gaps."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 2 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The African Growth and Opportunity Act at 14: The Road Ahead."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Paid Family Leave: The Benefits for Businesses and Working Families."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "When Catastrophe Strikes: Responses to Natural Disasters in Indian Country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "VAWA Next Steps: Protecting Women from Gun Violence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 30, 2014, at 2:15 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Pricing Policies and Competition in the Contact Lens Industry: Is What You See What You Get?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION,
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 30, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "The Flood Insurance Claims Process in Communities After Sandy: Lessons Learned and Potential Improvements."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS,
AND MINING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2014, in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Admitted or Not? The Impact of Medicare Observation Status on Seniors."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Akunna Cook be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of the Bring Jobs Home Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Joshua Wolff,

a fellow with the Health, Education, Labor and Pension Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session and that Aly Boyce and Kate Kollars, interns with the committee, also be granted floor privileges for today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 2709

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2709, introduced earlier today by Senator MANCHIN, is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2709) to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASEY. I now ask for a second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 31,
2014

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 31, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2648, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, postcloture, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided

between the two leaders or their designees, with Senator SESSIONS controlling the time from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m., and the majority controlling the time from 11 a.m. to 12 noon; and finally, that the time during the adjournment count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, Senators will be notified when any votes are scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:26 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 31, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CYNTHIA H. AKUETTEH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE GABONESE REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS
AUTHORITY

RICHARD A. KENNEDY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 30, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

ERIKA LIZABETH MORITSUGU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 30, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 30, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the stroke of a pen 49 years ago today, several weeks after I finished high school, then-President Lyndon Johnson signed into law two of the largest and most important health-related programs the country had ever seen, Medicare and Medicaid. Those programs were created nearly half a century ago because our Nation's leaders saw, time and time again, the hopelessness of people who had no way to provide the most basic level of health care for themselves and their families.

It was President Harry Truman who initially conceived of a health care safety net for struggling Americans. Nearly 70 years ago, Truman said: "Millions of our citizens do not now enjoy good health. Millions do not have security against the economic effects of sickness . . . and the time has arrived for action to help them get that protection."

Since the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, no achievement has been as

significant and consequential as the Affordable Care Act. In addition to providing affordable health insurance, to some for the first time ever, the ACA has also provided for significant expansion of states' Medicaid programs so that individuals with incomes less than 138 percent of the poverty level could finally have access to basic care.

A Supreme Court case would make Medicaid expansion voluntary. Now, nearly half a century after Medicaid was created to help the least among us, 24 States in this country, 24 States believe it best to disenfranchise millions and deny them access to Federal dollars they rightfully deserve by not expanding their programs.

States that have refused to expand point to the increased costs as a main reason for their decision. But, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has committed to pay 100 percent—that is, 100 percent of the cost of expansion—for the first 3 years and then 90 percent beyond the first 3. Nationally, the States would see only a 1.6 percent increase in their share of Medicaid spending, a 1.6 percent increase to provide health care for millions of deserving individuals.

The benefits of expansion far outweigh the costs. In my home State of North Carolina alone, expanding Medicaid will save the State more than \$65 million over the next 8 years and would benefit its economy by adding nearly \$1.5 billion to the State's revenue. It would not only help to save jobs, but help to create them, too. That is just in North Carolina. And this same scenario is playing out in nearly half of all the States in our country.

The cost of not expanding is simply too great. Pungo Hospital, located just outside of my congressional district in Belhaven, has closed its doors, closed its doors because North Carolina refuses to expand Medicaid.

The decision by Governor Pat McCrory and the Republican-led State legislature has cost a woman her life. Portia Gibbs was 48 years old. She had a heart attack and died on her way to the nearest open hospital, which was an hour away.

Providing care to the sick and injured is a moral imperative that Harry Truman saw nearly 70 years ago when he first spoke about it. Congress and President Lyndon Johnson believed caring for the least among us was a moral necessity when Medicare and Medicaid were passed and signed into law.

At the signing ceremony 49 years ago, former President Harry Truman

said of the people that would benefit from Medicare and Medicaid: "These people are our proudest responsibility, and they are entitled, among other benefits, to the best medical protection available. We don't want them to have any idea of hopeless despair." That was President Harry Truman.

In response to Truman, President Lyndon Johnson said improving the health of all Americans "calls upon us never to be indifferent to despair. It commands us never to turn away from helplessness. It directs us never to ignore or to spurn those who suffer untended in a land that is bursting with abundance."

Those elected officials standing in the way of Medicaid expansion should simply reflect on President Johnson's words. In a country that has come so far—so far—Americans who struggle financially deserve better than that. They deserve better than to have their elected officials tell them that their worth in this world is tied to their ability to afford health insurance.

ISRAEL HAS THE RIGHT TO DEFEND ITSELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak strongly and unequivocally in support of Israel's right to self-defense, the same right to self-defense we would assert if America were attacked and Americans killed by rockets and other weaponry.

Israel launched Operation Protective Edge in response to relentless and unprovoked rocket attacks launched from Gaza by Hamas, a brutally ruthless terrorist organization. In just the last 3 weeks, more than 2,500 rockets have rained down on Israel, and the targets of these rockets are not military but civilian.

2,500 rockets fired at any country is a lot. It is an act of war that triggers self-defense military responses. But 2,500 rockets fired at a country as small as Israel is even worse. To put the size of Israel in perspective, Israel is smaller than the Tennessee Valley of north Alabama that I represent. If anyone dared to fire even a single rocket at the people of the Fifth District of Alabama, much less if 2,500 rockets rained down on the Tennessee Valley, you can be darn sure that we would demand an overwhelming military response.

In Israel, Hamas fires at communities, at schools, at daycare centers,

all with the same goal: to invoke terror by injuring and killing as many innocent Israeli citizens as possible.

Fully 80 percent of the Israeli population is living under the constant threat of missile attacks, having to run into the shelters constantly at a moment's notice, in the middle of the night, at all times of the day with mere seconds of warning. No country on Earth would tolerate such a situation.

So that we are clear, Hamas consistently places and fires its rockets within heavily populated areas, including schools and hospitals. Hamas does this to use their own civilian population as human shields. This means that every time they fire a rocket, they are committing not one, but two, war crimes: targeting civilians in Israel while using human shields in Gaza.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said it very well in describing the juxtaposition of Hamas firing from civilian areas in the hope of drawing fire and the use by Israel of the Iron Dome missile defense system: "We use missiles to protect our people. Hamas uses their civilians to protect their missiles."

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not emphasize how truly miraculous the Iron Dome missile and mortar defense system is. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet.

I thank the Tennessee Valley's incomparable defense workers who, working hand-in-hand with very bright Israeli engineers and scientists, made hitting a bullet with a bullet possible. Untold Israeli citizens' lives have been saved as a result of the Tennessee Valley's technological contributions to Israel and the Iron Dome defense system.

Since the beginning of Operation Protective Edge, Israel has discovered more than 30 offensive Hamas terrorist tunnels dug from Gaza under the border and into Israel. These tunnels have 60 different access points, and the entrances have been found in houses and mosques.

The purpose of the tunnels is to allow armed Hamas terrorists to emerge in Israeli communities to murder and kidnap civilians—defenseless mothers, fathers, and children, it makes no difference to Hamas. Hamas kidnaps, tortures, and murders, and seemingly enjoys it.

Israel's only solution, the only path to peace in the face of those who kill in the name of religion, is Israel's disarming of Hamas and the demilitarization of Gaza.

Israel is the only democracy in the tumultuous and dangerous Middle East. Israel is unquestionably America's most reliable ally in the Middle East. The people of Israel are engaged in a fight to protect their home, a fight for survival, and America must stand with Israel without hesitation.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the most fundamental right in any democracy since it is the right from which all others meaningfully derive.

Deny someone the right to vote, and you may deny them the right to speak, to associate with whom they choose, or to freely exercise their faith. For if these other rights are infringed, how may we seek redress but at the ballot box?

Not even the courts can secure our rights in the absence of an effective franchise. Congress established the inferior courts, and Congress may abolish them. The right to vote alone is foundational to all of the others.

So it is deeply disturbing to see the right to vote being diminished in many States. These new State laws restrict voter registration drives, eliminate same-day voter registration, reduce the early voting period, and require photo identification and proof of citizenship to vote.

In total, 34 States have passed laws now requiring voters to show some kind of identification at the polls. For many Americans who already are registered to vote and can provide this documentation, these new requirements may not sound burdensome. But although these new laws apply to all Americans, they disproportionately impact young, elderly, minority, low-income, and disabled voters.

Eleven percent of American citizens do not have a photo ID; 7 percent do not have citizenship documents. That means a significant number of eligible voters have been disenfranchised by these new laws.

It has been argued that it is appropriate to put a significant burden on people who simply want to cast their vote because voter fraud is widespread, but it is not. It is true that in jurisdictions which allow people to pay a bounty for new voter registration cards that voter registration fraud exists. But voter registration fraud is not the same as voter fraud, since these false registrations do not result in non-existent people voting.

The fraud artists should be prosecuted for violating the law and cluttering up the voter registration rolls, but legitimate voters should not be disenfranchised. Rather, we should crack down on the bounty system that incentivizes this kind of misconduct.

These new and stringent voter ID laws will not stop voter registration fraud, but they will prevent legitimate voters from casting their ballots. Indeed, in many places, this is their very intention. They are the worst form of voter suppression, not voter protection.

The backward movement on voting rights is not confined to the States. The Supreme Court has also made it more difficult to ensure adequate protection from disenfranchisement.

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act required that nine States and many other counties and municipalities around the country with histories of voter discrimination obtain Federal preclearance before changing voter laws. However, the Supreme Court, in *Shelby County v. Holder*, ruled that the formula to determine which jurisdictions must get preclearance is out-of-date.

Immediately thereafter, Texas announced that a previously blocked voter identification law would go into effect and that redistricting maps would no longer need Federal approval, actions that could severely undermine minority voting rights in that State.

□ 1015

In January, the Voting Rights Amendment Act was introduced to restore and strengthen the protections of the VRA that were dismantled by the Supreme Court. This bill was introduced by Congressman JOHN CONYERS and Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER, demonstrating the bipartisan support for restoring a crowning achievement of the civil rights movement. I am a strong supporter of the Voting Rights Amendment Act, and I am encouraged that Members of both parties see the need for this legislation.

As a country, we have made incredible progress in expanding the right to vote to previously disenfranchised populations. Now is not the time to turn the clock back. We should, instead, be moving forward, ever forward, and encouraging legal, eligible voters to fully participate in their government, in democracy, and in voting—not working to exclude them.

Congress must commit to passing the Voting Rights Amendment Act and ensuring that the ballot boxes in our States, in our Nation, and in our democracy remain open to all.

CENTRAL ALABAMA VETERANS HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with this Congress and with this Nation a story of mismanagement, malfeasance, negligence, and coverup at the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System, or CAVHCS.

I know most of my colleagues can point to at least some problems at the VA systems in their State. But what has transpired in my hometown of Montgomery, Alabama, and central Alabama rises to a level of misconduct and mistrust I am not sure many other systems can match. And I do this not

simply just to disparage the system for no reason. I do this to shine a light on some truly disturbing practices so we can finally clean up the mess. I do this so that the 50,000-plus veterans that depend on the Central Alabama VA can one day have confidence in the health care system we promised them.

After Phoenix, when the scheduling scheme began to unravel, it was revealed in early June that the Central Alabama VA had one of the worst wait times in the country. It was particularly bad for mental health patients.

I actually met with our local VA director, who acknowledged the discrepancies and tried to reassure me by leading me to believe that action had been taken to remove those responsible. It turns out that wasn't true. No one was fired. Mr. Speaker, if a Member of Congress can't get a straight answer from the VA, imagine what our veterans go through every single day.

In the wake of this clear breach of trust, we began digging deeper to find out what was really going on at the Central Alabama VA. The information that we received from sources who came forward was alarming. It is also consistent with reports gathered by independent inspectors and some great investigative reporters.

Here is what is being uncovered:

A Montgomery VA pulmonologist manipulated more than 1,200 patient records to show tests that never occurred. After being caught, the doctor was never fired or suspended. He actually was caught manipulating records again but somehow went on to receive a "satisfactory" performance review;

At least 900 unread patient X-ray tests, many showing malignancies, were lost over a 5-year period. When the tests were discovered recently, top hospital administrators tried to cover up the problem;

Email records show the Central Alabama VA director was alerted to the concerns over patient scheduling practices more than 8 months before taking action;

And finally, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the strongest evidence yet has emerged that the rampant scheduling manipulation at Central Alabama wasn't a misunderstanding at all but, rather, a facility-led standard operating procedure. More than 57 percent of staff surveyed at Central Alabama said they received "instruction" to manipulate patient wait times, 57 percent. Mr. Speaker, that is off the charts. The national average is 12.7 percent, and other systems near Montgomery aren't even close.

There is clearly a systematic problem in Montgomery, and it needs to be corrected. That is why I have joined with Senator RICHARD SHELBY to write the new Secretary of Veterans Administration, Robert McDonald, to call his attention to the Central Alabama VA. Specifically, Senator SHELBY and I are

asking Secretary McDonald to review these instances of mismanagement, visit CAVHCS with us, and develop a plan of action to reform the Central Alabama system.

It is so important to remember that thousands of doctors, nurses, and public servants at the VA work very hard every day to give veteran patients the best health care that we can offer. Their service is honorable, and it is a shame that it is overshadowed now by a system that too often fails those it was created to help.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the American people to forget about this. We cannot allow the news media to move on to the next story. I hear from veterans every day who are depending on us to make this right. This will be an uphill battle. I know that. But it is a fight we have to fight. We have to change this culture of complacency. That starts with new leadership, and I look forward to working with Secretary McDonald.

THE BORDER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks, many of us have visited my home State and have gone to places where I have gone over the decades of service and living in Texas, and that is to our great neighbors who live on the border. Many great citizens of the State of Texas and of the great country in which we live, they have lived and worked and played, and they have created an economic engine, cities like Brownsville, Laredo, Harlingen, McAllen, and many others. And they have, in fact, experienced over the years an influx of individuals coming to do harm.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and a member who has served as chairwoman and ranking member on a number of subcommittees, we have made great strides.

I am reminded of the low number of Border Patrol agents some many years ago, and now we are upwards to 25,000 hardworking Americans who serve on both the northern and southern borders.

They have met the challenge of a serious influx. First, the drug cartels. The violence on the Mexican side of the border. We have come together with Mexican Presidents and have worked with the Mexican national defense forces, and we have quashed, to a certain extent, the extensive violence. But yet, our Federal agents of the ATF, the DEA, FBI, and certainly other collaborative efforts have worked to bring this violence down.

We take note of the fact that El Paso is noted as the safest city in the United States, and it is on the border. We note

that a great deal of commerce comes through the southern border, as it does the northern border.

Over the last couple of weeks, beginning maybe in 2013, we saw a new phenomenon, an unplanned phenomenon, a phenomenon driven by the devastating and destructive elements found in Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Central America, none of which were driven by a pointed pronouncement from the United States or the President of the United States, President Barack Obama. But elements who wanted to misuse and abuse the need for comprehensive immigration reform decided to misrepresent the laws of the United States of America.

Every Member of Congress has adhered to a particular theme. I started using it in the 1990s. We are a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants. And the laws are intended to be used to instruct how we guide our hearts and our laws. We still have the Statue of Liberty in the harbor of New York that says, we welcome the forlorn and those who are in need.

Unfortunately, bad information was given to desperate people. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker: desperate people. Desperate mothers and fathers who saw the beheading of young people, or people in their neighborhood threatened by MS-13 and other horrific gangs who say, if your child does not join, your child will be killed, or your little girl will be raped. Or maybe the 3-year-old that I saw down in Brownsville with a diaper on was given to someone just to save her life.

That is the misnomer and the abuse that has been going on in the debate here. These are the real lives of children who fled with a more than credible fear of the loss of life. I am so disappointed sometimes in how we can reinvent truth, and that is that these children are fleeing because of what President Obama represented. That is not true. And it is important to tell the American people the truth.

They were fleeing because of the sheer unbelievable violence, insane violence, mixed in with the mistruths and misrepresentations of those who just wanted to make money and abuse the system. So now we have the surge, maybe 50,000 plus here in the United States. And we have to do something about it.

I listened to three young people yesterday. Most of us have not heard from the children because we were protecting the children's privacy. But these youngsters explained the arduous journey that they took and how they came here for nothing more than a better life, and that violence was all around them.

Yes, we need to work with Honduras and Guatemala and El Salvador. But we started out trying to do what was right. The President offered a supplemental. He knew it was right to have

funding for the wilderness funding. He knew it was right to give the Border Patrol agents their appropriate monies, and he knew it was right for enforcement to add more judges.

But what I would say is, what we have on the floor now, Mr. Speaker, is a pitiful example in H.R. 5230. This is a bad emergency supplemental. It is not even that. It is not worth voting for. America is better than this, and we need to do better than this with the supplemental to help these children and help America.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, to begin my short statement today, I would like to read you a recent headline from The Washington Times: "Golden Hammer: U.S. squandered \$34 million on failed Afghan soybean project." The first few sentences of this report read: "Call it the great American soybean heist, the latest tale of U.S. taxpayer abuse to emanate from Afghanistan. Despite clear evidence that Afghanistan's arid soil was a bad place to grow soybeans, the U.S. Department of Agriculture spent \$34.4 million trying to establish the crop in that country, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction."

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, talking about the waste, fraud, and abuse of American resources in Afghanistan.

Yesterday I spoke on the House floor in memory of three members of the United States Army who died as a result of their service in Afghanistan. The deaths of these three men represent my greatest concern with our servicemembers continuing to remain in Afghanistan: that more and more of our men and women in uniform will be killed and wounded.

The loss of life and limb is far more important than the money that is being wasted. However, Mr. Speaker, our country is in a dangerous financial situation.

In addition to the soybean report, I want to read three more headlines that accentuate the waste of our taxpayer money in Afghanistan. From CBS News: "Is the Pentagon wasting taxpayer money in Afghanistan?" From the Center for Public Integrity: "The U.S. military was no match for Afghanistan's corruption." And from the World Affairs Journal: "Money pit: The monstrous failure of U.S. aid to Afghanistan."

Mr. Speaker, how much more can the poor American taxpayer continue to spend on a failed policy in Afghanistan? I cannot emphasize enough that we have children, senior citizens, and veterans here at home that desperately need our assistance, yet we run out of

money for their programs because we refuse to make cuts to the funds that are being funneled overseas, and especially in Afghanistan.

I say to the administration and to Congress that it is time to fix America's problems, not Afghanistan's problems, and not the world's problems.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want, again, to mention the three Army soldiers who were killed last week on July 25: Staff Sergeant Benjamin G. Prange, PFC Keith M. Williams, and PFC Donnell A. Hamilton, Jr.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, beside me, I have poster after poster of the cost of war. As a young kid named Tyler Jordan—this is actually from 2003, our early days in Iraq, a very unnecessary war—his father was a gunny sergeant named Philip Jordan, and he was killed, and here is Tyler being given the flag that was folded after it was taken off his father's grave.

I don't know how many of these three names I just mentioned—I know one family, he had two little girls, maybe they got a folded flag—but it is time for Congress to wake up.

There is no need to have our young men and women overseas giving their life and limb and to see the money wasted overseas in fraud, waste, and abuse when we can use it right here to fix America's problems.

Please, God, continue to bless our men and women in uniform; and please, God, continue to bless America.

THE FUTILITY OF LITIGATING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, with just 1 day before the recess and many pending issues before us, the majority has focused on one issue and one issue alone: suing the President of the United States for essentially doing what they seem incapable of.

The lawsuit focuses solely on a small part of the ACA, one that Republicans themselves wanted to roll back. I am going to list my objections to this monumental waste of time on this poster.

First is standing. The S is for standing because the Speaker is trying to sue the President, and he does not have standing. He must show that there is some concrete harm to him that goes beyond the general interest in seeing the law enforced.

In fact, he should listen to conservative legal minds like Justices Roberts, Scalia, and Rehnquist, all of whom have expressed skepticism about a court granting standing to the House to sue the President.

It is absurd to think that the House of Representatives, as an institution,

has been harmed by President Obama's attempting in good faith to implement the ACA. I understand their feelings might be hurt, but acting out only gets them negative attention, and the Americans agree that this is a waste of time.

The next reason that I object is the taxpayer waste of money. The last time the Republicans sued the President, it was over the implementation of DOMA, which went nowhere and cost the taxpayers \$2.3 million. Like this previous fruitless lawsuit, this will bounce around the courts for years, making rich lawyers rich. That is the only jobs program the Republicans will have passed in Congress this year.

The next reason I object to it is that it is useless. Just what are the Republicans trying to accomplish with this circus? It is certainly not governing. As of June 30, this Congress has only enacted 125 bills into law—the lowest number of any Congress in history since 1973, when they started keeping data.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say, well, it is all about the Senate, but in five previously divided Congresses before this one, the average number of bills enacted at the same time period was 254—almost twice as many.

The next reason I object to this lawsuit is P, political stunt aimed at appeasing the fringe elements in the Republican Party that want to impeach the President. The same people calling for this lawsuit shut down the government last fall because they wanted to delay the Affordable Care Act, and it cost us over \$24 billion. Now, they are suing the President over the fact that he did something they wanted him to do in the first place.

The only other group of people I know who scream that they want something and then throw a tantrum when they get it are toddlers.

The next reason I object to this lawsuit is that it is inconsistent. It is inconsistent because when George Bush was proposing the prescription drug benefit and we were trying to implement that, he asked to have it delayed for 1 year—and guess what? The Republicans didn't object then.

Then the final reason that I object to this lawsuit is because it is a distraction. The Republicans are trying to distract Americans from the fact they have ruled over a do-nothing Congress.

While we are frittering away our last few days in session in this pointless and childish exercise, we are not creating jobs, fixing immigration, renewing the Export-Import Bank, doing tax reform, or even completing a full appropriations process.

Words fail me in describing the petulance of the other side. This toddler is more adult than some of my colleagues. She has figured it out. I suppose I will have to let her express her feelings.

GENOCIDE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share two pictures showing the tomb of the prophet Jonah in Mosul, Iraq. The first shows Jonah's tomb as it looked for centuries prior to last week. The second shows the site after it was destroyed by ISIS last week. Thousands of years of Biblical cultural history were erased in a matter of moments by Islamist terrorists.

This ancient site had once been the location of a church and then a mosque famous for its architectural beauty which stood there since the 14th century. The mosque of the prophet Yunus—built around Jonah's tomb—honored a figure who is sacred to Jews, Christians, and Muslims.

Jonah, who was sent by God to preach repentance to the people of Nineveh, is the subject of a book in the Hebrew Tanakh—the Old Testament—and multiple passages in the Koran.

While ISIS has targeted Christians for elimination in its destructive rampage through Syria and Iraq, this atrocity is an offense not just to Christians, but to all humanity. This is more than fundamentalism or extremism. It is nihilism. It is genocide. It is genocide of an entire people of faith in this region.

The world should be outraged at the crime against our shared cultural heritage, including the Islam that ISIS claims to represent. ISIS has destroyed millennia of history by detonating an explosive charge and turning this ancient site of pilgrimage to rubble.

However, it is not just Biblical sites and Christian churches that are targeted by ISIS extermination. It is exterminating the Christian people of this region. The Christian people of this region are being exterminated.

I want to share another picture. Do you see this spray-painted symbol on the wall to the right of the gate? That is the Arabic word “nun” which stands for nasara, a pejorative name for Christians. They are singling out Christians. ISIS has been marking the homes of Christians to symbolize their ultimatum: convert to Islam or die.

Similarly, ISIS has used the letter “raa” for rawafidh, a slur against Shiites that they also expelled from Mosul.

This is the sixth time in a week that I have appeared on this floor to call attention to the genocide that is taking place right before our eyes. The media is starting to pay more attention, but where is the Obama administration?

It has to make protecting this ancient community a priority. It needs to encourage the Kurds to do more of what they can to protect those fleeing ISIS and provide safe refuge. It needs to ensure that of the resources going to the region, that a portion should be

guaranteed to help the Christian community. It needs to have the same courage as President Bush and former Secretary of State Colin Powell had when they called it genocide in Darfur because this is genocide.

For the sake of these communities and for the sake of the ancient, tangible heritage that is being destroyed daily by ISIS and Iraq, President Obama must speak.

President Reagan consistently made human rights and religious freedom a hallmark of American diplomacy. He famously described the U.S. Constitution as “a covenant we have made not only with ourselves, but with all of mankind.” He understood that the promises enshrined in that document transcended time and place.

There is no more urgent time and place to speak out than now, given what is happening to Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq. We are seeing, during this Congress where everyone here is serving and during this administration, we are seeing the end of Christianity in Iraq, and soon, we will see the end of Christianity in the Middle East, where it all began.

HOUSE DEMOCRATS' ECONOMIC AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, I held my Congress on Your Corner at the Litchfield Public Library, and there, I had conversations with folks young and old, and we talked about what matters to them and to their families, and I heard about their concerns with the pressing issues facing our country right now.

How can Washington jump-start our economy again? When will we rebuild our aging bridges and roads? What is Congress doing about our broken immigration system?

Here we are, 2 days before the Speaker's August recess, and there is a vote to sue the President. Yes, that is right, we are wasting time and taxpayer money voting on politically-motivated attacks against the President, rather than this House taking action to help the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we should be debating a long-term, sustainable solution to fund the dwindling highway trust fund, fix our infrastructure, and create jobs. We should work together to fix our broken immigration system and to address the humanitarian crisis at the border, and we should vote to enact Make It In America legislation that supports good-paying jobs right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, moms in my district and across this country ask me every day: When will this House allow a vote on commonsense gun violence prevention? Coming from a State that is working to regain jobs that were lost

during the recession, I believe that we should cancel this recess to extend emergency unemployment for job-seekers in my State of Connecticut and all across America.

No; instead, we are wasting time and taxpayer money on a frivolous lawsuit, rather than working together—working together—to stop corporate tax inversions or close tax loopholes for companies that are shipping our jobs overseas.

The folks I listened to in Litchfield last Saturday morning deserve better. The American people deserve better. It is time to put partisanship aside and to put middle class families first. We should cancel recess. We should stay here and work together on policies to jump-start our economy and get the job done for all of the people we represent.

THE ORDEAL OF FIRST LIEUTENANT NADIYA VIKTORIVNA SAVCHENKO OF THE UKRAINIAN ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a solemn and pressing issue that unfortunately has not received the attention that is warranted. This issue is the illegal capture, transport, ongoing detainment, and upcoming trial of First Lieutenant Nadiya Viktorivna Savchenko of the Ukrainian Army by pro-Russian Ukrainian separatists and, now, the Russian Government.

Lieutenant Savchenko, whose first name Nadiya means “hope” in Ukrainian, is a true patriot and hero. She was born in 1981 in what was then the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and grew up in that Soviet Union-aligned Republic.

At the early age of 16, 1 year younger than myself when I joined the United States military, Nadiya joined the Ukrainian Army as a radio operator and started an incredible and groundbreaking career in service to a free and independent Ukraine.

Now 33, she has not only been trained as an elite paratrooper, she also became the first female air force pilot in the Ukrainian military. Her exemplary time in uniform includes service in Iraq between 2004 and 2008 as a member of Ukrainian peacekeeping troops, during which time she served alongside and earned the respect of U.S. personnel, including Special Operations Forces.

In fact, her tour in Iraq overlapped with part of my own time serving in that theater. I personally know the hardships and exemplary work done by our coalition forces during that difficult period, including Nadiya's Ukrainian contingent.

She has since become a national hero and icon, serving in the 3rd Army Aviation Regiment and being recognized by Ukrainian defense forces and the United Nations. Nadiya also became a leading national figure in the Euromaidan demonstrations, which led to the fall of President Viktor Yanukovich.

□ 1045

After Yanukovich, pro-Russian forces began stoking anger and violence across Ukraine's eastern provinces and the Crimean Peninsula. Lieutenant Savchenko then joined one of many volunteer, pro-government units that were organized to supplement deployed government forces. As the leader in the Aidar Battalion, she served alongside Ukrainian military personnel and civilians alike to quell the Russian-supplied, -trained, -supported, and -supplemented separatist forces.

On June 28, Nadiya was captured by the separatists. After several days of unknown whereabouts, she resurfaced in Russia in the custody of the Russian Government on charges of murdering two Russian journalists. Access to her by family and Ukrainian officials has been very limited, and calls for her release based on her illegal capture, transport, transfer, and detention have gone unanswered. This is unacceptable. As Americans, we must recognize those who have fought alongside us and those who have stood up for democracy and freedom across the globe. Furthermore, we cannot let international law and due process be violated by any entity or nation.

For these reasons, I call on the United States Government and the United Nations to take immediate action to seek release of First Lieutenant Nadiya Viktorivna Savchenko. If she, a citizen of the sovereign state of Ukraine and a war hero, is to face trial, she must be granted the full ability to do so in an open, transparent, and unbiased venue such as through the international court system or be granted the privilege of a full and proper investigation by her own country. Lieutenant Savchenko deserves due process of law. I further call on Russia to comply with its international obligations and immediately release Nadiya Savchenko to her family or appropriate authorities.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a cochairman of the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, I rise this morning to talk about how important expanding Medicaid is for my State and for every State in this great Nation.

It gives me great pride to be in the well of the House this morning speak-

ing on the topic of expanding the Medicaid program today, the 49th anniversary of the date when the legislation creating the Medicaid antipoverty program was signed into law by President Lyndon Baines Johnson. More than 30 Members of Congress have joined the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus because we know that opening the way to health care for the poor is good, it is righteous, it is just, it is merciful. It is the right thing to do because, according to Matthew 25:40:

Whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.

And for those who have not a care about the poor, then you should know also that expanding Medicaid to more poor people will stimulate the economy by creating jobs in the burgeoning health care and other ancillary industries. More jobs mean more spending, which leads to more profits. For those of you who are only concerned about your bottom line, then you should also know:

Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord, and he will reward them for what they have done.—Proverbs 19:17.

The stimulation of economies is exactly what expanding Medicaid has accomplished in the 27 States that have expanded eligibility. It is exactly what will happen in every recalcitrant State when their political leaders finally come to their senses and choose to accept the Federal funds to expand their Medicaid systems, the funds having already been paid into the system by their own taxpayers.

So 27 States, a majority of the States of this great country, looked at the facts and made the choice to help their people be healthier and therefore lead more productive lives. Expanding Medicaid in those States provided health care coverage to approximately 10.5 million people who otherwise would not have had it, according to Families USA.

Despite the politics, this is a bipartisan issue, as we see when Republican Governors in Arizona and Ohio, for example, expanded Medicaid. As a result of their action, almost a million people will have access to affordable health care. States led by Republicans and Democrats that expanded Medicaid should be commended for their actions. In California, almost 3 million people have benefited by getting access to health care when their State expanded Medicaid. These are just some of the success stories.

The Federal Government will cover 100 percent of the costs of expanding Medicaid today, and 90 percent of the cost for the duration of the program in every State. Expanding Medicaid will bring billions of Federal tax dollars back into States that will help develop the health care infrastructure and improve the economy.

It will also help low-income Americans access health care. We must re-

member that the people who will benefit from expanding Medicaid are no less deserving of health care than anyone else.

In my home State of Georgia, expanding Medicaid would mean access to health care for 684,000 poor people, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. The Georgia Budget and Policy Institute estimates that expanding Medicaid will bring \$65 billion in new economic activity to Georgia over 10 years, which will support more than 56,000 new jobs throughout the State. My Governor reacted to this news by signing a bill eliminating his own authority to expand Medicaid. I can't think of a time that a chief executive has willingly given away some of his authority.

We know why Governors and State legislators are choosing to deny access to health care for their people. It is politics, pure and simple.

I am here today to urge every State to expand Medicaid. I urge my colleagues and those watching at home to contact their Governor and their State legislator in support of expanding Medicaid.

CONGRESS LEAVES WITH WORK UNDONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am concerned about and I think every American is concerned about is the reputation of the Congress of the United States in the eyes of the American people. We know what our approval ratings are, and we are well aware of it; but we often don't take a moment and pause and say what are the things that we could do to have the American people once again view this Chamber, the people's House, as a place of honor, as a place that is actually doing the people's business.

Here we are, 48 hours away from a recess. We are going to be going back and talking with the people in our districts. Each one of us represents around 700,000 American citizens. We are going to go home and we are going to spend some time talking with those citizens, and I think that is appropriate. However, I also think it is appropriate for us to get our work done, and I want to talk this morning, Mr. Speaker, about a key fundamental requirement of the law of this Congress, and that is to provide the Nation and the American people with a budget that is fiscally secure and to provide for spending bills under the law so that the money that the taxpayers are sending to Washington, D.C., they are aware of how that money is being spent.

This is 2014, Mr. Speaker. Leaving for the entire month of August was a tradition, as I have read, brought to this

Chamber because of the extreme heat of Washington, D.C., prior to air-conditioning. But here we are in 2014, the building is air-conditioned and the lights are on. It is a relatively comfortable place to work. We could stay here and actually finish up some of the work of the people.

For example, in 1974, four decades ago, the Congress of the United States passed a budget act and the President signed into law a budget act that required the Congress to actually pass a budget and to do its spending bills and complete them by September 30. In four decades, here we are on the 40th anniversary of that law. In four decades, it has not happened even one time when the Congress did its work and completed its spending bills within the amount of time allotted under the law. The American people are struck by that.

How can the Congress of the United States ignore the law? How can the Congress of the United States say we are going to find ourselves in agreement, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate and the President, and we are going to agree to do these things? Well, quite frankly, the law had one weakness: it had no enforcement trigger in it.

A few years ago, a good friend of mine, a gentleman from across the aisle, Congressman JIM COOPER from Nashville, Tennessee, wrote a piece of legislation called No Budget, No Pay. A couple of years ago, we finally signed that bill into law—a part of it into law—and for the first time since I have been in Congress, the Senate of the United States actually passed a budget because they found out that if they didn't, there would be an enforcement trigger that happened.

I have recently written a bill called the Do Your Job Act, which would require the Congress to do all 12 of the spending bills prior to the end of the year or they can't recess for more than 24 hours. They have to stay here and do their job so the American people can see firsthand what our priorities are.

I came to Congress in 2011, and in the 4 years I have been here, we have been required by law to pass 48 spending bills. The U.S. Senate, in those 4 years' time, has passed two. The House has done quite a bit better. They have passed 24. But they are required to pass 48. This year, the Senate has passed zero. They have done none. The House of Representatives has passed seven, and has referred another four out of committee that are ready to go. We ought to stay here and pass those bills and send them to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House. We ought to be here doing the people's business for the good of the American people. We should stay here and do our job.

HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise to introduce the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014.

The Congressional Tri-Caucus, over the past 10 years, has been tireless in its effort to educate Congress and the country about the disproportionate burden of premature deaths and preventable illnesses existing in our minority communities. Towards that end, the Tri-Caucus developed a national strategy for the elimination of racial and ethnic health disparities. The keystone of this strategy is the Tri-Caucus Health Equity and Accountability Act, first introduced in 2003 and every Congress since.

HEAA, in many ways, is unique. First, the bill and its introduction rotates each Congress among the three caucuses. This year, as chair of the CHC Health Task Force, I have the distinct honor of carrying on the tradition by introducing the bill for the 113th Congress.

Second, and most importantly, HEAA outlines the collective institutional knowledge of a diverse group of policymakers, health professionals, and advocacy organizations from throughout the country on what policies are needed to halt, reduce, and eliminate health disparities.

At the beginning of each new Congress, the HEAA working group convenes and several hundred minority and health advocacy organizations meet on a regular basis to discuss the bill and update it based on new research and recommendations to meet the ever-changing needs of our Nation's most vulnerable populations.

Also, just as the bill introduction rotates each Congress between Member offices, the leadership of the HEAA working group rotates among advocacy organizations. In the 113th Congress, this effort was spearheaded by the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, whose members I commend for their deep commitment to social justice and for their tireless work on this bill, which included coordinating the input of over 350 health and minority advocacy groups.

The HEAA is a principled living road map that can be used by policymakers and providers alike. For example, the Affordable Care Act contains many groundbreaking policies first introduced in HEAA, including expansion of Medicaid eligibility, increased resources for community health centers, and institutionalizing Federal efforts to achieve health equity.

Nevertheless, while the ACA has made a significant impact on access to quality health care, many inequities and obstacles remain that prevent the elimination of health disparities in our country. That is why the HEAA of 2014 provides Federal resources and advanced policies to improve health outcomes in all populations regardless of race, ethnicity, immigration status, age, ability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or English proficiency.

□ 1100

The HEAA is made up of ten titles proposing a wide spectrum of health initiatives that address disparities and mental health and specific high impact minority diseases.

The bill also provides guidelines for improving the health outcomes for women, children, and families, and targets resources to communities striving to overcome negative social factors.

Finally, the bill includes recommendations to enhance data collection, technology, accountability, and evaluation; increase workforce diversity; and ensure access to culturally and linguistically appropriate care.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Tri-Caucus and members of the HEAA working group believe no one's health or life expectancy should be determined by the color of their skin or the Zip Code in which they are born.

The Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014 is a consensus blueprint of the most comprehensive and strategic plans to eliminate health disparities in our country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2014.

RISE OF ISLAMIC FASCISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we are watching the rise of Islamic fascism on a scale unprecedented in modern times. It may be wrapped in different symbols and trace genealogy through a different line, but at its core, it is fascism. Listen to its virulent anti-Semitism, the explicit promise of genocide against Israel, the utter rejection—indeed, disdain—for fundamental principles of democracy and human rights and justice. There can be no doubt what is happening.

European fascism might have consumed all of Europe except for one gritty holdout: for more than a year Great Britain stood in the breach. Had it fallen, the consequences would have been unthinkable.

Today, one gritty holdout stands against the rise of Islamic fascism in the Middle East. Israel is the only island of democracy and civilization left in that region, and it is standing alone and in the breach.

The current conflict between Israel and Hamas offers a clear distinction between good and evil.

Israel took control of the Gaza Strip as a result of the Six-Day War in 1967. It granted self-governance to the region in 1994, and in 2005, unilaterally withdrew its forces.

The resulting Hamas government has since militarized Gaza and used it as a launching site for continuing and escalating attacks against the civilian Israeli population, with the avowed objective of wiping Israel off the map.

The Arab Spring welcomed by the Obama administration brought the Muslim Brotherhood to power in Egypt. During its brief tenure, it opened a road for the mass importation of weapons to Hamas. These weapons, and others smuggled in by sea, were strategically placed in schools and hospitals and fired upon Israeli cities without provocation.

As Churchill once said of Britain: Israel did everything it could to secure peace. Perhaps it did too much.

The result was thousands of rocket attacks and many terrorist incursions by Hamas aimed solely at the civilian population. Israel finally did what any civilization must do under such circumstances: it finally fought back.

Hamas has deliberately staged its attacks from hospitals, schools, and mosques, using children as human shields, leaving the Israelis the Hobson's choice of enduring the killing of their own population or taking out the instruments of destruction that are deliberately sited in schools and hospitals. They have chosen to defend themselves.

There is absolutely no doubt of Hamas' objectives and that of its allies: they have been crystal clear and unwavering on their intention to destroy Israel and kill every Israeli. They seek to eradicate the Jewish homeland, whose history in the region stretches back more than 3,000 years.

Their allies have been intent on annihilating every Christian and Jew in the Middle East, and they are well on their way toward achieving this goal. It would be the height of naivete to believe that it will stop. Yet, this administration, and many on the Left, seem to view the two sides as moral equivalents. Many on the Left even portray Israel as the aggressor.

Israel has made the decision to by force demilitarize Gaza for its own survival. It is now making serious progress and degrading Hamas' ability to make war. That is the only true path to peace.

Yet, the Obama administration is now working to halt Israel's progress and allow Hamas the time to resupply and regroup and resume its attacks. This serves only the objectives of Hamas and is a prescription for prolonged war and bloodshed.

Hamas has broken every cease-fire it has agreed to, and Israel has abided by

every cease-fire, often holding return fire for hours after Hamas has broken these accords. There is no reason to believe that Hamas will abide by future cease-fires the moment it has recovered its war-making capabilities.

Why would this administration interfere in this manner, the effect of which is to take sides against the only pro-Western regime left in the Middle East?

Today, all that stands between a peaceful and free world and a fanatical fascist caliphate stretching from the Bosphorus to North Africa is the state of Israel and the influence of the Western democracies, particularly that of the United States.

In 1929, Churchill warned of Britain's irresolution in the Middle East. He said: "Any appearance of lack of willpower on the part of the British government or of lack of confidence in its mission in these countries blows like a draught of air on the dull, fierce embers."

Mr. Speaker, at this perilous hour, let us not repeat the mistakes of history.

ADDRESS OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, I stood at the back of the Senate Chamber and watched a critical debate. Under the leadership of Chairman RON WYDEN of the Senate Finance Committee, his partner, Ranking Member HATCH; Chairwoman BARBARA BOXER from California, CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut, BOB CORKER from Tennessee, and Senator TOM CARPER from Delaware held forth on critical legislation to be able to help America deal with our infrastructure crisis.

America—it is no secret—is falling apart and is falling behind. It is well overdue for us to have a robust, important 6-year reauthorization to deal with our transportation needs.

We can't do that unless we resolve the funding conundrum. We have been limping along. We can't even get through the current 27-month extension without a summer slowdown, cutting back on critical Federal funding for contracts around the country.

What the Senate did was tackle this issue head on. They had a funding proposal that was fairly debated, where they were able to provide enough funding to get us through the end of the year, but not so much that it allows this Congress off the hook to slide into the next Congress, and probably the Congress after that, but instead, face up to our responsibilities now.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation of Senator CORKER from Tennessee urging us

to be grownups and move forward, and Senator BOXER talking about the critical needs and not to be waylaid by this fantasy that somehow the Federal Government should abandon its commitment to a National Transportation Highway System that we initiated under President Eisenhower, that somehow that is a thing of the past, turn our back on it, slash transportation funding, and just kind of wait and see what happens around the country—she was eloquent and forceful. Again, we have watched Senator MURPHY and Senator CARPER be focused on that which we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, we need to address and embrace the bipartisan Senate vote yesterday: 79 bipartisan votes to be able to do our job, avoid the summer shutdown, and do so in a way with a funding approach that is much more sustainable and reasonable, not the so-called pension smoothing that is ill-advised on so many levels.

Two weeks ago, Democrats in the House of Representatives were united: 99 percent supported what is, essentially, the Senate outcome. That didn't prevail on the floor of the House in a motion to recommit that I offered. But Democrats didn't pick up our marbles and quit. We actually provided the votes necessary to keep the issue alive and send the suboptimal Republican approach across to the other body. There weren't enough Republican votes to pass it, but we kept it alive hoping that we could see what happens on the Senate side, that we might have a stronger more reasonable proposal.

That optimism and cooperation on the part of the Democrats in the House was rewarded because we have this bipartisan proposal, which is, in fact, better, supported by 79 Senators.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to be able to address this bipartisan approach from the Senate. Allow us to vote on it. It ought to be the first step in our being able to avoid the summer shutdown and be able to get on with the 6-year bill.

Rarely have we seen the stakeholders so united. The American Trucking Association, the road builders, the U.S. Chamber, building and construction trades, the bicyclists, and the engineers. We watch across the country the people who build, who maintain, and depend on our infrastructure united, supportive of the approach that has emerged from the United States Senate. Even as we speak, they are contacting congressional offices, urging Members support the bipartisan Senate approach.

I respectfully urge the Republican leadership to allow those voices to be heard, to heed the stakeholders, heed the American people, give them a bill worthy of voting on. It will pass overwhelmingly, and we will be doing our job.

SPURRING TEACHER EDUCATION MOVEMENT FOR STEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, every country must deal with and answer the question: What does it take to be prosperous and to have prosperity for future generations?

There are many answers to that question, but one of the keys is science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM fields—in our educational system.

The United States needs to be able to compete in these fields on a global scale, and children of all schools should have the opportunity to develop these skills no matter where they live.

Recently, teachers in the Second District of New Mexico brought up the question: What about us? Can we use funds that are set over here in the Education Department to develop better skills in the STEM areas?

Those questions were not answered in a completely positive way—that maybe it was not possible. Therefore, the teachers put forward an idea that maybe we should just get the flexibility in, a practical suggestion for an important concept.

Teachers and educators in the Second District provided firsthand experience and developed the idea into a concept. Several teachers formed an ad hoc working group. Brian Claar from White Sands Schools, Lindsey Guerrero and Marci Hearn from Gadsden Independent School District, Marci Behrens from Las Cruces Public School District, as well as Susan Brown, Nicole Delgado, and Christina Abeyta from the New Mexico State University STEM Outreach Center, all came together and developed that concept into a proposed legislation.

Working with my staff, they actually got the bill written, and on June 25 of this year, I introduced H.R. 4973, titled: Spurring Teacher Education Movement for STEM Act, also known as the STEM for STEM Act.

H.R. 4973 increases flexibility for teacher development funds under the Rural and Low Income title of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. It allows the funds to be used for teacher development in teaching STEM.

The STEM for STEM Act also expresses the need for the U.S. to compete on a global scale. A teacher should have the high-quality professional development opportunities in STEM to increase their content knowledge and improve student learning.

Professional development is essential for providing teachers and educators with growth opportunities that then are presented to our children.

□ 1115

Teacher professional development enriches the learning environment for

students and educators alike. It is important for us to say thank you to those teachers who make it possible for America to compete into the next generation.

Hopefully, this bill, H.R. 4973, will provide a small element of help for the rural areas that stretch across the Western part of this country.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of comprehensive immigration reform and the growing humanitarian crisis we are facing at our southern border.

It is the job of the Congress to face and resolve challenging issues like our broken immigration system. We ought to pass the bipartisan Senate bill that would provide commonsense solutions to address not only reforming our immigration system, but to deal with this immediate humanitarian crisis at our border.

Instead, the Republican House leadership refuses to allow a vote on comprehensive reform and has come up, instead, with a plan that would change the law passed in 2008 to combat human trafficking. In addition, this partisan bill will provide limited funding for this fiscal year.

Again, House leadership plans to pass a short-term fix, so that they can go back to their districts next month and say: well, we tried to fix this crisis that we are facing.

This is not how we should be solving our Nation's problems. Each day that our immigration system remains broken, jobs are lost, and our economy suffers. It is time to set politics aside and focus on fixing our current immigration system. In fact, failure to address reform is making it more difficult to deal with the thousands of unaccompanied children arriving at our southern border in hopes of finding safety.

The humanitarian crisis that we are facing is in part a result of the increasing turmoil in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, where drug trafficking, human trafficking, and violence is rampant. Families have been tortured and killed, and today, there are people who are literally running for their lives.

Atrocities are being committed in those countries, and they must bear the responsibility of addressing and resolving their issues. Mexico also has a role to play.

We in the United States must now face the humanitarian crisis this violence is causing at our southern border. In a joint statement, President Obama, along with Presidents from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, pledged to reduce criminal activity in

Central American countries by promoting greater social and economic opportunity.

It is my hope that these leaders stay true to their word and demonstrate leadership by addressing the humanitarian crisis taking place within their own countries.

These young unaccompanied children must be treated in a humane and dignified way. Ultimately, these children's fate rests in the hands of our immigration judges, and those children who are not granted asylum must return to their countries. Playing politics with this grave crisis, as some are doing, is not productive.

It is the height of hypocrisy that Republicans want more border security, but have refused to allow a vote on a comprehensive immigration reform bill that would in fact provide more funding to secure our borders. That makes no sense. We have spent billions of dollars on border security, but clearly, our border is not yet secure.

The comprehensive immigration reform bill passed by the Senate in a bipartisan fashion requires that a long-term plan be developed and executed with an initial \$8.3 billion in funding to focus on securing the borders today and an additional \$6.5 billion in funding to be spent over the next 6 years to in fact secure our border.

What we need now, more than ever, is an open and honest discussion on the House floor about the relationship between immigration reform and this humanitarian crisis. Therefore, I urge my Republican colleagues to join together, in a bipartisan fashion, like they did in the Senate, to find an effective and humane short- and long-term solution to this crisis, which is directly related, in my opinion, to fixing our broken immigration system.

ABLE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I want to bring attention to proposed legislation known as the ABLE Act, or Achieving a Better Life Experience. It is something that is important to me and to a lot of Members of the House.

I first filed this legislation 7 years ago. Since then, we have come a long way. Today, 377 Members of the House and 74 United States Senators are cosponsors of this legislation. There is no piece of legislation in the Congress today that enjoys more bipartisan, bicameral support than the ABLE Act. Tomorrow, the Ways and Means Committee in the House will take up this legislation, and I hope that they will pass it with a favorable vote.

Just what is the ABLE Act? It is a piece of legislation that attempts to help those individuals with disabilities

achieve their full potential. How does it do that? Well, it allows individuals with disabilities to set up a tax-free savings account. They take that account, it grows tax free, and they can use the proceeds, as long as they meet qualified expenses.

Those individuals face challenges that you and I can sometimes hardly imagine. They might be medical, transportation, education, or housing needs. We already allow other individuals to use tax-exempt savings accounts to help them.

If you want to save for retirement, you can set up a tax-free savings account called a 401(k). If you want to set up a tax-free savings account to help you go to college, you can do that through what is called a 529. If you want to help with your health care, you can set up a health savings account. It seems only fair that we level the playing field and allow those individuals the same opportunity.

Let me introduce you to someone by the name of Sydney Leach. She lives in Jacksonville, Florida. Today, she is a fifth-grader at Crown Point Elementary School. She has Down syndrome. When she was born, her proud mom and dad, Stacy and Jeff Leach, made a commitment to make sure that she would not only have a happy life, but that she would be able to realize her hopes and her dreams and her full potential.

Soon they realized that when you raise a child with Down syndrome, you face challenges that a lot of people can't imagine. Unlike her classmates, she had to have special behavioral counseling. She had to have special medical care. She needed individual counseling. So it was difficult.

Her parents then found out that if you have Medicaid, you are limited to \$2,000 for the amount of assets that you can have in your name. If her parents or loved ones wanted to give her a gift, they jeopardized the care that she needed.

So the ABLE Act seeks to correct those inequities. It says that you can, number one, set up a tax-free savings account and let those proceeds grow. Number two, it won't count against your \$2,000 limitation on assets.

This is America, home of the American Dream. Individuals with disabilities ought to be able to live the American Dream, just like you and I. They ought to be able to have an education and work on their own, if they can. They ought to be able to save for the future. The ABLE Act allows them to do just that.

We live in a great, prosperous country. Sometimes, we are called upon to speak out for the people that can't speak out, to stand up and seek justice for those that can't seek justice on their own.

The ABLE Act will have a positive impact on millions of people with disabilities all across this land. That is

worth fighting for. I hope soon the ABLE Act will become the law of the land.

HEALTH EQUITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, last September, I was honored to welcome the Tri-Caucus Health Disparities Summit to my home State of New Mexico. The Center for Health Policy at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque brought experts from all over the country together to talk about what they are seeing as providers, researchers, and patients; and we heard that communities of color continue to face substantial cultural, social, and economic barriers to obtaining quality health care and achieving equitable health outcomes.

Several of my colleagues in fact joined me at that summit, and we all pledged not to just acknowledge these disparities, but to act to provide the tools and resources necessary to achieve health equity. That is what the Health Equity and Accountability Act does.

It is a comprehensive bill, developed with significant stakeholder input, that would build on the gains of the Affordable Care Act and put in place the policies and the infrastructure needed to eliminate health disparities.

The bill sets national standards for culturally and linguistically appropriate care and includes programs to address diseases that disproportionately impact minority communities. It also provides grants and scholarships to build diversity in the health care workforce and extends funding to strengthen the health IT infrastructure in minority communities.

These provisions are just part of a larger strategic approach because problems like this really are more systemic. We can't just add some funding here or make a policy change there and walk away. This takes thoughtful, comprehensive policy to make a substantial long-lasting difference on issues like this.

I would like to commend my colleague, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD from California, for her leadership on this bill. It is not easy to put together a bill of this size in consultation with dozens of Members' offices and more than 300 stakeholder groups, but she managed to do just that, and I thank her for putting together one of the best versions of this bill I think Congress has had before it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CHAPLAIN JENNIFER NIELSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Chaplain Jennifer Nielson of the 108th Sustainment Brigade. I believe it is important that we recognize and value the work performed by our country's military chaplains.

Following an initial deployment as an enlisted soldier, Jennifer Nielson became a chaplain while waiting to fulfill a second deployment in Kuwait. As a resident of the capital city of Springfield, Illinois—which I am proud to represent—Jennifer has served as a Wounded Warrior chaplain, providing support for our Nation's veterans, and has organized yellow ribbon events welcoming home our returning veterans.

Currently, Chaplain Nielson is working with the National Guard's Family Program Division, providing support and counsel in Illinois. Because of her unyielding support and compassion, I am proud to recognize her service today.

As we take time this week to recognize the chaplains who have bravely provided spiritual guidance to their fellow servicemen and -women throughout history, it is important that we also acknowledge those who carry on their traditions and thank them for their service.

Chaplain Nielson has faithfully served her country for the Illinois Army National Guard, and I am proud to honor her and the rest of the dedicated chaplains supporting our troops across the globe.

HONORING TEACHER CYNTHIA DIPERT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss today if I weren't able to honor a former teacher of mine who made an impact in my life that she may never have known.

When I was 7 years old, my family moved from Des Moines, Iowa, to Taylorville, Illinois, and almost a week later, I was sitting in a brand-new classroom as a second-grader at South Elementary School in my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois.

A young graduate student teacher who was doing some work in that classroom came up to a very shy boy who was determined not to talk to anybody in class that day. That was me. When she knelt down beside my desk, all the heads of my classmates around me turned and welcomed me as one of the new kids in that second grade class.

□ 1130

That confidence that Mrs. Cynthia Dipert gave me that day was confidence that built up throughout my elementary school career, junior high, and high school. Frankly, maybe that instance—maybe that gesture of compassion that Cynthia gave me that

day—helped lead me here to this great institution we call the House of Representatives.

Now, Mrs. Dipert went on to teach my daughter. I always enjoyed going to parent-teacher conferences when my daughter was in Cynthia's class. Then we saddled her with my twin boys in the exact same class, and I thought I would enjoy going to parent-teacher conferences then, too. However, I walked in one day, along with my wife, and we asked Cynthia, Why is a bloody hand hanging from the ceiling? It was fake, of course. She said, Oh. Your son sits there, and I am reminding him that he needs to raise his hand before he talks.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we might need to have props like that here in the House of Representatives sometimes.

It is hard for me today to stand here and think about those fun times I had and the impact that Cynthia Dipert had on so many kids—my own, me, and those of so many people in my hometown of Taylorville—as she is not going to be able to have that impact any longer because, just under 2 weeks ago, Cynthia passed away.

I stand here on the floor of this great institution to tell her thank you and to tell her thank you for the service that she has provided so many people in central Illinois.

Rest in peace, Cynthia Dipert.
God bless you all.

THE CANCER OF ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, once insightfully and eloquently observed that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

In the wake of the current conflict between Israel and Hamas, there has been a disturbing outbreak of the cancer of anti-Semitism in many parts of the world.

In France, there have been firebombs directed at synagogues, a radio station, and a library, amongst other incidents that have taken place in a country which is home to the third-largest Jewish community in the world.

In Germany, there has been hate speech permeating rally after rally all throughout the country, including at one where the chant was: "Hamas. Hamas. Jews to the gas." This is disturbing language in any location, but it is particularly disturbing given the context of what we know occurred in Germany.

In England, there has been an epidemic of violent crime directed at the Jewish community, an exponential increase rivaled in recent times only by a similar outbreak of hate crime that took place in 2009 during the last conflict in that region.

Now, in a civil society, reasonable people should be able to disagree without being disagreeable, but anti-Semitism is not a legitimate form of criticism. It is a cancer that needs to be stamped out in the same way that racism and sexism and homophobia—whenever and wherever it might be found—need to be crushed to the ground.

I urge this Congress to speak out to condemn and to do everything possible to eradicate this outbreak. As Dr. King observed, injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 30, 2014 at 8:56 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment, H.R. 5021.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 108.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 30, 2014 at 9:31 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 4028.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 106.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment, H. Con. Res. 103.

That the Senate passed, S. 2577.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Alphonso Jackson, Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Has thou not known? Has thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the Earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of His understanding. He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might, He increases their strength. Even the youth shall faint and be weary. The young men shall utterly fall. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary. They shall walk and not faint.

Dear Heavenly Father, I thank Thee for this day.

I thank You for the privilege to stand in this hallowed place and invoke Thy presence. I pray now that You would bless these men and women that serve in the House of Representatives. Please grant them with a double portion of wisdom and understanding as they seek Your will in the affairs of this great Nation.

I pray that they accomplish what Moses instructed the leaders to do in Deuteronomy 1:16: "Hear the disputes between the people, and judge them fairly." I ask these blessings in the name of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR.
ALPHONSO JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today guest chaplain, Reverend Alphonso Jackson, Sr., of the Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights in my district. I hope you will all join me in thanking him for honoring us with today's opening prayer.

For over 30 years, Reverend Jackson has dedicated himself to serving God, his family, and our community in Richmond Heights, a community created for African American World War II veterans so that they could use the GI bill.

Founded 50 years ago by Reverend Ferguson, the Second Baptist Church of Richmond Heights has grown to more than 4,000 members and continues to flourish under his leadership.

Reverend Jackson also helps strengthen his community outside his church by serving as moderator for the Seaboard Baptist Missionary Association of Florida, second vice president to the Florida Baptist State Convention, and president of the Richmond Heights Community Alliance.

We can all look to his words today for guidance as we work to resolve our country's most pressing issues, and I invite you to join me in honoring the words of his prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EBOLA

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Nancy Writebol, a dedicated Christian missionary from Charlotte who chose to run toward danger.

Ms. Writebol and her husband, David, serve as missionaries with SIM at a hospital in Monrovia, Liberia. They turned down the opportunity to evacuate when Ebola struck Liberia. Instead, Nancy volunteered to help sanitize the medical personnel and their equipment as they worked in the Ebola isolation ward.

This week, Nancy learned that she, too, has contracted Ebola. Like the people she volunteered to help, Nancy is now in isolation. Although stable, she is battling an illness that kills 60 percent of the victims. Nancy and

David could have chosen the easy route. Instead, they chose a higher calling of sacrificial love and service.

Please join me in praying for Nancy's complete recovery and giving thanks for the Writebols, Samaritan's Purse, and the SIM mission agency for working tirelessly to help Ebola victims and others in need in Liberia.

DEMOCRATS' MIDDLE CLASS
AGENDA

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, the economy is rebounding, but many of our constituents are still feeling the effects of the recession. Millions of people are still unemployed after losing jobs that never came back during the recovery.

The recently passed Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is a step that will help prepare Americans for in-demand jobs based on the needs of local businesses, resulting in a more skilled workforce and greater business productivity. But our failure to fully embrace and address this challenge is unacceptable. So today I rise to highlight the importance of investing in the true engine of our economy, the American worker.

We have a great opportunity to build the middle class with a jump-start agenda that focuses on American workers. This agenda incentivizes U.S. job creation, increases infrastructure investments, and raises the minimum wage, all of which will help workers find quality, stable employment. We still have a lot of work to do to rebuild our economy, but investing in American workers is the right path forward.

TONY GELDENS: DUTCH RESISTANCE FIGHTER, AMERICAN PATRIOT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Tony Geldens was a Dutch boy when on May 10, 1940, the Nazis invaded and occupied the Netherlands. Persecution of the Jews began immediately by the occupiers. Jews were required to wear yellow Stars of David on their clothing. Jews were shot, beaten, and sent to concentration camps.

Tony and a few of his Boy Scout friends joined the Dutch resistance. Tony began a 4-year career of being the Robin Hood of the Netherlands. He would steal supplies and food from the Nazis and give them to local Jews and citizens, much to the risk of his own safety. He hid Jews and helped rescue American and Allied pilots that had been shot down over the Netherlands. He would help the pilots through the

Dutch underground and help get them safely to England.

Tony was arrested, beaten, and imprisoned numerous times by the Nazis, only to escape. He was on trial by the Nazis when the Canadians liberated his hometown. Numerous Jews and Allied pilots lived because of Tony Geldens.

Tony moved to America in 1967, married Anna, had five kids, and finally became a U.S. citizen in 2000. He wore the American flag lapel pin every day of his life.

He was an architect and political and community activist. My very good and personal friend Tony Geldens died yesterday in Kingwood, Texas, at the age of 90. Tony will be missed deeply. He was quite an individual.

And that is just the way it is.

REPUBLICAN LAWSUIT AGAINST
THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, with just 2 days left until the Congress leaves for a 5-week recess, I rise today to urge my colleagues to take the little time we have left to address the issues that are most important to the American people.

As we speak, Republicans in Congress are wasting taxpayer money and time on a lawsuit against the President. Over what? Because they disagree with his political ideology. From the very day he was elected, the Republicans have been determined to delegitimize this President, even at the cost of their constituents not receiving their unemployment insurance extension and other things. What is it, Mr. Speaker, about this President that will have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle resort to anything to delegitimize him?

He is the President of the United States, elected by the majority of the people in this Nation. And I say that he should be respected, as every other President in this great Nation has been.

STOP DISABILITY FRAUD ACT OF
2014

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every worker in America pays a portion of their hard-earned wages into the Social Security Disability Insurance program for promised benefits if he or she becomes too disabled to work.

While providing a vital safety net, the disability program is plagued by major fraud. This fraud reveals significant weaknesses in the program that put at risk not only billions of taxpayer dollars but also the benefits on

which millions of disabled Americans rely.

At a time when the program revenues will cover only 81 percent of benefits in 2016, not one dime should be lost to fraud, waste, or abuse. That is why as chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, I am introducing the Stop Disability Fraud Act which makes fair, commonsense changes to combat fraud and better protect taxpayers and beneficiaries. Americans want, need, and deserve no less. I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

DO YOUR JOB

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the GOP majority, our immigration system is still broken, offshore tax loopholes are still open, criminals can still buy guns on the Internet, and corporations can still pay workers poverty wages.

When you have no record to run on, when you have destroyed what little faith Americans have left for this institution, what do you do? You sue the President for doing his job, when the problem is that you refuse to do your own.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP is guilty of recklessly abandoning 3.5 million job seekers who need unemployment insurance to feed their families, guilty of putting gun industry interests ahead of public safety, and guilty of willfully neglecting the priorities of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, in the condominiums of south Florida, my constituents sometimes turn to Yiddish to find the perfect word. They have a message for the GOP majority: Stop this mishegas—craziness—and do your jobs.

EXECUTIVE OVERREACH

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, article I of the Constitution vests the power to make laws in the United States Congress. The President is given the responsibility to faithfully execute the laws passed by the Congress. President Obama has failed to understand this vital distinction. The President is not able to unilaterally bend the law to his own goals and desires.

Take, for example, the latest news reports indicating that he plans to expand amnesty and extend work permits and visas for millions of illegal aliens, all by using executive orders. These are not lawful actions. These are the power-hungry actions of a President who refuses to work with Congress.

By suing President Obama for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the

land, we are saying, stop. The people's representatives will not turn a blind eye to the lawlessness of this President. We will do whatever it takes to hold him and future occupants of the Oval Office accountable. We must make it clear that the U.S. Congress is a coequal branch of government and one that represents we, the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the President.

THE BUFFALO BILLS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in my western New York community, there is no shortage of pride for our NFL Buffalo Bills. Taxpayers are currently investing millions into the existing stadium, and the community is engaged in discussions about future ownership and potential construction of a new stadium.

Despite this, outside interests are making moves to pull the team out of Buffalo, and antiquated rules turn TV screens black on game day. Both threaten to take the team away from its loyal fan base.

Our legislation, the Furthering Access and Networks for Sports Act, eliminates the antitrust exemption that gives NFL teams the ability to black out home games that haven't sold out and ensures that local fans will be able to watch their teams from home.

The people of Buffalo have stood by our team. And the next owner of this franchise, the Buffalo Bills, must be one that will stand with this community for generations to come.

□ 1215

PRESIDENT'S UNLAWFUL ACTION

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, article I of our Constitution says Congress makes the laws, article II says the President enforces them, and according to article III, the judicial branch resolves conflicts between Congress and the executive. That is the system the Founders gave us. That is why the House of Representatives is taking the President to court to stop his unlawful actions.

According to legal experts, legislators sued the executive branch 41 times. Sixty-eight percent of the time, they were brought by Democrats, including the Rules Committee ranking member, who joined a 2006 Democratic lawsuit against President Bush. Now, you would think the Democrats could have better spent that time working to avoid the Great Recession of 2008.

President Obama unilaterally delayed the legislative mandate in the

Affordable Care Act without consulting Congress. This is only one of many areas he has abused his executive authority, with the latest abuse leading up to the current border crisis.

No President of either party should ever abuse their power. That is why this lawsuit is so necessary.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Democrats overwhelmingly supported a sustainable solution to the current shortfall in the highway trust fund, but when the entire House didn't adopt it, the Democrats provided the votes to move the issue on to the Senate, confident that with more time and discussion, we can do better, especially working with the vast army of stakeholders who build, maintain, and use our Nation's transportation system.

Our cooperation and confidence yesterday was rewarded as the Senate overwhelmingly passed what was essentially the Democratic motion of 2 weeks ago. With the artful and strong leadership of Chairman WYDEN, Chairwoman BOXER, Ranking Member HATCH, Senators CARPER, CORKER, and MURPHY, they carried the argument, and they carried the day. The result was 79 votes for a sustainable solution.

Mr. Speaker, the stakeholders are united. They are out now across the country, arguing that we allow the House to vote on the Senate proposal. Let's commit to working together to solve this transportation problem.

RECOGNIZING HOBE AND SUE WILLIAMS FOR THEIR WORK IN THE DAILY BREAD COMMUNITY KITCHEN

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hobe and Sue Williams for their service to the people of the great State of Tennessee.

Hobe and Sue founded the Daily Bread Community Kitchen in Morristown, Tennessee, in November of 1994 in response to what they saw as a growing need for feeding the poor. Upon opening, the Daily Bread managed to feed around 50 people a day.

Today, the nonprofit feeds over 350 people a day, every day except Sundays, and has just renovated their building, providing them with an even greater opportunity to serve their east Tennessee neighbors. Twenty years later and staffed with 150 volunteers, the Daily Bread continues to provide for those most in need.

At age 89, Hobe Williams, with his wife, Sue, by his side, have no immediate plans to retire and continue to

work hard for the people of east Tennessee. East Tennessee is a better place to live and our community is stronger because of the dedication of people like Hobe and Sue Williams.

God bless you, Hobe and Sue, for your service and friendship, and I wish you all the best with the newly-renovated building.

ANOTHER LOST SUMMER

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House is about to go out for 5 weeks, but first, they are going to sue the President and hope that we don't pay attention to the unfinished business of this country. I only have 1 minute, so I am going to have to read it fast.

Let me list for you some of the bills they are not going to address: comprehensive immigration reform, propping up the highway trust fund, funding the Federal Government, reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank, providing additional resources to fight wildfires in the West, bipartisan Federal IT procurement reform, raising the minimum wage, extending emergency unemployment insurance, reauthorizing terrorism risk insurance, comprehensive tax reform, modernizing the Voting Rights Amendment Act, and ensuring equal pay and nondiscrimination of the workplace.

I have run out of time, but our constituents have run out of patience with this majority.

MAJORITY LEADER ERIC CANTOR AND ISRAEL

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR and to support a country I know is so dear to his heart.

Yes, Leader CANTOR has been focused on making life better for the American people, and his recent contributions in the areas of workforce training and pediatric research will have a lasting impact on generations to come.

He has also been a mentor and a friend to many new Members of the House. He and his wife, Diana, have led several freshman trips to Israel for many years, and I was very fortunate my husband and I were able to participate on one of those trips last summer.

Seeing this innovative nation and preeminent ally is truly a life-changing experience. In Israel, I found a people that craves peace for all of its citizens of all faiths, even when faced with enemies who want nothing more than to erase Israel from the map.

I want to say, loud and clear, that Members of this body are committed to Israel. We stand together with Israel and its obligation to defend its people from attacks from the terrorist group Hamas.

We are so grateful we have had a member of our leadership team so committed to a strong and thriving Israel. Leader CANTOR's efforts in Congress have lived up to the title he holds. He is a true leader. This is a tribute to that strong leadership for Israel.

VETERANS DESERVE CARE AND BENEFITS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent revelations of corruption and scandal at the VA have cast a dark cloud over a Department that should be held to the highest possible standard.

We cannot forget the cost of war does not stop when the last bullets are fired. We have an obligation to make sure that every last veteran gets the care and benefits that he or she earned on the battlefield.

The compromise that is before us today is an important step forward. It provides emergency funding for access to timely care and invests in the VA's long-term capacity to address veterans' needs, but still, there is more to be done.

I regularly meet with young veterans in San Diego who are having trouble adapting to civilian life. These are some of the brightest, hardest-working men and women in the United States, and yet they often find it hard to prove that the skills they developed in the military have prepared them for work or school.

To help them, we need to take a broader look at the challenges veterans face entering the workforce, getting an education, and managing their finances as they transition out of the service.

I certainly look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that our veterans have the tools they need to succeed. It is the least we can do.

RECOGNIZING NAVAL CHAPLAINS

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our military chaplains. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Congressional Prayer Caucus, I am blessed to often witness firsthand the importance of a strong chaplain corps.

Two chaplains I have encountered recently are prime examples: Navy Commander Roy Hoffman and Navy Captain Michael Gore.

Commander Hoffman serves as the senior chaplain aboard USS *Ronald Reagan*, an aircraft carrier with over 4,000 sailors, most of whom work long, exhausting hours, only to return to cramped racks for a brief rest.

Commander Hoffman and his staff support these sailors through traditional prayer and worship, as well as counseling, mentorship, and community outreach.

As senior chaplain at the Naval Academy, Captain Gore is a valuable resource for the thousands of midshipmen facing rigorous academics and training as they prepare to be leaders in our military.

Serving in our All-Volunteer Force can be challenging, and the presence of chaplains like Commander Hoffman and Captain Michael Gore is critical for maintaining strong morale across our military.

Please join me in showing support and gratitude toward all of our military chaplains.

MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, too many middle class families are still struggling to make ends meet. Income inequality continues to grow, and unemployment remains unacceptably high, particularly in my home of State of Rhode Island. Our constituents deserve solutions that will promote job creation and increase economic opportunities for everyone.

One of the most important things that we can do for our country is to ensure that our workers have 21st century skills for a 21st century economy. In particular, I have been proud to work across the aisle to expand career and technical education, securing a \$52 million increase for funding for Perkins Act career training programs this year alone.

However, skills training is only one piece of the puzzle. We must incentivize companies to bring jobs back home, increase the minimum wage so that full-time workers aren't living in poverty, and invest in infrastructure to ensure safety, boost commerce, and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, economic opportunity should not be subject to partisan politics. It is time to act on these common-sense policies and provide all Americans with the means to make it in America.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an ongoing

employment challenge facing our Nation's veterans. When I go back home to Oklahoma, I speak with a lot of local veterans who can't find jobs.

It is unfortunate because these men and women are some of the hardest-working individuals you will ever find. I know because I have hired veterans in my private sector business, and I currently have two congressional team members who are veterans.

So I can tell you they are motivated and they are ready to work, but we must remember that serving our Nation is no easy task, and these men and women are facing transitional challenges. On top of that, our wounded warriors battle a whole host of adversities, but with the right training, I have seen our veterans do amazing things.

In my district, companies like Baker Hughes—one of the world's largest oil field service companies—are training and hiring veterans and seeing tremendous results.

So I stand here today to encourage both the private and public sector to come together to give our Nation's heroes a fighting chance for their incredible service to this great Nation.

GOP LAWSUIT TO NOWHERE

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the baseless, misguided, and partisan lawsuit that our Republican colleagues have brought to the floor for a vote today. This lawsuit is just a continuance of the outright disrespect and disdain that the House Republicans have given President Barack Obama since he was elected.

While millions of Americans are waiting for Congress to renew emergency unemployment insurance and raise the minimum wage, we are here debating a senseless lawsuit. I am disappointed by the shameful partisan politics that is being played.

In contrast, I am proud of the work that we are doing as House Democrats trying to put the American people first with our Make It In America agenda and working to jump-start the middle class. With a long laundry list of things we need to get done, it is time to promote the people's business, not our political parties' business.

Enough is enough. With only 2 days left before our 5-week recess, we need to be doing the business of the American people, not the business of our political parties.

COMMENDING SAMARITAN'S PURSE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the dedicated work under-

taken by Samaritan's Purse, an international Christian aid group based in Boone, North Carolina. Specifically, I want to bring to your attention Dr. Kent Brantly, who has been heading up Samaritan's Purse work with Ebola patients in Monrovia, Liberia.

Tragically, Dr. Brantly, along with fellow American missionary Nancy Writebol, has contracted the Ebola virus. Both are currently fighting for their lives in an isolation ward in an African hospital.

Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues and all who hear this to join me in prayer for Dr. Brantly, Mrs. Writebol, and the more than 1,000 other patients who have contracted Ebola in this outbreak, which has already claimed over 600 lives.

The disease continues to spread, and Dr. Brantly, true to the selfless spirit of his missionary calling, has asked that his case not be treated differently from any other. Let us keep all those affected in our prayers.

DO-NOTHING GOP

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Republican Speaker JOHN BOEHNER will adjourn the House, and Congress will leave town for 5 full weeks. I rise to urge Speaker BOEHNER to cancel this recess and keep us in session, so we can address the urgent issues facing the American people.

Democrats have a clear list of priorities that will jump-start the middle class. We want to renew emergency unemployment benefits, raise the minimum wage, fix our broken immigration system, reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, invest in repairing and rebuilding America's infrastructure, and make sure women earn equal pay for equal work.

We have an opportunity to lift millions of hardworking Americans out of poverty, create jobs, and grow the economy by passing these bills that will help the middle class.

It is a complete dereliction of duty for Speaker BOEHNER to adjourn the House and leave town without addressing any of these issues, but what is even worse, instead of getting these things done for the American people, the Republicans will take up a bill to sue the President for moving too slowly to enact a bill that they oppose, that they have tried to stop over 50 times.

You can't make this stuff up. The American people deserve better, and the American people cannot afford 5 weeks of inaction.

□ 1230

ALARMING SITUATION ON OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the situation on our southern border and the influx of unaccompanied migrant children is both tragic and alarming. Even more concerning is the lack of leadership coming from the White House.

We also know that a law passed in 2008—the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization—has further complicated the administration's response. The law guarantees minors from Central America a court date and assistance for temporary relocation as they wait out their pending appeal. Unfortunately, a large number of these individuals evade attending these proceedings. Few minors are sent home, and most are able to stay for years, if not permanently.

The current situation is a stark reminder of just how flawed the Senate's immigration reform bill is. Granting amnesty to millions would merely reinforce the perception that, if you come to the United States illegally, you will be rewarded. Unfortunately, billions in new spending will not reverse the perception of a lenient enforcement environment in the United States.

What we need is for the White House to enforce the laws, secure the borders, and put aside political games and start working with Congress in a bipartisan manner.

NOTARIO VICTIM RELIEF ACT

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, while America waits for House Republicans in Washington to bring immigration reform to a vote, we cannot forget about the invisible casualties of our broken immigration process, notario fraud victims.

While there are many communities and religious organizations that are providing legitimate immigration-related services, there is also a growing number of nonlawyers posing as legal consultants, and they are known as "notarios," and they are not licensed to give legal advice. Notarios are basically scam artists who prey on immigrant communities.

This week I introduced H.R. 5228, the Notario Victim Relief Act, which would allow victims of notario fraud to reopen their cases and immigrate lawfully. The bill is just the first step toward stopping fraudulent immigration services in our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of H.R. 5228 and help the victims of our broken immigration system.

THANKING JAY KROEZE

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank a constituent from the wonderful little town of Biglerville, Pennsylvania, for his service and sacrifice to spread the cooperative principle of concern for community.

Jay Kroeze, a lead lineman at Adams Electric Cooperative, volunteered for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation in Haiti as part of the Caracol Community Electrification Project. He spent 2 weeks in northern Haiti building and upgrading more than a mile and a half of power lines to help communities receive affordable, safe, and reliable electricity.

To date, more than 4,800 consumers in the northern part of Haiti now have access to electricity. Some now have TVs. A few have water treatment plants. Doctors can provide better care to patients, and residents have opened their own small businesses.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International currently is providing support to USAID in Haiti to bring safe, reliable, and affordable electricity to areas in northern Haiti.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I commend Jay Kroeze and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association International Foundation for their tireless efforts in Haiti and around the world.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT
SUCCEEDS IN KENTUCKY

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Kentucky has been a national model for how the Affordable Care Act can succeed. Through Kynect, our State exchange, more than 413,000 Kentuckians have gotten health insurance, nearly 310,000 of them for the first time.

These two maps show how health reform has reduced the rate of the uninsured in the Commonwealth's 120 counties. The orange and red in the top map show counties with pre-Affordable Care Act uninsured rates of 14 percent to more than 20 percent. Some of the most impoverished areas, such as eastern Kentucky, also had the highest uninsured rates.

The bottom map shows Kentucky today under the health care law. Only one county still has an uninsured rate of more than 14 percent. In three counties in the heart of Appalachia, the uninsured rate plummeted from more than 20 percent to less than 5 percent, as shown in blue.

Mr. Speaker, overall, in just 6 months, the Affordable Care Act reduced the total number of uninsured Kentuckians by nearly a half. Behind every number, behind every red county turned blue or green are the stories of a person or family getting the health care they need. That is success by any standard, but most importantly, Kentucky standards.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, some of our military have been sent emails telling them not to eat or drink in front of their Muslim brothers who are with them during Ramadan. I have never heard the military come out and say don't eat leavened food in front of your Jewish colleagues during Yom Kippur or Passover. I have never heard the military put out something such as be careful what you are eating in front of your Christian brothers during Lent because they may have chosen to do without.

Last Christmas, soldiers at Camp Shelby in Mississippi were told during a diversity briefing that they could not use the word "Christmas." A VA hospital in Texas refused to accept holiday cards from boys and girls because the cards mentioned "Christmas" or "God bless you," and a nativity scene near a lake on Shaw Air Force Base in South Carolina was removed after someone complained.

So you might understand why Ron Crews, executive director of the Chaplain Alliance for Religious Liberty, is a bit surprised by the Pentagon's recent behavior.

There is a good Biblical word for this: hypocrisy.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I sit on the Natural Resources Committee here in the House, and through our investigations into our treasured national parks, my colleagues and I have discovered a number of tragic choices and changes that are in store for all of us and our children.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Glacier National Park's glaciers will melt and be no more.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Joshua Tree National Park's Joshua trees will disappear from the park named after them.

Mr. Speaker, because of a changing climate, Rocky Mountain National Park's forests are dying because mild winters cannot kill pine beetles, which are devastating the park's trees.

Climate change is upon us now. We are paying for its effects today, regardless of the number of votes this body takes to deny what is happening before our eyes.

COMPETING FOR JOBS

(Mr. RICE of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, counties and States around this country compete every day for jobs. How they do it is not complicated. They adjust their tax and their regulatory burdens to attract businesses, and those that do the best job attract the most jobs. The problem is that they are competing for a declining pool of jobs in America because Washington is not competitive. We need to adopt that competitive attitude right here.

In times of war, we forget partisanship and pull together. In truth, we are in an economic war. Countries around the world have teams of people that work every day to beat us economically. The House has passed 39 jobs bills in this Congress which are gathering dust in the Senate. Surely HARRY REID and the President can find one among these 39 bills they can work with to make our country more competitive and put our people back to work.

COMMEMORATING 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, thank you President Johnson, and happy birthday to Medicaid and Medicare. I am excited about the lives that have been saved, and I am looking forward to the full expansion in all 50 States of Medicaid in 2015, its 50th birthday.

I will tell you, when President Johnson signed Medicare into law, less than 50 percent of our seniors had health insurance and 35 percent lived in poverty. Now, over 52.4 million Americans are given health care benefits through Medicare, Medicaid, regardless of their condition, and then for some also when their income is very low.

Mr. Speaker, 43.6 million Americans age 65 and above have Medicare and Medicaid, including 8.8 million disabled. Our seniors are able to be in long-term living because of Medicaid. By the time the baby boomers reach 65, it is expected that 80 million people will be covered by Medicare.

What is the common sense and lack thereof of the States that have not accepted expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act? Mr. Speaker,

Medicare and Medicaid together save lives. I am interested in saving lives. Let's stand up for the Affordable Care Act, Medicare, and Medicaid to save the lives of Americans.

ISSUES CONGRESS NEEDS TO ADDRESS

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise deeply disappointed in Congress this week. There are real issues that Congress needs to address for the American people. But instead of addressing the long-term issues of comprehensive immigration reform, comprehensive tax reform, our debt and deficit, getting our economy going, we are considering suing the President of the United States and beating the drum of impeachment.

Where were my Republican colleagues when President Bush was issuing his egregious executive orders? The hypocrisy here is appalling.

We need to provide long-term funding for the highway trust fund, the Export-Import Bank to keep the American businesses competitive, Federal education programs to prepare our people and children for the next generation and workforce. We need to pass a long-term solution for our doctors. We need to provide funding to address the wildfires that are ravaging the Western United States, including my home State of Oregon. We need to get the unregulated amount of money out of politics.

We need to get back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 676, AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 935, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2014, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2014

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 694 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 694

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered

as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014,—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 964 provides for consideration of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013.

On Monday, the House had a full and thorough debate on H.R. 935. While the bill did not gain the two-thirds major-

ity necessary to pass by suspension, it did receive 253 bipartisan votes.

□ 1245

It is important we pass this bill in order to reduce the regulatory burden that has been placed on the nearly 365,000 pesticide users, and this rule allows us to do that.

The rule also allows the House to consider H. Res. 676.

This resolution will allow the Speaker to initiate litigation for actions by the President—or other executive branch officials—inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution.

The fact that we have to sue the President simply to ensure that he is working within the constraints of the Constitution, to me, Mr. Speaker, is troubling, but that is the situation we are facing.

While there have always been disagreements between the legislative and executive branches about how expansive the President's authority is, the Constitution is explicit that Congress writes the laws and the President's role is to "take care" that those laws are faithfully executed. No President may have both powers.

Our Founding Fathers understood the danger of having a President who not only enforced the laws, but made them. An executive with those powers would easily infringe on citizens' liberty. Our Founders saw this firsthand. That is why they were fleeing to come to this country and form this country. They knew the Executive would try to exceed the power afforded under the Constitution, even when it is occupied by someone who previously taught the limits the Constitution puts on Presidential power. That is why they were so careful in delegating among the three branches.

This system of checks and balances has served America so well for so long. Now, I am sorry for the civics lesson, but it is clear that some on the other side of the aisle have temporarily lost sight of how important these checks and balances are to the functioning of this House and to the legislative branch in general.

But that wasn't always the case. When Representative CONYERS, for instance, was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he remarked:

We are coequal branch of government, and if our system of checks and balances is going to operate, it is imperative that we understand how the executive branch is enforcing or ignoring the bills that are signed into law.

Representative NADLER, for his part, cautioned:

And I hope that anyone who thinks that inquiring into the excesses of the executive branch and into what appears to be a concentrated effort in every different aspect of law to destroy the power of the Congress and the judiciary and to limit our power to protect the liberties of the American people against encroachments by the Executive are a waste of time, I hope they will rethink what they are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, I read these quotes to illustrate the concern of the executive branch overstepping its authority isn't confined to just one party or one President. This is a legislative versus executive issue; it is not a Democrat versus Republican issue. And, to be frank, the legislative branch has been on the losing end of this for quite some time.

But my point is that we shouldn't be so callous or shortsighted as to not defend our article I powers simply because the President in question happens to belong to one party.

If we don't take action now, what stops future Presidents—Republican or Democrat—from eroding our powers further? Congress, itself, has shown little opposition to the harm it has done to the separation of powers over the years. That is why it is critical that we take action now. This should be a cause that the legislative branch can unite around, not divide over.

Instead, we have Members of Congress standing in applause when the President says he will bypass Congress to enact his agenda. Mr. Speaker, half of this body stood up in applause. It should be done in defiance. Here we have Members of Congress cheering for the President for basically saying he is going to eliminate their purpose here.

This isn't the first President whose actions have raised the alarms of an overreaching executive, and it is clear if we do nothing, it will not be the last.

I urge my colleagues to defend our role in government, and to stop the assault on the separation of powers.

Let's finally say to the Executive: "Enough is enough." Let's finally say: "Support the Constitution, support the separation of powers, and support this rule."

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Today, we are taking up the very serious issue of the constitutionality of separation of powers, but the rule also covers the deregulation of pesticides. I think that should be noted here as well, because one is as ridiculous as the other.

This is a ridiculous lawsuit of one House of Congress seeking to sue the President for not implementing a law they have tried everything to kill.

The majority has wasted time, money, and energy on legislative proposals designed to distract us from the real problems of the United States.

Instead of tackling climate change, ensuring that college is affordable, and modernizing our crumbling infrastructure, the majority wants to sue the President for doing his job. The record is clear. This has been judged the most recalcitrant and useless Congress in history.

This lawsuit will be a monumental waste of time, energy, and funds. This is a political maneuver timed to peak as Americans go to the polls in November for the midterm elections. This lawsuit is a drumbeat pushing Members of the Republican Party to impeachment.

Last week in the Rules Committee, Democrats attempted to amend this resolution. In the pursuit of transparency and accountability, we offered several amendments that addressed the cost of this lawsuit.

The majority in the Rules Committee voted down every amendment that the minority offered. With this closed rule, we have set a new record, by the way, for the most closed rules in a single Congress. On the committee level, on the House floor, and in the minds of our citizens, this is a closed process, a partisan maneuver, and nothing but a political messaging opportunity.

This lawsuit is a gimmick, which even legal scholars of the majority's own party say will fail, including the conservative writer and former Justice Department official Andrew C. McCarthy. He wrote about this lawsuit and said it is:

A classic case of assuming the pose of meaningful action while in reality doing nothing.

Democrats in the House and the American people could not agree more.

The House minority has three main concerns about this lawsuit: first, the cost; second, the partisan nature; and third, the lack of legal standing and the implications for our constitutional separation of powers.

First, the cost. Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, which not a single Republican voted for, the majority has mounted a Herculean effort trying to repeal, dismantle, and discredit it. It seems that they will spare no expense attempting to take health care away from millions of Americans.

Not only did they shut down the government to deny Americans health care, it took from this economy \$24 billion to pay for that shutdown. In addition, with over 50 votes on the House floor to undermine the Affordable Care Act, the majority has spent more than \$79 million on that voting effort.

When the minority of the Rules Committee requested from the majority the proximate costs of this lawsuit, we got a response that read: "A lawsuit is a small price to pay."

Cost is not a hypothetical question, because there are real consequences for our country.

The minority and the American people still would like to know how much will this cost and where will the money come from. We asked directly through letters and by offering amendments to the resolution, and we have gotten no clear answers.

What cuts will come from what programs that Americans depend on to

pay for this ridiculous lawsuit? The majority will spend money on more than 13 hearings, 50 briefings, 25,000 pages of documents produced, and allocated \$3.3 million for a Select Committee on Benghazi. All that money for Benghazi, but they won't give us a concrete answer on where the funds will originate to pay for the lawsuit.

In a similar lawsuit, when Republicans defended the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, they paid their lawyers \$520 an hour. I choke over that figure. At that rate, we would have paid over \$1 million a year for a 40-hour workweek. If we are spending that kind of money, we ought to do it out in the open, and that amendment was defeated on party lines.

The majority does not intend to make this lawsuit anything but another opportunity to attack the President, which leads me to our second concern: its partisan nature.

As I said, no Republican voted for the Affordable Care Act. After strenuous efforts to take health care away from millions of Americans, the majority plans to file a lawsuit that, if successful, would result in the faster implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The inconsistency is breathtaking. Let me reiterate that. After not a single vote for health care, with over 50 votes to kill it, they are suing the President of the United States because he did not implement it faster. I don't know if anybody can make sense out of that, but all this effort to derail a law that is working. Just 2 days ago, The Washington Post reported in an article, titled "Medicare finances improve partly due to ACA, hospital expenses, trustee report says," that the Affordable Care Act has extended the life of Medicare by 4 years because of the savings, and that will only get better.

I would like to insert this article from The Washington Post dated July 28, 2014, into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 2014]
MEDICARE FINANCES IMPROVE PARTLY DUE TO ACA, HOSPITAL EXPENSES, TRUSTEE REPORT SAYS—OUTLOOK FOR SOCIAL SECURITY, HOWEVER, REMAINS THE SAME

(By Amy Goldstein)

Medicare's financial stability has been strengthened by the Affordable Care Act and other forces that have been subduing health-care spending, according to a new official forecast that says the fund covering the program's hospital costs will remain solvent until 2030—four years later than expected a year ago.

The annual report, issued Monday by trustees overseeing the government's two largest entitlement programs, found little change overall in the finances of Social Security. The trustees warned, however, that the part of Social Security that pays monthly benefits to people with disabilities is especially fragile and, without changes, will start to run short of money for benefit checks in 2016.

Taken together, the findings provide a nuanced portrait of the fiscal future of these two programs, which act as cornerstones of social insurance—and a buffer against poverty—for older people and other vulnerable

Americans. The trustees welcomed the improved financial prospects for Medicare but acknowledged that the underlying reasons are not yet entirely understood. At the same time, they exhorted Congress to take steps to prevent both programs from collapsing in the long term.

"Neither Medicare nor Social Security can sustain projected long-run program costs," the trustees said in a message accompanying their reports.

For the past few decades, Democrats and Republicans have fretted about the unsustainability of the Medicare and Social Security programs. They have appointed high-level commissions, proposed legislation and tried to stoke public fears that benefits might not be available for their parents—or themselves. But Congress has not restructured either program to withstand long-term fiscal pressures, and the issue has been absent lately from the agendas of both parties.

At a news briefing Monday, Cabinet secretaries and two public trustees reiterated the call for Congress to act. "[We] must make manageable changes now, so we do not have to make drastic changes later," Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said.

"It is getting very late in the game" to find a bipartisan consensus, said the trustees' only Republican, Charles P. Blahous III, who worked on Social Security and other economic issues as an aide to President George W. Bush. "A solution much further delayed is a solution much less likely to occur."

Both programs are being strained by the nation's demographics. As more baby boomers reach retirement age, people 65 and older are making up an increasing percentage of the country's population, with proportionally fewer working-age Americans chipping in payroll taxes.

Medicare's finances are facing other pressures, too, including from scientific advances that lead to new treatment and therapies, the report said.

The trustees' forecast said that the trust fund that pays for hospital care—Medicare Part A—has been strengthened significantly, with the date when it is predicted to start running short of money extended by 14 years since the Affordable Care Act was enacted in 2010. The report also predicted that the insurance premiums that older Americans pay for the portion of Medicare that covers doctors' visits and other outpatient care would probably remain the same for a third year in a row.

Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Mathews Burwell said that it is impossible so far to gauge how much of that trust fund's improved fiscal health was due to the health-care law as opposed to other changes in the health-care system that are slowing cost increases. She said both had a role. The ACA, for instance, is slowing payments to Medicare Advantage, the part of the program in which older Americans join private health plans, while other provisions focus on curbing hospital readmissions.

The report said that spending on hospital stays last year was less than expected, although trustees noted that analysts have not determined whether this trend reflected broad economic trends or stemmed from specific changes in the practice of medical care.

If Medicare is unchanged by 2030, the year it is projected to become insolvent, it would then be able to pay 85 percent of its beneficiaries' hospital bills, a proportion that would slip to 75 percent by 2047, the forecast said.

For Social Security, the trustees predicted that the program's two separate trust funds

will, combined, have enough money to pay all the retirement and disability benefits it owes until 2033, the same time horizon as in the last two annual forecasts. They forecast that Social Security will be able to afford checks for retirees and workers' survivors until 2034—nearly two decades longer than the part of the program that pays disability benefits.

Social Security's expenditures last year exceeded its income from payroll taxes, as it has each year since 2010, the report says, although interest so far is making up the difference.

This year, President Obama backed away from an idea he broached in his budget last year to save money for Social Security by changing the basis on which inflation is calculated for the program. But his 2015 budget proposal reprises the idea of charging more for care under Medicare to older Americans who are relatively well-off—an idea that Congress has not touched this year.

In calculating Medicare's future finances, the trustees for the first time acknowledged that Congress has each year overridden scheduled reductions in Medicare doctors' fees—cuts that, if adopted, would lower payments for doctors' services by 21 percent in 2015. In the latest report, the trustees assumed that such cuts would continue to be waived.

The trustees noted that their new forecast was released 49 years to the week that President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the law that enacted Medicare, a major component of the Great Society programs of the mid-1960s. Social Security was a response to the Great Depression of the 1930s.

Last year, Medicare insured 52 million Americans, including 43.5 million age 65 and older and nearly 9 million younger people with disabilities. Social Security last year provided benefits to 41 million retired workers and their families, 6 million survivors of workers who died, and 11 million working-age people with disabilities.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll from the Commonwealth Fund found 77 percent of people were pleased with their new coverage. Republicans themselves have a 74 percent satisfaction rate with the new plan that they have bought.

The House majority is going to spend unknown millions of dollars coming from somewhere to stymie a law their own party Members support.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this article from Talking Points Memo, citing a survey from July 10, 2014, entitled: "Survey: Most Republicans Who Bought ObamaCare Coverage Like Their Plans," into the RECORD.

[From Talking Points Memo Livewire, July 10, 2014]

SURVEY: MOST REPUBLICANS WHO BOUGHT OBAMACARE COVERAGE LIKE THEIR PLANS
(By Dylan Scott)

About three-quarters of Republicans who obtained health insurance under Obamacare are satisfied with their coverage, according to a survey published Thursday by the Commonwealth Fund.

The survey found that 74 percent of Republicans said they were very or somewhat satisfied with their new coverage. Overall, 78 percent of Americans said they were satisfied: 73 percent of those enrolled in a private plan and 84 percent of those enrolled in Medicaid.

There was a minimal difference between the previously uninsured and the previously insured: 79 percent of the former were satisfied and 77 percent of the latter were, according to the survey by the group, which is generally supportive of Obamacare.

Those surveyed also reported being better off: 58 percent said that they were better off now than they were before, while 9 percent said they were worse off. And 81 percent said that they were optimistic that their new coverage would help them get the health care they need.

Some of the survey's broader findings, on the overall drop in the number of uninsured and the percentage of Obamacare enrollees who were previously uninsured, generally fell within other findings. It found that the uninsured rate for adults under 65 fell from 20 percent to 15 percent since Obamacare enrollment began. It also found that 63 percent of Obamacare enrollees had been previously uninsured.

The survey, conducted from April 9 to June 2, covered 4,425 U.S. adults.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is also obvious to the American people that this is a political stunt. A recent poll, commissioned by CNN, shows 57 percent of us oppose this lawsuit. That is right: the majority of this country recognizes it for what it is: a political scheme. They recognize that there is no basis for this lawsuit.

And our third concern is the legitimacy of standing, in the legal sense, as well as the constitutional principles that the Supreme Court has said limit the kind of disputes that a court can consider.

Perhaps the best authority for the inadequacy of the majority's claim to standing is one of the majority's own witnesses at our Rules hearing, the Florida International University College of Law professor, Elizabeth Price Foley. Professor Foley wrote in a February article:

When a President delays or exempts people from a law—so-called benevolent suspensions—who has standing to sue him? Generally, no one. Benevolent suspensions of law don't, by definition, create a sufficiently concrete injury for standing.

That's why, when President Obama delayed various provisions of ObamaCare, his actions cannot be challenged in court. Congress probably can't sue the President, either.

If the majority's own witness doesn't think that Congress has standing, what judge will?

Finally, one of the most dangerous possible consequences of this lawsuit would be an unprecedented transfer of powers from the legislative to the judicial branch.

This concern for maintaining the separation of powers as it was written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers is exactly why courts have established what is called the "political question doctrine."

It says that courts should stay out of fights between the other two branches of the Federal Government and should defer to the other branches when the Constitution says the matter to be resolved is the responsibility of the

President or the Congress. That couldn't be clearer, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1300

The mismanagement of our Nation's funds is deplorable, the partisan nature of the stunt is a abundantly clear, and our constitutional balance of powers is in jeopardy. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the closed rule which, yet again, distorts the legislative process and stifles debate even on the most important issues.

Mr. Speaker, we will ask the House to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to bring up four bills: first, the Bring Jobs Home Act; second, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which pays women equal to men for the same job; third, a bill to increase the minimum wage to \$10.10; and finally, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which makes it easier for young people to pay their college loans.

These are the priorities of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and align themselves with those priorities instead of this lawsuit, which is surely a waste of time, money, and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate law of our great Nation is not just the important work that we undertake here in the House. Above all else, it is the Constitution that we all swear to preserve, protect, and defend. Above everything, it is the Constitution.

The first words of the Constitution, article I, section 1, are the following:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

It doesn't just say "some." It says all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States. No other entity of our Federal Government has the power to write law, not the executive branch or the judicial branch—only Congress.

Article I, section 7 states the following:

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate

shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves, he shall sign it, but if not, he shall return it.

So if he approves, it shall become law. If not, he vetoes the law and sends it back to Congress. Nowhere is the President given the authority to rewrite the law on his own.

Article II, section 3 places the following responsibilities with the President:

He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks the third branch of government, the judicial branch, to solve problems arising from the President's failure to faithfully execute the law and, specifically, aspects of the Affordable Care Act, as he is required in article II, section 3 and to have exercised power expressly given to Congress to write the law under article I.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders, in their genius, put in place this system of checks and balances for a very, very important purpose, which is to make certain that no one person could both impose and then enforce the law—because that type of action amounts to tyranny, Mr. Speaker. In short, we have no king in this Nation. In America, we have a President. We do not have a king.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the people of the 10th District of Michigan and someone who is sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, I believe strongly that I have a responsibility to support this resolution, so that the courts can affirm that legislative power is vested in this House—the people's House—and not in the White House.

As the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I will have the responsibility to verify that any contracts with those who will litigate this case comport with the rules of the House. That is a responsibility I take very, very seriously.

As such, many on the minority side have asked how much this will cost. My answer is that we don't know yet because no contracts have been negotiated. We don't know how long such litigation will take to conclude, but the questions I would ask are: What price do you put on the adherence to the rule of law? What price do you place on the continuation of our system of checks and balances? What price do you put on the Constitution of the United States? My answer to each is: priceless, Mr. Speaker.

I am certain that this process will move forward with due diligence, will be conducted within the rules of this House, and it is my firm hope that in the end the courts will uphold the constitutional principles that are the bedrock upon which our great Nation has been built.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we remember why we are here today. We are here today not because of the majority's commitment to the rule of law, but because of politics. We are here because the Republican leadership of this House is trying desperately to placate the far right-wing of their base.

They are trying to placate a vocal and organized faction that refuses to accept the fact that the American people elected Barack Obama twice as President of the United States. They are birthers and Tea Partiers and minutemen militia members and supporters of nullification, but here is the problem: they will never, ever, ever be satisfied.

Listen to this finding from a poll taken just this month: 41 percent of Republicans surveyed believe that President Obama is not really an American citizen. That is percent. That is the base of the modern-day Republican Party, and it is ugly. If you are really concerned about the balance of power between the executive branch and the Congress, there are ways to address it.

Just last week, I worked with the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House and of the Foreign Affairs Committee to reaffirm the proper role of Congress in matters of war and peace. I brought a resolution to the floor under the rules of the House, and it passed by a vote of 370-40. That is the way we should do our work around here, not this nonsense about lawsuits.

It is the same with the Affordable Care Act. I know my Republican friends are devastated that the bill they hate so much is actually working. Millions of people who didn't have health insurance are now covered. Millions of people can now get preventive care. Millions of young adults can now stay on their family's insurance plan.

Being a woman is no longer considered a preexisting condition. Insurance companies can no longer discriminate against the sick, and as we learned just yesterday, the Affordable Care Act has already helped to extend the life of the Medicare trust fund by 4 years.

The entire Republican majority in this House was built on opposition to the Affordable Care Act, and yet it stands. The fact that it stands makes the Republican leadership do desperate and irrational things. It makes them vote to repeal the ACA over 50 times. It makes them decide it is somehow a great idea to sue the President for the way he is implementing the law.

It saddens me to see how low a once great party—the party of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt—has sunk. Instead of addressing the real and pressing needs of our country—passing an immigration reform bill,

raising the minimum wage, passing a long-term highway bill—they have been reduced to government shutdowns and lawsuits and partisan stunts and gimmicks.

This is show business at its worst. Enough of this stupidity. I say to my Republican friends: Do your job, do the people's work, this is shameful.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding, and I want to commend my colleague from Michigan, Congresswoman MILLER, for explaining our motivation on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule, in support of the underlying resolution, and in support of this effort to restore every branch of this government to its proper constitutional bounds.

This is not about politics. If there were a Republican President doing the same thing, I would feel just as strongly. This is about the Constitution.

Our Constitution was drafted deliberately to ensure that the greatest power in our government resided closely with the people. That is why the portion dealing with Congress was placed first.

In article I, the Framers placed the ultimate power of creating and changing laws with the Congress, and they particularly empowered the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Every 2 years, Members of this House face the voters, and our actions in this body are judged. No other member of this government must submit to the people more regularly.

For too long, this body, under the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans, has ceded parts of our constitutional authority to the executive branch and the agencies that are, at best, remotely accountable to voters. It is time for that to stop. Today, we take a step to make it stop.

This lawsuit is about actions—the actions of an administration that has claimed more power than it has been given, even when we have already given it more authority than we should have.

I bear no animus to this President, but I strongly disagree with many of his policies, his stated priorities, and, ultimately, his actions. This lawsuit is not entered into lightly. It is not our first response, but rather, it is our last resort.

I will vote “yes” on this rule and this resolution, not for electoral gain, but rather to preserve our Constitution and the separation of powers enshrined therein.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up

H.R. 1010, the minimum wage increase, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking President Obama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Florida yield for the purpose of the unanimous consent request?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not, Mr. Speaker. I want to reiterate my earlier announcement that all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only, and we are not yielding for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, hasn't it been the tradition of this House that the Speaker yields to Members who want to make unanimous consent requests during the course of debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the pending resolution, all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start our middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking our President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1010, the minimum wage increase, in order to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit against the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, H.R. 4582, to strengthen the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010, the minimum wage bill, to give America a pay raise and to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan attack on the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to consider H.R. 4582, the Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which would help the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010. America deserves a raise by raising the minimum wage, which will jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this unprecedented, partisan lawsuit against our President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent re-

quest, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up—and I am pleading to bring up—H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act—for men and women, same job, same pay—to jump-start this middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act, to jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit, which we don't need, attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act and a minimum wage increase, which would jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up H.R. 1010, a minimum wage increase, to jump-start the middle class, instead of the partisan lawsuit attacking the Honorable Barack Obama, President of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to bring up H.R. 851, the Bring Jobs Home Act. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida would want to yield time for that—to jump-start the middle class—instead of this partisan, pointless lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded time for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to immediately bring up H.R. 377, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would jump-start the middle class, instead of this partisan lawsuit attacking the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the gentleman's unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the resolution authorizing the Speaker to bring a legislative branch lawsuit against the President.

Never before in the history of the Congress has there been institutional litigation between two coequal branches of government—never.

Don't my Republican friends understand that the House's acting alone cannot by itself enforce a legislative enactment? It must be bicameral.

This resolution will establish a precedent unknown in our jurisprudence. It is an abuse of power. It will threaten the separation of powers principle and the checks and balances that we have long cherished in this country.

Do you want the judiciary to become the arbiter of disputes between Congress and the President? Our branches are coequal.

Do you really want to cede to the courts the authority to resolve disputes between the branches?

Would you want the President to sue the House for missing a budget deadline? Where does it end?

How do you plan to pay for this litigation? This resolution would give the

Speaker a blank check to pay legal costs and expert costs, which would add to the deficit.

I call on House Republicans to talk to objective legal scholars, to read the literature and court decisions, to protect the integrity of our Federal system, and to reject this dangerous legislation.

This is a very sad day in the House. I know what you are doing, and the American people know what you are doing. You are using this legislation in your constant effort to discredit President Obama. Every day that President Obama has occupied the Oval Office, you have attacked him. You have attacked his ideas, and you have attacked those who surround him and his Cabinet. You are denying the American people a functioning government.

I sincerely believe that you are trying to set the stage for a despicable impeachment proceeding should you hold the majority in the House and gain the majority in the Senate. Shame on you, House Republicans. Shame on you.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and on final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the only people I hear talking about impeachment in this Chamber are the Democrats. The Democrats must want the President impeached as far as I can tell.

My favorite piece of art in this Capitol Building is a picture in the rotunda of a group of our forefathers, who gathered together because they could no longer bear living under a monarchy, and they decided that they would fight for freedom. They signed the Declaration of Independence, knowing full well that they were signing their own death warrants if they were caught and tried for treason.

Our forefathers fought a Revolution against the greatest military power on Earth in order to escape the bonds of a monarchy. At the end of the bloody Revolution, the last thing they wanted was another king. They wanted freedom. To protect that precious freedom, they designed a government where power rested with the people based on the separation of powers.

The legislative branch makes the laws. The President enforces the laws. President Obama has decided that he cannot be bothered with the separation of powers. He has bragged that, if Congress will not accept his priorities, he has a pen and a phone, and he will make the law. He may have a pen, but the people have the Constitution. Our forefathers recognized that one man who can both make the law and enforce the law is not a President—he is a king.

Thomas Jefferson once said that freedom does not disappear all at once; it is eroded imperceptibly day by day.

The prosperity of our great country sprang from our freedom. Our form of government, set forth in the Constitution by our forefathers, has protected that very fragile freedom for 200 years.

My friends across the aisle worry about the price of a lawsuit to protect our freedom. Our forefathers paid dearly for that freedom. Many paid everything. Our freedom is in peril. We cannot stand by and watch the President shred our Constitution.

I stand in support of House Resolution 676.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the fact that only Democrats are speaking of impeachment.

Just today, The Hill newspaper announced that a most respected and admired member of the Republican Conference said of the lawsuit, spearheaded by JOHN BOEHNER:

Theater is a show. Why not impeach instead of wasting \$1 million to \$2 million of the taxpayers' money? If you are serious about that, use what the Founders of the Constitution gave us.

He was referring to impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from the Empire State for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this lawsuit is nothing more than a waste of time and a cover-up with respect to the House Republicans' failure to effectively govern.

You have failed to create jobs. You have failed to increase the minimum wage. You have failed to deal with our broken immigration system.

□ 1330

You have failed to extend unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who have been left on the battlefield of the Great Recession. You have failed to deal with our crippling transportation and infrastructure system.

Mr. Speaker, your majority has failed to do what is in the best interest of the American people, and so, to cover up the mess, you are taking us on a joyride through the article III court system. It is an effort that will crash and burn. Yet, nonetheless, you are willing to waste millions of dollars of taxpayer money in order to make a down payment on impeachment.

Instead of engaging in responsible legislative action, the majority has chosen to act up and to act out in order to satisfy the thirst of the blame Barack Obama caucus.

Shame on you, Mr. Speaker. It is time to get back to the business of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been kind of scratching my head as to why it is we are filing this lawsuit. Why is it that the independent House, the Speaker of the House, second in line for the Presidency, instead of passing a bill, is filing a lawsuit? I think I have kind of figured it out. The power of the majority is being used in a way to make that power useless and impotent.

They can pass any laws they want in this House. They can repeal any laws they want in this House, in fact, have repealed health care 55 times. But once it goes across this hall into the Senate, it dies. It is not taken up. If it were taken up, it would never be signed by the President.

I have got another idea. Instead of filing a lawsuit, let's do our job. We have got some disagreements. We think—and I think the American people believe, and I know the President agrees—we should raise the minimum wage. You don't. Let's work it out.

We believe—and the President believes, the American people believe—we need comprehensive immigration reform. Let's take it up and have a vote.

We believe it is time for equal pay for equal work.

What are we afraid of? Why don't we take it up?

Is the judge going to help us decide this, or should we have an out-of-court settlement, which, in our case, would mean we actually have a discussion, a discussion that includes the members of the Republican Party who have different points of view, as opposed to simply the narrowest views from the most gerrymandered of districts. It means we talk to Democrats on the House side of the floor. It means we work with our counterparts in the Senate. It means we do our job.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have got a job to do that can't be done by a judge. You have got a job to do that won't be resolved in a court of law. It will be resolved here in the United States House of Representatives. And the fact that we disagree and the fact that the issues between us are difficult and contentious is no excuse for us to not do our job.

The Republicans represent a lot of Americans, but the Democrats represent at least half of America. And never in the history of this country have we made progress by refusing to legislate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members

are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, just when we think the level of dysfunction by the Republican majority in this House can't get any worse, no, they surprise us and find a way to prove us wrong. They are going to cap off 7 months, Mr. Speaker, of the worst doing Congress in this Nation's history, and Republicans have now decided to chart a dangerous and unprecedented path by suing the President of the United States. The American people have to hear this. Suing the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker. And for what? Because the President is doing his job?

So when House Republicans are not doing their jobs, they choose to sue the President of the United States. And the American people do see this for exactly what it is.

So we move from one political stunt to the next, Mr. Speaker, from shutting down the government—that is what Republicans did—to a lawsuit, and then onward to impeachment. This do-nothing Congress, Mr. Speaker, suing the President of the United States.

We should be working to make college more affordable, to enact comprehensive immigration reform, equal pay for equal work, raise the minimum wage, renew unemployment benefits, improve the Nation's infrastructure. And instead, House Republicans are suing the President.

I thought this was a fringe element, Mr. Speaker, of the House Republican majority, but it is not. It is the majority. But somehow, Republicans in the House of Representatives—you know what? We get it. The Republicans in the House don't like the President. They don't like the President, Mr. Speaker. But they are suing the President of the United States.

Shame, shame, shame.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question because defeating it will allow an amendment that provides for consideration of legislation that will, in fact, create jobs, grow the economy, support small businesses, ensure equal pay, and alleviate the financial burdens on working families today.

There are so many things we can and should be doing right now to spur the economy for the American people. We

need to help workers. We need to help them find opportunities. We need to achieve higher pay for their hard work.

Instead of considering those many bills, this Republican majority continues to waste this institution's time by pushing a partisan lawsuit against the President. This is the first time in history that a branch of Congress has tried to sue a President. My God, what a legacy you leave.

Americans are tired of partisan dysfunction. They want to see us working to solve their problems, and defeating that previous question will allow us to have a vote today on something very important to American families, and that is equal pay for equal work.

Women in America face overwhelming financial challenges. They are more likely to be poor, make minimum wage, go bankrupt, less likely to have retirement security. Women still only make 77 cents, on average, for every dollar made by men. That is \$11,000 lost wages every single year, and over the course of a career, that adds up to \$434,000 lost.

I have introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act in every Congress since 2007. It passed the House twice with bipartisan support. It would ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

A famous American once said, and I quote: "Mind you, I believe in marriage and children and home, but I'm not one of the kind that think that God made women to do nothing but to sit at home in the ashes and tend to babies. He made her to be as good as man, and he made her better too . . . If a woman can do the same work that a man can do and do it just as well, she should have the same pay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that was Buffalo Bill Cody, and he said that in 1898, 116 years ago.

Women, Mr. Speaker, are tired of waiting.

Let us not waste our time on the partisan lawsuit against the President. Let us defeat the previous question and today give women a vote on equal pay for equal work.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I will place into the RECORD an exchange of letters between myself and Chairman SESSIONS and between Ranking Member BRADY and Chairwoman MILLER of the House Administration Committee. This exchange of letters catalogs our repeated requests for an estimate of the projected cost of this partisan enterprise and the identification of accounts that will be cut to pay for it. As you will note, the responses

to our letter provide no information about the cost estimate and no indication from where the funds will come.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Within the draft resolution to initiate a lawsuit against the President, we learned that you intend to seek authorization to "employ the services of outside counsel and other experts." Such authority clearly falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and as such, I am writing to express my expectation that Republicans will be open and transparent about the use of taxpayer money in pursuing this highly dubious and partisan lawsuit.

As evidenced by House Republicans' conduct in the \$2.3 million failed effort to defend the discriminatory and unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act in the courts, strong bipartisan oversight is clearly necessary in any plan to hire outside counsel. The Republican majority must not be permitted to use taxpayer dollars as a slush fund to award a no-bid contract to high-priced, politically connected Republican lawyers without any transparency or accountability to the House or the American people.

Our opposition to the deeply partisan basis of your lawsuit in no way diminishes the need for normal oversight of the terms of any contract signed by Republican Leadership obligating the House to pay millions of dollars to private attorneys. Therefore, I expect you will honor regular order through my committee, even with this highly irregular lawsuit.

The American people deserve to know how and where their tax dollars are being spent, and House Administration Committee Democrats insist on regular consultation and transparency in the selection criteria and process, cost, and lobbying connections of any counsel or experts hired in the name of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBERT BRADY,
Ranking Member,
Committee on House Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT A. BRADY,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER BRADY: I write in response to your July 14th letter to the Speaker of United States House of Representatives expressing concerns about the draft resolution to initiate lawsuit against the President. As always, the Committee, and Republicans, will be open and transparent about the use of taxpayer money. I will, however, note that there is no higher use of taxpayer funds than protecting and defending the United States Constitution which both you and I took an oath to uphold and defend.

All appropriate and applicable procurement procedures will be followed in the award of any contract for outside counsel for a lawsuit. Regardless of your partisan political feelings on the lawsuit, I am sure that you would agree that the United States House of Representatives, as an institution, deserves full and zealous advocacy in the defense of its prerogatives as a co-equal branch of our government and in defense of the Constitution.

Rest assured that I will not unilaterally ignore or rewrite laws passed by Congress.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,
*Chairman, Committee on
House Administration.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
*Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that the Committee on Rules will meet in the coming weeks to consider amendments to the proposed resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House to sue the President of the United States.

Before that meeting is scheduled, the Members of our Committee must have the answers to two important questions:

1) What is the anticipated cost of the lawsuit against the President?

The draft resolution places no limit on the amount of taxpayer funds the Speaker may dedicate to his lawsuit against the President. The American people have a right to know—before the House votes to initiate such a lawsuit—how much money will be allocated to this exercise.

We do not expect you to provide a detailed budget for the lawsuit, and we understand that unforeseen variables will influence the ultimate cost. But there is no reason to assume that the House of Representatives cannot do what every American family must do—use its best judgment to estimate future expenditures. The President's Office of Management and Budget must provide such estimates every day. We do not see why the House of Representatives should be exempt from the ordinary budget discipline of estimating the cost of its own activities. We request that you provide to the Committee, in advance of our markup, your best estimate of the anticipated cost of the lawsuit to the American taxpayers.

2) Which accounts will be cut in order to pay for the lawsuit against the President?

The draft resolution authorizes the Speaker to hire outside lawyers to assist him in his suit against the President. Yet the resolution does not provide any new resources. Therefore, funding for the lawsuit must be transferred from other Legislative Branch accounts.

Before the Members of the House cast their vote on this resolution, they should know which of their legitimate legislative activities will be curtailed in order to divert funds to this entirely partisan enterprise. We request that you provide the Committee, before the markup, your best estimate of the legislative branch accounts that will be reduced to cover the anticipated cost of the lawsuit.

We have learned in too many cases what happens when the House fails to disclose the anticipated cost of such activities in advance. The American public only learned, after the fact, that the House had wasted \$2.3 million on its misguided intervention in the Defense of Marriage Act litigation. Another example is the resolution to launch yet another investigation of the Benghazi matter. When the Rules Committee considered this partisan legislation, we asked repeatedly—and in vain—for a cost estimate. We learned after the vote that the House plans to spend as much as \$3.3 million on this duplicative and wasteful effort this year alone—more than the budgets of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs and the House Committee on Ethics.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that the anticipated cost of the Speaker's lawsuit against our President be disclosed to the American people before we vote on the resolution authorizing it. We are making this request so far in advance because we want to ensure there is ample time to make the assessments necessary for a fully informed estimate. No meeting should be scheduled on the draft resolution until the answers to these questions have been made public.

Sincerely,

LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,
Ranking Member.
JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Member of Congress.
ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Member of Congress.
JARED POLIS,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2014.

Hon. LOUISE SLAUGHTER,
*Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Rules,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

Hon. ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
*Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JAMES MCGOVERN,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JARED POLIS,
*Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MRS. SLAUGHTER AND MESSRS. MCGOVERN, HASTINGS, AND POLIS: Thank you for your letter dated July 17, 2014, outlining your questions regarding H. Res. 676, which authorizes House litigation. Specifically, you asked to be provided with information regarding the anticipated cost of a lawsuit against the President as well as which accounts would supply such funding. As demonstrated by our nearly five hour hearing last week, it is my intent to conduct this process in a thoughtful and transparent process.

In regard to your first question, it is too early in the process to calculate an exact dollar amount that will be spent on all elements of the litigation process. H. Res. 676 authorizes the Speaker to initiate litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to retain outside counsel or experts, if needed. The resolution does not require either action, nor does it authorize or appropriate any new funding. Decisions regarding legal action and whether to retain outside experts would occur after passage of H. Res. 676.

However, in the Defense of Marriage Act litigation referenced in your letter, the House of Representatives defended that law in court in close to two-dozen cases across the country. After consultation with the interested parties, I fully expect potential legal action brought under this resolution to be far narrower in scope than that case, which suggests that total litigation costs should be lower as well.

It is also important to note that I anticipate that all contracts surrounding any litigation authorized by this resolution will go through the approval process previously used by the House Administration Committee for Office of General Counsel initiated contracts. Funds spent on outside counsel have been and would continue to be included in the quarterly Statements of Disbursements, which are publically available.

I can more clearly answer your second question. I do not anticipate that any new

funds would need to be appropriated in this fiscal year. Funds spent on such litigation would come from the account of the Office of General Counsel, which falls under House accounts. If those previously existing funds were found to be insufficient, the appropriate House officers, in coordination with the Appropriations Committee, could then transfer funds from other House accounts with anticipated savings.

While I am confident that any use of taxpayer money will go through an open and transparent process, we must ensure that the House of Representatives has the flexibility necessary to hire the most qualified experts available to defend the Constitution. A lawsuit against the President for failing to fulfill his constitutional duty to faithfully execute the law is a small price to pay for defending the separation of powers and the American people.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
*Chairman, The Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday the Committee on Rules filed a report to accompany the resolution (H. Res. 676) authorizing the Speaker, on behalf of the House, to initiate or intervene in certain litigation against the President of the United States or other federal officials. The Committee on House Administration (CHA) received an additional referral of the resolution due to its implications for the operations of the House, especially the potentially enormous depletion of appropriations intended for other purposes.

As you know, a number of provisions in this resolution—particularly those concerning the hiring of outside counsel and consultants, and the spending of money on their hiring—are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, where I serve as Ranking Minority Member. Our Committee has held no hearings, meetings or markups of this resolution.

Yesterday, with the concurrence of our chairman, Representative Miller of Michigan, the Speaker discharged the House Administration Committee from further consideration of the resolution. This occurred despite the fact that all three House Administration Democrats last week formally invoked the extraordinary Rule XI procedure calling for a special committee meeting to consider the legislation. So we now confront a situation in which CHA, the “money committee” on this subject due to our jurisdiction over House accounts and officers, will not be heard.

I also know that the Speaker has not provided this Committee with a good-faith estimate of how much this lawsuit or lawsuits could cost taxpayers.

In my view, this mad rush to confront the President in court represents yet another ill-conceived, ill-considered action pursued merely for political purposes. It will cost the American people millions and inevitably deplete the legislative resources otherwise available to support the work of all Members of this House. In light of the haste we have already witnessed in this process, I urge you to allow consideration of amendments on the floor, and also to permit a motion to recommend with or without instructions so that we may either have the opportunity to return H. Res. 676 to the House Administration

Committee for substantive review or offer instructions proposing changes relevant to our Committee's concerns.

Respectfully,

ROBERT A. BRADY,
*Ranking Member,
Committee on House Administration.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT A. BRADY,
*Ranking Minority Member, Committee on House
Administration, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. BRADY: Thank you for your letter dated July 29, 2014, discussing your concerns with provisions in H. Res. 676 that fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and requests regarding floor consideration of the measure. Unfortunately, my office did not receive your letter until roughly 15 minutes before the start of the Rules Committee meeting to provide for floor consideration of the resolution.

The provision that you specifically reference authorizes the Speaker to initiate litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to retain outside counsel or experts, if needed. The resolution does not require either action, nor does it authorize or appropriate any new funding. As I stated in my letter dated July 23, 2014 to the minority members of the Rules Committee, I do not anticipate that any new funds would need to be appropriated for this fiscal year. It should also be recognized that this is a limited, targeted measure that seeks to address an important constitutional issue.

You also expressed concerns with the process, but the Committee on House Administration was discharged from further consideration of the measure pursuant to an agreement between Chairman Miller and myself, which has been the standard practice used by both Democratic and Republican majorities. Our exchange of letters can be found in the committee report accompanying H. Res. 676.

While I appreciate your requests for specific elements in the rule, I feel that the Committee adopted an appropriate rule for consideration of this important measure. H. Res. 676 is a critical first step in an effort to defend the Constitution and compel the President to faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if people are supposed to think that this is really a genuine concern by the House of Representatives and not a partisan gimmick, then why didn't the majority consult with Democrats or the Senate beforehand and say: We want to do this on behalf of Congress. Will you talk with us about participating?

That idea of joint participation is long gone from here, and I regret to say that.

But that didn't happen. It was cooked up in some meeting where we probably discussed how to win back the Senate, or whether to impeach the President, or how the campaign fundraising is going and so forth.

You are not fooling anyone. This is about politics and the elections, and you know it and I know it and, polling

shows it, all the people in the country know it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, our ranking member on the Rules Committee, for the time and also, more importantly, for her great leadership in so many ways. In so many ways, it has been about her advocacy for the priorities of the American people.

So today we have on the floor of the House legislation that is a serious matter about suing the President of the United States instead of doing the people's business, which is what Ms. SLAUGHTER and others have advocated for, whether it is bringing good-paying jobs home, creating jobs by building the infrastructure of America, reducing the cost of higher education for families, investing in our children, raising the minimum wage, passing legislation to have equal pay for equal work, everything that would increase the financial stability of America's families. Instead, we are wasting the taxpayers' time and money on the floor of the House on a matter that is serious but is a waste of time.

There are those who have said that this initiative to sue the President of the United States is about a step toward impeachment. Others who say, no, it is instead of impeachment.

I told the Speaker that I had a similar situation years ago—not similar in terms of the subject, because I think there is no basis for this and no standing in this House on the subject of suing the President, but similar in that there were calls by some to impeach President Bush when we took the majority and people were very unhappy about the Iraq war and the false claims made to draw the American people into support of that war effort, which proved to be untrue. It wasn't about people in your caucus clamoring for suing the President. It was about hundreds of thousands of people in the streets objecting to the war in Iraq and the false basis on which we went in.

But when I became Speaker, and people clamored for the impeachment of the President, I said what I advised the Speaker to say right now: Impeachment is off the table. If this isn't about impeachment, that simple sentence will be a clear one: Impeachment is off the table.

Why hasn't the Speaker said that? Why are there those in your caucus who won't deny that that is a possible end in sight for this ill-fated legislation that you bring to the floor?

We are going to adjourn tomorrow for 5 weeks, leaving unfinished business here. We need to solve problems for the American people, to create opportunities for them, but that kind of legislation is nowhere in sight, whether it is job creation, reducing the cost of high-

er education, equal pay for equal work, raising the minimum wage, some of which I already mentioned.

We have precious few hours remaining to act on the priorities of the American people and finish the "can't wait" business before the Congress. So much needs to be done: the humanitarian situation at the border, which provides an opportunity for us to do the right thing; the highway trust fund, to deal with it appropriately and give it the proper amount of time instead of rushing it through. But once again, Republicans are putting the special interests and the howls of impeachment-hungry extremists before the needs of the Nation.

□ 1345

The lawsuit is only the latest proof of House Republicans' contempt and disregard for the priorities of the American people. It is yet another Republican effort to pander to the most radical rightwing voters at taxpayers' expense: \$2.3 million spent defending DOMA, a doomed case; more than \$3 million on the select committee to exploit Benghazi—by the way, something that had been investigated again and again at the very admission of leaders on the Republican side. Why are we doing this? And then this, which we don't have a pricetag on that they will reveal to us.

Again, why would you sue somebody unless you want to prove something? And why would you go down that path unless you wanted to do something about it?

But the fact is, Republicans in Congress have no standing in this suit. Most constitutional scholars have admitted or do admit that. Even the Republicans' expert witnesses have in the past said you don't have standing on it.

Middle class families don't have time for a Republican partisan grudge match with the President. They know that this is a funny thing because—well, funny in the one strange interpretation of the word "funny." But a couple of weeks ago on the steps of the Capitol, House Democrats were there to launch our middle class jump-start about some of the issues I raised—job creation here in the U.S., affordability of college, early childhood education, all of those things, equal pay for equal work, raise the minimum wage. We were doing that on the steps of the Capitol. And in the Capitol buildings, the Republicans were launching their lawsuit against the President. What could be more different in terms of addressing the needs of the American people?

We made the point that this was all happening on the same day. But the fact is, that difference of focusing on progress and job creation and process and do nothing is what we live through here every single day. And today is another one of those days on the floor of the House.

So let us recognize what this is. Serious, serious, on a path to nowhere, or maybe, amongst some of your ranks, a path to impeachment. But if we just want to talk about the lawsuit, it behooves the Speaker of the House to say, Impeachment is off the table. I hope we can hear that soon, and then we will see what the merits of this case are. It has no standing. It has no merits. It has a political basis. And let the American people judge it for what it is.

If you don't want to hear people use the word "impeachment," as your people have done, then tell them, Impeachment is off the table. That is what I had to do. That is what this Speaker should do.

Mr. NUGENT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of this legislation. Unemployment. The deficit. Outsourcing. Higher education. Immigration. Tax reform. Gun control. Medicare. Social Security. Transportation. A continuing resolution. Ukraine, Syria, Nigeria, Libya, Israel, Gaza, Iran.

Instead of talking about any one of these, what are we spending one of the last 14 scheduled voting days before the election to discuss? We are talking about suing the President for implementing a policy that the majority supports. Go figure. What a colossal waste of time. What a colossal waste of taxpayer money.

We know why the majority is focusing on this instead of trying to solve the country's problems. It is because they have no solutions. We haven't heard any, unless you are keeping them in a secret black box.

Their only goal is to indulge the partisan impulses within your own party, 57 percent of whom want to impeach President Obama. The House of Representatives is apparently taking its marching orders from Sarah Palin. Good for us.

The fact of the matter is that the American people are tired of the relentless partisanship that has led the Congress to having a lower approval rating than head lice.

Our constituents want us to solve problems. That is one of the reasons we get paid. Our colleagues in the Senate today are voting on legislation I put forward to end tax breaks. We can't even get a hearing on this side of the building. These are commonsense solutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to conclude by reading something, Mr. Speaker. And if you don't know where this came from, that is part of the problem:

Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith that the dark
past has taught us,
Sing a song full of the hope that the present
has brought us;
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march on till victory is won.

Your problem is, most of you don't even know where it came from.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again would remind all Members of the House of an essential rule of decorum in the House. Under clause 1 of rule XVII, Members are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. NUGENT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to ask: Why did the majority shut off all amendments to this resolution? And more importantly, why have they even blocked a traditional motion to recommit? That is something that we generally always give to the minority on both sides of the aisle, a motion to recommit.

Now, I think the reason is—you know, being somewhat cynical, and I will admit to that after what we have been through here—but the cynic would say that they don't want us to have a motion to recommit because our side might bring up a motion, which it would be our privilege to do, that might put the Republican Members on record on impeachment. Now, I don't know that. We got no answer as to why we were not given the privilege of a motion to recommit.

But there is one thing we do know. We know that this lawsuit is going to cost unknown millions and will be an unconscionable waste. We know that that cost is going to come out of programs that have already suffered grievous cuts over the last few years and on which people oftentimes depend for their very lives.

We know that it is pretty partisan because the Democrats were never consulted at any point on this issue, and we know that it is flawed because experts have told us that there is no way in the world that the House of Representatives has any standing on this issue and that a good Federal judge will send it back to us almost immediately.

We know it is a distraction, and we know that what it distracts us from are the serious, serious issues that all of us hear about every day from our own constituencies.

Do you think anybody ever calls me up and says: Why don't we impeach the President or go after the President because it is raining today and it surely is his fault? No, we don't hear that.

I hear about, I am having a hard time getting a new job. I need help to pay for my child's education. I hear a lot of times, my daughter's unemployment

benefits have run out. She is facing eviction. I don't know what I am going to do. I hear from people who talk about the children who have come to this country—many of them unaccompanied, by themselves—in an absolute inhumane wave of human suffering that we need to pay some attention to.

I know that out there today, we have had floods in my part of the country in upstate New York that have devastated entire water projects and sewer projects, and something needs to be done. But we won't do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question and please vote "no" on the rule. This is one of the most important issues that we have ever faced during our time in Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard a lot here today. A lot of it, I don't know exactly where they are coming from. But we have heard a lot of things today.

Democrats would like to believe—or would like the American people to believe, or go to that narrative—that Congress hasn't done its job. Well, you have to remember that the House of Representatives is one-half of that. The Senate is the other half.

Now, if you think about it, we have sent 40 jobs bills over to the Senate, where they are gathering dust on Leader REID's desk. We have passed seven of the appropriations bills here in the House. The Senate, zero. We have passed important tax legislation to ensure our economy continues to grow and that companies continue to hire.

We will be voting today on a veterans package to help our veterans. And tomorrow, for the second time, we are going to consider a bill as it relates to the highway trust fund.

So perhaps the Republicans in the House are getting the job done with support of Members on the other side of the aisle. How many bipartisan bills are sitting there in the Senate just languishing away because there is a decision made just not to move anything forward from the House? That is unfortunate because that hurts the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of things that are supposedly what we want to do. But here is what I believe we are trying to do today. It is about defense of the Constitution. It is pure and simple. It is about the protection that is given by the Constitution to the two houses of the legislative branch and to the President of the United States and the executive branch and to the judiciary, and that separation of powers is within the Constitution. That is what we are fighting for.

Forget about all this other stuff that has been thrown up as a smokescreen. We are fighting to defend the Constitution.

And people say, well, you know, it could cost money. Well, thank goodness. Thank God that our Founding Fathers didn't say, well, you know what? It is a reach too far. It will cost too much. It could cost our lives. They didn't make that decision. What they said was, it is important for the future of this country that we live by the Constitution, that we design a Constitution that will endure into the future.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that this Constitution has endured and has provided the guidance for this country to move forward every day. It is not by happenstance. It is by the fact that we are supposed to live by and defend the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a deputy sheriff, if we just said, You know what, I don't agree with the free speech portion of the Constitution, we would have stopped free speech. I had to defend people, stand there and put my body in front of people who were opposed to what the people behind me were saying that was repugnant to us and to most Americans. But I had to put my safety at risk for their free speech. And you know, I don't agree with that. That is just part of the Constitution. Let's not worry about free speech. But we didn't do that. We didn't rewrite the law. We didn't rewrite it.

You know, yesterday or the day before—I am not sure which day it was—but in the Rules Committee, we heard an impassioned description from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER), who was the speaker of the house in Florida, who was sued by the Governor in regards to the implementation of law. And guess what? That body won.

And thank goodness that the house won in the Supreme Court of Florida and that they just didn't say, You know what, you don't have standing. So forget about that.

A lot of people are trying to pre-suppose what the Supreme Court is going to say or do. I would suggest to you that I am willing to go along with whatever the Supreme Court says. Now, I may not like it. But I am willing to go along with it because I do believe they are the ultimate arbitrators as to what is constitutional and what isn't.

□ 1400

It is amazing that this document that we are talking about, that there is a question about it, that there is a question about the separation of powers.

I would like to read a quote from then-Senator Barack Obama:

We have got a government that was designed by the Founders with checks and balances. You don't want a President that is too powerful, a Congress that is too powerful, or a Court that is too powerful. Everybody has got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation.

The President can veto it or sign it, but what George Bush has been doing as part of his effort to accumulate more power in the Presidency, he has been saying, well, I can basically change what Congress passed by attaching a letter that says I don't agree with this part or that, I'm going to choose to interpret it this way or that way.

It is not part of his power, but it is part of the whole theory of George Bush that he can make laws as he goes along. I disagree with that.

Once again, quoting then-Senator Obama, Senator Obama says:

I taught the Constitution for 10 years. I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States.

Now, I don't know what happened on the trip from the Capitol down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, how that changed, but I guess the Presidency can change your view of the world. It may not be an accurate view of the world, but it can change it.

I think what then-Senator Obama said rang true then and rings true today. It is about the separation of power, and let me tell you something, my friends on the other side of the aisle should be standing there with us because, for too long, this House has now become irrelevant. Congress in general is becoming irrelevant.

When I got elected just over 4 years ago, I came up here with a purpose. I came up here with a belief in the Constitution and that there is separation of powers between the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch, but now, I hate to say it, in my 4 years, I have become disenchanted with the fact that this House for way too long has just had a "cooperate and graduate" kind of attitude, and I don't think we should do that.

That is why, today, the buck stops here. We have got to make a stand in regards to is the Constitution relevant, is this House relevant. If not, we should just all go home. There is no reason to be here.

I have three sons that serve their country and that have put their lives on the line for this country, not by their own choice—I mean, they serve their country at their choice—but when they go off into war, it is at the direction of the President.

It is a direction to protect this country, and they do so willingly. They raised their hand to say they are going to support and defend the Constitution. I raised it as a police officer outside of Chicago, I raised it as a deputy sheriff, I raised it as sheriff, and I raised it here when I got sworn in as a Member of this body.

I take that seriously, and I take it seriously when anybody thinks they can trample on the Constitution. I take it seriously when anybody thinks that they are above where we need to be.

This legislation is about empowering the Speaker of the House, if he so deems it, to sue the President. I happen

to agree with that. Mr. Speaker, we can talk all day—at least I could—in regards to why it is important that this House protect its prerogative in regards to passing legislation and reminding the executive branch as to what their duties are.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about Democrats and Republicans. Let me tell you something, I wasn't here before this. I got here 4 years ago. I don't care if it is a Republican or Democrat or Independent or whatever. I believe in this institution. I believe in the Constitution of this country, and I believe we should do everything in our power to defend it no matter who is trying to usurp it.

So I encourage my colleagues for the last time to support this rule, to support this institution, and to support this Constitution. It is about are we really serious about the checks and balances that our Founding Fathers so rightfully created.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 694 OFFERED BY
MRS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Bring Jobs Home Act (H.R. 851). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 851, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 377). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for

amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 377 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013 (H.R. 1010). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 1010 the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act (H.R. 4582). The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 851, H.R. 377, H.R. 1010, or H.R. 4582.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5195) to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5195

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR END OF CALENDAR YEAR 2014.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and ending on December 31, 2014, an additional 1,000 principal aliens may be provided special immigrant status under this section. For purposes of status provided under this subparagraph—

“(I) the period during which an alien must have been employed in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(ii) must terminate on or before December 31, 2014;

“(II) the principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with paragraph (2)(D) not later than December 31, 2014; and

“(III) the authority to provide such status shall terminate on December 31, 2014.

“(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—Clause (i) shall not be construed to affect the authority, numerical limitations, or terms for provision of status, under subparagraph (D).”

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY FEE INCREASE FOR CERTAIN CONSULAR SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of

State, not later than January 1, 2015, shall increase the fee or surcharge authorized under section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note) by \$1.00 for processing machine-readable non-immigrant visas and machine-readable combined border crossing identification cards and nonimmigrant visas.

(b) DEPOSIT OF AMOUNTS.—Notwithstanding section 140(a)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236; 8 U.S.C. 1351 note), the additional amount collected pursuant to the fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) SUNSET PROVISION.—The fee increase authorized under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5.5 years after the first date on which such increased fee is collected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5195, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5195 makes available through the end of calendar year 2014 1,000 visas for the Special Immigrant Visa program created by the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009. The 1,000 visas are in addition to 3,000 that Congress already allocated for fiscal year 2014.

The main eligibility requirement, Mr. Speaker, to receive a Special Immigrant Visa under this program is that the Afghan principal applicant must have worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government for at least 1 year in Afghanistan.

The State Department has indicated that it will issue all 3,000 of their originally allocated visas by the beginning of August, and the Department currently has around 300 approved applications simply waiting for additional visas to be allocated. That number will rise as State continues to process applications over the next few months.

We must remember that simply because a visa cap is reached does not mean that Congress must automatically allocate additional visas. In fact, Congress rarely does so in immigration programs.

I understand that proponents of this legislation claim that individuals waiting on a visa are in harm's way due to their work for the United States Government and the drawdown of U.S.

forces in the region, but as with any immigration program, Mr. Speaker, we must also be cognizant of our duty to ensure the safety and security of the United States by making sure that anyone issued a visa is not a threat to our public safety or national security.

So when there are calls for this program to be extended once again before the balance of fiscal year 2015, the Judiciary Committee will be conducting oversight over the program. Such oversight will allow us to make educated decisions on how many, if any, special immigrant visas should be allocated for fiscal year 15.

I look forward to that oversight and urge my colleagues to support this bill that we have under consideration. I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your consultation with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 5195, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, which involves the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs under House Rule X. As a result of those consultations, I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that bill, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 5195, the Foreign Affairs Committee does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this, or any other, legislation. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5195.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5195, a bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has Rule X jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 5195. I am, therefore, most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of the bill so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include your letter and this reply letter memorializing our mu-

tual understanding in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5195.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5195 accomplishes the important goal of allowing these additional 1,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visas to be issued before the end of the calendar year.

As has been mentioned, this program was established in 2009 to protect Afghan nationals who were placed in grave danger because they were employed by or assisted the United States Government. Having benefited greatly from their faithful service, Members on both sides of the aisle recognized that we owed a debt of gratitude. We owed these people and their family members the opportunity to live safely and freely.

The Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program has not been without its problems. Many of us have come together over the years to complain that the process for issuing the visas was too slow and cumbersome.

Mr. Speaker, from the start of the program through fiscal year 2012, only 1,051 of the 8,500 visas authorized by statute had actually been issued to deserving Afghan nationals. In October of 2012, The Washington Post reported that more than 5,000 Afghan Special Immigrant Visa applications were sitting in a backlog waiting to be adjudicated.

Secretary Kerry recently stated that because of "unconscionably long processing times for applicants, some deserving people were simply falling through the cracks."

Now, recently, the program has undergone major improvements. In this fiscal year alone, the State Department has issued more Afghan Special Immigrant Visas than in all previous years combined. The process is now moving swiftly enough that we are coming right up against the cap of 3,000 visas that we set earlier this year in the appropriations act.

That is where this bill comes in. By making these visas available to Afghan nationals who are facing danger precisely because they provided service to our country, to America, this bill will help ensure that we stand by our commitment to protect those who helped to protect us.

I think it is worth noting that keeping our commitment to these people—the large majority of whom acted as our translators in the field—is not merely a good in and of itself. It is important that the United States stands by its commitment here because we ultimately have to work collaboratively with people all over the globe.

We must ensure that the message we send through our actions is that we honor those who take great personal

risks to assist our men and women serving overseas and we do not forget what they do.

Mr. Speaker, I support today's bill. I hope to work with my colleagues to support future extensions of this program, if necessary. I urge my colleagues to also support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a champion on this issue.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for helping to bring this to the floor very quickly, also to the Majority Leader-elect KEVIN MCCARTHY for his hard work and also to my good friend on the other side of the aisle, Representative BLUMENAUER, who has had a passion for this program since even before I got here.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we just get debating a lot of tough things, it is great to see times when Republicans and Democrats can come together and do things for those that fight hard on behalf of our country and on behalf of theirs.

The Special Immigrant Visa program was designed to provide safe refuge to the countless brave Afghan men and women who willingly put their lives on the line and served shoulder to shoulder with our servicemembers in Operation Enduring Freedom.

This program is critical to our national security and to our servicemembers and veterans in any future engagement that will likely come at some point in the future.

The SIV programs provide lifesaving protections to those who served in U.S. missions and now are in danger as a result at the end of that service. The Taliban are hunting these people down as we speak here today.

Because it is in our national security interest to keep these promises and protect our allies and simply because it is the right thing to do, I want you to think about for a second: In a time of war, what can American soldiers and American marines, airmen, and sailors do in order to communicate with the local population and to get them on our side versus a very tough and determined enemy? Of course, the basic thing to that is to be able to speak to the local population.

So you think about, in many cases, these young men and women—these translators that, in some cases, wouldn't even put on anything to obscure their face and would stand side by side with American soldiers against Taliban in very tough areas, many of them, now as America withdraws its mission from Afghanistan and winds down its mission, now find themselves under threat every day.

Whether we agree or we disagree with the war in Afghanistan and anything

like that, the reality of it is this: we all can agree that those that were willing to stand by us and to stand against this very, very bad enemy well deserve to come here.

□ 1415

We of course want to ensure that we are going through the proper process, and I want to commend the State Department for recently improving their ability to process these applicants and to do so correctly and safely. But I also would remind folks that when we talk about the United States of America and who do we want here, people who are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with our soldiers and defend our cause and defend their cause are the ones we would like to see in the United States of America enjoying their freedom as well.

I mentioned earlier the threats that these people live under. It is estimated that multiple people are being killed every day who engaged in this kind of effort on behalf of the United States. So I want to commend everybody in this body for standing together to say that we need to stand with those who stood with us.

Recently there was a very interesting news special that talked about the reality of what was going on, and it interviewed a lot of these translators. Something that struck me the most was somebody who had been denied a visa, or at least it had taken a very long time to get, but he still had faith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLDING. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. He stood up and said that he had faith that he was going to make it to the United States of America because the United States of America came to his country to help them, and he knows that the United States of America will do the right thing. It is inspiring to see that kind of belief in our country that we have, but to see it shared by people in war-torn areas.

So again to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, thank you. Representative BLUMENAUER, thank you for your friendship and your hard work.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding me the time to add my voice to this bill which addresses an issue of national security and affirms our moral commitment to those who have risked their lives on our behalf.

I especially want to give a shout-out to Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. KINZINGER for their diligence in getting this measure to the floor.

During our war in Afghanistan, our forces have been assisted ably and loyally by some Afghan nationals who

have been essential to the mission and the lives of our military, especially Afghan interpreters. Now that we are leaving Afghanistan, these brave partners and their families face a mortal threat from the Taliban. They are relying on us to uphold our commitment to return their loyalty—and now that time has come—by allowing them to relocate to the United States.

This Special Immigrant Visa category recognizes the extraordinary debt we owe these partners. As Ms. LOFGREN mentioned, for a number of years, that category suffered from administrative neglect, and the visa process was hardly functional. In the past year, though, important improvements have been made to the processing system and many more of our Afghan allies are being admitted to the United States.

Among them is Janis Shinwari, who served a translator alongside U.S. troops and saved the life of U.S. Army Captain Matt Zeller, with whom he now has a lifelong bond. Janis is now a member of my staff in my district office in Alexandria, Virginia. He continues to hear the desperate stories of his fellow translators who are in great peril and desperately seek to leave Afghanistan. Unfortunately, there are no visas left for the many deserving Afghans who are still in this administrative limbo. In fact, State estimates that we will hit the statutory cap on visas this summer with thousands of applications still outstanding.

The 1,000 visas authorized under this emergency measure are necessary. This bill is critical, but it does not represent the end of our responsibility on this issue.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to ensure that an appropriate number of visas are authorized for 2015. We have to stand by our friends and ensure that those who have the courage to work with us in future conflicts know that they will not be abandoned.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act, which would add 1,000 new visas for Afghans who served American troops.

This program was designed to provide safe refuge to the many Afghans who put their lives on the line and served with our troops in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. I served personally with several Afghans who literally bled for us and who still aspire to immigrate to America in conformity with our laws—exactly the kind of immigrants which we welcome.

This program is also critical to our national security and to our troops who, in the future, will again serve around the world and need support

from local nationals. If we don't stand with these brave Afghans now, how will our troops in the future get the support they need?

Indeed, many Afghans who served with American forces are now hunted by the Taliban and other terrorist groups. Adding a thousand visas this year may be the difference between life and death for some of these brave Afghans, particularly as America withdraws our troops from that country.

Friends, colleagues, I urge you to support this bill because it is in our national security interests to keep our promises and protect our allies, and it is the right thing to do.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the author of this bill, who has been a tremendous advocate to make sure that America does the right thing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her leadership in working with us on this challenging problem.

Mr. Speaker, in a way this represents an amazing, positive development. I have been working in this area for 10 years, dealing with the plight of the foreign nationals that too often America was at risk of leaving behind. But in the course of our work, what has been celebrated here is that actually the challenge today is the result of the administration listening to Congress and improving a system that was fatally flawed—there is no polite way around it—but they have worked hard to improve it. As a result, the visas we have granted have expired. They are gone now. There are no more to be issued. These additional 1,000 visas are critical to be able to get us through this gap.

It is, Mr. Speaker, I think, testimony to the fact that people here in Congress can cross party lines, can work together cooperatively on problems where we are focused. I appreciate the kind words of my friend, Congressman KINZINGER. We wouldn't be where we are right now without him, his focus and his commitment.

I should probably talk about his staff, Michael Essington and Zach Hunter.

There are a list of people who are heroes in this fight that I hope we can spend a moment or two acknowledging because we did get cooperation from Majority Leader MCCARTHY, his security adviser, Emily Murry.

Chairman GOODLATTE, who has returned to this on numerous occasions, we wouldn't be here without him.

Leader CANTOR and his staff, particularly Robert Story Kareem, who helped us navigate a similar crisis for the Iraq program last fall.

Our whip, STENY HOYER, and his policy members, Daniel Silverberg and Tom Mahr, were there. At times when

there is a lot going on, there is a lot of controversy, there are competing interests, but they kept their eye on the ball to move this forward.

We have got some critical people in the outside world, the NGOs, particularly the Iraqi Refugee Assistance Project, and their gurus, Becca Heller and Katie Reisner, who helped provide the details, the push.

And I have to admit that there is a champion in my office, my legislative director, Michael Harold, who is as responsible as any one single person who just would not give up, late nights, early mornings, weekends, dealing with things that none of us want to know that happened behind the scenes. But the point is that we are here.

I am hopeful that this signals not just a new era in terms of our being able to get past this, but that we take a comprehensive look at the Afghans and the Iraqis that are left behind because we are facing additional deadlines, and we shouldn't have to go through this on a repeated basis. It takes time that could be better spent more appropriately.

I am confident, at the end, we will do the right thing, but we shouldn't go down to the deadline. We shouldn't create doubt in the minds of people who are waiting desperately, who are trying to evade the tender mercies of the Taliban and al Qaeda, who have long memories and who have hunted these people down. They have captured them and they have killed their siblings. They have tortured them, beheaded them. That is not a fate that they deserve.

I was at the National Airport when Janis Shinwari and Captain Matt Zeller were united, and it is a moment I will never forget. But our moving forward now with this legislation and committing ourselves to the big picture, doing it right on a cooperative basis, means that it will make the difference of life or death for thousands of others that are waiting in this pipeline, and it will make all of us feel better as we conclude this summer session that we are doing it on a note of the sort of thing that we should do, how we should do it, and why we should do it.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), who has herself served our country in the armed services.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is a proud moment that we are witnessing here today as we see a bipartisan team of leaders here in Congress who have so passionately been committed to this issue, taking action and finding a solution, not in an ideal way in this crunch time, but nonetheless finding a solution that will change people's lives.

When I first joined the military, one of the first lessons drilled into us as

young privates by our drill instructors was the importance of teamwork, that we cannot be successful as individuals and how crucial it is for us to work as members of a team towards that singular mission. One team, one fight.

These Afghan interpreters and their families put their lives on the line right alongside our troops, not carrying arms, not carrying ammunition to defend themselves, but placing their lives in the hands of our servicemembers as they worked together to complete that mission. Through that sacrifice, they became a member of our team. They felt pain with our losses, and they felt victorious in our successes.

The very least that we can do is to take this small step and honor our commitment to our team members by passing H.R. 5195. This is one step towards keeping our promise and just beginning to repay the debt to these Afghan people who have served and sacrificed alongside us.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for allowing me a chance to share some words today, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

To my colleagues Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. BLUMENAUER, thank you for your continued leadership on this issue and many others. It has been through your persistence and perseverance that this day comes, and you deserve quite a bit of gratitude and recognition for your work.

Throughout the war in Afghanistan, U.S. servicemen and -women worked alongside thousands of Afghan partners who were employed as translators, as drivers, as cooks, as NGO staff, cultural advisers, and janitors. These Afghans risked their lives on a daily basis to come to work. They faced the very same violence, attacks, and threats as U.S. troops, but bravely put themselves in harm's way to aid in our shared mission.

As has frequently been the case in the past, when the United States began to withdraw troops from Afghanistan, Congress created a Special Immigrant Visa program open to foreign nationals who served in critical roles and supported the American war effort. To date, more than 9,000 Afghans have benefited from the Special Immigrant Visa program. I am pleased to hear that the State Department has accelerated the processing time for these special visas in recent months, especially since there are over 6,000 still in the pipeline. However, as a result of this progress, the State Department is quickly running out of visas previously authorized by Congress.

The bill before us today will authorize 1,000 visas for the remainder of 2014 so that the State Department can continue processing applications for Afghan men and women who assumed enormous risks to aid our troops. Most importantly, this bill sends a message that the United States is a loyal partner, that we keep our word and we honor our promises, that we stand with those who stand with us in an ongoing fight for a fairer, freer world.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), and then I am prepared to close.

□ 1430

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

I won't take much time, except to say it is very inspiring—as I think it is important to note when it happens—to see both sides of the aisle talking about such a very important issue.

I think it is important to note that when we exit the shores of the United States, Americans stand together with those that stood with us.

This is going to be a very important message to our current allies, and, again, something that is important to understand, as we all know, as history repeats itself, that at some point into the future, and we hope it is far out into the future, America will find itself engaged in something similar again where we need the indigenous population to help us to give them freedom and to defeat evil terrorism, or whatever it may be at the time. This is a message that we are sending to future conflicts that we will stand with you.

This is also going to, Mr. Speaker, save the lives of American soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors in the future, as they have somebody that can help them to communicate with the local population and win the trust.

Again, for everybody involved, I want to just once again say thank you.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will just thank all of the people who worked so hard on this, certainly on both sides of the aisle, and, most especially, Mr. BLUMENAUER, who has just been ceaseless in his efforts to make sure that these translators were not left behind and not forgotten.

A note on the future: I am happy to support this bill for 1,000 visas today. However, it is reported that there are 5,000 translators backlogged. Now, we don't know, in that 5,000, some may have been murdered already, some may have given up, or some may have gone elsewhere. We don't know that we are going to need an additional number of visas, but we need to open our hearts in

the same spirit of bipartisanship that if we fall short, we are going to have to come together as a country. Because we all know, not only is this the right thing to do morally, but for our troops in the field it is essential.

People have to know in other countries that if they step forward to assist the United States, the United States will honor its promises to them.

That is why this bill is so important, not only for what it does, but what it stands for, and why I urge its adoption.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, this is an important piece of bipartisan legislation. The Afghans, who benefit by this legislation, put their lives on the line for the United States of America. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

I look forward in the coming Congress to doing oversight to look at the further backlog of Afghans who may be eligible for visas, and look through oversight how this program is being administered and ensure that we are able to fulfill the promises that we have made to Afghans who have helped us in the field.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5195, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENOUNCING USE OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS BY HAMAS AND OTHER TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 107

Whereas the term “human shields” refers to the use of civilians, prisoners of war, or other noncombatants whose mere presence is designed to protect combatants and objects from attack;

Whereas the use of human shields violates international humanitarian law (also referred to as the Law of War or Law of Armed Conflict);

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 50(1) to the Geneva Convention defines “civilian” as, “[a]ny person who does not belong to one of the categories of persons referred to in Article 4(A) (1), (2), (3), and (6) of the Third Convention and in Article 43 of this Protocol. In the case of doubt whether a person is a civilian, that person shall be considered a civilian.”;

Whereas Additional Protocol I, Article 51(7) to the Geneva Convention states, “[T]he presence or movement of the civilian population or individual civilians shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular in attempts to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield, favour or impede military operations. The Parties to the conflict shall not direct the movement of the civilian population or individual civilians in order to attempt to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield military operations.”;

Whereas since June 15, 2014, there have been over 2,000 rockets fired by Hamas and other terrorist organizations from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Hamas has been using civilian populations as human shields by placing their missile batteries in densely populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques;

Whereas Israel drops leaflets, makes announcements, places phone calls and sends text messages to the Palestinian people in Gaza warning them in advance that an attack is imminent, and goes to extraordinary lengths to target only terrorist actors;

Whereas Hamas has urged the residents of Gaza to ignore the Israeli warnings and to remain in their houses and has encouraged Palestinians to gather on the roofs of their homes to act as human shields;

Whereas on July 23, 2014, the 46-Member UN Human Rights Council passed a resolution to form a commission of inquiry over Israel's operations in Gaza without a single mention of the indiscriminate rocket attacks by Hamas or the use of human shields, with the United States being the lone dissenting vote;

Whereas public reports have cited the role of Iran and Syria in providing material support and training to Hamas and other terrorist groups carrying out rocket and mortar attacks from Gaza;

Whereas throughout the summer of 2006 conflict between the State of Israel and the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Hezbollah forces utilized human shields in violation of international humanitarian law;

Whereas Al-Qaeda, Al-Shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and other foreign terrorist organizations typically use innocent civilians as human shields;

Whereas the United States and Israel have cooperated on missile defense projects, including Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow Anti-Missile System, projects designed to thwart a diverse range of threats, including short-range missiles and rockets fired by non-state actors, such as Hamas;

Whereas the United States has provided \$235,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for Iron Dome research, development, and production;

Whereas, during the most recent rocket attacks from Gaza, Iron Dome has successfully intercepted dozens of rockets that were launched against Israeli population centers; and

Whereas 5 million Israelis are currently living under the threat of rocket attacks from Gaza: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the use of innocent civilians as human shields;

(2) calls on the international community to recognize and condemn Hamas' breaches of international law through the use of human shields;

(3) places responsibility for the rocket attacks against Israel on Hamas and other terrorist organizations, such as Islamic Jihad;

(4) supports the sovereign right of the Government of Israel to defend its territory and its citizens from Hamas' rocket attacks, kidnapping attempts and the use of tunnels and other means to carry out attacks against Israel;

(5) expresses condolences to the families of the innocent victims on both sides of the conflict;

(6) supports Palestinian civilians who reject Hamas and all forms of terrorism and violence, desiring to live in peace with their Israeli neighbors;

(7) condemns Hamas' repeated refusals to accept a cease-fire with Israel;

(8) supports efforts to permanently demilitarize the Gaza Strip, removing Hamas's means to target Israel, including its use of tunnels, rockets, and other means; and

(9) condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased commission of inquiry into Israel's Gaza operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the chairman and ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH of Florida for their good work on this legislation. I am pleased to have worked with Mr. ENGEL and the leadership to ensure that this legislation was scheduled for the floor today for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation places responsibility for the escalation and violence squarely where it belongs: with the Iranian-backed terrorist group Hamas. Hamas is deliberately targeting Israeli civilians through the use not only of rockets but longer and longer range missiles—2,500 of these so far—aimed at cities—Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, attempting to attack Israeli communities. Remember, these attacks are at civilian populations, they are not at military installations. And Hamas is perpetuating the kidnapping and murder, which started with three Israeli teenagers.

Again and again, we have seen these incursions through these tunnels—32 new tunnels found so far—3 miles into Israeli territory. One of the amazing things, when you go into the tunnels, you see not only how they are used for these attacks, but what they have in reserve in these tunnels: ropes, syringes, tranquilizers, handcuffs, explosives, walls and walls of explosives. These were attempts to inflict mass casualty attacks on the civilian population.

\$100 million is approximately what was spent on these tunnels, at the expense, I might add, of the Palestinian people. That is 4,000 trucks of equipment coming in over the border from Israel with cement—which was presumed to be used, hopefully, for schools or hospitals—with cement, with aggregate, with steel, instead used for the construction of these tunnels tunneling under Israel.

Less than 10 years ago, Israel pulled out of Gaza. The Strip was going to flourish without Israel's control. That was what we were told. But it wasn't supposed to be this way. It wasn't supposed to be a situation where Hamas would take resources and plow it into terror day by day.

Today, the Gaza Strip is a terrorist sanctuary on Israel's borders with sanctuaries within this sanctuary. We now know 32 of these are tunnels.

Beyond targeting Israeli civilians with kidnapping and indiscriminate firing of rockets, Hamas shows a callous disregard for the lives of the Palestinians it ostensibly represents. That is the purpose of this initiative here today, to call attention to that fact.

Earlier this month, the Hamas spokesman Sami Abu Zuhri appeared on Al-Aqsa television and encouraged Gaza residents to act as human shields. That is the responsibility they ask as they are hidden down in these tunnels. As they are in these bunkers, they ask their civilian population to go and make of themselves human shields in front of rocket launchers.

The world can't let terrorists embed their forces among the civilian population, using them as human shields, without speaking out. This is a direct violation of international humanitarian law and the law of war, sacrificing the innocent in an effort to protect those engaged in terror from an Israeli response.

Hamas is engaging in a crime of enormous proportions, perpetrated by those who are deliberately hiding among civilians to protect themselves. According to the Geneva Convention, the presence of the civilian population, or individual civilians, shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular, in attempts to shield military objectives from attack, or to shield, favor, or impede military operations. That is the Geneva Convention.

A full court press to discredit Israel is on in the United Nations. My question is: Where are the defenders of international law in condemning Hamas' use of human shields? I saw the report. There is no mention in there of the rockets being fired against Israel.

Yes, this is a case where Israel is using missile defense to protect its civilians, and Hamas is using their civilians to protect their missiles. It is a case where we have to recognize Israel's right to defend its people by taking necessary and appropriate force to neutralize the threat posed by Hamas.

Think about the recent discovery that Israeli security sources unearthed, evidence that Hamas was preparing to dispatch 200 terrorists via ten tunnels toward six Israeli communities with a goal of killing and kidnapping scores and scores of Israelis on the Jewish New Year. If that was on our border with Canada, how would we react?

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, which takes a strong stand against Hamas' crimes, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 107, condemning Hamas' use of human shields in Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, on our TV screens and computer monitors, in the pages of newspapers and magazines, we have seen the bloody and brutal results of war. We have heard the reports of so many lives lost. No matter where you come from or what you believe, if you don't grieve over every innocent killed, you simply don't have a heart.

What is missing from many of these stories, though, is why these blameless men, women, and children ended up in harm's way. When Israel acts to defend itself, it does everything it can do to warn civilians and minimize loss of life. Israel warns Palestinians ahead of time, going so far as to say specifically where an airstrike is going to occur.

What does Hamas do, on the other hand? It forces Palestinians to stay in their homes, to stay in the line of fire. All the while, Hamas leaders cower in their underground tunnels. Then they have the cynicism to point their cameras at the dead, show the world the outcome of their human shield strategy, and blame Israel. It is despicable and it is shameful.

This resolution sends a clear message. The Palestinian people of Gaza should not have to take this anymore from Hamas.

It also makes clear that we support taking away Hamas' ability to wage terror campaigns.

As Secretary Kerry said on Tuesday:

Any process to resolve the crisis in Gaza in a lasting and meaningful way must lead to the disarmament of Hamas and all terrorist groups.

Now is the time for the United States to stand firm in our support of Israel.

Hamas has Qatar and Turkey, shamefully, to support them, and the rest of the world has turned a deaf ear to Israel's pleas for security.

The U.N. Human Rights Council, which, frankly, is a joke, even voted to investigate Israel for war crimes, with the United States casting the courageous lone dissenting vote. We know the Human Rights Council typically has a muddled view of Israeli-Palestinian issues. But given the constant barrage of Hamas rockets, launched from civilian population centers, day in and day out, week in and week out, year in and year out, and falling on Israeli civilian population centers, the Council seems especially out of touch.

We ought to mention something that is very important. This war started because Hamas keeps attacking the Israeli civilian population through the years with its missiles—civilians. So for Hamas to now fret over civilian casualties, which is the fault of them in both Gaza and Israel, really just rings hollow.

□ 1445

If Hamas were so concerned about human casualties, why does it target Israeli civilian populations, as it has all these years?

As Israel's security is threatened and its reputation is smeared—frankly, the media hasn't been helpful or even-handed—this moral equivalency between a terrorist group and a democratic country trying to protect its citizens is sometimes sickening.

The United States is the only one true friend that Israel has. We must always stand up for Israel's security, and we must state plainly that Israel is not alone.

I want to thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN and Representative DEUTCH for their leadership on this issue. They have done very strong work in bringing to light Hamas' deplorable crimes against the Israeli and Palestinian people. I also want to thank Representative STEVE ISRAEL and Representative TOM COLE for sponsoring a similar resolution, which the House passed just a few weeks ago.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE, who has worked diligently and hard to bring consensus to our committee, so we can speak with one voice to let the Israeli people know that when it comes to the support of Israel, support is strong and bipartisan from this Congress, and that is the way it should be.

So only when the world rejects Hamas and its tactics and when Hamas can no longer rain terrorist rockets on Israel and send the Palestinian to their deaths will peace between Israelis and Palestinians be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from

Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend, the chairman of our committee, ED ROYCE of California, as well as the ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL, for their continued efforts in support of human rights and Israel's right to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution condemning Hamas' use of human shields in violation of international humanitarian law is an extremely important and timely measure, given the current situation in Israel and Gaza.

I want to first thank my colleague from South Florida, TED DEUTCH, for joining me in introducing this legislation. It was at an official factfinding mission trip that we took to the Middle East earlier this month where Ted and I realized how important this measure was needed.

While we were there, Hamas had already begun to increase the frequency of indiscriminate rocket attacks against Israel. Prime Minister Netanyahu was compelled to respond, but made it clear from the very beginning that the objective was to restore peace and security to the people of Israel and that quiet would be met with quiet, but Hamas would not relent and only increased its attacks.

While Hamas was firing rockets at innocent Israeli civilians, Israel was taking every step imaginable to avoid Palestinian civilian casualties. Hamas' response was to intentionally place the Palestinians in harm's way.

It stores its rockets and weapons underneath the homes of Palestinians and even in at least three schools run by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and it uses Palestinian men, women, and children as human shields, in violation of international humanitarian law, by placing its missile batteries in densely-populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques.

Mr. Speaker, the contrast between Israel—a legitimate sovereign state—and Hamas—a terrorist organization—could not be any clearer. Israel values and goes to great lengths to protect human life, while Hamas has no respect for human life and goes to great lengths to sacrifice anyone, including the Palestinian people, in the name of its war against Israel.

Israel has accepted repeated cease-fire offers. Hamas has rejected them all. While Israel seeks to fight terrorism, Hamas is an internationally recognized terror organization that is being supported by countries like Qatar in its war against our true democratic ally, Israel, yet it is Israel that wrongfully faces international condemnation for exercising her right to protect her citizens and defend herself and gets singled out when the world should be condemning Hamas.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Human Rights Council, an institution that has been leading the anti-Israel charge for years now and has since lost any legitimacy that it might have had, passed a resolution to investigate what it calls war crimes and human rights violations by Israel, not Hamas.

There was not even a word about Hamas' attacks against innocent Israeli civilians, nor Hamas' use of Palestinians as human shields. Of the 47 members on the Human Rights Council, you would think that there would be many voices of reason—or some voices of reason—to speak out against this obvious anti-Israel bias, but the United States was the lone voice of dissent against this anti-Israel resolution.

Our so-called European allies lacked the courage of their convictions, and they couldn't even muster the resolve to vote for or against the resolution. Instead, they abstained. This is a disgrace, and it is a shame.

If the United Nations Human Rights Council will not act and use its voice, that is why it is so important for the U.S. House of Representatives to pass this resolution and not only stand up for the Palestinian people who have been made pawns in Hamas' mission to destroy Israel, to their detriment, but for Israel in the face of this biased anti-Israel agenda.

We must be the counterbalance, Mr. Speaker. We must send a message to the world that we will continue to stand alongside Israel and that we will condemn Hamas and its use of human shields. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to stand up for our ally, Israel, and to stand up for human rights and American ideals and principles.

I thank the chairman, Mr. ROYCE, and the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, as well as my South Florida colleague, Mr. DEUTCH, for their help.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee and co-author of this resolution.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL and especially Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN for her partnership in this effort to call the world's attention to Hamas' use of innocent civilians as human shields. I also thank Casey Kustin of my staff, Eddy Acevedo of Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN's staff, and the committee staff as well, for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and I were in Israel the night that the world learned the tragic fate of the three Israeli teens: Eyal, Gilad, and Naftali. We mourned with the families and tens of thousands of others at their joint funeral, and we were there just days later when 16-year-old Mohammed Abu Khdeir was brutally and tragically murdered.

In the wake of these heartbreaking deaths, violence escalated when Hamas began indiscriminately launching rockets at Israel, with the sole purpose of causing terror and death. Israel responded.

Every civilian death is tragic. We continue to mourn the loss of innocent lives on both sides of this conflict, but we cannot forget how this started, and we cannot forget who is responsible.

It is Hamas that has chosen to launch 2,600 rockets at civilians. It is Hamas that hides rockets and rocket launchers in UNRA schools, in mosques, and even in hospitals, using the Palestinian people as cover for their weapon stockpiles and their rocket launchers.

It is Hamas that chose to spend millions of dollars digging tunnels into Israel to launch terrorist attacks and fortifying underground bunkers for its terror commanders, instead of investing, so that the people of Gaza have a chance at a prosperous future.

It is Hamas that is responsible for the miserable condition of the Palestinians in Gaza, even before this military engagement started.

As former President Clinton said last week:

Hamas was perfectly well aware of what would happen if they started raining rockets in Israel. They fired a thousand of them, and they have a strategy designed to force Israel to kill their own civilians, so that the rest of the world will condemn them.

Mr. Speaker, while Israel warns the residents of Gaza of incoming attacks via text messages, phone calls, and leaflets, Hamas' spokesmen go on television to urge people to stay in their homes to act as human shields. This is a direct violation of the Geneva Convention. Let me be clear: the use of civilians as shields to protect military objectives is a violation of international law.

It is time for responsible nations to condemn this abhorrent behavior and condemn the use of innocent civilians as human shields.

Passing House Concurrent Resolution 107 won't stop Hamas from putting the lives of its citizens at risk as human shields, but it will make clear that the U.S. House condemns the terrorists who wants to destroy and murder Israelis—the terrorists who violate international law by using human shields.

I ask my colleagues to please support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been said many times, but I think we should say it again: Israel uses its missiles to protect its citizens, and Hamas uses its citizens to protect its missiles. That says it all. That is just a disgrace, and it is a fact.

The United States must back Israel in its quest for security. Any cease-fire

that is put forth must contain the total disarming of Hamas and the total destruction of those death tunnels that Hamas has been building to try to kill Israeli civilians. That concrete was allowed to be trucked in, under the eyes of Israel, because they were told that the concrete would be used to build schools and infrastructure. Instead, the concrete was used to build tunnels to kill Israelis. This really cannot be tolerated at all.

I would also say again that the media reporting of what is really going on in Gaza has been less than stellar. There are atrocities in Syria, but that seems to be yesterday's story. So while every death in Gaza and in Israel is something over which we grieve, there are more deaths in Syria every single day in that bloody civil war than there have been in Gaza, yet you hear no mention of it on the news. All you do is have cameras focused on Gaza.

War is hell. Nobody wants war, but a terrorist organization like Hamas must be told that terrorism cannot prevail.

Israel's fight is not with the Palestinian people. It is with Hamas, a terrorist organization that denies Israel's very right to exist and that wants to kill as many Israelis and Jews around the world and destroy the State of Israel. That is why the United States and the European Union have designated Hamas as a terrorist organization.

We need to put that in perspective. A terrorist organization that uses its own people as human shields is not to ever be taken seriously, nor has it the right to lecture anybody about the sanctity of human life.

In closing, let me say again that Israel has the right to self-defense. Hamas' use of human shields demonstrates just how much they devalue human life. The Palestinian people deserve better than Hamas. The Israeli people deserve better.

I want to again thank my friend, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DEUTCH, for their hard work on this issue. I want to thank my friend, Chairman ROYCE, for his leadership on so many issues, but on this issue as well.

Democrats and Republicans agree that we stand by our ally, Israel, and we condemn the terrorist organization Hamas, which uses its own people as human shields.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH). He is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. YOH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 107.

This resolution denounces the cowardly act of using civilians—women and children—as human shields by

Hamas and any other terrorist organization, which is in violation of international humanitarian law.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, I was proud to have worked with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, Chairman ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL. It is my hope that this resolution sends a very clear message to Hamas that their abhorrent practice of using civilians as human shields must stop.

Hamas has continued to fire rockets indiscriminately into Israel from residential areas within Gaza, as well as having continued to store munitions near schools and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of human does this kind of thing? It is a coward. It is a person who does not value human life.

Since June of 2014, over 2,000 rockets have been fired at Israel. In response to the repeated rocket attacks, the United States and Israel have worked together on missile defense projects, such as the Iron Dome. The Iron Dome is an effective missile defense system. It has proven its worth time after time, intercepting dozens of Hamas rockets bound for densely-populated areas within Israel.

This resolution must pass in order to assure our Israeli allies of our commitment to them, as well as to send a very clear message to Hamas that their use of human shields must stop.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was in Haifa, Israel, in August of 2006 during the second Lebanon war, during the war between Hezbollah and Israel. While I was there, I was in Haifa. Rockets were raining down. For 30 days, rockets rained down on that city. Air sirens were blaring during the day. It looked like a ghost town. It was very debilitating, as you can imagine.

What amazed me was the targeting of the civilian areas of that town and the targeting of the hospitals—the deliberate targeting of civilians. That was the goal. At one point, we had to go into a bunker when rockets were fired close to where we were.

The one takeaway I had was that out of that came the Iron Dome. In a few short years, that system, the Iron Dome, which they were working on, went from the drawing board to deployment and battle, proving its mettle, and it proved its ability to shield Israelis in the south from the Hamas rocket threat more recently. Congress, I think, can be proud of our role here in backing the Iron Dome, which is recognized as part of this resolution.

There is another part of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I have to tell you that Israel has more than the right to defend itself; it has the duty to protect its citizens. I saw what happened in Haifa—over 600 people in that one trauma hospital I was in.

It is exercising that responsibility right now to protect its people because, time and again, day after day, these rockets continue to be fired from these rocket launchers in Hamas-held territory.

No country would stand for the Hamas terror organization's rockets and tunnels. Remember, these tunnels come 3 miles into the border, 3 miles under Israel—one of them right outside an Israeli kindergarten. That is Hamas.

Of course, Hamas' whole reason for being, for any of you who have read its charter, is to attack Israel and to attack Jews. This nihilistic terrorist organization works to kill the maximum number of Israeli innocents while using its own population as human shields. Yes, that is a double war crime.

Since the last conflict, Hamas has improved on all aspects of its operation, courtesy of Iran. In the same way Iran supplied Hezbollah, Iran supplies Hamas, and this could not have been done without the longer-range missiles—the M-302s—that Iran has now transferred into the inventory of Hamas, so that Jerusalem and Tel Aviv can be targets.

Earlier this month, my committee held a hearing that exposed Iran as the primary backer of Hamas through weapons, through funding, through missiles. Imagine the increase in material support to Hamas from Iran if that government—if the Ayatollah regime—is granted further sanctions relief as part of nuclear negotiations.

I ask all Members to join me in condemning Hamas on its despicable use of human shields and to continue to stand with Israel to face down the many shared threats that we face.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart as death and violence once again rips the Middle East. Innocent civilians find themselves again hostage in a war that none of them sought. The rockets continue to rain down in Israel and civilians in Gaza find it harder and harder to find refuge. And there is no end in sight despite the ongoing work of peacemakers.

The most pressing need at the moment is an immediate ceasefire that ends the rocket fire, allows humanitarian aid to reach those in need, and lays the foundation for efforts to address Israel's long term security needs. I am disappointed by the absence of any language in this resolution supporting international efforts to bring about an immediate ceasefire. Additionally, no one has come forward today to argue how this legislation brings us any closer to a peaceful resolution in the region or an end to the violence, terror, and fear being experienced in Israel and Gaza.

Over 1,000 Palestinians have been killed so far, many, but not all of them civilians. Over 50 Israelis, including 3 civilians and two Israeli-American soldiers, have been killed so far. The key concern for me is the qualifier—so far. A key question at this volatile moment is how to end the violence. This resolution is absolutely silent on that point.

I strongly believe that we need to work for an immediate ceasefire to prevent further death and destruction in both Israel and Gaza. I commend the U.S. for continuing to seek an immediate ceasefire which I fully support. Despite the gallant attempts of the Secretary of State and the U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon and others, an agreement remains elusive and the violence continues.

The resolution rightly condemns Hamas, a terrorist organization that has shown time and again its disregard for innocent human life. The only party that seems to benefit from further chaos and loss of life is Hamas, which continues to lob rockets at innocent Israelis. The barrage of rockets must stop. Hamas has no regard for the lives it puts in danger. Its despicable tactics have been thoroughly denounced by the international community including the U.N. Secretary General who recently noted that “the United Nations position is clear: We condemn strongly the rocket attacks. These must stop immediately. We condemn the use of civilians—schools, hospital and other civilian facilities—for military purposes. No country would accept rockets raining down on its territory—and all countries and parties have an international obligation to protect civilians.”

The resolution recognizes, as President Obama has, that Israel has a right to defend itself from relentless rocket attacks. The current rocket count is well over 1,000 and growing every day. Israel does not need authorization from the U.S. House of Representatives to act to stop the rocket fire by Hamas.

I have been to Sderot. I talked with Israelis living in the shadows of the rockets, including one woman whose relative was killed by a rocket from Gaza in a previous conflict. And I remember her fervent desire to live at peace with her neighbors.

I would point out that the resolution rightly recognizes that innocent civilians on both sides have suffered. According to the U.N., nearly 10% of the population of Gaza are seeking shelter at U.N. facilities, some of which have been attacked. The U.S. has recently announced it would provide \$47 million to help meet immediate humanitarian needs in Gaza amid deteriorating conditions.

However, I remain concerned that this resolution does not press for an immediate ceasefire by all parties or urge or express support for efforts by the U.S. and international community to push for that peace. That is the best way to support innocent civilians on both sides—ending the violence that threatens them. You can't force peace on those who don't want it, but we must make every effort to offer a path out of misery and suffering and fear.

As President Obama has said, “Israel has a right to defend itself against rocket and tunnel attacks from Hamas.” He also stated, “I've also said, however, that we have serious concerns about the rising number of Palestinian civilian deaths and the loss of Israeli lives. And that is why it now has to be our focus and the focus of the international community to bring about a ceasefire that ends the fighting and that can stop the deaths of innocent civilians, both in Gaza and in Israel.”

As a Congress, we should join with the State Department, the U.N. Security Council,

and others in urging all parties to redouble efforts to protect civilians, to find a way to end the violence and ensure peace and security for all, and to then move to find a long-term resolution that meets Israel's security needs and the rights of civilians to live in peace. This cycle of violence cannot continue indefinitely.

Innocent Israeli and Palestinian civilians cannot afford another three weeks of rocket fire and further bloodshed. We must continue to push for a ceasefire and to help find a long term solution that will allow Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace, side by side. What is needed now is de-escalation of violence and escalation of diplomatic efforts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 107, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of the State of Israel as it defends itself against rocket attacks launched by Hamas.

These deadly rocket attacks launched from Gaza into Israel by Hamas against unarmed civilian populations are deserving of the condemnation of this House and the international community.

Mr. Speaker, since the most recent air-strikes began, hundreds of persons—Israelis and Palestinians—have been killed and many hundreds more injured.

No sovereign nation can be expected to stand idly by while unprovoked acts of violence are perpetrated against its citizens by terrorists or foreign entities.

Israel has, as do all countries under the law of nations, the right to exist and the right to self-defense. This means Israel is allowed to take all necessary, appropriate, and measured actions required to keep its people safe. Hamas should cease using their fellow citizens as human shields.

But at the end of the day, the peace and justice we all seek will come from the parties acting in good faith to find a just and lasting peace that recognizes Israel's right to exist, renounces violence and terrorism, and achieves the two-state solution.

Among the most important things that can be done to bring peace and the two-state solution into being and to halt the suffering is for the Administration to redouble its efforts to mediate a peaceful resolution of the conflict and for the President Mahmoud Abbas to exercise stronger leadership in rallying and uniting the Palestinian people under the banner of peace with justice.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn launching rockets into civilian populations. In addition to death and destruction, such attacks instill fear and cause suffering to innocent men, women, and children.

Finally, I offer sympathies for the loss of life among the Israelis and the Palestinians.

As the great theologian St. Augustine reminds us, “peace is the necessary condition in which people can be free to work out their eternal destiny.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 107, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 2014, at page 13342.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014.

General Omar Bradley, the former administrator of what is now the Department of Veterans Affairs, once said of our work, "We are dealing with veterans, not procedures—with their problems, not ours."

We have come face-to-face with the problems our veterans routinely encounter, and they are considerable to say the least. As every American now knows, congressional oversight and whistleblower revelations have exposed widespread corruption and systemic delays in access and failures of accountability across our Nation's second largest bureaucracy.

Thousands of veterans across this country have been left to wait—some for years; some in pain; and, most disturbingly, some in caskets that are draped with American flags; some while chronic or fatal conditions worsened until little hope was left—for the health care they earned through their honorable service to our Nation. Meanwhile, poor-performing VA leaders and employees continued to receive large

bonuses, subject to little accountability for their many inadequacies.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Veterans Affairs, as we know it today, is in crisis, and as a result, our veterans are suffering. The conference report we are considering this afternoon is the first step to alleviating their pain and for paving the way for the failing VA health care system to experience much-needed structural and cultural reform.

To immediately improve access to care for veteran patients, the conference report would require the VA to authorize non-VA care to any eligible veteran who is unable to secure a timely appointment at a VA facility or who resides more than 40 miles from the nearest VA medical facility, with certain exceptions.

Eligible veterans would include those who are enrolled in the VA health care system as of August 1 of 2014 or who are newly-discharged combat veterans.

It would further require the VA to issue a veterans choice card to eligible veterans to facilitate care provided by non-VA providers and provide \$10 billion for the newly-established veterans choice fund to cover the costs of access to non-VA care under this bill.

To lead the way for true reform in the long term, the conference report would require a comprehensive assessment of VA care by an expert independent entity or entities and would establish a congressional commission on care, which would be charged with setting the future course for access to and quality care throughout the entire VA health care system.

To improve the VA's internal capacity to provide timely and high-quality care to our veterans, this report would also provide the Department with \$5 billion to hire physicians and other clinical staff and would provide for certain critical physical infrastructure improvements.

The conference report would also extend the VA's rural health care-focused project, ARCH—a pilot program—for an additional 2 years. It would extend the pilot program for an additional 3 years to provide rehabilitation, quality of life, and community integration services to veterans with traumatic brain injury.

It would authorize 27 medical facility leases across 18 States and Puerto Rico and make certain improvements to care provided to veterans who have experienced military sexual trauma and others.

To advance genuine accountability for incompetent or corrupt senior managers, the conference report would reduce funding for bonuses available to VA employees by \$40 million each year through fiscal year 2024, and it would authorize the Secretary to fire or demote Senior Executive Service employees and title 38 SES equivalent employees for poor performance or mis-

conduct. Poor-performing employees who are disciplined under this authority would be provided an expedited and limited appeal process, but would be prohibited from receiving their pay, bonuses, or benefits during the appeal process.

This provision will give the Secretary the tools he needs to expeditiously hold senior managers accountable for the types of willful misconduct and possibly criminal negligence we have seen during our investigations.

The conference report would also require public colleges to provide instate tuition to veterans and eligible dependents for the school to remain eligible to receive GI Bill education payments.

This provision closely mirrors the bill that I offered, H.R. 357, the GI Bill Tuition Fairness Act, which passed the House earlier this year. The men and women who served this Nation did not just defend the citizens of their home States; they defended the entire United States of America.

The conference report would also include approximately \$5 billion in offsets with additional incidental offsets expected to accrue over time as a result of increased third-party collections for nonservice-connected conditions and reductions in Medicare payments as a result of the increased utilization of the newly-created choice program.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is one that I am proud of, but more importantly, it is one that I believe our Nation's veterans can be proud of. It is not a blank check for a broken system, but it is an important first step down a long road toward true transformation.

However, our work is far from over. We all know that congressional oversight was crucial to bringing the failures at the VA to light, and it will increase in the days and weeks and months ahead after the passage of this bill.

The passage of this conference report will increase access to care and improve accountability within a desperately broken bureaucracy. However, the reform that is necessary to reforming the agency will require dedication for years to come, and I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in beginning that effort today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 3230, the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER, Senator SANDERS, Senator BURR, and the other members of the conference committee for working so diligently on this legislation.

Even when it looked like an agreement would not be possible to achieve

a compromise and bring it to the House floor today, at the end of the day, we all worked together to make sure our national commitment to veterans is there. This compromise agreement can serve as a model on how Congress should look at serious problems facing our country and how to address them.

It has been a long road getting here. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee, under Chairman MILLER's leadership, has held over a dozen oversight hearings in the past couple of months alone. We have heard from veterans, their families, VA employees, and veterans service organizations about what is and what isn't working within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The measure before us today isn't a long-term solution to all of the VA's problems, but it is an appropriate and well-crafted response to the immediate problems of veterans not being able to access quality health care in a timely fashion.

This bill also takes important steps to begin to address the systemic problems within the Department of Veterans Affairs that have led to this crisis: too few doctors, inadequate infrastructure, and a management culture that is asleep at the wheel. It holds those whom the Nation has entrusted with our veterans' lives and well-being responsible for the outcomes.

For the 12 years that I have been on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have fought to ensure that our veterans, especially those who are living in rural areas, have access to quality health care. I fought for the needs of veterans returning from the current conflicts, while not forgetting the sacrifices and the needs of veterans from previous conflicts.

One of the successes that you heard from Chairman MILLER earlier I am most proud of is the Project ARCH. The Access Received Closer to Home project expands the opportunity for rural veterans to receive health care without long drives to a VA facility many miles away. I am pleased to see that the conference report extends and expands this important program. It is critical for the thousands of veterans who live in districts like mine. Many veterans in my district would be forced to make a nearly 600-mile round trip drive to the nearest VA facility if it weren't for ARCH.

Another important aspect of this bill not only deals with Senior Executive Service, but also the title 38 employees, which covers about 80,000 within the VA. It sets metrics and outcomes and accountability for those employees.

This bill also will address the immediate problem of long waiting times for health care, while beginning to strengthen the VA, so we are not facing the same crisis next year or the year after.

But I would also like to remind my colleagues that this bill is only the

first step. After 12 years on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am more convinced than ever that we must begin to talk about the innovative solutions that will truly modernize the Department and better meet the needs of current and future veterans.

Far too often, the good intentions underlying the laws that we passed are stymied by an organizational structure that has originated back in the seventies and eighties. Far too often, the good intentions of the Department of Veterans' Affairs employees meet the wall of bureaucratic indifference. Far too often, our veterans ask for help and there is no one there at the other end to answer for that help.

This is totally unacceptable, and it is why I believe we must begin the work of radically restructuring the Department of Veterans' Affairs. We must restructure it to better assist our veterans, to better live up to the promises we have made to them. We need to look at the fundamental business model, the processes, the organization, the technology, the data and information and the workforce capabilities.

Our work today is to pass this conference report and get it to the President's desk as quickly as possible so that we can fix the current crisis. The work for tomorrow is the work that I ask each and every one of my colleagues to continue working on: to make sure that the Department of Veterans Affairs evolves to a new, more veteran-centered Department of Veterans Affairs.

It is going to take a lot of work and a lot of oversight, as you heard the chairman mention earlier. Once again, I would encourage my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), a member of the conference committee.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman JEFF MILLER for his continued leadership as we work to provide our veterans with the care and benefits that they have earned.

Keeping the promises that we have made to our veterans and their families is of utmost importance to me and all Americans. This piece of legislation is a major step in the process of restoring veteran trust in the VA.

This bill will expand access to non-VA care, making wait times shorter and increase convenience. Although this will ensure veterans who are currently on a waiting list will get the timely care they deserve, much more needs to be done.

I am especially pleased that an independent congressional committee on care will be formed to look at the VA from the ground up. For lasting change to take place, the corrupt culture

shown by some in the VA must be purged. It must be replaced with an ethos that puts the veteran first.

By authorizing the Secretary of the VA to fire senior employees that are guilty of poor performance or misconduct, this bill ensures that newly confirmed Secretary McDonald will have more tools to hold individuals accountable for their actions. However, granting this authority will mean nothing if it isn't combined with the leadership required to always do the right things for our veterans. Through his words and actions, Secretary McDonald must make it clear from day one that individuals will be held accountable, whistleblowers will be protected, and anyone responsible for poor performance, negligence, or preventable deaths, even, will be held accountable.

It has been an honor to serve with the chairman during this conference committee.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the VA conference report.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I thank Mr. MICHAUD and Chairman MILLER for their leadership on this important bill.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been working with my colleagues to ensure that veterans have access to the highest quality care in a timely fashion. This legislation before us takes important steps towards that goal.

I am especially pleased that the compromise includes three of my bills, which ensure that: one, all victims of sexual assault in the military, including those in the National Guard, have access to the care they need; two, that spouses of those who have died in service to our country get education benefits; and, three, more residencies are going to be funded at VA hospitals in areas of the country that are underserved by doctors in private practice.

Our committee, I know, will continue to work in a bipartisan fashion with the new Secretary to ensure that all veterans have access to the benefits and care that they have so bravely earned.

Today, we are acting on behalf of a grateful Nation to provide our country's heroes the care they need and restore their trust in the VA. So I urge my colleagues to support this conference report to the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a veteran, a physician, and also a member of the conference committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand before this body in support of the conference report, the first major step in providing

timely, high-quality health care to the veterans who so selflessly served this great Nation. As a physician, veteran, and member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it was an honor to have served on the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, a corrosive culture has been allowed to exist within the Veterans Affairs bureaucracy for far too long and to the detriment of our veterans. The most important thing this bill does is give the veterans who are experiencing long wait times or live more than 40 miles from the nearest VA facility a choice. These veterans will now be able to obtain a veterans choice card, which will allow them to seek care in the private sector. Only by forcing the VA to compete will we achieve the cultural change that is required in how they serve veterans.

I have met with many physicians in recent weeks, and the desire to help our veterans is stronger than ever. Hospitals and physicians, alike, are ready and willing to care for veterans, helping to address a crisis created by VA mismanagement.

Moving forward, this report creates a process by which we can make significant strides toward accountability, by giving the VA Secretary the ability to fire senior employees who fail to do their jobs and ensuring that there will be swift, harsh penalties for knowingly misreporting or falsifying information.

This agreement will also improve educational benefits for veterans and their dependents.

As the founder and cochair of the House Invisible Wounds Caucus along with my friend TIM WALZ, I am pleased this report includes a provision to extend an important pilot program intended to help veterans with traumatic brain injuries for 3 more years.

The negotiations were tough, but I know the final product will have a very positive impact on the lives of our veterans, and I would like to thank the House and Senate VA committee staffs for all their late nights and hard work they put into this toward this worthy goal.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the chairmen, MILLER and SANDERS, for their leadership throughout this process, along with Ranking Member MICHAUD and Senator BURR.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this report.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3230.

As a member of the conference committee, I pushed for negotiations on this bill to continue because veterans have waited too long for the care they deserve.

This bill reflects the comprehensive, meaningful reforms that passed the Senate and that I introduced as the

companion bill in the House. This bill ensures that rural veterans who live too far from a veterans' medical facility and veterans who have waited too long for an appointment can see a provider closer to home.

For the tribal veterans in my district, this bill strengthens the relationship between the Veterans Administration and the Indian Health Services.

This bill also ensures that the Veterans Administration can quickly hire more doctors, nurses, and medical professionals, and this bill gives the Veterans Administration Secretary the authority to hold VA employees accountable.

Our veterans deserve world-class health care and a VA that puts veterans first. I believe this bill provides the foundation to do just that. Again, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill so it can be signed into law without delay.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a former physician within the VA system.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to the Veterans Access to Care Act.

As a doctor who served at the VA hospital in Iron Mountain, Michigan, for 20 years, I have seen firsthand how Washington bureaucracy can keep doctors and nurses from taking care of veterans. On its most basic level, this is the sacred mission of the VA, and the VA has failed.

Today we take an important step toward reversing that failure. Most urgently, our bill will allow veterans suffering long waits for care the option to be seen by a local doctor at a private hospital. I believe every veteran should have a choice as to where they receive care, and this bill moves us closer to that goal.

But this triage measure is not the long-term solution. That is why our bill directs the VA to tap the best health care minds that we have in this country to go step by step through the system and write us a blueprint for a lean, smart, 21st century VA.

Our bill is not perfect, and the problems at the VA will not be solved overnight. However, this landmark effort is the best chance we have had in years to make fundamental changes to the way the VA operates.

Make no mistake, our true test comes next. We must continue to keep the pressure on the VA long after the headlines have faded and the worst employees have been fired, because our veterans will still be there and they will still deserve to be at the top of our priority list.

As the father of a veteran myself, I am committed to refusing to let this issue go. We will demand results, and we will demand swift and full imple-

mentation of this legislation. Anything short of that is not worthy of our veterans and is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

□ 1530

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 35 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the most senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I strongly believe that the VA provides the best care for our Nation's servicemembers returning from protecting the freedoms we most hold dear, and I am committed to VA continuing their critical mission of serving our veterans.

VA has served the special needs of our returning veterans for over 75 years and has expertise in their unique health care needs, including prosthetics, traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, and a host of other veteran-specific injuries. My focus continues to be on ensuring that the VA retains the unique responsibility for the health care our veterans receive, regardless of the provider.

The bill includes critical language that I discussed with Senator BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont to ensure the VA has the final authority over the care that the veterans receive, whether at the VA or at non-VA providers. We need to continue to work with our veteran stakeholders to ensure the VA has all the resources it needs to provide superior health care to our veterans.

I am looking forward to working with the new VA Secretary. And I want to thank the past Secretaries. I have worked with past Secretaries from Jesse Brown to the present one.

I know a lot of people will say that we have given the VA everything they need. But of course many of us don't have institutional memory.

I remember the first time the VA got the real budget they wanted in 2009 under President Barack Obama, when we had a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. So a lot of us talk the talk, walk the walk, but don't really roll the roll.

So we have got to make sure as we move forward that we don't just talk about providing service, but that we really provide service and we ensure that the veterans have the service that the first President, George Washington, promised the veterans.

And I do want to thank our chairperson, Mr. MILLER of Florida, for his leadership and the way he has conducted our meetings, and also our ranking member.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute and 35 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a United States veteran and another member of the conference committee.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Chairman MILLER

for his dedicated work on behalf of our veterans.

As a Marine Corps combat veteran and chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I have spent the past year working side-by-side with the members of my subcommittee and with Chairman MILLER to investigate and uncover the largest scandal in the history of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I am proud that Republicans and Democrats were able to put aside their partisan differences to focus on supporting our Nation's warriors with choice, accountability, and greater transparency. These reforms will allow veterans to vote with their feet if they cannot get an appointment within a reasonable timeframe at a VA facility.

I am also proud that we were able to include much-needed reforms on the treatment of victims of sexual assault in the military. The scourge of sexual assault in the military and the corruption of covered-up waiting lists at VA hospitals are shameful acts, and we must work together to confront them head on.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I congratulate Mr. MILLER, the chairman of the committee, and Mr. MICHAUD, the ranking member, for working together to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of a bipartisan agreement. And while I have some serious concerns about a number of provisions of which I will speak, I am supporting it because it assigns resources to help cut down the waiting times for veterans to get the care they need and that we owe them. That must be our number one goal.

I remain deeply outraged, as so many of us are, by what transpired in Phoenix and at other VA facilities, where our wounded warriors were made to wait weeks, months to get an appointment and receive treatment, including for serious postdeployment mental health issues. That is not acceptable. This is more than unacceptable, however. It is unconscionable.

I think there is wide agreement on both sides of the aisle that any VA personnel who facilitated this wrongdoing or undermined veterans' health care must be held accountable.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with provisions in this bill regarding the removal of senior executive personnel. While this bill does improve on the House version by adding a 21-day period for appeals, it still undermines civil service protections that

had been in place for decades to ensure a merit service, not a politicized, patronage service.

There are already strict rules in place that facilitate the swift removal of SES officials who do not perform their jobs responsibly, as there should be.

Those protections strike the right balance between giving agencies the authority to remove personnel without trampling on the due process rights of SES employees, who need to do their job without fear of political reprisal or arbitrary removal.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses major challenges at the VA. It provides resources to ensure that our veterans can access health care at private facilities if they face a very long wait or live in rural areas far from VA doctors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And it makes health care services more available and accessible to veterans through additional resources for medical and other VA personnel.

This, of course, is not a perfect bill. But then again, I don't think I have ever voted for a perfect bill. But this is a good bill that moves in the right direction.

Again, I congratulate Mr. MILLER and Mr. MICHAUD on their work on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), another member of our conference committee and an outstanding member of the full committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD, on behalf of the 54,000 veterans in my district and the 20 million around the country, thank you. And to every conferee that has served on this conference committee, thank you. This is a huge step forward today, and I am grateful to have been a part of this process. The need for this legislation and for our conference committee to have worked together was great, and it has been an incredible experience.

Let's not forget, in the past decade, nearly 1,000 veterans have died as a result of substandard treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and many more cases are under investigation. Mr. Speaker, 50,000 new patients have waited at least 90 days for their first appointment at VA hospitals. VA staff have admitted to falsifying medical appointment dates to fit within the agency's wait time performance goal of 14 days. All these facts have been simply appalling. All of us in Congress have constituents who have been directly impacted by this scandal.

The need for the legislation is so timely today. I just came from the

World War II Memorial, and I thanked a veteran from the Chicagoland-Indiana area. I shook his hand, looked him in the eye, and thanked him for serving our Nation. He stood up out of his wheelchair, looked me in the eye, and said: "Thank you for fighting for us." It just simply shows how important this is. This is an opportunity, as legislators, to take the first steps toward real change at the VA.

So today we stand together to help our Nation's heroes. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with nothing but the best. However, echoing the chairman's comments, simply providing a financial boost to an agency that has repeatedly demonstrated awful management practices will not solve the problem.

In the coming weeks and months, we must continue to stand together to ensure additional improvements are made to the VA. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen very much on behalf of the State that has one of the largest populations of veterans, including those in my congressional district. I would like to say thank you.

To Ranking Member MICHAUD and Chairman MILLER, thank you for allowing me to sit in on a hearing. Thank you to the conferees. Thank you for understanding that, when our soldiers put on the uniform, have any of us ever had them question why? And therefore, we should never question why are we giving the best service that we can give to our veterans.

I am grateful for the \$5 billion that allows this temporary flexibility, that if you cannot get service, you are, in fact, able to go to civilian doctors.

The professionals that are going to be added with primary and specialty doctors are the TMI, housing, PTSD, sexual assault. All of these are making a difference.

In the name of the World War II veteran that I saw in Normandy, by the name of Curtis, a veteran in my district who had an appointment in 2013 and never heard back from the veterans hospital, in his name, I believe that this is the most important opportunity. We should vote for this and be able to provide our veterans with the promise we have made to them: You serve, and we will serve you.

God bless America.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report to H.R. 3230, "Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014."

We must remember that freedom is not free and pause to recognize the valor and self-sacrifice of our nation's veterans.

We also need to keep our promises to the nation's more than 2 million troops and reservists and 23 million veterans.

I support the Conference Report for 6 principle reasons. The legislation before us:

1. Expands access to health care for veterans;
2. Addresses the shortage of health professionals in the VA;
3. Ensures access to care for rural veterans;
4. Provides funding to establish 27 new VA clinics;
5. Expands access to education for veterans and their families; and
6. Extends a community-based housing program for veterans.

Specifically, the conference report provides that the bulk of the funding in this agreement—\$10 billion in emergency funding—be used to expand access to non-VA health care options for veterans who have been left waiting for more than 30 days for an appointment or live more than 40 miles from the nearest VA facility.

Additionally, the bill provides \$5 billion to VA to hire more primary and specialty care physicians and other medical staff and includes incentives to attract more doctors, nurses and other medical personnel to the VA, and to increase medical education opportunities to attract doctors in the future.

Third, the bill extends the ARCH (Access Received Closer to Home) pilot program for two years. The ARCH program expands VA's ability to serve veterans who live far from VA facilities in Northern Maine; Farmville, Virginia; Pratt, Kansas; Flagstaff, Arizona; and Billings, Montana.

Fourth, the bill expands VA authority to provide counseling, care and other services to veterans and certain other non-veteran service members who have experienced military sexual trauma during active or inactive duty training (including members of the National Guard and Reserves). The legislation also requires the VA and DOD to conduct an annual assessment focused on the transition and continuum of care from DOD to VA for those who have experienced military sexual trauma.

Fifth, the conference report includes \$1.5 billion to lease 27 new VA clinics, including a new research facility in my home city of Houston, Texas, bringing care closer to where veterans live and increasing access to specialty care services.

Sixth, the Conference Report permits veterans who are eligible for education benefits under the post-9/11 New GI Bill to qualify for in-state tuition and it expands the Marine Gunner Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship to include spouses of members of the Air Force who die in the line duty while serving in active duty.

Finally, the Conference Report gives the VA Secretary the authority to immediately fire or demote senior executives based on poor job performance or misconduct but includes an expedited appeals process for terminated employees to prevent political firings and protect whistleblowers from retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, my state of Texas and Houston appreciates the service and sacrifices of veterans and takes care of them.

The Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center, for example, located in Houston, Texas serves the 32,477 veterans and is the primary healthcare provider for almost 130,000 veterans in southeast Texas.

Veterans from around the country are referred to the DeBakey VA Medical Center for specialized diagnostic care, radiation therapy, surgery, and medical treatment including cardiovascular surgery, gastrointestinal endoscopy, nuclear medicine, ophthalmology, and treatment of spinal cord injury and diseases.

DeBakey VA Medical Center provides vital healthcare services to Veterans in the Houston area and through the nation.

I am proud to support the Conference Report since veterans from Houston and surrounding regions will benefit with the establishment of a new facility that will extend access to specialty care services.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to long wait times at VA facilities, many veterans face a number of other challenges, including homelessness, coping with PTSD, and finding suitable employment in the civilian job market.

To address these problems, earlier this year I was successful in passing amendments to this year's Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act and the Defense Appropriations Act providing additional funding and resources targeted to helping homeless veterans secure housing and treating veterans suffering from PTSD in underserved urban and rural areas.

I also introduced H.R. 4110, the "Transitioning Heroes Act of 2014," which provides strong tax incentives for employers to hire, retain, and employ veterans in positions that take maximum advantage of their skills and experience.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in the military have fulfilled a commitment to this nation and to each other that we should imitate in our actions to work to provide for veterans now that their military service has ended.

That is why as Members of Congress we need to make sure our veterans receive the best medical care that modern medicine has to offer to them and their families.

That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Conference Report to H.R. 3230, "Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014."

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the full committee and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today I rise in support of the VA conference report on H.R. 3230. The Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 is a positive first step toward reforming the VA, which provides, among other things, relief to veterans who have waited excessively to receive the health care they have earned at a level of quality they deserve, Mr. Speaker.

This bill also includes real accountability provisions, allowing the VA Secretary to fire or demote Senior Executive Service employees for lack of performance and management negligence.

This reform package is focused around ensuring the veteran has timely access to quality care and includes language to authorize 27 major medical fa-

cility leases, including one in Pasco County, Florida, in my congressional district.

The veterans in my area will soon have the ability to seek treatments at a consolidated clinic, thanks to Chairman MILLER, as opposed to having to travel between the main clinic and four other satellite facilities.

Authorizing these leases will improve the timeliness for veterans to receive care in Pasco County and in 17 other States throughout the Nation, as well as Puerto Rico.

Passage of this bill is the beginning, not the end. Obviously much work needs to be done. However, immediate action needs to be taken to get veterans off waiting lists and ensure they receive care within the VA health system or in the private sector, if they so choose. The veteran should have the choice. We need to get this done for our veterans.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to thank Chairman MILLER for the gracious way that he has conducted the committee hearings, and I thank Ranking Member MICHAUD for his hard work.

Principally, I am very pleased that this conference report also includes 1,500 funded graduate medical school education slots at veterans facilities around this country. It was a good thing that we approved access to non-VA care for those servicemembers, those veterans who have been on waiting lists for far too long. But that would not be satisfactory to those areas of the country that are experiencing physician shortages. This is a huge, huge accomplishment for a Congress that is so partisan to approve these 1,500 funded GMEs.

I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this bill.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I want to take a moment to share a little about what this bill means for my Kansas veterans.

Since coming to Congress, I have heard dozens of stories from Kansas veterans about their troubles with the VA. They have shared about how they are required to travel hundreds of miles for simple medical tests or to renew their prescriptions, all the while, driving past dozens of local hospitals and other health care providers with the ability and desire to meet their needs locally. Many Kansas veterans drive halfway across the State or to Colorado, Nebraska, or even Texas to

get their simplest health care needs met.

In fact, just yesterday, my office had to step in to help a 94-year-old World War II veteran. The nearest VA hospital was 240 miles away. He just had a recent serious surgery, and they said, you have to come into the hospital to renew your prescriptions.

□ 1545

Thankfully, I was able to contact the VA and ensure this veteran could get his care in his local community, but as I tell folks in Kansas, you shouldn't have to call your Congressman to get the care you deserve.

With this bill, hundreds of rural Kansas veterans will be able to use their new veteran choice card or Project ARCH, call their local doctor, and get their health care needs met. Just like Medicare or TRICARE, veterans should have the choice to schedule their own appointments, pick their own doctors in their own communities.

When our veterans come back from serving and defending our country and return to communities across the United States, most of them don't ask for much, but I want our veterans to know that I believe you deserve the best, not just the mediocre, scandal-plagued culture we have seen at the current VA.

This bill is just plain common sense. It is a big first step towards giving veterans real choice and real accountability. As this law is implemented, I remain committed to continuing to ask the hard questions and working to return the VA to its true mission, to serve our veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for bringing this Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act to us today.

In medically-underserved communities, where health care staffing shortages have caused delays in appointments, this conference agreement will help provide critical investments so that the VA can begin hiring the doctors it needs to serve our veterans.

It will help to reduce the backlog in VA construction and maintenance projects. It will help to ensure that veterans unable to get a medical appointment at a VA facility will be able to get the care they need from a non-VA provider.

This legislation can do a lot of good, but it is only a first step. The bill must be implemented, regulations issued, and scarce moneys allocated to ensure that veterans get the care that this legislation promises.

We must not lose sight of the rural, underserved areas in our Nation like in southern West Virginia, where veterans are elderly and travel is costly and burdensome. We must not lose sight of the need for medical facilities and health providers in those areas.

I urge the VA to remember rural veterans as it implements this bill, and I certainly aim to help to ensure that it does so. Again, I commend the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to us today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), someone who always has veterans first in his mind.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a necessary repair for our vets' damage that was caused by VA workers who were willing to allow veterans to die by denying them care, ostensibly to receive a bonus.

Leave no doubt that this is a patch and that the VA requires a complete overhaul. For example, 7 years ago, the VA hospital in Omaha was deemed to be in such poor condition it needed to be replaced ASAP. It was put on the official list, and in those 7 years since, the project has actually fallen down the list, as few projects have been completed.

The VA is just not able to manage major projects. The entire Nebraska delegation wrote then-Secretary Shinseki over a year ago to meet and discuss the lack of progress and possible alternatives, but he refused to meet with our delegation, even after repeated requests.

This is evidence of total dysfunction of this VA in Washington, D.C. My hope is that the new VA Secretary will be more accommodating to listen to the Nebraska delegation whose sole goal is simply to help our veterans receive the appropriate care in a building that meets at least today's standards.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to rise today in support of the Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 and to commend Representative MILLER and Representative MICHAUD for their leadership in getting this bill to us and this conference committee report to us today.

As the son of a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, I say it is long overdue that Congress took action to provide the quality of care that our veterans have earned. I am here today to fight for veterans in southern Arizona, of which I represent 85,000, and veterans all across this Nation.

I have been pushing for better access to health care for our veterans since I came to Congress a little over 2 years ago. This has become even more urgent given the tragedy, the disgraceful be-

havior that we have uncovered in Phoenix and potentially across veterans centers in our Nation. To play games with our veterans to get bonuses is despicable, and this bill, I hope, will move us in a direction of correcting those terrible actions.

One of the first bills I introduced was the veterans' access to health care bill to ensure that veterans could get health care they need in their communities, and this bill, I am glad to say, includes that provision. I commend the leader, the chairman, and the ranking member for their work, and I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" for this important bill for our veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the conference committee report, asking all of our fellow members to support it, and I congratulate the chairman with whom I had a rather spirited conversation on this floor, as well as the ranking member on accomplishing the first step, I think, and it is the first step, but it is a significant step.

I am particularly proud that two of the provisions that I came to this floor to argue for—that being additional facilities, including an expansion of the facility in San Antonio, as well as additional support personnel, medical personnel, and health care personnel—are included in this bill.

This bill includes so much more: a graduate medical education component and, in addition, educational opportunities for spouses and families. This is an incredible first step.

I, again, want to underscore my thanks to the chairman, to the ranking member, to the members of the conference committee, and this is a great first step at putting us in the right direction towards finally treating our veterans with the respect that they not only deserve, but they have earned over the period of their service.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to state my support for this agreement, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014, and thank both Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their leadership on bringing this issue to a resolution.

Last week, I offered a motion to instruct as a way to spur a bipartisan solution and to ensure that vets on the GI Bill could pay lower in-state college tuition. I am happy that that provision has been included.

Enacting the measures offered in this plan will go a long way toward improving veterans health care though, as everyone noted, there is much more work to be done. The more than 200,000 veterans who live in San Diego County deserve access to the medical care and benefits America has promised them and they have earned.

It is my hope that our action today will give new hope to the many vets who felt despair and disappointment at the way they have been treated by the VA after all they have sacrificed. Today, we send a bipartisan message to them: America keeps its promises to our veterans.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am ready to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 3230. This is a very important bill. It is a bill that we have worked long and hard over the last several months. It is one that took into consideration a lot of the concerns that Members from both sides and both bodies had, and we came together with this bill.

I do want to thank Chairman MILLER for his hard work and dedication to our veterans and their families. We would not be here today if it wasn't his determination in having strong oversight hearings over the last couple of months within our committee.

I also want to thank staffs on both sides, the majority and minority staff. I know they have put in thousands of hours for oversight hearings to work on this conference report to get us where we are today. We could not have done it without our dedicated staffs on both sides of the aisle going through this document and making sure that every Member's concerns were addressed in this document.

With that, I want to once again thank the chairman for your hard work on this effort and look forward to the vote on this. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say thank you to the ranking member of the full House committee, Mr. MICHAUD, for his tenacity in what he has done to move this conference report along.

I also want to say thank you to the ranking member, Mr. BURR, in the Senate and to Senator SANDERS because, as we continue to negotiate through, there never was a willingness to quit by either side.

I am grateful to the 24 other conference committee members who worked with us, with their input, their ideas, and their willingness to embrace this compromise. It was brought forth by diligent, focused effort and a willingness on all sides to put aside differences of opinion and ideology and

focus not on our disagreements, but how best we can all help our veterans.

While not perfect, this is an example of all the good work we can accomplish when we work together, and remember, it is the veteran who is sacred, not the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, there is no Federal agency more deserving of our attention than the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA has served generations of heroes who have sacrificed on behalf of our country and we have an obligation to take care of them when they come home.

Without a doubt, the American people expect and veterans deserve the best service possible and I firmly believe that it is a duty of all of us in Congress to ensure that no one betrays the sacred trust owed to our Veterans.

The failure and mismanagement of care for our veterans that has come to light through the IG's investigation over the past two months must never be repeated, and I trust that this bill will go far to help reverse the failures, and ensure better future treatment of veterans at the VA.

I think this conference report contains provisions that will help provide timely care to veterans, hold the management of the Department of Veterans Affairs accountable, uphold the integrity of the department, and improve education benefits for veterans and their dependants—representing a major step in the right direction in meeting those obligations.

Specific measures to do so include; providing \$5 billion to the VA to hire additional physicians and other medical staff, authorizing a system for the VA to fire or demote management level employees for poor performance or misconduct, and increasing access to non-VA care for those veterans in dire need.

Yesterday, we were greeted with the good news of the Senate confirmation of the new VA Secretary, Robert McDonald. While the Senate acted swiftly on the confirmation of McDonald, I was disappointed to see that the Senate Appropriations Committee Chairwoman was unable to bring the FY 2015 MilCon/VA Appropriations bill to floor due to objections from the Senate Minority. If we truly wanted to get the ball rolling to make the VA better the Senate Minority should allow the bill to come to the floor.

Nevertheless, I also have full expectation that with the passage of this conference report it is going to be important that this Congress hold Secretary McDonald and his subordinates fully accountable moving forward.

Many in Congress are concerned about the cost of this bill. One way to help pay the cost of improved health care for veterans would be to improve third party collections.

Section 201 of the bill authorizes an independent assessment of a number of VA activities. Among other provisions, the assessment would report on ways to increase funds owed to the VA by third parties.

Over the past dozen years, the GAO and the VA/OIG have issued more than a dozen reports outlining the problems with third party reimbursement. I hope that the assessment team will not reinvent the wheel.

We already know that the VA has increased its billings for these services, but its collection rate has decreased or has remained stagnant. As a result, in FY13 alone, the VA failed to collect more than \$3 billion in billings. Between FY07 and FY13, the VA left nearly \$23 billion on the table.

The assessment should include specific directives for the improvement of the entire billings and collections process—from initial billing to denied claims to appeals of denied claims. The private sector seeks to maximize reimbursement. The VA should do no less.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conference Report on H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014. I also want to commend Chairman SANDERS, Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member BURR, and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their work on crafting a bipartisan bill that not only provides for our veterans but addresses many of the systemic problems within the Veteran Health Administration.

The final conference agreement provides over \$17 billion in funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs. This includes \$10 billion in funding to allow veterans who live more than 40 miles away from a VA facility, or who have waited more than 30 days for an appointment at a VA medical center, to seek care with an outside provider. In addition, it provides the VA with \$6.5 billion in funding to address its critical shortage of doctors and nurses and to allow the VA to enter into 27 new medical facility leases. By expanding access to care, increasing staffing needs, and authorizing new clinics, this bill is a great first step in tackling many of the ongoing problems that have surfaced at the VA in recent years.

The Conference Report strengthens a number of other programs to help support our veterans and their families. It expands eligibility and provides veterans who experienced military sexual trauma while on inactive duty the opportunity to seek sexual trauma counseling. It also modifies the post-9/11 GI Bill and allows veterans to receive in-state tuition rates at any public university, if they decide to relocate. Finally, today's legislation extends an important program set to expire later this year to provide housing for veterans struggling with traumatic brain injuries.

I do, however, have reservations about a provision in this bill which gives the VA Secretary broad authority to fire Senior Executive Service (SES) employees even though the VA already has tools to remove SES employees who are rated unsatisfactory. However, I am encouraged that—unlike legislation that passed the House earlier this year—the conference agreement does provide SES employees with an expedited appeals process through a Merit Systems Protection Board.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important than providing for those who have sacrificed so much for our country. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on H.R. 3230.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 694;

Adopting House Resolution 694, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and adopting the conference report on H.R. 3230.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 676, AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 935, REDUCING REGU- LATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR PRO- CEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2014, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 694) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from August 1, 2014, through September 5, 2014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—227

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

NAYS—195

Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Witman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcla
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Clay
Clever
DesJarlais
Garrett

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan

NOT VOTING—10

Gosar
Hanabusa
McKeon
Nunnelee

□ 1623

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. RICHMOND and LANGEVIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Posey
Barton	Hall	Price (GA)
Benishek	Hanna	Reed
Bentivolio	Harper	Reichert
Bilirakis	Harris	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Ribble
Black	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Rigell
Boustany	Hensarling	Roby
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rokita
Bucshon	Hunter	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Campbell	Jolly	Royce
Cantor	Jordan	Runyan
Capito	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Cassidy	King (IA)	Sanford
Chabot	King (NY)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kingston	Schock
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coble	Kline	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Conaway	Lankford	Simpson
Cook	Latham	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Latta	Smith (NE)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Long	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Southerland
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Daines	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Marchant	Stockman
Dent	Marino	Stutzman
DeSantis	Massie	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McAllister	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Tipton
Ellmers	McHenry	Turner
Farenthold	McKeon	Upton
Fincher	McKinley	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Wagner
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleming	Meadows	Walden
Flores	Meehan	Walorski
Forbes	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Mica	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
	Mullin	Williams
	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
	Neugebauer	Wolf
	Noem	Womack
	Nugent	Woodall
	Nunes	Yoder
	Olson	Yoho
	Palazzo	Young (AK)
	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Barber	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Bass	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hahn	Owens
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Payne
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Holt	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Peterson
Brownlee (CA)	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Israel	Pocan
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Polis
Capps	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Carney	Jones	Rangel
Carlson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kildee	Rush
Cicilline	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	T.
Clyburn	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Langevin	Sarbanes
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Costa	Levin	Schrader
Courtney	Lewis	Schwartz
Crowley	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Loeb	Scott, David
Cummings	Loeb	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lowey	Sherman
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Delaney	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DelBene	(NM)	Speier
Doyle	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Duckworth	Maffei	Takano
Edwards	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Matheson	Tierney
Enyart	Matsui	Titus
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Esty	McCollum	Tsongas
Farr	McDermott	Van Hollen
Fattah	McGovern	Vargas
Foster	McIntyre	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Vela
Fudge	Meeks	Velázquez
Gabbard	Meng	Visclosky
Gallego	Michaud	Walz
Garamendi	Miller, George	Wasserman
Garcia	Moore	Schultz
Grayson	Moran	Waters
Green, Al	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
	Nadler	Welch
	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Clay	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Cleaver	Hanabusa	Pompeo
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Sires

□ 1633

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 466, a recorded vote on H. Res. 694. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230,
PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE
ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report to the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 5, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—420

Aderholt	Clarke (NY)	Fortenberry
Amash	Clawson (FL)	Foster
Amodei	Clyburn	Fox
Bachmann	Coble	Frankel (FL)
Bachus	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Barber	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Barletta	Cole	Fudge
Barr	Collins (GA)	Gabbard
Barrow (GA)	Collins (NY)	Gallego
Barton	Conaway	Garamendi
Bass	Connolly	Garcia
Beatty	Conyers	Gardner
Becerra	Cook	Garrett
Benishek	Cooper	Gerlach
Bentivolio	Costa	Gibbs
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gibson
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Gohmert
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Gosar
Black	Cuellar	Gowdy
Blackburn	Culberson	Granger
Blumenauer	Cummings	Graves (GA)
Bonamici	Daines	Graves (MO)
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Griffin (AR)
Bridenstine	DeGette	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Guthrie
Broun (GA)	DelBene	Gutiérrez
Brown (FL)	Denham	Hahn
Brownlee (CA)	Dent	Hall
Buchanan	DeSantis	Hanna
Bucshon	Deutch	Harper
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Bustos	Dingell	Hartzler
Butterfield	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Byrne	Doyle	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Duckworth	Heck (NV)
Camp	Duffy	Heck (WA)
Campbell	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Capito	Edwards	Higgins
Capps	Ellison	Himes
Capuano	Ellmers	Hinojosa
Cárdenas	Engel	Holding
Carney	Enyart	Holt
Carlson (IN)	Eshoo	Honda
Carter	Esty	Horsford
Cartwright	Farenthold	Hoyer
Cassidy	Farr	Hudson
Castor (FL)	Fattah	Huelskamp
Castro (TX)	Fincher	Huffman
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Chu	Fleming	Hunter
Cicilline	Flores	Hurt
Clark (MA)	Forbes	

Israel	Messer	Barbanes
Issa	Mica	Scalise
Jackson Lee	Michaud	Schakowsky
Jeffries	Miller (FL)	Schiff
Jenkins	Miller (MI)	Schneider
Johnson (GA)	Miller, Gary	Schock
Johnson (OH)	Miller, George	Schrader
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Schwartz
Johnson, Sam	Moran	Schweikert
Jolly	Mullin	Scott (VA)
Jordan	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Joyce	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Keating	Nadler	Serrano
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Neugebauer	Sherman
Kilmer	Noem	Shimkus
Kind	Nolan	Shuster
King (IA)	Nugent	Simpson
King (NY)	Nunes	Sinema
Kinzinger (IL)	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick	Olson	Smith (MO)
Kline	Owens	Smith (NE)
Kuster	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Pallone	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Pascarella	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Pastor (AZ)	Southerland
Lance	Paulsen	Speier
Langevin	Payne	Stewart
Lankford	Pearce	Stivers
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Stutzman
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Latham	Perry	Takano
Latta	Peters (CA)	Terry
Lee (CA)	Peters (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Lewis	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Tiberi
Loeb	Pitts	Tierney
Lofgren	Pocan	Tipton
Long	Poe (TX)	Titus
Lowenthal	Polis	Tonko
Lowe	Posey	Tsongas
Lucas	Price (GA)	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Upton
Lujan Grisham	Quigley	Valadao
(NM)	Rahall	Van Hollen
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rangel	Vargas
(NM)	Reed	Veasey
Lummis	Reichert	Vela
Lynch	Renacci	Velázquez
Maffei	Ribble	Visclosky
Maloney,	Rice (SC)	Wagner
Carolyn	Richmond	Walberg
Maloney, Sean	Rigell	Walden
Marchant	Roby	Walorski
Marino	Roe (TN)	Walz
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Wasserman
Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Schultz
Matsui	Rogers (MI)	Waters
McAllister	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Weber (TX)
McCarthy (NY)	Rooney	Webster (FL)
McCauley	Ros-Lehtinen	Welch
McClintock	Roskam	Wenstrup
McCollum	Ross	Westmoreland
McDermott	Rothfus	Whitfield
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Williams
McHenry	Royce	Wilson (FL)
McIntyre	Ruiz	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Runyan	Wittman
McKinley	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McMorris	Rush	Womack
Rodgers	Ryan (OH)	Woodall
McNerney	Ryan (WI)	Yarmuth
Meadows	Salmon	Yoder
Meehan	Sánchez, Linda	Yoho
Meeks	T.	Young (AK)
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (IN)

NAYS—5

Crawford	Kingston	Stockman
Jones	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—7

Clay	Hanabusa	Sires
Cleaver	Nunnelee	
DesJarlais	Pompeo	

□ 1640

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 3230

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 111

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 101(a)(1)(B)(i), insert before the period at the end the following: “, including any physician furnishing services under such program”.

(2) In section 101(d)(3)(A), insert after “1395cc(a))” the following: “and participation agreements under section 1842(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(h))”.

(3) In section 101(d)(3)(B)(i), strike “provider of service” and insert “provider of services”.

(4) In section 101(d)(3)(B)(i), insert before the semicolon the following: “and any physician or other supplier who has entered into a participation agreement under section 1842(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(h))”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1645

AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE LITIGATION FOR ACTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 676) providing for authority to initiate litigation for

actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules printed in the resolution is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 676

Resolved, That the Speaker is authorized to initiate or intervene in one or more civil actions on behalf of the House of Representatives in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction to seek any appropriate relief regarding the failure of the President, the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or employee of the executive branch, to act in a manner consistent with that official's duties under the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to implementation of any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, including any amendment made by such provision, or any other related provision of law, including a failure to implement any such provision.

SEC. 2. The Speaker shall notify the House of Representatives of a decision to initiate or intervene in any civil action pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Office of the General Counsel of the House of Representatives, at the direction of the Speaker, shall represent the House in any civil action initiated, or in which the House intervenes, pursuant to this resolution, and may employ the services of outside counsel and other experts for this purpose.

(b) The chair of the Committee on House Administration shall cause to be printed in the Congressional Record a statement setting forth the aggregate amounts expended by the Office of General Counsel on outside counsel and other experts pursuant to subsection (a) on a quarterly basis. Such statement shall be submitted for printing not more than 30 days after the expiration of each such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the consideration of H. Res. 676.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to discuss the unwarranted, ongoing shift of power in favor of the executive branch.

Under President Obama, the executive branch has increasingly gone beyond the constraints of the Constitution. In fact, in a number of instances, the President's actions have gone beyond his article II powers to enforce the law and have infringed upon the article I powers of Congress to write the law.

We are here today because, at the beginning of this Congress, every Member of this body took an oath of office in which we swore to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States." At the beginning of each Presidential term, the President takes an oath to "faithfully execute the Office of the President of the United States and . . . to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." While these oaths are slightly different, the object of both oaths is the same. The President and Members of Congress have an obligation to follow and defend the Constitution.

The text of the Constitution that we have sworn to defend provides separate powers for each branch of the Federal Government. Article I puts the power to legislate—that is, to write the law—in the hands of Congress. Article II, on the other hand, requires that the President "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The difference is important. The Founders knew that giving one branch the power to both write and execute the law would be a direct threat to the liberties of the American people. They separated these powers between the branches in order to ensure that no one particular person, whether it be the President or a Member of Congress, could trample upon the rights of the people.

My fear is that our Nation is currently facing the exact threat that the Constitution is designed to avoid. Branches of government have always attempted to exert their influence on the other branches, but the President has gone too far. Rather than faithfully executing the law as the Constitution requires, I believe that the President has selectively enforced the law in some instances, ignored the law in other instances and, in a few cases, unilaterally attempted to change the law altogether.

These actions have tilted the power away from the legislature and toward the Executive. They have also undermined the rule of law, which provides the predictability necessary to govern a functioning and fair society. By and large, this country is founded upon the rule of law, and this tilts that balance. By circumventing Congress, the President's actions have marginalized the role that the American people play in creating the laws that govern them. Specifically, the President has waived work requirements for welfare recipients, unilaterally changed immigration laws, released the Gitmo Five without

properly notifying Congress, which is the law, and ignored the statutory requirements of the Affordable Care Act.

We have chosen to bring this legislation forth today to sue the President over his selective implementation of the Affordable Care Act because it is the option most likely to clear the legal hurdles necessary to succeed and to restore the balance between the branches intended by the Founders. This administration has effectively rewritten the law without following the constitutional process.

When the executive branch goes beyond the constraints of the Constitution and infringes upon the powers of the legislative branch, it is important that the remaining branch of government—the judiciary—play its role in rebalancing this important separation of powers. After all, the constitutional limits on government power are meaningless unless judges engage with the Constitution and enforce those limits.

My friends in the minority do not seem to believe that the judiciary is up to its role in rebalancing the separation of powers. I disagree. Yesterday, at the Rules Committee, Members of the minority argued that this lawsuit is frivolous and a waste of time. They argued that if this litigation were to go forward that it would lead to countless lawsuits between the branches of government.

What my friends in the minority might fail to tell you—but I will today on the floor—is that they were for suing the President before they were against it. Eight years ago, in 2006, some Members of the minority, including the ranking member of the Rules Committee—the gentlewoman from New York—were plaintiffs in a lawsuit filed by congressional Democrats against then sitting President George W. Bush.

That is right. Eight years ago, my friends across the aisle filed a lawsuit against the President, brought by Members of one half of the Congress. The Democratic ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, who is also a plaintiff, argued that he was alarmed by the erosion of our constitutional form of government and by a President who shrugged about the law. After consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the Nation, he said he had determined that there was one group of people who was injured by the President's lack of respect for checks and balances—the House of Representatives.

I want to echo one line that he argued at the time regarding the separation of powers:

If a President does not need one House of Congress to pass the law, what is next?

Perhaps this makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from The Huffington Post, on April 26, 2006, by the ranking mem-

ber of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan. It is entitled, "Taking the President to Court," in which he made a compelling argument as to why Members of the House could, in fact, have standing to sue the President.

[From The Huffington Post, July 30, 2014]

TAKING THE PRESIDENT TO COURT

As some of you may be aware, according to the President and Congressional Republicans, a bill does not have to pass both the Senate and the House to become a law. Forget your sixth grade civics lesson, forget the book they give you when you visit Congress—"How Our Laws Are Made," and forget Schoolhouse Rock. These are checks and balances, Republican-style.

As the Washington Post reported last month, as the Republican budget bill struggled to make its way through Congress at the end of last year and beginning of this year (the bill cuts critical programs such as student loans and Medicaid funding), the House and Senate passed different versions of it. House Republicans did not want to make Republicans in marginal districts vote on the bill again, so they simply certified that the Senate bill was the same as the House bill and sent it to the President. The President, despite warnings that the bill did not represent the consensus of the House and Senate, simply shrugged and signed the bill anyway. Now, the Administration is implementing it as though it was the law of the land.

Several public interest groups have sought to stop some parts of the bill from being implemented, under the theory that the bill is unconstitutional. However, getting into the weeds a bit, they have lacked the ability to stop the entire bill. To seek this recourse, the person bringing the suit must have what is called "standing," that is they must show they were injured or deprived of some right. Because the budget bill covers so many areas of the law, it is difficult for one person to show they were harmed by the entire bill. Thus, many of these groups have only sought to stop part of it.

After consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the nation, I determined that one group of people are injured by the entire bill: Members of the House. We were deprived of our right to vote on a bill that is now being treated as the law of the land.

So, I am going to court. With many of my Democratic Colleagues (list appended at the bottom of this diary), I plan to file suit tomorrow in federal district court in Detroit against the President, members of the Cabinet and other federal officers seeking to have a simple truth confirmed: a bill not passed by the House and Senate is not a law, even if the President signs it. As such, the Budget bill cannot be treated as the law of the land.

As many of you know, I have become increasingly alarmed at the erosion of our constitutional form of government. Whether through the Patriot Act, the Presidents Secret Domestic Spying program, or election irregularities and disenfranchisement, our fundamental freedoms are being taken away. Nothing to me is more stark than this, however. If a President does not need one House of Congress to pass a law, what's next?

The following is a list of co-plaintiffs on this lawsuit. I would note that I did not invite every Member of the House to join in the suit, and I am certain many, many more Members would have joined if asked. However, this was not possible for various arcane legal reasons.

The other plaintiffs include Rep. John Dingell, Ranking Member on the Energy and Commerce Committee; Rep. Charles B. Rangel, Ranking Member on the Ways and Means Committee; Rep. George Miller, Ranking Member on the Education and Workforce Committee; Rep. James L. Oberstar, Ranking Member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; Rep. Barney Frank, Ranking Member on the Financial Services Committee; Rep. Collin C. Peterson, Ranking Member on the Agriculture Committee; Rep. Bennie Thompson, Ranking Member on the Homeland Security Committee; Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, Ranking Member on the Rules Committee; Rep. Fortney "Pete" Stark, Ranking Member on the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee; Rep. Sherrod Brown, Representing Ohio's 13th District.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the litigation considered by this resolution is a lot different and is a lot stronger than litigation filed by my friends on the other side against a previous President. The majority of these lawsuits was brought by a small group of legislators or individual Members. Today, the House as an institution will vote to authorize the suit, which gives this case, I believe, a far better chance in court than previous attempts.

My friends in the minority at the Rules Committee yesterday claimed that this is all about politics, but the Republican members of this committee repeatedly insisted that we disagreed. The issue is not about partisan politics. It is not about Republicans and Democrats. This lawsuit is about the legislative branch's standing up for the laws that have been passed and signed into law by the legislative branch and signed by the Executive of this great Nation. Republicans are motivated to stand up for the Constitution, the separation of powers, and the rule of law.

Any person who believes in our system of government should be worried about the President's executive overreach. This President, as well as future Presidents—from either party—must not be allowed to ignore the Constitution and to circumvent Congress.

Both Republicans and Democrats have stood up for the legislative branch in the past. In fact, there have been 44 lawsuits filed in the last 75 years in which legislators sought standing in Federal court. Of the 41 filed by plaintiffs from a single party, nearly 70 percent were brought by Democrats, representing the body.

I submit for the RECORD an editorial by Kimberley Strassel, from *The Wall Street Journal*, dated July 17, 2014, that further explains why the Democrats were suing the President before they were against it, and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for Congress and to defend our Constitution against the executive branch.

[From *The Potomac Watch*, July 17, 2014]

THE BOEHNER-BASHERS' TRACK RECORD

(By Kimberley A. Strassel)

In the tiny House Rules Committee room in Congress on Wednesday, New York Demo-

crat Louise Slaughter let roll her grievances against House Republicans' lawsuit against Barack Obama. It took a lot of coffee.

The suit, which sues the president for unilaterally changing a core provision of ObamaCare, is a "political stunt," declared Ms. Slaughter. Republicans have "timed" it to "peak . . . right as the midterm elections are happening," said the ranking Rules member. Having failed to stop ObamaCare, they have chosen to "run to the judicial branch." And, she lectured, a "lawsuit against the president brought by half of the Congress" is "certainly" not the "correct way to resolve" a "political dispute." As for the legal merits, well! Ms. Slaughter feted her witness, lawyer Walter Dellinger, praising his work on *Raines v. Byrd*, a 1997 case in which the Supreme Court found members of Congress do not have automatic standing to sue. The courts, she insisted, had no business settling such disputes. A lawsuit against the president, she declared, "is preposterous."

About the only thing Ms. Slaughter didn't do in five hours was offer House Speaker John Boehner her litigation notes. For it seems to have slipped Ms. Slaughter's mind—and the press's attention—that a mere eight years ago she was a plaintiff in a lawsuit filed by congressional Democrats against George W. Bush. The year was 2006, just as Democrats were, uh, peaking in their campaign to take back the House.

Democrats were sore that they'd lost a fight over a budget bill that made cuts to Medicaid and student loans. They dredged up a technical mistake—a tiny difference between the House and Senate version of the bill. Michigan Democrat John Conyers, ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, decided to (how did Ms. Slaughter put it?) file a lawsuit against the president brought by half of the Congress. He was joined as a plaintiff by nearly every other then-ranking Democratic member and titan in the House—Charles Rangel, John Dingell, George Miller, Collin Peterson, Bennie Thompson, Barney Frank, Pete Stark, James Oberstar and Ms. Slaughter herself.

In an April 2006 *Huffington Post* piece titled "Taking the President to Court," Mr. Conyers explained that he was "alarmed by the erosion of our constitutional form of government," and by a president who "shrugged" about "the law." After "consulting with some of the foremost constitutional experts in the nation," he had determined that there was "one group of people" who were "injured" by Mr. Bush's lack of respect for "checks and balances": Congress. So he was "going"—or as Ms. Slaughter might put it, "running"—"to court."

The plaintiffs—including Ms. Slaughter—meanwhile filed briefs explaining why *Raines v. Byrd* (her Dellinger special) should be no bar to granting them standing. They chided the defendants for omitting "any mention" of *Coleman v. Miller*, a 1939 case in which the Supreme Court did grant standing to members of a legislature to sue. By Wednesday, it was Ms. Slaughter who was omitting any mention that any such decision ever existed.

Then again, there was so much that escaped Democrats' minds at that hearing. Not one of those present, for instance, recalled that only two years ago, four of their House colleagues filed suit against Vice President Joe Biden (in his capacity as head of the Senate) challenging as unconstitutional the filibuster. Or that Democratic legislators also filed lawsuits claiming standing in 2011, and in 2007, and in 2006, and in 2002 and in 2001 and . . . It was left to Florida International

University law professor Elizabeth Price Foley, another witness, to remind Democrats that in fact no fewer than 44 lawsuits in which legislators sought standing had been filed in federal court since *Coleman v. Miller*. Of the 41 filed by plaintiffs with unified political affiliation, nearly 70 percent were brought by Democrats. At least 20 of those came since 2000. The GOP might thank Ms. Slaughter for the idea.

Save one crucial difference. It was also left to Ms. Foley to explain that the reason most of these prior cases had failed is because most were, in fact—again, in Ms. Slaughter's words—"political stunts." The majority, including the Slaughter case, were brought by ad hoc groups of legislators, sore over a lost political battle, complaining to courts. The judiciary wasn't much impressed.

By contrast—and by far the more notable aspect of the five long hours of the hearing—is the care the Boehner team is putting into its own suit. While Democrats used Wednesday to score political points, Republicans used it to grill their expert witnesses on case law and constitutional questions. Mr. Boehner's decisions to have the House as a whole vote to authorize the suit, and to narrowly tailor it around a specific presidential transgression (and one that no private litigant would ever have standing to protest), are designed to make this a far different and better breed of a court case.

It's precisely because Democrats know how good a point Republicans have about Obama unilateralism that they are already working to dismiss the suit as "political." And to do that, Ms. Slaughter must have us forget that up until, oh, two weeks ago, Democrats were all about asking the courts to vindicate Congress's prerogatives. How times change.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, through this lawsuit, the United States House of Representatives will take a critical and crucial step in reining in the President and in defending the Constitution so that it will endure for yet another generation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, conservative thinkers and legal scholars are discrediting this lawsuit against the President. They are exposing it for what it is: a political stunt timed to peak in November as Americans are heading to the polls for the midterm elections.

For example, Harvard Law Professor and Former Assistant Attorney General under President George W. Bush Jack Goldsmith wrote: "the lawsuit will almost certainly fail, and should fail for lack of congressional standing."

Even Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, joined by Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas, wrote that the Framers of the Constitution emphatically rejected a "system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking."

Conservative writer and former Justice Department official Andrew C.

McCarthy wrote recently that this lawsuit is “a classic case of assuming the pose of meaningful action while in reality doing nothing.”

Heavens to Betsy, how much more do we have to hear that this is not going to work?

A recent poll by CNN found that 57 percent of Americans oppose the lawsuit. Yes, the majority of the American people recognize it for what it is: political theater. They recognize this lawsuit is not only a distraction from the real problems that plague our Nation, but that it is designed to appease radical Republicans clamoring for impeachment.

The Rules Committee, of which I am ranking member, was the only committee to consider this lawsuit. Under regular order, the House Administration Committee would have also held hearings and a markup because they are the “money” committee that handles the House’s internal accounts, but they were not given the chance to do so.

Over the past 3 weeks, the Rules Committee heard testimony from constitutional scholars who debated the merits of the lawsuit and offered several amendments. The minority on our committee offered nearly a dozen amendments aimed at bringing some transparency and accountability to this process, and they were all voted down along party lines.

Democrats offered an amendment that would have required that this political stunt be funded from the Benghazi Select Committee’s budget, another political stunt. After the 14 investigations of the Benghazi tragedy, they have allocated \$3.3 million to continue to chase after a nonexistent scandal.

We offered an amendment that would have ensured that any law firms contracted for this lawsuit were not also lobbyists trying to influence us at the same time that they represented us in court, a clear conflict of interest.

We even offered an amendment that would have required disclosure of which programs and budgets in the Federal budget will be reduced to pay for the lawsuit. Would the funds come from the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, the House Armed Services Committee? We don’t know, because the majority has refused to tell us.

Before they vote today, Members of this House deserve to know exactly which legislative branch functions will be curtailed to pay for this folly. Otherwise, how can we cast an informed vote?

We focused our amendments on cost because of how important cost is. It is not, as has been stated here, an imaginary concern. Republicans have wasted hundreds of billions of dollars in this month alone passing over \$700 billion, with a B, of unpaid-for tax extenders on this House floor. Republicans took

\$24 billion out of the economy when they shut down the government to deny health care to millions. And, according to CBS News, the majority has wasted over \$79 million on the more than 50 votes for the House floor to dismantle, to undermine, and to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Where in the world does it stop?

When Republicans defended the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act and employed outside counsel in a similar lawsuit—with the fate that we believe this will have—they cost the American taxpayers \$2.3 million. We learned later that their lawyers charged \$520 an hour—an hour, and at that rate, they would have been paid \$1 million a year for a 40-hour workweek.

So what will this lawsuit cost, Mr. Speaker? That is what we want to know. The minority requested this information. The majority replied: “A lawsuit is a small price to pay.”

We could be spending money on our crumbling infrastructure, investing in our education system, making it easier for our children to go to college, even building some high-speed rail—we are about the only country left in the world that doesn’t have any—or addressing climate change. We just had a terrible flood in my district and next door, where they have lost sewer systems, water systems. We could be doing so many other things than simply throwing this money away.

The idea of fiscal responsibility, of fiscal tightness, absolutely is decimated in just what I have said already at this time, the money wasted here, with nothing for it, when the needs are so great and the population cries out for relief. But instead of investing in our country, the majority insists on bringing a lawsuit that, if it is successful, will do the opposite of everything they have been trying to accomplish since 2010.

Yes, after years of rallying against the Affordable Care Act, not one of them would vote for it as it passed the House, voting to derail it, working against it—pay attention here—they are suing the President for not implementing it fast enough. And if that makes no sense to you, you are not alone. We don’t understand it either.

Not only is this logic upside-down and inside out, it is directly against the feelings of members of their own party. A recent poll from the Commonwealth Fund found that 77 percent of people were pleased with their new coverage. Republicans themselves have a 74 percent satisfaction rate with the new plans that they have bought.

Now before us, we have a lawsuit that has been ridiculed and railed against by conservative thinkers and progressives alike. It is a deplorable waste of taxpayer funds and would go against everything the Republicans have been working for for 4 years. The Republicans that I worked with in this Con-

gress when I first came here would not even think of this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his leadership on this issue.

Without enforcement of the law, there cannot be accountability under a law, and political accountability is essential to a functioning democracy. We in the House of Representatives who face reelection every 2 years under the Constitution are perhaps reminded of that more often than others. And while there is at least one political branch willing to enforce the law, we will not fail to act through whatever means of which we can successfully avail ourselves.

When the President fails to perform his constitutional duty that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed, the Congress has appropriations and other powers over the President. But none of those powers can be exercised if a Senate controlled by the President’s own political party refuses to exercise them. Nor would the exercise of those powers solve the problem at hand, because they would not actually require the President to faithfully execute the laws.

And, of course, the most powerful and always available means of solving the problem at hand is to vote out of office supporters of the President’s abuses of power. In the meantime, however, the need to pursue the establishment of clear principles of political accountability is of the essence.

Earlier this year, I joined with Representative GOWDY to introduce H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE the Law Act, to put a procedure in place for Congress to initiate litigation against the executive branch for failure to faithfully execute the laws. But while that legislation passed the House with bipartisan support, the Senate has failed to even consider it, so today we consider a resolution to authorize litigation by the House to restore political accountability and enforce the rule of law.

Although the case law on standing may be murky, one thing is absolutely clear: the Supreme Court has never closed the door to the standing of the House as an institution.

As President Lincoln said: “Let reverence for the laws be . . . enforced in courts of justice.”

It is the courts’ duty, too, to uphold reverence for the law, and it is the specific duty of the courts to call fouts when the lines of constitutional authority under the separation of powers established by the Constitution have been breached.

A lawsuit by the House of Representatives would grant no additional powers to the judicial branch over legislation. Indeed, what a statute says or doesn't say would remain unaffected. But it would be the appropriate task of the Federal courts to determine whether or not, whatever a statute says, a President can ignore or alter it under the Constitution.

The stakes of inaction are high. The lawsuit will challenge the President's failure to enforce key provisions of the law that has come to bear his name in the popular mind and was largely drafted in the White House. What provisions of ObamaCare have been enforced have not proved popular, and what provisions the President has refused to enforce have been delayed until after the next Federal elections.

How convenient for the President, yet how devastating to accountability in our Republic.

Imagine the future if this new unconstitutional power of the President is left to stand. Presidents today and in the future would be able to treat the entire United States Code as mere guidelines and pick and choose among its provisions which to enforce and which to ignore. The current President has even created entirely new categories of businesses to apply his unilaterally imposed exemptions.

In that future, if a bill the President signed into law was later considered to be bad policy and potentially harmful to the President's political party if enforced, accountability for signing that policy into law could be avoided by simply delaying enforcement until a more politically opportune time, if at all. No longer would Presidential candidates running for reelection have to stand on their records, because their records could be edited at will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Sign one bill into law, enforce another version of it in practice. Rinse and repeat until the accumulation of power in the Presidency is complete.

We should all support this resolution today, as it aims to unite two-thirds of the Federal Government in delivering a simple message: Congress writes the laws and the President enforces them. Our own constitutionally required oath to support the Constitution of the United States requires no less.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the bill that is before us.

It is somewhat ironic that the Republicans want to sue the President for not enforcing a law that they want to

repeal. How ironic. But it is, frankly, a demonstration of their frustration that they have been unable politically to attain the objective that they seek. They therefore repair to the wasting of time by this Congress and the wasting of the taxpayers' money on a hypocritical and partisan attack against the President, one that is meant to distract from the pressing issues of the day, like fixing our broken immigration system, raising the minimum wage, or restoring emergency unemployment insurance for those seeking jobs.

While the majority of Americans oppose this lawsuit gimmick, House Republicans continue to move ahead with it instead of acting on those policies and other critical legislation which the majority of the American public do support: Make It In America jobs bills, Export-Import Bank reauthorization, terrorism risk insurance, Voting Rights Amendment Act, continuing resolutions and appropriations bills. All of these the American people want to see us do.

But in polls, they show they don't want us to be doing this. They think it is frivolous. They think it is without merit. They think it should not be done.

All the bills that I referenced they think ought to be done. How sad it is that we come here and do things the American public thinks are a waste of time while not doing things Americans think are very important.

I tell my friend from Texas, and he is my friend, none other than Justice Antonin Scalia has made the point that the judiciary traditionally does not hear cases of political disagreement between the other two branches.

□ 1715

In fact, in *United States v. Windsor*, Justice Scalia said, a "system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking." Scalia felt that was not justified.

We believe this legislation is not justified. We further believe that the American people do not believe this legislation is justified. We do believe that the base of the Republican Party that tried to defeat President Obama in 2012, voted against him in 2008, and disagreed with him on the issues thinks this is what is available to them.

It is wrong. It is a waste of time. It is a waste of money. It is a distraction from the issues that are so important to our people. This lawsuit is nothing more than a partisan bill to rally the Republican base, and for some, it doesn't go far enough.

Under President Clinton, Republicans' playbook was shut down and then impeach. Under President Obama, Republicans said that if the Affordable Care Act were not repealed—not that

they would sue him. They said they would shut down the government if they didn't get their way. They didn't get their way, and they shut down the government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. They threatened to shut down the government, and they shut down the government. And the American people said, that is not what we want done.

Again, they come to this floor because they cannot achieve, through their political process, the ends they seek. They have voted over 50 times to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. They do not want it implemented. Now they want to sue the President because he is not implementing it fully, and now they are suing and refusing to say that impeachment is off the table.

In fact, their newly elected whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) declined the opportunity to rule out impeachment on four separate occasions last weekend.

My friends, instead of wasting time and money on the lawsuit and what might follow, Congress ought to do what our constituents sent us here to do: create jobs, grow the middle class, invest in an economy where all of our people can work hard, and make it in America.

Reject this waste of time. Vote "no" on this unjustified, impractical, losing proposition for the suit against the President of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a lot of revisionist history.

But I will answer the question. And the answer is that years back, we did impeach William Jefferson Clinton because he lied to an FBI agent. He lied to a Federal grand jury, and he violated a Federal law, which was a felony. Oh, by the way, that led to impeachment for a felony while in office, a sitting President.

In this instance, the President of the United States is not faithfully executing the laws of the country, and that is an entirely different process. So for the gentleman to suggest that this is going to lead to that is simply not true.

I will tell you that William Jefferson Clinton violated the Federal law as a felony, and we believe our President, now Barack Obama, is not faithfully executing the laws. And anybody could figure that out who serves as a Member of Congress.

I would now like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Natural Resources Committees.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my colleague from Maryland who just spoke

that, in my humble opinion, HARRY REID shut down the government.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain for everybody watching at home across America what the separation of powers doctrine means. I know this is obvious for most Americans because we study it in school. But since our constitutional scholar President doesn't seem to get it, it apparently needs to be explained again.

Our Constitution says that we, the legislative branch—this branch—we write the laws. The President executes the laws. And the courts settle any dispute we may have. Got it? We write the laws. The President executes the laws. The court settles the disputes.

Our Constitution does not say that the President gets to write his own laws. Our Founders knew that was a bad idea. They had seen kings wield that kind of power, and they knew they didn't want that for the new Nation. They understood that too much power in the hands of any one person or any one group of people would inevitably lead to tyranny.

As Christian men of the day, they understood that since the Garden of Eden, man is fallen, and that fallen men, once they have a taste of power, they will always lust for more. They knew that "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

So in their understanding of fallen man, the remedy was a system of checks and balances, and clearly delineated, but separate, powers divided among three equal branches of government. We write the laws. The President executes them. It should be simple, right?

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the President has failed us in two directions. He has failed to execute the laws we have written, and he has rewritten the laws on his own. I believe that is a breach of his oath of office to uphold the laws.

So we are gathered here, as the first branch, the legislative branch, the branch that is closest to the people, to seek the judicial branch's help in reining in the power of an out-of-control executive branch, plain and simple. We are here specifically to bring legal action against the President of the United States to stop him from unilaterally rewriting the so-called Affordable Care Act.

By the way, that is really a misnomer. There is nothing "affordable" about the Affordable Care Act, and the American people know it. But really, that is a discussion for another day.

From the individual mandate to the business mandate to the waivers for Big Labor to the HHS regulations that were struck down by the Supreme Court, to the decision just last week to exempt the U.S. territories—how many people is that, 4 million people?—exempt 4 million more people from the law known as ObamaCare with just the

action of the President's pen, time and time and time again, we have seen this President rewrite the law.

But rewriting ObamaCare isn't only one of the ways this President has abused his power. Look at the mess on the southern border right now, a mess of the President's own making, thanks to his decision not to enforce the immigration law and his attempt to attempt to rewrite that law through a failed DACA regulation and so-called "prosecutorial discretion." Last week, I sent the President 21 tweets which laid out the things that he could do to stop this mess at the border that are within the law, within his purview. And still, he continues to operate outside the law.

And it is not just the border and ObamaCare. It is DOMA and the NLRB and an out-of-control EPA trying to backdoor cap-and-trade legislation, a regulatory war on coal, and the waters of the United States—regulation after regulation, administrative action after action with no basis in real, actual bona fide law that this body has passed. This administration has chosen repeatedly to flout laws or to try to rewrite laws without going through the legislative process that our Founders set up for us.

The Constitution, they are laying all over the place. Get a copy. Look at it. Understand the separation of powers.

This Congress must use every power at our disposal to restore balance to our government and uphold the rule of law. We have voted repeatedly to use the power of the purse to cut off funding for unconstitutional activities within this administration. We have voted repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, to overturn bad regulations. We passed the ENFORCE Act, the REINS Act, and I have cosponsored numerous other efforts that repair our broken system of checks and balances in order to stop the overreaches of this administration. We must act today, and we must continue to act until this administration and this President relent and get it right.

I support this resolution to take this President to court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Let's take this President to court because I believe we need to take whatever steps are necessary and in our power to rein in this administration and hold them accountable to the United States Constitution and citizens of the United States of America.

The Founding Fathers gave us this recourse to restore the balance of power and uphold the rule of law. That is why this is so important for the legislative branch to reassert our authority, to make the law so he can enforce the law.

May God continue to bless this body. May God continue to bless the men and women that serve this country. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 676, which would authorize the Speaker to file suit against the President of the United States for failing to enforce the Affordable Care Act, which has been attacked more than 51 times unsuccessfully in the House.

Now, why do I oppose this seriously flawed measure? One, the fact that it addresses a nonexistent problem. Two, it violates constitutional requirements and fundamental separation of power principles. And three, it diverts Congress from focusing on truly critical matters that require prompt legislative responses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter received only today signed by eight constitutional law scholars explaining the reasons why a lawsuit filed pursuant to H. Res. 676 is likely to fail.

JULY 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, We write as law professors who specialize in constitutional law and federal courts to express our view that the members of the House of Representatives lack the ability to sue the President of the United States in federal court for his alleged failure to enforce a federal statute, even if an Act of Congress were to authorize such a suit and especially without such legislative authorization. Never in American history has such a suit been allowed. In fact, in many cases, the United States Supreme Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit have held that members of Congress lack standing to sue in federal court. An entire House of Congress is in no stronger a position to sue. Moreover, this is exactly the type of political dispute which courts have found to pose a non-justiciable political question and that should be resolved in the political process rather than by judges.

In *Raines v. Byrd*, 521 U.S. 811 (1997), members of Congress sued to challenge the constitutionality of the line-item veto. The Court dismissed the case for lack of standing and said that the members of Congress "have alleged no injury to themselves as individuals, the institutional injury they allege is wholly abstract and widely dispersed, and their attempt to litigate this dispute at this time and in this form is contrary to historical experience We therefore hold that these individual members of Congress do not have a sufficient 'personal stake' in this dispute and have not alleged a sufficiently concrete injury to have established Article III standing."

After *Raines v. Byrd*, it is clear that legislators have standing only if they allege either that they have been singled out for specially unfavorable treatment as opposed to other members of their bodies or that their votes have been denied or nullified. This is consistent with a large body of lower court precedent, primarily from the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, that requires a showing of nullification of a vote as a prerequisite for standing. The Court of Appeals has stated that a member of Congress has standing only if “the alleged diminution in congressional influence . . . amount[s] to a disenfranchisement, a complete nullification or withdrawal of a voting opportunity.” *Goldwater v. Carter*, 617 F.2d 697, 702 (D.C. Cir. 1979), vacated and remanded on other grounds, 444 U.S. 996 (1979); see also *Harrington v. Bush*, 553 F.2d 190, 213 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

It is just for this reason that the House of Representatives as a body, like its members individually, lacks standing to sue. The claim that the President has not fully enforced provisions of the Affordable Care Act, or other laws, does not amount to a “disenfranchisement, a complete nullification, or withdrawal of a voting opportunity.” Congress retains countless mechanisms to ensure enforcement of a law, ranging from use of its spending power to assigning the task to an independent agency.

On many occasions throughout American history, the Supreme Court has seen the need for the federal judiciary to stay out of disputes between the elected branches of government. That is exactly the lesson that the proposed lawsuit would ignore. Thus the suit likely would be dismissed both for want of standing and because it poses a non-justiciable political question. As Justice Scalia pointed out years ago, courts frequently fail to review actions or inaction by the Executive when a decision involves “a sensitive and inherently discretionary judgment call, . . . the sort of decision that has traditionally been nonreviewable, . . . [and decisions for which] review would have disruptive practical consequences.” *Webster v. Doe*, 486 U.S. 592, 608 (1988) (Scalia, J., dissenting). The question presented here poses the very essence of what the Supreme Court in *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962), said is a political question because of “the impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion; or the impossibility of a court’s undertaking independent resolution without expressing lack of the respect due coordinate branches of government.” The idea of a judge telling a President how to exercise his discretion in enforcing a law cuts at the heart of separation of powers and thus presents a question non-justiciable in the courts.

Under long-standing practice and precedents, disputes, such as this one between members of the House of Representatives and the President, must be worked out in the political process, not the courts.

Disclaimer: institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only.

ERWIN CHEMERINSKY,
Dean, University of
California, Irvine
School of Law;

JANET COOPER ALEXANDER,
Frederick I. Richman
Professor of Law,
Stanford Law
School;

PETER EDELMAN,
Professor of Law,
Georgetown University
Law Center;

LAWRENCE LESSIG,
Roy L. Furman Pro-
fessor of Law, Har-
vard Law School;

BURT NEUBORNE,
Inez Milholland Pro-
fessor of Civil Lib-
erties, New York
University Law
School;

KERMIT ROOSEVELT,
Professor of Law, Uni-
versity of Pennsyl-
vania Law School;

SUZANNA SHERRY,
Herman O.
Loewenstein Pro-
fessor of Law, Van-
derbilt University
Law School;

CHARLES TIEFER,
Professor, University
of Baltimore School
of Law.

Mr. CONYERS. To begin with, H. Res. 676 seeks to solve a nonexistent problem because the President has, in fact, fully met his obligations to fully execute the laws.

Allowing flexibility in the implementation of a major new program, even where the statute mandates a specific deadline, is neither unusual nor a constitutional violation.

Indeed, in the case of the Affordable Care Act’s employer mandate, the administration acted pursuant to statutory authorization granted to it by Congress.

Section 7805(a) of the Internal Revenue Code authorizes the Treasury Secretary to issue any rules necessary for the enforcement of the Code, including the provisions that enforce the employer mandate.

Exercising discretion in implementing a law is the reality of administering sometimes complex programs and is inherent in the President’s duty to “take care” that he “faithfully” execute laws.

This has been especially true with respect to the Affordable Care Act. The President’s decision to extend certain compliance dates to help phase-in the Act is not a novel tactic.

Yet, even though not a single court has ever concluded that reasonable delay in implementing a complex law constitutes a violation of the Take Care Clause, the Majority insists there is a constitutional crisis.

In addition, a suit initiated under H. Res. 676 would itself be unconstitutional and would violate separation of powers principles.

This is because such a lawsuit would essentially allow federal courts to second-guess decisions by the Executive Branch in how it chooses to implement a policy.

The federal judiciary, under the political question doctrine, avoids answering such questions precisely because a court is not appropriate forum to resolve issues of complex policy.

Additionally, it is highly unlikely that Congress could satisfy the standing requirements of Article III of the Constitution that must be met in order to enforce the Take Care Clause.

To meet those requirements, a plaintiff—under the Supreme Court’s 1997 decision in *Raines v. Byrd*—must show, among other things, that it suffered a concrete and particularized injury.

Injury amounting only to an alleged violation of a right to have the Government act in accordance with law—which is what this resolution contemplates—is not judicially cognizable for Article III standing purposes.

This is in stark contrast to cases where Congress has sought to protect a fundamental power, like its subpoena authority.

In subpoena enforcement cases, courts have found standing for one House of Congress to sue because a specific legislative prerogative was at stake, constituting a sufficiently concrete injury to Congress to confer Article III standing.

Article III’s standing requirements enforce the Constitution’s separation-of-powers principles. Congress cannot simply legislate away these constitutional standing requirements.

Finally, H. Res. 676 is obviously just pure political theater that distracts the public from the fact that this Republican-controlled House has failed to address a whole host of critical issues.

These include immigration reform, extending unemployment insurance, enhancing environmental protections, ensuring worker safety, and helping those who are financially struggling.

Coincidentally, H. Res. 676 shares a number with H.R. 676, the “Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act,” which I introduced in February of 2013.

H.R. 676 would create a publicly-financed, privately-delivered health care system that would greatly improve and expand the already existing Medicare program.

My legislation would ensure that all Americans have access, guaranteed by law, to the highest quality and most cost effective health care services regardless of their employment, income or health care status.

Instead of discussing this and other critical matters, today we continue to waste precious resources on a patently unconstitutional measure that would authorize a lawsuit destined to fail.

We owe it to the American people to address real, not imaginary, challenges facing our Nation, including enhancing health care for all Americans.

I would also note that the litigation referred to by the gentleman from Texas that I was involved in eight years ago involved a situation where the House and Senate passed different versions of the same budget bill that was signed by the President. That was brought in our individual capacity as Members, not the House as a whole, and did not involve the use of additional taxpayer funds. The resolution before us today is of course an entirely different matter.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 676, a resolution to authorize the House of Representatives to initiate litigation against the President, or any executive branch employee, for failure to act in accordance with their duties. Specifically, this resolution deals with the President’s failure to implement the employer mandate required by his

own signature law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

While the scope of the litigation authorized is narrow, it is symbolic of a much larger problem—the President's continued refusal to faithfully execute the law, choosing, instead, to usurp Congress' exclusive constitutional right to legislate.

Simply because Congress chooses not to be the President's rubberstamp does not bestow upon him the power to circumvent the law. Conversely, when the President decides enforcement of a law might be politically perilous, he can't simply choose to ignore it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about party politics. This is about the proper role of government, as defined by our Founders. The Federal Government was intentionally designed with three branches, each with their own separate powers and the ability to serve as a check and balance on the other two. Yet, the President—as a former constitutional law professor—refuses to recognize his proper role, defying the law and unilaterally enacting policies, or ignoring the law, at will.

I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution as a Member of this institution, and I have taken that oath seriously every single day.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, I believe the President's actions undermine the very same oath that he has twice taken, so I urge my colleagues to join me in this step to uphold the law and protect the balance of power by supporting the resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in strong opposition to this resolution that would propose to have the House sue the President of the United States.

With only a few hours left before Congress adjourns for the August district work period, we have a full plate of responsibilities left unfinished. When I go back home to my district, I highly doubt that many constituents will be running up to me to thank me for Congress passing a resolution to sue the President of the United States.

I know what I will hear instead: Why hasn't the House passed comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken immigration system? Why hasn't Congress raised the minimum wage so people who work full time don't remain in poverty? Why haven't we renewed emergency unemployment insurance for more than 3½ million Americans, including nearly 300,000 veterans?

The only answer I will be able to give them is that Republican leadership in the House cares more about scoring political points against this President than they do about helping America's middle class families.

This is a question of priorities. The American people sent us here to respond to the pressing needs that face our Nation. It should be a given that we would use our time to focus on the most important issues. Instead, we waste time on suing the President of the United States while failing to address commonsense measures to ensure economic security for every American.

Not only does this resolution reflect a very different set of priorities from the majority of Americans, we are yet again wasting millions in taxpayer dollars, just like the \$3 million wasted in defending the indefensible and unconstitutional Defense of Marriage Act and billions of dollars wasted by shutting down the government to try to take away Americans' health care benefits.

It is unconscionable that when this do-nothing Republican Congress finally decided to do something, it is suing the President for doing his job when they refuse to do theirs. I wish I could say that this was politics at its worst, but I have heard too many in the Republican majority raise the specter of impeachment not to know better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this time- and taxpayer money-wasting resolution and urge Republicans in the majority to join Democrats and address the serious challenges facing our Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I also want to thank the whole House for its work to address the American peoples' concerns about jobs and our economy. All told, we have sent the Senate now more than 40 jobs bills, almost all of them in a bipartisan way.

From the first day of this Congress, I have said our focus would be on jobs, and it has been, but also on that first day, you may recall that I addressed the House about the importance of our oath of office. I noted that it is the same oath we all take, that it makes no mention of party, it makes no mention of faction or agenda. The oath only refers to the Constitution and our obligation to defend it.

Mr. Speaker, I said that with moments like this in mind. I said that knowing there would be times when we would have to do things we didn't come here to do, we didn't plan to do, and things that require us to consider interests greater than our own interests.

I have to think this is why, on several occasions, members of the minority party have taken a similar step. In 2011, some of them filed litigation against the Vice President. They took similar steps in 2006, 2002, 2001, and so forth.

Because this isn't about Republicans and Democrats—it is about defending

the Constitution that we swore an oath to uphold and acting decisively when it may be compromised.

No Member of this body needs to be reminded of what the Constitution states about the President's obligation to faithfully execute the laws of our Nation. No Member needs to be reminded of the bonds of trust that have been frayed, of the damage that has already been done to our economy and to our people.

Are you willing to let any President choose what laws to execute and what laws to change? Are you willing to let anyone tear apart what our Founders have built? Think not only about the specifics of the oath you took, but think about how you took it: as one body, standing together.

That is all I am asking you to do today, to act as one institution defending the Constitution on behalf of the people that we serve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Well, Republicans today are choosing lawsuits over legislating. They are choosing to sue the President rather than pursuing legislation to support American families.

There is no shortage of legislation awaiting action: immigration reform, a bipartisan Senate bill held up by the Speaker who has just spoken; unemployment insurance, a bipartisan Senate bill has never gotten a vote in this House held up by this Speaker; the employment nondiscrimination bill, the Senate bill not brought up here and held up by the Speaker; paycheck fairness, not brought up; a minimum wage bill, not brought up; Ex-Im, caught in controversy within the Republican conference; a highway bill, another patch, the inability of House Republicans to face up to the need for a long-term highway bill; and a voting rights reform bill sponsored by a senior Republican, held up by the Speaker of this House and the conference of the Republicans.

The Republicans in this House are suing the President because they conjure up that the President did not adopt what Republicans argue is the correct implementation of a law they have tried 50 times to destroy. It is the House Republicans who should be sued, if that were possible, for their abdication of their responsibilities to the people of this Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, my favorite piece of art in this Capitol is a picture in the rotunda

of our Founding Fathers gathered together to sign the Declaration of Independence, a document that they knew, when they signed it, they were signing their own death warrant if they were caught and tried for treason. They felt that strongly that they wanted to escape the bonds of a monarch and pursue freedom.

Our forefathers fought a Revolution against the greatest military power on Earth to escape the bonds of a monarchy. At the end of that bloody Revolution, the last thing they wanted was another king. They wanted freedom.

To protect that precious freedom, they designed a government of, by, and for the people based on a separation of powers. The legislative branch makes the laws; the executive branch enforces laws.

President Obama has decided that he is not bound by the separation of powers. He has bragged that if Congress will not accept his priorities, he has a pen and a phone, and he will make the laws himself.

He may have a pen, but the people have the Constitution left us by our forefathers. Our forefathers recognized that one man who can both make the laws and enforce the laws is a king, not a President. Thomas Jefferson once said that freedom does not disappear all at once, but is eroded imperceptibly day by day.

The prosperity of our great country sprang from our freedom. Our form of government set forth in the Constitution by our forefathers has protected that very fragile freedom for 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle worry about the price of a lawsuit to protect our freedom. Our forefathers paid dearly for that freedom. Many gave all they had, even their lives.

Our freedom is in peril, my friends. We cannot stand by and watch the President shred our Constitution. I stand in support of H. Res. 676.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. The constitutional question raised by this measure is whether the House has standing to sue the President over what is, in essence, a policy difference. "Standing" is a constitutionally-defined status and requires that the plaintiff, among other things, demonstrate a legally recognizable injury. In the case of a suit between branches of government, the House would also have to show that there is no other remedy.

On both of these counts, this lawsuit fails. The House cannot speak for the Senate, which doesn't agree with its position, and therefore cannot represent the legislative branch. Even if it could, neither body has suffered a recognizable injury merely because some Members of the Congress do not like

how the President has interpreted a law passed by a different Congress.

Moreover, this Congress has a remedy if it doesn't like the way that the President has implemented the Affordable Care Act: it can change the law. That would be a far better approach, one more consistent with our separation of powers than this expensive and ill-conceived lawsuit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to reject this effort.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker does not have a good record when it comes to wasting taxpayer dollars on frivolous lawsuits. When the Justice Department concluded that the Defense of Marriage Act could not be defended in court, the House wasted \$2.3 million trying to defend the indefensible and lost in the Supreme Court.

Now, the Speaker wants to waste more of the taxpayers' money on a meritless lawsuit against the President for not "taking care that the law be faithfully executed."

What did the President do? In implementing the Affordable Care Act, which the Republican-led House has voted to repeal 50 times, he postponed implementation of one provision by a year, a provision the Republicans and the House opposed.

Now, they want to waste money to go to court to say the President had no power to postpone this provision for a year, although no one opposed President Bush when he postponed implementation of a provision of the Medicare drug act for a year.

It is well-settled that it is within the discretion of Presidents in implementing a law to postpone implementation of part of it in order to get it done right, but this leads to another absurdity of the case. Let's assume the Republicans get the House to go into court and somehow overcome the standing question—which they will not. What is the remedy they will seek?

By the time it got to court, the provision in question will have already been implemented, so the Republicans want to waste \$5 million or \$6 million in taxpayers' money to go into court and say, Judge, please order the President to implement what he has already implemented. Totally ridiculous.

So what have we got? We have a Congress that has passed no highway bill, no minimum wage bill, no unemployment extension bill, no pay equity for women bill, no action on campaign finance reform, no action to reduce the burdens of student loans, no action to make sure that women continue to have access to contraceptive services despite the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision, no action on all the

emergencies that face the American people, but we are going to waste money and time on a meritless lawsuit that will go nowhere, but will simply serve the single function of diverting attention from all the real problems the House Republicans want to continue to ignore.

This is not a proper use of the taxpayers' money. More wasted money for political purposes. For shame.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman very much, and I rise to oppose H. Res. 676, which is seeking an unconstitutional right to sue the President for doing his duty and following the law.

The underbelly of this resolution would, in essence, put fire in the hearts and minds of Americans when we find out that this legislation is to undermine the President and any of his officers and employees from doing their jobs.

□ 1745

This is a failed attempt to impeach the President. I am willing to say that word because the President has been following the law. The law passed, and it gives him discretion to interpret the Affordable Care Act to make it best work for the American people. As has been stated, if you want to change the law, go to the floor of the House. But in actuality, this resolution smacks against the Constitution which says there are three equal branches of government. Therefore, the Executive has the right to perform his duties.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution for it is, in fact, a veiled attempt for impeachment, and it undermines the law that allows the President to do his job. It is a historical fact that President Bush pushed this Nation into a war that had little to do with apprehending terrorists. We did not seek an impeachment of President Bush because as an Executive, he had his authority. President Obama has the authority.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to, in essence, provide the opportunity for us to do valid things for the American people—improve the minimum wage, paycheck fairness—and stop undermining the authority as indicated in the Constitution that gives equal authority to the three branches of government.

We can pass laws. We have the ability to pass laws, and citizens have the

right to go into court on their independent standing. The courts have often said that the Congress has no standing. The House of Representatives has no independent standing, as evidenced by many cases that we have already taken to court and determined that Congress has no standing.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

That dictates on how you gain standing, and I would say the constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete, and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

Let me be very clear. We in Congress can make no argument that the President has injured us. We can make no independent argument of that, and so I ask my colleagues to oppose this resolution and do not accept a veiled attempt at impeachment when our President is doing his duty and following the law under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H. Res. 676, providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other Executive Branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the constitution of the United States.

We could be doing some very important legislation to help the American people from Texas to the tip of Maine, like Comprehensive Immigration Reform, the Appropriations Border Supplemental, comprehensive tax reform, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, or the Voting Rights Act, yet my Republican colleagues insist on wasting valuable time.

The Congressional Black Caucus did a Special Order earlier this week entitled: the GOP's March Towards Impeachment, and that is where we appear to be headed.

But first let me make a distinction between impeachment and a lawsuit initiated by the House, qua House of Representatives, via H. Res. 676.

Article II, Section 4 of the United States Constitution states:

The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

In any impeachment inquiry, the Members of this branch of government must confront some preliminary questions to determine whether an impeachment is appropriate in a given situation.

The first of these questions is whether the individual whose conduct is under scrutiny falls within the category of President, Vice President, or "civil Officers of the United States" such that he is vulnerable to impeachment.

A preliminary question is whether the conduct involved constitutes "treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors."

Now Mr. Speaker, whether we get to this point where we are actually considering impeachment of the President is a question that only the GOP majority can answer. It appears that we are heading in that direction—even in the face of doubt from numerous experts as to whether the effort will succeed or not.

Indeed, it is a matter of historical fact that President Bush pushed this nation into a war that had little to do with apprehending the terrorists of September 11, 2001; and weapons of mass destruction, "WMD's" have yet to be found.

House Democrats refused to impeach President Bush.

Let me state that again: House Democrats refused to impeach President George W. Bush.

Now I wish to turn to the resolution which the GOP Majority intends to put before this body in a last-ditch effort to stir their base before November.

Former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger testified before the Rules Committee two weeks ago and had this to say about the potential lawsuit:

The House of Representatives lacks authority to bring such a suit. Because neither the Speaker nor even the House of Representatives has a legal concrete, particular and personal stake in the outcome of the proposed lawsuits, federal courts would have no authority to entertain such actions.

Passage of the proposed resolution does nothing to change that. If federal judges were to undertake to entertain suits brought by the legislature against the President or other federal officers for failing to administer statutes as the House desires, the result would be an unprecedented aggrandizement of the political power of the judiciary.

Such a radical liberalization of the role of unelected judges in matters previously entrusted to the elected branches of government should be rejected.

My colleagues on the other side argue that lawsuits by Congress to force the administration to enforce federal laws will prevent the President from exceeding his constitutional authority,

But the Supreme Court has constantly held that the exercise of executive discretion being taken by President Obama is within the President's powers under the Constitution.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in Article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

The constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely to be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

To satisfy the constitutional standing requirements in Article III, the Supreme Court imposes three requirements.

The plaintiff must first allege a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual or imminent, concrete, and particularized.

Second, the injury must be "fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct, and" third, the injury must be "likely to be redressed by the requested relief."

PRUDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the constitutional questions posed by the doctrine of standing, federal courts also follow a well-developed set of prudential principles that are relevant to a standing inquiry.

Similar to the constitutional requirements, these limits are "founded in concern about the proper—and properly limited—role of the courts in a democratic society," but are judicially created.

Unlike their constitutional counterparts, prudential standing requirements "can be modified or abrogated by Congress."

If separation-of-powers principles require anything, it is that each branch must respect its constitutional role.

When a court issues a decision interpreting the Constitution or a federal law, the other branches must abide by the decision.

The executive branch's ability to fulfill its obligation to comply with judicial decisions should not be hampered by a civil action by Congress pursuant to this bill as my amendment to H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE ACT made clear.

And Mr. Speaker, a basic respect for separation of powers should inform any discussion of a lawsuit from both a constitutional standpoint and a purely pragmatic one.

In our constitutional democracy, taking care that the laws are executed faithfully is a multifaceted notion.

And it is a well-settled principle that our Constitution imposes restrictions on Congress' legislative authority, so that the faithful execution of the laws may present occasions where the President declines to enforce a congressionally enacted law, or delays such enforcement, because he must enforce the Constitution—which is the law of the land.

This resolution, like the bill we considered in the Judiciary Committee on which I serve and before this body, the H.R. 4138, The ENFORCE Act, has problems with standing, separation of powers, and allows broad powers of discretion incompatible with notions of due process.

The legislation would permit one House of Congress to file a lawsuit seeking declaratory and other relief to compel the President to faithfully execute the law.

These are critical problems. First, Congress is unlikely to be able to satisfy the requirements of Article III standing, which the Supreme Court has held that the party bringing suit have been personally injured by the challenged conduct.

In the wide array of circumstances incident and related to the Affordable Care Act in which the resolution would authorize a House of Congress to sue the president, that House would not have suffered any personal injury sufficient to satisfy Article III's standing requirement in the absence of a complete nullification of any legislator's votes.

Second, the resolution violates separation of powers principles by inappropriately having courts address political questions that are left to the other branches to be decided.

And Mr. Speaker, I thought the Supreme Court had put this notion to rest as far back as *Baker v. Carr*, a case that hails from 1962. *Baker* stands for the proposition that courts are not equipped to adjudicate political questions—and that it is impossible to decide such

questions without intruding on the ability of agencies to do their job.

Third, the resolution makes one House of Congress a general enforcement body able to direct the entire field of administrative action by bringing cases whenever such House deems a President's action to constitute a policy, of non-enforcement.

This bill attempts to use the notion of separation of powers to justify an unprecedented effort to ensure that the laws are enforced by the President—and I say one of the least creative ideas I have seen in some time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to deliberate before we are at a bridge too far.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time and money. We are sent to Congress to make progress on behalf of the people of this Nation, yet House Republicans spend all of their time and energy fighting this President. Why?

The Republicans need to jump off the bandwagon of political attacks and come together to jump-start the economy. While Americans were unemployed, they did nothing to put them back to work. When people were losing their homes, they did little to protect them from foreclosure. While hunger and poverty are on the rise in this country, they have hardly mentioned the disappearing middle class.

From his first day in office, Republicans in the House, in this House, have never supported this President. Every olive branch he has extended was broken.

But today, Mr. Speaker, they have reached a low, a very low point. This resolution to sue the President just goes a little too far. It is a shame and a disgrace that we are here debating the suing of the President. The American people deserve better. We can do better. We can do much better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to have the raw courage—nothing but courage—to oppose this insulting and offensive resolution. It has no place on this floor. Let us get back to the work that we were elected to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to speak within the time yielded to those Members.

The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. With the gentlewoman having 5½ minutes left, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee on the Constitution and Civil Justice.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I find it interesting that this is all about President Obama engaging in an executive overreach. Look at the statistics. During President Obama's first term and comparing him to prior Presidents, President Bush issued 173 executive orders, President Clinton 200, President Reagan 213, and President Obama only 147. And during this part of President Obama's second term, he has thus far issued only 36 executive orders, while President Bush, during his second term, issued 116; Clinton, 164; and Reagan, 168. So I ask you, based on the statistics, is that overreach? No, it is underreach. It is underreach.

MITCH MCCONNELL said upon President Obama's inauguration the job was to see that this man wasn't reelected. Now the job seems to be to see that the attack on the President can be such that the Republicans take the Senate and hopefully set the stage for 2016 of the Presidency. This unquestionably is impeachment lite. It is an attempt to put the President in a situation in a lawsuit that, if successful, which I find hard to believe, would be the foundation for impeachment.

This President has done nothing that is impeachable, nothing that merits this type of action, nothing that merits this type of disrespect. He should be respected as our President and supported, and we should work to create jobs, pass an infrastructure bill, pass a minimum wage bill, and extend unemployment insurance.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time.

There are plenty of places in the Affordable Care Act where it is full of drafting errors and stuff that, quite frankly, just wasn't quite ready for prime time, but, Mr. Speaker, there is no ambiguity over this issue.

When the President delayed the institution of the employer mandate on July 2, 2013, it couldn't have been clearer. Let me give you an example. The effective date for the individual mandate as written in law, and this is for the individual mandate:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

Pretty clear. "Shall apply." Seems straightforward.

The effective date for the employer mandate, section 1514 of the law, effective date:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

It really does seem straightforward. There is no ambiguity there. I would just ask the question: Is there a list of laws that must be followed and those that may or may not be followed depending upon whatever the will of the President is that day?

I would remind my colleagues the words of Abraham Lincoln:

The best way to end a bad law is to enforce it strictly.

We should do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we in this body are called upon to represent the wishes of the American people. The last national election, President Obama was reelected by the American people by an overwhelming majority. What we find today are the people who opposed his reelection, the people who for years now have been wishing upon him failure, are attempting to do with this lawsuit what they could not do at the polling places.

Rather than address the problems of the American people, repair our crumbling infrastructure, getting affordability for our young people to attend colleges and universities and other postsecondary education, here we are trying to find a way to discover some peg upon which to hang an impeachment resolution. That is what this is all about.

I would hope that we would hurry up and return dignity to this body and stop these charades that are inflaming the American people in a way that they are undeserving of.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the gentlewoman that I have no additional speakers except myself to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to bring to a close this sorry spectacle of legislative malpractice. It really saddens me to think that we have arrived at this point in this legislative year when we are about to go home for 5 weeks of legislative work in the district when we should be here on the floor taking care of the very many issues that people have talked about all day.

But most importantly, this lawsuit goes against everything that the majority has been working for for the last 4 years. They have tried over 50 times, spending \$79 million, to repeal the Affordable Care Act. And no one, frankly, listening to this is now going to believe

that there is this great change of heart and they are so broken up that it wasn't implemented in time and by the book that you are going to try to sue the President of the United States. I don't think even to kids watching Sesame Street that would make any sense. In fact, the strongest arguments about it really come from the majority's own party. It is sadly a partisan political election year stunt, and it has no place in this House.

As I said earlier today, when I first came here, the bipartisanship was so wonderful and strong that the New York delegation, all of us, stood together on issue after issue. I miss that terribly and long for it to come back.

In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to vote against this disgraceful resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our system of government is in a bad place when one branch of government is compelled to sue another branch of government for failing to play its proper constitutional role. We shouldn't be in that situation, but we are. The President should have fulfilled his oath to faithfully execute the laws as written by Congress and signed by this President. Unfortunately, this lawsuit is necessary because the President has not implemented the law as passed and chose to pick and choose how he would have the law affect the American citizens.

This resolution will help guarantee that the legislation passed by Congress and signed by the President is faithfully executed according to the rule of law and not according to the whim of one person, that being the President of the United States. Also, no President should be allowed to pick and choose which laws matter and which ones do not.

It is unfortunate that some Members of Congress believe this body should be irrelevant. It is unfortunate that they believe any President should be able to enforce the law or not enforce the law as that President chooses.

The American people elect their Member of Congress. They live under the laws that are written. They make their plans and follow through based upon what the laws are, and they live under these rules of law, and they need to be able to count on them. When Members of Congress believe the laws that we pass no longer matter, they are also saying that the beliefs of the American people do not matter.

□ 1800

When we allow the President to singlehandedly determine what the law is, the Constitution, our separation of powers, and the American people become irrelevant. That is why the President's system of unilateral governance cannot stand. It must be stopped. Even

if it takes a lawsuit to do so, that is what we think the Federal judiciary is there to do: to resolve differences based upon the law. If the President's goal was to goad the House into defending the Constitution and the role of the government, he certainly had succeeded when he said: Why not just sue me?

Our Constitution must be defended and the role of the American people in the lawmaking process must be understood and guaranteed. This resolution is an important step in doing that.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I submit an exchange of letters between Chairman of the Committee on House Administration, CANDICE MILLER, and myself regarding the Committee on House Administration's jurisdictional interests in this resolution as well as Chairman MILLER's desire to waive House Administration's consideration of H. Res. 676. These letters were also included in House Report 113-561, which was filed on July 28, 2014.

JULY 24, 2014.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, The Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS: On July 24, 2014, the Committee on Rules ordered reported H. Res. 676, a resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States. As you know, the Committee on House Administration was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the allowance and expenses of administrative officers of the House.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Committee on House Administration. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on House Administration does not waive its jurisdiction over H. Res. 676.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on
House Administration.

JULY 24, 2014.

Hon. CANDICE S. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you for your letter regarding H. Res. 676, resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States, which the Committee on Rules ordered reported on July 24, 2014.

I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in this legislation and appreciate your cooperation in moving the bill to

the House floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on the bill will not prejudice the Committee on House Administration with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record when the House considers the legislation.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,

Chairman, House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today on the House Floor, the Republican leadership is taking a dangerous and unprecedented action by bringing up H. Res. 676, a bill to move forward with a lawsuit against President Barack Obama.

Beyond a doubt, the move to sue the President is yet another example of the failed leadership of the Republican Party. If the Republicans had acted on critical issues to move our country forward instead of wasting time and taxpayer money by taking over 50 senseless votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act or shutting down the Federal government, the President would not have needed to use Executive authority in the first place.

With fewer than 150 bills enacted into law to date, the 113th Congress is on course to be the least productive in our nation's history. Undeniably, this Republican led Congress is the worst, and least productive, in our nation's history.

Instead of spending time passing partisan bills that attack working Americans, weaken environmental protections and retreat on education and job training opportunities, this Congress should be working to create jobs and strengthen the middle class, not wasting taxpayer dollars on yet another political stunt.

Congress should instead be focusing on the issues that matter: creating jobs, fixing our broken immigration system, restoring unemployment insurance for 3 million Americans, and raising the minimum wage to help workers and their families to have access to opportunities. Along with my Democratic colleagues, I strongly urge House Republicans to work with Democrats to help create jobs and opportunities for the American people, not engage in political tricks.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the unprecedented Republican plan to sue the President of the United States.

At a time when Congress should be focusing on strengthening the middle class and expanding opportunities for all Americans, our Republican colleagues in the House accuse the President of unconstitutionally abusing his executive power by delaying the requirement in the Affordable Care Act that larger companies provide health insurance to their employees.

At a time when student debt exceeds credit card debt in our country, when mothers are the primary breadwinner yet receive unequal pay, and when job creation is stagnating, our Republican colleagues have proposed a baseless, shameful lawsuit that further erodes the public's confidence in the United States Congress and a functioning American democracy.

The lawsuit is fundamentally flawed in several ways:

First, Republicans argue that the President acted outside of his authority with respect to implementing the ACA.

Claims that the President is ignoring the law are unmerited. Records show that the President is using the same flexibility that presidents of both parties have long utilized to phase in new programs and policies and ensure that statutes are implemented in workable, sensible ways, minimizing disruption to individuals, families and businesses.

Everything we do in Congress bears the mark of humanity. No law is perfect and occasionally, presidents must make reasonable, short-term accommodations to reality.

Second, the courts are not the appropriate place to work out political disagreements between one half of one House of Congress and the Administration.

The Affordable Care Act was passed by the House and the Senate and signed into law by the President. I understand that many House Republicans hate the law; they've made that abundantly clear in the more than 50 times they have voted to repeal it.

After unsuccessfully attempting to repeal the law through regular order, House Republicans, grasping at straws, have opted to give away the mighty powers of the legislative branch to the judicial branch. If Congress starts relying on judges to check executive power, instead of the tools the Constitution grants us, this body will transfer enormous authority to the judicial branch.

And to add insult to injury, the entire cost of this political misadventure will be paid for by the taxpayers.

Repeated attempts to maintain regular order regarding cost transparency have been rebuffed.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER of the Rules Committee sent a letter to Chairman SESSIONS, asking for a cost estimate of the lawsuit. No useful information has been provided.

Ranking Member BRADY of the House Administration Committee sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER asking for regular order and transparency with the use of taxpayer money. No useful information has been provided.

Amendment after amendment was offered by the Minority Members of the Rules Committee to provide transparency to the expenditures which would come out of legislative branch funds. All were voted down on party lines.

This lawsuit is further proof of House Republicans' contempt and disregard for the priorities of the American people—an effort to pander to the most extreme, rightwing voters at taxpayer expense and our nation's well-being.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 676. This legislation, which authorizes a lawsuit that the Republican Party plans to bring against President Obama, is a waste of time and a waste of money.

Congress has two days before the August recess and instead of bringing up unemployment insurance, the Bring Jobs Home Act, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, the Paycheck Fairness Act, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, universal pre-K legislation reauthorization of the America COMPETES

Act, reauthorization of the Export Import Bank reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, legislation addressing global climate change, legislation to fund the federal government after September 30th of this year, gun control, comprehensive immigration reform, or any number of other issues that have stalled in the House since the Republicans took control in 2010, this is what the Republican majority has chosen to pass.

The proposed lawsuit has dubious legal standing and no evident merit at all. Every administration has used the executive authority delegated to it by the Constitution and by the Congress, in the implementation and execution of our nation's laws. In fact, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia said "The framers of the Constitution emphatically rejected a system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress's liking."

I hope that the American people will see this action for what it is—a stunt—an attempt to placate a radical wing of the Republican Party. The majority should be embarrassed to use Congressional time for this rather than for real, pressing issues.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 3.5 million Americans who have lost their unemployment benefits over the past seven months and the one million Dreamers whose aspirations continue to be tragically denied and in strong opposition to the Majority's endless parade of political stunts, now best highlighted by the present legislation, H. Res. 676, a resolution giving one chamber of Congress the authority to sue the President.

As the American people's elected representatives, we have a duty to debate and vote on pressing legislation, such as long-term unemployment insurance and comprehensive immigration reform.

Instead, the Majority is wasting the American people's time and precious tax dollars on this political stunt that will inevitably fail. Any first-year law student would be able to tell the Majority that our chamber would lack standing before any court under the U.S. Constitution because there's simply no injury.

Just nine days ago, Judge William Griesbach agreed, dismissing a suit brought before the Eastern District Court of Wisconsin by Senator RON JOHNSON against the U.S. Office of Personnel Management over its implementation of the Affordable Care Act because the Senator lacked standing.

To quote Judge Griesbach, "Under our constitutional design, in the absence of a concrete injury to a party that can be redressed by the courts, disputes between the executive and legislative branches over the exercise of their respective powers are to be resolved through the political process, not by decisions issued by federal judges."

One of our nation's most noted jurists, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia agrees. He wrote last year in his opinion in *United States v. Windsor*, regarding the dangers of resolving a political question before a court, that the framers of the Constitution unequivocally rejected a "system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into

court, in their institutional capacity, whenever the President . . . implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress's liking."

Our Constitution provides the Executive wide discretion in the implementation of federal law. In 2006, then-President George W. Bush extended the deadline and waived penalties for certain seniors who failed to sign up in time for the new Medicare prescription drug program.

At that time, or in the following year when control of this chamber changed hands, neither Democrats nor Republicans contemplated suing President Bush over his use of executive discretion.

If the Majority is dissatisfied with current federal law, it should use its authority granted under Article I to amend it.

Otherwise, the Majority should do what every elected official under our present government has done since 1788—go before the American people and openly debate the merits of their agenda—which today includes the unashamed denial of millions of Americans essential unemployment benefits or the million young persons raise in our country the opportunity to become Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 201, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cook	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Crawford	Grimm
Barletta	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barr	Culberson	Hall
Barton	Daines	Hanna
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Bentivolio	Denham	Harris
Billakis	Dent	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Black	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Blackburn	Duffy	Hensarling
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Bridenstine	Ellmers	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hunter
Burgess	Fleming	Hurt
Byrne	Flores	Issa
Calvert	Forbes	Jenkins
Camp	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Carter	Gardner	Joyce
Cassidy	Gerlach	Kelly (PA)
Chabot	Gibbs	King (IA)
Chaffetz	Gibson	King (NY)
Clawson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Kingston
Coble	Gohmert	Kinzinger (IL)
Coffman	Goodlatte	Kline
Cole	Gosar	Labrador
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Granger	Lamborn

Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

NAYS—201

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison

Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

DesJarlais
Foster

NOT VOTING—6

Hanabusa
Nunnelee

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1828

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 468 had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS
ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the bill (H.R. 935) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.”.

SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

“(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

“(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

“(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

“(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

“(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

“(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

“(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

“(ii) Treatment works effluent.

“(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013.

The reason we are back here on the floor for this bill today is pure politics. In the last Congress, this bill then was H.R. 872. It was introduced on a bipartisan basis, with overwhelming bipartisan support, and it passed on the suspension calendar with two-thirds of this body in support of it. In this Congress, H.R. 935—the exact same bill—was again introduced on a bipartisan basis, with bipartisan support, and it was voice-voted out of the Transportation and Agriculture Committees.

However, earlier this week, partisanship reared its ugly head, and Members who were on record as voting in support of this legislation or in having agreed to it by voice vote were urged to change their votes from “yes” to “no” in order for it not to be agreed on by two-thirds of this body. This is partisanship at its ugliest. The principles and policy of this legislation have not changed over the last few years. Instead, the politics of it did.

I introduced H.R. 935 to clarify congressional intent regarding how the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters should be regulated. It is the

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act—also know as FIFRA—and not the Clean Water Act, which has long been the Federal regulatory statute that governs the sale and use of pesticides in the United States. In fact, FIFRA regulated pesticide use long before the enactment of the Clean Water Act. However, more recently, as the result of a number of lawsuits, the Clean Water Act has been added as a new and redundant layer of Federal regulation over the use of pesticides.

I will not repeat the history I gave in Monday's debate of how the EPA came to impose this unnecessary second layer of Federal regulation, but I think it is important for everyone to realize that this regulatory burden is impacting not just farmers, but cities, counties, and homeowners.

Federal and State agencies are expending vital funds to initiate and maintain Clean Water Act permitting programs governing pesticide applications, and a wide range of public and private pesticide users are now facing increased financial and administrative burdens in order to comply with the new permitting process. This is adding another layer to an already big and growing pile of unfunded regulatory mandates being imposed on the regulated community. Despite what some would have you believe, all of this expense comes with no additional environmental protection.

The cost of complying with the NPDES permit regulations and the fears of potential liability are forcing mosquito control and other pest control programs to reduce operations and redirect resources to comply with the regulatory requirements. This may be having an adverse effect on public health. In many States, routine preventative programs have been reduced due to the NPDES requirements. This most likely impacted and increased the record-breaking outbreaks of the West Nile virus around the Nation in 2012. H.R. 935 will enable communities to resume conducting routine preventative mosquito and other pest control programs in the future.

H.R. 935 exempts from the NPDES permitting process a discharge to waters involving the application of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, where the pesticide is used for its intended purpose and the use is in compliance with pesticide label requirements. This is appropriate because pesticide registration and enforcement programs under FIFRA take into account environmental and human health risks just like the Clean Water Act does.

H.R. 935 was drafted very narrowly with technical assistance from the United States EPA to return pesticide regulation to where it was before the court got involved. It leaves FIFRA as the appropriate and adequate regu-

lating statute. Well over 150 organizations, representing a wide variety of public and private entities and thousands of stakeholders, have signed a letter supporting a legislative resolution of this issue.

I will insert the letter in the RECORD. Just to name a few of these organizations, they include the American Mosquito Control Association, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, the National Water Resources Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, Farm Family Alliance, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, CropLife America, and Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

In addition, I will submit for the RECORD a letter from the National Alliance of Forest Owners, who expressed support for H.R. 935. NAFO represents private forest owners and managers of over 80 million acres of private forestland in 47 States, supporting 2.4 million jobs.

Finally, I will submit for the RECORD a letter of support, plus a rebuttal paper, prepared by the American Mosquito Control Association, which rebuts the inaccuracies of several statements made by several Members on the House floor Monday evening.

JULY 28, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations ask for your vote in support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, today. The bill will be on the floor of the House of Representatives on suspension this evening.

Pesticide users must now comply with the added requirement that certain pesticide applications—already stringently regulated under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)—obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or delegated states. The legislation would clarify that federal law does not require water permits for FIFRA-compliant pesticide applications.

The new water permit for pesticides provides virtually no environmental benefit because all pesticide applications are already stringently regulated through FIFRA, including applications to and near water. Compliance requirements under the permit impose significant resource and liability burdens on thousands of small businesses, farms, municipalities, counties, and the state and federal agencies legally responsible for protecting public health. Most notably, the permit potentially exposes all pesticide users to citizen law suits under the CWA.

In the 112th Congress, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act—then, H.R. 872—passed the House of Representatives on suspension.

Now, in the 113th Congress, the Act has been reintroduced as H.R. 935. Strong bipartisan support was again demonstrated by the bill's recent passage out of both the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the House Committee on Agriculture.

Pesticides play a critical role in protecting crops from destructive pests, controlling

mosquitoes and other disease-carrying pests, and managing invasive weeds that choke our waterways and shipping lanes, impede power generation, and damage our forests and recreation areas. We believe that the water permit for pesticides jeopardizes these protections and the economy as regulators and businesses expend time and resources on implementation and compliance all for no additional environmental benefits. We urge you to vote in support of H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act.

Sincerely,

Agribusiness Council of Indiana, Agricultural Alliance of North Carolina, Agricultural Council of Arkansas, Agricultural Retailers Association, Alabama Agribusiness Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, Alabama Farmers Federation, American Mosquito Control Association, American Soybean Association, Aquatic Plant Management Society, Arkansas Forestry Association, Biopesticide Industry Alliance, California Association of Winegrape Growers, Cape Cod Cranberry Growers Association, The Cranberry Institute, CropLife America, Council of Producers & Distributors of Agrotechnology, Edison Electric Institute, Family Farm Alliance, Far West Agribusiness Association.

Florida Farm Bureau Federation, Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Georgia Agribusiness Council, Golf Course Superintendents Association of America, Hawaii Cattle-men's Council, Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho Potato Commission, Idaho Water Users Association, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Fertilizer & Chemical Association, Kansas Agribusiness Retailers Association, Louisiana Cotton and Grain Association, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Maine Potato Board, Michigan Agribusiness Association, Minnesota Agricultural Aircraft Association, Minnesota Pesticide Information & Education, Minor Crops Farmer Alliance, Missouri Agribusiness Association, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

Montana Agricultural Business Association, National Agricultural Aviation Association, National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Farmers Union, National Pest Management Association, National Potato Council, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Water Resources Association, Nebraska Agri-Business Association, North Carolina Agricultural Consultants Association, North Carolina Cotton Producers Association, North Central Weed Science Society, North Dakota Agricultural Association, Northeast Agribusiness and Feed Alliance.

Northeastern Weed Science Society, Northern Plains Potato Growers Association, Ohio Professional Applicators for Responsible Regulation, Oregon Potato Commission, Oregonians for Food & Shelter, Pesticide Policy Coalition, Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Professional Landcare Network, RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment), South Dakota Agri-Business Association, South Texas Cotton and Grain Association, Southern Cotton Growers, Inc., Southern Crop Production Association, Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Southern Weed Science Society, Texas Ag Industries Association, Texas Vegetation Management Association, United Fresh Produce Association, U.S. Apple Association, USA Rice Federation.

Virginia Agribusiness Council, Virginia Forestry Association, Washington Friends of Farm & Forests, Washington State Potato Commission, Weed Science Society of America, Western Growers Association, Western Plant Health Association, Western Society of Weed Science, Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine, Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association, Wisconsin State Cranberry Growers Association.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FOREST OWNERS,
July 30, 2014.

Hon. BOB GIBBS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GIBBS: On behalf of the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO), I write to express NAFO's support for your bill, H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. NAFO represents private forest owners and managers committed to promoting economic and environmental benefits of privately-owned working forests. NAFO membership encompasses more than 80 million acres of private forestland in 47 states, support 2.4 million U.S. jobs. NAFO seeks to sustain the ecological, economic and social values of forests and to assure an abundance of healthy and productive forest resources.

In many parts of the country, wetland areas form an integral part of working forests. Congress has recognized in section 404 of the Clean Water Act that forest management maintains the wetlands function and has provided a permit exemption for normal silviculture activities. Judicious use of herbicides once or twice over 30 years helps ensure a healthy and vigorous forest stand is regenerated after a harvest.

Herbicide use must now comply with the added requirement that certain pesticides obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or delegated states. This NPDES permit for herbicides provides virtually no additional environmental benefit because applications are already stringently regulated by EPA under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). The permit must be renewed every five years and exposes all pesticide users to citizen law suits under the CWA.

Your legislation would clarify that federal law does not require water permits for FIFRA-compliant herbicide applications. We believe this clarification will provide certainty to forest managers and others who rely on these products. We appreciate your leadership to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

DANIEL SAKURA,
Vice President for Government Affairs.

AMCA,
July 30, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, I am writing on behalf of the American Mosquito Control Association (AMCA) to request your support for H.R. 935, which is of vital importance to the public health mission of the nation's mosquito control agencies.

Threats to the public from existing and new and emerging mosquito-borne diseases persist and have amplified. West Nile virus (WNV) is now endemic throughout the United States and annually causes local epidemics and fatalities. Eastern equine encephalitis (EEE) continues as a significant health risk,

especially to children. Now, a new mosquito-borne virus, chikungunya virus (CHK), has emerged in the Western Hemisphere, causing hundreds of thousands of human cases in the Caribbean and Central America. Recently, locally transmitted cases of CHK have occurred in Florida, and this disease now threatens numerous other states as well.

Effective, local mosquito control programs are the best line of defense against these mosquito-borne diseases. Yet these programs face challenges, not the least of which is the financial burden caused by the imposition of permit requirements under the Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). This NPDES permit requirement mandates that mosquito control agencies' limited financial resources be shifted away from actual mosquito surveillance and control activities to administrative and compliance monitoring activities.

Mosquito control products are already very well regulated under FIFRA. NPDES compliance by public health agencies does not, in fact, add any additional environmental benefit, but does add unnecessary costs. The impact of those added costs will be felt by people at most risk to mosquito-borne diseases.

The solution is the elimination of this duplicative regulatory burden by supporting and passing H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. This legislation clarifies that no additional federal NPDES permits are required when pesticide applicators are using those products in accordance with the federal mandates established by the US Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Pesticide Programs that are already specified on the product label.

We respectfully request your support of H.R. 935.

Sincerely,

STEVE MULLIGAN,
AMCA President.

AMCA,
July 30, 2014.

On the House floor this week, Representative DeFazio said that his local mosquito control district applied for their permit online and has been able to operate just fine before and after the NPDES permits went into effect. It is our understanding that Rep. DeFazio does not live in a mosquito control district.

However, he has contacted the 4 Rivers Vector Control District in Bend, Oregon to spray his vacation home. 4 Rivers VCD told him the permit would be a financial burden on their operation and they were already regulated under FIFRA.

Rep. DeFazio's staff has called the North Morrow Vector Control and the Baker Valley Vector Control managers in Oregon who explained the negative impacts the permit was having on their districts. The managers of those districts have met with Rep. DeFazio's staff repeatedly in Washington D.C. over the past several years regarding the burden NPDES is having on mosquito control and provided written information (AMCA briefing papers) during those meetings.

It is our understanding that many Oregon Mosquito and Vector Control Districts have similarly written him about NPDES impacts on their districts at various times when there has been a push for legislation.

Rep DeFazio stated on the floor that anyone with a computer can easily get a NPDES permit online, with no fee, and no waiting period. This is not an accurate statement in the State of Oregon and most other states in the country.

Instead, operators seeking to register under the Oregon permit must take the following steps so that uninterrupted coverage continues:

Write a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan.

Obtain a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) application form through the mail or in person from a DEQ regional office, or download the application from the DEQ website.

Submit the application and maps of the treatment area, by mail, no less than 45 days before a planned pesticide application. There is no online application system.

Pay the permit fee is \$903, and you must continue to pay an annual fee.

Failure to pay applicable fees may result in denial of an application or termination of coverage under this permit.

Submit an Annual Report. This cannot be submitted online, and there is no acknowledgement from the state that your Annual Report has been received.

The free, online permit only applies to the EPA's pesticide general permit that covers discharges in areas where EPA is the NPDES permitting authority. This only includes four states (Idaho, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New Mexico), Washington, D.C., all U.S. territories except the Virgin Islands, most Indian Country lands, and federal facilities in four additional states (Colorado, Delaware, Vermont, and Washington).

NPDES permits do not reduce the amount of pesticides being used, or bring about additional water monitoring. Integrated Mosquito Management strategies used by mosquito control programs for over a century, new technology, safer products, and our dedication to a healthy environment is what reduces adverse effects to Waters of the U.S.

The California NPDES permit is the strictest in the nation requiring post-treatment water testing, but after the initial samples showed that mosquito control did not adversely affect water quality, that provision of the California permit has been eliminated.

Our pesticides are vigorously tested by the Environmental Protection Agency to be used over, near, and in water without causing adverse affects to the environment. When used according to the label, the EPA has built in a significant margin of safety.

Pesticides are detected in many of our nation's waters, but the technology used today can detect pesticides at miniscule amounts; this does not mean that pesticides are present at levels toxic to people, aquatic plants or animals.

Why would environmental groups want pesticide applicators regulated under the CWA? Because it leaves municipal mosquito control programs vulnerable to lawsuits where fines may exceed \$35,000/day. Under FIFRA they would need to demonstrate that the pesticides caused harm or were misapplied; because our pesticides are specific to mosquitoes and used in low doses by qualified applicators that would be extremely difficult. However, under the CWA, all they have to prove is a paperwork violation.

Communities without established Mosquito Control Districts are being deprived of the economic and health benefits of mosquito control. Historically, a local contractor could be hired to provide spraying services with the understanding that if he/she follows the FIFRA label he/she will be in compliance with the law.

Now, these local applicators must apply for a NPDES permit, create a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan, publish a Notice of Intent to apply pesticides, and wait for approval from the State or EPA. In most states

the permits are not free. The steep fines under the Clean Water Act and the cumbersome administrative process have caused local applicators to discontinue mosquito control services.

Mr. GIBBS. This is a good bill that reduces burdensome regulations without rolling back any environmental safeguards.

Don't just ask the environmental community about what it takes to comply with the current duplicative Clean Water Act regulation of pesticides. Ask your farmers and your mosquito control agencies in your cities and your counties. Then look at your States' Web sites to see what it takes to apply for the NPDES permit for pesticide applications. We did that. It costs over \$200 in my State of Ohio, and in Oregon, it is over \$900. That does not count the time of an applicant to complete the process or the time of a regulator to evaluate the application—all to regulate again something that is already adequately regulated under FIFRA.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 935.

In the 112th Congress, the Republican leadership moved similar legislation under the guise that, unless Congress acted, the process for applying a pesticide would be so burdensome that it would grind to a halt an array of agricultural and public health-related activities.

Now, some may say that this may be a bit of hyperbole to describe the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's pesticide general permit. However, if you were to compare the concern expressed before the Agency's draft permit went into effect with the almost nonexistent level of concern expressed after almost 3 years of implementation, you would likely question why we are here this evening debating this bill.

Contrary to the rhetoric, the EPA and the States have successfully drafted and implemented a new pesticide general permit, a PGP, for the last 2½ years that adopted several common-sense precautionary measures to limit the contamination of local waters by pesticides. They do so in a way that allows pesticide applicators to meet their vital public health, agricultural, and forestry-related activities in a cost-effective manner.

This sky has not fallen. Farmers and forestry operators have had two successful growing seasons, and public health officials successfully addressed multiple threats of mosquito-borne illness while, at the same time, complying with the sensible requirements of both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA.

I say "sensible" because, as we should clearly understand, the intended focus of the Clean Water Act and FIFRA are very different. FIFRA is intended to address the safety and effectiveness of pesticides on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse effects on human health and the environment through uniform labels indicating approved uses and restrictions. Very sensible. However, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of the Nation's waters, with a primary focus on the protection of local water quality—two very distinct purposes.

It is simply incorrect to say that applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide in accordance with its labeling requirements is a surrogate for protecting local water quality. As any farmer knows, complying with FIFRA is as simple as applying a pesticide in accordance with its label. Farmers do not need to look to the localized impact of the pesticide on local water quality.

So why are groups, ranging from the American Farm Bureau Federation to CropLife America, so adamantly opposed to this regulation?

Let's explore that.

One plausible answer is that these groups do not want to come out of the regulatory shadows that have allowed unknown individuals to discharge unknown pesticides, in unknown quantities, with unknown mixtures, and at unknown locations.

I wonder how the American public would react to the fact that, for decades, pesticide sprayers could apply massive amounts of potentially harmful materials almost completely below the radar.

In fact, prior to the issuance of the pesticide general permit, the only hard evidence on pesticide usage in this country came from a voluntary sampling of the types and amounts of pesticides that were purchased from the commercial dealers of pesticides. No comprehensive information was available or required on the quantities, types, or locations of pesticides applied in this country.

Based on that practice, I guess we should not be surprised that, for decades, pesticides have been detected in the majority of our Nation's surface and groundwater, which leads me to question how eliminating any reporting requirement on the use of pesticides is protective of human health and the environment. All this would do is make it harder to locate the sources of pesticide contamination in our Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams, and it would make the accountability for these discharges even more difficult. If this legislation were to pass, we would require more disclosure of those who manufacture pesticides than those who actually release these dangerous chemicals into the real world.

During the debate this past Monday, several speakers questioned the envi-

ronmental and public health benefits of the Clean Water Act for the application of pesticides. However, many of these benefits are so obvious that it is not surprising they may have otherwise gone overlooked.

First, it is the Clean Water Act, not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to minimize pesticide discharges through the use of pesticide management measures, such as integrated pest management. I find it very difficult to argue that using an appropriate amount of pesticides for certain applications would be a problem.

Second, it is the Clean Water Act, not FIFRA, that requires pesticide applicators to monitor for and report any adverse incidents that result from spraying.

□ 1845

I would think that monitoring for large fish or wildlife kills would actually be a mutually agreed-upon benefit.

Also, it is the Clean Water Act and not FIFRA that requires pesticide applicators to keep records on where and how many pesticides are being applied throughout the Nation. Again, if data is showing that a local water body is contaminated by pesticides, I would think the public would want to quickly identify the likely sources of pesticide that is causing the impairment.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I am unaware that, despite repeated requests to both EPA and the States, of any specific example where the current Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing their services.

So despite claims to the contrary, the Clean Water Act has not significantly increased the compliance costs to States or individual pesticide sprayers, nor has it been used as a tool by outside groups or the EPA to ban the use of pesticides.

So let me summarize just a few points.

One, the Clean Water Act does provide a valuable service in ensuring that an appropriate amount of pesticides are being applied at the appropriate times and that pesticides are not having an adverse impact on human health or the environment.

Number two, to the best of my knowledge, the pesticide general permit has imposed no impediment on the ability of pesticide applicators to provide their valuable service to both agricultural and public health communities. In fact, most pesticide applications are automatically covered by the pesticide general permit, either by no action or by filing of an electronic notice of intent.

Three, Federal and State data make clear that application of pesticides in compliance with FIFRA alone, as was the case for many years, was insufficient to protect water bodies throughout the Nation from being contaminated by pesticides. So, if we care

about water quality, more needed to be done.

I can see no legitimate reason why we would want to allow any user of potentially harmful chemicals to return to the regulatory shadows that existed prior to the issuance of Clean Water Act pesticide general permits. It has caused no known regulatory, administrative, or significant financial burden, and it has been implemented seamlessly across country. As was stated during the debate on Monday, this legislation is seeking to address a pretend problem that simply does not exist.

I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 935, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Well, as a farmer, I take a little bit of offense to some of the remarks that we are applying pesticides in the shadows.

Pesticides cost money and, as farmers, we do not control what we get for our products, our commodities. We are raising corn and soybeans. We are at the mercy of the commodities market, so we have to do everything we can do on the cost side. And we certainly aren't going to waste a valuable input cost: pesticide, herbicide, and insecticide. So that is just an erroneous statement. That is just not true. Farmers of today are professionals, high capital cost operations, and it just makes no sense that we would waste those inputs.

On the issue about finding pesticide residues in water bodies, there is an issue that we call legacy issue, meaning that there was pesticides used many years ago that didn't break down in the environment, weren't biodegradable, and there is essentially a bank of residue left, and you get those legacy issues. The pesticides we are using today are much safer. The industry, the technology has improved drastically, and a lot of these pesticides, if not all, are more biodegradable.

Also, keep in mind, under FIFRA, the EPA approves the label. That is the approval of the process and the application and the amount that can be used. In most States, if not all States, most of these pesticides are being applied, have to be applied by certified applicators, and they are licensed. So they are filling out some paperwork and have to do due diligence.

This bill really does add a lot of duplication, because we went to a couple of States, and if you are applying a pesticide near a water body or a wetland—and that is open for definition how close that may be—you have to go online and apply for the permit. In some States, you have to apply for, you have to submit a management plan. You have to list where you are going to be applying the pesticide, the location.

So, basically, let's take this down to a homeowner level. A homeowner

maybe wants to spray their yard for dandelions. If they are maybe reasonably close to a water body, or maybe not—that is open for discussion—they have to go online and, like I said, in Oregon, they have got to apply for a permit and submit a management plan and pay over a \$900 fee. In my State of Ohio, it is over \$200.

I think that is a little bizarre, as long as they are applying it to the label under EPA approval.

So let's also talk about mosquito control districts. We had a huge outbreak of West Nile virus in 2012. That was a big mosquito year. I guess last year wasn't as much. This year, the debate is going to be out on that.

But we were hearing evidence that, because of the permitting requirements, that some of our mosquito control districts—and the American Mosquito Control Association actually surveyed their members. Some of them were actually kind of holding back and doing the preventative programs.

I know of one large metropolitan area in the southern part of this country that had to declare an emergency. And the irony of this, when they declare an emergency, they don't have to get any permits. It was so bad, they had to do aerial spraying, so that was putting the environment even at more risk. When you go from land application up to aerial, you can imagine the possible results that could happen of contamination—and with no permit requirement.

So we do have evidence, there was some talk on Monday night in this debate that the one gentleman on the other side of the aisle was talking about: My mosquito control district, there is no issue—no issue, no problem.

Well, we talked to his mosquito control district and it is a problem, and they have been talking to them for the last several years that this is a problem.

I would also contend, I did some research, checked around with some of our local spraying outfits, the grain elevators that do spraying. They don't know about this new rule yet because the EPA, in a lot of States, hasn't notified, they haven't implemented it. I think maybe because they know there is legislation hanging out there. So a lot of our entities don't know about it yet. Some of the larger, obviously, mosquito control districts and larger operations might know.

But the reason, when you talk about it has been nearly 3 years, which is more like 2 years, and there hasn't been a problem as we might think there should be a problem is because a lot of them aren't doing the NPDES permits because they are not aware of that fact yet.

So at some point, if we don't fix this, the hammer is going to come down and you are going to hear about it from farmers, mosquito control districts, and individual homeowners.

So I just want to make that clear that this bill is duplicative, and they are under a lot of regulation, and the EPA approves the label. If you are not applying a pesticide under the label requirements, then you have got a problem.

But we don't need to open this up to farmers and landowners and mosquito control districts to lawsuits and other problems. So what this is really boiling down to today is, now I am starting to see this is a revenue stream into the EPA for these outrageous costs of the NPDES programs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, which will relieve farmers, foresters, and other pesticide applicators from a potentially costly regulatory burden that would do little, if anything, to protect the environment. The legislation simply makes clear congressional intent by amending both the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA, to prohibit permits for pesticide application when pesticides are applied consistent with FIFRA.

This legislation is necessary following a 2006 decision by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that overturned an EPA rule which specifically exempted permitting of certain pesticide applications under the Clean Water Act. The Court's decision preempts FIFRA by the Clean Water Act for the first time in the history of either statute.

Clean Water Act permitting requirements place a significant burden and responsibilities on the States and the EPA. These National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits do not reduce the amount of pesticides being used or bring about additional water monitoring.

I know many of my colleagues share my concern about the regulations coming from the EPA, and frankly, the last thing we need to do, we need the EPA to do, or the lawyers or the judges who don't understand agriculture, is to have them tell farmers how to farm or add another meaningless paperwork exercise to their workload. The courts are not the place to make agriculture policy, and this legislation takes a step to address that.

Additionally, this bill is identical to legislation passed by the House last Congress with broad and strong bipartisan support. So I urge my colleagues to show that same support today.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

This legislation was the product of collaborative work done by two House committees, along with technical assistance from the Obama administration's Environmental Protection Agency. This is the way legislation should be handled, and I am proud of our efforts in the House.

To refresh our memories, this problem stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. This decision invalidated a 2006 EPA regulation exempting pesticides regulations that are in compliance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act from having to also comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

I want to be clear, our pesticides are vigorously tested by the EPA to be used over, near, and in water without causing adverse effects to the environment. When used according to the label, the EPA has built in a significant margin of safety. Communities without established mosquito control districts are being deprived of the economic and health benefits of mosquito control.

Historically, a local contractor could be hired to provide spraying services with the understanding that, if they followed the FIFRA label, they would be in compliance with the law. Now these local applicators must apply for an NPDES permit, create a Pesticide Discharge Management Plan, publish a notice of intent to apply pesticides, and wait for approval from the State or EPA. In most States, the permits are not free. The steep fines under the Clean Water Act and the cumbersome administrative process have caused local applicators to discontinue mosquito control services.

The effort to have these same products today doubly regulated through the Clean Water Act permitting process is unnecessary, costly, and, ultimately, undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of regulatory compliance costs for a variety of public agencies and doubles their legal jeopardy. Think about that—doubles their legal jeopardy.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for debate purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and I certainly appreciate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Waterways for his leadership.

I rise today in support of H.R. 935.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing we need in agriculture right now is more regulation. Pesticides are and have been an integral part of insuring that our Nation continues to produce the world's most abundant, safe, and affordable food supply. As it stands today, pesticides already go through a minimum of 125 safety tests before being registered for use. On top of that, they are subject to strict labeling and usage requirements, as the Agriculture Committee chairman alluded to in his remarks.

Passage of H.R. 935 will clarify congressional intent that Clean Water Act permits are not required for lawful pesticide applications and protect pesticide users from abusive lawsuits.

□ 1900

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 935, which prevents wasteful and duplicative regulations that could ultimately expand the EPA's reach further into every part of our country.

Federal law already requires the EPA to ensure that pesticides cause "no unreasonable adverse effect" to humans or the environment. Labels attached to pesticides that are related to its use are crafted to minimize such impacts. The label, in effect, is the law today. When a person does not follow the label, regardless of additional permits, they are violating the law.

Yet activists believe requiring water permits, even when a user abides by the pesticide label, will somehow strengthen our water quality. States continue to spend more and more money and man hours implementing and enforcing a water permit process that most regulators do not believe does anything to further protect the water quality. That is why H.R. 935 is so important.

This bill removes a pointless paperwork exercise and burden through NPDES permits that do nothing but create additional hurdles between consumers and the benefits of products like pesticides provide.

Registration and labeling of a pesticide already does as much as any additional NPDES permit would require. In fact, EPA's own analysis suggests that the NPDES permits program for pesticides is the single greatest expansion in the program's history, covering over 5.5 million pesticide applications per year by 365,000 applicators.

If H.R. 935 is not implemented, the effects of the EPA's overregulation would be felt across the State of Geor-

gia. For example, county officials will have one more hurdle to overcome when trying to control the mosquito population and the outbreak of West Nile virus. These counties are forced to address an additional bureaucratic hurdle before they are able to address a serious health threat to our citizens, a hurdle that provides no additional benefits.

With this unprecedented expansion, all stakeholders are affected, including State agencies, cities, counties, municipalities, research scientists, forest managers—and every American will pay for this. Last Congress, we passed this same legislation, 292-130, and I ask Congress to, again, do the same thing.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up a couple of points here.

For the record, 45 States actually manage their own pesticide programs. So it is not the responsibility of the Federal Government or the EPA.

In fact, contrary to what we have heard here tonight, Mr. Speaker, small applicators are already covered. They don't need to do anything. They are covered already under the permitting process.

And then just to be clear, in fact, in the management of those 45 States—a State like Idaho, for example, currently has 122 active permits, and there has been no charge for that permit. It is free from the Federal Government. And that is true for actually a number of States.

Now, we have heard about the dramatic effect that the regulations would have. But, in fact, for almost 3 years now, there has been no drama. The process has worked well. And confusing the FIFRA process and the purposes of the Clean Water Act, I think in some ways, is what brings us here today. As I said earlier, they are very distinct. And, in fact, just because we need to cover applying pesticides and controlling the way that those are applied and the application doesn't absolve us of a responsibility also to make certain that our water bodies are clean.

There is another myth, actually, that has been put forward here that we have heard. And that is that maintaining the Clean Water Act would subject pesticide applicators to litigation and increase citizen suits. In fact, this is false. If a pesticide applicator abides by the terms of the Clean Water Act, the pesticide general permit—which applies in accordance with the FIFRA label and minimizes the use of the pesticide and conducts routine monitoring of acute impacts—they are, by the terms of the Clean Water Act, immune from lawsuits by any party.

Another myth that we have just heard here is that the permitting process, Mr. Speaker, the FIFRA requirements and the Clean Water Act, are duplicative. As I have said earlier, FIFRA addresses the safety and effectiveness

on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse impacts on human health and the environment through uniform labeling requirements. In contrast, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of local water bodies, with direct considerations on the potential impact of additional pollutants to specific waters. So measuring the human health and environment with uniform labeling and protecting the waters are two separate purposes.

Another myth that we have heard here is that most of the pesticides that are contained in the existing studies are legacy pesticides that are no longer used domestically. There is no evidence of pesticide contamination by currently used pesticides. This is absolutely false.

Although the U.S. Geological Survey did publish a report in 2006 that documented how pesticides were detected in every stream tested by the USGS, including pesticides such as DDT and chlordane that were previously banned as recently as 2014, the USGS has published several research studies showing how more recently developed pesticides and insecticides are being detected as widespread in streams in high corn and soybean regions of the United States.

So we have heard a lot of mythology here, but it is important for Congress to deal in reality. So I just wanted to clear those things for the record.

And I would inquire of the gentleman if he has additional requests for time because I am prepared to close.

Mr. LUCAS. I do, indeed, have one further request, and then I will yield back to my friend from Ohio, who will close.

Ms. EDWARDS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation. This evening, we are, once again, considering H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. Many of you will remember that the House voted in support of this legislation 3 years ago. That bill, H.R. 872, passed the House floor on suspension with a vote of 292–130.

This same language was included in the 2012 farm bill that was reported out of the Agricultural Committee, as well as the 2013 farm bill, which the House sent to the farm bill conference. It was included in the committee-reported text of the fiscal year 2012 Interior and Environment Appropriations bill. Unfortunately, due to the opposition from a couple of our friends in the Senate, we have been unable to get this bill to the President's desk, which we know, once done, will guarantee his signature.

As many of you may recall, this language was drafted at our request for

technical assistance by the EPA general counsel. The problem we asked the EPA to help resolve stems from an uninformed court decision in the Sixth Circuit. This decision nullified a 2006 EPA regulation that exempted certain pesticides from having to comply with a costly and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland, gave a very nice speech. And she mentioned several times the potential problem of contaminating creeks, the potential problems of this pesticide causing all of these problems that we haven't seen. We don't have the facts on that, and to regulate something that is already regulated—and I must caution everybody how these drugs and how these pesticides come out. They go through extensive testing. Millions of dollars are spent by these industries. And the intent by those pressing to have federally registered pesticides regulated through the Clean Water Act is unnecessary, it is costly, and it ultimately undermines public health. It amounts to a duplication of compliance costs for a variety of public agencies, adding to their legal jeopardy and threatening pesticide applicators, including mosquito control districts, with fines set at \$37,500 per day per violation. All I can say is, welcome to going out of business if you are in the private sector.

Across the country, several mosquito control districts may have to cease operations due to these costs. If this occurs, it would expose large portions of the population to mosquitoes carrying a number of dangerous and exotic diseases, such as West Nile virus. Hospitalization and rehab costs ranging from the tens of thousands into the millions of dollars, lost productivity, a decrease in tourism, and negative impacts on horses and livestock production are but a few of the costs that will further strain public health resources.

Being a veterinarian for the last 30 years, I have seen effects of mosquito-borne diseases. In addition, the West Nile virus causes deaths, from alligators to humans. Also, diseases such as Eastern encephalitis are transmittable to people, along with dengue fever, which is moving its way up from the Caribbean through the peninsula of Florida, and it will, no doubt, get up further to the mainland of the United States of America, in addition to the heartworm disease in our pets.

This unnecessary mandate applies not only to local and State interests but also to Federal agency lands located in States directly regulated by the EPA. For example, Federal agencies, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, authorize the use of some of their lands for many purposes, including recreation and agriculture. These uses often require pesticide applications to prevent mosquito-borne transmitted diseases and for other purposes.

Although the local mosquito control district may be the entity actually applying the pesticide, the Army Corps District is required to obtain the permit and sign off on related reports, thereby pointlessly driving up costs to the Federal Government. We have agencies suing government agencies.

Further, experience has shown that the Corps is unwilling to assume permit responsibility for activities that it is not actually performing. This is a regulatory burden that Congress never intended, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from 144 environmental organizations, community-based organizations around the country that oppose H. Res. 935.

BEYOND PESTICIDES, BEYOND TOXICS, CATA—THE FARMWORKER SUPPORT COMMITTEE, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, EARTHJUSTICE, ENDANGERED SPECIES COALITION, FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, GREENPEACE, LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVERKEEPER, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NORTHWEST CENTER FOR ALTERNATIVES TO PESTICIDES, NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES, NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE CENTER, PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK, SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER, SIERRA CLUB, SURFRIDER FOUNDATION, WATERKEEPER ALLIANCE, WATERKEEPERS CAROLINA,

July 25, 2014.

Re Oppose H.R. 935 ("Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013")

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters nationwide, we urge you to oppose H.R. 935 ("Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013"), which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting water supplies from direct applications of pesticides.

Nearly 150 human health, fishing, environmental, and other organizations have opposed efforts like H.R. 935 that would undermine Clean Water Act permitting for direct pesticide applications to waterways. We attach a list of these groups for your reference, as well as a one-page fact sheet with more information on the issue.

Regulating pesticide discharges to waterways under the Clean Water Act is critical. Despite current regulation under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, pesticides continue to impair our waterways in significant quantities and have caused real harm to public health and ecosystems. H.R. 935 would render ineffective the Clean Water Act pesticide general permit that took effect in 2011 ("pesticide general permit"). This permit is necessary to protect our waterways, public health, and fish and wildlife.

There have been mischaracterizations of the existing permit that we must correct:

The pesticide general permit has no significant effect on farming practices. The permit in no way affects land applications of pesticides for the purpose of controlling pests. Irrigation return flows and agricultural stormwater runoff will not require permits, even when they contain pesticides. Existing agricultural exemptions in the Clean Water Act remain.

The pesticide general permit allows for spraying to combat vector-borne diseases such as the West Nile virus. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, the permit “provides that pesticide applications are covered automatically under the permit and may be performed immediately for any declared emergency pest situations.”

The pesticide general permit—which has been in place for more than two and a half years now—simply lays out commonsense practices for applying pesticides directly to waters that currently fall under the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act. Efforts to block this permit are highly controversial, as evidenced by the attached list of groups opposed.

Please protect the health of your state's citizens and all Americans by opposing H.R. 935.

Sincerely,

Marty Hayden, Vice President, Policy & Legislation, Earthjustice; Scott Slesinger, Legislative Director, Natural Resources Defense Council; Sara Chieffo, Legislative Director, League of Conservation Voters; Dalal Aboulhosn, Senior Washington Representative, Sierra Club; Jeannie Economos, Pesticide Safety & Environmental Health Project Coordinator, Farmworker Association of Florida; Nelson Carrasquillo, Executive Director, CATA—The Farmworker Support Committee; Mary Beth Beetham, Director of Legislative Affairs, Defenders of Wildlife; Jay Feldman, Executive Director, Beyond Pesticides; Brett Hartl, Endangered Species Policy Director, Center for Biological Diversity; Nina Bell, Executive Director, Northwest Environmental Advocates; Rick Hind, Legislative Director, Greenpeace; Pete Nichols, National Director, Waterkeeper Alliance; Heather Ward, Executive Director, Waterkeepers, Carolina; Mark Riskedahl, Executive Director, Northwest Environmental Defense Center; Tara Thornton, Program Director, Endangered Species Coalition; Marylee Orr, Executive Director, Louisiana Environmental Action Network; Paul Orr, Riverkeeper, Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper; Jason Flanders, Program Director, San Francisco Baykeeper; Kristin S. Schafer, Policy Director, Pesticide Action Network; Lisa Arkin, Executive Director, Beyond Toxics; Gus Gates, Oregon Policy Manager, Surfrider Foundation; Kim Leval, Executive Director, Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.

WHO OPPOSES EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE CLEAN WATER ACT PERMITTING FOR DIRECT PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS?

The below organizations have signed letters opposing legislation that guts Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticides:

Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Altamaha Riverkeeper and Altamaha Coastkeeper, Atchafalaya Basinkeeper, Apalachicola Riverkeeper, Assateague Coastkeeper/Assateague Coastal Trust, American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, Audubon California, Better Urban Green Strategies, Beyond Pesticides, Big Black Foot Riverkeeper, Biscayne Bay Waterkeeper, Black Warrior Riverkeeper, Blackwater Nottoway Riverkeeper Program, Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper, Butte Environmental Council, Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Californians for Pesticide

Reform, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Cape Fear River Watch, Cascobay Baykeeper, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Inc., Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Environmental Health, Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment, Charleston Waterkeeper, Choctawhatchee Riverkeeper, Clean Water Action, Clean Water Network, Coast Action Group, Colorado Riverkeeper, Cook Inletkeeper, Inc., Defenders of Wildlife, Detroit Riverkeeper, Dolphin Swimming and Boating Club, The Earth Cause Organization, Earthjustice, Emerald Coastkeeper, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environment California, Environmental Protection Information Center, Environmental Advocates, Flint Riverkeeper, Food & Water Watch, Forestland Dwellers, French Broad Riverkeeper, Friends of the Earth, Friends of Five Creeks, Friends of Gualala River, Friends of the Petaluma River, Galveston Baykeeper, Geos Institute, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Grand Riverkeeper, Grand Traverse Baykeeper, Gunpowder Riverkeeper, Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc., Haw Riverkeeper/Haw River Assembly, Housatonic River Initiative, Hurricane Creekkeeper/Friends of Hurricane Creek, Hudson Riverkeeper, Humboldt Baykeeper, Idaho Conservation League, Indian Riverkeeper, Inland Empire Waterkeeper, Kansas Riverkeeper, Klamath Forest Alliance, Klamath Riverkeeper, Lake George Waterkeeper, Lake Pend Oreille Waterkeeper, Lawyers for Clean Water, League of Conservation Voters, Long Island Soundkeeper, Louisiana Bayoukeeper, Louisiana Environmental Action Network, Lower Mississippi Riverkeeper, Lower Neuse Riverkeeper, Lower Susquehanna Riverkeeper, Madrone Audubon Society, Milwaukee Riverkeeper, Mothers of Marin Against the Spray, Narragansett Baykeeper, National Audubon Society, National Environmental Law Center, Natural Resources Defense Council, Neuse Riverkeeper Foundation, New York/New Jersey Baykeeper, Northcoast Environmental Center, Northern California River Watch, Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Northwest Center for Alternatives for Pesticides, Ogeechee Riverkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, Oregon Wild, Oregon Toxics Alliance, Ouachita Riverkeeper, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Pamlico-Tar Riverkeeper, Patuxent Riverkeeper, Peconic Baykeeper, Pesticide Action Network, Pesticide-Free Sacramento, Pesticide-Free Zone, Pesticide Watch, Planning and Conservation League, Potomac Riverkeeper, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Puget Soundkeeper Alliance, Quad Cities Riverkeeper, Raritan Riverkeeper, Riverkeeper, Rogue Riverkeeper, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee, Russian Riverkeeper, Sacramento Audubon Society, Inc., Safe Alternatives for Our Forest Environment, Safety Without Added Toxins, Saint John's Organic Farm, Saint Louis Confluence Riverkeeper, San Diego Coastkeeper, San Francisco Baykeeper, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, San Francisco Tomorrow, Santa Monica Baykeeper, Santee Riverkeeper, Satilla Riverkeeper, Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition, Savannah Riverkeeper, Shenandoah Riverkeeper, Sierra Club, Silver Valley Waterkeeper, Spokane Riverkeeper, St. Johns Riverkeeper, Stop the Spray East Bay, Tennessee Riverkeeper, The Bay Institute, Toxics Action Center, Tualatin Riverkeepers, Upper Neuse Riverkeeper, Upper Watauga

Riverkeeper, Waterkeeper Alliance, West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Western Nebraska Resources Council, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Yadkin Riverkeeper.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I think it is important for us to deal in facts and not in mythology. And a couple of the facts are these:

In 2008, States reported to the EPA—that is, State reporting agencies—that 16,819 miles of rivers and streams, 1,766 square miles of bays and estuaries, and 260,342 acres of lakes are impaired or threatened by pesticides. So it is simply not the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is no identified pesticide contamination in our water bodies. It is simply not true.

I just want to note also for the record, Mr. Speaker, that, again, there has been no evidence at all that, again, despite the repeated request of the EPA and State-run permit programs, that there are specific examples where the application of the Clean Water Act requirements have prevented a pesticide applicator from performing their services. So if there was a problem and a burden, then identify it. And there simply has been no identification of such a problem.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to review our recent history. Just on Monday of this past week, the House of Representatives actually defeated the bill that we are considering tonight, H.R. 935, under suspension of the rules. So having gone through that defeat, tonight we have debated the merits again of that same piece of legislation under a rule that does not allow any amendments to improve the bill to be offered, debated, or voted on. Tomorrow, the House will, once again, vote on passage of H.R. 935, the bill that failed under a suspension of the rules on Monday.

This legislation will undermine one of our Nation's most successful environmental laws, the Clean Water Act, in limiting the potential contamination of our Nation's waters by pesticides.

Contrary to some of the rhetoric—some of which we have heard tonight, Mr. Speaker—the Environmental Protection Agency has successfully drafted and implemented a new pesticide general permit for the last 2½ years.

□ 1915

That regulation has several commonsense precautionary measures that limit contamination of local waters by pesticides—we have heard from the States even since 2008 that pesticide contamination in thousands of miles of streams, rivers, and estuaries are in fact contaminated by pesticide—while it would allow pesticide applicators to meet their vital public health, agricultural, and forestry-related activities in a cost-effective manner.

Now, last Congress, Mr. Speaker, the House narrowly approved a similar bill,

H.R. 872, under suspension of the rules by a vote of 292–130, under the guise of regulatory uncertainty under a yet-unseen Clean Water Act permit program.

However, since that time, the EPA has issued a reasonable and protective Clean Water Act permit program that preserves vital farming, forestry, and mosquito control activities at the same time as protecting our Nation's waters. So a year passed, and we have implemented a program that is underway now.

Mr. Speaker, the Clean Water Act is a key to those of us who value clean drinking water and fishable, swimmable waters or who represent States that depend on tourism, like my home State of Maryland, since we have the fourth longest coastline in the continental United States, the Chesapeake Bay—which is the largest estuary in the United States—and several of its tributaries, including the Anacostia, Patuxent, Potomac, and Severn Rivers that flow through the Fourth Congressional District.

The shoreline of the Chesapeake and its tidal tributaries stretch for over 2,000 miles, and thousands of streams, rivers, and acres of wetlands provide the freshwater that flows into the bay.

Thanks to the Clean Water Act, over the past 40-plus years, billions of pounds of pollution have been kept out of our rivers, and the number of waters that meet clean water goals nationwide has doubled, with direct benefits for drinking water, public health, recreation and wildlife.

The act represents a huge step forward by requiring States to set clean water standards to protect uses such as swimming, fishing, and drinking and for the regulation of pollution discharges.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly want to return to a laissez-faire policy that provided no accountability to who was using what pesticides, where they were using those pesticides, and in what amounts and resulted in thousands of miles of streams and lakes being contaminated by pesticides.

I would urge my colleagues to take the commonsense approach that the EPA has taken and to, on both sides of the aisle, vote “no” on H.R. 935 and to once again vote down legislation that is looking to solve a problem, Mr. Speaker, that simply does not exist.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, how much time does my side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not deregulate pesticides as has been suggested by some speakers. Pesticides have been regulated under

FIFRA for decades, and this bill does not change that.

This bill makes it clear that if you are a mosquito control agency, a farmer, or a citizen that is applying a pesticide and you are complying with FIFRA, you do not need an NPDES permit.

Now, there are a couple facts that came out here tonight that the other side said that, without this bill, it is not necessary because you don't have to get a permit to go out and apply pesticides. Well, if you are applying near a water body or a wetland, you do have to get an NPDES permit from the court decision.

This was not an EPA decision. This was a court decision that looked at it in a narrow vision, and it was a very ill-advised court decision, and I would say when you look at proposed rules out there about waters in the United States, it is up to debate what is near or close to a water body, so that is a fact that we would have that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a personal experience. Several years ago, my soybean crop—it was a Friday, late Friday afternoon, working with my certified pesticide applicator, we discovered that my soybean crop had just been attacked by spider mites, an insect, and we had to make application, insecticide application, to take care of it.

That application was made on a Friday night. If I had to apply for an NPDES permit, fill out the form, put in the management plan, submit it to the State, it comes back—I don't know if we would have got it until Tuesday. I would have lost—the damage to my soybean crop would have been substantial.

So the issue out here that there is no cost happening, there will when this thing gets fully implemented because, in practice, this court decision has not been fully implemented in practice across the country, but that will be coming if we fail to enact H.R. 935.

This bill removes the needless and duplicative regulation that threatens public health and imposes an expensive burden on public and private entities trying to safely approve pesticides.

This is a bipartisan bill. It has passed out of this House last Congress by a two-thirds majority. We had partisan antics going on Monday night. We had people switch their votes under pressure for partisan reasons, and that is not good government.

This bill will help protect the environment and human safety when you especially look at West Nile virus and all the other mosquito diseases we are finding that are coming about.

We have to allow our certified pesticide applicators, our mosquito control districts to do their job, and if the private sector wants to go in here and have to do all this extra permitting—we are not talking—when you hear

about general permit, you think, oh, I just get a permit for the season, and I am good to go.

That is not what the general permit means. What it means is you have to go every time you do an application, if it is near or close to a wetland or water body, apply for a permit, put in that permit where the location is going to be, probably the date.

Well, say it is raining that day or it is too windy. Do you have to reapply for your permit? That is kind of up in the air still, so there are a whole bunch of issues out there, plus the costs, the time to do it, the bureaucracy, the red tape, and the costs.

Mr. Speaker, I think the one that is really bizarre is if you are a homeowner and you want to apply a pesticide to your yard and if you are near a water body or a wetland, whatever, you have to apply for a permit because of this court decision.

This will bog down the NPDES permit process, and it will delay and add costs, and it puts farmers in jeopardy to get their crops to maintain and get the yields we need to produce the wholesome food supply in this country that our agricultural community produces and our mosquito control districts that protect many of our citizens from West Nile virus and other mosquito-borne diseases.

So this is critical that these bills pass because we are getting close to the time when we are going to see very much damage being done. We saw a little bit of it in 2012, in at least one large metropolitan area, when they had to spray for mosquitoes aerially when they declared an emergency when it got so far out of hand because they didn't do the preventative measures.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to pass this bill, send it to the Senate, and hopefully, the Senate takes it up and passes it to protect the environment and health and human safety of the citizens of this country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 935.

This debate is not one about the usefulness of pesticide use in modern society—which, clearly, pesticides have found such a role. Whether to control nuisance species, such as mosquitoes or aquatic invasive species, or to assist in the production of reliable agricultural harvests, pesticides have proven useful in sustaining the American livelihood.

At the same time, we must remember that modern pesticides can be highly toxic chemicals that need to be thoroughly studied and used with great care to limit the potential impacts to human health and the environment. It was only a few decades ago that we learned the lessons of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, and the devastation to the natural environment caused by the use of DDT.

Yet, even today, the U.S. Geological Survey has consistently found the presence of pesticides and pesticide residues in our nation's

lakes, rivers, and streams, including many that serve as drinking water sources for local communities. Contrary to statements made on Monday, these are not simply the legacy contaminants of decades-old pesticides, but also modern pesticides, such as those linked to bee-colony collapse.

So, common-sense should dictate that we approach the issue of pesticide use in or near our rivers, lakes, and streams with great caution, and with an even greater understanding of the cumulative and lasting impacts of pesticides on human health and water quality.

Unfortunately, H.R. 935 would abandon any caution related to pesticide use in or near our nation's waters, and allow potential polluters to return to the regulatory shadows.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 935 argue that the protections of the Clean Water Act are simply duplicative of the requirements of FIFRA, and are unnecessary to protect local waters from pesticide contamination.

These statements are simply not supported by the facts.

As many of my colleagues noted during Monday's debate on this bill, these two statutes, although complimentary with one another, have entirely different focuses.

FIFRA is intended to address the safety and effectiveness of pesticides on a national scale, preventing unreasonable adverse effects on human health and the environment through uniform labels indicating approved uses and restrictions.

However, the Clean Water Act is focused on restoring and maintaining the integrity of the nation's waters, with a primary focus on the protection of local water quality.

It is simply incorrect to say that applying a FIFRA-approved pesticide in accordance with its labeling requirement is a surrogate for protecting local water quality.

Similarly, contrary to statements made during Monday's debate, FIFRA's risk assessment process for individual pesticides is no substitute for the Clean Water Act's focus on local water quality.

First, the FIFRA labeling process for a vast majority of pesticides do not address off-site, non-target, and sub-lethal effects of pesticide drift that can grow stronger over time.

Second, the EPA risk registration process only considers the effect of the active ingredients in a pesticide, and does not consider the synergy of multiple ingredients in a pesticide formulation, or between multiple pesticides in the environment. Yet, many of the unregulated, inactive ingredients in pesticides have significant toxic effects in their own right.

Third, the FIFRA re-registration process is a lengthy and ongoing process with outstanding and missing health and environmental data associated with pesticide reviews. As a result, EPA's assessment process has been routinely criticized as failing to fully assess the short- and long-term impacts of pesticides on human health, particularly on children, and on the environment.

Fourth, under FIFRA, EPA does not track pesticide poisonings, including short-term and long-term adverse effects, as pointed out recently by the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

Finally, EPA presumes, under FIFRA, that if a pesticide is applied according to its label,

there will not be any unintentional pesticide exposure to water—therefore, the risk assessment process does not evaluate the impact of terrestrial pesticides on water quality, despite the fact that these pesticides often are detected in waters—presumably through drift or contaminated runoff.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 935 also argue that the costs of implementing the Clean Water Act permitting requirements have been excessive. However, I have yet to see one documented case where a state, a mosquito control district, or a pesticide applicator has incurred significant increased costs from complying with the Clean Water Act for pesticide applications.

This administration worked hand-in-hand with these groups to ensure that implementation of the Clean Water Act was consistent with current practices, and was not going to be costly or burdensome. If we are going to have a debate on the merits of this issue, it is incumbent upon the proponents of H.R. 935 to show proof of any perceived burden—but as of yet, no such proof has been provided.

As noted by my colleagues on Monday, there is no substantive reason why this legislation is necessary, other than to limit the scope of Clean Water Act protections over a source of known pollutants that are causing water quality impairment in this nation.

There is no evidence of an emergency. There is no evidence of any significant regulatory burden. And there is no evidence of any substantial increase in compliance costs.

In my view, the proponents have made no argument why this legislation is necessary, other than that the groups who want to restore their regulatory anonymity have asked for it.

We need to ensure that potential sources of water pollution continue to be brought out of the shadows, which would be accomplished by defeating H.R. 935.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 935.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called “Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act,” which would roll back clean water protections and allow untracked pesticide pollution in our rivers and streams.

More than two and a half years ago, the Environmental Protection Agency put in place basic pesticide protections by requiring a general permit for the direct application of pesticides into waterways. Nearly 2,000 waterways are already contaminated by pesticides, harming fish and amphibians and potentially accumulating in people who eat those fish. The commonsense permit does not affect land applications of pesticides, maintains existing agricultural exemptions, and allows for immediate spraying to protect the public from vector-borne diseases.

Today's legislation would roll back the permitting rule, leaving pesticide application unmonitored and our waterways vulnerable to contamination. I urge a “no” vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 935 is postponed.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to honor the life of longtime Arkansas police officer and Law Enforcement Training Academy instructor, Mark Williams.

Born and raised in El Dorado, Mark began his law enforcement career in his hometown with the El Dorado Police Department in 1977, serving as a patrolman, detective, and sergeant.

Mark also served as a supervisor in the Hope Police Department's Patrol Division before joining the faculty of the Arkansas Law Enforcement Training Academy in 1994, where he trained new police officers until his retirement in 2013.

Mark's commitment to Arkansas didn't end there. He was also a gifted musician, who served as an Artist in Education, playing his guitar to entertain and educate children across south Arkansas.

I extend my deepest condolences to Mark's wife, children, and grandchildren on their loss. May they find comfort in knowing that Mark's legacy lives on with the thousands of Arkansas police officers he trained over nearly two decades at the academy and in the countless children and Arkansans he inspired with his music.

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 138TH anniversary of the founding of the Revenue Cutter School of Instruction, the predecessor of today's Coast Guard Academy, on July 31, 1876.

On that day, the Academy's first training exercise was held aboard the

two-masted topsail schooner Dobbin, with a class of nine cadets. The class boarded the Dobbin in Baltimore, Maryland, for a 2-year training mission led by Captain John Henriques. Training aboard the ship emphasized seamanship and navigation, as it still does each summer when cadets still sail on-board the Coast Guard Barque Eagle.

Today, the Coast Guard Academy, located in New London, Connecticut, since 1910, is the home to a corps of nearly 1,000 cadets, 200 of whom graduate each year.

The Coast Guard Academy produces almost half of the service's corps of commissioned officers and has graduated distinguished leaders such as Thad Allen, Bob Papp, and the present commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Paul Zukunft, who lead our Coast Guard and serve the Nation. Today, it is led by the first woman officer to lead a United States military academy, Admiral Sandra Stosz.

As a cochair of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus and the representative of Connecticut's Second District, home to the Coast Guard Academy, I am honored to recognize its distinguished beginnings and the long-standing traditions of leadership and excellence which continue to serve our country.

MEDICARE'S 49TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise today to celebrate the 49th anniversary of the Medicare bill. The impact of Medicare on the lives of millions of Americans over the past 49 years has been extraordinary. As a result of this program, Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have lived longer, more productive, and healthier lives.

I am very fortunate and honored to be able to say that I was one of the few Members still here who cast a vote for Medicare in 1965. Earlier that year, I joined with the gentleman from California, Cecil King, and I introduced, as my very first piece of legislation, a bill that would have provided health care under Social Security and an increase of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I said at that time:

Our senior citizens have far too long been neglected in this, the most prosperous society on Earth. Many of them, after leading productive lives prior to their twilight years, have been so overburdened with medical costs that they have been denied the rewards that should come with retirement.

I am proud to say that in my nearly five decades since the enactment of Medicare, the program has accomplished its mission of providing retire-

ment security for America's seniors and care for those suffering from disabilities and debilitating diseases; yet Medicare continues to face threats from some of the same opponents that have opposed its enactment back in 1965.

They continue to seek to cut Medicare's guaranteed benefits and push seniors into private plans, which value profits over health outcomes.

□ 1930

Today we present another path forward, one in which Medicare's benefits are protected by expanding health care security and insurance coverage to more Americans, not fewer.

Since 2003, I have introduced H.R. 676, the Expanded and Improved Medicare for All Act, which would create a national publicly funded, privately delivered single-payer health care system. Studies have shown that enacting H.R. 676 would save nearly a half trillion dollars by slashing the administrative waste associated with the private health care system.

Another \$100 billion would be saved by using the purchasing power of the Federal Government to reduce pharmaceutical prices to the levels that exist in other industrialized nations.

Lastly, by slowing the growth of health care costs, H.R. 676 would save \$5 trillion over the next decade, thereby ensuring that the guarantee of affordable public health insurance will be there to be enjoyed by future generations.

And so for all of these reasons, H.R. 676 is one of my most important pieces of legislation in my way of thinking, and I am proud that it now has 60 cosponsors. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for being the 60th sponsor. But I would be remiss if I did not reiterate my strong support for President Obama's landmark health care legislation, the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act's results speak for themselves. As of this month, the percentage of uninsured Americans is now the lowest on record. The Affordable Care Act has protected as many as 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions from being denied health care coverage or being charged higher premiums. It has provided free preventive health care services such as mammograms, birth control, and immunizations to the 100 million Americans who are on private insurance or Medicare. Around 60 million Americans have gained expanded mental health benefits. And since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, almost 8 million seniors have saved nearly \$10 billion on prescription drugs as the health care law closes Medicare's doughnut hole.

But, as with any complex law, implementation can be difficult and there will be unforeseen issues. Those issues

have been seized by some opponents against expanding health care who hope to eliminate health insurance for those who cannot afford it. This is unacceptable.

While we must continue to defend the Affordable Care Act, we must also work to ensure that any future changes to the Affordable Care Act take us in the direction of the universal health care enjoyed by virtually all of the citizens of other industrialized countries.

I hope Members of Congress and the American public will join me to fight for a day when, in the wealthiest country on Earth, no one has to suffer and die unnecessarily because their health care system prioritizes corporate profits over their health.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

STUCK IN THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you being down with me here tonight. It took me awhile to get my materials over here because the topic I have tonight is the topic of what this House has been doing to make a difference in the life of families across this country. That is the good news. I have to confess, I am here with good news/bad news tonight.

This is the stack of bills that this House has passed, again, to make a difference in the lives of families, to make a difference in small businesses, to grow the economy, to create jobs, the bills this House has passed collaboratively that sit collecting dust in the United States Senate. That is the bad news part of tonight.

It is fair enough if folks think this process is broken. It is fair enough if folks think there is too much partisanship in Washington, but what we have here are the successes. What we have here are not the hypothetical "if only" bills. What we have here are the bills that have actually left this House and sit in the United States Senate. It is 356 bills, Mr. Speaker, 356 bills that have left this House that sit collecting dust in the Senate. We did a hashtag, Mr. Speaker: #StuckInTheSenate. We all remember, "I am just a bill sitting on Capitol Hill," that Saturday morning cartoon. This is not a dictatorship. We had that conversation a little bit earlier this afternoon. It is not a dictatorship. It is a collaborative effort, and the House has collaborated to pass over 356 bills that have gone to the Senate to do nothing.

Now, again, it is good news/bad news day. Let me start with something that is good news, because if folks don't believe there is opportunity for success, I

could imagine how folks would give up, not just folks here in this Chamber, but folks across the country, families across the country.

This, Mr. Speaker, you may remember it, H.R. 803, the Workplace Innovation and Opportunity Act. This passed the House. It passed the Senate. It was signed by the President. This has become law. This was a bill to consolidate a variety of workplace training programs. We talk so much about a trained workforce, how it is we get Americans who may be transitioning in their life, are transitioning home from Iraq or Afghanistan, transitioning from an industry that is in decline to an industry that is growing, how do we get those folks trained.

I credit Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX with this. She is one of my colleagues here in the House. I serve with her on the Rules Committee, but she also serves on the Education and the Workforce Committee. She has been working to try to consolidate programs, take money from programs that were not effective and move the money to programs that were effective. Imagine that. Imagine that. Here she is, a conservative Republican, and what she was trying to do was take money from places that weren't working and put it into places where it would make a difference for moms and dads and kids. And she did it. She did it.

Now, what we passed out of the House was strong, Mr. Speaker. We went out and we found every single program that was failing in America and we brought them together and put them into a single pot and sent it over to the Senate. The Senate said: No, we don't think all of those programs are failing. We don't want to move that big of a package. We want to do something smaller. They ended up consolidating about half of what we consolidated in the House.

But guess what. When you elect ROB WOODALL dictator, then I get to have it my way every day. Until then, this is a collaborative effort here: the House, the Senate, and the President.

So we worked with the Senate, and we worked out our differences. We found that package of consolidation that we could all live with, and we sent it to the President and we got a signature. That is what the American people expect. That is what my constituents expect. They expect us to work together to get things done, not sacrificing principle, not compromising on values, but finding consensus because we all agree that American workers need help. We all agree that moms and dads in transition need to find a better way to feed their families.

We can spend tax dollars better. We found a way to do that here. I call it common sense, Mr. Speaker. It is not supposed to take a rocket scientist to sort some of these issues out. It is supposed to be common sense.

Did I mention #StuckInTheSenate, Mr. Speaker? If I didn't, I want to mention it right now because here is one that really gets me.

We were just talking about hiring more moms and dads. It is called the Hire More Heroes Act. Do you remember it, Mr. Speaker? We passed it out of this House with over 400 votes. Now, young high school students, middle school students, they might not know how many Members there are in the House. There are 435 Members in this House, and more than 400 of them said we should pass the Hire More Heroes bill, but it is stuck in the Senate. Over 400 folks voted "yes," only one voted "no," so I don't want to hear about bipartisanship in the House. I don't want to hear about Republican this and Democratic that.

Mr. Speaker, 400-plus folks said let's pass this bill. I will tell you what it does. The Hire More Heroes Act says one of the highest rates of unemployment we have in this country are men and women in uniform coming home from overseas. It says that we have small employers in this country, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, most of the employment in this country is not driven by the big guys. It is driven by small employers. We heard from small employers in this country who said: I want to hire those veterans, but I am worried about that 50-employee threshold that throws me into this brand-new round of ObamaCare regulations.

Guess what this House did, Mr. Speaker. More than 400 out of 435 got together and they said, if you are a small business owner in America and you want to put unemployed veterans to work but you don't because you are worried about some Federal Government regulation dealing with ObamaCare, we will waive that regulation for you. Hire all of the veterans you want to, and be not afraid of Federal Government regulation.

Think about that. Think about that. It is what I think about. It is why I ran for Congress. It is why my friends on the other side of the aisle ran for Congress. We came to make a difference—to make a difference. Who among us doesn't want to see unemployed veterans get a job? Who among us doesn't want to see small businesses succeed? We came together, more than 400 of us, to pass the Hire More Heroes Act, but it is stuck in the Senate.

Why? Why? Over 400 of us, almost every Democrat—we lost one—but every Republican, almost every one of us voted "yes" to make a difference for small businesses, get them the labor that they need and make a difference for veterans looking for a job.

That was a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and still is, and it is stuck in the Senate. It is not stuck because we can't come to agreement on it, Mr. Speaker. It is not stuck because Republicans are intransigent. It is stuck because the Senate can't get these bills moving.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking folks to just come together and do what I want them to do. What I am talking about are things that we are celebrating in this institution. I am not talking about things that squeaked through by the skin of their teeth. I am not talking about Republican proposals that we jammed through with the might of the majority. I am talking about common-sense proposals that make a difference in people's lives.

I will give you another one. How about H.R. 4414, Mr. Speaker? It is the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014. That doesn't sound very exciting, does it? And you know what, it is not very exciting for about 99 percent of Americans. But for Americans who have to work overseas and who have seen their health insurance policies canceled, quadrupled in price, folks who have struggled to find coverage, what this says is, if you don't live in America but you are working for an American company, really, you can sort out your insurance needs on your own over there. If you don't live in America, you don't have to comply with all these needs because—guess what—if you are doing business in London, the health care system is different in England.

□ 1945

If you are doing business in Paris, the health care system is different in France. If you are doing business in Moscow, the health care system is different in Russia. The rules we passed here won't work in those places. It is commonsense.

Had we not jammed that bill through Congress, that Affordable Care Act, maybe we would have gotten to that, but I don't know. It is a small group of people.

We passed a solution—let's look—269-150. I dare say those folks who voted "no" wouldn't say they opposed the policy, they would say they just thought it was a symbol of undermining ObamaCare in some way, they didn't want to undermine the President. I say nonsense about undermining the President. I want to make a difference in the lives of families.

Ninety-two days, Mr. Speaker, 92 days this bill has been sitting in the Senate.

Now, that is a minor piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that could make a big impact, but for a small number of people. What about things that make a big impact for a large number of people? What about those things?

The REINS Act, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 367, the REINS Act says—and it is a crazy bill, I will confess—it says before you pass a regulation, you need to consider the economic impact of that regulation. Now, while that is common-sense back home in Atlanta, it may seem crazy here in Washington, D.C.

Before you pass a regulation, weigh the pros and the cons to see if it is a

good idea or not, weigh those pros and the cons. It is a REINS Act because we are just out of control here with regulation and we need to have a thoughtful conversation about it.

H.R. 1105, the Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act. Trying to find ways for our small businesses to get access to the capital they need in what have been incredibly tight credit markets.

H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, we are passing bills—they are all here, they are all sitting on HARRY REID's desk over in the Senate—passing bills in an effort to make a difference in people's lives. If it didn't matter, we wouldn't be interested in doing it. I don't have a bill in this stack that is about making a political statement. I don't have a bill in this stack that is about trying to be one up on the other guy, trying to embarrass somebody, trying to call somebody out. What I have in this stack—did I mention there are 356 bills in this stack?—what I have in this stack are bills that could make a difference to a struggling economy today—today. I say today. These bills passed a week ago, a month ago, a year ago or more. They could make a difference. They are #StuckInTheSenate—356 bills.

I have got the great honor tonight, Mr. Speaker—I am not alone in this endeavor, haven't been alone in passing 356 bills. It has been a team sport from day one, team sport from day one—Republicans, Democrats, folks from the North, folks from the South, folks representing families from across the country.

Tonight, I have got Mr. ROTHFUS here, an 18-month Member of this institution, who came, I wager, not to make a point, but to make a difference, and has been doing that every day he has been in this Chamber.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for organizing this very informative Special Order tonight.

You are right: I came here to make a difference. I came here to be part of a team that wants to relight America, relight the job market, relight opportunity, relight the American Dream, because people are hungry for it. They see this town that is out of control, they look at this town, and if they visit this town, they marvel at the growth that is happening in Washington, D.C.

I challenge everybody who visits Washington to count the construction cranes they see and the explosive growth and the high-end shops that open here and the concentration of wealth and power in this town. It is a scandal to the rest of the country. I see these construction cranes here on Pennsylvania Avenue. I would like to

see those construction cranes back in Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker.

But this is a very important discussion we are having about the actions that this House is taking to relight the American economy and how it gets snuffed out in the Senate.

As we have reviewed this evening, Mr. Speaker, the House has continued to pass legislation that would move our country ahead, grow our economy, add more jobs, and increase wages and prosperity. Then there is the brick wall across the other side of the Capitol.

Nowhere is the Senate's inaction more evident than in the budgeting and appropriations process we have here in Washington, D.C. The Senate and House have together managed to pass all 12 appropriations bills and complete the appropriations process on time by September 30 only four times since 1977. It is shocking.

This House, Mr. Speaker, has been working to correct this problem. I want to recognize the hard work of the House Appropriations Committee and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

This year, the Appropriations Committee has already passed 11 out of the 12 appropriations bills out of committee. Seven of those bills have already passed the House here, most of them with strong bipartisan majorities.

How many bills, how many appropriations bills has the Senate passed? Zero. They have yet to pass a single one.

The Senate's failure to do its work is disappointing, but it is not surprising. That is why I introduced the Congressional Pay for Performance Act earlier this year.

The bill is simple. The House and Senate must each pass a budget and all annual appropriations bills by August 1 or have their pay withheld until the job is done. It applies that fundamental lesson that we learn in our first job: if you don't do your work, you don't get paid until you do. That is the lesson that millions of young Americans learned working their first job this summer. It is the lesson I learned on my first paper route. I didn't get paid if I didn't deliver the newspaper. It is past time for Members of Congress to live by that lesson.

Beyond the Senate's failure to execute their constitutionally prescribed job of appropriations, the House has passed, as you noted, more than 350 bills, including many jobs bills, that Senator REID allows to collect dust in the Senate. Over 98 percent of these bills have passed with bipartisan support, both Republicans and Democrats.

As of this morning, Mr. Speaker, 195 of these bills passed without opposition. House Democrats introduced 60 of these bills that now gather dust in the Senate. Again and again, the Senate refuses to act.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I may have misunderstood what you said, because what my constituents believe is that it is partisanship that has shut this down. That it is Republicans fighting with Democrats and Democrats fighting with Republicans.

We are talking about over 350 bills that are sitting in the Senate that have passed this House, that we have come together on this House, you are saying 60 of those were introduced by Democrats?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Sixty of those bills, Mr. Speaker—you look at the stack of paper that the gentleman from Georgia has with him here today—Mr. Speaker, 60 of those bills were introduced by Democrats, and yet they gather dust in the Democrat-controlled Senate.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we passed dozens of energy-related bills designed to increase production, reduce prices, add family sustaining jobs, and promote American energy independence. Bills like the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, the Northern Route Approval Act, which is going to get the Keystone XL pipeline going, passed in May of 2013, 241–175. It has been sitting over in the Senate for 434 days.

We have passed dozens of regulatory reform bills to promote job growth and keep an out-of-touch and out-of-control Washington, D.C., bureaucracy in check. Those like the REINS Act that the gentleman from Florida mentioned. A very simple bill. If a regulatory agency puts out a regulation on the economy that is going to cost more than \$50 million to implement, suppressing job growth, bring it back here for an up-or-down vote. Let's restore the constitutional responsibility for both the Senate and the House, who have that responsibility for making the law. Let us take accountability for that. If there is a regulation that merits approval, we are going to vote for it. It is called being accountable. But you can't fire these bureaucrats who come up with these regulations that have a negative impact on our economy.

We have also passed the Achieving Less Excess in Regulation and Requiring Transparency Act, known as the ALERRT Act. It is an effort to improve thoughtful consideration of the consequences of regulation.

I offered an amendment to the ALERRT Act. The amendment requires the capital bureaucrats to acknowledge whether their regulations will have a negative impact on jobs or wages in a particular industry.

Any such regulation will be subject to additional review to ensure that the benefits justify the costs to families and communities. The principle is simple: if Washington bureaucrats are

going to implement rules that take wages or jobs away from hardworking Americans, they should take responsibility for and justify their decisions. It is important that regulators think through the impacts, costs, and burdens that red tape imposes on families and communities, and it is time for the Senate to come to the support of those individuals and those communities and take up the ALERRT Act.

We have passed several tax-related bills to help individuals keep more of their hard-earned money and to help small businesses add jobs and increase wages, like the Child Tax Credit Improvement Act and the Student and Family Tax Simplification Act.

We have also heard stories of people whose hours have been cut because of the 30-hour work week in the President's health care law. But the House has acted. That is why we passed the Save American Workers Act to restore the traditional 40-hour work week and help those who want the opportunity to work more hours and see their wages go up.

The Senate has to act. Time and again, Mr. Speaker, the House has acted but the Senate has not.

I really thank the gentleman from Georgia for shining a light on what is going on at this Capitol, the production that is coming out of this side of the Capitol and then hits the wall on the other side. It is time for the Senate to act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would stay just 1 more minute. I see you are down here with three lovely young women from the next generation of Americans. When they grow up, they are going to be the leaders of this country.

You mentioned energy in your presentation. I have got to be honest with you, I didn't come to deal with those big issues that are sometimes amorphous. I came to deal with the issues that make a difference in families' lives today, tomorrow, and in the next generation.

We talk about energy, we talk about streamlining production, we talk about the Keystone pipeline, but I live in Georgia. We are not drilling any wells in Georgia. I can't tell much of a difference at the price of the pump. I don't have that many families who say: This is going to make a difference in my pocketbook, this is going to make a difference for a job right here in Atlanta, Georgia. But you come from a different part of the country.

Can you see the difference that these bills make, not from a Republican/Democrat partisan perspective, but from a real world difference, real dollars in families' pockets back home?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Georgia notes that western Pennsylvania has a growing energy industry. We are seeing a tremendous number of jobs coming in, family sustaining jobs.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, when somebody gets a job in that field and they start to get that paycheck—and every American who gets a paycheck sees this—there is some stuff that is taken out. There is a FICA charge, a Medicare tax charge, and Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we are paying for Social Security, that is how we are paying for Medicare. When people pay their income taxes, it is how we pay for the defense of our country. This is a dangerous world, Mr. Speaker.

We need to have an economy that is generating the kind of jobs where people can get back to work and get those salaries and wages so that when they pay taxes, they are paying for Social Security, Medicare, and veterans benefits. We have got a boom like you have never seen before, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Georgia has all these bills there that show the work that this House is doing, all to help this economy get growing again.

If you want to be paying for Social Security, if you want to be paying for Medicare, if you want to be paying for veterans benefits, we have got to grow this economy at 4 percent, at 5 percent, yes, at 6 percent. So many people, Mr. Speaker, have said, that is not going to happen, we can't get there. It happened. It happened in the 1980s, it happened in the 1990s. We can do this. We are a blessed land, Mr. Speaker, and in western Pennsylvania we see that.

□ 2000

We are having a big debate right now with respect to the President's greenhouse gas emissions, and there is testimony being taken across the country, including in Pittsburgh. We have to use our resources.

Under his plan, in 2008, when the President was running for his seat, he promises, "Electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket."

No single person should have the authority to impose a policy on a country that would cause electricity rates to necessarily skyrocket. That is why the REINS Act is so important. That is why Senator REID has to move the REINS Act to the floor of the Senate, to have this Congress have a voice. Our Constitution has an executive branch, a legislative branch, and a judicial branch. The legislative branch is where those policy decisions should be made.

Mr. WOODALL. I am looking at the Northern Route Approval Act poster you have got behind you, and I am looking at the "days in the Senate" column. It says it has been 434 days that that bill has been in the Senate.

You are a new Member in this body. I have only had a voting card for 3 years. I know it is a collaborative process, but as I look at that 434 days in the Senate, does it mean that we have sent over a proposal to expand energy production to make those family-pro-

viding jobs that you mention and the Senate didn't like our idea, and so they sent us back a different proposal, and we have dropped the ball? Is that a possibility?

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is asking questions about what is happening on the Senate side. They are simply not acting.

It was 241-175. I think the last time I counted, there are some 234 Republicans in this House. It was 241, so there are Democrats voting for this bill.

There is almost universal support for Keystone XL. The President could allow it to go forward. Thousands of jobs are in the waiting—thousands of jobs where people would be paying Social Security tax and Medicare tax and increasing the supply of North American energy being able to be refined in this country, which means American jobs refining that.

So what is happening over there in the Senate? It is not coming up. We get phone calls all the time from our constituents, and it is important that constituents call their Members of Congress, who are their employees. We are the employees of the American people. The Senators are the employees of the American people because they pay our paychecks.

Their hard-earned tax dollars are what fund the paychecks for Senators and the paychecks for the Members of this House. We are the employees of the American people.

So we welcome phone calls from our bosses, our employers out there. They need to be calling their employees in the Senate and saying: Why aren't you approving the Keystone XL pipeline? We need those jobs. Why aren't you approving the REINS Act?

We don't think one person should make the decision that would turn off the lights in this country, turn off the lights at power plants, turn off the lights in coal mines, turn off the lights in factories because the prices are going too high.

When the President said that electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket, if you are opening up a plant and you are looking at that, that is a cost. If the income doesn't exceed the cost, that factory isn't going to get built.

So there are folks across the country—entrepreneurs—who want to get things going. They want to hire people, but then they look at the cost, and they say: no, we are going to put our money elsewhere.

We need people investing in this country because that is what is going to cause this country to boom again, and look at some of the tax bills we passed out of this House, which wait in the Senate—where is the Keystone XL pipeline? Where is the Northern Route Approval Act right now?

I can't answer the question that the gentleman from Georgia asks, but I think maybe the Senators could answer that question if their bosses—the people who pay their salaries—would call them.

Mr. WOODALL. The gentleman said it so well. This isn't about one person. This isn't about one Chamber. This isn't about one part of the government. We are all in this together. Families in western Pennsylvania and families in north Georgia are in this together. We will rise or fall as a Nation together.

I go back to what you said when you first took the well. There are so many awful stories about Washington, D.C., and the way that we work together. Some of them are true, and many of them are just lore, but I believe you said—and my staff handed it to me after you said it—that about 254 of the 356 bills that are stuck in the Senate passed this House either unanimously or with more than two-thirds of the Members voting in favor of them.

I don't know everything about western Pennsylvania, but I know you don't get elected to Congress there because you are interested in propounding wild views that make no difference to people. You get elected there because you care about people and you want to do the things that matter. You know who the boss is, and it is those folks back home.

When I think that about this stack of bills, it would be so easy for people to dismiss it as: well, those are those crazy Republican ideas, and this is just some sort of political stunt.

How many times have we heard that it is a political stunt? Why are those guys talking about those bills? It is because of what you said. Sixty of these bills introduced by Democrats passed this Chamber, and 254 of these bills stuck in the Senate passed with two-thirds of us coming together—or more—to send them over to the Senate.

We have an obligation to work together. The answer to the question is that, after 434 days, the Senate hasn't said no. The Senate hasn't said: we have a better idea, so we will send this back to you. The Senate didn't say: you are focused on the wrong pathway; let's look at a different route approval. The Senate did nothing.

Mr. ROTHFUS. You raise a good point because the way the process is supposed to work, one side of our Capitol—the House—will pass the bill or maybe the Senate will pass a bill, and then there might be a slightly different bill passed out of the other Chamber, and then the two sides would come together in a conference, and there would be some negotiating. There is some compromise going on.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had a job of negotiating contracts. Your client would tell you when you go into that negotiating room: whatever you do, make sure you get A and B into that contract.

So you know what your marching orders are, but you understand the other side has come in, and they have been told by their client: make sure you get C and D in that contract, whatever you do.

The art is that the two of you get together and you negotiate. You go back and forth. Are you going to get 100 percent? You never do. That is negotiating. That is life, but here, we passed these bills. We are waiting to negotiate. They are not even acting.

I go back to the appropriations process, which is fundamentally broken. Since 1977, you have only four times that the House and the Senate got this job done by September 30. That is a scandal.

Everybody in this country knows that April 15 is an important date. You have got to pay your taxes that day. You can't call the IRS and say: Hey, can I get a continuing resolution on that? Can I have 3 weeks?

The gentleman from Georgia pointed out that I have two of my young children with me. We know that the Tuesday before Labor Day, school starts. Am I supposed to be able to call the principal and say: hey, we're not ready? Can I have a continuing resolution on that summer, so we can have 3 more weeks to get ready?

It shouldn't happen. The spending bills will be passed, whether it is through a continuing resolution that will extend it until December or January or February or March. Why can't it get done by September 30? It is an act of the will.

If the other side of the Congress—the Senate—hasn't passed any, where can you even begin to have that negotiation between the two different ideas and what is in those bills? We would love to negotiate with Senator REID.

We would love to negotiate. In fact, it has worked. I think you pointed out the SKILLS Act which, again, the House passed some 16 months ago. It took a while for the Senate to get going. It finally did. We passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act last summer. We finally got it to the Senate and got together. It got done.

We passed a temporary patch for the highway trust fund that we sent over to the Senate. The Senate had some other ideas, so they are making some changes, but this is the process that is supposed to work. One House moves; the other House moves. They are not even moving, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. I think about those seven appropriations bills you talked about. I want to remember the numbers. We have gotten 12 out of committee. We passed seven on the floor of the House. We have sent those over to the Senate.

Again, I don't know if the Senate is going to take our ideas or reject our ideas or come up with their own ideas,

but they have done none of those things. They haven't taken our ideas, they haven't rejected our ideas, and they promulgated absolutely no ideas of their own.

I don't enjoy being down here. This is not #kickthesenate. This is #StuckInTheSenate. It is not that there is not a way forward. You have described the way forward. It is not all my way. It is not all your way. It is not all anyone's way. It is a negotiated pathway forward.

When I ran for Congress, that is what I expected. When my constituents sent me here, that is what they expected.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It isn't my way or the highway, but if you have one part of this Congress—the Senate—not even acting, what is the communication there? It is no way.

We invite the Senate to act. We invite the Senate to come and start to talk about the Keystone XL pipeline and the thousands of jobs that are waiting, talk about the REINS Act, talk about the ALERRT Act to require the bureaucrats in this wealthy and powerful Capitol to take a look at the regulations that they are putting out and making an assessment whether those regulations are going to hurt wages or jobs.

I talk to people who are capped at 29½ hours. They can't get above 30 hours, Mr. Speaker, so we passed legislation that, again, sits in the Senate. We need to boom this economy again. That is how you pay for the critical programs that we have.

We have to use the God-given resources we have in this country—yes, prudently, smartly, and in a responsible way. There are ways to do that.

We have made tremendous progress in this country over the last 50 years. I am from Pittsburgh, and they talk about, back in the day, that you had to bring two shirts to work because, by noon, your shirt would be dirty.

We are making tremendous progress with the environment. I have another bill that I am trying to get this House to move, so we can send it over to the Senate to help that progress continue, called the SENSE Act, H.R. 3138. Again, I hope to get this House to move it, but we have to get the Senate to act.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend for focusing on those commonsense points.

Again, when I open up the newspaper, what I hear is it is about partisan nonsense and it is about election-year politics. When we are talking about over 350 bills and we are talking about 60 of those bills being introduced by Democrats, but passed with Democrat and Republican support here in the House, when we are talking about 250 of those bills being passed with more than a two-thirds vote—many of those unanimously—what it tells me is we are not in the business of trying to make a point.

We are in the business of trying to make a difference, and if we had a willing partner in the Senate, we could absolutely make that difference.

I yield to my friend from Indiana, a former secretary of State, which has you in the executive side of things. You actually had to be responsible for getting things done. I guess that is my frustration with the Senate.

I just need somebody to stand up and be a partner and take responsibility for moving a few of these things forward, trying to make a difference in people's lives.

□ 2015

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for organizing this here tonight.

I think the gentleman is exactly right. We need leadership. Leaders are supposed to lead. When you look at what the gentleman rightly put here on the House floor in terms of the stack of work that sits in HARRY REID's—the Senate majority leader's—in-box, you realize what leadership isn't, and that is a real problem.

If my constituents, Mr. Speaker, saw that pile in my in-box, I don't know how much longer I would last. I wonder what the citizens and voters and taxpayers of Nevada think at this point.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, I rise today to discuss with my colleagues the importance of improving education in our country.

This House has done excellent work in that regard. We understand here in the House—and parents, teachers, and school administrators are all too aware—that the current state of our education system threatens the American Dream for the current and future generations of students.

I know that we want to help create a better world and the possibility of a better life for our young students. Leaving the world in better shape than we found it is as much a part of our American exceptionalism as is the freedom we enjoy that allows us to pursue the American Dream.

To our credit, frankly, when American citizens see what is not being done in the Senate, they can look to the House for some great things that have been accomplished in terms of righting what is wrong on education.

Right now, sadly, we are not faring well on the international education stage. Our children are not reading at grade level, while math and science performance by U.S. students trails far beyond that of our counterparts in other developed countries. We are not competing to win in a 21st century world.

The comical irony of that—if it weren't just so plain sad—would be that the American education system is failing the students that its most pas-

sionate advocates claim to want to help. Sure, you can argue that somehow while we aren't universally successful, our best and brightest rival any in the world, and our leading institutions will continue to provide the high-quality instruction that will keep us afloat, but I would say to the gentleman of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, that the America I know, the America that I believe in—the America that my constituents and that, I think, Americans across the country believe in—doesn't include a two-tiered system. We want everyone to have an equal opportunity. We want everyone to only be limited by the capacity of their dreams.

At the subcommittee level, in what we call K–12 education and in a more broad sense on the Education and the Workforce Committee and then on the floor of the House, we have done some things to right that ship, as I explained.

One of those bills that passed the House was H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act. This was a bipartisan bill. It passed on 5–9–14, just this year. The vote tally, Mr. Speaker, was 360–45. It has been in the Senate for 82 days. 360–45 is a huge bipartisan victory. It is one of the biggest bipartisan victories we have had on the floor of the House.

This is a charter school bill. It is school choice. I believe charter schools—like a majority of the people on the floor of this House believe—play a critical role in creating educational options for all children. Charter schools encompass two key principles American families want from our Nation's education system: choice and flexibility.

These innovative institutions will empower parents to play a more active role in their children's educations, open doors for teachers to pioneer fresh teaching methods, encourage State and local innovation, and help students escape poor-performing schools.

Why do we want to continue to shackle students to poor-performing schools and give them no choice and take away that equal opportunity for them to be successful? This bill, Mr. Speaker, did it. This bill now sits in HARRY REID's in-box.

Across the Nation, charter schools are leading the way in innovation and in improving education outcomes. In my home State of Indiana, for example, the Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School in Indianapolis—which serves a predominantly low-income and minority student body—expects every student, no matter his or her background or circumstances, to have a college acceptance letter upon graduation.

No matter his or her background or circumstances, one has to have a college acceptance letter upon graduation. The school's rigorous curriculum and laser focus on preparing students for higher education has helped 100 percent

of its students to date gain acceptance into college. This bill sits, awaiting action in the Senate. It is not leadership.

Mr. WOODALL. I would just like to ask my friend because, in serving on the committee, you have an insight that most of us don't have.

I am looking at those numbers, at 360 Members of this House voting "yes." That is more than you need to pass a constitutional amendment, for Pete's sakes.

Mr. ROKITA. That is right.

Mr. WOODALL. That is about as close to unanimous as we generally get. I am looking, and it hasn't been at the Senate for 1 week or 2 weeks. It has been there for almost 3 months so far.

What have they said? Have they said, We have got a better idea, and they have sent back an alternative to the committee? What have you heard?

Mr. ROKITA. I would love at this point—I think we all would—to hear them say: We have a better idea, we are going to take it up, and we will show you.

I would take that as progress, sir. This is what we have heard: silence.

Mr. WOODALL. These are not partisan issues. Education is not a partisan issue. Children are not partisan issues. We have votes with 360 Members of this body. Again, this is the hyperpartisan House—so the news tells me—and two bills right there in front of you are making a difference in people's lives. They could make that difference today, and yet the Senate does nothing.

I have been preaching the "Stuck in the Senate" hashtag message, I will say to my friend, because I still believe. I told folks when we started this hour tonight that this is a good news/bad news hour. The good news is I am sitting on top of a stack of 356 bills that this House has passed in a bipartisan way, and the bad news is that they are stuck in the Senate.

I believe that perhaps you and I, as young Congressmen, can't move the Senate, but I believe the American people still can move the Senate.

Mr. ROKITA. I think the gentleman is exactly right, if the American people show the Senate that the American people care as we know they do. This is still the home of the free. This is still an open republic, and it is still we, the people, who are in charge. We can make the change happen if we show the "leaders" of this country that we care.

Mr. WOODALL. It is a "we" question. I thank my friend. There are folks who get wrapped up in the partisan issues of the day, and there are those folks who have committed themselves to finding willing partners wherever those partners may be.

What I have seen of you in our 3 years of working together is that you came here to do things that mattered, and whoever you have to partner with and however late you have to work and

however early you have to get up—whatever you have to do—if this job is worth doing, it is because it is making a difference in people's lives, and I am grateful to you for that.

It may be a Midwestern values night. I have got the gentleman from Indiana, and I have been joined by a gentleman from Illinois, who has also been a true champion, Mr. Speaker. You didn't have the great pleasure of coming in with this big freshman class of 2010, but what was so neat about it to me was that, in showing up to freshman orientation, I met these two guys for the very first time, and I met my new Democratic colleagues for the very first time.

Truthfully, when we talked about why we came here, I couldn't tell the difference between the two because the American people sent a crowd of folks here to do the things that mattered, and we have partnered to do those.

The gentleman from Illinois is one of those great partners, and I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HULTGREN. Thank you so much. I want to thank my good friend from Georgia for hosting this hour.

It is so important to talk about what really matters to people—our constituents, hardworking families—who are just trying to make it through, to get by, and to have hope for a bright future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, troubled over a recent email I received from a constituent of mine. Jessica from Lake in the Hills in Illinois wrote me with concern about her current economic condition.

She is a single mother with two teenagers, but like many Americans, she recently lost her job amidst the slow economic recovery. Of course, she is greatly concerned about providing for her children, now that her main source of income has dried up.

As Gallup recently confirmed, many Americans like Jessica are having to spend more on items they have to buy and less on items they choose to buy. This mandatory spending is squeezing out everything else in their budgets.

The rising costs of basic necessities, like groceries, gas, and utilities for middle class families like Jessica's, smothers them as the cost of day-to-day living goes up and up. At the end of the month, there is little left over for them to choose to buy something for their homes, for their families, or for themselves.

This is heartbreaking and frustrating because the House has passed legislation to lower energy prices, create jobs, improve work-life balance, and do many other things to help people.

Energy prices are an ever-present concern for Americans who drive their kids to school, commute to their jobs, cool their homes, run their manufacturing plants, or harvest their crops.

The House passed Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works

Act, and it would do just that, cut prices at the pump by opening new Federal lands to energy development. The Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act would grow Main Street jobs by reducing regulatory burdens on American businesses.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would help workers better manage their work-life balance. That is especially crucial for families like Jessica's who are stretched thin between caring for their families and working just to earn a living.

The House has also acted on behalf of veterans, and I am so proud of this. When our servicemen and -women return home, the last thing they should have to worry about is unemployment.

It is our duty in Congress to ensure there are jobs available for our veterans, but the employer mandate in the President's health care law has discouraged many small businesses from hiring more workers at a time when our economy is still struggling to recover.

H.R. 3474, the Hire More Heroes Act, is commonsense legislation that relieves the employer mandate burden on businesses that want to hire veterans.

It is just astounding to me that the Senate still refuses to take up this legislation that would help our veterans. Still, I do have hope. I have hope that we can work across the aisle to help address the problems of the middle class.

That is what the American people sent us here to do. Just this month, the House and Senate passed and the President signed H.R. 803, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, or the SKILLS Act, which helps reform and modernize our Federal jobs training programs.

By 2022, our country will lack millions of skilled workers with degrees beyond high school, such as paralegals, welders, radiology technicians, and police officers. Federally funded job training programs help Americans of all working ages gain the knowledge and skills necessary to reenter the workforce, retrain for new jobs, or increase their value to their current employers.

When far more people in my home State of Illinois have given up looking for work and have left the workforce than have found new jobs, our communities need the tools necessary to match available jobs with available and trained workers.

H.R. 803 will help put local workforce investment boards in the driver's seat to tailor their services to fill the local jobs of the 21st century. It also streamlines a confusing maze of programs and ensures the business community's voice is heard, putting businesses above bureaucrats.

At the same time, it ensures that we have strong accountability over the use of taxpayer dollars. H.R. 803 is a

good example—when regular order is followed and both sides agree to talk and work out their differences—that the House can pass important legislation.

We have also passed the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, a bill I cosponsored, which permanently prevents States and local governments from taxing Internet services. Taxing the on-ramp to the Internet is just bad policy.

It hurts lower income families the most and penalizes Americans for communicating with family or for looking for a job online. Again, this bill passed with strong bipartisan support.

The Science Committee recently passed the RAMI Act, which will help the strong manufacturing base we have in Illinois and others across the country. The bill creates a network of nationwide regional institutes, each specializing in the production of a unique technology material or process relevant to advanced manufacturing.

Small- and mid-sized manufacturers can expand their research and development capabilities and train an advanced manufacturing workforce.

The Senate also introduced a companion bill, and I trust the RAMI Act will become law soon. When it does come down to it, I truly believe we can all agree on about 80 percent of the issues facing this Nation.

Building relationships and working on common goals can help us address the other 20 percent without being divisive.

□ 2030

But where does this leave middle class families right now? They are still finding their paychecks don't go as far as they used to go. Energy prices are still high, and groceries aren't getting any cheaper.

More than 350 bills are stuck in the Senate. Many of those would help Americans get back on their feet again. We don't need political posturing. We need real solutions for hardworking individuals and families. Let's help families like Jessica's and get these bills passed through the Senate now.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. It is exactly that commitment to working together to make a difference that I think folks long for in this place. And it is exactly what you have there, H.R. 803, the Workplace Innovation Act. It is true. That is one of our success stories.

But you first came to the floor to support that in March of 2013. The reason we are able to call this a success is because the Senate finally got around to dealing with it in June of 2014—over a year. It could have been making a difference in people's lives.

I am thrilled that now we are making that difference, but we wasted a year. And the family that you talked about, a family struggling to try to decide what tomorrow is going to look like, doesn't have a year to wait.

The Internet Tax Freedom bill you discussed just came out of this body this summer. That is something the Senate could take up immediately. As you said, it came out of here with wild bipartisan support. It could begin to make a difference tomorrow—tomorrow.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. HULTGREN. I agree with you. And families like Jessica's can't afford to wait any longer. They want help. They are not looking for something to be given to them. They are just looking for opportunity. They are looking for hope, and that is the legislation that we have passed, any legislation like this that just makes sense.

As I travel around my district, it is in the western suburbs of Chicago. As I travel around and talk to job creators, small businesses, entrepreneurs, people who are starting up small businesses or want to start up small businesses, I ask them over and over again—I would love for them to hire 20 more people, but I ask: What would it take for you to hire one more person, just one more person? And over and over again it is common themes of: deal with the things that are causing us to struggle. They are convinced they can continue to make a great product, provide a great service, serve their customers, beat all competition all throughout the world if they can just have an opportunity, if government can get out of the way.

Their fear is uncertainty that is coming out of Washington, D.C., uncertainty under high taxes, increase of taxes and different things, so much regulation that is out there, and now the high cost of health care, uncertainty there as well.

We have taken some commonsense steps, as my good friend from Georgia has pointed out so well. So many of these votes have been strong, bipartisan votes, people on both sides of the aisle working together, cosponsors on both sides of the aisle getting this done, oftentimes with well over 300 votes, and yet it languishes over in the Senate. 356 bills stuck in the Senate.

It is about time that we get that moving. Families like Jessica's, so many other families across this Nation want that help, want us to get out of the way, want the Senate to act, move things forward, and have that hope and opportunity once again.

I thank my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. He is such a great leader. Bringing voices together is that skill set that sometimes this institution lacks, and he has it in spades.

As I close tonight, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear, this isn't a partisan stunt. This isn't Republican machinations. 356 bills sit in the Senate right now that, if the Senate moved them, could begin to make a difference in the lives of American families.

I want to tell you about those bills: 98 percent of them passed with a bipar-

tisan vote. 98 percent of these bills passed with a bipartisan vote. 254 of these bills passed with either no opposition or two-thirds support. Almost 200, no opposition at all; 60 introduced by my Democratic colleagues.

Making a difference for America is not a partisan exercise, Mr. Speaker, but it is a sacred trust. I am so proud of this House for moving forward on these bills to make a difference. I know that we can work together to encourage HARRY REID to do the same. I know our friends across the country, the bosses of the United States Senate, can encourage the Senate to do the same.

This country is thirsty for leadership. I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the House for providing it. I look forward to partnering with the Senate and the President to move these bills into that difference-making position for those families across this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 30 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, today we have Democrats on the Financial Services Committee here where we have gathered on the House floor to talk about the Export-Import Bank, which supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and levels the playing field so that American businesses, large and small, can compete successfully in the global markets.

Tomorrow, Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican leadership will leave town for a 5-week congressional recess, and legislation to renew the Export-Import Bank hasn't even seen a vote in our committee. When we return in September, there will be just 10 legislative days to renew the bank before its charter lapses on September 30.

This ideological push to abolish the Ex-Im Bank is an irrational crusade to destroy an agency that supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and propels economic recovery without costing taxpayers a dime. The result could be the end of an institution that, over the past 5 years, has supported 1.2 million private sector American jobs, and over 200,000 jobs last year alone.

Additionally, the Ex-Im Bank reduced our deficit by returning over \$1 billion to taxpayers last year alone through interest and fees. Still, critics of the bank say it is a risk to taxpayers, that it picks winners and losers, and that it interferes in the free market and, therefore, creates a less efficient economy. For all of those reasons, it should be abolished, they say.

But first, let me say, this notion that there is such a thing as pure free enter-

prise, that if left to its own devices would flourish with total efficiency and self-discipline and allocate resources and spread risk in such a way that accrues to the benefit of everyone in society, this notion of just pure free enterprise simply doesn't exist.

In fact, I thought one of the lessons we learned from the recent financial crisis is that markets must be embedded in systems of governance. The idea that markets are self-correcting, many of us thought, had received a mortal blow.

Regardless of the outcome, Republicans have already created uncertainty for thousands of American companies trying to compete against businesses in China, Korea, and across Europe, all of which have their own version of the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from Mr. Steve Wilburn, who is the CEO of the green energy company FirmGreen, who lost \$57 million in contracts because of uncertainty surrounding the future of the Ex-Im Bank.

At this time, and before us sharing this information with you, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, thank you to Ranking Member Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Export-Import Bank and current legislation, H.R. 4950, to reauthorize the bank introduced by my freshman colleague and fellow Financial Services Committee member, Congressman HECK from Washington.

The Export-Import Bank has been helping United States businesses of all sizes sell their products around the world for over 80 years. But despite the bank's proven track record of creating jobs, helping American businesses compete globally, and reducing the Federal deficit, a faction of House Republicans want to close the door of this important Federal agency forever.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down the Export-Import Bank makes no sense to me, and it makes no sense to my constituents. In my congressional district, Ohio's Third, 10 companies, including six small businesses, have grown because of the Export-Import Bank. These businesses have been able to expand sales internationally and create jobs locally because of the Export-Import Bank.

Earlier this month I received a letter from the CEO of Yenkin-Majestic Paint, a manufacturer in my district. In his letter, he writes: "Normally we would not write in context of Washington crosscurrents about the bank. However, it would be very unfortunate if the Congress cannot reach a responsible bipartisan reauthorization of this work to encourage commerce for American-made products abroad and to help expand U.S. employment from

sales beyond what is available on the home front."

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of many letters I have received from affected constituents.

I have also heard from a young man who works at International Risk Consultants, a Columbus-based company that provides guidance to small businesses to export internationally. He writes: "The Ex-Im Bank offers trade finance solutions that work for small businesses that cannot find alternatives in the private market."

He closes his letter in this way, I think most telling: "Perhaps the most devastating effect of not reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank will be visited upon the many firms that never began exporting but would, if they were introduced to Ex-Im Bank solutions."

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not allow an extreme faction of the Republican Conference to execute an ill-conceived and destructive plan to close Export-Import Bank. My constituents deserve better. Ohioans deserve better, and the American people deserve better.

I urge the House Republican leadership to bring H.R. 4950, a bill with over 200 cosponsors, to the floor so we can keep the Export-Import Bank operating and, more importantly, keep Americans working.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I will read into the RECORD a letter from Steve Wilburn, CEO of the green energy company FirmGreen, who lost a \$57 million contract because of uncertainty surrounding the future of the Ex-Im Bank. I will read you excerpts from his letter.

Mr. Wilburn attended the Ex-Im Bank panel I organized in April, and last month we invited him back to be one of our Democratic witnesses at a House Financial Services Committee hearing on the Ex-Im Bank. He is among the best witnesses we have ever had at a hearing.

In his letter, Mr. Wilburn explains that FirmGreen's export potential has been directly affected by the uncertainty of reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank U.S. and the aggressive financial terms offered by the Korean Ex-Im Bank.

Attached to his letter is another letter from a company in the Philippines, Green Energy Solutions, informing him that his business lost a \$57 million contract. The letter begins: "Dear Mr. Wilburn, in view of the uncertainty of

the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank and project finance structure you proposed have become problematic. We have made the decision in May, this year not to proceed with your project offering."

□ 2045

Mr. Wilburn goes on to say: "In summation, as a combat-decorated veteran, small business owner, job creator, exporter, and concerned citizen, I believe we should not unilaterally disarm and abandon the very governmental agency that allows U.S. manufacturers and other U.S. exporters to fairly compete on the world's trading stage."

Mr. Speaker and Members, the main criticism of the bank that I would like to discuss right now is the assertion that the bank is the embodiment of corporate welfare, benefiting a handful of large companies, which they claim represents crony capitalism.

Last April, I held a panel on the Ex-Im Bank which included a number of small business owners from across the country. They came here to Washington to discuss their work with the bank and how the bank helped their companies compete in the global marketplace. Every one of those panel members were extraordinarily decent people, hardworking business owners who create jobs and pay taxes and have families and a civic sense of duty. And this is why I am so offended by this label of "crony capitalists" that critics like to attach to users of the bank.

Those of us who know what it is like to live behind a label understand how they work. Once you are able to put a label on something or to someone and it sticks, then you could be done with them. And if enough people can be convinced that customers of the Ex-Im Bank are crony capitalists, well, there is nothing left to do but get rid of them.

It is so important to note that while a good amount of the bank's support goes to large companies, the vast majority of Ex-Im transactions—nearly 90 percent—help small businesses. In fact, if the Ex-Im Bank were abolished today, it would affect small- and medium-sized businesses just as much, or more, as large exporters—perhaps more, given the distinct challenges and risks small businesses face when looking to export.

Moreover, large U.S. exporters that benefit from high dollar values of Ex-Im financing also have large domestic supply chains which consists largely of small- and medium-sized businesses that benefit indirectly but in very important ways from Ex-Im support.

At a later time, I will be entering into the RECORD excerpts from Brek Manufacturing and Hansen Engineering.

This letter is from Mr. Greg Lay, vice president of Hansen Engineering. I will read this letter first from Hansen Engineering:

Hansen Engineering company is one of many small businesses in the South Bay area of Los Angeles, California, that is dependent on Boeing contracts to support the business. Ninety percent of our contracts support Boeing aircraft, either directly or indirectly, through our prime aerospace companies throughout the world. My company staffs approximately 60 employees who live in the South Bay and surrounding areas and depend upon the support of Boeing for the well-being of their families.

Without the reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank, it would be impossible for us to have a big impact on the health of our businesses and its employees and their families.

Next we have a letter from Brek Manufacturing:

Brek Manufacturing company is a small business in California with 170 employees who have a critical interest in foreign sales of Boeing commercial aircraft. The Export-Import Bank plays an important role as an intermediary in the sale of these aircraft.

This letter is to express our support for the Ex-Im Bank, as it is key to securing additional sales of Boeing commercial aircraft.

He goes on to say:

Our representatives who support the military should also be concerned with the Ex-Im Bank because of the role it plays in supporting jobs and companies like ours, both large and small across the country.

He further states:

We supply critical aircraft structural components which are key to successful, safe air transport and air defense. There are many others like us who represent thousands of high-skilled and well-paying positions with good benefits.

Please express our support for the Ex-Im Bank to your colleagues. We are counting on them to do the right thing and support American manufacturing jobs.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) who is a leader with the bill that would reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, if we could get the support from the opposite side of the aisle that we need.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member of the committee very much.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer four elegant, simple, straightforward reasons why it is so critically important that the U.S. Congress reauthorize the Export-Import Bank prior to its expiration on October 1, and they are simply as follows: the Export-Import Bank creates jobs; it helps small businesses; it promotes fiscal responsibility; and it advances economic growth.

With respect to jobs, it has already been cited that in the last 5 years alone, the Export-Import Bank is responsible for the creation of over a million jobs, 205,000 jobs in just the last year.

But here is what has not been said: export-related jobs in America pay 13 to 18 percent more than non-export jobs. So it doesn't just create jobs; it creates good jobs. And it helps small businesses. Nearly 90 percent of all transactions of the Export-Import Bank are with small businesses. And to put a fine point on that, last year, it

was 3,413 small businesses, businesses like Pexco in Fife, Washington, which makes traffic signs to promote safety during construction. Pexco recently sold \$125,000—a small order by any measure—to the Netherlands, I think it was. Only one entity would guarantee payment because no one else could collect across international borders. And that entity, of course, was the Export-Import Bank.

Stac, another veteran-owned business in Sumner, Washington, with eight employees, they do exporting. They are going to hire three new employees on the basis of their international sales. But do you know what is incredibly frustrating for somebody who comes from the private sector? It is, frankly, the woeful deficiency in understanding, because the small business support that the Export-Import Bank provides does not stop with direct loans and loan guarantees to small businesses because big businesses buy goods and services from small businesses as well.

The greatest airplane maker in the world, Boeing airplanes, uses 15,000 businesses in their supply chain, and 6,600 of them are small businesses.

I was recently on an Alaska flight from Sea-Tac to National Airport in Washington, D.C., and a friend of mine named Eric Hahn, who works at General Plastics in south Tacoma, was sitting a couple seats behind me. As everybody was gathering on the plane and shoving their luggage up above and getting seated, Eric jumped up, and he said, “Denny, do you see this? Do you see this?” And he was pointing at the plastic between the two overhead bins. He said, “We made that. We made that.” General Plastics has 185 employees, another small business.

The Export-Import Bank promotes fiscal responsibility. It has been more than a generation since there was any red penny supporting or subsidizing the Export-Import Bank, in the wake of reforms adopted during the Reagan years. Indeed, last October, more than \$1 billion transferred to the U.S. Treasury. If we deauthorize the Export-Import Bank, our deficit is going up. Who wants that to happen? And finally, the Export-Import Bank promotes economic growth.

Let me give you a series of facts. We cannot change these facts by wishing them away. Fact number one: 95 percent of the consumers in the world live outside our borders—95 percent-plus, actually. Another fact: since 1980, global trade has increased something like fivefold—fivefold. And let me give you another fact: if we in America want to keep our middle class, we had better learn how to sell to the growing middle class throughout the world. And the Export-Import Bank is an outstanding tool to do that.

You know, America’s economy is projected to grow by only about 2.4 percent a year over the next 10 years. And

do you know what the shame of that is? The shame of that is, it is not fast enough to absorb even the kids coming out of high schools and postsecondary education and colleges. We simply have to grow this economy faster. And there is no better way than to participate in the exploding global economy.

Every developed nation on the face of the planet has an export credit authority. And, in fact, about 60 in all, theirs are larger than ours either in absolute dollars or in terms of a percentage of their gross domestic product. Why? Why would we unilaterally disarm? Why would we unilaterally disarm?

Finally, let me say this. Right now, tonight, as we sit, as we speak, the people of China are pouring billions of dollars into the development of a commercial aircraft. They call it the C-919. They say it will be available for sale within 2 years. Frankly, I think it is going to be longer than that. It will be 3 or 4 or 5 years. But whenever it is, they are going to create even more fierce competition for an industry that is a bulwark of America’s manufacturing base, a bulwark. And what about China’s export credit authority? It is six times larger in absolute dollars than America’s. And as a percentage of GDP, it is 35 times larger.

So I ask the Members of the House, let us not wake up 63 days from now with no export credit authority. This is the 16th time, by my count, we have reauthorized the bank. Almost every time by virtually unanimous support. And there are more than 300 votes on this floor to pass it, if they will bring it to a vote.

In the name of jobs, in the name of small businesses, in the name of fiscal responsibility, and in the name of economic growth, let us reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), and I thank him for the leadership and the support that he has shown for the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you, Madam Ranking Member of the full committee. I am exceedingly proud to be a part of this effort. And I want to you know that when we succeed, it will be due in no small part to the energy that you have provided to help us get this legislation through.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for H.R. 4950, an outstanding piece of legislation. It extends the Export-Import Bank for 7 years, and it will increase the cap to \$175 billion. I think it is an outstanding piece of legislation. And, of course, I am one of the persons who is supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by indicating that the Export-Import Bank is not one of the too big to fail institutions. It wasn’t involved in the credit default swaps. It wasn’t involved with derivatives. It wasn’t involved with no-

doc loans. It wasn’t involved in all of these exotic products that nearly caused the collapse of the economy.

If the truth be told, the Export-Import Bank was one of the reasons why the economy was able to survive. It has been thriving. It has done well. It pays for itself by virtue of the loans that it makes, by virtue of the fees that it collects, by virtue of the products that it insures. The Export-Import Bank makes good sense.

I find no businesspeople in my community who are in opposition to the Export-Import Bank. It is not too big to fail, and it should not be too small to save. We ought to do what we have done 16 times in the previous 80 years, and that is, reauthorize the Export-Import Bank in a clean bill, and do it with very little fanfare.

Unfortunately, that is not the circumstance that we confront presently. Unfortunately, there are persons who believe that the Export-Import Bank no longer serves a useful purpose.

Well, it serves a useful purpose for the people in my district. And the facts speak for themselves. In my district, between 2007 and 2013, in the Ninth Congressional District, we had a total of 88 export-importers.

□ 2100

We had 39 small businesses, 13 minority-owned businesses, and four women-owned businesses, and we are proud of these businesses that are owned by women because we still contend that when women succeed, America succeeds. The Export-Import Bank is on the agenda to help women succeed.

I would add that there are businesses that have indicated that they are supportive. I have a letter from a company in Houston, the style of it is the South Coast Products Company, and I just shall read an excerpt from their letter. I have many letters to read, but I shall pick a few and just read excerpts.

This one reads—and it is addressed to the Honorable MAXINE WATERS:

We are a small manufacturer in Texas that exports thread and valve lubricants primarily to the oil and gas industry. We have used Export-Import Banks’ export credit insurance for 13 years. During that time, our export business has grown by a factor of 15 because of the security offered by our policy with Export-Import.

I shall go to the last paragraph which reads, “Please emphasize to your colleagues that Ex-Im Bank is not corporate welfare”—this is a business, a business that has written this to us—“or a charity of any kind. It facilitates U.S. exports, especially for small businesses like us, while supporting itself. Please do not let them put our livelihoods on the chopping block for their own political gain.”

This is from South Coast Products, a Texas business.

I would also like to read a letter from the Greater Houston Partnership. The Greater Houston Partnership is the

preeminent chamber of commerce in my area. It is called the partnership because we do things differently in Texas, and the partnership has also joined in this letter by a good many other entities that I shall name after having read an excerpt from this letter. It reads:

The Houston region continues to enjoy strong economic growth driven in large part by the Export-Import Bank. In order to keep momentum, it is crucial that Congress supports tools encouraging businesses to expand into new markets and create new jobs. The Export-Import Bank of the United States is one of these tools, and we ask that you support this legislation.

The letter is addressed to me.

It goes on to add:

Small- and medium-sized businesses in our region also benefit directly from Export-Import. Small businesses account for nearly 85 percent of Ex-Im Bank's transactions; further, these transaction figures do not include the tens of thousands of small- and medium-sized businesses that supply goods and services to large exporters using the bank.

This is signed by the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership, the Baytown Chamber of Commerce, the Brenham/Washington County Chamber of Commerce, the Clear Lake Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Tomball Area Chamber of Commerce, the Houston East End Chamber of Commerce, the Houston Northwest Chamber of Commerce, Lake Houston Area Chamber of Commerce, League City Chamber of Commerce, Pearland Chamber of Commerce, West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce, and the Wharton Chamber of Commerce.

I close simply with these words: businesses are supportive of the Ex-Im Bank. People understand the necessity for it. We but only need to have a vote on it to get it continued.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, Members, you have heard about businesses in any number of districts that receive the support from the Ex-Im Bank.

I would like to read to you excerpts from a letter from Chairman HENSARLING's district. This is from Fritz-Pak, and this letter is about how the Ex-Im Bank helped save his business.

His name is Gabriel Ojeda, president of Fritz-Pak Corporation, and this is the excerpt I would like to read:

During the past 5 years, we have grown our international sales from 15 percent to over 35 percent of our business. We now have major trading partners in over 30 different countries, including Brazil, Russia, India, and Taiwan. Most recently, we exhibited our products at Bauma International Trade Fair in Munich, Germany.

So what is Fritz-Pak Corporation today? We are an American manufacturer of the best concrete admixtures in the world, and we sell them as far as Yellowknife, Canada, and as far south as Wellington, New Zealand. We may be small, but we think big. In an age where everything seems to be made someplace else, we are thriving here in the USA and in no small part due to the services provided by Ex-Im Bank.

Lastly, I would like to read excerpts from Mr. Mike Boyle of BES&T in New Hampshire. The CEO and president of BES&T is Mr. Michael Boyle, and he sent us a very good letter last week.

Mr. Speaker, at a later time, we will enter into the RECORD these letters that we are not able to read this evening. I thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters in support of the Export-Import Bank:

1. Letter from Steve Wilburn, President and CEO, FirmGreen, July 21, 2014
2. Letter from Greenery Solutions, Inc, June 23, 2014
3. Letter from Brek Manufacturing to Ranking Member Maxine Waters
4. Letter from Hansen Engineering Company, July 23, 2014
5. Statement from Fritz-Pak, June 17, 2014
6. Letter from Boyle Energy Services & Technology, Inc, July 22, 2014

JULY 21, 2014.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER WATERS: I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Ranking Member, Chairman Hensarling, all the Committee Members and staff, for the opportunity of testifying before the House Committee on Financial Services on June 25, 2014.

It was an extreme honor to appear before the Committee. Only in America can a disabled Veteran small business owner like me, hope to share the national stage with a multi-billion international conglomerate, and have my voice heard on such a critical issue as the Reauthorization of the Export Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im Bank US).

I remain deeply concerned over the continuing negative comments and name calling emanating from many members of Congress concerning the Reauthorization of the Export Import Bank of the United States. I believe such public comments are harming US Exporters and helping to embolden our overseas competitors. As stated in my testimony, "Words have consequences." FirmGreen lost an order worth \$57 million due to the uncertainty created by a vocal minority of Congressional critics opposed to Ex-Bank Reauthorization.

I feel that the current economic recovery occurring in the US is fragile. We are experiencing mounting trade deficits. I firmly believe that the decades-long decline and deterioration of the once formidable United States industrial and manufacturing base is having a negative effect on our economy and our national security.

In 1970, more than a quarter of U.S. employees worked in manufacturing. Today, the number is only one in 10. Over 76 percent of current jobs in the US are in the Service Sector.

Ensuring the viability of our manufacturing and industrial sectors is critical to providing jobs that pay good wages, is important to the recovery of our struggling economy and is vital to the defense of our Republic.

In my opinion, we cannot continue to be a global power capable of responding to serious threats to US interests worldwide, without the support of a strong industrial manufacturing base.

According to declassified CIA reports, China has overtaken Japan and is now second to the United States in terms of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In recent years, led by a strong expansion of its Industrial and Manufacturing Base. China has more than doubled the USA's rate of growth in GDP.

According to the CIA's World Fact Book, as of 2013, China and the European Union are ahead of the United States in Exports. More troubling than the shrinking dollar amount of US exports, is a growing trade deficit in "manufactured" goods.

In order for US Exporters to recover from the recent economic downturn and create jobs, they must have access to sufficient working capital and credit support. Since the near total collapse of the Global Banking system in 2008, Export Credit Agencies (ECA's) and Development Finance Institutions (DFI's) have played an increasingly important role in financing exports.

While US commercial banks are still recovering, sources of capital for US exporters have become constrained. On the world stage, nations and private clients seeking to import manufactured goods and technology have increasingly looked to the competitively priced financial products provided by ECA's and DFI's. Chinese, Japanese and Korean competitors to FirmGreen, and other US Exporters have easy access to very attractive finance terms being offered by the Chinese, Japanese and Korean ECA's.

FirmGreen's export potential has been directly affected by the uncertainty of reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank US and the aggressive finance terms offered by the Korean ExIm Bank (KEXIM). (See Attached Letter from Greenery, Solutions, Inc.).

In many of the international markets where FirmGreen competes, ECAs are providing the only project finance available. In the energy infrastructure marketplace, fully nine out of 10 projects that get done on a true project finance basis have ECA support.

"JBIC remains a global leader for energy and infrastructure project finance; KEXIM is rising in prominence, particularly in energy; Chinese institutions are also very active and increasingly willing to work with other International finance providers as opposed to going it alone as they have done in the past." (Source Baker and McKenzie 2013 Report on the Rise of ECA's and DFI's).

The Export-Import Bank of the United States allows US Manufacturers, such as FirmGreen, to compete on an equal basis with the project finance terms being offered by foreign ECA's and DFI's. Ex-Im Bank US provides valuable comfort to US commercial banks, allowing them to provide the longer tenor loans that are essential for many US Exporters, and vital for FirmGreen's credit-worthy energy and infrastructure projects.

In summation, as a combat decorated Veteran, small business owner, job creator, exporter and concerned citizen, I believe that we should not unilaterally disarm and abandon the very governmental agency that allows US Manufacturers and other US Exporters to fairly compete on the world's trading stage.

I strongly urge members of Congress to support the Reauthorization of Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Respectfully Submitted,

STEVE WILBURN,
President, CEO.

JUNE 23, 2014.

Mr. STEVE WILBURN,
Chief Executive Officer, FirmGreen, Inc., Newport Beach, CA.

DEAR MR. WILBURN: In view of the uncertainty of the reauthorization of the Exim

Bank, and project finance structure you proposed had become problematic, we have made the decision in May this year not to proceed with your project offering.

Our previous partner-developer has provided us assurance of the certainty of obtaining satisfactory finance from the Export Import Bank of Korea for our Cavite Biomass-Waste-to-Energy Project.

With previous discussion with you, we had the impression that your company, FirmGreen can provide the best technology for our project, but without terms similar to what being offered by the Exim Bank of Korea, it will be impossible for our company to conclude a transaction.

If you can produce a Letter of Interest (LOI) from the Exim Bank of the United States by June 30, 2014, our company will reconsider using FirmGreen technology for the project and reconsider retaining FirmGreen as the project Technical Operator for this important project.

The roadmap to obtaining the long term project finance commitment on favorable terms is critical in our decision making process.

We hope that this all be worked out to the satisfaction of both our companies.

Very truly yours,

RUTH P. BRIONES,
President/CEO, Greenery Solutions Inc.

AUGUST 26, 2014.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER WATERS: Brek Manufacturing Company is a small business in California with 170 employees, who have a critical interest in foreign sale of Boeing Commercial Aircraft. The Export-Import Bank plays an important role as an intermediary in the sale of these aircraft. This letter is to express our support for the Ex-Im bank, as it is key to securing additional sales of Boeing Commercial Aircraft.

Our company produces approximately 40 percent of our output to Boeing Commercial Aircraft customers, with the other 60 percent representing military customers.

With the decrease of the military business available, it is critical that the commercial sales be kept as high as possible to preserve the industrial infrastructure that this company and that of other companies in our industry represent.

Our representatives who support the military must also be concerned with the Ex-Im Bank because of the role it plays in supporting jobs in companies like this one, large and small, across the country.

Although our company is not a household name like Boeing, we supply critical aircraft structural components which are key to successful, safe air transport and air defense. There are many others like us who represent thousands of high skilled and well paid positions with good benefits.

Please express our support for the Ex-Im Bank to your colleagues. We are counting on them to do the right thing and support American manufacturing jobs.

Regards,

WILLIAM A. CONRAD,
Director of Contracts.

JULY 23, 2014.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,

Ranking Member, House Financial Services Committee.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN WATERS, Hansen Engineering Company is one of many small businesses in the South Bay area of Los Angeles California that is dependent on Boeing contracts to support our business.

Hansen Engineering is a manufacturer of machined aerospace parts and assemblies with 90% of our contracts supporting Boeing aircraft either directly or indirectly through other prime aerospace companies throughout the world. My company staffs approximately 60 employees who live in the South Bay and surrounding areas and depend upon the support of Boeing for the wellbeing of their families. Without the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank it would have a big impact on the health of our business, its employees and their families.

This is a critical time for manufacturing and small businesses in America. Without the Export-Import Bank, many of Boeing's customers could decide to purchase commercial airplanes produced outside of the United States. Hansen Engineering Company is in strong support of legislation to approve the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Thank you for your support of the Export-Import Banking reauthorization initiative.

Sincerely,

GREG LAY,
Vice President,
Hansen Engineering Company.

[June 17th, 2014]

HOW EX-IM BANK HELPED SAVE MY BUSINESS
(By Gabriel Ojeda, President of Fritz-Pak Corporation)

In 1998, I began the American Dream. I had been working for another company for over 14 years when I decided it was time that I work for myself. I was managing the concrete admixtures division there, and when it came up for sale, I borrowed money from everywhere I could and purchased it. I incorporated my new business, Fritz-Pak Corporation, in the state of Texas, where we are proud to manufacture all of our products to this day.

Concrete admixtures are chemicals used in construction to make handling, placing, and creating high performance concrete easily and efficiently. The most obvious examples are retarders and accelerators. During the summer, concrete will start to set faster due to the heat, so you use a retarder to slow down the setting time. In the winter, concrete will set slower due to the cold, so you use an accelerator to speed it up. Those are just two examples, and in total, we sell about 40 different specialty products.

Back in 1998, the sales distribution was only 15% international. To be honest, I only maintained the international accounts I inherited from the original sale of the business. We were fortunate that concrete construction in the USA started to take off, so I didn't really have a need to expand internationally. I grew the business from less than \$1 million in sales to over \$3 million by 2007. However, the recession that began in '07/'08 hit the construction industry hard.

Data from the US Geological Survey shows that US cement consumption in 2007 was 117 million metric tons (MMT), falling to 99 MMT in 2008 and 72 MMT in 2009. Likewise, our sales fell from over \$3 million to under \$2 million. Concrete construction in the US was deteriorating rapidly, along with our profits, sales, and our workforce. After a particularly hard round of layoffs in 2009, we were in complete survival mode, and I was beginning to consider selling the company.

With the American construction market failing, my son came to me with the idea to start promoting our products overseas to compensate for the loss in revenue. Expanding internationally had always appealed to

us, but trying to come up with a cost efficient and safe method for selling our products in other countries during the worst recession in our lifetime seemed like a pipe dream. How can we sell \$50,000 worth of goods to customers half way around the world we've never even met? How can we increase our payment cycle from 30 days to 60 days when we are struggling just to make payroll every month?

However, after speaking with our bankers at Comerica, we were put in touch with Export-Import Bank. With the help of Ex-Im, we were able to insure our international receivables at minimal cost. With an affordable safety net, we were able to sell more volume with increased terms to compensate for international shipping. During the past 5 years, we've grown our international sales from 15 percent to over 35 percent of our business. Partners in over 30 different countries including Brazil, Russia, India, and Taiwan. Most recently, we exhibited our products at the BAUMA International Trade Fair in Munich, Germany. In addition, our products were used in the construction of the Sochi Winter Olympics in Russia.

So what is Fritz-Pak Corporation today? We're an American manufacturer of the best concrete admixtures in the world, and we sell them as far north as Yellowknife, Canada and as far south as Wellington, New Zealand. We may be small, but we think big. In an age where everything seems to be made some place else, we're thriving here in the USA. And it is in no small part due to the services provided by Ex-Im Bank.

BOYLE ENERGY SERVICES &
TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Manchester, NH, July 22, 2014.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MRS. WATERS, Ma'am, BES&T needs every effort you and your team can expend to help with the Re-Authorization of the Export Import Bank of the United States.

You see we are at a great moment in time. Our company, through our exporting, has invented a technology and been awarded US Patents for that technology which dramatically reduces the cost of commissioning energy facilities being built anywhere in the world. In fact we have recently been awarded an Innovation in Energy Award by the Coalition for Global Leadership for this technology. We are about to break through from being a small business to a midsize company working globally. Our revenues are going up dramatically by our ability to export our unique services, engineering and field equipment that helps our clients save millions of dollars.

I have a small line of credit from the Bank of America. I would not be able to support bid bonds and other financial work on the project without EXIM support. At present BOA does not have a means of securing the collateral against our credit while it is in foreign countries, nor does it support financing foreign receivables without EXIM. It is my experience that most US domestic banks behave the same way. While it might be possible to search for a new bank we do not have the resources, time, nor network to re-qualify a bank with what we do. It would be disastrous to us. BOA has taken 10 years to understand our business.

Since undertaking our R&D program in 2003-2008 we have gone from 4 million in revenue in 2003 to nearly 30 million now. We have gone from 10 employees to nearly 50. But ma'am these are not minimum wage jobs. We pay the top salaries in the world for

what our people do. We pay 100 percent blue cross blue shield health insurance, 401K, life insurance etc. I have high school graduates who are considered by the energy industry as the best people in the world at what they do making more than \$150,000 per year. BES&T is poised to triple in size again. Additionally we gave over \$150,000 to charity this year in celebration of our 20th anniversary as a company. We feel it is our civic duty to help those in need as we excel around the world.

We represent what America does best. We innovate through entrepreneurialism. We take that innovation and we run with it all over the world and here in the US. We hire our friends and neighbors who buy homes and cars and send their kids to college. We promote good will in the countries we work and make friends around the world.

I grew up on welfare in Massachusetts, needed school lunches to get through the day and chose to go into the Navy as an enlisted Boiler Technician for 6 years. At every turn I have leveraged the support of the United States and the states in which I lived to create a positive American life for me and for others. Our business is a direct result of the training I got during my enlistment. Now we rely on the EXIM bank for help while we push forward once more. I feel an incredible sense of pride and patriotism that the Export Import Bank of the United States stands with me and my employees. It's one of the great tools for small business in the country.

Several years ago I had the privilege to meet Chairman Hochberg at an outreach meeting hosted by Senator Shaheen of New Hampshire. Since then I have been invited by the Chairman to voice my opinion to him and the board of directors on a wide variety of subjects relating to the banks support of small business. What I can tell you is this, from the top office of the Chairman to the people who work for the bank, EXIM bank is committed to working and improving services for small businesses. I have been witness to countless improvements on behalf of small companies and the Chairman listens to the small business community and so does the board. They are committed to working with us, and it shows.

Mrs. Waters if there were a better, or cheaper way we would have done it. Small businesses always look for that edge. Right now our work with EXIM is highly valuable to our global growth. We work in 17 countries tonight. American women, men and equipment. We rely on EXIM for credit insurance and for our line of credit with BOA. We have never defaulted nor had a claim. We pay heavy fees and costs for this privilege. EXIM is a partner for us in our success.

I would ask you to convince the Chairman that this platform will hurt us, badly. I buy millions of dollars of equipment year on year to help with our exporting. We buy from vendors in Texas, and Tennessee, and California. All of these people would be hurt as well.

This is not a fight we should be undertaking at this time in our recovery. BES&T will continue to add jobs, and pay our taxes on the profits we incur. We will take care of our people and our neighbors. We will honor your trust and support.

If I may be of any assistance to either you or Chairman Hensarling in this matter please call upon me at once.

Please re-authorize the EXIM bank its good for America, and BES&T.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL P. BOYLE,
President/CEO.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the Export-

Import Bank because helping Arizona businesses expand their manufacturing capacity and exporting ability creates jobs and grows our economy.

The Export-Import Bank fills gaps in private financing, stepping up where the private sector can't or won't.

Last year, Export-Import Bank Chairman Fred Hochberg visited my district to help small and growing businesses increase their global exports right from our own backyard. From Fiscal Year 2007 to Fiscal Year 2014 the agency supported \$176 million in exports from AZ-09 companies.

One of those companies, MarTek Inc. of Tempe, Arizona, was reluctant to sell their semiconductor equipment to customers in Asia. They were concerned that once the equipment left their building, there was no guarantee they would get paid.

Because of the large price associated with the equipment, their customers were unwilling to pay for the equipment in advance with the same fears that the equipment would not ship or be a quality product.

The Export-Import Bank offered MarTek a solution. The bank issued an insurance policy so MarTek could make sales and have some guarantee they would be paid. Thanks to the Export-Import Bank MarTek now exports to companies in Asia, Europe and the Americas.

Another business in my district that benefits from the Export-Import Bank is Ulthera, Inc. of Mesa, Arizona, which manufactures medical devices. Thanks to the Export-Import Bank Ulthera was able to access additional debt financing at a critical point in their business. It's now one of the fastest growing companies in Arizona with sales in over 30 countries outside the U.S.

As we all know, the Export-Import Bank's current charter is set to expire at the end of September. A lapse in authorization would threaten the competitiveness of these and many other Arizona businesses. I am a co-sponsor of legislation to extend the Export-Import Bank's authorization and will continue to work to reauthorize this important investment in American jobs.

THE IMPACT OF A POROUS BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, one of my reasons for coming and taking some of this time this evening was around a frustration I have had, and I think this may be for a lot of us who are from a border State, who have been watching both the press and a lot of our brothers and sisters around this place speechify about immigration, about the border crisis, and what is happening. If you are actually from Arizona, this isn't a new issue for us. We have been bathing and living this for decades now.

I had that moment this last week, Mr. Speaker, where I realized maybe the awareness in this body is starting

to change to understand the impact of a porous border and what it means to communities.

When I had one of my friends here from the Midwest come up to me and ask me a number of questions because he had held a townhall—and it was the first time he had had to face barrages of questions about immigration, about the unaccompanied minors, about the populations coming across the border, what were the potential threats, the disease, the drugs—then I realized maybe I have partially had a misunderstanding because, when I go home, the border is one of the key questions we talk about because of the effects it has had on my home State, in regards to education, incarceration, health care, and the amount of the burden that my citizens in Arizona, my taxpayers, have had to take on that ultimately were the responsibility of this Federal Government.

I wanted to go through just a handful things, a couple of numbers that we have found, talk about some of the mechanics that may be coming at us tomorrow. I know many of us are going to have some different views on legislation, where it takes us, but I want to get some of the record straight here.

Do you remember, over the last 3, 4 years, particularly before the 2012 Presidential race, we kept hearing how secure the border was? I remember my former Governor, Janet Napolitano, giving a speech telling us that the border is more secure today than ever before.

Do you remember the rhetoric that the President was bathing in, in early 2012, allowing himself to be called the “deporter in chief”?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we later found out—and we found out sort of when many of the Democrat base activists started believing it and started protesting the President, saying: How can our Democratic President be the deporter in chief?

All of a sudden, the truth came out, and we found out that the Obama administration had manipulated the way they calculate the numbers.

The previous administration, if you were a Mexican national—and this is for the southern border—if you had been arrested within a couple miles of the border, you were captured, taken back, and released back over the border, then that did not count in the deportation numbers. This President very conveniently apparently allowed them to redefine the math.

There becomes one of our great frustrations. We have debates here on this floor, and we realized how manipulated so much of the math is, some of the underlying statistics that we will come down here and quote, and we are holding the data, and we realize that we have we got conned. We got played.

Mr. Speaker, if you are going to build public policy, and I don't care if you

are on the left or the right, you have to have an administration that is willing to play the data straight. If you are going to make public policy on public data, give us honest data.

That becomes one of our great frustrations, Mr. Speaker, because I will even have my hometown newspaper quote numbers that we found out months ago weren't correct, were manipulated. They redefined the math. So just keep that in mind.

Just something that came across my desk just before I was walking over here, one of my county sheriffs—and you have to understand, in Arizona, we have only 15 counties—our counties are big, but Arizona is a small State relative to the rest of the country.

We are also the most urbanized State in the country, something that most people don't understand. Most of our population lives in Maricopa County and then the Tucson area.

So think, Arizona is the most urbanized State because the Federal Government controls the vast majority of our land. It is also why you have these incredible opportunities of a porous border because you have distances where there is no civilization.

Our Pinal County sheriff was on the radio, apparently, today and had a quote that we have had 123,000 illegals arrested in the Tucson sector. I am assuming that is over this last calendar year.

I haven't been able to get a response on that one, but think about that. Right now, so much of the national attention is the discussion of what is happening along the Rio Grande, in Texas. Don't forget Arizona. Don't forget what is going on in our State for so many years.

I had an economics professor years ago, that we had actually had this discussion of if you were ever to try to truly understand the math and how porous a border is, how would you build an economic model to truly understand it?

He had this brilliant idea, and it still rings in the back of my head because, multiple times, we have had this discussion of if we were going to build a border enforcement bill before allowing anything else to move in this body, do you have the border State Governors be the ones to declare the border secure?

Well, do you really want to put that type of political pressure on my Governor in Arizona, the Governor of New Mexico, small States where, let's face it, some of the activist groups with their budgets could manipulate our Governor's races, our elections? So what would be an honest economic method?

My old professor had this one thing: look at the price of drugs on the street, look at the price of certain types of labor; but he liked the drug calculation because if illegal drugs that are being

sourced in other parts of the world and the price stays stable or is actually going down on the streets across the country, particularly in communities like Phoenix, which is often a distribution center, you actually have an economic model to understand if the border is truly secure.

Mr. Speaker, in conversations I have had with some law enforcement over the last year, apparently, a lot of the illegal drug prices on the streets in my community are stable or going down; but, yet, I had a President who is willing to stand behind microphones—I had the head of Homeland Security willing to stand behind microphones and declare the border more secure than ever, but the underlying fact is, now, we know we weren't being told the truth.

On occasion, we will go home, and we will hold townhall meetings and discussion groups in the chambers, and some of the activist groups will come and sit down with us and say: Why won't you do this? Why won't you do that? Why won't you accept the Gang of Eight bill? Why won't you do this?

You turn and say: How would you hand that type of policy, that type of legislation to this administration? Do you really trust them? Do you really trust the Obama administration to keep its word? Do you really trust the Obama administration not to play games with the math? Because we already have multiple occasions here where I can demonstrate to you the math has been played you with.

So then I wanted to chase after something else that we came across. How many speeches here, how many discussions, how many press conferences, how many talking heads on evening cable have we seen over the last month saying, oh, the unaccompanied minor issue, well, was a surprise to all of us, we never expected this, if we had just known—which is an amazing thing because I have a few documents here, and they are budget documents, and we all know what goes into starting to model and build budgets.

□ 2115

Here is one. It is a newsletter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and it was talking about some of the Catholic services. They do wonderful work. They do it at some great prices. But this was a newsletter from last November, so November 2013. On that one, the Department of Homeland Security estimates more than 60,000 unaccompanied minors could enter the United States in 2014. It was out there in writing.

Then we came across some other things that we found very interesting. Here is actually from 4-13, so over a year ago, a number of budget line items for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services in regards to unaccompanied minors. The original 2014 budget request they had been

working on earlier was going to be \$494 million, and somehow on 4-13, so well over a year ago, they knew something was wrong and they added another \$373 million to that budget line item. Yet earlier today, I watched a Member of the other side get behind a microphone and tell me how surprised they were.

So let me pull what we voted for last January. Unaccompanied alien children, line item, and this was woven into the continuing resolution we did last January, so you know the numbers were worked up months before that. We went from the 2013 estimate, \$376 million, to \$868 million. That is what we pushed out of here in January.

So back to that whole trust conversation, as we put forward policy in dealing with our crisis on our border, don't forget States like Arizona that have had to take this on for years and had to carry the burden of the cost as those here in the Federal Government, here in this bubble that is Washington, D.C., looked at a small State like Arizona and said: Stop making so much noise; you are bothering us. Stop telling us one thing in your speeches, but we can find documents that show your staff knew something very different.

Tomorrow we will have a piece of legislation to step up and deal with parts of the border crisis. It is not a half a loaf. It is not a quarter of a loaf. It is not an eighth of a loaf. It is sort of the heel of the loaf. But for those of us in Arizona, I believe it does a handful of things that we have been demanding.

I have a piece of legislation to put 10,000 National Guard troops on the border, and I had a little fun with a couple of Members who have been here for a long time. I had one Member who has been here for a long time, and she was just outraged that we would want to put that many troops on the border. So I said: But you supported this in 2006 and 2008 when we had Operation Jump Start, and I think at that time we put 7,000 National Guard troops on the border as auxiliary services to the Border Patrol.

So think of that, 2006 to 2008, who controlled this body? It was the Democrats. We had a Republican President, and NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker here. And it is fascinating, now we are a few years later, that formula has flipped. We are proposing it, and the very people who supported it a few years ago now are just appalled. The duplicity around this place sometimes is stunning.

One of the things that I support that will be voted on tomorrow, it is not just putting National Guard troops, if our Governor so will; there will be money behind it, the ability to pay for it. One more time asking States like Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, that if you are going to step up and take these responsibilities that belong to the Federal Government, you need to cover our costs. I don't think it is enough

money that is in the bill, but remember, this is short term. What is going to run tomorrow is actually only between now and the end of the fiscal year, which is the end of September.

Updating the 2008 language, we have heard a lot of discussion about this. The reality of it is we have a White House, Department of Homeland Security, I believe, that has already been manipulating the actual language. If you sit down and read it, it had to do with those who were being exploited and being brought across the border, trafficked. This is a little different mechanically than someone who goes out and hires a coyote or a family who takes their children and hires the services.

But nevertheless, we have been told over and over, if we don't update the 2008 law, our hands are tied by so many of our law enforcement on the border. So we are going to do that.

There are a couple of other mechanisms here, but I want to make it perfectly clear for many of us—and hopefully I am speaking for many of my supporters and friends and family and my State—this isn't enough. It may be just the beginning.

I do hope we get the chance to discuss the one issue here that continues to be a bit of friction. The President's deferred action, many of our friends on the left keep trying to tell us that that had nothing to do with what we are seeing at the border, but as we have already just walked through the documents, once the deferred action, referred to as DACA, had gone into effect, they knew the numbers were coming. They were calculating. We now have some charts that much of this crisis was being watched for months. It finally just became overwhelming.

Illegal immigration—and legal immigration—work on incentives and disincentives. We have created incentives. This President has created incentives to break our laws, and until we step up with a number of policies that change those incentives, I believe we are partially chasing our tail here. We will do some good things. We need to step up the quality of our law enforcement and our border enforcement, but we also need an administration that we can trust, an administration that will tell us the truth, and an administration that will actually follow our laws.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be recognized to address you here on the United

States floor of the House of Representatives in this most deliberative body that we have and are. I appreciate the comments and the position taken by the gentleman from Arizona ahead of me. He is one who has lived along the border for a lifetime. He deals with the issue every day, every week. He is one of the individuals that I look to to inform me, but also I have taken a real interest in it myself.

Even though I am from the heart of the heartland, from Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I have a great appreciation for the Constitution and the rule of law. Because of that, I have watched as the lawlessness has grown along our border.

I will say that certainly in all of the time that I have been in this Congress and in the years building up to it, and less so in the years prior to that, and I take myself back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986 due to the counsel that he had around him, I believed at the time that he would veto that bill because of his reverence for the rule of law would overcome all of the counsel that came from the House and the Senate and the people around him. Well, Reagan relented and signed the bill on the promise that we would legalize roughly a million people in exchange for the enforcement of the law thereafter and that there would never be another amnesty again so long as this country would live.

The 1 million became 3 million, and the amnesties that were added to that in smaller proportions added up to at least 6, perhaps 7, in addition to the 1986 amnesty. And here we are today, having fought off this amnesty these years for more than a decade that I have been directly involved in the immigration policy, and we are on the cusp of it again.

The President of the United States stood up there in front of you where you are, Mr. Speaker, and he gave his State of the Union address here on the floor of the House of Representatives and essentially, and figuratively, he waved his ink pen at us and he said: Congress, you do what I tell you on immigration. I want comprehensive immigration reform. I want you to pass the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty act.

Now I am speaking figuratively, of course, because that is not a direct quote of the President, but it is certainly the message that the President delivered: Do what I tell you to do, or I will use my, in one other setting, his cell phone, or his ink pen, to act in a unilateral—he didn't say it, but he knows it—unconstitutional fashion.

I can think of another night during the State of the Union address when our President came here and he spoke right in front of you, Mr. Speaker, and he pointed down here to the Supreme Court and he lectured the Supreme Court on what they should do, as if somehow he were article III, somehow he was the man who commanded the

Supreme Court of the United States. And the camera was looking over at the Justices as the President lectured them on the Constitution and the rule of law as if the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court needed to get a lesson from an adjunct professor of the University of Chicago School of Law who taught Constitution law for 10 years in Chicago. He should go to school with every one of those Justices, Mr. Speaker.

And one of them, the television cameras repeated it over and over again until they read the lips, and they interpreted his lips to say "not true, not true." That seat that that camera was focused on has been empty ever since. It has been empty ever since because that Justice, and I suspect a number of other Justices, decided I am not going to listen to that again. I am not going to listen to a President that is out of bounds, a President who believes somehow he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can lecture to the judicial branch of government, that he can stand here at this rostrum as a guest of the House of Representatives and wave his ink pen or finger at us and announce that we shall do in this Congress what he commands or he will do so in a unconstitutional fashion. Essentially, what did the President say? So sue me. The President says: I am going to do what I am going to do. I know it is lawless, it is unconstitutional, so sue me.

So today we passed here on the floor of the House of Representatives a resolution that declares that the House of Representatives has standing to go before the court to command the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

We have had multiple hearings before the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives. We have had excellent constitutional scholars come forward. There hasn't been one who can carry water for the President's position and hold his own under the scrutiny of the constitutional lawyers and other scholars that we have on the Judiciary Committee who take them apart one by one, argument by argument, piece by piece. And yet the President of the United States persists in asserting that he can be article I, the legislative branch of government, the United States Congress, and he can be article III, the judicial branch of government, and the sole commander of the executive branch, article II.

He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He leads from behind. He stepped back and followed the French into Libya, and he waited for the British to go before the House of Commons and vote down David Cameron's initiative to go into Syria, and then the President of the United States, following—and leading from behind—is the very definition of following—the President of the United

States then offers to Congress, through trial balloons through the press, that he would like to have Congress endorse military action in Syria.

Where is our leader? Where is our Commander in Chief? Well, he is off in the never, never land of advancing administrative amnesty, calling together his smartest, leftist lawyers that he can find, Mr. Speaker, and saying to them: Put your think tanks together. You guys go grab the best brains you can find, attached to the leftist brains you are, and see if you can come up with a strategic plan that I can grant some administrative amnesty to the maximum number of people because, Lord knows, there aren't enough undocumented Democrats in America. We need more of them. We need an endless supply and endless stream of them. And where do they come from? Well, they come across our southern border primarily, although they come in other ways.

□ 2130

And Democrats in here, when the President says to Congress: Thou shall pass the bills that I tell you to pass or I am going to use my pen to unconstitutionally—that is in parentheses, Mr. Speaker—enact executive edicts that will do what I want done, regardless of whether it has the support and the will of the people or not—we are the support and the will of the people—when the President said that he is going to enact those immigration unconstitutional executive edicts, when the President uttered that, I saw a little less than half of this Chamber rise in a spontaneous standing ovation, enthusiasm for the President's statement.

It reminds me of the one Democrat who said: I am marching for abortion rights because my mother didn't have that opportunity. Who would say that? If your mother didn't have the opportunity to have an abortion, but you want to march so that you wish she would have, that means you wish you had never been born. And this Congress with less than half of it, a bunch of Democrats over here, cheered the President when he said: I am going to usurp your article I legislative authority, and I am going to write legislative law with my pen the way I see fit. And they cheered.

These are the same people that stood here on the floor of the House a year ago last January and took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States so help them God. And they say: Well, we were glad when the President decides he is going to roll over Congress, roll over the House, roll over the Senate, roll over the judicial branch by intimidating them into, some say, a decision on ObamaCare that would not conform with the constitutional directives that they have.

We are in a mess, Mr. Speaker. We are in a mess, and we have the Presi-

dent of the United States poised during August, when this Congress has every year been out of session because our Founding Fathers and our early, early leaders recognized that Washington, D.C., gets to be a hot and humid place in the month of August, and you need a little break to get out of the circle of the Beltway that causes Potomac fever to go back to your districts so you can look real people in the eye and hear from them. That has been the tradition of this country.

Some people complain that Members of Congress actually go home. I would say on the other way around, if we didn't go home we would hear a lot of complaints. It is important that we go back to our districts and go out and hear from the people that we have the honor and privilege to represent, and we will do that, maybe as early as tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

But the President is poised to follow through on his threat to issue the edict, not a lawful act, not a lawful executive order, an edict, that he would give a lawful status to 5 or 6 million illegal aliens, many of them, maybe most of them, probably not all of them, criminal aliens.

He has issued orders to the Department of Justice to examine how they can get an early release for people who are in our prisons who have been sentenced. That is hundreds of thousands, as many as 400,000 felons that the President would release on the streets of America. He has released criminals to the tune of 36,000-plus out onto the streets. That is in one category. There is another category of tens of thousands more.

And he has opened up our borders by signing the documents and the Morton Memos—not physically signed, he had his subordinates do that—and the Morton Memos say we are not going to enforce a law against people who didn't commit a felony or aren't guilty of these three mysterious misdemeanors. And they said that if you came into the United States illegally, theoretically through no fault of your own, if you did so before your 18th birthday and you did so before December 31 of 2011, then you get to stay for the duration of this permit that he manufactures lawlessly out of thin air.

And then he manufactures a work permit so that these people can compete for jobs against naturalized and natural born American citizens and green card holders, who likely did it the legal way.

Because he gets a political kick out of this, a political bonus out of this, because he is bringing in undocumented Democrats, and they have a plan to document them so they can vote, we have a situation here where the constitutional underpinnings of America are in crisis mode. The employment in America is at great risk and under great threat, and the security of our border is very weak.

I went down, Mr. Speaker, last weekend, down to the southern tip of Texas, down to the mouth of the Rio Grande, planted a flag right there at the southern tip where the waters of the Rio Grande flow out into the sea, and then followed the river to Brownsville and went through the ports of entry at Brownsville, other facilities in Brownsville, on up into McAllen and to the ports of entry there, to the border patrol centers there, to a resettlement center there, and on up all the way to Laredo.

And from what I saw and what I heard, from our Border Patrol, from our Customs and Border Protection, from the Department of Public Safety in Texas, and others, they are good people, a lot of them with uniforms on, that are doing a good job, doing the best they can with what they have to work with.

We have a lawless order from the President, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, which is more accurately DACA, Deferred Action for Criminal Aliens. DACA has become the magnet that the coyotes have used to advertise throughout the Central American countries, in particular, El Salvador, Honduras, and also Guatemala. People that are already in the United States oftentimes will save up money, maybe borrow money, and send it down to Central America to the tune of, the lowest number that I pick up is \$4,000 a head, on up to 5, 6, 7, 8, maybe even \$9,000, for the coyotes to transport an illegal alien into the United States.

They are coming into America in the southern tip of Texas and the Rio Grande Valley sector of the border in numbers that work out this way. The unaccompanied alien children, UACs as they are known, and referred to sometimes as "unaccompanied alien juveniles," number this way: this fiscal year, from October 1 to June 15, 57,000 UACs, unaccompanied alien children—57,000. That number has surely grown to over 60,000, probably over 70,000, predicted to go to 90,000 for this fiscal year.

The peak of this thing seems to have passed behind us. We are either in a temporary lull, or we have seen the peak behind us. But, in any case, when we think of numbers in the area of 60,000 unaccompanied alien children coming into the United States, that is only 20 percent of the overall population coming in. So we are at 300,000 or more. But of those roughly 60,000—the number that we surpassed—here is how they break down: 80 percent male, 20 percent female.

The 80 percent male and the 20 percent female also need to take into account that these are not kids that range from age 1 day to 1 day before their 18th birthday, Mr. Speaker. These are unaccompanied alien children that have a demographic breakdown that works like this: 80 percent male, 83 percent that are either the ages of 15, 16,

or 17. Once they are 18, they are no longer qualified as UACs—83 percent.

So I do the simple math, Mr. Speaker, and I say: 0.8, 80 percent, times 0.83, 83 percent, 15, 16, or 17 years old—that means that 66.4 percent of these unaccompanied alien “children” are young men ages 15, 16, and 17 years old. They come from the most violent countries in the world. The six most violent countries in the world are south of Mexico. It is not Mexico, it is south of Mexico, Mr. Speaker. Eight of the 10 most violent countries in the world are also south of Mexico.

It is a fact, according to the United Nation’s data, that of the most violent countries in the world, only Honduras is more violent than the city of Detroit. Yet, there are those in this Congress that are convinced, because the Central American countries have a high degree of violence, that the people are leaving those countries because of the violence, and they are scared and they are running off. Well, if that is so, then one would think they would be running out of Detroit at a pace similar to the pace they are running out of Guatemala and El Salvador and other violent countries down there—probably run a little faster out of Honduras than they are out of the other countries, than they are maybe out of Detroit.

But as I said in a Judiciary Committee hearing, in response to the witness’ testimony that was there, I said: If we are going to bring these kids to the United States because they are afraid where they are, we had better not take them to Detroit because they will be in more danger there, unless they came from Honduras. Those are the facts, and those are the data. Yes, they come from violent countries, and they come from countries that are controlled to a high degree by drug cartels.

But here is what is happening. The families that are sending people here usually have one or more members in the United States now. They may have left their kids back in their home country in Honduras. They will send money down there, they might borrow money. Then usually locally they will hire a coyote that is going to smuggle them up into the United States.

Then the family most often, not 100 percent of the time, but most often, whoever is in custody of this young girl that might be 12 or 13 or 14, or on up to 17 or older, they go down to the local pharmacy, where a prescription is not required, and they buy a monthly supply of contraceptives, birth control pills, and they take it back and they start giving those birth control pills to that girl, and then send her across 2,000 to 2,500 miles of dangerous Central America and Mexico to get on the train of death—it is called “The Beast,” and ride that train up as near the Rio Grande as possible. Then that child has to get off of there and make their way

to the Rio Grande River, then pay a coyote to get a ride across the river, and then submit themselves to the U.S. authorities.

We went to center after center, we talked to people after people that had been working with these unaccompanied alien children, and we asked them how many of them are sexually assaulted, how many of them are raped? And the answers came back a guess, but a range, a range between 30 percent and 70 percent.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker. Think of having a daughter and living in El Salvador and deciding, I want to send her to her mother in the United States or her aunt in the United States, or being an aunt in El Salvador and you want to send your niece to her mother in the United States. You get a wire that sends you down \$5,000 or \$6,000, and you go out into the neighborhood and you solicit a coyote, and then you say, I want to send this niece or my daughter up to America, but why don’t you wait a few days because I have got to go down and buy some birth control pills and make sure she is ready for the trip, because I am pretty confident she is going to be raped along the way.

That is what is going on, Mr. Speaker. It is not going on now and then; it is going on from a third to 70 percent of the time for the girls, and they told us that the numbers of boys were equivalent to the numbers of girls who were sexually assaulted. That was a question that was repeated over and over again.

So this President has done real damage and destruction to the rule of law. The result of that is America is flooded with illiterate, unskilled people into the job categories where we have the highest available employment, the highest ratios of unemployment. The double-digit unemployment exists in the lowest-skilled jobs. There is no metric out there that suggests that we should be bringing more unskilled people in, more people who are illiterate in their own language into America, thinking somehow that that is work that Americans won’t do.

Nuts. There is no work that Americans won’t do. There has been no work that I won’t do. I have done some of the toughest, nastiest, most difficult, and some of the dangerous jobs that the country has to offer, and I haven’t come close to doing the jobs that the United States Marine Corps does on a regular basis.

What is the most dangerous job that we ask an American to do? How about rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah? How about taking on radical al Qaeda extremists in places like Afghanistan?

When the Marine Corps goes into Fallujah for the first or second battle, and we have seen what has happened since then, what do they get paid to put their lives on the line? If you figure

it at 40 hours a week, something like \$8.49 an hour, Mr. Speaker. That is back then when I calculated it, when we had operations going on then. If you can pay a United States marine \$8.49 an hour to lock and load and go into a place like Fallujah, you can’t convince me that there is work that Americans won’t do, especially if it pays an appropriate wage and we respect the work that gets done.

So we have a President who has decided he is going to defy the rule of law, and he is going to manufacture law as he goes and create work permits out of thin air.

□ 2145

When we see this calamity of the huge hole in our southern border, primarily at McAllen, Texas, the House of Representatives decides it wants to overreact to the President of the United States, and since they are afraid that they will somehow get the blame if nothing gets done in the month of August, they decided to bring a piece of legislation here to the floor.

This piece of legislation was written by a staff person that was once that of JOHN MCCAIN, and we know what he has brought for immigration policy. It has been very troubling to me to deal with the legislation that he has supported, but I have this in my hand here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

It doesn’t do what it is advertised to do. It doesn’t do what needs to be done, but it grants this. If there is an unaccompanied alien child, here are the consequences for failure to appear to a hearing:

Any alien who fails to appear at a proceeding required under this section, shall be ordered removed in absentia if the government establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien was at fault for their absence from the proceedings.

No evidence can be admitted into that proceeding after the fact, and it can’t be admitted if they don’t anticipate that there is not going to be an appearance of the alien, so that means the government has to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it was the alien’s fault they didn’t show up.

The only way I know that you can do that is if you have a video camera on them, and they are sitting on the couch, Mr. Speaker. This is a wide open hole that grants a pass under that provision. Then it says:

In General—at the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be admissible to the United States.

They get a new hearing under a new section created, which is 235, and if the preponderance of the evidence indicates that they might receive asylum and if they think they are likely to receive asylum in a separate category, then 50 percent plus 1 is preponderance—likely is 50 percent plus 1. Fifty percent of 50 percent is 25 percent, plus

one, are the odds that they need to claim in order to receive a hearing for asylum.

So if you have got a one in four shot at it, Mr. Speaker, you are going to get a hearing for asylum. Then you are going to get an asylum hearing, and then if you are turned down at the asylum hearing, you get to go to a removal hearing. That is three bites at the apple. They are all renewable; times two, that is six different bites at the apple.

No such thing exists for Mexican unaccompanied alien children. The determination is made under the Wilberforce law of 2008 by the Border Patrol whether or not they go back to Mexico.

They purport that this bill treats the other than Mexican unaccompanied alien children the same as the existing law treats unaccompanied alien Mexican children. Mr. Speaker, if it does, there is language in here that then diminishes our ability to send the Mexican kids back. That is what we have. We have a bill that has been whipped to be something that it is not.

I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee tonight. There was a long discussion and debate over it, Mr. Speaker, but here is what we have: my amendment said that we have got to fix the 2008 William Wilberforce language.

By the way, no Republican voted for that, not one. It was introduced on December 9, 2008. It was taken up by a unanimous consent request after everybody left town on December 10, 2008. It was passed by voice in the House, sent to the Senate. The Senate caught the lateral and passed it by voice to the President.

We didn't see that bill. It became a component of what they have utilized as an open door; coupling the 2008 bill with an expansive reading of the asylum language and the President's DACA language is what is bringing these tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien minors here, which are only 20 percent of the overall group that are coming.

There are also family units—usually, mothers with a child or children. There are individual males coming in, in significant numbers. I have said that we have imported at least 40,000 15-year-old, 16-year-old, and 17-year-old boys—prime gang recruitment age—and that doesn't give you the data on those that are 18, 19, 20, 25 to 31; and those are just the ones that are covered under DACA.

I offered an amendment that would have cut off all funding to DACA. It mirrors the Cruz-Blackburn language. It is good language, and it should be part of this bill. It is not, by the information I have, Mr. Speaker.

There is a 2008 fix that I wrote over a month ago that needs to be part of this bill. It is not, by the report I am getting from the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that there was

even a vote on it up in the Rules Committee.

There is asylum language that has been offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, that fixes some of the expansive utilization of asylum that is allowing for people to be distributed all over the United States at taxpayers' expense. That is not part of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have a deliberative process in this Congress because they are not going to allow a legitimate vote, and the language that is out here is bad.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on this bill that has come before us, and I am going to have to consider what I do on the rule, but if this House sends a message to support cutting off all funding to enforce or implement DACA, that will be constructive because it will say to the President: these are the Republicans that have at least a chance of standing up against you if you decide that you are going to function in a lawless, unconstitutional manner in the month of August—or any other month—with regard to this granting any expansion of the lawlessness that we have seen today.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2338

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 11 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-567) on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit

certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2577. An act to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to \$5,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of Naftali Fraenkel, a dual United States-Israeli citizen, that began on June 12, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4028. An act to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6678. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Change in Size and Grade Requirements for Grapefruit [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0015; FV14-906-2 FIR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6679. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of

Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base [Doc. No. AMS-FV-13-0088; FV14-985-2 FR] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6680. A letter from the Supervisory Financial Program Specialist, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Government participation in the Automated Clearing House (RIN: 1530-AA05) received July 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6681. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Products, User Fees, Requirements for the Submission of Data Needed to Calculate User Fees for Domestic Manufacturers and Importers of Tobacco Products [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-0920] (RIN: 0910-AG81) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments to Compliance Certification Content Requirements for State and Federal Operating Permits Programs [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0162; FRL-9913-88-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ71) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6683. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Nitrogen Oxides Exemption Request [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0895; A-1-FRL-9913-56-OAR] received July 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Nitrogen Compounds [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0400; FRL-9914-44-Region 6] received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: The 2014 and 2015 Critical Use Exemption From the Phaseout of Methyl Bromide [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0065; FRL-9911-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR80) received July 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6686. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0046; FRL-9913-15-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6687. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indi-

ana; Solvent Degreasing Operations Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0214; FRL-9914-24-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Bellefontaine Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0791; FRL-9914-22-Region 5] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Locally Enforced Motor Vehicle Idling Limitations [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0890; FRL-9914-31-Region 6] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions, Clark County Department of Air Quality [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0495; FRL-9914-17-Region 9] received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6691. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Moran, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-102] [RM-11696] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6692. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Closed Captioning of Internet Protocol-Delivered Video Programming: Implementation of the Twenty-First Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 [MB Docket No.: 11-154] received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6693. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6694. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 25 [Docket No.: 140305202-4478-02] (RIN: 0648-BE07) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6695. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #9 [Docket No.: 140107014-4014-01] (RIN: 0648-XD329) received July 21, 2014,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6696. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Nanticoke River; Bivalve, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0138] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6697. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Notice of Arrival Exception [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0797] (RIN: 1625-AC12) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6698. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0005] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6699. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tennessee River, Miles 255.0 to 256.5, Florence, AL [USCG-2013-0753] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6700. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; United States and Canadian Military Exercise Jump Training, Lake Erie, Hamburg, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0260] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6701. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Meridian Health Fireworks, Navesink River, Rumson, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0353] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6702. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Incorporation by Reference; North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria; Hazardous Materials Safety Permits [Docket No.: FMCSA-2014-0135] (RIN: 2126-AB73) received July 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6703. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-5304C; Camp Lejeune, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0272; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6704. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Elkin, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0046; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-1] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6705. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Foreign tax credit guidance under section 901(m)

received July 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6706. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rules Regarding the Health Insurance Premium Tax Credit [TD 9683] (RIN: 1545-BM23) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 696. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-567). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 5255. A bill to enhance the procurement of information technology by establishing a United States Digital Government Office and United States Chief Information Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. JENKINS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5256. A bill to encourage compensation transparency; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction relating to the compensation of the lesser earning spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to index the dependent care credit and income exclusion for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5259. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5260. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent disability fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5261. A bill to establish a North and Central American and Caribbean border security cooperation initiative, enhance the security of Mexico's southern border, improve United States short term detention standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 5262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5263. A bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, Education and the Workforce, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the work opportunity credit permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HOLDING):

H.R. 5265. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Hamlet, North Carolina, as the "Edward 'Ed' James O'Neal Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5266. A bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 5267. A bill to protect the pets of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 5268. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to prohibit the assembly or manufacture of secure credentials or their component parts by the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 5269. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase transparency and reporting on campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5270. A bill to promote the transportation of liquefied natural gas from the United States on United States flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5271. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5272. A bill to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 5273. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of veterans to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 5274. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow voluntary agreements for Social Security and Medicare coverage of employees of Guam and American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5275. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the amount of loan forgiveness for which teachers in teacher shortage areas are eligible; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 5276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat bicycle sharing systems as mass transit facilities for purposes of the qualified transportation fringe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5277. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of

higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 5278. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on sugar-sweetened beverages, to dedicate the revenues from such tax to the prevention, treatment, and research of diet-related health conditions in priority populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIREN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5280. A bill to strengthen the current protections available under the National Labor Relations Act by providing a private right of action for certain violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for individuals under age 18, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5282. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Medgar Wiley Evers, in recognition of his contributions and ultimate sacrifice in the fight for racial equality in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5283. A bill to establish national goals for the reduction and recycling of municipal solid waste, to address the growing problem of marine debris, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations to attain those goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the work opportunity tax credit and to allow the transfer of such credit in the case of contracted veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MULVANEY,

Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LONG, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 5285. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5286. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a more equitable geographic allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 5287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5288. A bill to establish a National Care Corps through which qualified volunteers provide care, companionship, and other services to seniors and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5289. A bill to establish the Indian River Lagoon Nutrient Removal Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5290. A bill to establish a Military Community Infrastructure Program to provide grants for transportation infrastructure improvements in military communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5291. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to goods exported for processing abroad and reimported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5292. A bill to provide public safety officer disability benefits to officers disabled before the enactment of the Federal public safety officer disability benefits law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 5293. A bill to address non-compliance by the Russian Federation of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs.

CHRISTENSEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5294. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5295. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5296. A bill to require a demonstration program on the accession as Air Force officers of candidates with auditory impairments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5297. A bill to improve transparency in charity regulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 5299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an enhanced credit for the rehabilitation of buildings located in low-income communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5300. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to primarily consider, and to separately report, the domestic benefits of any rule that addresses emissions of carbon dioxide from any existing source or new source that is an electric utility generating unit, in any such rule, and in the regulatory impact analysis for such rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5301. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 695. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding steps that Congress should take to restore democracy and change the way we do politics in the United States by reducing the influence of money and corporations and promoting the participation of the people in politics and government; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BARR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VELA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 697. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2014 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. NUNES, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 698. A resolution condemning the attack that occurred at the Oak Creek Sikh Gurdwara on August 5, 2012, and honoring the memory of those who died in the attack; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

295. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Penn-

sylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 397 urging the Pentagon to explore alternatives to increase the cost-effectiveness of maintaining the Army National Guard in ways that do not adversely impact its mission readiness; to the Committee on Armed Services.

296. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 61 urging the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives to release the TBI report "MLK Document 200472"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California introduced a bill (H.R. 5302) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Special Forces Command Sergeant Major Ramon Rodriguez of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 5255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to "lay and collect Taxes" and "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ." The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111-148, as amended. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 5265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 5266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 5268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, granting Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 5270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 5271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution."

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 5273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 5274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4 Section 3

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The changes made by this bill to the Higher Education Act are within Congress' authority under Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ."

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 5277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 5282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article ' of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article 1

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Constitution of the United States, which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 5290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—promoting the general welfare

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 5293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 5294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article X, Section Y, Clause Z

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several states).

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 5299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5302.

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 129: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 279: Ms. KUSTER.

- H.R. 292: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 303: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 333: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 440: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 460: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 523: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 543: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 647: Mr. REED and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 676: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 690: Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 725: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 728: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 792: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 831: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 851: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 954: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 975: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 1020: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1070: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. SIRE.
H.R. 1074: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1148: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1179: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1250: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1284: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 1318: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1339: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1387: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1428: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1431: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1449: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1462: Mr. COOPER and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1527: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1563: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1620: Mr. LANCE, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 1696: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1725: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 1812: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 1852: Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1878: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1910: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1921: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2001: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2056: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2086: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2116: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2169: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2323: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2417: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2450: Mr. LOESACK.
H.R. 2457: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2468: Ms. ESTY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2504: Mr. KILMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2506: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2536: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2540: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2594: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2662: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2673: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2707: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2745: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2835: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2841: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 2870: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2957: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2994: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3123: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3276: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3327: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3395: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3426: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3456: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3471: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3555: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3560: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3600: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3680: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3708: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3711: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3714: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3717: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3722: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3740: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3742: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3833: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3850: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3877: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 3899: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3940: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3991: Mr. MARINO and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 3992: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4149: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4158: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4162: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4172: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. HALL and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4214: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 4216: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4221: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4252: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4319: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 4365: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4378: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 4385: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4426: Mr. TONKO and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4427: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4498: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4504: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4510: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 4525: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4544: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4567: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4577: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4584: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4620: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4632: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4664: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4674: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4682: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4717: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4723: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4726: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4748: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. REED, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 4763: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4793: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4811: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4815: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4818: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4833: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4837: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4847: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4857: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4863: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4864: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4865: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4886: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4906: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4930: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 4933: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4942: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 4951: Mr. GALLEGRO and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 4960: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4964: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4970: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4989: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 4995: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5002: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5007: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5009: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5011: Ms. SINEMA and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 5014: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 5023: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 5051: Mr. DELANEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5052: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 5059: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5064: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5069: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 5078: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PITTEGER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 5082: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5088: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 5101: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 5110: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 5113: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5130: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 5137: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 5143: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 5146: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DENT, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5160: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 5168: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5179: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5182: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5185: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 5194: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 5207: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 5219: Mr. HONDA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5226: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 5227: Mr. LONG and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5238: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5239: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 5245: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 5253: Mr. SANFORD.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. ESTY and Mr. VEASEY.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr.

ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H. Res. 35: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Res. 208: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 231: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 281: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 440: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 489: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 518: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 522: Mr. KILMER.

H. Res. 536: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H. Res. 587: Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 620: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H. Res. 683: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 689: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RUSH.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday July 29, 2014 I inadvertently voted "yes" on final passage of H.R. 4315 (rollcall 463). I wish the RECORD to reflect my intention to vote "no" on H.R. 4315.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF FORT BRAGG'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the City of Fort Bragg on the occasion of its 125th Anniversary Celebration on August 5, 2014.

For a century and a quarter, the remarkable citizens of Fort Bragg have helped the city evolve from a small lumber and fishing town to a city renowned for its beauty and small town feel. With just over 7,000 residents, Fort Bragg is a destination for sport fishermen, abalone divers, and visitors wishing to enjoy one of the most beautiful stretches of coastline in California.

In 1889, the City of Fort Bragg was incorporated on the site of a former military fort and Pomo Indian reservation with C.R. Johnson, president of the Fort Bragg Redwood Company, as its first mayor. His company established the plans for the city, which maintains many of its original historic features today.

The City of Fort Bragg is a Mendocino County treasure, a gateway to the Redwoods, and due to the enduring dedication of its residents, the city will surely continue to be a wonderful place to live and visit for years to come. Please join me in expressing hearty congratulations to the City of Fort Bragg on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

HONORING MR. HARRY WURTH

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Harry Wurth, an esteemed citizen of my congressional district who committed his life to his country and to his fellow veterans. Mr. Wurth, a longtime resident of Albertson, NY, passed away on June 14, 2014 at the age of 87. A veteran of World War II and a leader of the United States Vet-

erans of Foreign Wars Department of New York, Mr. Wurth's life was an example of what it means to serve one's nation.

After graduating high school in 1945, Mr. Wurth enlisted in the Navy and was deployed to the Pacific Theatre toward the end of the war. Aboard the aircraft carrier, the USS *Bel-leau*, he served as deck crew and later as a baker. He was honorably discharged at the end of the war.

Mr. Wurth committed the remainder of his life to serving New York veterans. In 1964 he joined the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 3211 in Hicksville, New York, and rose to Post Commander in 1969 and All State Commander. A frequent visitor to VA hospitals in Northport and St. Albans, New York, in 1972 he was elected Chaplain to the Nassau County VFW Council.

Mr. Wurth continued his dedication to the VFW in various positions on the Nassau County and State level. He was elected Chaplain and Commander of VFW District 1 in 1978, and in 1981 he transferred to the Albertson VFW Post 5253. Rising to New York State VFW Chief of Staff in 1993, Mr. Wurth led the effort to establish 19 new Veterans' Posts in New York.

From 1994 to 1996 he continued to move up the ranks in the State Council, rising to VFW State Commander. At the time of his passing Mr. Wurth was the Quartermaster for the Albertson VFW post and Quartermaster of the Nassau County VFW Council.

Mr. Wurth passed away while attending this year's NY State VFW Convention. Until his death, Mr. Wurth never ceased serving our country and veterans alike. I am honored to have had the pleasure to serve as Mr. Wurth's representative. His life will forever be remembered as one of service and commitment to his fellow countrymen.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE FLASINSKI FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. George Flasiński, the Commander of the Sons of the American Legion, Detachment of Pennsylvania. In his time as Commander, George Flasiński has been an invaluable leader of the detachment and has shown a strong commitment to the Four Pillars of the American Legion.

The Sons of the American Legion is the nation's largest wartime veterans service organization. The Legion is committed to supporting our veterans and service members, honoring our country, and mentoring youth in our community.

Under Mr. Flasiński's leadership, the membership of the Pennsylvania Sons of the American Legion has risen to nearly 60,000 members. George has organized two Honor Flights to Washington, DC for World War II veterans. Mr. Flasiński has also raised funds for Pennsylvania's homeless veterans and the American Legion's Child Welfare Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank George Flasiński and the Sons of the American Legion for their dedication to honoring our nation's heroes and inspiring our nation's youth to emulate them. George Flasiński has shown exceptional guidance in his service as Detachment of Pennsylvania Commander, and I applaud his successes and wish him the best of luck in his retirement.

HONORING LEROY R. COLES UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge and honor the unparalleled work of Leroy R. Coles—former Buffalo Urban League CEO. Mr. Coles' work, knowledge, and expertise have left a mountainous, positively-influential footprint not only on the Western New York Area, but nationwide.

Mr. Coles received much of his early social and cultural development as a participant in the Buffalo Urban League programs—which strive to enhance education and youth empowerment, economics, health and quality of life, civic engagement, as well as civil rights and racial justice.

During the historic and tumultuous times of the 1960s and 1970s, Mr. Coles bravely and actively participated in the March on Washington and continued to march for the rights of others through the 1990s. Furthermore, Mr. Coles was especially active in promoting peace and racial harmony during and after the 1960 riots and the desegregation of public schools in Buffalo, New York.

Upon returning to the Western New York area in 1972, Mr. Coles was appointed as president and chief executive officer to the Buffalo Urban League—the same establishment where he began laying his foundation of ethics. Mr. Coles led the Buffalo Urban League through a variety of locations, steadily building programs and services to meet the emerging needs of the minority citizens of Buffalo, New York and Erie County.

Mr. Coles was especially successful in leading the Buffalo Urban League in grant development at the national and state level in order to bring new services to the Western New York community, resulting in additional project

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

initiatives such as the small business loan program for women and minorities who were rejected by banks. Additionally, Mr. Coles advocated for the development of Advanced Vocational Education and Progressive Advanced Vocational Education and Exploration programs for young at-risk students seeking to improve their academic and social skills.

The accomplishments of Leroy R. Coles are extraordinary and uniquely admirable. From being the first African-American trustee of Erie Community College, to president of the National Urban League's Association of Executives, or to his induction into the Buffalo Urban League's Quarter Century Club, Mr. Coles' work ethic shines brightly through.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the commendable hard work and positive influence that Leroy R. Coles has brought to Western New York and the nation as a whole. I encourage Americans to use Mr. Coles as an exemplar in how to carry one's self as an individual. Furthermore, I am grateful for the hard work that Mr. Coles has continued to put forward, making Western New York as a whole a better place for all.

CELEBRATING THE RICH HISTORICAL HERITAGE OF MONESSEN, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the rich heritage of Monessen, Pennsylvania, and to remember two important events which took place 150 years ago and ultimately helped shape the town's history.

This year marks the sesquicentennial of the birth of one of the key figures in Monessen's founding, William Henry Donner. Donner was instrumental in the development of the town, using a cash bonus of \$10,000 to turn twenty acres of land on the banks of the Monongahela River into Monessen's first factory, the National Tin Plate Company. In doing so he created the town's initial industry, one that went on to grow and thrive. He was a member of Monessen's first school board and spearheaded efforts to build the Monessen Water Company, as well as Monessen's first school building. His work was crucial to the emergence of Monongahela as a vibrant community, and he played a major part in spurring its growth.

I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize another great figure in the history of Southwestern Pennsylvania who also was a founder of Monessen, James M. Schoonmaker. Schoonmaker was born in Peebles Township in 1842, and was a student at Western University of Pennsylvania when the Civil War broke out. He enlisted in the army and was assigned to the 1st Maryland Calvary, where he quickly established himself as a competent leader. In 1862, Schoonmaker was given the authority by Secretary of War Edwin Stanton to raise the 14th Pennsylvania Cavalry Regiment, of which he was made colonel. His actions in leading soldiers during the Third Battle of Winchester in 1864 were

crucial in helping the Union achieve victory, and for his heroic efforts he was awarded the Medal of Honor. This September marks the 150th anniversary of that famous cavalry charge.

On August 16th, The Greater Monessen Historical Society in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania will celebrate the City of Monessen's annual Founders Day at Monessen City Park, commemorating these two events. I wish to thank the Society and its President Dan Zyglowicz for keeping alive the memory of these important leaders, and preserving our region's history for the next generation. We must never forget the lessons of the past, and their work is a crucial way to make sure these Pennsylvania leaders continue to be a part of our heritage for decades to come.

HONORING THE TOWN OF ELIZABETH, MISSISSIPPI

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable Town of Elizabeth, Mississippi.

The town of Elizabeth, Mississippi is located on U.S. Highway 61, approximately 1 mile north of Leland and 2 miles east of Stoneville. In March 1889, a deed was issued to Mr. Joshua Skinner for a railroad depot in the area. At the time, the place was named "Athol", but it was later changed to its current name "Elizabeth".

In 1889, Elizabeth was advertised as "a new town with an unparalleled future, located in the heart of the famous Yazoo Delta . . . the richest and most fertile section of the earth where king cotton reigns supreme." Elizabeth had the unique distinction of being located at the crossroads of the first two main railroads in the Delta: the Louisville, New Orleans, and Texas RR (which later became the Illinois Central RR) and the Georgia Pacific RR (which eventually became the Columbus and Greenville RR).

The town of Elizabeth was designed along the west and south sides of both railroads. Elizabeth emerged early on as a mercantile city, with numerous businesses started up due to the existence of the rail lines. The town can no longer boast a commercial center. Leland has taken that role. However, it does retain its identity as Elizabeth. It boasts a modest population of nearly 200 people and a beautiful roadside park. In 2013, DuPont Pioneer opened a new 30,000 square foot research center near Elizabeth that focuses on soybean breeding and product development as well as corn product testing and characterization for farmers in the Delta.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Town of Elizabeth for its dedication to serving others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 25, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on No. 453 and "yea" on No. 451, No. 452, and No. 454.

On Monday, July 28, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 455, No. 456, and No. 457.

On Tuesday, July 29, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 458 and No. 459. I would have voted "nay" on No. 460, No. 461, and No. 462. I would have voted "yea" on No. 463 and No. 464.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,613,035,203,018.10. We've added \$6,986,158,154,105.02 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 7TH ANNIVERSARY OF PASSAGE OF H. RES. 121

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 7th anniversary of the passage of H. Res. 121, an historic resolution which expresses the sense of the U.S. House of Representatives that the Government of Japan should formally acknowledge, apologize, and accept historical responsibility in a clear and unequivocal manner for its Imperial Armed Force's coercion of young women into sexual slavery, known to the world as 'comfort women', during its colonial and wartime occupation of Asia and the Pacific Islands from the 1930s through the duration of World War II.

H. Res. 121 was passed on July 30, 2007, and I commend my good friend, Congressman MICHAEL HONDA of California, for introducing it. I admire his courage and devotion for causes that matter. As a Japanese-American, he gave voice to this cause in a way no other could and, because of him, this Resolution stands as a testament of his advocacy for and on behalf of those who suffer.

I also commend Dong Suk Kim of Korean American Civic Empowerment (KACE) for his grassroots efforts in bolstering support for H. Res. 121 which led to its successful passage. His contributions made a significant difference.

I also commend the Honorable NANCY PELOSI. In my opinion, her decision to bring H. Res. 121 to the Floor for House consideration was the key factor that made passage possible. As the first woman in American history to serve as Speaker of the House, her clarion call for equality and empowerment for women is of consequence globally and historically. Her personal commitment to the women who still bear the scars from the Imperial Armed Force's coercion will never be forgotten.

In 2007, it was my honor to hold the first hearing ever held on this sensitive issue. Although this legislation had been introduced in the U.S. Congress for more than a decade, including by my good friend, former Congressman Lane Evans, no Committee had ever held a hearing on the matter. But, in 2007, I determined that my first action as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific would be to hold a hearing calling upon Japan to apologize for the war crimes its Imperial Armed Forces perpetuated against innocent young girls and women.

Congressman HONDA testified before the Subcommittee as did three survivors, including Ms. Yong Soo Lee, Ms. Jan Ruff O'Herne, and Ms. Koon Ja Kim. I will never, ever forget the testimony of these three women. They remain my heroes. Because of their courage, an official record now stands forevermore on file with the U.S. House of Representatives that speaks the truth about what Japan's Imperial Armed Forces did to them. Their childhoods were stolen. Their destinies were disrupted. But their spirits were not broken because they know, like I know, that God will one day set everything right and justice will come—no matter what.

And so, I pay tribute to Ms. Lee, Ms. O'Herne, Ms. Kim and all those they represented. It has been my honor to know them and also to know all my grandmothers at the House of Sharing. I wish God's sweetest blessings upon them.

I also thank President Park Geun-hye, then a member of South Korea's National Assembly, for attending our Subcommittee hearing as an observer. The Subcommittee was extraordinarily honored to welcome her. Her presence at the hearing honored every young girl and woman ever victimized by Japan's Imperial Armed Forces.

While I strongly urge the Government of Japan to formally acknowledge and apologize in order to begin the reconciliation process, I bear no animosity or ill-will towards the people of Japan. If given the choice, I believe the people of Japan would also call for its government to apologize for the atrocities its Imperial Armed Forces committed against innocent young girls and women. But, regrettably, the Government of Japan chooses to whitewash its history. However, sooner or later, truth will prevail. Until it does, I will continue to do everything I can to bring increasing awareness to this issue.

HONORING MICHAEL MAY,
FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
AMY BIEHL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael May, an outstanding leader and educator in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for his time as Executive Director for Amy Biehl High School (ABHS).

Founded in 1999, by public school teachers Tony Monfietto and Tom Siegel, ABHS fundamentally changed the idea of what a high school can contribute to the students it educates. The founders envisioned a school that not only prepared students for college, but held itself accountable for a student's success after graduation. It is no coincidence that during Mike's tenure, nearly 100 percent of ABHS students attended college and 86 percent of those students graduated with a Bachelor's degree.

More than that, Mike has inspired students to strive for academic excellence while fulfilling their commitment to the community at large. On March 18, 2014, I visited the school to recognize and congratulate the students for their achievement of 65,000 hours of community service to over 140 non-profit organizations. And on June 17, 2014, after working closely with Mike, I introduced and the House of Representatives passed the Albuquerque, New Mexico, Federal Land Conveyance Act of 2014 (H.R. 3998), which allows ABHS to obtain ownership of the Old Federal Court House and Post Office in the heart of downtown Albuquerque. We will continue to work to enact this bill into law, preserve this historic building, and provide students with a first-rate education.

Mike always put his students first and even talked at length to the Economic Forum of Albuquerque about the great work done by his school to benefit the business community. When asked about ABHS's numerous successes during his time as Executive Director, Mike said:

I would love to thank the community for the support of the school and what we have accomplished. What we have accomplished would not have been possible without the commitment of so many people who have seen the value in what we are doing.

This statement reflects Mike's selflessness and demonstrates the respect and admiration that Mike has for our community in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Mike's vision, passion, dedication, and hands-on approach with students are one-of-a-kind. While he will be sorely missed, I have no doubt that he will accomplish great things in his new role directing the L'Ecole d'Humanite boarding school in Switzerland.

HONORING WEE CARE NURSERIES
AND LEARNING CENTERS, INC.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a landmark establishment within the City of Tchula that provides one of the most critical and essential services for all working parents: Wee Care Nursery and Learning Center, Inc.

Tchula's Wee Care Nursery and Learning Center began as Tchula Day Care. Tchula Day Care opened its doors on September 3, 1991. The name was later changed to Tchula's Wee Care Nursery and Learning Center, Inc. On May 15, 1995, Wee Care Nursery and Learning Center #2 opened its doors in Lexington, MS.

Tchula's Wee Care capacity is 142 and Lexington's is 169. Current enrollment is 77 and 54 respectively.

At Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, their mission is to provide child care that meets the needs of each child and family in a safe, educational environment.

They take pride in the Centers and focus on the individual needs of each child, while providing quality, reliable and safe child care.

The goals of Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers are: (1) To provide affordable, convenient, dependable child care services; (2) To create a child care setting for social, cognitive, and physical development; (3) To provide a nurturing environment; (4) To provide learning experiences for children; and (5) To provide a preschool program, readying children for lifelong learning.

Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, Inc. believes that a high quality early childhood program provides a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, emotional, social, and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of families. They believe in promoting an anti-bias, pro-social curriculum that teaches children to value and respect themselves and others for their own unique individuality. Each child is considered unique in temperament and rate of development. Curriculum is planned to enhance and challenge particular, distinct individual needs, interests and abilities. The curriculum includes: manipulatives, art, music, games, and outdoor play. They believe child-initiated, child-directed, teacher-supported play is an essential component of developmentally appropriate practice. Activities and relationships occur in a healthy, positive and relaxed environment in which well-qualified staff provide personal attention, guidance and nurturing to each child.

Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, Inc. strives to maintain continuity and consistency throughout the program by conducting helpful staff planning, training and a variety of joint activities involving various groups of children. In this context, all caregivers at Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers are encouraged to express their individual educational strengths as they work with children and in their cooperative efforts with other staff members.

When you come to Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, your child will receive the best care the industry has to offer. All you need to do is "expect more." They have been fortunate to get special recognition from: Greenwood Voters' League, Mississippi State University, The Cities of Tchula and Lexington, Mississippi Building Blocks and The Delta Foundation.

Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers are able to care for children ages 6 weeks to 12 years. Along with regular childcare services, they also provide before and after school care and a summer reading and math enrichment program.

Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, Inc. have a motto/slogan: Building a better world one child at a time. Learning Today . . . Leading Today!

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Wee Care Nurseries and Learning Centers, Inc. for its past and present dedication to providing impeccable, dependable childcare services in an effort to help families of all backgrounds within the Tchula community.

COMMEMORATING THE 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 49th anniversary of Medicare, one of the most popular and successful social insurance programs in the history of the United States.

When President Lyndon Johnson signed it into law on July 30, 1965, less than 50 percent of seniors had health insurance and 35 percent lived in poverty.

Now, over 52.4 million Americans are given health care benefits regardless of their condition or income.

This includes over 40 million Americans age 65 or above and 9 million disabled Americans receiving Social Security benefits.

Medicare saves lives and money, and here is why.

Since its creation Medicare has provided comprehensive health care coverage for the senior citizens who cannot afford it.

Without Medicare, most seniors would not have insurance and be unable to afford health care due to high costs or pre-existing conditions.

It provides 37 million seniors prescription drug coverage and offers free preventive health screenings, including mammograms, diabetes, or cancer screenings now thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

Medicare is not welfare. It is an cost-effective social program that works.

In combination with the Affordable Care Act, I believe that Medicare's future is even brighter.

These improved benefits include incentives for doctors and health care providers to coordinate more smoothly, reduce waste and fraud, and lower out of pocket costs for beneficiaries.

Forty-nine years after its inception, the program continues to do its job and I hope that we can continue to support it.

IMMIGRATION

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the situation on our southern border and the influx of unaccompanied migrant children is both tragic and alarming.

As the House and Senate debate this matter, it's important for us to recognize several areas of discussion that demand our attention.

To start, Mr. Speaker, we know this influx has been building for some time and that over the last several months it has grown at an even faster pace.

Before 2009, the flow of unaccompanied children attempting to cross the border was less than 10,000 per year.

These numbers have increased dramatically over the last few years. While recent estimates over the past month appear to indicate the flow is subsiding, we remain on pace to exceed 90,000 children for 2014.

We also know that more than 90 percent of all these children come from just three countries—El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

While economic conditions in this region have been poor for quite some time, they have not significantly changed in the last few years.

We also know that a law passed in 2008 with the best of intentions—the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization—is making it more difficult to return unaccompanied children to their families.

Unlike illegal immigrants from Mexico, who are required by law to be processed and promptly returned home, the 2008 law guarantees minors from these countries a court date and mandates extensive assistance for temporary relocation as they wait out their pending appeal.

We also know that a large number of these individuals evade attending these proceedings, and that ultimately, few minors are sent home. In fact, most are able to stay for years, and a large number remain permanently.

According to Immigration and Customs Enforcement data, only 1,669 children were deported in 2013 despite more than 26,000 apprehensions.

These statistics are stunning, Mr. Speaker.

There is no wonder that according to interviews conducted by the Department of Homeland Security that more than 90 percent of these children expect they will be able to stay in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what's even more concerning is how many of the Obama Administration's policies have not helped the current crisis.

For example, the President's 2012 policy for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals gives these families hope that they might receive some sort of amnesty. This policy not only is detrimental to the rule of law and an overreach of executive authority, but it also sends the wrong signal.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is a stark reminder of just how flawed the President and Senate's immigration reform bill is. Granting amnesty to 11 million illegal immigrants would merely serve to reinforce the perceptions that if you come to the U.S. illegally you will be rewarded—and not only with a hearing, but full legalization. This does not help the current situation, to say the least.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, billions in new spending as the President has requested will not reverse the perceptions of a lenient enforcement environment in the U.S.

Alternatively, what we do know is that this administration—and every administration—must do more to secure the border.

What we do know, Mr. Speaker, is that we must do more to stem this migration influx, which should include changes to the 2008 trafficking law.

What we do know, Mr. Speaker, is that we must do more to leverage our relations with Central America to support the expedited return of these children in a humane fashion.

What we do know Mr. Speaker, is that we need the White House to enforce the laws, better secure our border, and to put aside political games and actually start working with Congress in a bipartisan manner.

HONORING ISAAC PALMER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable person, Mr. Isaac Palmer.

Mr. Isaac Palmer was born on May 23, 1914 in Sharkey County, Mississippi, the oldest of nine children born to the late Reverend Littleton and Frances Nathaniel Palmer. Mr. Palmer was married to the late Vera Lee Bell Palmer for over 50 years. He has eight children: Betty, Geraldine, Odell, Isaac Lavelle, Nina, Patricia, David (deceased) and Fred (deceased).

Mr. Palmer wanted to attend school badly; but, he had to leave school when he was twelve years old, in the 6th grade, to work on the farm and help provide for his younger sisters and brothers. However, he didn't let this stop him. He learned to read, write and speak more fluently by studying the Holy Bible. Mr. Palmer was a "jack of all trades", doing things like driving tractors, farming, welding and being a mechanic, just to name a few.

At an early age, Mr. Palmer accepted Christ as his Savior. He was an active member of New Hope Baptist Church in Blanton, Mississippi, where he served as Senior Deacon and Superintendent of the Sunday school for many years. During this time, he led many children, friends and acquaintances to Christ. He has been and remains a laborer for Christ for more than 85 years.

Though Mr. Palmer only had a 6th grade education, he remains passionate about helping and encouraging his children and other young people to get as much education as possible. To help out, he would drive his own children to and from Alcorn and Jackson State

Universities, as well as their friends who lived in the area (free of charge), after working all day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Isaac Palmer for his dedication to serving and giving back to his family and community.

STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to allow for the governments of Guam and American Samoa to enter into voluntary agreements for Social Security and Medicare coverage for their local government employees. This bill provides parity to Guam and American Samoa with each of the 50 states and other territories.

Section 218 of the Social Security Act authorizes the Social Security Administration and State governments to enter into voluntary agreements to provide Social Security and Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) or Medicare HI-only coverage for State and local government employees. Under the current statute, the governments of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are eligible to enter into these agreements with the Social Security Administration; however the District of Columbia, Guam, and American Samoa are specifically excluded from the definition of "State" for this section of the law. All 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have entered into a Section 218 agreement to cover some or all of their government employees.

Guam and American Samoa's exclusion from this section prevents our local governments from entering into a similar agreement with the Social Security Administration. It prevents government employees in Guam from receiving Social Security benefits similar to what is provided to private sector employees on Guam who contribute to Social Security. The Guam Legislature unanimously passed a resolution requesting for me to introduce legislation that would remove Guam from the exclusion of the definition of "State" for Section 218. The Guam Legislature wishes to provide the government of Guam with the opportunity to enter into a Section 218 agreement to have their employees covered under Social Security. They have identified a local funding source to begin contributions to the Social Security Trust Fund.

In closing, I urge support for this bill to rectify this inequity and provide government employees in Guam and American Samoa an equal opportunity to contribute into Social Security. I thank Congressman FALOMAVAEGA for cosponsoring this bill, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was called away yesterday, July 29, 2014, for an important meeting along with local officials at Southwest Key, a shelter in my district for youth that crossed the border illegally. I would like to submit my votes on the matters considered by the House in my absence.

For rollcall vote No. 458, ordering the previous questions on H. Res. 693—the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4315—21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, I would have voted "yea."

For rollcall vote No. 459 on adoption of H. Res. 693—the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4315—21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, I would have voted "yea."

For rollcall vote No. 460 on Amendment No. 2 by Rep. DEFAZIO (D-OR) to exclude scientific information published solely in internal Interior Department publications from the definition of "best available science," I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote No. 461 on Amendment No. 3 by Rep. HOLT (D-NJ) to strike a provision which includes all data submitted by State, County or Tribal governments as "best available science," I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote No. 462 on Rep. KIRKPATRICK (D-AZ) Motion to Recommit H.R. 4315 with instructions, I would have voted "nay."

For rollcall vote No. 463 on passage of H.R. 4315—21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, I would have voted "yea."

For rollcall vote No. 464 on H.R. 4809 to reauthorize the Defense Production Act, to improve the Defense Production Act Committee, I would have voted "yea."

RAISING AWARENESS OF HEPATITIS C AND FORGING A PATH TO ITS ERADICATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize The Second Annual African American Hepatitis C Awareness Action Day which was held on Friday, July 25, 2014. Hepatitis C is a deadly and contagious viral disease that attacks the liver and kills thousands of Americans each year. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), an estimated 3.2 million people in the United States have chronic Hepatitis C virus infection, many of them unknowingly in the absence of symptoms. African-Americans have been disproportionately afflicted by the Hepatitis C virus more than any other ethnic group, representing an estimated 22 percent of chronic Hepatitis C cases in the United States.

The National Black Leadership Commission on AIDS, Inc. (NBLCA) has played a tremen-

dous role in raising awareness by organizing the African American Hepatitis C Awareness Action Day. HIV infected persons are more susceptible to contracting the Hepatitis C virus, thus it is critical that people at risk are made aware in order to prolong a quality life. NBLCA does the community and its residents an exceptional service, surpassing its mission of educating African-Americans on means to counteract HIV/AIDS and other health disparities across the nation.

NBLCA has serviced thousands of organizations through technical assistance, development, and public policy. Their actions have garnished over \$2 billion in federal funding for HIV/AIDS, formulating the first programs existing in the black community to address the problems caused by the HIV/AIDS virus. Furthermore, NBLCA continues to maintain chief consultant positions on various health related issues in numerous national organizations. They remain partners with the Congressional Black Caucus, the National Association of Black Social Workers, and the National Caucus of Black State Legislators, totaling over 500 black state officials being represented by the organization. NBLCA is also a prominent partner of the National Baptist Ministers' Convention, which represents 8.2 million African Americans. Internationally, this well-accomplished organization has served as an advisor on HIV/AIDS related issues to the United Nations, Gabon, Central African Republic, Uganda, The Bahamas, and others.

During this week, NBLCA has partnered with health care organizations and providers to provide communities with free screening services and information on behaviors associated with contracting the Hepatitis C virus. This initiative will allow many people who are unknowingly infected with the Hepatitis C virus to receive treatment before the virus causes fatal conditions such as liver cancer or cirrhosis. With the establishment of alliances with community leaders, clergy, and public officials across the nation, NBLCA has truly become a remarkable asset inspiring a much needed element of change within our communities.

Fortunately for millions across the world suffering from this chronic disease, an effective and curative treatment for the Hepatitis C virus, Solvadi, has been developed by the U.S. based pharmaceutical company Gilead Sciences, Inc. However, it is disappointing that the high cost of Solvadi, \$84,000 for a 12-week treatment, may leave the drug inaccessible to many Americans reliant on Medicaid. State Governments and health insurers in the U.S. will be challenged as they seek to provide this curative treatment to a large population of beneficiaries who otherwise could not afford it. Solvadi is truly a triumph in modern medicine but if it cannot be made affordable to all those in need of treatment, it would certainly fail to serve its purpose. It is especially disheartening to learn that Gilead has offered to supply its ground breaking drug to foreign countries at up to a 99 percent discount of the price within the United States. Hepatitis C is a contagious chronic disease that often requires decades of treatment and expensive organ transplant procedures. If made affordable, Solvadi could save our country's health care system indefinite costs.

We are in the midst of a golden opportunity to rid the world of a disease that has claimed

the lives of countless people. As evolution continues to give rise to new disease that may plague future generations, we must make a fervent national commitment to eliminating disease and ensuring the health of our citizens as we have in the past against diseases such as polio and smallpox. I am glad we have organizations such as the NBLCA, who is fighting the good fight on the grassroots level. It would be a great triumph for humanity and modern medicine to speak of Hepatitis C as a disease of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in raising awareness of such a debilitating disease and support appropriations that grant funding to non-profit organizations like the NBLCA across our Great Nation. These talented organizations do such a tremendous job saving so many lives.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KEVIN LEO OSWALD

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of the Central Florida community, Mr. Kevin Oswald. Oswald was recently awarded the Air Traffic Control Association (ATCA) Air Traffic Controller of the Year Award.

As a controller, Oswald has seen the Kissimmee Gateway Airport grow and expand from a small non-automated facility to a control tower with Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS) radar, touch screen communications and FAA flight data input/output (FDIO) equipment. He has been an integral player in the success of the Kissimmee Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) in achieving over 2.3 million operations without an operational error.

An excellent example of Mr. Oswald's controller abilities occurred on December 19, 2013, when he was working as controller at the Kissimmee ATCT. He observed a Beechcraft airplane that had been cleared for landing and was over the approach end of runway 15 without the landing gear extended. He immediately cleared the aircraft for a "go around" and explained the situation to the pilot. The pilot responded and on the next approach made a safe landing. Later, the facility received a letter from the pilot expressing his appreciation to Mr. Oswald and stated that his actions prevented a catastrophe. Apparently, the pilot had inadvertently silenced the gear warning light to accomplish a single engine landing. The Pan Am International Flight Academy changed its operations policies based on Mr. Oswald's actions.

Seeing a need to improve emergency response time, Oswald developed a training program to assist both the Fire and Police departments to better understand the Air Traffic Operations during an inflight emergency. He contacted the Kissimmee Fire Department Training Director and jointly they developed a plan to have all the fire and police department personnel visit the tower for an extensive training and observation course. This training has im-

proved the emergency response time for both departments.

Mr. Oswald was also instrumental in developing routes for the medevac unit which flies out of Kissimmee Airport. He established standardized procedures and expedited routes to allow the life-saving medevac unit to operate in the quickest and safest way possible.

As a true team player, his efforts on a daily basis have significantly helped the Kissimmee Airport to be recognized as a destination of choice for individual pilots and aviation oriented organizations. His devotion and dedication to duty make him most deserving of the ATCA Air Traffic Control Specialist of the Year Award.

I am happy to honor Kevin Oswald for his accomplishments and contributions to the Central Florida and aviation communities.

HONORING PASTOR E.L. KING

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor E.L. King, who is a former Educator in the Greenwood Public School District, Extraordinary and public servant.

Mrs. Ethel King was born in Leflore County on June 8, 1959 to Robert and Ethel L. Lawrence. At the age of thirteen, her mother died and she was nurtured by her grandfather, Mr. Willie James Lawrence, along with her seven siblings.

Mrs. King attended Greenwood Public School. She dropped out of school in the twelfth grade in 1976 because she had her first child. She was very independent and determined to make an easier life for her child. She immediately went to work at Rocky Manufactory at the age of eighteen. She remained there 3½ years. She left Rocky Manufactory to work for Irvin Industry Automobile & Parts for 3½ years. After seven years of working in a factory environment, she felt life had more to offer her. She went on to take her GED and attended Mississippi Valley State University in 1986. Before completing college in November, 1989, her daughter fell ill and later died with Leukemia in December, 1990. While at the University Hospital, she volunteered as a coordinator to help parents cope with their children's illness. She later volunteered with a candidate for a supervisor position in the 2nd District in Greenwood.

Mrs. King was called into the Ministry in 1992. She completed her Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice in 1993. After completing her degree, her health failed. She continued to fight on in 1996. She went to work as a volunteer permanent substitute teacher at Dickerson Elementary School under the leadership of Mrs. Vivian Redmond. Later she was hired as a full-time substitute teacher. Mrs. King was very dedicated to educating children.

In 1998 she was hired at Bankston Elementary School as an assistant teacher until her health failed again. She retired in 2006. After retiring from the school system, Mrs. King worked as a Notary Public of the State of Mis-

issippi under Governor Haley Barbour. She also volunteered with the Fannie Lou Hamer Foundation in Leflore County. Later, she became Pastor of Monument of Grace Church II in Lexington, MS for three years under the leadership of Bishop L.J. Johnson.

Pastor Ethel L. King has made an impact on the lives of many children and adults alike, encouraging them through the scripture, "... but seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all things shall be added unto you."

Pastor Ethel L. King is married to Edward E. King and they are the proud parents of two beautiful daughters and eight precious grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pastor Ethel L. King, a Former Educator, a Pastor who is yet inspiring others and often giving of herself to make many lives better.

CELEBRATING THE HILLCREST COMMUNITY CIVIC ASSOCIATION ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the Hillcrest Community Civic Association (HCCA) on its 25th anniversary, which will be celebrated in September.

Ward 7's Belva T. Simmons, was the founder and 1st president of the HCCA. The idea for the HCCA was conceived on the front lawn of Dennis and Gloria Logan, on August 8, 1989, National Night Out Against Crime. The HCCA past and current Presidents are: Belva Simmons, Paul Savage, Pastor Franklin G. Singer, III, Vincent Spaulding, and Karen Lee Williams.

Located just east of the Anacostia River in Ward 7, Hillcrest is a beautiful and increasingly diverse neighborhood. Among its residents are D.C. Mayor Vincent C. Gray, former Metropolitan Police Chief Isaac Fulwood, former U.S. Marshal James Palmer, and other notable public figures, as well as teachers, doctors, lawyers, government workers, civic leaders, professionals, retirees, and blue collar workers.

In the early 1900s, Hillcrest was referred to as part of East Washington Heights. The initial developer, Andrew Randle and his United States Realty Company, is responsible for establishing the Pennsylvania Avenue southeast gateway that paved the way for development of Hillcrest under the Alger Company. Both early developers had inserted into some of the residential property deeds racial covenants to preclude African Americans from renting or purchasing homes in East Washington Heights. In fact, these deplorable covenants continue to remain as burdens on the land, but cannot be enforced due to a 1948 U.S. Supreme Court case known as *Hurd vs. Hodge*.

HCCA is a proud force joining members together in a community that stands for equality, diversity, civic pride and fellowship, while opposing crime and threats to its beloved community. HCCA has adopted Beers, Randle

Highlands, and Winston Elementary schools. HCCA has partnered with the Palisades Community Civic Association. The community continues to grow and acquire new members and diversify.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Hillcrest Community Civic Association of Ward 7 on 25 years in the District of Columbia.

RECOGNIZING SARA BARBA, CALVIN FRAUENFELDER, KATHRYN KORNACKI, AND NATHAN VANNOY

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sara Barba, Calvin Frauenfelder, Kathryn Kornacki, and Nathan Vannoy for their hard work and dedication to the people of Colorado's Sixth District as interns in my Washington, DC office for the Summer 2014 session of Congress.

The work of these young men and women has been exemplary and I know they all have bright futures. They served as tour guides, interacted with constituents, and learned a great deal about our nation's legislative process. I was glad to be able to offer this educational opportunity to these four and look forward to seeing them build their careers in public service.

All four of our interns have made plans to continue their work in public service next year with various organizations in both Colorado and Washington. I am certain they will succeed in their new roles and wish them all the best in their future endeavors. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Sara Barba, Calvin Frauenfelder, Kathryn Kornacki, and Nathan Vannoy for their service this summer.

IN HONOR OF FRANK DECLERQ

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank DeClerq for the outstanding commitment and dedication he has demonstrated to the community of San Diego throughout his 35 years of service in the Fire Department.

Throughout his career, Frank DeClerq has been an advocate for the San Diego City Firefighters and their families. He earned the rank of Fire Captain in the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department. As a fearless leader he has worked with the Fire Department Management, elected officials, and industry experts to advocate for the enhancement of firefighter health and safety.

Frank DeClerq believes that a firefighter's sworn duty to serve their community extends to their off duty time as well. He has consistently demonstrated this belief by supporting numerous charities such as: the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the San Diego Burn In-

stitute, San Diego Firefighter Aid, San Diego 9/11 Memorial Stair Climb, San Diego Youth Sports, and Local 145 Holiday Giving Programs for Low Income Families, among others. Frank DeClerq has not only influenced the welfare of firefighters of Local 145 as their leader, but also promoted the welfare of our residents throughout San Diego and the region.

EDUCATION IS THE ONLY ANSWER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Lee R. Johnson, a man for whom I have great, great respect, is very concerned about the type of education young people are receiving today.

Mr. Johnson spent a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Army. Since leaving the U.S. Military, he has become a leader in East Tennessee.

I bring to the attention of my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the wise words of Mr. Johnson.

MY LIFE FROM ZERO TO 101

(By Lee R. Johnson)

EDUCATION IS THE ONLY ANSWER

America's New National Education Mission Statement: America must educate and mentor all of our young men and women so that they are prepared to be academically and financially competitive in all walks of their lives no matter where they choose to live and work in this global society.

Globalization has brought us to the realization that the entire world is more important than ever. Globalization has forever changed the way that we should judge the education system in the United States, and there is no going back! Think, for instance, about the way that we often compare our local public school system with the same type of system in neighboring cities, counties, and states. We even compare our local system with the national average. When we judge our school system in this way, the future of our education system looks good. But if we judge our education system on a world-wide basis, we can see that our system actually deserves a failing grade. If our students are to compete successfully in a global culture and economy, our school systems will have to undergo a major overhaul. Our students (who will become our future workers, supervisors, and CEO's) must be prepared to compete—as never before—with the rest of the world. Most Americans have not yet come to realize what a problem this is now and how much more problematic this worldwide competition will become in the future. If we fail to recognize this problem, we will never find the answer to global competition, and we will be left far behind.

To understand how other nations impact most areas of our lives, consider President Ronald Reagan's answer when he was asked about the strength of America's military. He answered that he did not determine the strength of America's military; instead, he added, that the enemies of the U.S. determine the strength of our military. The same can be said of our education system. Competitors in every corner of the world will determine what our education system must be

like. Our system should be flexible and constantly updated to meet ever-changing global demands or the United States will fail to keep up.

DRASTIC CHANGE IS THE ONLY ANSWER

Education is the largest business in America today, and so education must be run as a business! Teachers, principals, school board members, school superintendents, members of state legislatures, governors, and federal government leaders who don't believe this should get out of the American education system immediately!

In the business world, a business must be operated in real time—even better five, ten, fifteen even twenty years in the future—certainly not 25 years in the past. Our school systems should be just as up-to-date! At the present time in our nation's school systems, it takes years to change a simple policy or even to add or drop a single subject. With the changes in the world today, we must find a way to be flexible enough to change twenty-five percent of our entire education system within one year and continue to make changes every year until we get our school systems back on track. If not, our country will be in serious trouble—unable to compete in a global economy.

To date, our government and our leaders in the education field have not even been able to define what a proper world-class education is. We don't even have a national education "Mission Statement"—what we expect from our children when they finish each of the four levels of training (pre-K through elementary years, middle school years, high school years, and college/university years). A "Mission Statement" is essential to our understanding of the definition of a "world-class education." I give our government and all of our so-called learning institutions an "F" for their failure to understand what the problems are in our education systems. Many people, who realize that this problem exists, would describe the situation by use of this age-old saying, "the blind leading the blind." And when the blind lead the blind, everyone goes around in circles—never getting anywhere.

If America fails to adopt this mission statement and carry through on its implementation, then our students will not be prepared to measure up to other students around the world. We cannot fail our children and grandchildren! After all, they are the most cherished treasures of our hearts and our most valuable resources. We must be "on mission" to provide these students of ours with a world-class education.

HONORING MRS. DEBORAH MOORE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Unsung Hero in Cleveland, Mississippi.

Deborah Moore is the Associate Vice President of Community Relations at Delta Health Alliance. Mrs. Moore is assigned to the Indianola Promise Community where she provides administrative oversight and technical assistance to the community and organizations. Mrs. Moore worked one year as Project Manager IV at Delta Health Alliance before being promoted to Assistant Vice President and then to Associate Vice President.

Mrs. Moore is a retiree from the state of Mississippi where she served 27 years in community and economic development. She spent the last 12 years of her career before coming to Delta Health Alliance at Delta State University's Center for Community and Economic Development in Cleveland, MS where she served as AmeriCorps director for two programs and then as director of the Center for Community and Economic Development the last five years. In her role as director of the Center for Community and Economic Development she assisted grass-root communities by empowering individuals, strengthening relationships and developing projects and programs to strengthen communities. Moore has extensive work with proposal writing having secured grants in excess of \$15,000,000.00.

Mrs. Moore is a member of several nonprofit boards, the Mississippi Center for Nonprofits, Cleveland Youth Council and Friends of the Environment. She currently serves as chair of the board for the Delta Fresh Foods Initiative. Moore serves in an advisory capacity for the Breast Education-Early Detection Project and the School-based Asthma Management Project at Delta State University. She also serves on the advisory board of the Excel By 5 program in Cleveland, MS and is a member of the Excel By 5 Coalition in Indianola, MS.

Mrs. Moore works tirelessly in assisting the elderly by running errands and doing other tasks they may desire; mentoring youth in diverse subject areas, so they can become an asset to society and work faithful with her husband's ministry to enhance congregants both spiritually and naturally.

Mrs. Moore is a native of Cleveland, MS. She is a graduate of Delta State University with a B.B.A. degree and a M.B.A. degree. She has a certification as an Economic Development Finance Professional from the National Development Council (NDC) and received her PhD from the University of Southern Mississippi in Human Capital Development.

Mrs. Moore is married to Dr. Billy Moore and they are the proud parents of two daughters, A'ndrea and Alicia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Deborah Moore, an amazing Unsung Hero, for her dedication and service to mankind.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DEXTER FOXWORTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Dexter Foxworth. A recognized Central Florida community leader, Dexter is known for achieving change through collaboration, partnerships, and relationships.

Since 2012, Dexter has served as the Director for the Zebra Coalition, whose mission is to foster hope, dignity, and self-respect in lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and all youth

(LGBT+) community and to provide them an opportunity to grow up in a safe, healthy and supportive environment. In partnership with 24 different local social service and government agencies, schools, colleges and universities, and businesses, Dexter oversees the coalition's operations and strategic growth in order to provide a full continuum of services and resources to LGBT+ youth throughout Central Florida. The Zebra Coalition is the only organization in Central Florida that assesses the needs of and offers a full continuum of services to LGBT+ youth.

Under Dexter's direction, the Zebra Coalition has strengthened its programming and resources, opened Central Florida's first drop-in center dedicated to LGBT+ youth, and became a national model for LGBT+ youth continuum of care. The coalition also received accreditation and licensing under the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) as well the Department of Children and Families (DCF). Dexter also helped the coalition obtain its first federal grants through the White House and the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Through Dexter's leadership, the Zebra Coalition, its staff members, volunteers, member organizations, supporters and board members, have come together to provide support and hope to Central Florida's LGBT+ youth.

I am happy to honor Dexter Foxworth, during LGBT Pride Month, for his service to Central Florida's youth.

RECOGNIZING DR. CORA MARRETT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dr. Cora Marrett's career of service to our country—both in government and education. Since 2011, Dr. Marrett has served as deputy director of the National Science Foundation (NSF), and I have had the pleasure of working with her as chairman of the House Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations subcommittee. I recently learned that she will be retiring next month after an exceptional career in academia and with NSF.

Dr. Marrett has helped lead NSF as its acting director, deputy director, acting deputy director and as the assistant director for Education and Human Resources, where she led efforts on STEM education research and outreach—a key priority for the CJS subcommittee in recent years. I particularly appreciate her leadership on efforts included in appropriations bills at my request to better understand gaps in K–12 STEM education research and to bolster American competitiveness in those fields.

Cora has a long history of service at NSF. She previously served as the first assistant director for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences directorate from 1992–1996. During that time she earned NSF's "Distinguished Service Award" for her leadership. She subsequently served as senior vice chancellor for academic affairs and provost at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and later the senior

vice president for academic affairs for the University of Wisconsin system, as well as a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. Marrett for her outstanding leadership and service at NSF and wish her and her family all the best for her upcoming retirement.

COMMEMORATING MR. GARNETT KELLY'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Mr. Garnett Kelly's 90th birthday. Throughout his life, Garnett has served his country and community with the utmost respect and integrity. Garnett is a veteran of World War II, a retired Missouri State Representative, and a farmer.

Garnett Kelly nobly served his country in the United States Navy between 1944 and 1946, during World War II. He then turned his focus to farming and later to state politics where he ran for Missouri's 143rd District, and served Douglas County from 1970–1984. While serving in the Missouri House of Representatives, Garnett served on the House Committees on Agriculture, Fees and Salaries, Appropriations, and Education. After his tenure in the Missouri House of Representatives, Garnett came back to his farm in Douglas County. He has been farming for over 65 years, running both dairy and beef cattle and still puts up his own hay.

Garnett has been married to his wife Loretta since 1945, and they have been blessed with five children, twenty-three grandchildren, forty-nine great-grandchildren, and two great-great-grandchildren. It is my privilege to commemorate Mr. Garnett Kelly's 90th birthday, as well as recognize his numerous achievements before the House of Representatives.

HONORING MR. RYAN CEPREGI

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ryan Cepregi for his commendable and brave actions that saved his friend's life and earned him The Medal of Merit from the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Cepregi has acted in a manner that shows great concern for the well-being of others and will contribute greatly to our community in the future. We are proud to call Mr. Cepregi a resident of Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

Mr. Ryan Cepregi is only fourteen years of age, but this past June he saved his friend's life. Ryan received a text message from his friend stating that he had taken all of his depression medication in an attempt to take his own life. Ryan immediately contacted his friend's father and paramedics were able to save his life, partially as a result of Ryan's immediate and mature response. Ryan said, "I

was just being a friend. He has so many more years to live his life, he is too young to die." Ryan put the skills he was taught as a Boy Scout to use in order to save his friend's life. Ryan has been involved in the Boy Scouts of America since he was a Tiger Cub at the age of 7, and has been active in Troop 120 for many years now. For his use of these skills, Ryan is being awarded The Medal of Merit, which is given to a youth member or adult leader who has performed some outstanding act of service of a rare or exceptional character that reflects an uncommon degree of concern for the well-being of others.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose admirable actions have already impacted our community greatly and will likely continue to do so in the future. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Mr. Ryan Cepregi for his service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

HONORING TRINA GEORGE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Trina George, who is a Director, Leader and Public Servant.

Trina George was appointed on June 29, 2009, by President Barack Obama to serve as Mississippi's Director of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Development. She has made history by being the first woman appointed in this position for the State of Mississippi. In her new role, she is charged with assisting residents of rural Mississippi with a range of programs such as: Affordable Housing, Water Systems Upgrades, and Economic Development Efforts. Rural development also provides grant and loan assistance to local governments and non-profit organizations for fire and police protection as well as health clinics, libraries and other facilities for public use. She is an advocate for rural communities throughout the state to assist with their growth, development and sustainability.

Prior to this appointment, Mrs. George served for 15 years as a Special Project Coordinator for Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON where she resolved community and constituency issues by thinking inside, outside and around the box. Her hands-on experience in the Congressional Office served as an ideal prerequisite for her role in rural economic development and community participation for the State of Mississippi.

Mrs. George served on many civic organizations, including education and volunteer groups. She is actively involved in the community where she is: a Board Member for the Heart of the South Girl Scouts Council, which serves Northern Mississippi and Southern Tennessee; and a Member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc, and Pi Alpha Alpha Honor Society. She holds a Bachelor's Degree from Mississippi Valley State University and a Master's Degree from Mississippi State University. She is currently a Ph.D. Candidate in Public Policy and Administration at Walden Univer-

sity. Also, she holds a Professional Certificate in Management and Leadership from the NeighborWorks Training Institute of America in Washington, DC.

Mrs. George is an important advocate for rural communities throughout the state. She administers and manages over 40 programs which include: housing; business and cooperative programs; community programs; and community facilities which are designed to improve the quality of life in rural America. Rural Development is an agency that the Obama Administration wants to see in the forefront of efforts to promote renewable energy and conservation of natural resources while ensuring a safe, sustainable, nutritious food supply through the Agency's cooperatives for present and future users.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Trina George, a director, leader and advocate, who is improving the quality of life for rural America.

CELEBRATING EDITH LEDERBERG

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Edith Lederberg, who turns 85 years old in August. Edith is a vibrant member of our community, and a true friend and advocate to senior citizens locally, statewide, and across the country. Edith has worked for the Aging and Disability Resource Center for 37 years. She currently serves as Executive Director, a position she has held since 1986. As Executive Director, she plans, coordinates, and directs senior programming and advocates on behalf of seniors at the local, state, and national level. She also raises financial resources to support programs for Older Americans residing in Broward County.

Ms. Lederberg has been recognized for her dedication several times over the course of her successful career, including her selection as a Media Representative and then as a Regular Delegate to the White House Conference on Aging. She served as President of the Florida Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and as Vice Chair of Broward's Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board for almost 18 years. She has been elected to the Broward Women's Hall of Fame and the Broward Senior Hall of Fame.

These are just a few from her long list of accomplishments. Ms. Lederberg was born in Freeport, New York and she has three children and four grandchildren. She is a truly exceptional woman and I know I join with her friends and family in celebrating her birthday. I wish her good health and continued success in the coming year.

RECOGNIZING EDMUND COOK

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mr. Edmund Cook for his many

years of service to American Legion Post 506, and to veterans in Westchester County, New York.

Born in Lithuania in 1945, Edmund Cook was separated from his family in the closing days of World War II. After being found and fed by American soldiers, he was put in a "displaced persons (DP)" Red Cross camp for five years until he was adopted by an American family. The kindness shown to him by those American soldiers would have a lasting impact on Mr. Cook, and would lead to a life-long career of helping veterans.

After receiving a masters degree from Fordham University, Edmund joined the Veterans Administration (VA) at the Montrose, New York, VA Hospital facility as a Clinical Social Worker. In 1991, he was transferred to the White Plains, New York, Veterans Center to help soldiers suffering from PTSD in the aftermath of the Iraq War. He soon started treating veterans from all wars, and has worked tirelessly to ensure they all receive the care they need. He would even go to homeless shelters to seek out veterans in need of medical treatment, and would collect clothes to give veterans.

For the past 30 years, Mr. Cook has chaired the Boys State Program for Ossining Post 506 American Legion. This program offers high school boys the opportunity to learn how our government works, from the local and state level to the Federal Government. It is an important learning experience for young men who might one day seek opportunities in government work. Mr. Cook has infused his passion for helping others into this program, and he continues to inspire young men every year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Edmund Cook of Ossining, NY, for his lifetime of service to the veterans and youth of my district. His work has inspired others to help those in need, and he has truly lived up to the Veterans Administration motto, "to care for him who shall have borne the battle." I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring his tremendous accomplishments.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MRS. MARTHA ANN (GIBBS) MELTON ON THE OCCASION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs. Martha Ann (Gibbs) Melton, who was born on August 7, 1914, to Charles and Charie Gibbs. She is the youngest and only daughter of three siblings. Her two older brothers, Scott and Jim, have both made their transitions. After becoming a grandmother, Martha has been affectionately addressed as Granny by all who know and love her. She is indeed a very proud grandmother with 32 grandchildren and a host of great grandchildren and great-great grandchildren.

Martha Ann had a very interesting childhood. Her father, Charles Gibbs (Poppa) was one of 12 siblings born to Henry and Ann

(Wright) Gibbs. Grandpa Henry Gibbs was a free slave in Clay County, West Point, Mississippi. Because he was a man of many trades—such as a farmer, shoe maker, textile worker, blacksmith, cotton gin operator, and molasses mill operator—Grandpa Henry's 12 children also followed in his path. His freedom came with a 225-acre land grant from the Cottrell Plantation owner, which was eventually inherited by his children and passed down through generations to living descendants. The young Poppa Charles Gibbs was a very hardworking farmer and shoemaker. His 3 children also had to work hard. Although there was always work to do, the kids did find time to play. Some of Granny's favorite games were baseball, hop scotch, and jump rope. Her recollection of a normal day was being up at day break, attending the one room Pooles' school house, and then working in the cotton fields until sundown where she was either chopping cotton or picking up 200 pounds of cotton a day during harvest. She took what she learned from Pooles' school to later earn a GED. Granny shared one of her favorite pastimes which was sitting and watching Poppa operate his shoe lasting machines to make shoes. She was always amazed how the machine would use a needle to punch and sew shoes. Not only did Poppa make shoes, but he also removed soles from old shoes and patched the soles to make them look new.

As tradition goes, the expectation is that, as the only daughter in the household, Granny would have a room with some special frills or girly touches. Quite the opposite, she remembers having the basics—a small bed, a trunk and a chifferobe, and she was quite content with her provisions. In addition, Sundays were special in the Gibbs family. Everyone got up early and put on their best attire for a day of worship at Primitive Baptist Church. Granny later became a member of Union Star Baptist Church (West Point) where she sang in the choir. Granny was also a member of the Prince Hall Masons, Heroines of Jericho Lounge, Court #324.

As a young woman, Martha Ann was a mother to 5 children, the late Chanie (Gibbs) Randle, Sallie (Collins) Sellers, Isaac Melton, Jr., Amos Melton, and Clarence Melton. Her husbands from previous marriages were the late Willie James Collins and the late Isaac Melton, Sr. She held a variety of jobs while living in West Point, ranging from day work at various homes to Bryan Bros. Packing Company, Swift and Company, working as a dry cleaning attendant, and later as a salesperson for American Burial Insurance Company.

In her senior years, Granny became ill and moved to Chicago to be cared for by her daughter, Sallie. Her church, Union Star Baptist, honored her transition with a letter for membership to Greater Garfield Baptist Church (Chicago) under the pastorship of Reverend George Henderson, where she serves faithfully and is the senior member of the Mother's Board. Granny occasionally breaks out in song during service, and is welcomed by Pastor Henderson. She affirms that her all-time favorite hymn is "I Heard the Voice of Jesus Say." Even though Granny has reached this historical milestone, she continues to be one of the feistiast elders you will ever encounter. She has been there and done

that and knows more than any of us will ever be able to profess . . . just ask her.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs. Melton as she reaches a milestone of 100 years and commend her and her family for the great legacy of history and the contributions they have made to human kind.

AN APPRECIATION TO AMERICAN SONGWRITERS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that American songwriters are my sweethearts. Their ability to conjure emotion and experience into a tune that can be enjoyed by all rivals any talent in the world.

Recently, I sponsored H.R. 4079, the Songwriter Equity Act of 2014, because of the obvious inequity that exists in the rate structure for songwriters and performers. It is my hope that this disparity will be corrected but not solely at the expense, however, of our nation's and my home state's radio and television broadcast stations.

The art of songwriting depends on a vibrant workplace, which unfortunately is becoming more and more difficult to find. If we want to continue to lead the world in music, from a cultural and economic perspective, future changes to our copyright laws should be aimed at supporting and helping the American songwriter.

HONORING LAMBS OF GOD, INC.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a landmark establishment within the Clinton community that provides one of the most critical and essential services for all working parents: Lambs of God, Inc.

Lambs of God, Inc., formerly known as Agape' Childcare, was established on August 1987 by Jessie and Shirley Burns of Bolton, Mississippi. Over the past two decades, the establishment has changed ownership and name twice, but the quality of childcare and nurturing has continued to grow for over 20 years. In 1998, Victor and Cantrell Keyes, also of Bolton, Mississippi, became the new owners and changed the name to Agape Christian Academy. In June 2005, Kenneth and Vickie Lewis of Clinton, Mississippi became the establishment's present day owners and renamed the business Lambs of God, Inc.

Over 1,000 children have been served and ministered to through Lambs of God, Inc.

Founded in reference to John 21:15, the business is currently licensed to serve 57 children and is dedicated to developing and nurturing the physical, cognitive, emotional, and social growth in a safe Christian learning environment.

In addition to providing childcare, the establishment also offers summer camp, preschool, afterschool, before school drop-off, A'Beka tutorial and two well-balanced meals and two afternoon snacks. The overall mission of Lambs of God, Inc. is to interactively engage a child's educational needs while promoting professionalism in the field of childcare.

The vision and inspiration for Lambs of God, Inc. manifested via the encouragement given by Mrs. Daisy Johnson, owner of Kids Are Kids Learning Center in Brandon, Mississippi. Her insight in the field of childcare gave Mr. and Mrs. Lewis the inspiration and the tools needed to encourage and redirect families and single parents. Childcare became the perfect opportunity to lay a strong spiritual/educational foundation, build character and exemplify love, all while strengthening the community and establishing lifelong relationships.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lambs of God, Inc. for its past and present dedication to providing impeccable, dependable childcare services in an effort to help families of all backgrounds within the Clinton community.

HONORING MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER FRANCIS L. WAWROSKI, JR., U.S. NAVY RET.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of the late Master Chief Petty Officer Francis L. Wawroski, Jr., U.S. Navy Ret. of Laredo, Texas—a well-known veteran, educator, and philanthropist.

Master Chief Wawroski was a graduate of Southwest Texas State University. After graduating Master Chief Wawroski served a tour of duty in the U.S. Army during the Vietnam War. After being honorably discharged from the U.S. Army, Master Chief Wawroski enlisted in the U.S. Naval reserve, where he continued to serve for 32 years including service during Operation Desert Storm.

Master Chief Wawroski was also a long-term educator; he retired after 33 years of service with the Laredo Independent School District. Master Chief Wawroski was an honorable teacher, administrator and mentor to both colleagues and students. Civic involvements were also considered high priority to Master Chief Wawroski. These civic involvements included various community organizations, most recently with the Laredo Veterans Coalition.

Master Chief Wawroski is survived by his wife of 41 years, Francisca Gamboa Wawroski; their loving children Judith Wawroski-Addison, Valerie Wawroski-Rodriguez, and Dr. Patricia Wawroski-Mendoza; and his first granddaughter Olivia Marie Rodriguez. Master Chief Wawroski is also survived by his brother, MSG John W. Wawroski, U.S. Army Ret.; sister, Sandra M. Wawroski; and a foster brother, Eugene Perales.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had the opportunity to recognize the late Master Chief Petty Officer Francis L. Wawroski, Jr., U.S. Navy Ret. for his hard work and generosity

that has truly impacted many lives and our community.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JOHN
"SHERM" SHERMAN LEHMAN OF
BUFFALO MILLS, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my constituent John "Sherm" Sherman Lehman, a lifelong resident of Buffalo Mills, Pennsylvania. He is currently 100 years old.

Sherm Lehman was born on September 6, 1913, one of 14 brothers and sisters. He attended Hyndman High School until the age of 15, when he began working at the Celanese Corporation in Cumberland, Maryland to help support his family. He worked there for the next 45 years, seven months, and 17 days.

Sherm Lehman has always been deeply involved with his family, his church, and his local community. He married Geraldine Miller on January 25, 1936, and they have been together for 62 years, with three sons and two daughters who continue to reside in the Bedford, Pennsylvania region. His faith was particularly important to him, and he continues to worship at Christ Lutheran Church. Sherm even celebrated his 100th birthday in 2013 there, joined by many friends and family members. In addition, Sherm served on the Hyndman-Londonderry School Board in the 1950s, served as church treasurer, and remains an active member in the local Lions Club.

Sherm was drafted into the U.S. Navy in February 1945, and was honorably discharged when World War II ended six months later. As he describes it, "When the Germans found out Lehman was coming they decided to surrender right then and there." Sherm continued to express joy and success in athletics, winning over 100 medals in track and field events in the Bedford County Senior Olympics. He also went on to compete in the 100 meter dash in the National Senior Olympics held in St. Louis, Missouri in 1987, when he was 74 years old.

John Sherman Lehman stands as an outstanding example of American honor and citizenship, and to this day he takes the time to vote in every election. He worked hard throughout his life, providing for his family and ensuring that future generations understand the ideals of genuine humility and love-for-country that you find so frequently in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to honor Mr. John Sherman Lehman on the floor of the House of Representatives today. I congratulate him on a life well-lived.

TRIBUTE—DOUGLAS RING

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Douglas Ring, a valuable member of the Pueblo, Colorado community. Mr. Ring, a beloved husband, father, grandfather and friend, was a businessman and community servant who faithfully stood by his community for over four decades.

Mr. Ring moved to Pueblo with his family when he was 14 years old where he attended Centennial High School, graduating in 1958. As an avid baker and gourmet chef, Mr. Ring worked in the restaurant business in multiple capacities, eventually opening the Great American Winery in 1974. Throughout the rest of his life, Mr. Ring fueled his passion for cooking and baking, bringing as many as 15 to 20 recipes to the Colorado State Fair each year, and winning an award for his baklava recipe.

Mr. Ring was not only an award-winning chef and pastry maker, but a respected public servant. From 1975 to 1989, Mr. Ring served on the Pueblo City Council during some of Pueblo's hardest economic times. He worked tirelessly to help the city manage the downsizing of the then CF&I Steel Mill and the Pueblo Army Depot. During this time, the unemployment rate throughout Pueblo reached as high as 20 percent, forcing Mr. Ring to make tough decisions with his colleagues to determine the fate of his beloved community. As one of his colleagues on the Pueblo City Council recently said about him, Mr. Ring was a major influence in keeping the city moving in a positive direction.

In later years, Mr. Ring became a local realtor, working for Prudential Platinum. Even after retirement, he remained active in the Pueblo community, serving on multiple volunteer boards and community projects, and spending time with his wife, children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the life of Mr. Douglas Ring. He lived a life filled with passion for his family, friends, baking and cooking, and service to the Pueblo community. I stand with the Pueblo community and the State of Colorado in recognition of his life and service. He will be missed.

RECOGNIZING JENNY LIN FOUNDATION CONCERT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the free concert on August 1 organized by the Jenny Lin Foundation.

The Jenny Lin Foundation was founded 20 years ago, in 1994, following the tragic murder of Jenny Lin of Castro Valley at just 14 years old. Thanks to her parents, John and Mei-lian, Jenny's talents and spirit will never be forgot-

ten through the work of this wonderful organization.

In recognition of Jenny's love of music, the Jenny Lin Foundation sponsors a free summer music program. It culminates in a free community concert each year.

Not only have thousands of East Bay students benefited from this music education, but they have gained leadership skills too. That is because the Foundation's programs are student led.

The Foundation also supports music education through two scholarships to help with private music lessons. These are annual awards given to a Castro Valley Unified School District Music Program participant chosen as the "Most Promising Musician" and a Castro Valley middle school student for "Academic and Musical Achievement."

Another focus of the Jenny Lin Foundation is to help protect our children. It has done this through fairs to educate parents and children on how to stay safe, self-defense classes, and art contests.

Thank you to John and Mei-lian, the foundation, and everyone involved in it for making a tremendous contribution to the East Bay. I want to wish everyone involved in this year's concert the very best.

It is moving to see that such a positive benefit can come out of such a terrible crime. May the Jenny Lin Foundation continue to help our East Bay community for many years to come.

HONORING MURIEL ELLIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Muriel Ellis, who has been blazing through Mississippi's legal system.

Mrs. Ellis, 54, became the first African American clerk of Mississippi's Supreme Court and Court of Appeals on July 1 this year, after being the first African American Supreme Court deputy clerk and chief deputy clerk.

Mrs. Ellis worked her way through the clerk's office for 23 years after beginning as a legal clerk in 1991. The Callaway High School alumna, who graduated in 1977, became chief deputy clerk in 2009 after being named a team leader in 2000 and deputy clerk in 2007.

The Jackson native said she is blessed and honored to accept her new position. "I am just going to lead the clerk's office forward," she said. Mrs. Ellis took courses at Phillips Business College and worked as a ward secretary for St. Dominic Hospital from 1979-1987.

Mrs. Ellis has seen many changes since working in the clerk's office. Along with Ms. Kathy Gillis, former Mississippi Supreme Court Clerk of 33 years, Mrs. Ellis supervised the office's transition to electronic filing. Since the office's mandatory e-filing for briefs and motions began on January 1, 2014, she continues to work on the electronic transition through implementing emailed orders and clerk's notices, as well as e-filing transcripts and records from other trial courts.

The clerk became interested in a career in the legal system when she was serving as an

alternate juror in the Hinds County Circuit Court. While working in the billing edits department at the City of Jackson Water Department, she said she drove past the Supreme Court building all the time on her way to the Water Department office, which is also located on High Street. "I never knew what this building was, but I used to say: 'That is a pretty building. I would love to work there someday,'" Mrs. Ellis said.

Mrs. Ellis has three children: Karen Ellis Evans, Kimberly Ellis and Leonard Ellis; three grandchildren: Madison Evans, Leonard Ellis, III and Bryson Williams—and is married to Mr. Leonard Ellis, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Muriel Ellis.

RECOGNIZING NSF
INTERNATIONAL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the good work of NSF International and to commend them for their 70 years of service to citizens around the world. NSF International was founded in 1944 as the National Sanitation Foundation and aimed to set standards of quality for food and water. Since changing their name to NSF International in 1990 and expanding their influence to other areas, such as certifications for consumer goods and the environment, they have contributed greatly to the well being of our citizens and our planet.

NSF International is devoted to ensuring reliable and effective standards for all types of consumer goods, services and systems. The organization also provides auditing and risk management tools and solutions for the businesses and industries they support. They are truly great members of the business community as well as valued industry partners.

The sanitation and quality of our products and food present a monumentally important responsibility. We need to make every effort to ensure that people around the world receive healthy and safe goods and services that have a standardized backing. NSF International combines all of these values and I am proud to support their mission. I would like to thank NSF International for all their work over the past 70 years and wish them the best of luck in the future as they continue to work on behalf of people everywhere.

IN RECOGNITION OF WYNNTON
HILL BAPTIST CHURCH'S 153RD
ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia as the church's membership and

leadership celebrates a remarkable 153 years. The congregation of Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church will celebrate this noteworthy anniversary on Sunday, August 24, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. at the Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the Civil War era, the church was the first of any denomination to be built in the Wynnnton area of Columbus. In 1961, during a meeting at the home of Mr. Willis and Mrs. Sarah James, the first members of the church, the plans were established to build a sanctuary.

The first pastor, Reverend Phillip Owens, assisted in building the foundation of the church. Land was purchased from the James family to build a bush arbor which was covered by fresh bushes from a wooded area every Saturday before the Sunday service. After some time, a wooden structure was built. Rev. Owens served the church devotedly for 47 years.

In 1911, Reverend James H. Carter was called to lead Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church and he continued to build from Rev. Owens' foundation. Under Rev. Carter's leadership, the church expanded and the structure changed from wooden to brick. The first public school in the area was taught in the basement of the church. Mrs. Selena Cody and Miss Johnnie Hutchins were the teachers.

One of the most significant moments in the church's history occurred after a city ordinance was enforced in 1928. The church was condemned and torn down. However, a sanctuary was erected in 1930 and the church began to flourish. Throughout the coming decades, an education wing was installed. In addition, the church was incorporated in 1979. Unfortunately, turmoil was on the rise again. In 1989, a firebomb destroyed the education wing, but that did not prevail against the spirit of the members. The following year, the education wing was remodeled and rededicated. The construction of the present sanctuary was completed in 1999 and the loan was paid off in 2003.

During these progressions, Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church had eleven dedicated spiritual leaders that shepherded the flock and led them to a state of prosperity. Today the church continues to grow and give back to the community it has served for over 150 years.

The story of Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church, which began as a small group of people worshipping in a bush arbor church 153 years ago and has grown into an expansive and successful church, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Wynnnton Hill Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GROWING
AMERICAN SHIPPING ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the demise of the U.S. flag merchant marine and U.S. shipbuilding industry and to offer legislation to help revitalize these industries that are indispensable to the national security and economic interests of the United States.

Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, often recognized as the most important American strategist of the 19th Century, argued persuasively that our national greatness was inextricably associated with our control of the sea in order to secure both our commercial and security interests. That concept is as relevant today as it was in Mahan's time.

Our economic strength and national security today remain tethered to our ability to control the safety and security of the global supply chain. What has changed, however, is our vigilance in maintaining our commercial U.S. maritime industry.

That must change and fortunately I see a way forward. The U.S. shipbuilding industry and U.S. natural gas market are strategic industrial and natural resources essential to U.S. national security interests. In fact, the U.S. maritime industry has been interwoven into the fabric of our economy and national security since the founding of our Republic and the establishment of our Continental Navy in 1775.

Several factors explain why it is in the U.S. national interest to utilize the emerging coastwise and export trades for liquefied natural gas (LNG) to revitalize the U.S. flag.

First, this newly available and abundant energy source would provide reliable, long-term markets for U.S. commercial shipbuilding and new trades for U.S. flag vessel operators. Second, the imminent LNG export trade might also provide the impetus to attract new capital investment to expand the U.S. shipbuilding industrial base which has declined in capacity and international competitiveness over the past forty years. And third, the LNG export trade could be used productively to strengthen U.S. strategic interests and alliances with LNG trading partners, especially Japan, South Korea and India.

For these reasons, today I am introducing, along with my good friend, the Chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, legislation to provide a clear signal to the administration, maritime industry, energy industry, and our foreign trading partners that we in Congress intend to get serious about revitalizing our shipbuilding and maritime industries.

The Growing American Shipping Act is straightforward legislation that would expand existing authority under section 306 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 and under the Deepwater Port Act (33 U.S.C. 1503(i)) to ensure that the trade in LNG—both the import and the export of LNG—benefits the U.S. maritime industry.

This legislation, if enacted, would enhance U.S. national security and port safety by encouraging the transport of LNG on U.S. flag vessels. It would help maintain the skilled labor pool and technological and industrial infrastructure of the U.S. shipbuilding industry necessary to build and repair both military and commercial vessels. Furthermore, this legislation would ensure that vessels carrying LNG to or from the U.S. are crewed by credentialed U.S. mariners to reduce safety and security risks.

This legislation has received robust support from a host of maritime stakeholders, including the Maritime Trades Department (AFL-CIO), Seafarers International Union (AFL-CIO), Transportation Institute, Shipbuilders Council, Navy League of the United States, American Maritime Officers, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association (MEBA), International Association of Masters, Mates and Pilots (MM&P), Maritime Institute for Research and Industrial Development (MIRAID), Marine Firemen's Union, Metal Trades Department (AFL-CIO), Sailors' Union of the Pacific, and American Maritime Congress.

Again, this legislation builds on existing authority under the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 and the Deepwater Port Act which specifically authorized the Secretary of Transportation to develop a program to promote the use of U.S. flag vessels in the importation of LNG to the United States. This legislation simply would amend each statute to expand the scope of these authorities to apply also to the LNG export trade.

This legislation is a measured and reasonable step forward to revitalize our U.S. maritime industries, to support our economic and national security, and to begin the process of reclaiming our mantle as a great maritime nation. I urge members to join Chairman HUNTER and myself in this effort.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN A. HORSFORD

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain that on rollcall vote No. 463, held on July 29, 2014, I intended to vote "no." I am opposed to the 21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act, and I inadvertently recorded myself as an "aye" when the bill came to a vote.

HONORING LILLIE G. HENSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable hero, Lillie G. Henson.

Lillie G. Dean Henson was born to the late Aaron and Lillian Dean on August 10, 1949 in Sardis, MS, Panola County. She is the ninth of eleven children, five boys and six girls. There

were many challenges that she faced that seemed to have placed her in the line of the first born. She was blessed to be born in a Christian home where reading and studying the Bible were not an option, therefore, her faith in the Lord was well rooted and grounded.

Faced with many challenges of sickness in her family, Lillie learned the application of her faith was the only true anchor. Growing up was very challenging at times. Early in her growing up years her mother was stricken with a severe heart condition which required lots of rest and carefully prepared meals.

At the age of fourteen, much of the responsibility of taking care of the family fell upon Lillie. Cooking breakfast for the family and preparing a special diet for her ailing mom before going off to school was quite an experience.

As a little girl growing up, Lillie's dad would ask her to read the Bible to him, and as a child she remembers reading: "Honor your father and your mother that your days may be long upon the earth." This scripture and many others rested in her spirit as she grew into adulthood. Lillie's passion for the word of God grew greater and greater.

By the time Lillie was a junior in high school, she began to make plans for college . . . only to be asked by her ailing mother to stay home to make sure her younger sister, who was then a junior, finish high school. Her plans were shattered but she learned to be obedient to her parents through the studying of the scriptures.

In 1969, Lillie's mother went to be with the Lord, her sister completed her junior year of high school with perfect attendance and completed high school as planned.

In 1970, Lillie moved to Chicago with her older siblings. Lillie was employed at Brachs Candy Company for twenty years. She was among the first few African Americans to hold a manager's position in the Quality Control Department.

In 1990, Lillie's dad at the age of eighty-two became ill. Her husband, Otha Henson, Sr., who was also employed at Brach Candy Company and is from Kilmichael, MS, decided to move back south to care for Lillie's dad and baby sister, Rebecca, who was born with Spinal Bifida. Lillie's dad passed away in 1991 and Rebecca lived ten years after his death.

Since 1996 to present, Lillie has been employed as Program Manager at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, a Youth Development Program located in Lambert, MS.

Lillie continued her education at Northwest Community College, Senatobia, MS, Rust College, Holly Springs, MS, and in 2012, she earned a BA in Ministry and in 2013 she received a Masters in Christian Counseling from Jacksonville Theological Seminary in Jacksonville, FL.

Lillie is happily married, the proud mother of four children, eleven grandchildren and two great grand boys.

You can find her teaching Sunday school on Sunday mornings at Pleasant Green M.B. Church, Sardis, MS, also a praise and worship leader, counseling, and encouraging and nurturing those in need.

Eph. 6:2, "Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Lillie G. Henson for she is definitely the epitome of an unsung hero.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF FRANK ALSCHULER TO THE UPTOWN COMMUNITY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Frank Alschuler on his 90th birthday, September 10, 2014.

Frank is a lifelong Chicagoan and Cubs fan. He graduated from George B. Swift Elementary School, the University of Chicago Lab School, Dartmouth College and Yale University School of Architecture and he served in the United States Navy.

He and his late wife, Marjorie Traxler, married on July 24, 1960. In 1965, they moved to Junior Terrace in Chicago's Uptown neighborhood where they raised their two children, Matthew and Mimi.

Frank was a founding board member of C4 (Community) Counseling Centers of Chicago, formerly known as EUCMHC, Edgewater Uptown Community Mental Health Center). Recognizing the need to serve the many low-income residents living with mental health concerns in the Uptown and Edgewater neighborhoods, the mental health center was opened in 1972. As a licensed architect, Frank volunteered his services to help the organization every step of the way. Now with five locations and an additional one under construction, C4 currently provides mental health services, crisis intervention, and substance use treatment to more than 10,000 at-risk children, adults and families annually. Now, 42 years later, Frank is still on the board and still helping with space planning.

In addition to C4, Frank also served on the board of Voice of the People in Uptown for over 40 years. Voice of the People has worked for and with low-income individuals and families in Uptown to create quality affordable housing. Working with early directors Irene Hutchinson and Anne Dee Harper, Frank helped build a tenant organizing group into a full-fledged neighborhood housing development organization. With Frank's expertise on the Board, the Voice went from managing one 6-flat to developing and managing hundreds of units of family housing in Uptown.

Frank and his late wife Marjorie instilled in their children and grandchildren the importance of giving back to the community. I wish him a happy celebration of a life well-lived, and good health in the coming years.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAYOR SHERMAN JONES AND THE VILLAGE OF BROADVIEW, ILLINOIS AS IT CELEBRATES ITS ONE HUNDRED (100) YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 26th, I had the opportunity to march with the Mayor of Broadview,

the Honorable Sherman Jones; Mayor of Westchester, the Honorable Sam Paulia; Cook County Recorder of Deeds, the Honorable Karen Yarborough; the Honorable Chris Welch, State Representative; the Honorable Edwina Perkins, Mayor of Maywood; Trustees of Broadview, Attorney Richard Boykin and Democratic Nominee for District 1 of the Cook County Board, as well as a host of dignitaries from throughout the western suburbs, especially Proviso Township.

Proud residents of Broadview were lined outside their beautiful homes as we made our way to the shopping center where a daylong family festival was being staged. I understand that Governor Pat Quinn came later to bring greetings and salute the Mayors and other elected officials and residents who had gathered.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Village of Broadview on its 100 years as an organized part of Cook County and Proviso Township in the great state of Illinois.

49TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish Medicare and Medicaid a very happy 49th Anniversary!

On this day in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Social Security Act into law, establishing Medicare and Medicaid and the guarantee that a wide range of health and medical services would be available to millions of Americans.

A year after declaring a war on poverty in 1954, President Johnson created two programs that would serve as the backbone of our Great Society and provide a backstop so that our fellow Americans would never again be left without a safety net or a helping hand.

These programs matter, not only to their users, but to all citizens in our great nation.

Medicare matters because it provides comprehensive health coverage to seniors and gives families peace of mind that their loved ones can retire with security.

The program has provided seniors and the disabled with the quality health care, economic security, and the peace of mind they deserve.

Because of Medicare, millions of Americans have been able to age with respect and dignity, instead of mounting medical debt and uncertainty regarding treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand how important Medicare is to seniors and families in America.

Nearly 98 percent of older Ohioans were enrolled in Medicare in 2011, and nationwide more than 50 million seniors and people with disabilities are covered under Medicare.

Medicaid matters because 1 in 5 Americans and 1 and 3 children receive health care through Medicaid. Providing preventative care and lifelong health assistance is not only the right, moral thing to do, it is also fiscally responsible.

I look forward to continuing to work to strengthen and protect these programs and to ensure that the promise of health and economic security will be there for generations to come.

CONGRATULATIONS TO REV. MARK MCCOLLUM AND THE NEW HOME BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Mark McCollum was born in Sunflower, Mississippi on June 12, 1934. In 1954 he moved to Chicago, Illinois. In 1964, Rev. Mark McCollum and a small group of faithful followers and believers founded the New Home Baptist Church in February of that year. The church's first location was in the Stone Temple Baptist Church Annex on Millard and Douglas Boulevard. A year later on March 19, 1965, Pastor McCollum lost his right arm in an accident and the church moved several times before locating to 349 South Cicero Avenue. It was always Pastor McCollum's desire to be in a church building and the New Home Family worked and prayed for forty years for it to happen. They called those years, the wilderness years, referring to the 40 years the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness after leaving Egypt. The Church and its pastor had their challenges and struggles but as a skilled leader, administrator and businessperson, the church acquired most of the 300 South Cicero Avenue block and used it as leverage to purchase the new church location at 4804 W. Polk Street, which is now known as Dr. Mark McCollum Avenue.

While being a great preacher and pastor, Dr. Mark McCollum is also known as one of the greatest gospel singers in the world, and brings great joy and inspiration to thousands every week with his voice. He can be heard on radio every Sunday night on AM 1450 at 9:00 pm where thousands wait for his theme song, "I Will Trust In The Lord Until I Die."

Finally, the wait was over and for the past ten years the New Home Congregation has been worshipping at 4804 W. Polk St. in Chicago, Illinois and saying thanks be to God for all that he has done. As one who lived at 5252 W. Polk Street for twenty years, I say thank you New Home, Thank You Dr. Mark McCollum for all that you mean to our community!

God Bless and Keep you.

HONORING CLEOTHA SADDLER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable hero, Cleotha Saddler.

Cleotha Saddler was born on February 1, 1945 in Illinois to Garfield Allen and Viola Orr. She grew up in a home with six other relatives until her father decided he would raise her in Memphis, TN. Cleotha attended Mississippi Valley State University where she earned multiple degrees in elementary education. She later married Frank Saddler, Jr., settled in Marks, MS, and gave birth to nine children.

Today, Cleotha, also known as "Cleo" or "Lou," is the rock of her family. She continues to care for her children, and take care of her grandchildren. Over the course of her life, she has contributed to her community tremendously. Her name has become one so common for helping others that the desire from others to want to help even her grandchildren has increased. She is most known in her efforts for raising money for those in need.

In 2005, she stood at the main intersection in Marks, MS tirelessly to gather donations from townspeople to send to Louisiana for Hurricane Katrina victims. In addition to that, she has never been reluctant to gather donations in that same way for families who cannot afford to pay for the funerals and burials of their loved ones. She comforts those families, not just with funds but with endless visits and "check-in" calls. She also helps organizations to decorate and/or cook for different events in the community. She is one that is very supportive of the school system, in reference to achieving adequate education. Cleotha is never hesitant to help anyone in any way that she possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Cleotha Saddler for she is definitely the epitome of an unsung hero.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 31, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 31, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 31, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Roger Spradlin, Valley Baptist Church, Bakersfield, California, offered the following prayer:

Father, we thank You for Your sovereignty and providence in each person's life who stands before me and, more importantly, before You. Grant them today Your guidance in their deliberations.

We acknowledge that our country is facing serious challenges and that our world is in crisis. Give this body the courage that is necessary to lead. Rather than allowing our ideology to further divide us, may You, Father, unite us in our shared love for this great Nation.

Give the Members the wisdom to help the oppressed and the weakest among us, as well as the courage to lead by conviction, rather than by mere pragmatism.

Concerning our failures, rather than justice, we ask for Your mercy and grace. Give us the will to acknowledge and to repent of all wrongs.

We thank You for the values on which this country was founded and for Your continued blessing through the years. But we ask today, Father, for our country, that our best days would not be behind us, but before us.

We ask all these things in the strong name of Jesus.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I

demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARINO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND ROGER SPRADLIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am both honored and humbled to welcome my good friend, Pastor Roger Spradlin, as our guest chaplain this morning.

Holding a doctorate in ministry and serving as a major leader within the Southern Baptist community, Roger has served the Valley Baptist Church in Bakersfield, California, since 1983. In that time, he has led a congregation that has grown into a family of over 8,000 followers, a family that my wife, Judy, my son, Connor, and Megan belong to.

I have watched Pastor Roger do many things for our community. I have watched him use his grace, his humility, his ability to bring people together. But the part that inspires me the most is I have watched him in time of need, in time of tragic situations in our community, to help us heal. I have watched him officiate and bring joy to a husband and wife being married. I have watched him lift up those in

harm's way. But most importantly, I have watched him always bring the grace and inspire others.

So it is with a great deal of joy on a special day today that I am able to have my friend, an individual that helped change my life, be a part of all of our lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MIDDLE CLASS JUMP-START

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, hard-working American families deserve a Congress that is working hard for them. Unfortunately, under Republican leadership, the 113th Congress is set to be the least productive Congress in history. Let me say that again. Speaker BOEHNER is presiding over what will be the least productive Congress in history.

Mr. Speaker, leadership comes with responsibility. Rather than working with Democrats to enact legislation that will strengthen the middle class and expand economic opportunity for all Americans, my friends on the other side of the aisle are obstructing progress and suing the President.

Democrats have a different plan. Instead of blocking legislation that will grow the economy, we have a plan that will jump-start the middle class. It has concrete proposals that will bring jobs back to America, provide women equal pay for equal work, raise the minimum wage, provide emergency unemployment benefits, and help millions of students afford college.

Mr. Speaker, we have serious challenges facing our Nation. Let's put aside partisan differences and get to work to jump-start the middle class and create jobs. Let's not adjourn. Let's cancel the recess and stay here and do the work the American people expect us to do.

THE UNITED STATES MUST CONTINUE TO STAND BY ISRAEL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the world has watched violence in the Middle East escalate due to Hamas rocket attacks. The bottom line is that Israel, under the trusted leadership of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, has the absolute right to defend its citizens from murderous attacks.

Hamas is a terrorist organization attacking to achieve one goal: bring death and destruction to the people of Israel. The Hamas threat is: "We love death more than you love life."

Hamas continues to launch thousands of rockets into Israel and create a network of terror tunnels. Sadly, Palestinian civilians have died because Hamas uses the innocent as human shields.

The United States must stand by our greatest ally in the region. Anything but total support of Israel by the President signals weakness for future attacks on the American people.

Terrorist threats are increasing, despite the President's denial. The President's actions to defeat terrorism are more significant than words.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Rest in peace, Earl Brown, a South Carolina patriot.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF SHERIFF RALPH FROEHLICH

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the recent loss of Sheriff Ralph Froehlich.

Sheriff Froehlich was born and raised in Elizabeth, New Jersey. After serving over 9 years in the U.S. Marine Corps as an Infantryman and a drill instructor, Mr. Froehlich joined the Elizabeth Police Department. Mr. Froehlich worked for almost 20 years, rising up to the rank of Lieutenant.

In 1977, he was elected the Sheriff of Union County and, at the time of his passing, was in the midst of serving his 13th term. This gave him the distinction of being the longest-serving Sheriff in the history of New Jersey.

While serving as the Sheriff of Union County, he implemented several programs designed to make our community safer. He worked hard to establish units regarding missing persons, domestic violence, and search and rescue.

I want to express my deepest condolences for all who knew and cared for Sheriff Froehlich, and my gratitude for the years he devoted to keeping our community safe.

RECENT BIPARTISAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to draw attention to the recent bipartisan accomplishments here in the House of Representatives. These efforts include passage of legislation to keep the Internet tax-free, a highway bill that will keep more than 700,000 construction workers on the job, a series of education bills that will give students and their families the tools they need to help make postsecondary education more accessible and affordable, and legislation that will reform the Veterans Administration.

The House has also acted on an energy bill that would make it easier to ship our natural gas overseas, and put much-needed pressure on Russia, as well as a tax measure that will allow U.S. companies, large and small, to innovate, create jobs, and increase wages.

These are just a few of the more than 300 House-passed bills, including more than 40 jobs bills, that wait for action in the Senate of the United States. These bipartisan measures would benefit American families and businesses. They all deserve an up-or-down vote in the United States Senate.

THIS IS A SAD DAY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come today to this floor on what I believe is a very sad day for this House. There is no place left safe for children. Yesterday and today, we have condoned and endorsed activities which put children at risk. Children are not safe in mosques, in churches, in U.N.-protected schools, in hospitals, in ambulances, or even playing on the beach.

167 years ago, my great-grandmother came from Ireland, 12 years old, by herself, on a boat, landed in the docks of New York. If this Congress had been sitting then, she would have been sent back to Roscommon County, to her people, to her family, where a third of the people were dying of famine, a third emigrated, and a third stayed. That is what we would have sent her back to, without a hearing, without anything. She had no rights. And, luckily, it wasn't that way.

There is no resonance for Jesus' command: Suffer the little children to come unto me.

Our country will rue this day.

VETERANS ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am here to celebrate the

most recent of many bills produced by this House, the Republican-led House. This one is H.R. 3230, the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act, with overwhelming bipartisan support. This legislation will begin the process of reforming the Veterans Health Administration and instituting great accountability across our veterans' health system.

Being the father of an Army soldier and having worked for 30 years as a health care practitioner, my heart broke when I first heard of the disturbing revelations of gross misconduct and dysfunction at the VA.

Fortunately, with the passage of H.R. 3230, we have moved one step closer to restoring the trust of our veterans. This legislation will afford greater and timelier access to cost-effective care services, while bringing necessary changes to the Department of Veterans Affairs. However, Mr. Speaker, this is just the first step, and more needs to be done to fulfill the commitments we have made to these brave men and women.

I want to thank the chairmen of the House and the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees for their commitment to overcoming political differences and finding common ground.

□ 0915

KURDISTAN

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, over the conflict in the area of Iraq, dating from the first gulf war to the second, we have had staunch allies in the Kurdish people.

And just as the American people had within them the desire for independence in 1776, so, too, rises the tide of self-determination among the Kurdish people. And should they choose to take that path in a referendum and seek to separate themselves from the failing Iraqi State, I strongly encourage America to promptly recognize a new, independent Kurdistan to take its place among other important American allies, like Israel, in the region.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, before we go home for the August work period, I think it is important for this House to reaffirm to the world our support for Israel. Under President Obama, it would seem that America has switched sides from its historical support for Israel, which dates back to 1948.

The President seems to want hostilities to end so bad that he and his supporting cast within the mainstream media fail to remember or point out that Hamas has been lobbing rockets into Israel from shortly after Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in 2005.

In Secretary Kerry's mind, it would seem, a stop to hostilities means Israel must stop defending its people. But there is never mention of Hamas ending the constant barrage of rockets—22 red alerts have gone off thus far in Israel today. That is not 22 rockets. That is 22 separate events where rockets have been launched into Israel.

This President seems more interested in appeasing Hamas, which is a terrorist organization, than he is in comprehending Israel's desire to end this threat to its people and its existence.

This position put forward by the President and his Secretary of State, John Kerry, is an injustice and a betrayal toward a longtime friend and ally in the region. Israel deserves better, and they deserve more, Mr. President.

As for me and my office and my house and my family, we will always stand with Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 696 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 696

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 5230, and on the legislative day of July 31, 2014, the House shall consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully

present in the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SEC. 4. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.R. 5021 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 31, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 6. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 31, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of three measures: H.R. 5230, the supplemental appropriations bill to deal with the influx of unaccompanied minors across the southern border; H.R. 5272, a bill that would prevent the administration

from expanding the use of deferred action for individuals who are not legally present in the United States; and the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5230, the supplemental appropriations bill. This is consistent with the way all seven supplemental appropriations acts considered in the 110th and 111th Congresses were treated when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were in the majority. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and provides for one motion to recommit.

In addition, the resolution also provides that after the passage of H.R. 5230, that it be in order to consider H.R. 5272, a bill that would prevent the administration from expanding the use of deferred action for individuals who are not legally present in the United States. The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5272, provides for 60 minutes of debate, equally divided by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition, the rule also provides for consideration of a motion to disagree to the Senate's amendment to H.R. 5021, so we can send the bill that easily passed the House on an overwhelming bipartisan vote back to the Senate.

Finally, the rule provides for same-day and suspension authority today to resolve any outstanding issues before the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, this rule demonstrates this House's careful consideration of the President's supplemental request. Earlier this month, the President submitted to Congress a \$3.7 billion request to deal with both the urgent crisis of unaccompanied juveniles crossing the border and with wildfires.

Since then, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman GRANGER, Speaker BOEHNER, and the Republican Conference have thoughtfully considered what resources the President needs to address this crisis through the end of the fiscal year.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is a significantly pared-down piece of legislation. It provides \$659 million to meet the immediate border security and humanitarian needs. This supplemental sends the message that this administration has been unwilling to send, that if you come here illegally, you will be deported. And it provides the resources to effect just that.

It provides \$334 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement for boosted enforcement efforts, accelerates judicial proceedings by providing \$22 million to hire temporary immigration judges and provide courts with video teleconferencing equipment, and

makes smart policy reforms, like changing the 2008 sex trafficking law to require that all unaccompanied minors are treated the same, among others.

These important policy reforms, which the President initially asked for, are a reasonable, thoughtful response to the tenfold increase of unaccompanied alien children since 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the President's advisers warned him this crisis was coming back in 2012 and 2013, but he ignored that advice. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the administration has mismanaged this entire issue from the beginning.

If the President's FY 2015 budget had become law, we would have seen a reduction of nearly 3,500 detention beds, a 2 percent reduction in ICE's investigative capacity, and a 12 percent reduction to CBP air and marine operations, all vital tools to deal with this problem.

In addition, the President's budget request for the Central American Regional Security Initiative, which confronts narcotics and arms trafficking, gangs, and organized crime in that region and addresses border security deficiencies and disrupts criminal infrastructure, was actually proposed to be cut in the President's FY 2015 budget. The House FY15 foreign operations bill reverses those cuts and actually increases the resources to deal with these related problems.

Mr. Speaker, at every turn, the administration has failed to address the border crisis adequately, and now the President wants a blank check to proceed. His aim is not to stop and reverse the flow of unaccompanied minors into this country. He merely aims to manage that influx more efficiently. The House cannot accept that.

This legislation, H.R. 5230, adequately funds the shortfalls caused by this administration's policy by using existing resources. And Republicans are willing to provide additional resources should they be needed in FY 2015 appropriations, within the bipartisan budget cap set by the Ryan-Murray budget agreement. But we believe that this bill provides the appropriate resources at this time.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for consideration of H.R. 5272, which would prevent the administration from expanding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, the so-called DACA program. I, like many of my colleagues, believe that DACA has incentivized juveniles to attempt the long and dangerous journey from Central America, with the hope of staying in this country permanently. Executive orders, like DACA, only serve to keep that hope alive. I believe it is important to send a strong signal that this program should not be expanded. H.R. 5272 does just that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule would send back the original House-passed highway bill to the Senate. While I ap-

preciate what my friends in the other body have been able to do, I believe it is important to provide Members the maximum amount of flexibility to craft a long-term highway bill. By accepting the Senate amendment, which would only provide adequate funding of the highway trust fund through mid-December, we would be effectively creating a new crisis in the middle of a lame duck session of Congress. Given the limited number of session days before the election, this does not seem like a prudent course to take. Instead, the House should return to the Senate its bipartisan legislation, which passed this Chamber by a vote of 367–55.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to move forward on these three important pieces of legislation before the August district work period. I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am looking over the rule that was passed late last night, and my reading of the rule indicates that that there was a change in the standing rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, I would like some parliamentary clarification on that provision.

If you look at the resolution in section 4, it says, "Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.R. 5021"—that is the transportation-related bill—"may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee."

Now, I am looking at the standing rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and the standing rules of the House provide that "when the stage of disagreement has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments, a motion to dispose of any amendment shall be privileged."

My question is: Doesn't "privileged" mean available to any Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is asking the Chair to interpret the pending resolution, and that provision will not be interpreted by the Chair while it is under consideration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of a parliamentary inquiry was where the Speaker was supposed to clarify questions of the rules and the parliamentary order.

I am simply asking whether or not, in previous rulings by this House and by the Parliamentarian, "privileged" has been interpreted to mean something that is available to any Member of the House, not just to the majority leader or the designee of the majority leader?

□ 0930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret this resolution during its pendency.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If the Chair does not want to interpret this parliamentary inquiry at this time, at what point would it be in order to ask the Parliamentarian and the Chair to interpret the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A parliamentary inquiry should relate in some practical sense to pending proceedings.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is it not the rule, passed out of the committee, that is pending? That is the parliamentary inquiry. Is that what is pending before the House, the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry is a matter for debate on the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. But, Mr. Speaker, isn't the matter pending before the House the rule that the designated chairman—acting chairman—of the Rules Committee just spoke about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 696 is pending at this time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. And I am reading one of the provisions of that resolution, specifically section 4 of that rule, which is before the House which changes the rules of the House to say that a motion may only be made by the majority leader or his designee, as opposed to the privileged motion required under the underlying rule. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has stated, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If I could ask for 1 minute of time to discuss this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will further yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Look, yesterday, we were on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, and our Republican colleagues passed a measure to sue the President of the United States, waste millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to sue the President of the United States, and the claim was the President has exceeded his authority.

That is a specious claim, but what is incredible is the very next day our Republican colleagues are here suspending democracy in the House, changing the standing rules of the

House to take away from any Member of the House the opportunity to offer a motion with respect to the transportation bill, which is what the standing rules of the House provide, and they want to say no, we are going to take that right away from a Member, and we are going to give it exclusively to the Republican leader or the Republican leader's designee.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, the last time we saw this happen? On the government shutdown. Our Republican colleagues used the same measure to refuse to take up the Senate bill, which would have ended the government shutdown. They didn't want to end it, so they kept it going. That cost the American taxpayer \$24 billion in damage to the economy.

Let's not play games with the rule, that this rule allows every Member their rights. The Speaker is not the king, and we should make sure that every Member has an opportunity.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address the underlying rule, and I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland's efforts to get clarity as to what is in this rule.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we saw this rule for the first time late last night. We saw the bill for the first time late last night. I believe the underlying bill was dropped shortly after 8 p.m., and Rules Committee convened after 10 p.m.

We are still in the process of trying to understand what is in this rule and this bill. I know that there are legitimate questions with regard to how it changes the rules of our entire House of Representatives, as well as what this bill actually does.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the process of the rule and the underlying bill. The bill, of course, prohibits certain actions with respect to deferred actions for people who are already in our country.

This provision was added at the last minute in the midnight hour to restrict the deferred action for the childhood arrivals program, which is a form of prosecutorial discretion, which is used by all prosecutorial and administrative agencies.

When you have a situation where 10 or 11 or 12 million people have illegal presence in our country, clearly, with our limited enforcement resources, we need to have prosecutorial discretion and priorities. Whom should we be going after and in what form, given that it is not possible with the limited resources they have, to in any way address the entire issue?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that it makes perfect sense, with regards to the deferred action program, that we focus our limited enforcement resources on criminal aliens. Those are people who, in addition to having unlawful presence here, have committed

some kind of crime. It might have been a DUI. It might have been an assault.

We need to focus on promptly bringing people who have committed crimes to justice and deporting them under our laws. So whom does it make sense to not focus on, given our prosecutorial discretion?

I think the deferred action program is a perfect example, and this bill, in our understanding, even recognizes that, that many of the people that grew up in our country, that know no other country, that came when they were 2 or 3, that were cheerleaders or high school football players and know no other country than the United States of America and owe their loyalty to us, of course, should not be the enforcement priority of laws that are broken until we can fix our immigration system.

It makes sense that the President work—any President, Democrat or Republican—to identify additional groups that we can use with our prosecutorial discretion and offer some kind of deferred action to, so that we can further focus our limited enforcement resources on those who would do us harm or represent a threat to our safety or our economy.

If there is a way, for instance, to include the parents of American children who are here unlawfully and are not violating any criminal laws of our country, it would make sense that their enforcement should come after those who have committed criminal violations in our country. That is a customary aspect of prosecutorial discretion ranging from any DA to the Attorney General to the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under the language of this bill, it would further restrict the ability of the President to focus our limited enforcement resources on criminal aliens who would do us harm, reducing the security of the American people.

Now, we all know the real answer here is to replace our broken immigration system with one that works. The answer is not to have 10 million, 12 million, who knows how many million people here illegally and just focus on which group we can actually enforce the law on. We need to have a law that we can enforce universally.

There should not be people that are here illegally in our country. We need to secure our borders, we need to reunite American families, and we need to grow our economy. Later on today, if we defeat the previous question, Mr. GARCIA will offer a bipartisan bill that will do just that.

Instead of even allowing amendments on these controversial bills, including amendments that are extremely commonsense, we have a closed process that, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN pointed out, changes the very rules of the House, in the name of preventing the President

from focusing on deporting criminal aliens.

Look, Republicans and Democrats alike acknowledge that there is a crisis on our southern border. Unaccompanied minors are fleeing from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, fleeing horrific situations. I had the opportunity to visit the border the weekend before last, along with many of my colleagues, and got to speak to some of the kids, as well as the Customs and Border Patrol and HHS officials, and hear some of those stories firsthand.

We had this discussion yesterday in Rules Committee. Action means a bill passing the House, a bill passing the Senate, and the President signing it. Instead of taking action to address the crisis on our southern border, the House is considering a House-only bill that the President has said he would veto, that the Senate won't likely even bring up, and then promptly going home for a 1-month vacation. We wonder why Congress has a 12 percent approval rating.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree with my friend on a couple of points that he made. First, I would suggest the President actually hasn't taken action or suggested action. A month ago, he told us that the 2008 sex trafficking law was responsible for his inability to return people to their country of origin, unaccompanied minors.

We have been waiting for his corrective for 30 days; instead, Mr. Speaker, we get an open-ended supplemental that goes through from this fiscal year to the end of the next fiscal year with a lot of measures—some of which, by the way, we agree with—to manage the flow, but absolutely nothing to stop and reverse the flow.

So we think, in that absence of leadership from the executive branch, we have acted. We have actually done what a month ago at least he was suggesting ought to be done, giving some discretion and giving some ability to try to deal with the loophole in the law.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have looked at what he put in front of us, and we have decided, look, we can actually offset this money. We don't have to spend extra money. This is a higher priority. We will take money from lower priority areas.

We will get us through the end of this fiscal year and through the end of this calendar year, and in that interim time, we will have an opportunity to work with the administration to continue to address the problem within the limits of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that we agreed to on a bipartisan, bicameral basis not that long ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this issue of the DACA controversy that we have here, I

would like to make the following points: first, nothing in this legislation changes the current state of affairs at all. In other words, what the President has done up to this point is left undisturbed.

However, we do believe the abuse of prosecutorial discretion is actually one of the things that contributed to the current crisis that we have—not deliberately, but, frankly, I think the President unwittingly or unknowingly sent a signal that if you get here and you get across our border, you are going to be able to stay. So we want to be very careful that doesn't happen again.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the President has said if Congress doesn't do certain things by such and such a date or by the August work period, then I intend during that time to use my pen and my phone to effect some changes that I want.

What is interesting to us, by the way, less than 2 years ago, he said these kinds of things were unconstitutional and couldn't be done by the executive branch. Now, he has changed his view on that.

So we are going to finally put in place something that will prevent him in our absence from once again abusing prosecutorial discretion to achieve other aims.

With that, I would like to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my House Republican friends never cease to amaze me. Once again, House Republicans have turned control of their agenda to Senator Speaker TED CRUZ. The last time they did this, they shut the government down, and look at how that worked out for them. Some people never learn.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough that House Republicans, despite Speaker BOEHNER's promises of a more open House, continue to block consideration of comprehensive immigration reform. No, they need to go even further.

Last night, after a lengthy meeting with Senator Speaker CRUZ, House Republicans caved in a desperate and partisan way and produced an extreme bill that would prevent President Obama from building upon the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. This bill was introduced last night. It has never had a hearing, but here it is.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are victims of their own shortsightedness. In their attempts to placate the fringe elements on the far right, especially as the November elections grow closer, House Republicans continue to refuse to bring up any kind of comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Of course, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform overwhelmingly, and we know that the bill

would pass this House if it were brought up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this process is absurd. The bills we will consider today are cruel and cheap political stunts. They would do nothing to alleviate the crisis and merely serve as political cover, and what is worse, the Republicans are playing games with the lives of vulnerable children.

Further, the supplemental appropriations bill is a sham. It does not even come close to addressing the humanitarian crisis on our border. It provides nothing in terms of necessary resources for the Border Patrol, HHS, Homeland Security, and our immigration system to give these children and their families the attention that they need.

The policy is bad enough. The process absolutely stinks. The deal the Republican leadership cut with the hard right is this: if you want the opportunity to vote for a nasty bill to block expansion of DACA—which has absolutely nothing to do with the crisis on the border—then you have to vote for this terrible supplemental.

No wonder the approval rating of Congress is at 7 percent. With stunts like this, I am surprised it is that high. I know this is an election season, but I plead with Republicans: let's not lose our humanity in this process.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend is always a terrific and impassioned speaker, and I love to hear him. I genuinely do, but what he is saying is, frankly, at odds with the facts.

Look at the record. It was the President in his budget who wanted to cut border security, cut detention beds, reduce aid to Central America, and reduce law enforcement. That was the President's proposal.

□ 1045

Before this crisis, we had already corrected some of those mistakes in the FY15 Foreign Operations budget. So in terms of who has been willing to put resources not only in a law enforcement sense but in a humanitarian sense, it has been the majority side of the aisle, not the minority.

Frankly, our plan will not increase suffering; it will decrease it. What will increase suffering is continuing to send the signal that coming here illegally will be rewarded. The challenge of that is, number one, when you encourage that behavior, we are destroying the societies from which those young people are coming. The officials of those governments have met with ours, and they say that we would like our children back. That is a terrible thing that we are doing to those countries.

Number two, the people who are financing it, well-meaning people in most cases, trying to bring children into the United States, are turning

their money over to criminal enterprises and cartels. They are strengthening the very people who are destroying their society and committing crimes across the entire region, not just our country.

And finally, the children that are encouraged to come are young people, mostly juveniles from three countries and, frankly, are subject to a horrific and dangerous journey. Along the way, they can be pressed into sex trafficking. They can be turned into drug smugglers. They can be physically abused. We don't know how many of them never make it here at all.

Any policy left in place that encourages that, wittingly or unwittingly, ought to be changed. Until the signal is sent unmistakably to these societies, don't spend your money, don't put your kids at risk, the flow will continue.

Now the President of the United States, at least 2 weeks ago, said:

The majority of these children are going to be returned.

That is his statement, not ours, not us doing something that he said isn't going to happen. He said the overwhelming majority of these children will be returned. Doing this quickly and humanely might keep other children from following the same route.

This is a tough, tough situation. It is a situation, quite frankly, that the President was warned would happen in 2012, was warned in 2013 by officials in his own administration, and ignored. You can see he ignored it in terms of the budget he actually proposed to present to Congress this year. Thank goodness we didn't actually do what he asked us to do.

I think if you look at this objectively, you can see the President was overtaken by a crisis. He fumbled it and mismanaged that crisis, in my opinion, and now my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to turn this into something that it is not. It is a border crisis debate and discussion. It is not an overall immigration debate. It is not a political stunt. We certainly didn't plan for this to happen. My friends clearly did not plan for it to happen. The President didn't plan for it to happen or he would never have submitted the budget that he did. So we are trying to respond quickly and expeditiously to a crisis.

This is not, by the way, a once-and-for-all response. We are here in August. We will be back here in September. We will be back here after the election. We have an appropriations process, probably an omnibus bill waiting in the lame duck that will continue to address this, but something has to be done now.

What the President requests, again, doesn't address the problem. It is an open-ended check and, frankly, sort of gets him off the hook until September 30, 2015, when we would have to come back here again.

The bill in front of us is a much more prudent, much more targeted, much more thoughtful, and much, frankly, more efficient use of resources in the interim while we continue to work to get a handle on the situation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, allow me to address some of the concerns raised in the underlying bill concerning unaccompanied alien children. If our concern is with a secure border, you can talk to someone such as myself who represents El Paso, Texas, the largest city in Texas on the Mexican border which, today, is also the safest city not just in Texas, but in the entire United States. You can talk to other elected leaders, to the folks who actually live on the border, and you can look at the facts.

Apprehensions at the U.S.-Mexico border are down nearly 70 percent over the last 15 years. In the year 2000, we had 1.6 million apprehensions. This last year, 420,000. And even with this spike of refugees from Central America, we are not expected to get to half a million this year. The border, by the numbers, is as secure as it has ever been.

If your concern is with the welfare of these children once they enter this country, then I say let's increase the amount that we are spending with Health and Human Services which, in this current bill, is a pittance against what is necessary and what should be required.

And if your concern is with the welfare of these children in Central America and along this journey, then I ask you to do what this country's proud history, what our conscience, and what the law already mandates, which is to accept their applications for asylum, to help them once they are in this country, and to work with our neighbors in Central America and this hemisphere to resolve the underlying problems.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to come back together in September and to work on something that is rational, that is humane, and that is in the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's talk for a minute about the additional money to HHS. That is exactly, by the way, what this does. The difference—and I think there is probably some confusion here—is we are doing it for a short period of time, and then we are going to probably continue to do it next year, but do it within the constraints of the Ryan-Murray budget deal. The President, frankly, hot-wires around the congressional agreement that was made to lower the budget by extending these expenditures to the end of the next fiscal year.

So just to reassure my friend, nobody is more interested, I think—actually, let me put it this way. I think we are both interested in making sure that, when anybody is in the custody of the United States, they are treated humanely and that there are sufficient resources there to do the job. So this does it in the short-term. I would expect in the appropriations process—again, within the overall spending caps that we have both agreed to—we would continue to do that by moving resources from less important areas to more important areas.

I am going to disagree with my friend on, I think, his point that most of these folks ought to remain inside the United States. Frankly, I agree with the President of the United States: most of them should not.

There is a process, by the way, if you want to apply for refugee status. You do that by going to an American Embassy which is actually in the countries there and they make that determination. You don't do it by breaking the laws of Mexico and breaking the laws of the United States by simply arriving here.

The President has said that most of these young people will be returned. The longer they are here, the more you are going to encourage other people to come, the more people will be subjected to that journey that we all know is dangerous and deadly, and the more often criminal enterprises will be enriched as people give them money to transport juveniles to what they think will be permanent residence in the United States when the President of the United States himself says it will not be permanent, that most of them will return. Better to act on this now.

Now, again, I will be the first to tell you that I don't expect this to be the final piece of legislation. This is an emergency measure. It is timely, it is focused, and it is funded at an appropriate level. We will be back here again in September. We will be back here working on the appropriations process, no doubt, in a lame duck. Frankly, at that time, the appropriate additional resources will undoubtedly be made available, but they will be made available within the budget caps of the Ryan-Murray deal.

I think sometimes when we compare this bill to the budget request the President made, the supplemental request, we really are comparing apples to oranges because the timeframes are much different. Remember, the President's bill also includes wildfire funding. That may be appropriate, but we just don't think it is appropriate in this vehicle, in what ought to be a focused approach.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We spent a good time here yesterday debating and voting on a resolution to sue the President for doing his job, and we are up to about the same kind of tricks today. But if that show yesterday of the Republican obstinance wasn't enough, last night at 10:30, the majority changed the rules in the House to block efforts to achieve a long-term solution to our infrastructure problem. Can you believe that? I want my colleagues and everyone else to know what the majority is up to.

Mr. Speaker, we know and everybody knows that we need a long-term highway bill that would create more jobs and strengthen our infrastructure and provide more certainty for highway construction. And under the rules of the House—always—any Member of the House would have had the right to bring up real solutions to this problem, but not any more. In the middle of the night, the Republicans at the Rules Committee took that right away and gave it to one person, only one person out of 435: the Republican leader. It seems that Republicans are so fixated with my way or the highway that they are even willing to change the rules of the House to block a vote.

This parliamentary trick has only been used once before in the history of the House—only once—and it was during the government shutdown that we recently experienced. While they were obsessing over how to deny people health care, they changed the rules to ensure that no one could open the government back up. None of us could bring that up except one person, just one: the Republican leader. And the last time they pulled this stunt with the government shutdown, it cost the economy of the United States \$24 billion. That is with a B.

Now, we don't know what will happen this time, but what we do know is that it is a dangerous ploy that will undermine economic recovery and job creation. The interest here today is not with the people of the United States; it is purely, absolutely a political stunt after the stunts yesterday. And the whole bill, what we are doing on the border issue, again, is simply a diversionary tactic that signifies not much.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me pull us back from arguing about rules and procedures to what the real essence of the conflict on the transportation bill is: 357 Members, an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, voted to send the transportation bill to the United States Senate.

That bill, by the way, ran through, if I recall correctly, May of next year, giving us enough time to actually then come to what I know both sides want, and that is a longer-term highway bill.

What the Senate did was send us back something with fewer dollars and

a shorter timeframe that actually reaches simply into December, meaning a lame duck Congress would have to deal with the transportation deal. Not likely to happen, particularly when we will also be dealing with the omnibus spending bill since the Senate, in its infinite wisdom, has been unable to pass a single appropriations bill.

So I think cluttering the calendar with the transportation fund dispute and problem in a short timeframe simply isn't wise. We think it was a political game on the part of the United States Senate. But regardless, the position of this House as expressed by a bipartisan vote of 357, is overwhelmingly clear. We want to expedite that and get it back to the other side so hopefully they can see that type of gamesmanship doesn't work and they accede to the position that, frankly, both sides of this Chamber adopted in overwhelming numbers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the do-nothingism of the 19th century, the anti-immigrant fervor of that time, is alive and well here today in the House. Republicans are overwhelmed with fear. They are fearful of immigrants. They are fearful of little children at our border. But I think most of all, they are fearful of their own shadows—fearful that if they try to deal with any of the major problems that our country faces, that they might suffer political losses. So it is not only know-nothingism, it is do-next-to-nothing that prevails today.

Even when the Republican chair of the Homeland Security Committee last May obtained unanimous committee approval for a bill that he said would secure our border, Republicans were afraid to have it debated on the floor of the House for fear that it might lead to real comprehensive immigration reform, reform that was approved by the United States Senate over a year ago for which they have offered us nothing but excuses, one excuse after another as to why we could not permit a majority of this House to consider the best way to reform our broken immigration system.

□ 1000

Affording full participation to our DREAMers, students who came here long ago as children through no fault of their own without a visa, will not only benefit them as individuals to achieve their all, but it will create jobs and grow our economy. I met with these DREAMers. They have tremendous potential to give back to our country. Some want to deny that opportunity.

What about these children at our border? Aren't they all God's children?

Aren't they our children? Don't all children deserve a chance to survive without exploitation and violence and terror? We are not asking that every one of these children be permitted to stay in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 25 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. We are not asking for amnesty, but how about just a little decency, a little civility, a little humanity, how about just following existing law, going after the smugglers, and providing the supplemental resources needed to see that their rights are protected?

I believe that children who came here seeking refuge in this country at least deserve a fair adjudication, not to be met with the barrel of a gun and a one-way ticket back without considering whether they are justly in this country.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a subject on which, obviously, there is considerable passion and considerable emotion. I respect that on all sides.

I will remind my friends who are insisting on immigration, they did actually control the Chamber for 4 years and didn't bring up an immigration bill ever, had two different Presidents who would have signed anything that they cared to pass, and never introduced one.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will not yield until I finish my point. You have got plenty of time. I think you can make your points on your own.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield on just a quick correction on that point?

Mr. COLE. I certainly will yield to my friend on that.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The House of Representatives did pass the DREAM Act during the lame duck session.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I thought we were talking about comprehensive immigration reform—safely after an election I might add.

But the President of the United States, who ran in 2008, saying he would have a bill on the floor within 100 days, didn't do it.

My friends had basically complete control of this Chamber and the other Chamber. They demonstrated that by passing, again, ObamaCare without a single Republican vote, passing Dodd-Frank, and passing the stimulus bill, so they had the ability to do this and chose not to do it. That is their right. They were in the majority. But please don't lecture us on people stopping individual bills.

We have 350 bills, by the way, this Chamber has passed, sitting and wait-

ing for the Senate to consider any of them, any of them. So I recognize, again, there is a great deal of passion here, but that is not what this debate is about.

This debate is about a border crisis that we both recognize exist. This debate is to give the President additional resources to deal with that, even though he in some measure contributed to creating it. And this debate is to make sure that we send the message unmistakably: if you subject children to this journey and pay criminals thousands of dollars to bring them across, they are not likely to get to stay—a point that the President of the United States has made. He has said a majority of these children are going to go home. If my friends have a quarrel with that, they should direct that to the President, not to us.

In this case, we do think if you don't discourage that, you are going to feed criminal behavior. You are going to put these children at risk, and you are going to destroy the society from which they came.

I don't think we can in a single bill have an overall solution to this problem of this level. I personally think it is going to take an effort somewhat similar to what we did in Colombia—in a bipartisan sense, I might add—on the drug trade, where we invested considerable resources in Colombia to help them deal with that problem. I am not going to tell you it is perfect there, but it is considerably better than it was in the 1980s and 1990s.

So that is where we worked together constructively and did something good for those societies and something good for our own country. That will probably be the model that has to emerge again in Central America.

But, again, that is a problem far ahead of us and legislative in scope. This is a response to a crisis. We think it is the appropriate response.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 4-year-old Honduran girl whose body was found in a nylon bag showing signs of torture.

[From La Tribuna, July 20, 2014]

KIDNAP AND KILL A GIRL IN OLANCHO

(This is a Google Translation)

SAN FRANCISCO DE LA PAZ, Olancho. A heinous crime committed against a minor, has shaken an entire community that is not answered the savage and ruthless attitude of those involved in the sadistic action.

A little of just four years had disappeared last Thursday afternoon a little after 2:00 pm, according to the account of his father Anibal Cardona, about 30, who wept inconsolably so the tragedy.

Apparently a family would have caused neglect subjects mysterious little girl lifted

backyard to lead to an unknown destination Quiscamotelugar the community, the origin of the parents of the unfortunate infant.

INSIDE SACK

The body of the girl was placed inside a nylon bag and left abandoned near the home where a day earlier had kidnapped.

Showed signs of torture and was handcuffed, and the conditions under which the body was giving signs of having been killed on the day she disappeared.

The crime involves a mystery, which generates various speculations in the whole population and in the same family, which not only repudiate what happened, they also believe that someone close may be linked to macabre done.

The house where he carried the creature is roughly an area of half acre of land, fenced with cyclone wire mesh and only one entry and when the body was found no one saw who placed it on the site though many neighbors accompanied the family at that time.

RESCUE

The other uncertainty that goes through the head of the citizens, is related to an alleged phone call asking for ransom, which the authorities are already investigating and could become the thread from the skein that leads to the true origin of what happened.

It was learned that the police is on the trail of four subjects, which might be collusion, or have enough information from individuals who committed the detestable fact.

Those who were arrested in a nearby village and that from the beginning of the alarm mentioned that they were responsible, but last night only two people were detained for investigation.

The girl's father, Anibal Cardona, and uncle, Luis Alonso Duarte.

In less than a year, this olanchano municipality has been involved in two violent incidents that result in death left two young children, who still has shaken society.

On 11 October last year, another toddler died a brutal hands of a mentally alienated, brutalized by the effect of alcohol and drugs, committed a heinous murder.

At that time, parishioners wanted to take justice into their own hands hours after police stopped the confessed responsible, a young 22 year old named Carlos Peralta.

Today, the San Franciscan people revive those feelings of grief, sorrow and helplessness, and calls to the appropriate speed in the latter investigations mourns another family event. (FS)

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 17-year-old Guatemalan boy who received asylum because a gang killed his father and they were threatening him.

Cesar, a 17-year old boy from Guatemala, lost his father to gang violence at the age of 4. For 13 years, Cesar was harassed by the same gang who killed his father. When he refused to join the gang, he feared for his life and fled the country, swimming across the Rio Grande to cross the border. He was granted asylum, loves school and hopes to attend college.

CESAR—ASYLUM

Cesar, from Guatemala, was four years old when his father was killed by gangs in their community. The gang members were never arrested and continued to live in the town. They started harassing Cesar when he was

very young and never stopped. He was very scared but there was no way he could get away from them.

By the time he turned 17, Cesar could not stand the gang harassment any more. The gangs were trying very hard to get him to join and he was very afraid he was going to be killed. He decided to make the journey to the United States. He said was very hard; sometimes he didn't think he would survive. He swam across the Rio Grande to cross the border. A pro bono attorney KIND matched him with from Kirkland & Ellis helped him gain asylum. He loves school and wants to attend college.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of an 11-year-old Salvadoran boy who is applying for asylum because he was threatened by gang members who killed his cousin and who suffered severe domestic abuse.

Andres is an 11-year-old Salvadoran boy, abused by his caretakers and fleeing gang violence after his cousin was killed, he entered the U.S. to reunite with his mother, grandmother (USC), and extended family. He entered in July 2013 when he was 10 years old. He is applying for asylum.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated by previous occupants of the Chair on June 26, 2003, on June 27, 2002, and on March 24, 1995, although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude towards the pending measure, it is improper for a Member to embellish such a request with other oratory, and it can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate the Members, but the Chair must also ask that Members cooperate by confining such requests to the proper form.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. When these requests are submitted, the Members are merely stating the title of the document that is being submitted, which clearly has to have a name. I want a clarification as to whether that is charged to our time, if they are simply submitting a document and telling you the name of that document?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As most recently ruled by the Chair on July 11, 2013, a unanimous consent request that extends beyond a simple declarative statement of a Member's attitude about the underlying measure constitutes debate and may result in time being charged to the yielding Member upon execution of that order.

Mr. POLIS. Again, Mr. Speaker, I inquire—I would like your judgment, in fact—on when these motions are made and the document is submitted, clearly the document that is being referred to has to be referred to in the remarks. These Members are submitting a document, and they are, in fact, naming that document that they are submitting. I want to ensure that that complies with the Chair's interpretation of the House rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Also stated on July 11, 2013, the Chair will exercise discretion in determining whether an individual unanimous consent request results in a yielding Member being charged time in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what is the Chair's conclusion with regard to these unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Requests that include remarks in the nature of debate will be charged against the yielding Member.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, have the previous submissions of documents gone beyond the unanimous consent request compliance that the Chair stipulated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not yet charged any time to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Chair.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 12-year-old girl who was trafficked for sex and labor and escaped slavery with her baby and received a T visa in the United States.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE: VOICES OF CENTRAL AMERICAN YOUTH—WHY THEY ARE FLEEING THEIR COUNTRIES
BACKGROUND ON THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since the Fall of 2011, prior to the President's announcement of DACA, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) started apprehending significantly more unaccompanied minors from Central America. ORR promptly started to open more shelters and detention sites for these children.

Updated data from the UNHCR, has shown a 712% increase in asylum requests in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize by nationals from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

ORR has reported a significant increase in both younger children and girls coming.

Maria, a 12 year old girl from Central America, was trafficked for labor and sex, she fled with her baby to escape slavery. Maria was 12 years old, when she was kidnapped at gunpoint and taken to a home

where she was held captive. She was beaten and raped on an almost daily basis and eventually forced into prostitution. Because of this she became pregnant and gave birth to a girl while captive. Maria fled with her child, riding on top of trains so that they might escape the sexual bondage. Maria ended up qualifying for a T-visa and is currently doing well. She has now graduated high school.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a young Honduran girl the age of my granddaughter, who fled domestic violence and kidnapping. The document is from Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, and it is entitled: "Voices of Central American Youth—Why They Are Fleeing Their Countries."

Laura, an 8 year old girl from Honduras fled domestic violence and kidnapping. Laura was living in Honduras with her aunt while mother was in the U.S. working to provide for her family. One day a man she called "step-father" who was an ex-boyfriend of her mother's, kidnapped her from her aunt's care. Laura's mother in the U.S. said she could not report the kidnapping to authorities as they would do nothing. This step-father beat Laura daily with belts and pieces of wood, resulting in bruises, bleeding, and leaving visible scars on her body. On multiple occasions, he also threatened to kill her with a gun. The step father finally threatened Laura's mother that he would kill the Laura if her mother did not send him money. Laura's mother was finally able to save and send a large amount of money to the step-father and Laura was able to escape to come live with her in the U.S. A child like Laura might apply for asylum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of an 11-year-old Honduran boy who was kidnapped, tortured, and murdered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the only unanimous consent request that has been charged to our time is Mr. DOGGETT's. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Again, Mr. DOGGETT stated the title of the document that he submitted, which seems to be a prerequisite for submitting a document. I would like to inquire as to why the

Chair has ruled to charge the time to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the Chair's discretion, the gentleman engaged in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how can submitting a document and saying what the name of the document is constitute debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman was engaging in debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, can the Chair provide advice, so that my colleagues will understand what it was in reading the title and the source of the document that described the tragedy of this little Honduran girl seeking refuge in our country, constituted debate, rather than simply identifying the title?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is exercising his discretion.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, without any guidance to my colleagues as to how they can present documents within the rules of the House without reading the title and the source of the document, can the Speaker describe anything about my remarks that differed from any of the other remarks that were given by my colleagues, other than the reading of the title and the source from Lutheran Services of this young girl who sought refuge in our country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To clarify, the Chair has stated that a unanimous consent request to insert extraneous material may include a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude towards the measure, but it is improper for the Member to embellish such a request with extended oratory.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 15-year-old Salvadoran boy who has requested asylum because local gang members threatened to kill him after he refused to sell drugs for them.

PANGAEA LEGAL SERVICES CLIENT STORY

Jose is 15-years-old. He grew up in El Salvador with his grandparents. His parents immigrated to the United States when Jose was still a toddler, and he had not seen them since. Jose considered his grandparents as

his parents and wished nothing but to continue living with them and his little brother. In April 2013, at age 14, Jose was forced to flee his country after gangs threatened to kill him if he didn't sell drugs for them. The family suspects that Jose was targeted by the gang because Jose's uncle is the mayor of the small Salvadoran town, and has attempted to establish rehabilitation and anti-gang programs for several years. Jose is in removal proceedings and his asylum application is currently pending with USCIS.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of seven very young Honduran children who were tortured and brutally murdered after refusing to join a gang.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a young Honduran girl who resisted being robbed for \$5, was clubbed over the head, dragged out by two men who cut a hole in her throat and left her in a ravine.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 2014]

THE CHILDREN OF THE DRUG WARS

(By Sonia Nazario)

Cristian Omar Reyes, an 11-year-old sixth grader in the neighborhood of Nueva Suyapa, on the outskirts of Tegucigalpa, tells me he has to get out of Honduras soon—"no matter what."

In March, his father was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. His mother used the life insurance payout to hire a smuggler to take her to Florida. She promised to send for him quickly, but she has not.

Three people he knows were murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of two weeks at the beginning of this year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of \$5. She was clubbed over the head and dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat, stuffed her panties in it, and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

"I'm going this year," he tells me.

I last went to Nueva Suyapa in 2003, to write about another boy, Luis Enrique Motiño Pineda, who had grown up there and left to find his mother in the United States. Children from Central America have been making that journey, often without their parents, for two decades. But lately something has changed, and the predictable flow has turned into an exodus. Three years ago, about 6,800 children were detained by United States immigration authorities and placed in federal custody; this year, as many as 90,000 children are expected to be picked up. Around a quarter come from Honduras—more than from anywhere else.

Children still leave Honduras to reunite with a parent, or for better educational and economic opportunities. But, as I learned when I returned to Nueva Suyapa last month, a vast majority of child migrants are fleeing not poverty, but violence. As a result, what the United States is seeing on its borders now is not an immigration crisis. It is a refugee crisis.

Gangs arrived in force in Honduras in the 1990s, as 18th Street and Mara Salvatrucha

members were deported in large numbers from Los Angeles to Central America, joining homegrown groups like Los Puchos. But the dominance in the past few years of foreign drug cartels in Honduras, especially ones from Mexico, has increased the reach and viciousness of the violence. As the United States and Colombia spent billions of dollars to disrupt the movement of drugs up the Caribbean corridor, traffickers rerouted inland through Honduras, and 79 percent of cocaine-smuggling flights bound for the United States now pass through there.

Narco groups and gangs are vying for control over this turf, neighborhood by neighborhood, to gain more foot soldiers for drug sales and distribution, expand their customer base, and make money through extortion in a country left with an especially weak, corrupt government following a 2009 coup.

Enrique's 33-year-old sister, Belky, who still lives in Nueva Suyapa, says children began leaving en masse for the United States three years ago. That was around the time that the narcos started putting serious pressure on kids to work for them. At Cristian's school, older students working with the cartels push drugs on the younger ones—some as young as 6. If they agree, children are recruited to serve as lookouts, make deliveries in backpacks, rob people and extort businesses. They are given food, shoes and money in return. Later, they might work as traffickers or hit men.

Teachers at Cristian's school described a 12-year-old who demanded that the school release three students one day to help him distribute crack cocaine; he brandished a pistol and threatened to kill a teacher when she tried to question him.

At Nueva Suyapa's only public high school, narcos "recruit inside the school," says Yadira Saucedá, a counselor there. Until he was killed a few weeks ago, a 23-year-old "student" controlled the school. Each day, he was checked by security at the door, then had someone sneak his gun to him over the school wall. Five students, mostly 12- and 13-year-olds, tearfully told Ms. Saucedá that the man had ordered them to use and distribute drugs or he would kill their parents. By March, one month into the new school year, 67 of 450 students had left the school.

Teachers must pay a "war tax" to teach in certain neighborhoods, and students must pay to attend.

Carlos Baquedano Sánchez, a slender 14-year-old with hair sticking straight up, explained how hard it was to stay away from the cartels. He lives in a shack made of corrugated tin in a neighborhood in Nueva Suyapa called El Infiernito—Little Hell—and usually doesn't have anything to eat one out of every three days. He started working in a dump when he was 7, picking out iron or copper to recycle, for \$1 or \$2 a day. But bigger boys often beat him to steal his haul, and he quit a year ago when an older man nearly killed him for a coveted car-engine piston. Now he sells scrap wood.

But all of this was nothing, he says, compared to the relentless pressure to join narco gangs and the constant danger they have brought to his life. When he was 9, he barely escaped from two narcos who were trying to rape him, while terrified neighbors looked on. When he was 10, he was pressured to try marijuana and crack. "You'll feel better. Like you are in the clouds," a teenager working with a gang told him. But he resisted.

He has known eight people who were murdered and seen three killed right in front of

him. He saw a man shot three years ago and still remembers the plums the man was holding rolling down the street, coated in blood. Recently he witnessed two teenage hit men shooting a pair of brothers for refusing to hand over the keys and title to their motorcycle. Carlos hit the dirt and prayed. The killers calmly walked down the street. Carlos shrugs. "Now seeing someone dead is nothing."

He longs to be an engineer or mechanic, but he quit school after sixth grade, too poor and too afraid to attend. "A lot of kids know what can happen in school. So they leave."

He wants to go to the United States, even though he knows how dangerous the journey can be; a man in his neighborhood lost both legs after falling off the top of a Mexican freight train, and a family friend drowned in the Río Grande. "I want to avoid drugs and death. The government can't pull up its pants and help people," he says angrily. "My country has lost its way."

Girls face particular dangers—one reason around 40 percent of children who arrived in the United States this year were girls, compared with 27 percent in the past. Recently three girls were raped and killed in Nueva Suyapa, one only 8 years old. Two 15-year-olds were abducted and raped. The kidnappers told them that if they didn't get in the car they would kill their entire families. Some parents no longer let their girls go to school for fear of their being kidnapped, says Luis López, an educator with Asociación Compartir, a nonprofit in Nueva Suyapa.

Milagro Noemi Martínez, a petite 19-year-old with clear green eyes, has been told repeatedly by narcos that she would be theirs—or end up dead. Last summer, she made her first attempt to reach the United States. "Here there is only evil," she says. "It's better to leave than have them kill me here." She headed north with her 21-year-old sister, a friend who had also been threatened, and \$170 among them. But she was stopped and deported from Mexico. Now back in Nueva Suyapa, she stays locked inside her mother's house. "I hope God protects me. I am afraid to step outside." Last year, she says, six minors, as young as 15, were killed in her neighborhood. Some were hacked apart. She plans to try the journey again soon. Asking for help from the police or the government is not an option in what some consider a failed state. The drugs that pass through Honduras each year are worth more than the country's entire gross domestic product.

Narcos have bought off police officers, politicians and judges. In recent years, four out of five homicides were never investigated. No one is immune to the carnage. Several Honduran mayors have been killed. The sons of both the former head of the police department and the head of the national university were murdered, the latter, an investigation showed, by the police.

"You never call the cops. The cops themselves will retaliate and kill you," says Henry Carías Aguilar, a pastor in Nueva Suyapa. A majority of small businesses in Nueva Suyapa have shuttered because of extortion demands, while churches have doubled in number in the past decade, as people pray for salvation from what they see as the plague predicted in the Bible. Taxis and homes have signs on them asking God for mercy.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees recently interviewed 404 children who had arrived in the United States from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico; 58 percent said their primary reason for

leaving was violence. (A similar survey in 2006, of Central American children coming into Mexico, found that only 13 percent were fleeing violence.) They aren't just going to the United States: Less conflicted countries in Central America had a 712 percent increase in asylum claims between 2008 and 2013.

"If a house is burning, people will jump out the window," says Michelle Brané, director of the migrant rights and justice program at the Women's Refugee Commission.

To permanently stem this flow of children, we must address the complex root causes of violence in Honduras, as well as the demand for illegal drugs in the United States that is fueling that violence.

In the meantime, however, we must recognize this as a refugee crisis, as the United Nations just recommended. These children are facing threats similar to the forceful conscription of child soldiers by warlords in Sudan or during the civil war in Bosnia. Being forced to sell drugs by narcos is no different from being forced into military service.

Many Americans, myself included, believe in deporting unlawful immigrants, but see a different imperative with refugees.

The United States should immediately create emergency refugee centers inside our borders, tent cities—operated by the United Nations and other relief groups like the International Rescue Committee—where immigrant children could be held for 60 to 90 days instead of being released. The government would post immigration judges at these centers and adjudicate children's cases there.

To ensure this isn't a sham process, asylum officers and judges must be trained in child-sensitive interviewing techniques to help elicit information from fearful, traumatized youngsters. All children must also be represented by a volunteer or government-funded lawyer. Kids in Need of Defense, a nonprofit that recruits pro bono lawyers to represent immigrant children and whose board I serve on, estimates that 40 percent to 60 percent of these children potentially qualify to stay under current immigration laws—and do, if they have a lawyer by their side. The vast majority do not. The only way to ensure we are not hurtling children back to circumstances that could cost them their lives is by providing them with real due process.

Judges, who currently deny seven in 10 applications for asylum by people who are in deportation proceedings, must better understand the conditions these children are facing. They should be more open to considering relief for those fleeing gang recruitment or threats by criminal organizations when they come from countries like Honduras that are clearly unwilling or unable to protect them.

If many children don't meet strict asylum criteria but face significant dangers if they return, the United States should consider allowing them to stay using humanitarian parole procedures we have employed in the past, for Cambodians and Haitians. It may be possible to transfer children and resettle them in other safe countries willing to share the burden. We should also make it easier for children to apply as refugees when they are still in Central America, as we have done for people in Iraq, Cuba, countries in the former Soviet Union, Vietnam and Haiti. Those who showed a well-founded fear of persecution wouldn't have to make the perilous journey north alone.

Of course, many migrant children come for economic reasons, and not because they fear

for their lives. In those cases, they should quickly be deported if they have at least one parent in their country of origin. By deporting them directly from the refugee centers, the United States would discourage future non-refugees by showing that immigrants cannot be caught and released, and then avoid deportation by ignoring court orders to attend immigration hearings.

Instead of advocating such a humane, practical approach, the Obama administration wants to intercept and return children en route. On Tuesday the president asked for \$3.7 billion in emergency funding. Some money would be spent on new detention facilities and more immigration judges, but the main goal seems to be to strengthen border control and speed up deportations. He also asked Congress to grant powers that could eliminate legal protections for children from Central America in order to expedite removals, a change that Republicans in Congress have also advocated.

This would allow life-or-death decisions to be made within hours by Homeland Security officials, even though studies have shown that border patrol agents fail to adequately screen Mexican children to see if they are being sexually exploited by traffickers or fear persecution, as the agents are supposed to do. Why would they start asking Central American children key questions needed to prove refugee status?

The United States expects other countries to take in hundreds of thousands of refugees on humanitarian grounds. Countries neighboring Syria have absorbed nearly 3 million people. Jordan has accepted in two days what the United States has received in an entire month during the height of this immigration flow—more than 9,000 children in May. The United States should also increase to pre-9/11 levels the number of refugees we accept to 90,000 from the current 70,000 per year and, unlike in recent years, actually admit that many.

By sending these children away, “you are handing them a death sentence,” says José Arnulfo Ochoa Ochoa, an expert in Honduras with World Vision International, a Christian humanitarian aid group. This abrogates international conventions we have signed and undermines our credibility as a humane country. It would be a disgrace if this wealthy nation turned its back on the 52,000 children who have arrived since October, many of them legitimate refugees.

This is not how a great nation treats children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, again, if there is discretion that can be shared, that was directly from the article that I asked to be entered into the RECORD. On many occasions I have been on this floor and been part of many debates in the 5 years I have been honored to serve with the Congress and have used the exact same approach and have never been charged. Is there any discretion that the Speaker can give us direction on?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is exercising his discretion as the Chair has said previously. The Chair has discretion in this matter.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, with that being said to debate, even though the same practices are used by Members, rulings can change by the Chair on this particular issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does have discretion. The guidance has been to confine the request to a simple declaratory statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for clarification, that is exactly what I did, which is I read a statement from the article.

I am confused, Mr. Speaker. I am just maybe a junior Member from a small farm in New Mexico, but it seems that if I am reading from the article directly, that I don't appear to be violating any rules to be charged time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Embellishments or statements on other matters are debate and will be charged to the manager.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this was not an embellishment. This was a direct quote from the article. It appears to me that my understanding of an embellishment are my own words being added.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has advised that embellishments or statements on other matters are debate and will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for submitting that powerful testimony.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 17-year-old girl who fled her country with her 2-year-old daughter to escape constant physical and sexual abuse from the baby's father.

[From the National Immigrant Justice Center]

Lauren, a 17-year old, fled the country with her 2-year old daughter due to constant physical, sexual and verbal abuse from the baby's father. While in DHS custody, Lauren and her baby were held in two “hieleras” for a total of six days without adequate food and warmth.

Lauren is a 17-year-old who came to the United States with her two-year-old daughter, Charise. Charise's father, Juan, was

physically and verbally abusive. He has hit, choked, and raped Lauren and threatened to kill her and take their baby. Lauren fled to the United States with Charise to live with her parents and U.S.-citizen sister. While in DHS custody, both Lauren and her baby were held in two “hieleras” for about six days total. Lauren had to use her own clothing to keep Charise warm because DHS only gave her an emergency mylar blanket for Charise, despite the cold. Lauren slept on the floor of her cell with Charise in between her legs. DHS gave Charise two small burritos to eat each day, and gave Lauren a piece of bread with deli meat and an apple twice a day. When she asked for more food for her baby, who was hungry and cold, DHS told Lauren there wasn't any more food available.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 15-year-old Salvadoran boy whose body was found in a plastic bag with his hands and feet bound.

[From La Página, June 25, 2014]

BURN BUS ROUTE 177 IN TECOLUCA AFTER ASSAULTING PASSENGER

(By Maribel Montenegro and Carlos Hernandez)

A bus route 177 was intercepted by at least 8 heavily armed men, forcing passengers to surrender their belongings and then burned them down the unit, police said.

According to reports, the incident occurred in the village of Las Pampas, on the road that leads to San Vicente Zacatecoluca Tecoluca in the jurisdiction of the department of San Vicente.

Police said the fire was set and the place has become a unit of the Fire Department to extinguish the flames of the unit was completely destroyed.

Depending on the version of the automotive PNC was off course forcing it to penetrate into the community Las Pampas, where 20 passengers were assaulted. The authorities say they are on the trail of the perpetrators.

He also said that he reported no casualties, only material damage.

RESUME, RESUME

The body of an unknown man was found this morning in the subdivision Istecpec, Canton El Cerrito, the, in the department of Sonsonate municipality Nahuizalco. Police said the incident occurred the night before and do not know the motives of the crime that was committed with knives.

RESUME, RESUME

A 16 year old girl was killed by multiple gunshot wounds that caused unknown subjects while walking on the 3rd km of the Pan American Highway, in the jurisdiction of the municipality of El Carmen, department of Cuscatlan.

The victim was identified as Adonis Hernandez, according to the PNC disappeared yesterday. So far the police said he was unaware if the victim had any connection with gang groups.

COLON, LA LIBERTAD

The body of a 15 year old boy was found is tied hand and foot in a plastic bag that was abandoned in Lourdes, Colón, La Libertad morning.

The victim was identified as Ivan N., who was kidnapped last week in La Libertad.

According to the PNC, the young man had at least 36 hours have passed.

RESUME

A young man was killed last night near the resort Spain, CV.

According to authorities, the victim, identified as Brandon Ch, was attacked and killed by unknown assailants who left him seriously injured so he had to be rushed to a hospital emergency where he died in surgery.

SAN SALVADOR

The woman, identified as Marlene Rivas, was wounded with a knife this morning in the vicinity of San José San Salvador park.

According to police, the woman resisted being assaulted by a homeless man, who reacted violently and caused a wound in the neck.

The victim had to take shelter in a supermarket in the area, where Rosales was taken to hospital.

MERCEDES UMANA, USULUTAN

A gang Mara Salvatrucha, was murdered in Canton The Caulote, Mercedes Umana, Usulután.

The victim was identified as Fredy Mejia, 17, who authorities say was attacked by two gang Barrio 18 traveling on a motorcycle.

GARDENS SELTSUT RESUME

A trader was shot to death at night in the Garden Colony Selsut, Ilopango, San Salvador.

The victim was identified as Jorge Mario Arteaga, 53, who was killed by gang members for refusing to pay extortion, according to PNC.

NEW GUADALUPE, SAN MIGUEL

A man who was deported from the United States months ago was killed Tuesday evening in Freedom Colony, New Guadalupe in San Miguel.

The victim was identified as Adilio Quintanilla, 41, who had multiple gunshot wounds in the body. The authorities know the motive for the attack.

CANTON PLANS CONCEPCIÓN, LA PAZ

A man was killed in the canton Plans Concepcion, La Paz. The victim was identified as Carlos Palma, 47, who was shot at by unknown persons. Attack the causes are unknown.

SAN MARTÍN

A blind seniors tonight was killed by gang members in the neighborhood of Las Mercedes and Santa Teresa Street Project, San Martín.

The victim was identified only as Francisco and authorities said he was about 70 years. The old man died at the scene after being shot several times.

According to the PNC, the man was hit by bullets when the gang tried to assassinate some people who were inside a vehicle on the street entered Project, Las Mercedes neighborhood.

Subjects discharged a burst of lead impacted the blind who could not dodge bullets due to its limitation. After committing the fact, the gang fled in an unknown direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

□ 1015

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the story of an 18-year-old Mexican boy who was trafficked into the United States and held

by the U.S. Marshals Service so he could testify as a material witness to some deaths that he witnessed.

Juan Antonio is an 18-year-old Mexican UAC. He fled severe cartel and criminal gang violence in his home town. His uncle, cousin, and several family members were killed before he fled from Mexico. He was trafficked to the US and initially in the US Marshals custody to testify as a material witness before being turned over to ICE and released to ORR because he was a minor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the story of a 12-year-old girl who was trafficked for sex and labor, escaped slavery with her baby, and received a T visa in the United States.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE: VOICES OF CENTRAL AMERICAN YOUTH—WHY THEY ARE FLEEING THEIR COUNTRIES

BACKGROUND ON THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since the Fall of 2011, prior to the President's announcement of DACA, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) started apprehending significantly more unaccompanied minors from Central America. ORR promptly started to open more shelters and detention sites for these children.

Updated data from the UNHCR, has shown a 712% increase in asylum requests in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize by nationals from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

ORR has reported a significant increase in both younger children and girls coming.

Maria a 12 year old girl from Central America was trafficked for labor and sex, she fled with her baby to escape slavery. Maria was 12 years old, when she was kidnapped at gunpoint and taken to a home where she was held captive. She was beaten and raped on an almost daily basis and eventually forced into prostitution. Because of this she became pregnant and gave birth to a girl while captive. Maria fled with her child, riding on top of trains so that they might escape the sexual bondage. Maria ended up qualifying for a T-visa and is currently doing well. She has now graduated high school.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in the well to appeal to my Republican colleagues about this debate, which isn't about the underlying bill, it is about the rule. You ought to all be worried. We all ought to be worried. This rule is a sham to the institution of Congress.

I am an appropriator, and I am proud to do that. We respect the jurisdiction

of all other committees. That is why we have standing committees. We don't do their business.

This rule ignores all the standing committees in Congress. This rule says you can write a bill in the darkness of night. Nobody has read it. No Republicans read it, no Democrats read it. You can pick it up in the hallway here. I read it this morning.

The rule waives all points of opposition, which we say in this rule, "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived."

All points—that means all the ideas of all the committees that are supposed to be writing these bills. Nobody is going to be thanked if they vote for this. First of all, nobody is going to thank you for voting for the rule because it does so many things that misjudge the purpose of Congress, misappropriate the purposes of Congress, which is to have transparency and allow people to get into the debate.

Nobody who understands the problem in the embassies of the host country was able to testify. Nobody in the administration who deals with the border was able to testify. No Member of Congress who has some knowledge about this was able to testify. This bill says: So what? We wrote the bill, and you just have to accept it, and if you any objections, we waive all those points of orders.

So the rule does a disservice to Congress, and it ought to be rejected.

Secondly, on the bill, when you get to it, if it isn't rejected—first of all, if we reject the rule, nothing is broken. We can fix it. We can make it better because no one is going to thank you for voting for this.

Just to show you how outrageous it is, it says to the host countries that: we are going to give you money, but you have 15 days to convene your legislatures and enact legislation, secure your borders, and make sure everything is secure.

You couldn't do that in Washington in 15 days, much less essentially Third World countries. There are all kinds of provisions in here that don't make any sense and don't help fix anything that is broken, and for all the testimony you have just heard, there are a lot of other things that need to be addressed that aren't in this bill.

So my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the best thing we can do to respect this institution is to reject this rule and vote "no."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a great deal of respect for my friend from the Appropriations Committee. He is an excellent legislator and tremendous Member.

I am, though, going to point out the record of the Democratic majority the last time they were here and in control of what happened on the floor.

In the 111th Congress, the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI's time

as Speaker, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule—not one bill. That is the definition of a closed process.

Under Republican control, the House has returned to consideration of appropriations bills under an open process, with 22 open rules. We had no open rules on appropriations when my friends were in the majority.

This year alone, the House has considered 404 amendments during the appropriations process, and 189 of them offered were by our friends on the other side.

When you actually compare the record overall, frankly, I think the comparison is much to the advantage of Republicans. So we are trying to deal with complex issues in a relatively short period of time.

I know the Congress will be back in session in September. We will be working on the appropriations process in the lameduck again, so there are going to be ample legislative opportunities, but we are in a crisis situation, which we are in this case.

We are trying to respond thoughtfully and expeditiously. We are trying to put resources toward the problem. We are trying to get at the core of the problem, which the administration itself a month ago identified as a 2008 law, but has now offered absolutely no suggestions how to fix.

So we have not tried to repeal it. We have tried to tweak it and address the problem. If my friends have a better solution, we would love to hear it, but we haven't heard it. Instead, we have been told the 2008 law caused the problem, but you can't change the law. That seems to me both politically and intellectually indefensible.

We are going to continue to try to solve the problem that has been identified by the administration. At some point, we hope they will join us in trying to actually correct the problem that they say exists.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of two Honduran brothers who were tortured and murdered by gang members in San Pedro Sula, the murder capital of the world.

Mr. Speaker, how we treat our children speaks to the character of our Nation.

[From The New York Times, July 9, 2014]

FLEEING GANGS, CHILDREN HEAD TO U.S. BORDER

(By Frances Robles)

SAN PEDRO SULA, HONDURAS—Anthony O. Castellanos disappeared from his gang-ridden neighborhood on the eastern edge of Honduras's most dangerous city, so his younger brother, Kenneth, hopped on his

green bicycle to search for him, starting his hunt at a notorious gang hangout known as the “crazy house.”

They were found within days of each other, both dead. Anthony, 13, and a friend had been shot in the head; Kenneth, 7, had been tortured and beaten with sticks and rocks. They were among seven children murdered in the La Pradera neighborhood of San Pedro Sula in April alone, part of a surge in gang violence that is claiming younger and younger victims.

The killings are a major factor driving the recent wave of migration of Central American children to the United States, which has sent an unprecedented number of unaccompanied minors across the Texas border. Many children and parents say the rush of new migrants stems from a belief that United States immigration policy offers preferential treatment to minors, but in addition, studies of Border Patrol statistics show a strong correlation between cities like San Pedro Sula with high homicide rates and swarms of youngsters taking off for the United States.

“The first thing we can think of is to send our children to the United States,” said a mother of two in La Pradera, who declined to give her name because she feared gang reprisals. “That’s the idea, to leave.”

Honduran children are increasingly on the front lines of gang violence. In June, 32 children were murdered in Honduras, bringing the number of youths under 18 killed since January of last year to 409, according to data compiled by Covenant House, a youth shelter in Tegucigalpa, the capital.

With two major youth gangs and more organized crime syndicates operating with impunity in Central America, analysts say immigration authorities will have a difficult time keeping children at home unless the root causes of violence are addressed.

In 2012, the number of murder victims ages 10 to 14 had doubled to 81 from 40 in 2008, according to the Violence Observatory at the National Autonomous University of Honduras. Last year, 1,013 people under 23 were murdered in a nation of eight million.

Although homicides dropped sharply in 2012 after a gang truce in neighboring El Salvador, so far this year murders of children 17 and under are up 77 percent from the same time period a year ago, the police said.

Nowhere is the flow of departures more acute than in San Pedro Sula, a city in northwestern Honduras that has the world’s highest homicide rate, according to United Nations figures.

Between January and May of this year, more than 2,200 children from the city arrived in the United States, according to Department of Homeland Security statistics, far more than from any other city in Central America.

More than half of the top 50 Central American cities from which children are leaving for the United States are in Honduras. Virtually none of the children have come from Nicaragua, a bordering country that has staggering poverty, but not a pervasive gang culture or a record-breaking murder rate. “Everyone has left,” Alan Castellanos, 27, the uncle of Anthony and Kenneth, said in an interview in late May. “How is it that an entire country is being brought to its knees?”

He said the gangs operated with total impunity. “They killed all those kids and nobody did anything about it,” Mr. Castellanos said. “When prosecutors wanted to discuss the case, they asked us to meet at their office, because they were afraid to come here. If they were afraid, imagine us.”

The factors pushing children to migrate vary, according to an analysis of their home

cities by the Department of Homeland Security.

The Guatemalan children who arrive in the United States are more often from rural areas, suggesting their motives are largely economic. The minors from El Salvador and Honduras tend to come from extremely violent regions “where they probably perceive the risk of traveling alone to the U.S. preferable to remaining at home,” the analysis said.

“Basically, the places these people are coming from are the places with the highest homicide rates,” said Manuel Orozco, a senior fellow at the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based research group. “The parents see gang membership around the corner. Once your child is forced to join, the chances of being killed or going to prison is pretty high. Why wait until that happens?”

A confluence of factors, including discounted rates charged by smugglers for families, helped ignite the boom, he said. Children are killed for refusing to join gangs, over vendettas against their parents, or because they are caught up in gang disputes. Many activists here suggest they are also murdered by police officers willing to clean up the streets by any means possible.

In the case of the Castellanos family, the police said the older boy was a lookout for the gang and had decided to quit. The order to kill him, the police said, came from prison.

Several arrests have been made. Hector A. Medina, 47, who the police said lived at an abandoned house controlled by the 18th Street gang, where Kenneth was killed, was charged in the boys’ deaths. “It’s a serious social problem: any children born in this neighborhood are going to get involved in a gang,” said Elvin Flores, a police inspector in charge of La Pradera. “Our idea is to lower crime every day. We need a state policy to involve kids from when they are little to go to school.”

But gangs, which rob, sell drugs locally, kidnap people and extort money from businesses, often recruit new members at schools.

In some cities, blocks are empty because gangs demanding extortion payments have forced out homeowners. Many people have had to move within the country in a displacement pattern that experts liken to the one seen in Colombia’s civil war.

The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said that from 2008 to 2013, the number of asylum claims filed in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize increased sevenfold.

Most were from people of Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, the three nations with large numbers of migrants now arriving at the United States border.

Refugee advocacy organizations have urged the State Department to treat the children arriving at the United States border as refugees, and proposed a processing system where asylum claims could be reviewed in Central America and those accepted could move safely to the United States or countries willing to accept them, as was done in countries such as Haiti and Iraq. They have not yet received a response, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops said.

President Obama urged Congress on Wednesday night to pass a \$3.7 billion budget supplement that would, among other things, beef up border security, hasten deportations and help Central American nations address security problems. “The best thing we can do is make sure the children can live in their own countries, safely,” he said.

During a recent late-night visit to the San Pedro Sula morgue, more than 60 bodies, all victims of violence, were seen piled in a heap, each wrapped in a brown plastic bag. While picking bullets out of a 15-year-old boy shot 15 times, technicians discussed how they regularly received corpses of children under 10, and sometimes as young as 2.

Last week, in nearby Santa Barbara, an 11-year-old had his throat slit by other children, because he did not pay a 50-cent extortion fee.

"At first we saw a lot of kids who were being killed because when the gang came for their parents, they happened to be in the car or at the location with them," said Dr. Darwin Armas Cruz, a medical examiner who works the overnight shift. "Now we see kids killing kids. They kill with guns, knives and even grenades."

Dr. Armas said his family was thinking of migrating, too.

CORRECTION: JULY 11, 2014

Because of an editing error, an article on Thursday about the murderous gang violence in Honduras that is a factor in the recent wave of migration of Central American children to the United States misstated the amount of money that President Obama has requested from Congress to address the problem. It is \$3.7 billion, not more than \$4 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the chair of the Hispanic Caucus and the ranking member on the Education and Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5230 and the underlying rule.

I represent McAllen, Texas, which has been the epicenter for this humanitarian crisis. For years, my Republican colleagues have been ignoring the problems caused by their inaction on immigration reform. They have cut funding for immigration judges, so that people wait years to have their cases heard.

They have cut funding to help the countries of Central America deal with the internal problems causing their children to flee. The Republican solution has always been more walls and fences and more soldiers to militarize the border.

I live on that border of Texas and Mexico, and I know that their enforcement-only approach is not working because it doesn't address the root cause of immigration. It has been economically devastating to border communities who vainly try to persuade companies to move their plants and factories to our region to create jobs and bring us out of poverty that is the highest in the Nation.

Our veterans suffer because the VA can't get doctors to move to the border. All these companies and doctors hear is that the border is a war zone flooded with dangerous immigrants. That is not the border I know. My bor-

der home is a vibrant, educated, fast-growing, culturally diverse, welcoming region. I am proud of how we have embraced these children and families.

We are now voting once again to militarize our border, deny children legal representation and due process, and providing little help to Central America. We are not fixing the problem, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a few correctives, if I may. We are actually putting in additional resources. We haven't cut resources. It is the President's budget that cut resources. It cut detention beds, enforcement, and aid to the countries in Central America that are dealing with this problem. That is the President's budget.

Those things were all corrected in the Foreign Operations budget that has not yet reached the floor, but has been passed by the full Appropriations Committee.

I am going to disagree with my friends on the other side that this has anything to do with comprehensive immigration reform. Quite frankly, it does not. It is a border crisis. It has nothing to do with this legislation.

The root cause of the problem here are criminals who go back and tell people: if you pay money and subject yourself to a dangerous journey and we get you to the United States, you will be able to stay. That is who is at fault here. That is where the focus ought to be.

When my friends point to specific cases, I always point out, number one, we have an avenue called the United States Embassy. In the country, you can go and plead refugee status there. You don't have to travel 1,000 or 2,000 miles across very dangerous country. You simply afford yourself of the available opportunities.

Finally, in the President's judgment, most of these children will be returned. That is the President's judgment. Frankly, I think he made that judgment, trying to discourage what is happening now. That is precisely what we are trying to do in this piece of legislation.

So I think there is a lot of passion, and it is appropriate because there are some heartwrenching cases, but there is also a lot of political theater here. The reality is, again, most of these children, according to the President, will be returned.

The quicker that can happen, the less likely it is that other children will follow them and be subjected to a very dangerous journey. That is what we are trying to achieve. We are going to try to do that in this measure today, but we invite our friends to work with us as we go forward, as I suspect that we will.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, last week, we were part of a conversation and debate around strengthening antihuman trafficking laws. We all came to this floor, and Democrats and Republicans found a way to talk to one another and talk to the American public about what we should do to protect these children that are in harm's way, not just fleeing street violence, but being brutally murdered and raped, Mr. Speaker.

This week, what my Republican colleagues are doing is coming out of a conference and weakening antihuman trafficking laws.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, all I can say is God help this Congress if it is now our policy to weaken human trafficking laws. It is a sad, sad day, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that my colleagues take a chance to look at this and look into their hearts and pray on that and come to the floor and do the right thing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 696. This rule would provide for consideration of a supplemental appropriations bill that clearly demonstrates its Republican authors either have no idea what is needed to address the current situation at the border, or they are more concerned with scoring political points than making public policy.

The resources provided under the bill are both inadequate to provide the necessary humanitarian relief and misdirected toward so-called border security efforts that are unlikely to have any real effect on the number of unlawful border crossings.

For example, deploying the National Guard to the border when children and families are already running to the Border Patrol agents is a waste of taxpayer money; instead, we should be providing the Border Patrol with the funding necessary to move additional experienced agents to the Rio Grande Valley, which is what their leadership has indicated they need.

This misguided bill has also included provisions to undermine due process for unaccompanied children, many of whom are refugees fleeing terrible violence in their home countries.

Mr. Speaker, we are better than this as a Congress and as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying supplemental.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

□ 1030

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the heartbreaking stories my colleagues are telling about these young people coming across the border and being exploited and hurt and injured just confirm the wisdom of the approach the Republicans have taken to this problem based on common sense and long experience. It is called law enforcement. This is not complicated.

In order to protect these kids, protect the people of the United States, protect the communities along the border, we believe strongly in enforcing the existing law and in ensuring that the people of the United States are protected against the lawlessness: the drug dealers, the cartels, the smugglers, the gun runners who are coming across the border and exploiting these kids.

This is not a complicated problem. It has worked for years in Texas. We understand the border problem. It is simply a matter of law enforcement. No nation can survive that doesn't secure its borders and enforce its laws.

By enforcing the law and by bringing peace and quiet to the border, you will also ensure that free trade—that legal trade back and forth between Mexico, our biggest trading partner—can proceed as it should. Laredo is the largest inland port in the United States, and in order for businesses to do their jobs, they have got to have peace and quiet, and that means law enforcement.

That is the Republican approach to this problem. Enforce the law.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Oklahoma has any remaining speakers.

Mr. COLE. I do not. I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma for the courtesy that, if somebody else shows up on my side, I might further yield, but, otherwise, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLE. I would certainly do that for my friend.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House Republican proposal includes a provision that would roll back our bipartisan antihuman trafficking protections that have been in place for 20 years and that were most recently reaffirmed unanimously by Congress in 2008. This is a debate to maintain our due process laws under the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization

Act of 2008, which this bill strips, that help promote the safety of unaccompanied minors.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees, 58 percent of children fleeing to the U.S. from Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Mexico may have valid claims to asylum or other legal protections. Our existing laws ensure that these children receive due process. Many of them are victims of human trafficking, of sexual violence, or of other persecution, and they need to have the meaningful opportunity under a law to present their protection claims before an immigration judge. The underlying bill would, according to the UNHCR, drastically weaken the due process protections by subjecting Central American children to an inadequate screening process.

We have had our additional speaker arrive to offer our PQ, Mr. Speaker; and if the House had taken up the Senate immigration reform bill, the current influx of migrant children from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala may never have even become the humanitarian crisis that is facing us today. That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to give the House a second chance.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, so the House can finally vote on a broad, long-term solution to overhaul our country's immigration system and to address the border crisis. At the same time, it addresses the systemic causes rather than simply trying to apply Band-Aid, after Band-Aid, after Band-Aid. The House will soon find there are not enough Band-Aids made. We need to address the health of the patient.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say this bill were a joke. This is far worse than a joke. Not only does the underlying bill fail to provide adequate funding to deal with the situation at hand, it flat out ignores the root cause of the problem.

By tacking on a vote on the so-called "No New DREAMERS Act," House leadership is not just refusing to take action on immigration reform, it is prohibiting the President from doing things to fix a broken system. This is akin to watching a train crash or knowing that it is going to crash and stoking the furnace more, making the damage greater. They have no interest in fixing this crisis. They have no interest in fixing the problem. They are playing politics with people's lives, and they are playing politics with our Nation's economy.

This isn't a game. These are human beings. This is doing damage to our country. If we are truly committed to tackling this crisis on the southwest border and to ensuring a fair and efficient process for dealing with these kids, we need to begin with comprehensive immigration reform.

If the previous question is defeated, we will offer H.R. 15, the House bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill. Only by fixing our broken immigration system can we begin to better allocate the resources where they are needed most.

My bill provides a path forward for people already here so that their cases are no longer clogging our immigration courts and so that immigration officials can spend their time going after those who wish to do our Nation harm. It will provide green cards for thousands of Hondurans and El Salvadorans who have languished for over a decade under temporary status, and it adds the necessary due process protection for children on the border.

A speaker on the side opposite brought up the issue of what caused this. What was the straw that broke the camel's back? I will tell you what the straw is. Some of these children have waited 5 years; some of them have waited 8 years; and some of them have waited over a decade on the promises of this Congress—and there is blame to go to both sides—to have comprehensive immigration reform. Then the Speaker who had promised earlier in the year to work with the President finally announced there would be no comprehensive immigration reform. That was the straw that broke the camel's back because 55 percent of these children are coming to be with their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our country needs comprehensive immigration reform, and the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. There are enough votes in this House to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can finally consider comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In our last week—on our last day—before this House adjourns for a 5-week recess, we have an opportunity with Mr. GARCIA's previous question in that, if we can defeat the previous question, we can actually address these issues with a bipartisan bill, H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, nearly identical to the Senate bill. I am confident that, if this body passes that bill, Senate Majority Leader REID will promptly act on it and send it to the

President's desk so that we not only can address this border crisis but can prevent future border crises from arising by securing our border and restoring the rule of law to our Nation. The American people expect this body to act in a way that is consistent with our values. We have that opportunity today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question to bring up H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan immigration reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so this body—this House and this Congress—can tackle immigration reform and restore the rule of law to our country. I further encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to differ with my friends, obviously, on a number of important issues.

First, I think they, probably, without thinking it through, accused us of wanting to roll back a human sex trafficking bill that passed this body unanimously. Absolutely untrue. Nobody has any intention of doing anything like that. It is the administration that said that legislation—a loophole in it—is what caused this crisis. I would dispute that, quite frankly.

I think what has caused it is, first and foremost, the President's sending an unmistakable signal, a signal that may have been misinterpreted that, if you manage to get to the United States, you are going to be able to stay. He did that by unilaterally changing and thwarting whole sections of our own immigration law, by doing things that he, himself, had said a year before were unconstitutional. That signal, I think, has been picked up by criminals and turned into a message that has been directed at naive and vulnerable people, saying, if you give us thousands of dollars, we will take you on this journey, get you to the United States, and then you are going to be able to stay.

When the President first addressed this problem—again, he was warned in 2012 and 2013 by his own advisers that this might well happen—he did not prepare for it. He submitted a budget that actually cut border enforcement and that cut security aid to the Central American countries so they could secure their own territory. When he finally dealt with this, he said this 2008 law is part of the reason.

What this bill does is tweak it. It simply says we are going to treat chil-

dren coming from the affected areas, from noncontiguous countries, in the same way we treat Mexican children. It has always been a question as to whether or not we should have that distinction. There is no particular reason why somebody from Central America should automatically be treated differently than somebody from Mexico.

In addition, I will point out to my friends there is an easier way. Just go to the American Embassy in the country, and if you have got status that would qualify as refugee status, you can make your case there. You don't have to pay thousands of dollars. You don't have to subject yourself to a dangerous journey in the company of criminals.

The President, frankly, has said that this is an immigration issue. I don't think it is. I think it is a border crisis, and I think it needs to be dealt with that way. I think the record is, again, pretty clear on this, and that is exactly what we are trying to do. We have acted on a problem the President has identified.

When my friends express concern that the majority of these children will be returned, number one, remember they are going to be returned to the custody of their governments. They are going to be returned to the people who are actually responsible for trying to take care of them within their societies. Second, that is exactly what the President said is going to happen. Those were his words. The overwhelming majority of these young people will be returned. The quicker and the more humanely and the more expeditiously we accomplish that, the fewer of them will undertake this journey, and the fewer of these families will be conned out of their money. You are not doing the next people a favor by not dealing with the problem in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this legislation continues this House's commitment to govern and deal with crises before they become even worse—the shortfall in the highway trust fund, for instance, in the supplemental request. They are all things the American people expect us to deal with before the August district work period. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker I rise to speak in strong opposition to the Rule for H.R. 5230, a bill to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 to address the humanitarian crisis on our nation's southern border.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I have visited the border and seen the children that this bill intends to help.

This bill offers to little in funding to address the need that over 50 states are attempting to address by providing shelter and assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are now living in our country.

This bill does too little to actually help the thousands of children who are awaiting immigration hearings. They are victims of human trafficking, sexual violence, and witnesses to murders as well as acts of violence against other children who took that dangerous trek to the United States.

We should be focused on learning what they know and what they experienced to be sure the guilty are found and punished.

I offered, along with several other members of the House amendments in attempts to improve the bill, but all were rejected by the Rules Committee, which chose to place H.R. 5230 before the House in the form of a closed rule.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have authorized designated federal agencies to reimburse State and local governments and private nonprofit organizations for the costs incurred in providing psychological counseling, housing, education, medicine and medical care, food and water, clothes, personal hygiene and other in dispensable consumables, other human services in response to the humanitarian crisis on the Southwest Border.

This Congress has had the Senate's version of a Comprehensive Immigration reform bill for nearly a year, without accomplishing the task of taking up the issue and passing a House version.

Our nation's immigration system is broken and needs reform, but the only attempt at addressing immigration into the United States is this bill that is being presented as an appropriations bill.

H.R. 5230 is not an appropriations bill it is an immigration reform bill, which covers the jurisdictions of the two committees I serve on—the House Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees. Neither of these committees were given the opportunity to hold hearings or make the needed changes to the bill to make sure it conforms with long standing policies relating to unaccompanied minor or issues related to refugees.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have helped nonprofits, local and state governments in all of the 50 states who are now providing assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors within the United States.

The message has gotten to families in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Parents are no longer sending their children to the United States once they learned of the dangers and the prospects for their children surviving the journey without becoming victims of human trafficking.

Over two-thirds of the language in H.R. 5230 will make significant changes in existing law or creates new law regarding immigration policy without going through the committees of jurisdiction such as the House Committees on Homeland Security, Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5230 contains too much language that is legislative such as:

The bill makes significant changes to 2008 trafficking victims protection act. This change will subject all children to the initial screening process that now applies only to children from Mexico and Canada; erects a new expedited immigration court screening for any children

who pass the initial screening; prohibits administrative appeals from children ordered removed through the new expedited process; requires detention of certain children who demonstrate a credible fear of persecution throughout the pendency of their asylum proceedings; establishes new, high burdens of proof; and sets up a principle of "Last In, First Out" in the adjudication process.

The bill prohibits the secretaries of the interior and agriculture from impeding, denying, or restricting the activities of U.S. customs and border protection on federal land located within 100 miles of the U.S./Mexico border—This issue has already been addressed. Both Interior and Agriculture have existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and all these agencies, as well as the GAO, have testified that these agreements are working and that federal land management laws and activities do not impair border security.

The bill provides too few emergency immigration judges—the bill only requires the Department of Justice to designate up to 40 temporary immigration judges within 14 days of enactment of this legislation. Then the bill permits hiring of retired judges or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, to conduct expedited hearings for unaccompanied alien children to try to meet the new requirement that their cases be heard within 7 days of being screened by DHS officials.

The bill undermines a long standing policy reparding asylum—H.R. 5230 Prohibits anyone believed to have been convicted outside the U.S. of any drug-related offense punishable by a prison term of more than a year from being granted asylum.

The bill makes the wrong decision on border security by sending the national guard support for border operations—H.R. 5230 would deploy National Guard under Title 32 Status. National Guard troops with this change may be assigned duties as deemed necessary to provide assistance in operations, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossing by unaccompanied children.

The bill denies safe shelter to children through its sense of congress—the states that the Secretary of Defense should not be allowed to shelter unaccompanied children or other migrants unless certain conditions are met.

These children have found the compassion and love of thousands of Americans founds in the states of Texas, Alabama, Alaska, California, Illinois, North Carolina, South Dakota, New York, Utah, Virginia and—yes—even the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The nature of America is that of the Good Samaritan.

On July 3, 2014, I went to McAllen, Texas and observed a Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facility where unaccompanied children were being processed by the Border Patrol.

As I walked through the facility, I saw frightened and needy children, some as young as five years old.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this body who have not taken the time to visit the border or visit the children who are now in their own

states will stand before this body and accuse them of being dangerous—but they are not.

They are traumatized and frightened children driven from their homes by violence and inducements of these same gangs to get payments from desperate parents seeking to save the lives of their children to bring them to the United States.

These children had risked their lives to make their way to the U.S. by riding atop freight trains through dangerous territories in Mexico. One can only imagine the desperation and hopelessness that would prompt a parent to send their young child on such a treacherous journey.

It takes courage and desperation to escape senseless violence and I know that is what Cuban Americans faced, and Christians, Jews and all other groups facing violence have endured.

These are refugees and their status requires that the United States act appropriately.

Some may mention that the United States has a quota on refugees that we can take each year and that number has been reached. The program they refer to is for refugees that other nations around the world are providing shelter—but if the refugees are crossing our own border there is no limit.

This international law that the United States has backed for decades and pressured other nations to enforce. If the refugees are Christians escaping ISIS or Boko Haram or they are children escaping violent gangs in Central America they are not and should not be turned back.

Children do not leave their homes and families by the tens of thousands unless fear is driving them from their homes.

Upon my visit to South Texas borders, I witnessed hundreds of children whose young faces were pressed against glass jails with tears running down their faces. We are dealing with helpless children who have traveled a treacherous journey, and it should be within our American values to care for these children who fled their homes to escape violence.

These children are not perpetrators or criminals—they are in many cases victims fleeing deadly violence in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, and are seeking temporary safe haven in the United States, as so many people before them have done for centuries.

The surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border does not pose a threat to our national security. Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by army an of children dispatched to do us harm.

We are confronted instead with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries that now lead the world in murder rates: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem. Taking actions that address the root causes in the short and long term will. We should be taking up Immigration Reform to deal with the wide range of immigration problems.

The current status on the border is the number of children coming across the border has abated. Those children remaining in detention shelters along the border number only a few hundred.

According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, these three Central American countries have among the highest per capita homicide rates in the world, with Honduras topping the list and the other two nations in the top five.

To address this issue of the humanitarian crisis, I introduced H.R. 4990, the "Justice for Children Now Act of 2014," which authorizes the immediate hiring of an additional 70 immigration judges in the Executive Office of Immigration Review.

This bill will help but it is not sufficient to address the backlogs to help advance the flow of the children's immigration court hearings.

The amount allowed under this bill will leave states and aid agencies footing a significant portion of the cost for assisting these helpless children—when it is the role of the federal government to be present and actively engaged in leading the effort.

I support the President's request for \$3.7 billion to respond to the humanitarian crisis on the border and urge my colleagues in leadership to reconsider the level of funding for this great need.

Congress should allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States. Some of these persons are attempting to enter the country unlawfully and without justification. Our laws do not permit this and they should not be allowed entry.

The Administration is following immigration law as it relates to these unaccompanied minors.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, signed by President George W. Bush establishes the legal status of the children who have entered the nation unaccompanied.

That law provides persons fleeing lethal violence or escape from human trafficking the opportunity to have their case heard by an immigration judge.

Over the time Congress has delayed acting and an additional 366,000 pending cases were added to the immigration courts that must have hearings before any action can be taken.

Because this situation is untenable for everyone—law enforcement, taxpayers, and individuals petitioning for relief, the first thing that we can and should do to reduce the backlog is provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation.

Ensuring that there are available sufficient facilities to house detained children in a humane manner while they await their immigration hearing is another challenge.

I ask that the Rules Committee approve the Jackson Lee Amendment for inclusion in H.R. 5230.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 696 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS FROM COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other

purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated,

control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will now resume on H.R. 935, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPS. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 935 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING INFANTS AND CHILDREN FROM KNOWN OR SUSPECTED CARCINOGENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply to a discharge of a pesticide—

(1) if the pesticide—

(A) is a known or suspected carcinogen for infants or children; or

(B) is known or suspected to harm the neurological or physiological development of infants or children; or

(2) if the discharge is located in a geographic area that contains a cancer cluster.

(b) CANCER CLUSTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "cancer cluster" means a defined geographic area where there is the occurrence of a greater than expected number of cancer cases among infants or children over a specific time period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer this final amendment to H.R. 935.

If this amendment is adopted, it will not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

□ 1045

The House will have an opportunity to vote on final passage immediately after consideration of this amendment. What the amendment will do is ensure that our children are protected from known chemical threats.

Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise that when it comes to pesticides, infants and children are among the most vulnerable to harmful health impacts. Pound for pound, children drink more water, eat more food, and breathe more air than adults, and, as a result, they absorb a higher concentration of pesticides.

Infants and children are also exposed to pesticides in unique ways because of how they interact with the world. As any parent can tell you, children and infants crawl on the floor and on the grass, and they put almost everything into their mouths, including their hands, again, putting themselves at greater risk of exposure to pesticides than adults.

And the exposure of infants and children to pesticides poses a greater risk than the same exposure would do to an adult for an additional reason, and that is because children's internal organs are still developing, and their bodies may provide less natural protection from these toxins than adults have.

Simply put, our children are at greater risk from pesticide exposure, so they need greater protection, and that is what my amendment would do. It would help reduce risk by preserving several commonsense tools to protect children and infants from increased exposure to toxic pesticides.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our farmers and mosquito control districts have raised legitimate concerns about these regulations that need to be addressed, and I have supported the underlying bill in the past because I believe the legislative process needs to move forward to find the right solution to these issues.

However, this bill is not perfect. It takes a very broad approach that could be more targeted to ensure that we are

doing everything possible to protect our most vulnerable people. Unfortunately, this bill now has come to the floor with no opportunity to consider floor amendments to make these commonsense improvements, and so this is our last—really, our only—opportunity to strike the right balance between supporting our local farmers and protecting our children.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that pesticide exposure can lead to a variety of adverse health effects, especially for children. These harmful effects range from neurological disorders to birth defects to certain forms of cancer. In fact, recent news reports have highlighted more and more examples of potential cancer clusters associated with pesticide exposure.

For example, in Highland, New York, health officials are investigating the cases of six children who, one after another, were diagnosed with the same form of leukemia. Local residents believe that environmental pollution may be the cause and point to the routine pesticide sprayings in the area.

In Kern County, California, local officials are investigating over 20 cases of childhood malignancies, including the death of an 8-year-old boy, that may be linked to pesticides in that area.

In Washington State, local health officials are investigating why roughly 60 people in the Yakima area have fallen ill, reporting difficulty breathing, skin rashes, nausea, vomiting, and headaches, some of whom required emergency hospitalization. In this instance, State health officials suspect these health issues may be related to 15 different instances of spraying in commercial orchards.

These are just a few examples.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of California with a vibrant agricultural economy and culture that we all treasure. Our farmers and their families drink the same water as everyone else, so they have just as much at stake in this as anyone. Pesticides are an unfortunate but necessary part of food production, and our central coast farmers do the best they can to navigate the rules and use these pesticides safely, but there is clearly more that could and should be done to minimize pesticide exposure, especially when it comes to our children.

My amendment targets the most toxic of all pesticides, those that research indicates are known or suspected to cause serious health issues in infants and children. I want to be clear. This amendment does not block the use of these pesticides or block consideration of this bill. It simply says that if you are a pesticide applicator, you should minimize your use of these toxic chemicals, monitor any adverse impacts from their use, and report the location and quantities to local permitting agencies.

We may not agree on all the potential impacts of this bill, but surely we

can agree that protecting our Nation's infants and children from toxic chemicals warrants our full support. Simply put, that is what my amendment does. And as a public health nurse, I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is unnecessary. There are already adequate protections put in the law, in the FIFRA law. FIFRA evaluates it. The EPA evaluates the process. It goes through the process, and if there is any risk to the environment or human health, they won't get their label. There won't be a label. It will be a restricted pesticide, and it won't be approved.

So I say this is unnecessary. It is duplicative. There are already enough protections in the current FIFRA law, and all this is redundant and just plain unnecessary. So we need to move ahead.

I strongly oppose the motion to recommit and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 696; and adopting House Resolution 696, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 233, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

YEAS—195

Barber	Cárdenas	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Brady (PA)	Clay	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Doyle
Bustos	Connolly	Duckworth
Butterfield	Conyers	Edwards
Capps	Cooper	Ellison
Capuano	Courtney	Engel

Enyart	Loeback	Rangel
Eshoo	Lofgren	Richmond
Esty	Lowenthal	Royal-Allard
Farr	Lowey	Ruiz
Fattah	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ruppersberger
Foster	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Rush
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda T.
Gabbard	Maloney, Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Matheson	Schakowsky
Garcia	Matsui	Schiff
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schneider
Green, Al	McCollum	Schwartz
Green, Gene	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McGovern	Scott, David
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Serrano
Hahn	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Shea-Porter
Heck (WA)	Meng	Sherman
Higgins	Michaud	Sinema
Himes	Miller, George	Sires
Hinojosa	Moore	Slaughter
Holt	Moran	Smith (WA)
Honda	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Horsford	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Takano
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Israel	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Tierney
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tonko
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Tsongas
Kaptur	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Veasey
Kennedy	Pelosi	Vela
Kildee	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kilmer	Peters (CA)	Visclosky
Kind	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)	Wasserman
Kuster	Pocan	Schultz
Langevin	Polis	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Waxman
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Welch
Lee (CA)	Rahall	Wilson (FL)
Levin		Yarmuth
Lewis		
Lipinski		

NAYS—233

Aderholt	Crawford	Harris
Amash	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Amodei	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Daines	Heck (NV)
Bachus	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Barletta	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Barr	Dent	Holding
Barton	DeSantis	Hudson
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Bentivolio	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Billirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Black	Ellmers	Hurt
Blackburn	Farenthold	Issa
Boustany	Fincher	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Jolly
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Jones
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Jordan
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Joyce
Bucshon	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Calvert	Gardner	Kingston
Camp	Garrett	Kinzing (IL)
Campbell	Gerlach	Kline
Cantor	Gibbs	Labrador
Capito	Gibson	LaMalfa
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Cassidy	Gohmert	Lance
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gosar	Latham
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Latta
Coble	Granger	LoBiondo
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Long
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Conaway	Grimm	Marchant
Cook	Guthrie	Marino
Costa	Hall	Massie
Cotton	Hanna	McAllister
Cramer	Harper	McCarthy (CA)

McCaul	Reichert	Smith (NJ)
McClintock	Renacci	Smith (TX)
McHenry	Ribble	Southerland
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Stewart
McMorris	Rigell	Stivers
Rodgers	Roby	Stockman
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Stutzman
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Tipton
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Turner
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Mulvaney	Roskam	Valadao
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Wagner
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Walberg
Noem	Royce	Walden
Nugent	Runyan	Walorski
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)
Olson	Salmon	Webster (FL)
Palazzo	Sanford	Wenstrup
Paulsen	Scalise	Westmoreland
Pearce	Schock	Whitfield
Perry	Schrader	Williams
Peterson	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Pitts	Sessions	Womack
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Woodall
Pompeo	Shuster	Yoder
Posey	Simpson	Yoho
Price (GA)	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Reed	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

DesJarlais	McKeon
Hanabusa	Nunnelee

□ 1120

Messrs. THORNBERRY, DUNCAN of Tennessee, GARDNER, CASSIDY, CRAMER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FARR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KIND, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. RICHMOND changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANTOR was allowed to speak out of order.)

THE HONOR AND PRIVILEGE OF SERVING MY FELLOW AMERICANS

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to serve as majority leader of this distinguished body. I look around this remarkable Chamber, and I see so many friends and colleagues who have inspired me and who have inspired this Congress to do great things for the American people.

Walking into this building and walking on to this floor is something that excited me every day since I was first elected to Congress, as it should. Not one of us should ever take for granted the awesome honor and responsibility we have to serve our fellow Americans.

This is a privilege of a lifetime. I think of the sacrifices that helped me rise to serve the people of Virginia's Seventh District. My grandparents fled religious persecution in Europe in order to find a better life.

My grandmother, a young Jewish widow, was soon raising my dad above a grocery store in Richmond, just try-

ing to make ends meet, and so it goes, two generations later, her grandson would represent part of what was James Madison's seat in the House and then go on to serve as its majority leader.

I have truly lived the American Dream. That is what this country is supposed to be about: dreaming big and believing that each generation can do better than the last. Now, unfortunately, we have seen that dream erode in recent years, and our Nation faces many challenges. Too many are left wondering if we can be an America that works, an America that leads.

Too many children are condemned to a bad school because of the ZIP Code they live in. Being poor in America should not mean being deprived of a good education. We have all got to continue fighting for these kids. This is the civil rights issue of our time.

Even after kids graduate high school, too many can't afford college or access the skills they need to join a new and dynamic workforce. Government policies often increase these costs and restrict opportunities. During my time here, we have made some progress on some of these issues, but frankly, not enough.

One of my proudest moments was watching the President sign into law the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act sponsored by Congressmen GREGG HARPER and PETER WELCH. Prioritizing Federal dollars toward finding cures and treatments for disease can enrich and even save lives. The added benefit? Cures can help alleviate health care costs.

All the while, too many moms and dads who are healthy are stuck without a job or barely getting by in one that doesn't match their potential. This Congress, the House has passed many bills, some of which were bipartisan, to help create jobs and opportunities for those who desperately need them. I hope more of those bills will make it to the President's desk before year's end.

Our Nation and our economy cannot meet its full potential if we in America are not leading abroad. I look around at colleagues on both sides of the aisle, at chairmen, ranking members, and at my good friend, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER, all of whom have soberly and seriously helped ensure a fight for a strong foreign policy, so that our Nation can lead in order to help keep our people safe; yet never before have I been more worried about the prospects of that peace due to our diminished engagement on the world stage.

Instability and terror seem to be coming from every corner of the globe. The Middle East is in chaos, Iran is marching towards a nuclear weapon, and Russia has reverted to a cold war footing and invaded Ukraine.

America does lead in so many areas, including innovation, scientific dis-

covery, and medicine, but we have also got to make leadership abroad a priority. I shudder to think what the world will look like in 5 years for us and our allies if we don't steel our resolve and stand tall with those who stand with us.

Mr. Speaker, we don't always see eye to eye, even within our own parties in this Chamber, but that is how it is supposed to be. Our Founders did not design a rubber stamp.

This Congress, we have found ways to agree on much more than was ever reported with many bills passing this House in a bipartisan way. For that, much of the credit goes to the hard-working staff that quietly works around the clock to help us do our job. I would especially like to thank my team, starting with Chief of Staff Steve Stombres and my deputy chief, Neil Bradley, as well as our whole team for being there every day to assist Members on both sides of the aisle to help them deliver on their legislative goals. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank you for all you have done. Thank you for the example of firm leadership that you show and, at the same time, for not being afraid to show us all your kind heart and your soft spot from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, you reminded me yesterday that you and I have met with each other at least once a day every day that we have been in session for the past 5 years. For that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience.

I would like to thank our Conference chair, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS. She is as tough as she is compassionate, and her voice has so often helped our Conference and this House.

I would also like to recognize two of my colleagues and dear friends who I joined seven years ago to begin a fight for reform on behalf of the American people. To Chairman PAUL RYAN, thank you for your dedication to finding solutions to the problems that face our government. But more importantly, thank you for your commitment to identifying those conservative solutions that actually help people find their path to the American Dream. I know your efforts will continue to impact America in a positive way.

To my closest confidant and my good friend KEVIN MCCARTHY, our new majority leader, I know you will make this institution proud. I will miss the daily challenges that we faced together at the leadership table, but I know that your leadership will serve as an inspiration for all of us.

There are so many more Members and staff on both sides of the aisle who have made my time here so rewarding. Many of you have become as close to me as family, and that is what has always sustained me while being away from my own family in Richmond. I know that I speak for all of us when I

extend a heartfelt thank-you to the Capitol Police and the Sergeant at Arms for all they do to protect us and our families every day.

Finally, I want to thank my family: my wife, Diana; her mother; my children, Evan, Jenna, and Mikey; my parents; my brothers, all of whom have made sacrifices so that I could serve in this Chamber and as a member of leadership. They are my inspiration, and they are the rocks on which I will always lean.

Mr. Speaker, I close by once again thanking my colleagues for their service. I thank them for their friendship and warmth.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

THANKING THE HONORABLE ERIC CANTOR FOR HIS SERVICE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the majority leader for his service to this House and his service to this country.

When one of us leaves this body, it ought to remind us that all of us are here for a relatively short time, perhaps some longer than others, but all for a relatively short time.

Mr. CANTOR and I have had the opportunity to work together. As he pointed out, we have not always agreed, as we do not always agree across the aisle. But we have an extraordinary honor bestowed upon us, as he pointed out. There are less than 11,000 of us in the history of this country who have served in this body. There are 435 of us who have been asked by our fellow citizens to serve on their behalf, on behalf of their families, and on behalf of their country.

ERIC CANTOR has done that well, not because I always agreed with him, but because I always knew that he had the best interest of his country, his State, his community, his family, and our neighbors in mind when he acted. I want to congratulate him and I want to thank him for his service, and I want to thank him for working with me on those areas where we could find agreement. In those areas, we acted in a very productive manner and created a large bipartisan majority on most of those issues in this House. I thank him for doing that.

As one who has also had the honor, Mr. Speaker, of serving as the majority leader of this House, it is a special honor that our colleagues have bestowed upon us. I want to wish him well. I know that he will not be leaving the public community, the public square, and his voice will still be a voice of influence and he will make a difference in whatever area he pursues. He will remain always a Member of this body. He will visit us from time to time. We will welcome him back. We wish him well.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 161, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—267

Aderholt	Flores	Marino
Amash	Forbes	Massie
Amodei	Fortenberry	Matheson
Bachmann	Fox	McAllister
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Barber	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Barletta	Garamendi	McClintock
Barr	Garcia	McHenry
Barrow (GA)	Gardner	McIntyre
Barton	Garrett	McKinley
Benishek	Gerlach	McMorris
Bentivolio	Gibbs	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gibson	Meadows
Bishop (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Messer
Black	Goodlatte	Mica
Blackburn	Gosar	Michaud
Boustany	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Granger	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Brown (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (FL)
Buchanan	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Bucshon	Hall	Neugebauer
Burgess	Hanna	Noem
Bustos	Harper	Nolan
Butterfield	Harris	Nugent
Byrne	Hartzler	Nunes
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Camp	Heck (NV)	Owens
Campbell	Hensarling	Palazzo
Cantor	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Capito	Holding	Pearce
Capps	Hudson	Perlmutter
Carney	Huelskamp	Perry
Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Peters (MI)
Cassidy	Hultgren	Peterson
Chabot	Hunter	Petri
Chaffetz	Hurt	Pittenger
Clawson (FL)	Issa	Pitts
Coble	Jenkins	Poe (TX)
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Price (GA)
Collins (NY)	Jones	Rahall
Conaway	Jordan	Reed
Cook	Joyce	Reichert
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Cotton	Kind	Ribble
Courtney	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Cramer	King (NY)	Rigell
Crawford	Kingston	Roby
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Cuellar	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kuster	Rogers (KY)
Daines	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
DeBene	Lamborn	Rokita
Denham	Lance	Rooney
Dent	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	Latham	Roskam
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Ross
Duffy	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Loeb	Royce
Duncan (TN)	Loeb	Runyan
Ellmers	Long	Ryan (WI)
Enyart	Lucas	Salmon
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Farr	Lujan Grisham	Scalise
Fincher	(NM)	Schock
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Schrader
Fleischmann	Maloney, Sean	Schweikert
Fleming	Marchant	Scott, Austin

Scott, David	Stutzman
Sensenbrenner	Terry
Sessions	Thompson (PA)
Sewell (AL)	Thornberry
Shimkus	Tiberi
Shuster	Tipton
Simpson	Turner
Sinema	Upton
Smith (MO)	Valadao
Smith (NE)	Vela
Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Smith (TX)	Walberg
Southerland	Walden
Stewart	Walorski
Stivers	Walz
Stockman	Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—161

Bass	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Beatty	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Becerra	Hahn	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarella
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Higgins	Payne
Bonamici	Himes	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Polis
Capuano	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rangel
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Ciçilline	Kaptur	Rush
Clark (MA)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Connolly	Langevin	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Sherman
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Delaney	Lowe	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
Deutch	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Takano
Doggett	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Carolyn	Tierney
Edwards	Matsui	Titus
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen
Esty	McGovern	Vargas
Fattah	McNerney	Veasey
Foster	Meeks	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Visclosky
Fudge	Miller, George	Wasserman
Gabbard	Moore	Schultz
Gallego	Moran	Waters
Grayson	Nadler	Waxman
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

DesJarlais	McKeon
Hanabusa	Nunnelee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1142

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 696) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 198, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cook	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cotton	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Cramer	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Crenshaw	Grimm
Barletta	Culberson	Guthrie
Barr	Daines	Hall
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Benishek	Denham	Harris
Bentivolio	Dent	Hartzler
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Black	Duffy	Hensarling
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Hudson
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Hunter
Bucshon	Fleming	Hurt
Burgess	Flores	Issa
Byrne	Forbes	Jenkins
Calvert	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Campbell	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Capito	Gardner	Joyce
Carter	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	Gerlach	King (IA)
Chabot	Gibbs	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Gibson	Kingston
Clawson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)
Coble	Gohmert	Kline
Coffman	Goodlatte	Labrador
Cole	Gosar	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Granger	Lance

Lankford	Perry	Shuster
Latham	Peterson	Simpson
Latta	Petri	Smith (MO)
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Smith (NE)
Long	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Southerland
Luetkemeyer	Pompeo	Stewart
Lummis	Posey	Stivers
Marchant	Reed	Stockman
Marino	Reichert	Stutzman
Massie	Renacci	Terry
Matheson	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McAllister	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Tiberi
McCauley	Roby	Tipton
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Turner
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Upton
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Wagner
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walberg
Meadows	Rokita	Walden
Meehan	Rooney	Walorski
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
Mica	Roskam	Webster (FL)
Miller (FL)	Ross	Wenstrup
Miller (MI)	Rothfus	Westmoreland
Miller, Gary	Royce	Whitfield
Mullin	Runyan	Williams
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wittman
Neugebauer	Sanford	Wolf
Noem	Scalise	Womack
Nugent	Schock	Woodall
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder
Olson	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Paulsen	Sessions	Young (IN)
Pearce	Shimkus	

NAYS—198

Barber	Engel	Lujan Grisham
Barrow (GA)	Enyart	(NM)
Bass	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Beatty	Esty	(NM)
Becerra	Farr	Lynch
Bera (CA)	Fattah	Maffei
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Maloney,
Bishop (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Blumenauer	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bonamici	Gabbard	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Gallo	McCarthy (NY)
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Brown (GA)	Garcia	McDermott
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Bustos	Green, Gene	McNerney
Butterfield	Grijalva	Meeks
Capps	Gutiérrez	Meng
Capuano	Hahn	Michaud
Cárdenas	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Carney	Heck (WA)	Moore
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Moran
Cartwright	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Nadler
Castro (TX)	Holt	Napolitano
Chu	Honda	Neal
Ciulline	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Nolan
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	O'Rourke
Clay	Israel	Owens
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pascarell
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Conyers	Jones	Pelosi
Cooper	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Costa	Keating	Peters (CA)
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)
Crowley	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Cuellar	Kildee	Pocan
Cummings	Kilmer	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kind	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
DeFazio	Kuster	Rahall
DeGette	Langevin	Rangel
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
DeBene	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Deutch	Levin	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lewis	Rush
Doggett	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Loebach	Sánchez, Linda
Dowd	Loftis	T.
Edwards	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lowey	Sarbanes

Schakowsky	Slaughter	Veasey
Schiff	Smith (WA)	Vela
Schneider	Speler	Velázquez
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Schwartz	Takano	Walz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Serrano	Tierney	Waters
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Waxman
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Welch
Sherman	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Sinema	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Sires	Vargas	

NOT VOTING—8

Crawford	Hanna	Price (GA)
DesJarlais	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Hanabusa	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1149

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 220, noes 205, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—220

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hudson
Amash	Denham	Huelskamp
Amodei	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bachmann	DeSantis	Hultgren
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Barr	Duffy	Hurt
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins
Bentivolio	Ellmers	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Jolly
Black	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Joyce
Boustany	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Flores	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Forbes	Kingston
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	Kline
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gardner	Lamborn
Calvert	Garrett	Lance
Camp	Gerlach	Lankford
Campbell	Gibbs	Latham
Cantor	Gibson	Latta
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Carter	Goodlatte	Long
Cassidy	Gowdy	Lucas
Chabot	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Coble	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Coffman	Griffith (VA)	Massie
Cole	Grimm	McAllister
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)
Collins (NY)	Hall	McCauley
Conaway	Hanna	McClintock
Cook	Harper	McHenry
Cotton	Harris	McKinley
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Crawford	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Meadows
Culberson	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Daines	Holding	Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart

Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Rokita
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus
Byrne
DesJarlais

Hanabusa
Hartzler
McKeon

Nunnelee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1156

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 31, 2014, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 472, “yea.”

NOES—205

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum

McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 696, I call up the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS
TITLE IDEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$71,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to apprehend, transport, and provide temporary shelter associated with the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including related activities to secure the border, disrupt transnational crime, and the necessary acquisition, construction, improvement, repair, and management of facilities: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS
ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$334,000,000, to remain avail-

able until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including for enforcement of immigration and customs law, including detention and removal operations, of which \$262,000,000 shall be for Custody Operations and \$72,000,000 shall be for Transportation and Removal operations: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided by this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds that proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose than for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request for approval shall be submitted to such Committees.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Congress quarterly reports that include: (1) the number of apprehensions at the border delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; (2) the number of claims of a credible fear of persecution delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor, and the number of determinations of valid claims of a credible fear of persecution delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; (3) the number of unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor granted asylum by an immigration judge, delineated by year of apprehension; (4) the number of alien adults accompanied by an alien minor in detention facilities, alternatives to detention, and other non-detention forms of supervision; and (5) the number of removals delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor.

SEC. 103. Of the unobligated balance available for “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief Fund”, \$405,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on a budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, grants awarded under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) using funds provided under the heading “Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs” in division F of Public Law 113-76, division D of Public Law 113-6, or division D of Public Law 112-74 may be used by State and

local law enforcement and public safety agencies within local units of government along the Southwest Border of the United States for costs incurred during the award period of performance for personnel, overtime, travel, costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling, and costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor who have entered the United States.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY MILITARY PERSONNEL

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, \$12,419,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, \$2,258,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$15,807,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$4,516,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE (RESCISSION)

SEC. 201. Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated in title II of division C of Public Law 113-76 for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$35,000,000 is hereby rescinded to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for “Administrative Review and Appeals” for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, \$22,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which \$12,900,000 shall be for additional temporary immigration judges and related expenses, and \$9,100,000 shall be for technology for judges to expedite the adjudication of immigration cases.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE (RESCISSION)

SEC. 301. Of the unobligated balances available for “Department of Justice—Legal Activities—Assets Forfeiture Fund”, \$22,000,000 is hereby permanently rescinded.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION

SEC. 401. (a) REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION.—Of the funds appropriated in titles III

and IV of division K of Public Law 113-76, and in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, for assistance for the countries in Central America, up to \$40,000,000 shall be made available for such countries for repatriation and reintegration activities: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to this section may be obligated notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e) of section 7045 of division K of Public Law 113-76.

(b) REPORT.—Prior to the initial obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section, but not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section by country and the steps taken by the government of each country to—

- (1) improve border security;
- (2) enforce laws and policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States;
- (3) enact laws and implement new policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States, including increasing penalties for human smuggling;
- (4) conduct public outreach campaigns to explain the dangers of the journey to the Southwest Border of the United States and to emphasize the lack of immigration benefits available; and
- (5) cooperate with United States Federal agencies to facilitate and expedite the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the Southwest Border of the United States.

(c) SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State shall suspend assistance provided pursuant to this section to the government of a country if such government is not making significant progress on each item described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b): *Provided*, That assistance may only be resumed if the Secretary reports to the appropriate congressional committees that subsequent to the suspension of assistance such government is making significant progress on each of the items enumerated in such subsection.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 402. Of the unexpended balances available to the President for bilateral economic assistance under the heading “Economic Support Fund” from prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, \$197,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Refugee and Entrant Assistance”, \$197,000,000, to be merged with and available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the funds made available under this heading in division H of Public Law 113-76 “for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235”: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$47,000,000 shall be for the Social Services and Targeted Assistance programs.

This division may be cited as the “Secure the Southwest Border Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014”.

DIVISION B—SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Secure the Southwest Border Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

Sec. 101. Repatriation of unaccompanied alien children.

Sec. 102. Expedited due process and screening of unaccompanied alien children.

Sec. 103. Due process protections for unaccompanied alien children present in the United States.

Sec. 104. Emergency immigration judge resources.

Sec. 105. Protecting children from human traffickers, sex offenders, and other criminals.

Sec. 106. Inclusion of additional grounds for per se ineligibility for asylum.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

Sec. 201. National Guard support for border operations.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

Sec. 301. Prohibition on actions that impede border security on certain Federal land.

Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on placement of unauthorized aliens at military installations.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

SEC. 101. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—
(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—
(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: “AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “countries contiguous to the United States” and inserting “Canada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “PLACEMENT IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS” and inserting “EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2), shall be—” and inserting “who meets the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)—”;

(C) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) shall be placed in a proceeding in accordance with section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which shall commence not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (4);”;

(D) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(E) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) may not be placed in the immediate custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child is the subject of an order under section 235B(e)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;”;

(F) in clause (iii), as redesignated, by inserting “is” before “eligible”; and

(G) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting “shall be” before “provided”.

SEC. 102. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 235A the following:

“SEC. 235B. HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ‘asylum officer’ had the meaning given such term in section 235(b)(1)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(E)).

“(b) PROCEEDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child under section 235(a)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(4)), an immigration judge shall conduct a proceeding to inspect, screen, and determine the status of an unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission to the United States.

“(2) TIME LIMIT.—Not later than 72 hours after the conclusion of a proceeding with respect to an unaccompanied alien child under this section, the immigration judge who conducted such proceeding shall issue an order pursuant to subsection (e).

“(c) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING.—

“(1) AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.—The immigration judge conducting a proceeding under this section—

“(A) shall administer oaths, receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the alien and any witnesses;

“(B) may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and presentation of evidence; and

“(C) is authorized to sanction by civil money penalty any action (or inaction) in contempt of the judge’s proper exercise of authority under this Act.

“(2) FORM OF PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under this section may take place—

“(A) in person;

“(B) at a location agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the alien;

“(C) through video conference; or

“(D) through telephone conference.

“(3) PRESENCE OF ALIEN.—If it is impracticable by reason of an alien’s mental incompetency for the alien to be present at the proceeding, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien.

“(4) RIGHTS OF THE ALIEN.—In a proceeding under this section—

“(A) the alien shall be given the privilege of being represented, at no expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien’s choosing who is authorized to practice in such proceedings;

“(B) the alien shall be given a reasonable opportunity—

“(i) to examine the evidence against the alien;

“(ii) to present evidence on the alien’s own behalf; and

“(iii) to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government;

“(C) the rights set forth in subparagraph (B) shall not entitle the alien—

“(i) to examine such national security information as the Government may proffer in opposition to the alien’s admission to the United States; or

“(ii) to an application by the alien for discretionary relief under this Act; and

“(D) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence produced at the proceeding.

“(5) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION.—In the discretion of the Attorney General, an alien applying for admission to the United States may, and at any time, be permitted to withdraw such application and immediately be returned to the alien’s country of nationality or country of last habitual residence.

“(6) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO APPEAR.—Any alien who fails to appear at a proceeding required under this section, shall be ordered removed in absentia if the Government establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien was at fault for their absence from the proceedings.

“(d) DECISION AND BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(1) DECISION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be—

“(i) admissible to the United States; or

“(ii) eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act.

“(B) EVIDENCE.—The determination of the immigration judge under subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the evidence produced at the hearing.

“(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In a proceeding under this section, an alien who is an applicant for admission has the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alien—

“(i) is likely to be entitled to be lawfully admitted to the United States or eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act; or

“(ii) is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to a prior admission.

“(B) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—In meeting the burden of proof under subparagraph (A)(ii), the alien shall be given access to—

“(i) the alien’s visa or other entry document, if any; and

“(ii) any other records and documents, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to the alien’s admission or presence in the United States.

“(e) ORDERS.—

“(1) PLACEMENT IN FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has met the burden of proof under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien to be placed in further proceedings in accordance with section 240.

“(2) ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has not met the burden of proof required under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien claims—

“(A) an intention to apply for asylum under section 208; or

“(B) a fear of persecution.

“(3) CLAIMS FOR ASYLUM.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (2) claims an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution, the judge shall order the alien referred for an interview by an asylum officer under subsection (f).

“(f) ASYLUM INTERVIEWS.—

“(1) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term ‘credible fear of persecution’ has the meaning given such term in section 235(b)(1)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)(v)).

“(2) CONDUCT BY ASYLUM OFFICER.—An asylum officer shall conduct interviews of aliens referred under subsection (e)(3).

“(3) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—If the officer determines at the time of the interview that an alien has a credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) during further consideration of the application for asylum.

“(4) REMOVAL WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW IF NO CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the asylum officer determines that an alien does not have a credible fear of persecution the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review.

“(B) RECORD OF DETERMINATION.—The officer shall prepare a written record of a determination under subparagraph (A), which shall include—

“(i) a summary of the material facts as stated by the applicant;

“(ii) such additional facts (if any) relied upon by the officer;

“(iii) the officer’s analysis of why, in light of such facts, the alien has not established a credible fear of persecution; and

“(iv) a copy of the officer’s interview notes.

“(C) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

“(i) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process by which an immigration judge will conduct a prompt review, upon the alien’s request, of a determination under subparagraph (A) that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution.

“(ii) MANDATORY COMPONENTS.—The review described in clause (i)—

“(I) shall include an opportunity for the alien to be heard and questioned by the immigration judge, either in person or by telephonic or video connection; and

“(II) shall be conducted—

“(aa) as expeditiously as possible;

“(bb) within the 24-hour period beginning at the time the asylum officer makes a determination under subparagraph (A), to the maximum extent practicable; and

“(cc) in no case later than 7 days after such determination.

“(5) **MANDATORY PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.**—Any alien subject to the procedures under this subsection shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b))—

“(A) pending a final determination of an asylum application under section 208; or

“(B) after a determination that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution, until the alien is removed.

“(g) **LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (f)(4)(C) and paragraph (2), a removal order entered in accordance with subsection (e)(2) or (f)(4)(A) is not subject to administrative appeal.

“(2) **RULEMAKING.**—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process for the prompt review of an order under subsection (e)(2) against an alien who claims under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, after having been warned of the penalties for falsely making such claim under such conditions to have been—

“(A) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(B) admitted as a refugee under section 207; or

“(C) granted asylum under section 208.

“(h) **LAST IN, FIRST OUT.**—In any proceedings, determinations, or removals under this section, priority shall be accorded to the alien who has most recently arrived in the United States.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 235A the following:

“Sec. 235B. Humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children.”.

(b) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF REMOVAL.**—Section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or an order of removal issued to an unaccompanied alien child after proceedings under section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(b)(1)”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “section 235(b)(1)(B).” and inserting “section 235(b)(1)(B) or 235B(f).”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(b)(1)”; and

(B) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” in each place it appears;

(C) in subparagraph (2)(C), by inserting “or section 235B(g)” after “section 235(b)(1)(C).”; and

(D) in subparagraph (3)(A), by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b).”.

SEC. 103. DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **FILING AUTHORIZED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall, at an immigration court designated to

conduct proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, permit an unaccompanied alien child who was issued a Notice to Appear under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) to appear, in-person, before an immigration judge who has been authorized by the Attorney General to conduct proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 102;

(2) to attest to their desire to apply for admission to the United States; and

(3) to file a motion—

(A) to replace any Notice to Appear issued between January 1, 2013, and the date of the enactment of this Act under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229); and

(B) to apply for admission to the United States by being placed in proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(b) **MOTION GRANTED.**—An immigration judge may, at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the judge, grant a motion filed under subsection (a)(3) upon a finding that—

(1) the petitioner was an unaccompanied alien child (as such term is defined in section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279)) on the date on which a Notice to Appear described in subsection (a) was issued to the alien;

(2) the Notice to Appear was issued during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(3) the unaccompanied alien child is applying for admission to the United States; and

(4) the granting of such motion would not be manifestly unjust.

(c) **EFFECT OF MOTION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the granting of a motion to replace under subsection (b), the immigration judge who granted such motion shall—

(1) while the petitioner remains in-person, immediately inspect and screen the petitioner for admission to the United States by conducting a proceeding under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 102;

(2) immediately notify the petitioner of the petitioner's ability, under section 235B(c)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to withdraw the petitioner's application for admission to the United States and immediately be returned to the petitioner's country of nationality or country of last habitual residence; and

(3) replace the petitioner's notice to appear with an order under section 235B(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(d) **PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.**—An unaccompanied alien child who has been granted a motion under subsection (b) shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232).

SEC. 104. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 40 immigration judges, including through the hiring of retired immigration judges, administrative law judges, or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, that are dedicated to conducting humane and expedited inspection and screening

for unaccompanied alien children under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 102. Such designations shall remain in effect solely for the duration of the humanitarian crisis at the southern border (as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General).

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that sufficient immigration judge resources are dedicated to the purpose described in subsection (a) to comply with the requirement under section 235B(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 105. PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM HUMAN TRAFFICKERS, SEX OFFENDERS, AND OTHER CRIMINALS.

Section 235(c)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, including a mandatory biometric criminal history check” before the period at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following—

“(D) **PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of—

“(I) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)); or

“(II) a crime involving a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(ii) **REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.**—A biometric criminal history check under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifiers and conducted through—

“(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

“(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences.”.

SEC. 106. INFUSION OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS FOR PER SE INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.

Section 208(b)(2)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)(iii)) is amended by inserting after “a serious nonpolitical crime” the following: “(including any drug-related offense punishable by a term of imprisonment greater than 1 year)”.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 201. NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT FOR BORDER OPERATIONS.

(a) **DEPLOYMENT AUTHORITY AND FUNDING.**—Amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act shall be expended for any units or personnel of the National Guard deployed to perform operations and missions under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on the southern border of the United States.

(b) **ASSIGNMENT OF OPERATIONS AND MISSIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—National Guard units and personnel deployed under subsection (a) may be assigned such operations as may be necessary to provide assistance for operations on the southern border, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossings by unaccompanied alien children.

(2) **NATURE OF DUTY.**—The duty of National Guard personnel performing operations and missions on the southern border shall be full-time duty under title 32, United States Code.

(c) **MATERIEL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall deploy such materiel and equipment and logistical support as may be necessary to ensure success of the operations and missions conducted by the National Guard under this section.

(d) **EXCLUSION FROM NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.**—National Guard personnel deployed under subsection (a) shall not be included in—

(1) the calculation to determine compliance with limits on end strength for National Guard personnel; or

(2) limits on the number of National Guard personnel that may be placed on active duty for operational support under section 115 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) **HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS DEFINED.**—In this section:

(1) The term “high traffic areas” means sectors along the northern and southern borders of the United States that are within the responsibility of the Border Patrol that have the most illicit cross-border activity, informed through situational awareness.

(2) The term “unaccompanied alien child” means a child who—

(A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

(B) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(C) with respect to whom—

(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or

(ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

SEC. 301. PROHIBITION ON ACTIONS THAT IMPEDE BORDER SECURITY ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.**—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall not impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on Federal land located within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, to execute search and rescue operations, and to prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States. These authorities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on such Federal land apply whether or not a state of emergency exists.

(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.**—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall have immediate access to Federal land within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of conducting the following activities on such land that prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States:

(1) Construction and maintenance of roads.

(2) Construction and maintenance of barriers.

(3) Use of vehicles to patrol, apprehend, or rescue.

(4) Installation, maintenance, and operation of communications and surveillance equipment and sensors.

(5) Deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure.

(c) **CLARIFICATION RELATING TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any termination date relating to the waiver referred to in this subsection), the waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security on April 1, 2008, under section 102(c)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note; Public Law 104-208) of the laws described in paragraph (2) with respect to certain sections of the international border between the United States and Mexico shall be considered to apply to all Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture within 100 miles of such international land border of the United States for the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (b).

(2) **DESCRIPTION OF LAWS WAIVED.**—The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are limited to the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), Public Law 86-523 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the “Antiquities Act of 1906”; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”), the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), the General Authorities Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-383) (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 et seq.), sections 401(7), 403, and 404 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-625, 92 Stat. 3467), and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 101-628).

(d) **PROTECTION OF LEGAL USES.**—This section shall not be construed to provide—

(1) authority to restrict legal uses, such as grazing, hunting, mining, or public-use recreational and backcountry airstrips on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture; or

(2) any additional authority to restrict legal access to such land.

(e) **EFFECT ON STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—This Act shall—

(1) have no force or effect on State or private lands; and

(2) not provide authority on or access to State or private lands.

(f) **TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.**—Nothing in this section supersedes, replaces, negates, or diminishes treaties or other agreements between the United States and Indian tribes.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLACEMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should not allow the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation unless—

(A) the Secretary submits written notice to the congressional defense committees and each Member of Congress representing any jurisdiction in which an affected military installation is situated; and

(B) the Secretary publishes notice in the Federal Register;

(2) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not displace active members of the Armed Forces;

(3) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not interfere with any mission of the Department of Defense;

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens unless all other facilities of the Department of Health and Human Services are unavailable;

(5) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens for more than 120 days;

(6) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all unauthorized alien children are vaccinated upon arrival at a military installation as set forth in the guidelines of the Office of Refugee Resettlement;

(7) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all individuals under the supervision of the Secretary with access to unauthorized alien children at a military installation are properly cleared according to the procedures set forth in the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

(8) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should fully comply with the provisions of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) with respect to background checks and should retain full legal responsibility for such compliance; and

(9) in accordance with section 1535 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Economy Act”), the Secretary of Health and Human Services should reimburse the Secretary of Defense for all expenses incurred by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “Member of Congress” has the meaning given that term in section 1591(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “military installation” has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, but does not include an installation located outside of the United States.

(4) The term “placement” means the placement of an unauthorized alien in either a detention facility or an alternative to such a facility.

(5) The term “unauthorized alien” means an alien unlawfully present in the United States, but does not include a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5230, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

I rise today to present H.R. 5230, which provides immediate, short-term funding to address the southwest border crisis.

In total, this bill provides \$659 million to meet urgent border security and humanitarian needs for this fiscal year ending on September 30.

Thousands of illegal immigrants, including unaccompanied children, have flooded our borders and overwhelmed our current facilities and personnel.

□ 1200

This includes a staggering number of children, arriving with no family, who are being smuggled across our borders by criminal organizations, subject to abuse and violence. We need to put safeguards in place to prevent them from taking this dangerous journey, as well as provide the resources needed to take care of them and process them appropriately.

The President must take the lead on this by mitigating this crisis, turning back the tide of illegal immigrants, and fully enforcing our laws. This problem has, without a doubt, been exacerbated by the administration's policies on immigration, and it is up to the administration to find a way to fix that problem.

In the meantime, however, Madam Speaker, it is plain that something must be done to ensure that our law enforcement personnel and Federal agencies have the resources needed to deal with this dire situation in the short term.

The \$659 million in funding in this bill focuses on three areas—border security, humanitarian assistance, and prevention—to meet the most pressing needs. Of this total \$659 million, \$462 million is provided to increase security and enforce our laws, boosting personnel, and increasing detention space to the largest capacity in our history.

Part of this funding will help accelerate judicial proceedings by increasing the number of temporary judges and outfitting all immigration courtrooms in the Nation with teleconferencing equipment that would allow them to be able to join in the process of adjudicating those cases on the border. There are some 332 of those courtrooms around the country.

We have doubled existing funding for the National Guard to bolster their presence along our border, as they assist Customs and Border Protection with surveillance, investigations, and humanitarian efforts.

The bill also provides \$197 million to take care of these unaccompanied children, ensuring they have proper housing, meals, and temporary care while they are in U.S. custody.

Madam Speaker, to stave off the continued influx of illegal immigration, the bill redirects existing State Department funding to ensure that countries like Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador must quickly accept and repatriate those returning from the U.S.

This bill draws a hard line on spending, scrubbing the President's request to focus on the most immediate needs. It does not including funding for longer-term needs or unnecessary programs, like cash subsidies for coffee farmers. Any additional funding for this crisis can and should be addressed under the regular appropriations process for fiscal year 2015.

In addition, to make sure that this bill doesn't add a penny to our deficit, Madam Speaker, every dollar spent here is fully offset from somewhere else by making noncontroversial rescissions of unused, excess prior-year funds.

Lastly, the bill includes several policy provisions recommended by the Speaker's Working Group on the Border Crisis, led by the chairwoman of the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative KAY GRANGER from Texas. She will speak soon.

This includes a change in a 2008 law to ensure that all unaccompanied minors arriving in this country are treated the same as Mexicans and Canadians for the purpose of removal.

It also strengthens the law prohibiting immigration status to criminals convicted of serious drug crimes and prohibits the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture from restricting Customs and Border Protection apprehension activities on Federal land on the border, and it expresses congressional intent that detained aliens awaiting processing should not be housed on military installations.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill. This is a fair, sensible, and reasonable address of the most immediate needs on the border. It also puts in place much-needed policy changes that should stop the flow of unaccompanied children who are being put at risk during their long, dangerous journey through Mexico.

It is our congressional duty to quickly pass this bill in short order. Therefore, I ask all Members to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

DIVISION A -- SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS			
TITLE I			
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY			
U.S. Customs and Border Protection			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	393,549	---	-393,549
Salaries and Expenses.....	---	71,000	+71,000
Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement (emergency).....	39,411	---	-39,411
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	432,960	71,000	-361,960
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	1,103,995	---	-1,103,995
Salaries and Expenses.....	---	334,000	+334,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS -- THIS TITLE			
FEMA Disaster Relief Fund (Sec. 103) (rescission).....	---	-405,000	-405,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title I.....	1,536,955	---	-1,536,955
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE II			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE -- MILITARY			
Military Personnel			
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	---	12,419	+12,419
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	---	2,258	+2,258
Total, Military Personnel.....	---	14,677	+14,677
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	---	15,807	+15,807
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	---	4,516	+4,516
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	---	20,323	+20,323
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec. 201) (rescission).....	---	-35,000	-35,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title II.....	---	---	---
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE III			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Administration			
Administrative Review and Appeals (emergency).....	62,900	---	-62,900
Administrative Review and Appeals.....	---	22,000	+22,000

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

Legal Activities			
Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities (emergency).....	1,100	---	-1,100
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
DOJ Assets Forfeiture Fund (Sec. 301) (rescission)....	---	-22,000	-22,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III.....	64,000	---	-64,000
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE IV			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs			
Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency).....	5,000	---	-5,000
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President			
Economic Support Fund (emergency).....	295,000	---	-295,000
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Repatriation and reintegration (Sec. 401) (non-add)...	---	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Economic Support Fund (Sec. 402) (rescission).....	---	-197,000	-197,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title IV.....	300,000	-197,000	-497,000
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE V			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Administration for Children and Families			
Refugee and Entrant Assistance (emergency).....	1,830,000	---	-1,830,000
Refugee and Entrant Assistance.....	---	197,000	+197,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title V.....	1,830,000	197,000	-1,633,000
	=====	=====	=====
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS ACT			
Transfer authority (emergency).....	(250,000)	---	(-250,000)
	=====	=====	=====
GRAND TOTAL.....	3,730,955	---	-3,730,955
Appropriations.....	---	(659,000)	(+659,000)
Emergencies.....	(3,730,955)	---	(-3,730,955)
Rescissions.....	---	(-659,000)	(-659,000)

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today to oppose this bill that, sadly, falls short in too many ways.

The key Federal agencies tasked with responding to the humanitarian crisis on our borders are dangerously close to running out of money. These unanticipated costs are affecting the core functions at the Department of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services. Although the bill includes funding to hire additional immigration judicial teams and help set up new repatriation centers in Central America, the amounts provided are insufficient.

The Justice Department and the State Department will not be able to handle their duties without significantly more resources. All four departments need more funding than this bill provides and fewer partisan immigration policy riders than this bill now contains.

Our majority unwisely included legislative language to make sweeping changes to current law related to due process and immigration proceedings. Controversial legislation hastily added to an emergency supplemental is not the way to address a complicated problem.

On July 8, the President requested \$3.7 billion in emergency funding. The bill provides less than \$700 million. The President requested funding through fiscal year 2015. This bill barely covers the remaining weeks in FY 2014, setting this House up to do this all over again in September.

The President's request also sought emergency funding to combat a dangerous wildfire season. As of Monday, the Forest Service reported 26 large uncontained wildfires burning in eight States. As a Member from New York, a region devastated by Hurricane Sandy, I am acutely aware how important it is for the Federal Government to provide a robust response. With the House adjourning today, Federal agencies will be left to fight August fires without more funds.

This bill also fails to provide funding to procure more Iron Dome interceptors for Israel as requested. Hamas has used the ongoing crisis in Israel and Gaza as an excuse to launch thousands of rockets at Israeli cities and towns. The Iron Dome missile defense system has proven highly effective at neutralizing the rockets.

In addition to not funding important priorities, the majority offsets the funding that is provided with cuts to other programs. We should provide emergency funds in a crisis situation.

Lastly, I strongly object to the majority's significant policy changes to existing law without any hearings or markups. Three-quarters of this appropriations bill is straight authorizing legislation. Clearly, many factors led

these desperate parents to hand off their children to complete strangers, with the hope they make their way to safety here.

We ought to consider the complicated policy questions and provide a carefully considered solution, yet these policy changes reveal a knee-jerk response coupled with another bill to deport children who are already in the U.S.

In addition to emergency appropriations, we should consider bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform passed by the Senate over 1 year ago, which could have helped to prevent the current humanitarian crisis along our southwest border by increasing border security personnel and nearly doubling the number of immigration judges.

The two measures we will consider today are deeply disappointing. Madam Speaker, we should provide sufficient funding to cash-strapped agencies quickly and without the baggage of controversial immigration policy riders. I regret we will not do that with this bill, and I regret even more the consequences of our failure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, but more importantly, she has accepted the responsibility of the Speaker to put together a task force to investigate the problem on the border and to recommend solutions—and she has, with great success.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as we speak, unaccompanied minors continue to be sent from Central America through drug cartel smuggling networks across Mexico and through our southern border.

Families are being lied to and manipulated by the coyotes. The \$6,000 their families spend to send their children to the United States goes into the bank account of the most powerful drug cartels in the world.

Since October, over 58,000 unaccompanied children have made the dangerous journey to the United States, and many more will continue to come unless we send a clear message that they will not be allowed to stay in the United States.

I have seen firsthand the crisis that has unfolded at the southern border in places like the Rio Grande Valley and south Texas. I have seen the women and children sleeping on the floor of a bus station in Laredo.

I have seen motherless infants being cared for by any stranger who is around. I have seen the children who are alone in detention facilities in McAllen, Texas, and I have seen the 1,200 children who are being sheltered at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, and—most disturbing of all—I

have heard the stories about the most God-awful journey anyone should ever have to experience.

We are here today because we have a responsibility to stop this crisis. The President has failed to lead, so I firmly believe this Chamber must act. Doing nothing is not an option.

Since June, when the Speaker asked me to lead a working group to provide policy recommendations on what we can do to address the crisis, I have been to the Texas-Mexico border twice and led a codel to Guatemala and Honduras, to see where the children are coming from and why. I will be returning to the border tomorrow for a third time.

The members of the working group dove headfirst into this issue to understand this crisis and provide recommendations for a short-term, immediate response. The policies we recommended are not an attempt for immigration reform. They are serious solutions to address this crisis.

I want to take a moment to recognize the hard work of the members of the working group who have made policy recommendations to the conference and the expertise they brought to the table.

I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE; chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, MICHAEL MCCAUL; chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, JOHN CARTER; chairman of the Western Hemisphere Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, MATT SALMON; Congressman STEVE PEARCE from the Financial Services Committee; and MARIO DIAZ-BALART from the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1215

One of our conclusions from the last several weeks is that Congress should not provide more resources to the administration without changing the policies that have led us to the situation we are in today. Administration officials and officials in the Central American countries have all said that we have to make changes to the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. A month ago, it appeared there was a bipartisan consensus forming on this issue.

White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said from the White House podium just 3 weeks ago, when discussing changes to the 2008 law, that it is “a priority of this administration, and if you listen to the public comments of Democrats and Republicans, it sounds like it's a bipartisan priority.”

I agree, and it is disappointing that the White House has backed down from their original statements on how we can immediately address this issue.

We are not asking for a repeal of this law. We are saying we need to tweak the 2008 law so that all unaccompanied minors are treated the same as Mexican and Canadian children for removal

purposes. The policy changes included in this bill ensure that children receive a prompt hearing within 7 days after they are detained and require that a judge rules no later than 72 hours after a hearing.

Accelerating the hearing times requires more judges. I thank the chairman for including the necessary funding to hire 40 temporary judges until this crisis is under control.

For repatriations, we are prioritizing last in-first out. That means the last child to go into United States Government custody will be the first one we send home. After families have spent between \$6,000 and \$9,000 to send their children here, this will send a strong message to the families in the countries of origin that their children will not be permitted to stay. This is a message of deterrence.

I also note that Chairman ROGERS has prioritized funding for Central American countries to safely and humanely return these children, working with these countries as we return their children, as they have asked us to do.

With the surge of children, there has been increased pressure on our Customs and Border Protection officials. This supplemental deploys the National Guard to assist high-traffic States. This will free up the Border Patrol to focus on their mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. GRANGER. To fully support the Customs and Border Protection's mission, we include a provision to allow unfettered access to Federal lands. Right now, through a memorandum of understanding, Border Patrol officials are only permitted to pursue suspects onto Federal lands. They cannot do regular patrols.

Finally, the supplemental includes a sense of Congress that children should not be detained at military bases. While this will not change the law, this provision addresses a serious and growing concern for Members of Congress, not the least of concerns is that children should not be stored on military bases.

The Congressional Budget Office has given its assessment of policy changes in this bill. They have said that, because the legislation allows for the children to self-deport, it will lead to immediate savings.

This is a smart, targeted bill that addresses the crisis immediately. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the supplemental and show the American people that we are going to end this crisis.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished ranking member of the Labor, Health and

Human Services Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I must rise in opposition against this irresponsible and insufficient border supplemental.

For months, Democrats have urged this majority to pass comprehensive immigration reform—the bill that was passed on a bipartisan basis in the United States Senate—reform that reflects our values and the country that we want to be: one with strong enforcement at the border, the deportation of dangerous criminals, and a path to citizenship that protects workers, helps families reunite, and clears backlogs.

But this Republican majority has done nothing. They have refused to act. My colleague from Texas is right—doing nothing is not an option. Now we face a humanitarian crisis on our border that demands an immediate response, but the majority's answer is just to send home the children who enter our country alone regardless of the violence and the imminent danger that they face.

This bill only includes \$197 million for providing shelter and care for these refugee children. While these kids are here, we have a moral and, yes, we have a legal responsibility to provide for their housing, care, and processing in the most cost-effective way possible. This insufficient amount will mean that HHS will have to make up the difference through high-priced, short-term contracts. That will cost us more in the long run, and it could result in cuts to other priorities, like education, health, medical research, and job training.

If Congress tries to make up these shortfalls elsewhere, this is not responsible leadership. Our policy, signed into law by President George W. Bush, provides for the appropriate screening of those who may be victims of trafficking, and that rightly includes unaccompanied children. This supplemental appropriation would change this policy and would almost certainly result in children being returned to the violence that they are desperately trying to escape.

America can do and should do better. We should help protect those kids who are in serious danger, and we should push the leaders of these nations to address the root causes of why so many of their citizens are fleeing. We should pass comprehensive immigration reform. It is time for leadership from this Republican majority.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, it is a proven fact that lawlessness breeds lawlessness, and, sadly, I believe this assertion

sums up the issue that is confronting us today.

Thanks in large part to the President's political decision not to enforce our immigration laws, a chaotic situation has erupted into a national security crisis and a law enforcement nightmare along the border.

We all know the facts:

An estimated 90,000 unaccompanied alien children will cross into south Texas' Rio Grande Valley by the end of this fiscal year. Another 145,000 children are estimated to flood the border in fiscal year 2015. And these staggering figures do not include the tens of thousands of families who will also surge across our border over the same period of time.

As a result of this influx, our brave Border Patrol agents, CBP officers, and ICE agents are spending countless hours in caring for children rather than focusing on their primary enforcement missions. This would be tragic if it weren't so preventable.

Madam Speaker, we do not have an open border policy in this country, and as we tragically learned on 9/11, border security and the integrity of our immigration system truly matter to our Nation's security and the rule of law. So, today, we offer a strong but initial step to provide both the right tools and the right authorities to address and deter this seemingly unending influx of illegal aliens.

Included in this package is \$405 million, completely offset by recovered funds, for the Department of Homeland Security, funds that will enable the CBP and ICE to enforce our laws and apprehend, detain, and deport illegal aliens. Perhaps most importantly, this bill fully funds the administration's realization that detention is, in fact, a necessary deterrent to illegal immigration.

The President requested funds to fully support the long-mandated annual bed capacity—a complete reversal from his budget request in which he proposed, instead, to reduce detention beds by nearly 10 percent. The President has also retracted his policy on the detention of families who illegally cross the border. This bill provides funding through the end of the fiscal year to support 34,800 detention beds and an additional 6,320 family detention beds—a total of over 41,100 detention beds—to enable the necessary consequence management for breaking the law.

Lastly, this bill includes policy changes to bring reform and parity to the adjudication and reparation of these children and to prevent these children from being placed with criminals.

Madam Speaker, we must act and we must act now. Lawlessness has bred lawlessness, and we must act to stop it and to secure our borders. I urge my colleagues to support this strong bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misconceived and under-resourced legislation.

For a while, it looked like we might do better than this. As the ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I was pleased to take part in a delegation to Guatemala and Honduras, ably led by Chairman KAY GRANGER. But as successive versions of the Republican bill have surfaced over the past 2 weeks, in an apparent quest for votes only among Republicans, they have reflected less and less of what we learned on that trip.

The bill under consideration provides less than \$1 billion for the Departments of Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, Justice, and State—far below the President's request, what is being considered by the Senate, or what is required to deal with the crisis on our borders and beyond.

The bill only provides funding for anticipated needs for the remainder of this fiscal year, a mere 2 months. I would object to that less if the majority had any plans for actually completing our appropriations bills before the end of September, but we all know that they do not. Indeed, it appears unlikely that our Homeland Security Appropriations bill will make it to the House floor.

The approach taken in this legislation shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the issue before us. This isn't a border security crisis. This is a humanitarian crisis. We don't need to deploy the National Guard or surge our border capacity, because we are not failing to catch individuals as they cross. In fact, these young people are turning themselves in!

Now, we do have some agreement on the need to expedite the consideration of the claims of these minors for asylum or other forms of relief. But at \$12.9 million, the House bill falls far short of even the administration's modest request for more immigration judges.

Instead of focusing on this area of agreement, the majority relies upon a questionable and controversial rewriting of the Wilberforce law, enacted in 2008 to deal with child trafficking. My own view is that the Cuellar-Cornyn proposal incorporated in the bill both fails to address deficiencies in our present screening of Mexican youths for signs of torture or fear of persecution, and risks transferring these deficiencies to the treatment of Central American children. In any event, it is not wise to complicate or delay the consideration of this emergency sup-

plemental request with an authorization bill that surely requires more deliberation.

Madam Speaker, there have been some recent signs of progress down at the border. Over the past few weeks, the average daily apprehensions of unaccompanied children have dropped from 400 to well under 200. That doesn't mean the crisis is over. We can easily see another spike in apprehensions in the coming weeks.

We need a bill that both provides resources and reflects our values. Faith leaders of all traditions across the country are calling on Congress to provide the social and health services these children desperately need.

Perhaps the greatest failing of this legislation is that it fails to move us toward any viable, long-term strategy to address the causes of the current crisis. Beyond any funding we appropriate to help manage the flow of unaccompanied children or families over the next several months, we are setting ourselves up for similar crises in the future if we aren't willing to invest in a long-term strategy to help Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador—the three countries that are the source of the vast majority of unaccompanied minors—to stabilize their economies, to modernize their institutions, to reduce the levels of violence and the grip of the drug cartels and street gangs.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, I fear that the bill before us fails to address either short-term or long-term needs, and much of what it does contain is irrelevant to the current crisis.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), who chairs the Homeland Security Committee of the House.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, let me thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his hard work and Chairwoman KAY GRANGER for heading up this task force that I was honored to be a part of.

As the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee and a former Federal prosecutor who has dealt with the border for many years, I have never seen a crisis quite like this one. This crisis demands action. It demands leadership, and it demands a solution to the problem.

Since the President enacted DACA in 2012, we have seen 60,000 unaccompanied children cross into the border, in the Rio Grande Valley sector of Texas alone, 250 per day.

We went down there to see these children. These children are the victims caught between the administration's policies and the coyotes and the traffickers who exploit them and make money, between \$5,000 to \$10,000 apiece.

Madam Speaker, this bill fixes that crisis. First and foremost, this changes

the 2008 trafficking law as a message of deterrence. This crisis will not stop until we start sending them back, and all this does is it treats Central Americans the same way we treat Mexicans. It will provide for swift removal in a humane way back to their countries of origin.

It is unfortunate that the administration, while initially supportive, has now flip-flopped on that issue.

It also provides for the detention, removal, and repatriation of these children.

For me and my home State of Texas, importantly, it calls for the deployment of the National Guard to the southwest border to secure our border. My Governor, Governor Perry, has already activated the National Guard. But it is the Federal Government's responsibility, under the Constitution, to pick up that price tag, and that is precisely what this bill does.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I think, importantly, it directs the Southern Command, our military, to help secure the border between Guatemala and Mexico, which I believe, and I know the chairman of Appropriations as well believes, is a key to stopping the flow out of Central America.

Madam Speaker, the time to act is now.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of both the Labor, Health and Human Services, and the Homeland Security Subcommittees.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I visited the border and saw small children held in tiny cells and forced to sleep on cold concrete floors and benches. The treatment of these vulnerable kids, many of whom fled their homes to escape extreme violence, shocked me as a mother and as an American.

Unfortunately, this bill contains only 11 percent of the resources the President requested for the Department of Health and Human Services. This pittance amount will only make conditions worse for these vulnerable children by limiting the Department's bedspace capacity and exacerbating delays in transferring children away from the overcrowded Border Patrol stations into the more suitable conditions of HHS.

Unfortunately, insufficient funding isn't the only flaw in this bill. By treating all children the same, the majority means taking away protections and treating Central American children like Mexican and Canadian children who have limited protection under current law.

This legislation sadly undercuts the current critical humanitarian and due process protections for these desperate children seeking safe haven from the horrors of violence in their country.

Without due process, many of these children who would qualify for protection under our laws will be returned straight into the arms of the traffickers or their impoverished violent neighborhoods. That is why, national antitrafficking organizations like the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking strongly oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, the Republican supplemental is an irresponsible and inadequate bill that does little to protect our borders or address the humanitarian crisis facing our Nation. The bill is a senseless and deeply flawed political ploy that my Republican colleagues know will be rejected by the Senate.

Instead of playing political games, let us act in the best interests of our country and these kids by passing a bill that upholds our American values, honors our heritage as a nation of immigrants, protects our borders, and fully addresses the causes and consequences of the humanitarian crisis on our border.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), a member of our committee.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this border security legislation presented to us today, for a number of reasons.

It does provide for humanitarian assistance. This legislation does deal with this issue in a compassionate, thoughtful way to deal with the unaccompanied children. It secures the border, provides for funding for the National Guard, and it does many other things, too, in terms of policy changes that would treat these children just as we would treat unaccompanied children who cross the border from Canada or Mexico. It is the right policy for a whole host of reasons.

Just last week, Congressmen GERLACH, MEEHAN, and I visited an Office of Refugee Resettlement program in Womelsdorf, Berks County in Pennsylvania, and those children are treated compassionately.

But let me tell you what will happen if we do nothing here today. The children who are coming into my district in Womelsdorf, and also in Allentown, where I will be visiting a center tomorrow, these children will, in fact, keep coming into our communities and they will be treated humanely. Then they will be resettled and reunited with parents or family members who are already in the United States and, in most cases, here unlawfully.

That is what doing nothing means. The children will keep coming. They will be resettled throughout the country, and they will basically reside somewhere within the interior of this country. That is what doing nothing means. It would be reckless and irresponsible for the House to walk out of here today without addressing this border and humanitarian crisis.

This bill is the right thing to do. It secures the border, provides humanitarian assistance, and it makes the necessary policy changes to stop this flow of children.

This is a tragedy that these children are leaving their countries in this way. I can't imagine the desperation these families must feel, that they would let their children travel with somebody unaccompanied, drug dealers and cartels and human smugglers, coyotes. It is unthinkable. We need to make sure this stops. Many children aren't making it along the way.

I met with a 5-year-old girl who told me her horrible story, and I shudder to think of the children who didn't make it.

That is why we need to act today. It is the right thing to do, it is the compassionate thing to do, and it is in keeping with our American tradition.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was going to ask my friend from Pennsylvania whether he had talked to the Senate and thinks this has any chance of moving this week; and the answer I think I would give is no, it does not. So I agree with him. It would be tragic not to act.

It is tragic that we are acting in a partisan fashion, which almost ensures inaction on this, the last day that we are going to be here. We should be acting in a bipartisan fashion, as I have urged the majority leader to do.

What is a bipartisan fashion?

A, considering the emergency need today and funding the resources necessary to respond to that; B, taking under consideration the substantive legislative changes that can be affected that will help this issue, will send the messages that the gentleman wants to send.

He is my dear friend and a good Member of this body, but I will tell you, this bill has had no hearings, no committee consideration. Yes, there was a partisan task force, but this has had no consideration in this legislative process.

The majority leader, last week told me that there would be no bill that did not get 72 hours' notice. The gentleman knows you have a bill on the floor, which is contingent, of course, on the passage of this, which has had a few hours' notice, at best. Last night, I think at 10 o'clock the Rules Committee met on DACA.

So I will tell my friend that, had we acted in a bipartisan fashion, A, at whatever level of funding we could agree, pass a bill to meet the immediate crisis, B, have hearings on the ramifications of the law that passed with only two votes in opposition—over 405 Members voted for the 2008 leg-

islation. We are changing that without a hearing either in subcommittee, committee, or full committee. That is not the way we ought to be working. That is not good for our country. It is not good for this institution. It is not fair.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. I believe, once again, we find the Republican Party divided. Because they are divided, they are trying to cobble together some of their hardest-line Members so that they can get them to vote for this supplemental.

And they put on a bill which has had no notice to the American people or to Members of Congress. It is ironic that people are supporting this who demanded that we read the bills. There was no bill to read until this morning.

How sad for the American people. We have a humanitarian crisis that must be addressed without delay, and the way to address it without delay is to give the resources necessary and then pursue the legislative process, not together. It will slow it down, and I predict it will not pass the Senate. I think the gentlemen and ladies on this side of the aisle know that the Senate is not going to pass this bill.

So if you really think we ought to act now, do so in a bipartisan fashion, and then let us debate the legislation before us.

Mr. MCCAUL just said this is a real crisis. He just said it just minutes ago, Mr. MCCAUL, the chairman of the committee. This is a real crisis which demands action. The recommendation that has been made to us will undermine action by this body in the face of crisis. We should not pass this legislation. We ought to pass a very simple resource to the crisis now and legislation later.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I don't know where the gentleman gets his information, but this bill was filed Tuesday.

You have had since Tuesday morning to study this bill, and that is the appropriate—under our rules, that is the appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. As I understand it, the DACA legislation is dependent upon this legislation. That was not filed 72 hours ago.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That is not this bill. Reclaiming my time, this bill has been available to you since Tuesday.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman

from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, we are here because the President of the United States has requested an emergency supplemental appropriations of about \$3.7 billion. The Senate has acted in the range of about \$2.7 billion. The House now comes in at one-sixth of the request to deal with this crisis. It ignores the wildfires in the West, the challenges that relate to other parts of the bill that were presented by the administration, and it says we are acting responsibly.

I rise in opposition to the bill. I understand what the majority is offering, and I think it has been stated pretty clearly.

I believe, if we have children who are presented to us without adults—who have been the victims of trafficking, which is what the majority has said, they have been trafficked by cartels and paid criminal enterprises to bring them to our border; the majority says some of them have been sexually abused and mistreated in other ways—I don't believe that our response should be to close the door.

□ 1245

So as we think about our responsibilities as the United States of America, a Nation that had 12 million people without documents when the President was sworn into office—50,000 children, just like the 5-year-old girl that my colleague said he met and talked to—the idea that our moral responsibility is to say to her, “You go back to where you came from,” I don't believe that that is what we should be doing.

So I reject this—not because of the numbers or the other things. I think this is morally deficient, that our great country would say, as we demand other countries around the world take in refugees who are facing dangerous circumstances, that what our answer is, No, not here. Not in our backyard.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5230. There is a crisis at our border. It is a crisis, a disaster of the President's own making.

The Obama administration's lax immigration enforcement policies have given confidence to parents who are in

the U.S. illegally that they can stay, and now they are finding ways to bring their children, who are still in Central America and beyond, to the United States unlawfully.

Although President Obama has many tools at his disposal to stop this surge at the border, he refuses to use them, and instead proposes to make the situation worse by taking more unilateral actions to stop the enforcement of our immigration laws.

It is ultimately up to President Obama to end this crisis by reversing his policies that created it. However, since he refuses to do so, we have to act to the extent we can to provide narrow and targeted funding to meet the immediate needs of our law enforcement agencies at the southern border. We have to enable them to do their job, to secure our border, and enforce our immigration laws. And we should act to provide narrow tweaks to the 2008 law regarding the removal of unaccompanied alien minors.

Because of the President's inaction, we are taking the responsible step today of passing these narrow fixes that will help the American people avoid billions of dollars in additional costs due to the President not trying to solve this problem but asking for more money to continue to resettle thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of people into the interior of our country.

While the bill is not perfect, it does give law enforcement many tools they have requested. For example, while I was in the Rio Grande area earlier this month, Border Patrol agents cited administration-created restrictions that bar them access to Federal land as a significant stumbling block to securing the border. One of the most important provisions of this bill gives Border Patrol agents access to Federal lands so they can stop drug traffickers, human smugglers, and unlawful immigrants from exploiting these gaps along the border.

Since the President isn't taking serious action to address the crisis at the border, the House is doing so today, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chair of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I agree with those who have said that doing nothing is not an option. But making matters worse should not be an option either. Stripping children of the chance to establish their credible fear of death or endangerment is a crude and cold way of dispensing justice in America. That is not the American way.

This bill is a patch, not a solution. It lasts 2 months. So we will be right

back here, trying to solve this challenge again, in September. Governing and budgeting in pieces is what leads to government shutdowns. That is not the American way.

This bill robs Peter to give to Paul. How does this bill fund the money to pay for the border work that has to get done? First, it strips emergency funding to tackle devastating wildfires that the President has requested because the States have requested it. Second, it takes \$407 million from the Federal Emergency Management Agency's disaster relief fund, money which would be used to help people who have been devastated by wildfires and other natural disasters.

Madam Speaker, if we had passed immigration reform a year ago with the bill that passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis—which on this floor, we have been denied a vote on for more than 380 days—we would not be looking at a crisis on the border the way we are today. But that is the difficulty we have.

When you don't fix the broken immigration system, this is what you encounter. And these piecemeal approaches aren't going to solve anything. We are going to be right back at it in September. That is not the American way. We provide justice to people. We make sure we dispense it the way we should, and we take care of our emergencies.

Let's get this done the right way. Let's do two things: let's give the emergency funding that the people need at the border to run this process right, and then let's finally on the floor of this House have a vote to fix a broken immigration system.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), a member of the Speaker's task force that investigated the border problem.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Secure the Southwest Border Act of 2014.

This kind of came to light a few months ago when The Arizona Republic published a story that these families were being dropped at bus stations in Tucson and Phoenix. Then it highlighted the current administration's catch-and-release policies that are encouraging literally swarms of people to come across the 1,500-mile desert of Mexico into the United States, risking life, risking their happiness.

And the fact is, we can't keep doing nothing. This bill will stop these waves and waves of people from coming across our border.

As we went over to Guatemala and we went to Honduras and we talked with our State Department folks, that is exactly what they said: You have got to make it clear that we move from a catch-and-release policy to a detain-and-deport policy. And that is what this bill does. If we want to send a

strong message to people that that \$5,000 to \$8,000 that they are paying to these thugs that are transporting across the border and hurting these young boys and girls along the way and then holding them for extra money, extorting their parents, that if we want to stop this from happening and stop the pain that is going on with these children, then the best thing that we can do is to send a clear message that in America, there are no permits—permits, permissions; if you make that journey, you are going to be sent back to your country. That is the only thing that is going to make it happen.

Now, our liberal friends, they want to just throw more money at the problem and perpetuate the problem. They want it to keep happening. I say that is not compassionate. I say continuing that pain and that harm to these children is not a good thing to do, and the way to stop it is to send a clear message.

We have got folks on my side of the aisle that have problems with the bill. What do they have a problem with? Nothing inside the bill. Not putting the National Guard on the border, not stopping the catch-and-release programs, and not giving unfettered access to our Border Patrol. They can't come up with a good reason to vote against it. They are playing right into HARRY REID's hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. SALMON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Do you understand that the experts have told us that if we do nothing, if we don't change the law, that another 145,000 people will be with us next year alone? Is that not correct?

Mr. SALMON. That is what I understand.

I also understand that conservative estimates indicate it is going to cost \$2.6 billion a year to care for just half of the nearly 60,000 that are already here. We are talking about billions and billions of dollars, not to mention the fact that these children are being sexually molested along the way, that they are being killed along the way, that they are being sold into slavery, and we can stop it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Just focusing on the money part of this, the gentleman from Arizona is saying, if we don't change the law, we can expect to pay another few billion dollars a year—

Mr. SALMON. Just to care for those kids.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. To care for that continuing stream of people coming across?

Mr. SALMON. Right.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can't understand how any conservative in good

conscience would not want to stop that hemorrhage and make sure that we are not spending those billions of dollars that should be going to pay down our Federal debt.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, I would think that not only conservatives would like it, but that everybody would like that kind of savings.

Mr. SALMON. I think so too.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to say to the distinguished chairman, I would have liked to have heard from these experts in hearings. Unfortunately, the majority has not had hearings, and we are bringing this bill to the floor without any hearings, without any witnesses, and without any information.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentlewoman briefly yield on that point?

Mrs. LOWEY. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, if I have the time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The 145,000 additional people coming across the border, that number came from the Department of Homeland Security. So those are governmental estimates, if we do nothing on the law change.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I would also like to say to our distinguished chairman that it would have been helpful in having an analysis of the current statistics and the future prospects at hearings. But we are bringing this bill to the floor. The majority is bringing this bill to the floor without any hearings, without any discussion. This is really not the way to pass important legislation.

And, again, we had a bill. We could have had comprehensive immigration reform that passed the Senate in a bipartisan way.

I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, who, from day one of knowing about this challenge that we have with the children at the border, has reacted in a very wise, humanitarian—yes—and practical way as to what the best way is to address the challenge, honor the values of our country, and save the children.

I was interested in the back and forth between the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, and our ranking member on the subject of the change in the law that is in the legislative language that is in this supplemental, because I agree with our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER, and other who have said: There are two things happening here. We need to address the humanitarian challenge. We need resources to do that for particular purposes. And we should do that in the supplemental.

Another is to change the law, which we shouldn't do in a supplemental. It is legislating on an appropriations bill in a manner in which all kinds of statements can be made which may be anecdotally significant but not significant in terms of the difference that they make, a difference enough to change the law.

So when people talk about witnesses in one context or another, just saying something on the floor of the House, it is interesting. But there should be hearings. If we are going to change the law, there should be hearings where testimony can come forth, be challenged, confirmed, whatever it may be. But a serious discussion worthy of the country that we are, worthy of the Congress that passed the Wilberforce law, which was a very bipartisan initiative. And I salute my Republican colleagues who played such an important role in passing the bill. And that bill directed agencies of government to incorporate antitrafficking and protection measures for vulnerable populations, particularly women and children, into either post-conflict or humanitarian emergency assistance and program activities, according to the law.

There was a purpose for the law. But with a phrase in an appropriations bill, we want to undermine that purpose. That is not necessary to do here. Why does this belong in a bill where we are allocating resources to meet a humanitarian challenge that we have?

Now let's get to what is in the actual supplemental.

□ 1300

I had hoped that we could work in a bipartisan way, and I thought that is the path we were on. The Republican majority wanted to decrease the amount of resources and the amount of time—well, that is commensurate, if it is a lower amount of money and a shorter period of time, that is okay, but when you change what that money is for, then you are doing a disservice to the entire issue.

Instead of providing adequate resources to meet the humanitarian needs—the immediate humanitarian needs—largely of these children, that is just totally inadequate in this legislation, in terms of its proportionality in the bill, whether it fails to provide any resources for legal assistance to these children to plead their case.

They may have a legitimate cause for asylum—refugee status to come into the United States or not, but they should be represented, and they should be represented in a way that repatriates them back to their home country, if they do not qualify in a way that is safe. This legislation does not do that.

The American people are fair-minded, they are wise, they are practical, and they want to help, but they want to do so in a way that is fair to everyone involved. They want to feed the

children. There are not enough resources here to do that with the humanitarian side. They want us to honor who we are with due process for these children. This legislation does not do that.

They want to have judges to quickly facilitate giving these people a hearing, in addition to the representation that they should have due process. The bill does not. It tramples due process to rush terrified children back to the violence of their home countries.

That is not who we are as a country, and it also poses a particular danger to children victims of gang violence and human trafficking, which takes us right back to the Wilberforce bill—human trafficking. It is a global crisis. It is happening at our border.

We have a bill to stop it. This legislation on the floor today weakens that and then, in a manner of distribution of funds and paucity of funds, does not address the challenge. It takes us backward. It is hard to understand.

Now, what we should be talking about, what Mr. TIERNEY suggested, how do we help communities that are receiving these children into their communities and our country? Again, how do we help? This bill hurts.

Madam Speaker, in addition to this—I guess the way you were able to get the votes for this bill—which is even opposed by people who are anti-immigration because it is not bad enough—was that you had to sweeten the pie by having a followup bill that would only be taken up if enough of your Members agreed to vote for this bad bill, and that again does not address who we are as a country.

We are a great country because we are a good country. Others have said that as long ago as 200 years ago or longer, so let us be good and let us be great, and let us do something that really was closer to what the Republicans were talking about earlier in this discussion. It seems that in order to get more votes, you had to make the bill worse; the worse the bill, the more votes on the Republican side.

No, let's find common ground in the middle, where we can get the most votes to do the best possible job that we can do. It may not be every good thing we would ideally like to do, but it is a reasonable place to go forward to honor what the national Catholic Conference of Bishops have talked about, where all the people of faith are urging us to do here in the Congress and the United States, and that is to honestly respect the dignity and worth of all of these children, all of them children of God.

I get mocked for quoting what the bishops have said because it is so generous to the children, but let's give the children a fair shot. Let's do better than this, and you know that this bill isn't going anywhere, so once again, it is a waste of time. It is not a statement

of values. It is a statement of meanness.

The Republican bills responding to the humanitarian crisis at the southern border are the latest evidence of their breathtaking extremism.

The Republican proposal is unjust, inhumane and abhorrent to our values as a nation. Their supplemental:

Fails to provide any resources for legal aid to children with legitimate asylum claims;

Does not authorize enough judges to adjudicate extensive case backlog;

Tramples due process to rush terrified children back to the violence of their home countries; and

Poses a particular danger to child victims of gang violence and human trafficking.

To coax their party into voting for even that much, Republicans are also teeing-up a vote to bar any adjustment or expansion of DACA.

No additional relief for children and students;

No relief for parents of DREAMers;

No relief for parents of young U.S. citizens; and

Certainty that we will continue to tear apart immigrant families.

It is appalling that Republicans' price for doing next-to-nothing for vulnerable children is the opportunity to vote against the young immigrants who want nothing more than a future in the only country they have ever known.

We should be acting on comprehensive immigration reform, but this Republican Congress is allergic to meaningful solutions.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Madam Ranking Chair, for yielding.

I rise, Madam Speaker, on this bill with great concern. I am bringing a lot of passion to this debate because I lived in the barrios like the ones the children are coming from when I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, very violent barrios.

Look, this is not a border crisis. It is not a border security issue. This is a humanitarian crisis, and it is caused by problems on both sides of the border. Our country has a lot at fault here because we have not addressed comprehensive immigration reform, which means we have 11 million people living in the United States undocumented.

They are essentially incarcerated in this country. They are not allowed to go home because the minute they go home and try to get back to the United States, they get arrested, and they are

not allowed to ever return, or they are barred for 10 years from returning.

So what happens, Madam Speaker? They have been living here for years and years. They have children that they left because there were job opportunities here, and those children are now living in places that are really dangerous, and all of a sudden, yeah, things have changed. They have got to get out.

These countries are ranked number one, four, and five of the highest murder rates in the world. They leave them because there are real, serious humanitarian crises. They are showing up on our border. They are not sneaking across the border.

There is nobody having to go out there for these kids trying to sneak in. They are throwing themselves—help me, help me find my relative, my dad, my parent, my mom—in this country.

What does this bill do? It doesn't address the humanitarian problems at either end. It hires more cops and puts military in there, National Guardsmen.

Now, if that is such a great idea, why is California—with probably the busiest border in the world with Mexico—not putting its National Guard down there? Our Governors and our mayors don't think it is necessary.

Madam Speaker, why are we putting more money in for National Guard? We don't need the National Guard. We need Red Cross—it is a humanitarian crisis—Red Cross. No, we are putting more and more money for arms and more money for military and cops. I don't think that is the right answer.

We are also doing something really dumb. We are stripping a law now that says when we give money to these countries—by the way, before you spend this money on your cops and on your military, you have got to vet them. We have a human rights standard. This bill throws that out.

You don't have to do that now. We are going to give you \$40 million of American taxpayer money, and you don't have to do anything to abide by human rights. Now, that is really dumb, and I don't think American taxpayers want their money spent that way.

Madam Speaker, I am going to call upon my colleagues here not to come down here and think of themselves in a partisan way or an election year way, but come to this floor when you have to vote on this bill and think of yourself as a parent, as a neighbor.

A kid has knocked on your door, and you go to the door and say: Oh, my God he is crying, or she is crying. You say: What happened? They say: In my house, they are raping people and killing people, and I am running away. This bill says: Oh, what is your address? I will take you home.

Don't vote for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I support full comprehensive immigration reform, but today's vote on this supplemental appropriation bill is to provide funding to ICE, Border Patrol, and other agencies to deal with the humanitarian crisis on the border, an area that I represent, an area where I live, an area where 42,000 out of the 58,000 unaccompanied kids have crossed.

The policy change in this bill is to get rid of a loophole in the 2008 law that the smugglers in Central America and Mexico have taken advantage of. All due process and legal protections are left intact under this proposed bill.

You will see under a CRS report that compares the current law to today's bill, you will see that the same due process and the same legal protections are left intact. In fact, I respectfully ask my colleagues in opposition to show me specifically where there is due process and legal protection that is taken away out of the bill. I yet have heard where it does this.

Madam Speaker, I have also asked my colleagues in opposition respectfully to sit down with me and offer their alternative solution or their legislative proposal to this border crisis and have yet to hear those solutions.

In this appropriation bill, we have to provide the funding to the Federal agencies to provide an early border, but we can no longer afford to play defense on the 1-yard line called the U.S.-Mexico border. We need to play defense on the 20-yard line, and this is why working with the Central American countries and working with Mexico to address the core issues and to fix and to fight these smugglers is vital.

I want to thank the men and women on the border that have defended our homeland, and I want to thank the border communities, the churches, and the nonprofits that have done so much to help these folks at the border. In fact, I want to thank the chairman for allowing a provision for the border communities to seek reimbursement for the allowable expenses under this bill.

We cannot leave Washington today without putting the resources and the policy change to address the border crisis. We are sent here to address not the easy problems, but to address the hard problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the Chairman.

Madam Speaker, we are sent here to Washington not to address the easy problems, but to address the difficult problems that this Nation is facing. When President John F. Kennedy was faced with a very difficult crisis, he said:

I am not looking for a Republican answer or for a Democratic answer. I am looking for the right answer.

I think today, in a bipartisan way, we need to look for that right answer. I urge "yes" on this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Labor, Health, and Human Services; and Foreign Operations Subcommittees.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank our ranking member on Appropriations, Mrs. LOWEY, for yielding and for her steadfast leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this woefully inadequate Republican response to the humanitarian crisis along our border. Let me start by saying that as an appropriator, I am very troubled by the shamefully inadequate funding levels and misguided offsets in this bill.

I am also deeply concerned by the dangerous policy riders that strip protections for vulnerable children—protections signed into law by a Republican President, mind you.

Let's be clear. This crisis has nothing to do with the lack of funding for immigration enforcement. We don't do anything to help these children by pouring tax dollars into the further militarization of our border, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Madam Speaker, our response needs to put children first. In a hearing by the Congressional Progressive Caucus this week, we heard firsthand from Central American children who had fled violence in their home countries and who had passed through our broken detention system.

These children and thousands like them risk their lives on their way to this country. Some had witnessed murders and gang violence in their home countries and suffered freezing conditions and inadequate nutrition while in detention in the United States.

These stories were chilling and made clear where we need to direct our resources: humane care, access to due process, and support to end the violence and poverty plaguing Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

Now, no one disagrees with protecting our borders, but come on, we also have a duty to protect these children who, according to the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, 60 percent of whom were interviewed, these children need international protection.

My home district makes up Alameda County, where over 200 of these children have been reunited with their families locally. Their stories are real, and their stories are very, very powerful, so I urge a "no" vote.

Let's guarantee due process for these children who are fleeing violence. Let's have a heart.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. May I inquire of the gentlewoman from New York if she has further speakers? I am

prepared to close. If the gentlewoman has one additional speaker, then I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume because before I turn to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member, an expert on immigration on the Judiciary Committee, I just want to make one statement again.

The Senate, after months of hearings, passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill. It is really very sad that today we can't get together, Democrats and Republicans, and review the work that had been done by the Senate and pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill that would have prevented the emergency that we are trying to address today. The majority of the bill that is included in the supplemental should have been done through a thoughtful committee process.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Immigration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops tells us this bill would result in the U.S. sending children who have relief available to them back to the conditions they fled, and will result in many children being harmed and some being killed on their return.

I join the bishops in opposing this bill.

With this bill, children who have been trafficked, who have fled persecution, violence, and abuse, will be stripped of protections that have existed for years.

Our laws provide that victims of persecution and torture must have a meaningful opportunity to request safe haven. We need not prejudge the outcome of these cases. We need only adhere to our laws that ensure that each child is treated in a fair manner, that their case be individually considered, and if they deserve protection under the law, so be it; if not, they go home.

This is not new. Refugees have received protection in America for decades. In 1980, the asylum system that we have today was established. Most of the special protections for unaccompanied children were created in 1997. Many were codified in 2002. Critics of the antislavery law of 2008 claim it has caused the influx of kids to America, but the protections began in 1997, 17 years ago.

No, kids are fleeing because of the extreme violence in three countries. Children from other countries in the region are not fleeing here. And people from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala are fleeing to every other country in the region—a 712 percent increase in

asylum cases in Belize, Nicaragua, and the other Central American countries.

What the 2008 law actually did was give less protection to kids from Mexico and Canada, and that was a mistake because the U.N. review now makes clear that, as a consequence, we are sending kids who have been sex-trafficked back to their abusers. Rather than fix this loophole, this bill would subject all kids to that flawed process. I can't help but note that this will be the only immigration bill with an up-or-down vote, a bill to strip victims of their protections.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have a crisis on our border with Mexico right now. It can't wait. It is a humanitarian crisis. It is also a failure of our border. It is an open border now unless you fix it. If we don't change the law to treat Central American children the same as we treat Mexican children at the border, you are going to be flooded. The amount now on the border will pale into insignificance because Homeland Security tells us they anticipate another 145,000 children next year, on top of the tens of thousands of adults and families flooding across that open border.

So we have an immediate crisis today. This bill is an urgently needed bill. It provides immediate funding for critical border security and these humanitarian needs. The money will be there immediately. If we do not pass this bill today, you are going to risk these resources running out. Then your hands will be tied. More and more immigrants will continue to flood across that border if you fail to act.

This bill will allow the DHS, the Department of Homeland Security, and the National Guard to tighten security and restore the border. It will allow the Department of Justice to process the cases that may be needed more efficiently. It encourages repatriation in the countries from which these immigrants came, and it provides much-needed shelter and care for the thousands of unaccompanied children who have recently crossed that border.

We must act today before we leave town, not only to protect our borders, but to help these unaccompanied children who are being brought here by criminals, no less, on a long, dangerous, arduous journey, subject to abuse, injury, and death along the way. How can you turn away from these faces?

This bill directs responsible levels of resources toward the front line, toward the highest priority needs. The bill puts policy measures into place that keep criminals out of the country and helps encourage children not to make that very dangerous, life-threatening

journey. The President's request would do nothing to enforce our laws and make this Nation a safer place.

Help the problem. Stop the crisis. This bill does it. Vote for it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, how is it that we can find it within our capabilities to fund billions of dollars of deficit spending on unpaid-for tax extenders one week, but we can't muster the humanity to fund adequate legal representation for refugee children the next? The President's request included a modest \$24.5 million to fund the Department of Justice's programs to provide legal assistance to these children, their guardians, and law enforcement advisors in Central America, yet none of this was included in the legislation. Instead, Republicans focus only on punitive measures that will hasten the misery of these children.

Madam Speaker, I am interested to know why Republicans are comfortable spending untold amounts of American taxpayer's money on a frivolous lawsuit, but will provide absolutely no money on legal assistance for a child who, after traversing some of the most dangerous terrain our world has to offer, must now navigate our immigration system without the benefit of counsel. Make no mistake, these children are refugees.

If Republicans are so concerned about the plight of these children and making sure that we find a humanitarian solution, why have they stripped away all of the human rights conditions and certification requirements on the Guatemalan and Honduran militaries allowing them to use the \$40 million allocated to help with repatriation efforts? We're going to throw these children who have fled for their lives from horrific conditions right back to the same wolves who caused them to flee in the first place, and then pay to ensure they are stuck there.

Madam Speaker, rather than focus on sending these children back as quickly as we can, maybe we should take a page from the history books, and find it in our hearts to help them find safety and a new life here in the United States. In 70 years, we should be able to look back proudly on that accomplishment, and not have to shamefully admit that the United States could have done more.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5230, the woefully inadequate supplemental appropriations bill that will only exacerbate the growing humanitarian crisis impacting my home state of Texas.

Since the beginning of this year, nearly 60,000 unaccompanied children have crossed the Rio Grande into south Texas. The vast majority of these children are coming from three countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras—where whole communities are being terrorized by drug cartels and street gangs. Honduras, the U.N. reports, has the highest homicide in the world. El Salvador and Guatemala rank fourth and fifth.

Even before these children reach Texas, many of whom no more than seven or eight years old, they must make the long and dangerous journey through the remainder of Central America and Mexico. On the journey, these children are easy targets for robbers,

drug smugglers, and sex traffickers, further traumatizing them before they reach our country.

Once reaching Brownsville, McAllen, or one of our other communities on the border, these children are not trying to evade detection from Border Patrol. In fact, there are countless stories of these children running into the arms of our border protection officials, knowing that they will be safe from the violence and trauma once in American custody.

Madam Speaker, I can speak first hand, having visited our border facilities in McAllen earlier this month, on the hard work our nation's Border Patrol Officers are doing, along with their counterparts throughout DHS and HHS during this humanitarian crisis.

Congress needs to respond to this crisis in the best traditions of our great nation—with open eyes and compassion and balance the needs of the American people with our nation's historic role as the place of last refuge for those who are persecuted and in need.

The legislation before this chamber today, shamefully, does not reflect our nation's best traditions. It is a misguided, knee-jerk reaction that will do little to improve, or worst, exacerbate, the growing crisis on the Rio Grande.

H.R. 5230 would provide only one-seventh of the funds the President requested and would only authorize those funds through the end of September. And of these funds, Madam Speaker, the vast majority are directed towards greater border security and not—as is necessary—the humanitarian aspect of this crisis.

I have always been supportive of greater border security and providing our nation's Border Patrol Agents with the resources they need to protect us. However, our country is already deporting record numbers of people—over 1.2 million in the past three years—and there is growing concern among our border communities that their towns and cities are already being negatively affected by our border surge.

What these children need—and our DHS and HHS officials on the border have requested—are not more boots on the ground, but more judges, health officials, asylum officers, and facilities to temporarily house these children while we determine if they need to return to their home country or are eligible for asylum.

This legislation would further militarize our border, without regard to the wishes of our border communities, by authorizing the deployment of the National Guard and make null and void existing Memorandums of Understanding between CBP and the Interior and Agriculture Departments on protecting federal lands under these departments oversight, like Big Bend National Park.

I urge my colleagues to demand a vote on a clean supplemental and to vote against this shameful legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5230 "the Supplemental Appropriations to Address the Southwest Border Crisis."

This partisan bill does nothing to address the humanitarian crisis at the border. Instead this bill undermines due process protections for children who have been victims of trafficking, torture, and persecution.

It is shameful Republicans are using this crisis to advance their own agenda. In doing so, Republicans are jeopardizing children's lives, and hypocritically reversing their position on a law they once supported. With this bill, Republican Hypocrisy has been taken to another level.

Yesterday, I met President and Vice-President of the National Association of Immigration Judges, who said no current protections and due process for these children should be changed. Republicans should listen to them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong opposition to H.R. 5230, a bill to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 to address the humanitarian crisis on our nation's southern border.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I have visited the border and seen the children that this bill intends to help.

This bill offers too little in funding to address the need that over 50 states are attempting to address by providing shelter and assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are now living in our country.

Over two-thirds of the language in H.R. 5230 will make significant changes in existing law or creates new law regarding immigration policy without going through the committees of jurisdiction such as the House Committees on Homeland Security, Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5230 contains too much language that is legislative such as:

The bill makes significant changes to 2008 Trafficking Victims Protection Act. This change will subject all children to the initial screening process that now applies only to children from Mexico and Canada; erects a new expedited immigration court screening for any children who pass the initial screening; prohibits administrative appeals from children ordered removed through the new expedited process; requires detention of certain children who demonstrate a credible fear of persecution throughout the pendency of their asylum proceedings; establishes new, high burdens of proof; and sets up a principle of "Last In, First Out" in the adjudication process.

The bill prohibits the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture from impeding, denying, or restricting the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on Federal land located within 100 Miles of the U.S./Mexico border—This issue has already been addressed. Both Interior and Agriculture have existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and all these agencies, as well as the GAO, have testified that these agreements are working and that federal land management laws and activities do not impair border security.

The bill provides too few emergency immigration judges—the bill only requires the Department of Justice to designate up to 40 temporary immigration judges within 14 days of enactment of this legislation. Then the bill permits hiring of retired judges or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, to conduct expedited hearings

for unaccompanied alien children to try to meet the new requirement that their cases be heard within 7 days of being screened by DHS officials.

This is a rushed process for an emergency situation involving children. They require our best efforts to ensure their safety and wellbeing not a rushed job.

The bill undermines a long standing policy regarding asylum—H.R. 5230 Prohibits anyone believed to have been convicted outside the U.S. of any drug-related offense punishable by a prison term of more than a year from being granted asylum.

This provision has nothing to do with unaccompanied children entering the United States and clearly is an immigration reform that would impact several committees such as the House Committees on Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

This provision is problematic because what is considered unlawful in one country is a constitutionally protected right in the United States. Often people are fleeing religious, ethnic or political persecution.

Persecution means that they are experiencing or have experienced actions taken by their countries governments, which often includes imprisonment or torture while in custody.

This one change would hand repressive regimes like North Korea with an easy way to block the United States from helping those seeking to escape that country—charge and convict them of a felon.

A Sudanese woman was sentenced to death for being a Christian—would this Congress bar her entry into the United States?

The bill makes the wrong decision on border security by sending the National Guard support for border operations—H.R. 5230 would deploy National Guard under Title 32 Status. National Guard troops with this change may be assigned duties as deemed necessary to provide assistance in operations, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossing by unaccompanied children.

Sending armed soldiers to greet children escaping violence—Mr. Speaker what is the leadership thinking?

These children need our help not frightening images of more adults with guns.

The bill denies safe shelter to children through its sense of Congress—the states that the Secretary of Defense should not be allowed to shelter unaccompanied children or other migrants unless certain conditions are met.

The military and the administration are well aware of the conditions that are acceptable for children and this Congress should provide what is needed so that their needs can be met.

This bill does too little to actually help the thousands of children who are awaiting immigration hearings. They are victims of human trafficking, sexual violence, and witnesses to murders as well as acts of violence against other children who took that dangerous trek to the United States.

We should be focused on learning what they know and what they experienced to be sure the guilty are found and punished.

I offered, along with several other members of the House amendments in attempts to im-

prove the bill, but all were rejected by the Rules Committee, which chose to place H.R. 5230 before the House in the form of a closed rule.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have authorized designated federal agencies to reimburse State and local governments and private nonprofit organizations for the costs incurred in providing psychological counseling, housing, education, medicine and medical care, food and water, clothes, personal hygiene and other indispensable consumables, other human services in response to the humanitarian crisis on the Southwest Border.

This Congress has had the Senate's version of a Comprehensive Immigration reform bill for nearly a year, without accomplishing the task of taking up the issue and passing a House version.

Our nation's immigration system is broken and needs reform, but the only attempt at addressing immigration into the United States is this bill that is being presented as an appropriations bill.

H.R. 5230 is not an appropriations bill it is an immigration reform bill, which covers the jurisdictions of the two committees I serve on—the House Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees. Neither of these committees were given the opportunity to hold hearings or make the needed changes to the bill to make sure it conforms with long standing policies relating to unaccompanied minor or issues related to refugees.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have helped nonprofits, local and state governments in all of the 50 states who are now providing assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors within the United States.

The message has gotten to families in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Parents are no longer sending their children to the United States once they learned of the dangers and the prospects for their children surviving the journey without becoming victims of human trafficking.

These children have found the compassion and love of thousands of Americans found in the states of Texas, Alabama, Alaska, California, Illinois, North Carolina, South Dakota, New York, Utah, Virginia and—yes even the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The nature of America is that of the Good Samaritan.

On July 3, 2014, I went to McAllen, Texas and observed a Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facility where unaccompanied children were being processed by the Border Patrol.

As I walked through the facility, I saw frightened and needy children, some as young as five years old.

Madam Speaker, some members of this body who have not taken the time to visit the border or visit the children who are now in their own states will stand before this body and accuse them of being dangerous—but they are not.

They are traumatized and frightened children driven from their homes by violence and inducements of these same gangs to get payments from desperate parents seeking to save the lives of their children to bring them to the United States.

These children had risked their lives to make their way to the U.S. by riding atop

freight trains through dangerous territories in Mexico. One can only imagine the desperation and hopelessness that would prompt a parent to send their young child on such a treacherous journey.

It takes courage and desperation to escape senseless violence and I know that is what Cuban Americans faced, and Christians, Jews and all other groups facing violence have endured.

These are refugees and their status requires that the United States act appropriately.

Some may mention that the United States has a quota on refugees that we can take each year and that number has been reached. The program that refer to is for refugees that other nations around the world are providing shelter—but if the refugees are crossing our own border there is not limit.

This international law that the United States has backed for decades and pressured other nations to enforce. If the refugees are Christians escaping ISIS or Boko Haram or they are children escaping violent gangs in Central America they are not and should not be turned back.

Children do not leave their homes and families by the tens of thousands unless fear is driving them from their homes.

Upon my visit to South Texas borders, I witnessed hundreds of children whose young faces were pressed against glass jails with tears running down their faces. We are dealing with helpless children who have traveled a treacherous journey, and it should be within our American values to care for these children who fled their homes to escape violence.

These children are not perpetrators or criminals—they are in many cases victims fleeing deadly violence in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, and are seeking temporary safe haven in the United States, as so many people before them have done for centuries.

The surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border does not pose a threat to our national security. Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by an army of children dispatched to do us harm.

We are confronted instead with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries that now lead the world in murder rates: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem. Taking actions that address the root causes in the short and long term will. We should be taking up Immigration Reform to deal with the wide range of immigration problems.

The current status on the border is the number of children coming across the border has abated. Those children remaining in detention shelters along the border number only a few hundred.

According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, these three Central American countries have among the highest per capita homicide rates in the world, with Honduras topping the list and the other two nations in the top five.

To address this issue of the humanitarian crisis, I introduced H.R. 4990, the "Justice for Children Now Act of 2014," which authorizes

the immediate hiring of an additional 70 immigration judges in the Executive Office of Immigration Review.

This bill will help but it is not sufficient to address the backlogs to help advance the flow of the children's immigration court hearings.

The amount allowed under this bill will leave states and aid agencies footing a significant portion of the cost for assisting these helpless children—when it is the role of the federal government to be present and actively engaged in leading the effort.

I support the President's request for \$3.7 billion to respond to the humanitarian crisis on the border and urge my colleagues in leadership to reconsider the level of funding for this great need.

Congress should allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States. Some of these persons are attempting to enter the country unlawfully and without justification. Our laws do not permit this and they should not be allowed entry.

The Administration is following immigration law as it relates to these unaccompanied minors.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, signed by President George W. Bush establishes the legal status of the children who have entered the nation unaccompanied.

That law provides persons fleeing lethal violence or escape from human trafficking the opportunity to have their case heard by an immigration judge.

Over the time Congress has delayed acting and an additional 366,000 pending cases were added to the immigration courts that must have hearings before any action can be taken.

Because this situation is untenable for everyone—law enforcement, taxpayers, and individuals petitioning for relief, the first thing that we can and should do to reduce the backlog is provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation.

Ensuring that there are available sufficient facilities to house detained children in a humane manner while they await their immigration hearing is another challenge.

I ask that the Rules Committee approve the Jackson Lee Amendment for inclusion in H.R. 5230.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration on H.R. 5230 is postponed.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 696, I call up the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-aid Highways

Sec. 1001. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

Sec. 1101. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 1102. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 1103. Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Public transportation programs continuation.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Extension of hazardous materials programs.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Extension of Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 2002. Funding of Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 2003. Additional information on returns relating to mortgage interest.

Sec. 2004. Penalty for failure to meet due diligence requirements for the child tax credit.

Sec. 2005. Clarification of 6-year statute of limitations in case of overstatement of basis.

Sec. 2006. 100 percent continuous levy on payment to medicare providers and suppliers.

Sec. 2007. Modification of tax exemption requirements for mutual ditch or irrigation companies.

Sec. 2008. Equalization of excise tax on liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas.

Sec. 2009. Extension of customs user fees.

TITLE III—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Treatment for PAYGO purposes.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act and the amendments made by this Act:

(1) *MAP-21.*—The term "MAP-21" means the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 405).

(2) *PART-YEAR EXTENSION PERIOD.*—The term "Part-Year Extension Period" means the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date.

(3) *PART-YEAR FUNDING DATE.*—The term "Part-Year Funding Date" means December 19, 2014.

(4) *PART-YEAR RATIO.*—The term "Part-Year Ratio" means the ratio calculated by dividing—

(A) the number of days included in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date; by

(B) 365.

(5) SAFETEA-LU.—The term “SAFETEA-LU” means the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59; 119 Stat. 1144).

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-244), titles I, V, and VI of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title), that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Part-Year Extension Period a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under divisions A and E of MAP-21 and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title); multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) for the Part-Year Extension Period shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and in the same amounts (as calculated using the Part-Year Ratio) as the funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under—

(A) MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141);

(B) the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-244);

(C) SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59);

(D) the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178);

(E) the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-59);

(F) the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240); and

(G) title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) under this section shall be—

(A) available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) for the Part-Year Extension Period, except as provided in paragraph (3)(B), subject to the limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2015 in paragraph (3)(A) or an Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 or a portion of that fiscal year.

(3) OBLIGATION CEILING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the absence of an Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 or a portion of that fiscal year—

(i) the annual limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2015 shall be equal to that of fiscal year 2014; and

(ii) the limitation on obligations shall be distributed and funding shall be exempt from the limitation on obligations in the same manner as for fiscal year 2014

(B) APPLICATION DURING PART-YEAR EXTENSION PERIOD.—

(i) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—During the Part-Year Extension Period, obligations subject to the limitation described in paragraph (2)(B) shall not exceed—

(I) the annual limitation on obligations imposed under that paragraph; multiplied by

(II) the Part-Year Ratio.

(ii) EXEMPT NHPP FUNDS.—During the Part-Year Extension Period, the amount of funds under section 119 of title 23, United States Code, that is exempt from the limitation on obligations imposed under paragraph (2)(B) shall be—

(I) \$639,000,000; multiplied by

(II) the Part-Year Ratio.

(C) CALCULATIONS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Transportation shall, as necessary for purposes of making the calculations for the distribution of any obligation limitation during the Part-Year Extension Period—

(i) annualize the amount of contract authority provided under this Act for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs; and

(ii) multiply the resulting distribution of obligation limitation by either the Part-Year Ratio or the pro rata for the period of an Act making appropriations for a portion of fiscal year 2015, whichever is applicable.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, and other provisions authorized under subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109-59), and chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the Part-Year Extension Period a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109-59), and chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects and activities under—

(1) subtitle A of title I of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141);

(2) section 2009 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109-59); and

(3) chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 31101(c) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking

“fiscal years 2013 and 2014” and inserting “fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015”.

(e) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note; Public Law 109-59) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2013 and 2014” each place it appears and inserting “fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015”.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59), and part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, a sum equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59), and part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized to be appropriated under this section shall be available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if the funds were authorized by section 4101 of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59) and amendments made by that section, as amended by section 32603 of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), or authorized by section 31104 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under—

(1) title II of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141);

(2) title IV of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59); and

(3) part B of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) in the first sentence by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS CONTINUATION.

(a) EXTENSION FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT.**—There shall be available from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund for the Part-Year Extension Period, a sum equal to—

(A) the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 authorized under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(B) the Part-Year Ratio.

(2) **GENERAL FUND.**—There is authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, a sum equal to—

(A) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(B) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Funds made available under this section from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available for obligation in the same manner as set forth in section 5338(j)(1) of title 49, United States Code.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under division B of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code.

(e) **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER DIVISION B OF MAP-21.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for programs continued under this section shall be distributed to those programs in the same proportion as funds were allocated for those programs for fiscal year 2014.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. EXTENSION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS PROGRAMS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under title III of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code, that would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect through the Part-Year Extension Period.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i) of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning October 1, 2014, and ending on the Part-Year Funding Date, an amount equal to—

(1) the total amount authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under title III of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code; multiplied by

(2) the Part-Year Ratio.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for obligation and expended under the authority of this section shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same

manner and at the same rate as funds authorized to be appropriated or made available for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under title III of division C of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and chapter 51 of title 49, United States Code.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) **HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2014” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “December 20, 2014”, and

(2) by striking “MAP-21” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014”.

(b) **SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.**—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “MAP-21” each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014”, and

(2) by striking “October 1, 2014” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “December 20, 2014”.

(c) **LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.**—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “December 20, 2014”.

SEC. 2002. FUNDING OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(A) \$5,633,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund; and

“(B) \$1,500,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.

“(6) **ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE.**—There is hereby transferred to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund amounts appropriated from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund under section 9508(c)(3).”.

(b) **APPROPRIATION FROM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**—Out of amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund there is hereby appropriated \$1,000,000,000 to be transferred under section 9503(f)(6) to the Highway Account (as defined in section 9503(e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 9508(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

SEC. 2003. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RETURNS RELATING TO MORTGAGE INTEREST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 6050H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (I), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) the unpaid balance with respect to such mortgage at the close of the calendar year,

“(E) the address of the property securing such mortgage,

“(F) information with respect to whether the mortgage is a refinancing that occurred in such calendar year,

“(G) the amount of real estate taxes paid from an escrow account with respect to the property securing such mortgage,

“(H) the date of the origination of such mortgage, and”.

(b) **PAYEE STATEMENTS.**—Subsection (d) of section 6050H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) the information required to be included on the return under subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), (G) and (H) of subsection (b)(2).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns and statements the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2004. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MEET DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6695 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **FAILURE TO BE DILIGENT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.**—Any person who is a tax return preparer with respect to any return or claim for refund who fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary by regulations with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, the credit allowable by section 24 shall pay a penalty of \$500 for each such failure.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 2005. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and”.

(2) by inserting “(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)” in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after “In determining the amount omitted from gross income”, and

(3) by inserting “AMOUNT OMITTED FROM” after “DETERMINATION OF” in the heading thereof.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2006. 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2007. MODIFICATION OF TAX EXEMPTION REQUIREMENTS FOR MUTUAL DITCH OR IRRIGATION COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (12) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is

amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) TREATMENT OF MUTUAL DITCH IRRIGATION COMPANIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account any income received or accrued—

“(I) from the sale, lease, or exchange of fee or other interests in real property, including interests in water,

“(II) from the sale or exchange of stock in a mutual ditch or irrigation company (or in a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company) or contract rights for the delivery or use of water, or

“(III) from the investment of proceeds from sales, leases, or exchanges under subclauses (I) and (II),

except that any income received under subclause (I), (II), or (III) which is distributed or expended for expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company (as the case may be) shall be treated as nonmember income in the year in which it is distributed or expended. For purposes of the preceding sentence, expenses (other than for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements) include expenses for the construction of conveyances designed to deliver water outside of the system of the mutual ditch or irrigation company or of the like organization.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE.—In the case of a mutual ditch or irrigation company or of a like organization to a mutual ditch or irrigation company, where State law provides that such a company or organization may be organized in a manner that permits voting on a basis which is pro rata to share ownership on corporate governance matters, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without taking into account whether its member shareholders have one vote on corporate governance matters per share held in the corporation. Nothing in this clause shall be construed to create any inference about the requirements of this subsection for companies or organizations not included in this clause.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2008. EQUALIZATION OF EXCISE TAX ON LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS AND LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.

(a) LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, 18.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline, and”.

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF GASOLINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘energy equivalent of a gallon of gasoline’ means, with respect to a liquefied petroleum gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 115,400 (lower heating value).”

(b) LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by strik-

ing the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and” and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

“(iv) in the case of liquefied natural gas, 24.3 cents per energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel.”

(2) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—Paragraph (2) of section 4041(a) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) ENERGY EQUIVALENT OF A GALLON OF DIESEL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel’ means, with respect to a liquefied natural gas fuel, the amount of such fuel having a Btu content of 128,700 (lower heating value).”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) and paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by striking “liquefied natural gas,” and

(B) by striking “peat, and” and inserting

“peat and”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made

by this section shall apply to any sale or use of

fuel after September 30, 2014.

SEC. 2009. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “January 7, 2024”, and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “January 7, 2024”.

TITLE III—BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. TREATMENT FOR PAYGO PURPOSES.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Shuster moves that the House disagree to the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have an immediate, critical need to address the solvency of the trust fund and extend the current surface transportation law. If Congress fails to act, thousands of transportation projects and hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country will be at risk.

Two weeks ago, the House acted and passed H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. This important legislation extends Federal surface transportation programs and ensures the solvency of the highway trust fund through May of 2015. It provides certainty.

The House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 5021 with a bipartisan vote of 367–55. Then we waited for the Senate to act. We continue to wait and wait. Then on Tuesday, the Senate finally acted. The Senate amended our bill to reduce funding for the highway trust fund and only extend surface transportation programs through December 19, 2014.

The Senate approach is deeply flawed. First, the Senate proposal is not fully offset. It underfunds the highway trust fund by more than \$2 billion. Second, the Senate’s shorter extension would guarantee a manufactured crisis in a lameduck session, when some might be inclined to play politics with these issues or use them as vehicles for unrelated policies that should be subject to the full and open debate they deserve.

Today, the House is considering a motion to disagree with the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021 and send our original bill back to the Senate. I strongly support this motion. This course of action in no way precludes Congress from continuing to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill, which remains a top priority for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate on our shared goal of enacting a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill. However, this approach is the responsible solution at this time. It ensures that we don’t play politics with these programs and enables us to continue making improvements to our surface transportation system.

I strongly urge all Members to support this motion. A vote against this motion is a vote to shut down these projects and programs and would put more than 6,000 projects and more than 700,000 jobs at risk.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I stood in this exact spot and urged passage of a highway trust fund patch as soon as possible to keep our surface transportation programs up and running.

Now we stand at the edge of an enormous cliff with days—not weeks—to go before the trust fund goes belly up and the Transportation Department starts rationing payments to States. We do not have the luxury of time to deliberate or trade further ideas. Congress needs to act now to enact a bill and avert an unnecessary crisis. That is why I support the motion before us today, but not because I think the House bill is a better approach.

The Senate extended programs through December to keep the pressure on Congress to enact a long-term highway bill as soon as possible. I fully support this approach. Unfortunately, the Senate amendment contains a technical error. It does not fully offset the transfer to the highway trust fund, and the House Republican leadership has made clear that the House will not consider a highway bill that is not fully offset.

With a single legislative day left to address this looming crisis, we need to ensure continued funding of roads, bridges, transit systems, and the safety of our travelers and passengers.

Two weeks ago, House Democrats supported a shorter extension as an alternative to H.R. 5021.

□ 1330

This approach was rejected by House Republicans. Today, the House Republican leadership will not even allow us to vote on a fix to the technical error in the Senate amendment.

The House bill and the Senate amendment both help States get through the remainder of this construction season, and they both provide the opportunity for Congress to come together on a bipartisan basis, which the chairman and I have done so well under his tenure and for which I commend him, and pass a long-term surface transportation law in a lameduck session.

There is absolutely no reason that Congress cannot come together and complete a long-term highway bill this fall. I repeat the point I just made, that this legislation that we are acting on today does not preclude us from coming together in a lameduck session of Congress and doing what is necessary for the American people, and

that is passing a long-term, robustly funded transportation bill that puts our people to work and repairs our decaying infrastructure.

While I will vote for this motion today, it is not because the House approach is a better solution, but because it does provide the only path forward available to us to avert an immediate crisis and still allow the opportunity for Congress to do the right thing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this important motion.

Last year, I was honored to be a conferee on MAP-21, and I am proud of the bill our conference committee produced. Our Nation's transportation projects are being completed faster, and States like my home State of Indiana received more Federal funding than they had in the past.

With construction season under way, we need to ensure that every State can continue with their important summer construction projects. This legislation—this motion—is vital to keep thousands of Americans working to rebuild our aging infrastructure.

Funding our Nation's infrastructure should not be a political issue. We all agree that we need a long-term solution to fund our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, but today we need to approve this motion.

The proposal from our Senate colleagues contained an error in financing for their bill that only paid for funding through October, not December. The error came in over \$2 billion short. Nobody plans even the smallest transportation project on a month-to-month basis, and we should not be providing funding on a month-to-month basis. The Senate bill is not a viable solution for our States.

I met with Indiana Governor Mike Pence this morning, who reiterated to me how important it is to continue to provide long-term funding for every State. The House bill is the only proposal that gives every State the opportunity to adequately plan through this construction season and into the spring. The House bill is the only solution that is going to keep people working to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER for his strong leadership on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the distinguished ranking member on our Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the ranking member of the full committee, for his

work to try to get us a fully funded bill, that I am sure the chairman desired as well.

But I must say, Madam Speaker, we have shored up the highway trust fund four times since 2008—four patches, this would be the fifth—until May. Everyone knows what we are doing. We are setting ourselves up for another series of short-term extensions. We don't dare leave the trust fund insolvent—not us. But we don't have the guts to help our own States get on with urgently needed projects.

Short-term funding is like no funding. Where is the dissent on this traditionally bipartisan bill, the highway bill. It is certainly not in the States. It is in the Republican Conference, where they have a crisis among some of their members who believe that spending money on anything is an original sin, even at the demand of their own constituents.

Madam Speaker, I don't have the figures from my own district, so I give you some figures from the State of Arkansas, which I chose at random, to indicate what this bill means for the States. Arkansas relies for about 70 percent of its transportation funding on this bill. However, it has put off 15 projects, even with this bill coming. I am quoting from its Highway and Transportation Department:

We don't feel comfortable going forward with these projects because we are not sure if the highway trust fund will be resolved in time to fully see these projects to completion.

That is the position you are leaving the States in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. NORTON. An official from the American Road and Transportation Builders Association spoke about what this funding does. He said:

If you have your money coming in on an almost annual or every other year basis, subject to being shut down by Congress, you cannot make long-term investments and hire people.

The tragedy of these patches is they have a human face: millions of construction workers now working on a piecemeal basis. The differences between the House and the Senate are easily reconcilable. The Senate passed their bill 79-18. What is wrong with this House? In the past, we would have gotten these differences resolved. There has been plenty of time since MAP-21. If 2 years has not been enough, what in the world do we think the next 8 or 9 months will mean? Time is not the problem; will is. Let's spend this time in the recess getting a long-term bill, as our States are demanding.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand in front of you today in support of H.R. 5021, the Highway Transportation and Funding Act.

We, as a body, stand here all the time and we talk about creating jobs. What we need to do is create an atmosphere where jobs can thrive.

If this bill for some reason doesn't pass, we are talking about putting over 700,000 jobs at risk. In Oklahoma alone, that is 200 construction jobs at risk.

We need time. Yes, this Congress, this body, every now and then we push things down the road, but we are truly trying to find a real solution. The Senate bill just didn't give us enough time. This will push it through May and allow us to look at a long-term funding solution.

Now, either we are going to stand up as a whole and say, yes, this is our responsibility, yes, we are going to provide the industry confidence that this body is going to stay with them, or what we say when we are talking about creating jobs really doesn't mean anything.

Look, we have an opportunity here to build confidence in construction workers and contractors that we depend on every day. We rely on them to get to and from work. When we go to our local stores, we depend on them to make sure the goods are delivered there. And are we going to continue bickering about it a little bit or are we going to stand up and say, let's make sure you are funded? Let's stand up and say, we support you, we are going to make sure that industry and the 700,000 jobs that are there, we are going to make sure that you go to work tomorrow.

Let's make sure that we stand together as a body and invest in our infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a former member of our powerful House Transportation Committee, who decided to go to the esteemed Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership.

I listened to my friend from Oklahoma. I wish his leadership would listen to him to create an atmosphere of certainty and move forward.

There is a reason why the stakeholders uniformly supported the Senate approach. The Senate approach said: Wait a minute, on a bipartisan basis—79 votes, 25 Republicans—we said we are not going to kick this into the next Congress, because that is where the crisis is going to be. You will be in the middle of a new Congress, who knows what the lineup is going to be in the House and the Senate, and Presidential elections, and you won't be giving the certainty to the industry that they are asking for.

That is why construction trades, contractors, the AFL-CIO, Chamber of Commerce, the people who pave the roads, were uniformly supporting the Senate approach. They don't want to slide it into the next year.

I serve on the Ways and Means Committee. I have been trying for now 3½ years to get the Republicans who control the Ways and Means Committee to have a hearing on transportation finance. We have not had one in 3½ years. Now, that is the responsibility of the Ways and Means Committee. I left the T&I Committee hoping that I could help you in the pursuit of resources—3½ years, not a single hearing. My goodness. That is why we have had ever shorter reauthorizations. I don't count a 27-month bill as a reauthorization. And we had 21 short-term extensions.

Now, the House here, the Democrats uniformly said, let's get enough money to get us through the year and let's work together on the long-term issues, maybe we can even have a hearing on finance. When our notion didn't pass—although it was supported by all but three of our colleagues on the Democratic side—when it didn't pass, we didn't pick up our marbles and go home. We provided enough votes, because the Republicans didn't have enough votes to pass it, we provided enough votes hoping that we could get something better coming back from the Senate, and we did get something better coming back from the Senate.

There was a drafting error that we could pass a fix for in 14½ seconds on the floor of the House if we had the spirit of accommodation and follow-through, which my friend, the ranking member, has seen in his long years and has participated in. To try and advance it.

But, no, what we have seen is people are going to turn their back, they are going to slide into the next Congress, and we are going to duck all the tough issues. We haven't heard anything that deals with how we are going to move forward. The T&I Committee doesn't have a bill.

I would respectfully suggest that we ought to reject this motion, that, in fact, we ought not to reject what the Senate did. Let's work together. We can solve this in a matter of minutes if people are committed to doing so. We would be keeping faith with the people who build, who operate, and who rely upon the transportation systems in this country.

We have a unique moment in history to be on the side of that vast non-partisan coalition that wants us to do our job. I would respectfully request that we do it, and that we commit as a body that we are not going on vacation in August, we are not going to recess to campaign, and we won't recess for the year until we do our job for the American public.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a valued member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Many years ago, I worked as a bicycle mechanic, so I know how to patch a tube. But if you get to the point where you can't see the tube anymore for the patches, then it is time for a new tube.

Well, that is where we are at here today. We have had study after study that we are not even investing enough money in our infrastructure to bring it up to a state of good repair, let alone build a modern 21st century infrastructure.

□ 1345

We were the envy of the world with the Eisenhower program. We were the number one in infrastructure in the world. Where are we now? We are number 26. We are down there slugging it out with Third World countries, in terms of our infrastructure.

140,000 bridges on the national highway system need repair or replacement. Forty percent of the national highway system is so deteriorated that it has to be totally replaced. You can't just patch it anymore. You just can't resurface anymore.

Our transit agencies have a \$70 billion backlog to bring their existing systems up to a state of good repair—not to build new transit options for Americans, no—just to bring what we have up to a state of good repair.

Why are we here today? Because there are people on that side of the aisle who actually don't believe it is either the duty, obligation, or right of the Federal Government to invest in a national highway system, a national transportation system. They believe in devolution. Make the States do it.

We tried that. In the 1950s, Kansas built a brand-new turnpike. It ended at the Oklahoma border because Oklahoma ran out of money, and they didn't build it until the Eisenhower bill went through.

They want to go back to those good old days of the 1950s, when you couldn't even have roads that connected between States. That is nuts. It was bad in the middle of the last century, and it is nuts for the 21st century.

Are we just going to kick the can down the road again? If we pass this Republican proposal to continue the current anemic levels of funding until next May, that is not going to bring the States the certainty they need. It is not going to bring the industry the robust investment they need. It is not going to get us the jobs we need.

Yes, we will limp along until next May, and then there will be incredible uncertainty about the next construction season. There won't be major new projects planned. Nothing will happen. We need to resolve that this year.

We should stay here, as the gentleman from Oregon said, and resolve it this August. Five weeks, guys, and we can't get to this issue? Then you are going to kick it into next year? Better, at least, that we are confronted with it before the end of this year; then maybe we can get a robust funding source.

Maybe we can make the investments we need. Maybe we could give the States the tools they need next construction season and the certainty they need next construction season to go forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. We just had a Standard & Poor's study. 29,000 jobs are created, and these are not just construction jobs. They are engineering jobs, technical jobs, and manufacturing jobs for the equipment that goes into this or the steel that goes into this. These are small business jobs with a small business set-aside.

We are foregoing an incredible stimulus to our economy, putting hundreds of thousands of Americans back to work or at work, building us yet again toward a world-class infrastructure.

It is just shameful this has been bipartisan forever. Washington, canals and highways; Lincoln, the transcontinental railroad; Eisenhower, the national highway system; and Ronald Reagan put transit into the national highway program—now, we are here limping along with yet another patch that isn't adequate, won't give us the recovery we need, and won't give us the transportation infrastructure we need to be competitive in the 21st century.

It is a very sad day. We should reject this proposal and get to work.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the House passed their version of highway funding more than 2 weeks ago. The Senate acted last night. Because of their rush, there was actually a drafting error in the Senate version of the highway bill that either creates a \$2 billion hole in the deficit or only funds the program through early October.

The House is not scheduled to be in session in October, so I would suggest to my friends that I think the best thing to do at this stage of the game is to accept this proposal and send the House bill back to the Senate, which

does a couple of things: it certainly does not increase the deficit, as the Senate bill does, because of their mistake; but also, it gets us through May 31.

I have committed to the distinguished gentleman on the other side that the Ways and Means Committee will have a hearing on transportation funding in September when we return, but this gives us the time to look at the competing proposals to finance our infrastructure.

Those disagreements don't necessarily follow along partisan lines, as the previous speaker might have suggested. Not everybody agrees with the gas tax. Not everybody agrees with miles driven. Not everybody agrees with tolls. We are going to have to work through those alternatives and see what other proposals might be there to see where we can move forward.

I believe we can move forward in a bipartisan way on this issue because our infrastructure needs—I would agree with the previous speaker—are dire. They are important. We do need to move forward on a long-term funding bill, but if we don't get past October and if we don't do this today, August 1 is the day the contracts start ending. I think that would be completely irresponsible to allow that to begin to occur.

So let's have continuity in transportation projects and funding. Support the House bill. Send it back to the Senate. I am certain, given the mistake in their legislation, that will be accepted when it gets to the other side.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I deeply appreciate the comments of my good friend, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, with whom I have enjoyed working for 8 years now on the committee. I appreciate his commitment that we will have a hearing on transportation finance in September. I welcome that.

I absolutely agree that people are all over the map. Some people want to get us out of the transportation system on a Federal level—devolution—some want more resources, some want just to limp along. I look forward to having that conversation, but I would just make three brief observations.

One is that it is true we are not scheduled to be in business in October. I think that, frankly, is wrong. I don't think we should recess to campaign when there are all these questions about transportation, and we could roll up our sleeves and actually be doing something. I, for one, would be happy to be here in October, working to avoid a cliff next May.

Second, there is a \$2 billion drafting mistake on the part of the Senate.

These things are not unforeseen or unexpected. We have had experience with them in the past. I am quite confident, in a matter of minutes, we could work with the Senate and put the right language in, and we would be able to avoid that problem.

Finally, we were committed to solving the problem for stakeholders in business, labor, local governments, State, transits, environmentalists, equipment manufacturers, a whole range of people would be happy if we would sit down and be able to fix the modest little technical problem and embrace what all but three Democrats voted for 2 weeks ago and what 79 Republicans and Democrats voted for in the Senate.

I appreciate what I have heard, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to see what progress we can make. I volunteer to be here in October with him.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I will conclude and yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my strong support of this motion. It strips the Senate amendments to H.R. 5021 and sends our original bill back to the Senate, which we passed 367-55.

Our bill is the responsible solution that ensures that we don't play politics with these programs and enables us to continue making improvement to our surface transportation system.

This course of action in no way precludes Congress from continuing to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill, which remains a top priority for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

I strongly urge all Members to support this motion. Let me be perfectly clear: a vote against this motion is a vote to shut down surface transportation projects and programs. The American people deserve better than that, and we can do better than that.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, Surface Transportation Programs are too critical to our economy to become a political issue. The short-term Highway Trust Fund extension that the House is voting on today will keep workers on the job this summer and fall fixing our bridges, operating our transit systems and making our highways safer.

Unfortunately, we're already behind the 8 Ball in preparing for surface reauthorization and have some serious work to do in deciding how we are going to fund the future of transportation in this country.

Developing a bill based on strong policy is always the best way to write legislation, but

the most critical part of developing this next reauthorization bill is clearly finding a way to pay for it. Without that everything else is just talk.

As we prepare for reauthorization of MAP-21 we need to get serious about funding our nation's transportation system. We can't continue to provide grossly inadequate funding for our nation's infrastructure. We're failing to keep pace with our international competitors who are investing heavily in infrastructure, particularly rail infrastructure to move people, goods, and services in their countries. I agree we need to squeeze out every bit of efficiency we can through improved technology and innovation, but we are kidding ourselves if we don't think it will take a significant investment in our nation's infrastructure to truly solve the congestion problems we are facing.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee needs to take the bull by the horns and decide how we are going to fund all forms of transportation for the future. Our committee needs to have all possible options on the table to address our current shortfalls. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation infrastructure a D grade. That is unacceptable for the greatest country in the world.

Transportation and Infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to the nation, and, if properly funded, serves as a tremendous economic and job creator. In fact, Department of Transportation (DOT) statistics show that for every \$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure, 44,000 jobs are created, as is \$6.2 billion in economic activity.

So, as the Transportation & Infrastructure committee prepares the next transportation reauthorization bill, I hope we can develop a long term bill with dedicated funding source for all modes of transportation so we can improve our nation's infrastructure, create jobs and improve the economy, and provide new and innovative transportation options for the traveling public.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the highway bill before us today. While I strongly support infrastructure spending and believe we must pass a short-term fix to avert insolvency this summer, I am concerned that this bill will allow us to simply kick the can down the road one more time and delay a long-term solution.

This week, the Senate voted on a bipartisan basis to shorten the timeline of this emergency extension, increasing pressure for a permanent solution this year. The House should not now delay those urgent conversations into next Spring. Our states and businesses have repeatedly asked for a long-term highway bill that provides certainty and allows them to tackle our greatest infrastructure needs. Congress should pass a temporary patch to get us the next few months, and then immediately begin work to fix the Trust Fund once and for all. Our constituents expect solutions, not band-aids, and it is long past time for Congress to deliver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion to disagree to the Senate amendment will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 150, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

YEAS—272

Aderholt	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Portenberry	Lujan Grisham
Amodei	Porter	(NM)
Bachmann	Poxx	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	(NM)
Barber	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Baretta	Garcia	Maffei
Barr	Gardner	Maloney, Sean
Barrow (GA)	Gerlach	Marchant
Barton	Gibbs	Marino
Benishek	Gibson	Massie
Bentivolio	Gingrey (GA)	McAllister
Bera (CA)	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McCaul
Black	Gowdy	McClintock
Blackburn	Granger	McHenry
Boustany	Graves (GA)	McIntyre
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	McKeon
Bridenstine	Green, Gene	McKinley
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Meadows
Brownley (CA)	Guthrie	Meehan
Buchanan	Hall	Messer
Bucshon	Hanna	Mica
Burgess	Harper	Michaud
Bustos	Harris	Miller (FL)
Byrne	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Camp	Heck (NV)	Mullin
Campbell	Heck (WA)	Mulvaney
Capito	Hensarling	Murphy (FL)
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Cassidy	Higgins	Neugebauer
Chabot	Holding	Noem
Chaffetz	Hudson	Nolan
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Nugent
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Coffman	Hultgren	Olson
Cole	Hunter	Palazzo
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Pastor (AZ)
Collins (NY)	Issa	Paulsen
Conaway	Jenkins	Pearce
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)
Cramer	Jolly	Peterson
Crawford	Jones	Petri
Crenshaw	Jordan	Pittenger
Cuellar	Joyce	Pitts
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)
Daines	Kilmer	Posey
Davis (CA)	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rahall
DeBene	Kingston	Reed
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
Dent	Kirkpatrick	Renacci
DeSantis	Kline	Ribble
Diaz-Balart	Kuster	Rice (SC)
Duckworth	Labrador	Rigell
Duffy	LaMalfa	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roe (TN)
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Ellmers	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
Enyart	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Esty	Latham	Rohrabacher
Farenthold	Latta	Rokita
Fincher	Lipinski	Rooney
Fitzpatrick	LoBlundo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleischmann	Loeb sack	Roskam
Fleming	Long	Ross
Flores	Lucas	Rothfus

Royce	Smith (NE)	Wagner
Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Runyan	Smith (TX)	Walden
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Walorski
Ryan (WI)	Southerland	Walz
Salmon	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Sanford	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Scalise	Stockman	Wenstrup
Schneider	Stutzman	Westmoreland
Schock	Terry	Williams
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Wittman
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Wolf
Sessions	Tipton	Womack
Shea-Porter	Turner	Woodall
Shimkus	Upton	Yoder
Shuster	Valadao	Yoho
Simpson	Veasey	Young (AK)
Sinema	Vela	Young (IN)
Smith (MO)	Visclosky	

NAYS—150

Bass	Garamendi	Owens
Beatty	Garrett	Pallone
Becerra	Grayson	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Butterfield	Holt	Price (NC)
Capps	Honda	Quigley
Capuano	Horsford	Rangel
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Richmond
Carney	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rush
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciulline	Keating	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Langevin	Schwartz
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Connolly	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lewis	Sherman
Cooper	Lofgren	Sires
Costa	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Courtney	Lowey	Speier
Crowley	Lynch	Spallone
Cummings	Maloney,	Takano
Davis, Danny	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matsui	Tierney
Delaney	McCollum	Titus
DeLauro	McDermott	Tonko
Deutch	McGovern	Tsongas
Doggett	McNerney	Van Hollen
Doyle	Meeks	Vargas
Edwards	Meng	Velázquez
Engel	Miller, George	Wasserman
Eshoo	Moore	Schultz
Farr	Moran	Waters
Fattah	Nadler	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Welch
Fudge	Neal	Whitfield
Gabbard	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	O'Rourke	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor	Hanabusa	Pompeo
DesJarlais	Jeffries	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	
Ellison	Nunnelee	

□ 1424

Messrs. ISRAEL, SERRANO, and OWENS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HURT, SCHNEIDER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. POSEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 473, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, I want to advise all Members that additional votes are possible today. We will send out information as soon as it is possible.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

We are going to have to call some Members back. They already left on the representation that this was the last vote of the day. I would imagine you have some Members that are in that category themselves.

Can the gentleman give me any idea of when we will have notice as to whether or not there will be further votes today?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Knowing that some Members, with this vote just now closed, and earlier they announced that we would not walk off the floor until 3:45, I think it is possible to advise all Members that it is possible to have votes later today.

I am hopeful that by late this afternoon we will be able to notify the time of it.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1819

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-570) on the resolution (H. Res. 700) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MAJORITY LEADER

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, as chair of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that Conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from California, the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, effective August 1, 2014.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, as chair of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that Conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as majority whip the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable STEVE SCALISE, effective August 1, 2014.

RECALL DESIGNEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CLERK: Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1, and also for purposes of such concurrent resolutions of the current Congress as may contemplate my designation of Members to act in similar circumstances, I hereby designate Representative Kevin McCarthy of California to act jointly with the Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, in the event of my death or inability, to notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, of any reassembly under any such concurrent resolution. In the event of the death or inability of that designee, the alternate Members of the House listed in the letter bearing this date that I have placed with the Clerk are designated, in turn, for the same purposes.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Speaker has delivered to the Clerk a letter dated July 31, 2014, listing Members in the order in which each shall act as Speaker pro tempore under clause 8(b)(3) of rule I.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, and Kirk Boyle, Legal Counsel, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 113th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of Little League Baseball.

Little League was founded by Carl Stotz in my hometown of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, in 1938. Little League's success is because of the dedication of the volunteers, coaches, organizers, and especially youth that participate in this organization around the world.

For the past 75 years, Little League timelessly worked to grow the support of baseball and participation of youth in physical activity. Since its inception, over 35 million kids have participated in Little League baseball, with currently 2.4 million children playing in more than 80 countries around the world in over 7,000 programs.

This year, some of these 11- and 12-year-old boys and girls will join in South Williamsport, Pennsylvania, to celebrate their accomplishments as they play in the 68th Little League World Series.

I am honored to offer my congratulations to Little League Baseball.

I commend the League for continuing to promote the ideals of fair play, sportsmanship, and teamwork; providing a solid foundation of skills and ethics that will assist these children for the rest of their lives.

I am honored to offer my congratulations to all the participants, coaches, volunteers, sponsors, and organizers of Little League and Honor their dedication to the sport of baseball and the improvement of youth around the world.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

June 30, 2014:

H.R. 316. An Act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

July 16, 2014:

H.R. 2388. An Act to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingole Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes.

July 22, 2014:

H.R. 803. An Act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, and for other purposes.

July 25, 2014:

H.R. 255. An Act to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. An Act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the "Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 291. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. An Act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 356. An Act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes".

H.R. 507. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in holdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 697. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An Act to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. An Act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center".

H.R. 1376. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building".

H.R. 1813. An Act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building".

H.R. 2337. An Act to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 3110. An Act to allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

June 30, 2014:

S. 1044. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 1254. An Act to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 2086. An Act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

July 7, 2014:

S. 1681. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 1, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6707. A letter from the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, OPS, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): Implementation of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (RIN: 0584-AE31) July 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6708. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Revision of Assessment Requirements [Docket No.: AMS-FV-13-0090; FV14-987-2 FR] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6709. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0065; FV13-993-1 FR] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6710. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington and Imported Potatoes; Modification of the Handling Regulations, Reporting Requirements, and Import Regulations for Red Types of Potatoes [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0068; FV13-946-3 FR] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6711. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0002; FV14-932-1 FR] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6712. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Dusky Rocketfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD360) received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6713. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas and Imported Oranges; Change in Size Requirements For Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0009; FV14-906-1 FR] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6714. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Application of Certain Clauses to Acquisitions of Commercial Items (DFARS Case 2013-D035) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6715. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Domestically Nonavailable Articles-Elimination of DoD-Unique List (DFARS Case 2013-D020) (RIN: 0750-AI11) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6716. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds in Countries Bordering the Arabian Sea (DFARS Case 2014-D016) (RIN: 0750-A133) July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6717. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of HOPE for Homeowners Program Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5790-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD68) received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6718. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research — Research Fellowships Program (also known as the Mary E. Switzer Research Fellowships) [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0041] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6719. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research—Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0028] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6720. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program [Docket ID: ED-2014-OSERS-0023] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6721. A letter from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Endowment's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Federally Assisted Programs or Activities (RIN: 3136-AA33) received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6722. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6723. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Grant County Sulfur Dioxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0764; FRL-9913-94-Region 6] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6724. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York State; Transportation Conformity Regulations [EPA-R02-OAR-2014-0238; FRL-9913-

73-Region 2] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6725. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho Franklin County Portion of the Logan Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0228; FRL-9913-97-OAR] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6726. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Auto Exhaust Emission Controls [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0400; FRL-9913-81-Region 7] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6727. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0674; FRL-9913-79-Region 7] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6728. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0919; FRL-9913-92-Region 6] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6729. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0333; FRL-9914-11-OAR] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6730. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho; Portneuf Valley PM10 Maintenance Plan Amendment to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0388; FRL-9913-84-Region 10] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6731. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polyoxyalkylated Trimethylpropanes; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0023; FRL-9912-10] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6732. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: RFS Pathways II, and Technical Amendments to the RFS Standards and E15 Misfueling Mitigation Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0401; FRL-9910-40-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR21) received July 17, 2014, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6733. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — RFS Renewable Identification Number (RIN) Quality Assurance Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0621; FRL-9906-55-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR72) received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6734. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0644; FRL-9913-35] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6735. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Redesignation Requests, Associated Maintenance Plans, and Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Delaware Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards, and the 2007 Comprehensive Emissions Inventory for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0022; FRL-9914-53-Region 3] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6736. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska; Interstate Transport of Pollution [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0609; FRL-9914-48-Region 10] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6737. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nebraska; Fine Particulate Matter New Source Review [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0468; FRL-9914-52-Region 7] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6738. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0332; FRL-9914-45-Region 6] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6739. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Navajo Nation; Regional Haze Requirements for Navajo Generation Station [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0009; FRL-9914-62-Region 9] received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0904; FRL-9912-92] received June 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6741. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Export Controls and Physical Security Standards [NRC-2014-0007] (RIN: 3150-AJ33) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6742. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2014 [NRC-2013-0276] (RIN: 3150-AJ32) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6743. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 140429382-4382-01] (RIN: 0694-AG16) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6744. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-066, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-14-3942); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6746. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6747. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-76; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0052, Sequence No. 4] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6748. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-76; Item IV; Docket No. 2014-0053; Sequence No. 2] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6749. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings [FAC 2005-76; FAR Case 2013-017; Items III; Docket 2013-0017, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM64) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6750. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Small Business Protests and Appeals [FAC 2005-76; FAR Case 2012-014; Item II; Docket 2012-0014, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM46) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6751. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Equal Employment and Affirmative Action for Veterans and Individuals with Disabilities [FAC 2005-76; FAR Case 2014-013; Item I; Docket 2014-0003, Sequence] (RIN: 9000-AM76) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6752. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-76; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0051, Sequence No. 4] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6753. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6754. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reapportionment of Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Limit in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD347) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6755. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of Critical Habitat for Salt Creek Tiger Beetle [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2013-0068] (RIN: 1018-AY56) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6756. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Distinct Population Segment of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2012-0103; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AY71) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6757. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status of the Zuni Bluehead Sucker [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2012-0101] (RIN: 1018-AY25) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6758. A letter from the Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addresses of Headquarters Offices [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-BPHR-2014-0028; FXGO16600954000-134-FF09B30000] (RIN: 1018-BA52) received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6759. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Lesser Amberjack, Almaco Jack,

and Banded Rudderfish Complex [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-XD350) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6760. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD359) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6761. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD358) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6762. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Designation of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Upper Columbia River Spring-run Chinook Salmon in the Okanogan River Subbasin, Washington and Protective Regulations [Docket No.: 13071662-4522-02] (RIN: 0648-BD51) received July 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6763. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2014 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 140214138-4482-02] (RIN: 0648-XD139) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6764. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Administrative Wage Garnishment [EPA-HQ-OA-2014-0012; FRL-9913-63-OCFO] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6765. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance — Veterans' Group Life Insurance Regulation Update — ABO, VGLI Application, SGLI 2-Year Disability Extension (RIN: 2900-AO74) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6766. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Malibu Coast Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-007; T.D. TTB-121; Ref: Notice No. 138] (RIN: 1513-AC01) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6767. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Upper Hiawasse Highlands Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-

0008; T.D. TTB-120; Ref: Notice No. 139] (RIN: 1513-AC02) received July 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6768. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Fee; Procedural and Administrative Guidance [Notice 2014-42] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6769. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure Guidance on Indexing Under Section 36B and Section 5000A (Rev. Proc. 2014-37) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6770. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure Providing Guidance To Compute the Section 162(I) Deduction with Section 36B Credit (Rev. Proc. 2014-41) received July 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6771. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Branded Prescription Drug Fee [TD 9684] (RIN: 1545-BJ39) received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6772. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 5000A National Average Premium for a Bronze level of Coverage [Rev. Proc. 2014-46] received July 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6773. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Further Guidance on the Implementation of FATCA and Related Withholding Provisions [Notice 2014-33] received June 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6774. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Compliance, transmitting the Office's biennial report entitled "Americans With Disabilities Act Inspections Relating to Public Services and Accommodations" for the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5078. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McKEON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 644. Resolution condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security

concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists; with amendments (Rept. 113-569). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 700. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-570). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5303. A bill to promote the use of blended learning in classrooms across America; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5304. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of audiologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing audiology services under the Medicare program, to improve access to the audiology services available for coverage under the Medicare program and to enable beneficiaries to have their choice of a qualified audiologist to provide such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 5305. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5306. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce carbon pollution in the United States, invest in the Nation's infrastructure, and cut taxes for working Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5308. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to countries that do not prohibit shark finning in the territorial waters of the country or the importation, sale, possession, or consumption of shark fins obtained as a result of shark finning; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of

Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 5309. A bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5310. A bill to amend the S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to specify that courses offered by lenders for their own employees may not satisfy the pre-licensing education or continuing education requirement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5311. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate the Tenmile Recreation Management Area and Porcupine Gulch Protection Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 5312. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to improve the tracking of aircraft in flight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5313. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to allow sole proprietors and the spouses and domestic partners of sole proprietors to purchase insurance on the small business exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOESACK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5314. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to enhance the Federal Government's planning and preparation for extreme weather, and the Federal Government's dissemination of best practices to respond to extreme weather, thereby increasing resiliency, improving regional coordination, and mitigating the financial risk to the Federal Government from such extreme weather; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5315. A bill to authorize the President to transfer certain military equipment to the Government of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5316. A bill to secure the border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5317. A bill to make the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of security cameras, safety lighting, and building locking mechanisms in public housing an eligible activity under community development block grant program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5318. A bill to ensure certain safety measures are utilized in the interest of public health security with respect to labeling and transporting human tissue specimen or collection of specimens into interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain rules applicable to qualified small issue manufacturing bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 5320. A bill to direct the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5321. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit rescissions of coverage under health plans in the individual and group market, contingent on the enactment of legislation repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 5322. A bill to establish the Department of Energy and the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 5323. A bill to provide leave to certain new employees who are veterans with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5324. A bill to promote youth athletic safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to meet the needs of the American manufacturing workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for dependent care savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit work by children in tobacco-related agriculture as particularly hazardous oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 5328. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit application of preexisting condition exclusions and to guarantee availability of health insurance coverage in the individual and group market, contingent on the enactment of legislation repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 5329. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require establishment of objective numerical recovery goals for removal of species from lists of endangered species and threatened species under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the tax treatment for certain build America bonds permanent and to provide for recovery zone economic development bonds for certain cities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. McKEON, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NUNES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 5331. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, as the "Colonel M.J. 'Mac' Dube, USMC Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5332. A bill to promote identification of veterans and their health needs in furnishing of items and services under the Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 5333. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that a service animal of a patient receiving inpatient medical care at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs is able to access the room of the patient; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5334. A bill to require all candidates for election for the office of Member of the House of Representatives to run in a single open primary regardless of political party preference, to limit the ensuing general election for such office to the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes in such single open primary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5335. A bill to promote marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CUELLAR, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 5336. A bill to establish or integrate an online significant event tracker (SET) system for tracking, reporting, and summarizing exposures of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components thereof, to traumatic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5337. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations to improve flight recorder and aircraft crash location requirements on certain commercial passenger aircraft in accordance with new International Civil Aviation Organization flight recorder standards; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5338. A bill to repeal the revised annuity employee and further revised annuity employee categories within the Federal Employees Retirement System, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5339. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, acting through the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, to award grants to States to expand access to clinically appropriate services for opioid abuse, dependence, or addiction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 5340. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from Federal health programs to include certain individuals with prior interest in sanctioned entities and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities and to provide a criminal penalty for the illegal distribution of Medicare, Medicaid, or CHIP beneficiary identification or provider numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5341. A bill to delay for 1 year the application of Revenue Ruling 2012-18 with respect to the characterization of payments as tips or service charges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 5342. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to expeditiously grant privileges to members of the Armed Forces who are health care providers to provide hospital care and medical services in medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5344. A bill to prohibit the purchase, ownership, or possession of enhanced body armor by civilians, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 5345. A bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National

Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5346. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for investments in rural microbusinesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend qualified zone academy bonds for 2 years and to reduce the private business contribution requirement with respect to such bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5348. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to collaborate on foreign terrorist organization designations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 5349. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a deadline for the certification of certain forms by regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5350. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to allow the marketing, distribution, or sale of solid antimicrobial copper alloys with certain claims, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to exclude certain solid antimicrobial copper alloys from regulation as drugs or devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 5351. A bill to waive the application fee for veterans with a service-connected disability rated at 50 percent or more who apply to participate in the Transportation Security Administration's Pre✓™ program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. CHU, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 5352. A bill to strengthen and expand proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5353. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years payment parity with Medicare for primary care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REED, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 5354. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5355. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from retaining any interest in real property disposed of pursuant to a base closure law when that property was originally acquired by the United States by donation for the purpose of establishing or expanding a military installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5356. A bill to amend section 3720D of title 31, United States Code, to prohibit wage garnishment by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 5357. A bill to authorize a national memorial to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5358. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to clarify that no Federal agency shall be required to consider the social cost of carbon as a condition of compliance with such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5359. A bill to provide for the designation of, and the award of grant with respect to, air and health quality empowerment zones; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr.

BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 5360. A bill to enhance the competitiveness of American manufacturers and exports in the global marketplace by providing tax relief, regulatory relief, liability relief, and ensuring access to abundant and affordable supplies of energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, the Judiciary, Rules, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 5361. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Silver Alert plans throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MOORE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 5362. A bill to provide that the Social Security Administration pay fees associated with obtaining birth certificate or State identification card for purposes of obtaining a replacement social security card for certain victims of domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CHU, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5363. A bill to establish a WaterSense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5364. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 5365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an above-the-line deduction for child care expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 5366. A bill to establish a program to accurately document vehicles that were significant in the history of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 5367. A bill to amend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to allow for the use of certain assets of foreign entities to satisfy certain judgments against terrorist parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5368. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to address the factors driving large numbers of unaccompanied alien children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala to seek admission to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 5369. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is informed of the interment of deceased veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5370. A bill to provide student loan forgiveness for American Indian educators teaching in local educational agencies with a high percentage of American Indian students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5371. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds and the provision of technical assistance for the Heritage Partnership Program and National Heritage Areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to Patriot employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a minimum direct care registered nurse staffing requirement at nursing facilities and skilled nursing facilities under Medicare and Medicaid and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5374. A bill to establish a maximum limitation on the amount of the payment standard that may be used with respect to housing choice vouchers provided under the Moving to Work program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania,

Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5375. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enforcement of employment and reemployment rights of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5376. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 5377. A bill to provide for certain safeguards with respect to the sale of historic postal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 5378. A bill to establish an employment-based immigrant visa for alien entrepreneurs who have received significant capital from investors to establish a business in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5379. A bill to impose sanctions on individuals that are responsible for the commission of serious and ongoing violations of human rights or gross violations of human rights against nationals of the People's Republic of China or their family members, to protect universal freedoms in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5380. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a phased-in expansion of telehealth coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5381. A bill to amend the non-discrimination provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect older, longer service participants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt aircraft management services from the ticket tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt sports betting from the tax on authorized wagers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 5384. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend health plan coverage to dependent children in the individual and group market, contingent on the enactment of legislation repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 5385. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 5386. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 5387. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14373 Manchester Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5388. A bill to clarify the definition of nonadmitted insurer under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5389. A bill to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to prescribe an additional requirement for the designation of marine sanctuaries off the coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.J. Res. 122. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single law by requiring that each law enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject and that the subject be clearly and descriptively expressed in the title of the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia,

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 699. A resolution welcoming African leaders to the first United States-Africa Leaders' Summit and African trade ministers to the 13th Forum of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SALMON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 701. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the current outbreak of Ebola in Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia is an international health crisis and is the largest and most widespread outbreak of the disease ever recorded; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HURT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GOMMERT, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H. Res. 702. A resolution affirming that private equity plays an important role in growing and strengthening United States businesses throughout all sectors of the economy and in every State and congressional district and that it has fostered significant investment in the United States economy; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H. Res. 703. A resolution establishing an academic competition in the field of robotics among students in Congressional districts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Ms. HANABUSA):

H. Res. 704. A resolution reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region, and for the peaceful diplomatic resolution of outstanding territorial and maritime claims and disputes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H. Res. 705. A resolution recommending the designation of a Presidential Special Envoy to the Balkans to evaluate the successes and shortcomings of the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to provide policy recommendations, and to report back to Congress within one year; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. MASSIE):

H. Res. 706. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Res. 707. A resolution condemning all forms of anti-Semitism and rejecting attempts to justify anti-Jewish hatred or violent attacks as an acceptable expression of disapproval or frustration over political events in the Middle East or elsewhere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H. Res. 708. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 6, 2014, as "Everett McKinley Dirksen and Marigold Day", and designating and adopting the flower commonly known as the Marigold as the floral emblem of Congress for September 10, 2014; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. MATSUJI):

H. Res. 709. A resolution recognizing the importance of transformative breakthroughs in biomedicine, biotechnology, and life sciences in the diagnosis, management, curing, and treatment of illness and the existence of a "Valley of Death" in biotechnology and life sciences funding that stifles innovation and impedes translational medical research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

297. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 138 memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 151 urging the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress to invoke the participation of the International Joint Commission under Article IX, Article X, or

both, of the Boundary Waters Treaty; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 5303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 5304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 5305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 5311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 5312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, impost and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Also, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 12 "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8. To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The sale, transport, delivery, harvesting and storing of cadavers, body parts, human tissues and samples typically involves interstate commerce in that the original cadaver and harvested organs there from start in one state but are shipped to suppliers in other states. The nature of the tissue harvesting and transplant business is typically national in scope as donors and donees are matched through national databases and then the tissue and parts are shipped among the states.

The power to regulate inter-state commerce is set forth Article I, Section 8 power to "regulate commerce among the several states." If the matter in question is not a purely local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius (2012).

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 5319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, as this legislation regulates commerce between the states.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, providing Congress with the authority to enact legislation necessary to execute one of its enumerated powers, such as Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 5320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes")

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mrs. CAPPAS:

H.R. 5324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 5325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section I. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 5326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 5329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, clause 3, that grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 5331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 5333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution reserves to Congress the power to raise and support Armies and provide and maintain a Navy, as well as make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 5336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers."

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 5337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 5338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, "to promote the general welfare"

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 5339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 5341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, which allows Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 5342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 5344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I,

Section 8, "Congress shall have the power . . . To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;"

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McALLISTER:

H.R. 5355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. McALLISTER:

H.R. 5356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 5357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18, relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 5358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to enact this legislation to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 5359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 5360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I Section 8, Clause 4. "To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8. "To Promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9. "To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article III, Section 1, Clause 1. "The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

Article III, Section 2. "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;—to controversies to which the United

States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more states;—between a state and citizens of another state;—between citizens of different states;—between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Article IV, Section 3. "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Constitution of the United States, which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Constitution of the United States, which states, the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 5363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 1 and clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 5364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 5366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States:

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10 of the Constitution of the United States:

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof;

Amendment V

No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 5368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for legislation is Article 1, Section 8: to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 5374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 5375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 5377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution, which states that that "The Congress shall have Power To establish Post Offices and post roads." In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8,

Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof".

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 5378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 5380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 5383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 5384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MARINO:

H.J. Res. 122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to the Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 32: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 148: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 164: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 279: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 292: Ms. DELAUR0, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 303: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 333: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 467: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 494: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 498: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 515: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 532: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 535: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 609: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 628: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 690: Ms. ESTY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 713: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 715: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 860: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 920: Mr. REED.

H.R. 921: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 942: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 956: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 975: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 986: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 997: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1015: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1020: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1024: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1074: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1125: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1150: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1180: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1276: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1284: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1317: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1318: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1387: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1428: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1462: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1507: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1563: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1594: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1620: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ESTY, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. CLARK of MASSACHUSETTS.

H.R. 1625: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1627: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1638: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1663: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1666: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1705: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1738: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1767: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1774: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAUR0, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1787: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1795: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1812: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1827: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1830: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1838: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1852: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NUNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1878: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1884: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1893: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 1913: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1923: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1953: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1975: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1998: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2012: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2028: Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2084: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2116: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2146: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2159: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2185: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 2224: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2235: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2241: Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 2384: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2386: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2415: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2426: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2457: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2468: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2506: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2529: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2536: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. CLEAVER.

- H.R. 2607: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2663: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2664: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2673: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2686: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2692: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2694: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2707: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2725: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2734: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2757: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2827: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2852: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2856: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2870: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2901: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DENT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2917: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2959: Mr. TERRY and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2994: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2996: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3043: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3116: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 3152: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3172: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3382: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3383: Mr. KIND and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3391: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3397: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 3398: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 3463: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3465: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3471: Mr. BARBER and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3481: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3482: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3489: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3494: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3499: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3505: Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3513: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3544: Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3566: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3580: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3630: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3662: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3690: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3708: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3712: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3717: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 3723: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 3743: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 3750: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3776: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3867: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3902: Mr. KEATING and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3978: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4051: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4060: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 4129: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4148: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4158: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4188: Mr. SIRES and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4190: Mr. TERRY and Mr. REED.
H.R. 4216: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4217: Mr. KEATING and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 4227: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4234: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4308: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4319: Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 4325: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4333: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 4347: Ms. CHU and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4351: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4385: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4407: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 4426: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4433: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4440: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4510: Mr. MESSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4521: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 4525: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4551: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4574: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4577: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4592: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4612: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4634: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4644: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4645: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4647: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4664: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4675: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4682: Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 4717: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 4732: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4748: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 4763: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4772: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 4783: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4793: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4815: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 4816: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4818: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4833: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4837: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4843: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 4856: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4857: Mr. CROWLEY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4863: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 4885: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4886: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 4888: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4897: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4902: Mr. DELANEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4904: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4906: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4913: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4916: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4920: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 4930: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4947: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. LATHAM, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4969: Mr. TERRY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 4978: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4981: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4985: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4990: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4998: Ms. ESTY and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5000: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5005: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5023: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 5024: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5025: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5033: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5041: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5052: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5054: Mr. GALLEGRO.
H.R. 5059: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5063: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BERA of California, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 5071: Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 5077: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 5078: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 5083: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5088: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5095: Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 5101: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5109: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5136: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 5137: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5143: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 5156: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5159: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 5160: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5168: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 5179: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5182: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5183: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 5186: Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5213: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 5219: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 5228: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5229: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5232: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 5233: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 5241: Mr. MORAN and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 5243: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 5248: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5249: Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COLE, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5253: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 5256: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 5257: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 5258: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 5269: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 5270: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5278: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5285: Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5287: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5288: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5294: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 5300: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. SHUSTER.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. LANCE.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. YODER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 72: Ms. HANABUSA and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H. Res. 208: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 410: Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 428: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 456: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 525: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H. Res. 601: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 607: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 620: Mrs. NOEM, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. YODER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 640: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 668: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. SABLON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 679: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 688: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAROLYN

B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 689: Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 691: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. VELA.

H. Res. 697: Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. BONAMICI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 5272 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

94. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Morris County Board of Chosen Freeholders, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 47 urging the President to secure the release of Untied States Marine Sgt. Andrew Tahmooressi from Mexican custody; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Thursday, July 31, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, as we make the August exit, may we hear the words of the poet Longfellow when he said:

Art is long, time is fleeting and our hearts though stout and brave still like muffled drums are beating funeral marches to the grave.

May our lawmakers remember that history will not judge them so much on what they say as on what they accomplish. They will be known by their fruits. Teach them to number their days, that they may have hearts of wisdom. As the seasons come and go, may this wisdom keep them from majoring in minors and minoring in majors. Working together may they avoid the frivolous and reap a harvest worthy of their high calling.

Lord, we thank You for the service of our faithful pages.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 488, S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2648, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, postcloture. The time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees. The ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator SESSIONS, will control the time from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. and the majority will control the time from 11 a.m. to 12 noon.

We will notify all Senators when votes are scheduled.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2709

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2709 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2709) to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I respect, admire, and applaud Senators CANTWELL and MANCHIN for the work they have done on this most important bill. We need to find a way forward on it.

There are some in the House of Representatives and a few over here who have made this very difficult to do, and it is so important to the economic stability of our country.

I met yesterday with the head of Boeing aircraft, and they have 800,000 jobs directly and indirectly connected to this—I shouldn't say "to this." But it is a significant part of what they do and need to do to get their finances in order. It would be a shame if we weren't able to renew this. It expires at the end of September.

SEPTEMBER WORK SCHEDULE

Before we finish our business and Senators return for the work period at home, I want everyone to know about what is going to happen when we come back.

Following the August recess, when we convene on September 8, we will be here for 1 week, 2 weeks, and 2 days. That is it. September 23 is our target date to adjourn until after the election. I hope we can do that. This leaves us little more than 2 weeks and 2 days. That is not a lot of time for the workload we have to do.

We need to pass appropriations measures to keep the government from shutting down. We need to pass a temporary extension to the Internet Tax Freedom Act. We need to do something about the items I just mentioned about the Ex-Im Bank. We have to do the Defense authorization bill, which is extremely important for the fighting men and women of this country. We are going to address the Udall constitutional amendment on capping finance reform. And we are going to reconsider a number of issues: college affordability, minimum wage, Hobby Lobby, student debt.

We have a lot of work to do. So everyone needs to know that when we come back on September 8, there will be no weekends off. There are only 2 weeks until we go home, and everyone should not plan things on these weekends. So no one can say: You need to give us notice.

You have been given notice.

I had a chairmen's lunch yesterday. Every chairman there said we should work those two weekends. So everybody, this isn't me trying to dictate a schedule. At lunch yesterday, the chairmen of this institution said we should work those two weekends.

I just mentioned a few things we have to do. So again, Saturday, September 13; Sunday, September 14; Saturday, September 20; Sunday, September 21, we need to be here, including the Fridays that precede those dates that I gave. Every day between September 8 and September 30 is fair game. Friday, Saturday, Sunday, we need to be here.

I repeat for the third time here this morning: There is so much to do and so little time to do it. We have not had a productive Congress. We can't push everything back to the so-called lame-duck. Much of what we are able to accomplish in September depends on the Republicans in the House. Will they get their business done and pass legislation that is important for our country and including the economy?

Here we have lamented the fact that they refuse to take up and pass our comprehensive immigration reform. What a good piece of legislation, a bipartisan bill passed out of this body by an overwhelming margin, and Republicans refuse to take it up. Among other things, it will reduce the debt by \$1 trillion.

We have no extension of long-term unemployment benefits. I have talked about minimum wage and I have talked about student debt. I have talked about Hobby Lobby. I have talked about equal pay for women, getting paid equally for the work they do that is the same as men. But they have no interest in these issues. They certainly have no interest in getting corporate bosses out of health care for women.

No, they are busy turning the House floor into a theater. And it is a double feature like we used to go to when they had double features—at least I don't think they do anymore. It is a double feature.

House Republicans are, first of all, going to sue the President. And, above all, the Republicans in the House and the Senate—the most anti-trial-lawyer group of legislators in the history of the country—who are they going to? Trial lawyers. Who is going to pay those trial lawyers? The American taxpayers. And if that isn't enough, once their lawsuit gets going, they are going to try to impeach the President.

So that is what it is all about. We have a lot to do. A lot depends on the political theater in the House. If the House Republicans are serious and focus their time on legislation to help American families, then it could be a very productive month in September. If they keep up the sue-and-impeach show, we will stay right here working until they finally get serious about giving the American people a fair shot.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the ongoing humanitarian crisis at our Nation's southern border demands a solution. It really just boggles the mind that the President of the United States would rather fund raise in Hollywood than work with members of his own party to forge a legislative response to this tragic situation and to do something to prevent more young people from making the perilous and potentially life-threatening journey across the desert.

The President initially laid out reforms that, while modest, represented a step in the right direction. But evidently the politicians who increasingly have the President's ear these days couldn't go along with that, so the President stopped defending his own policy reforms. Instead, he demanded a blank check that would literally preserve the status quo, a blank check he knew wouldn't fix the problem, a blank check he knew couldn't pass Congress, and a blank check he knew members of his own party in Congress didn't even support.

Faced with a national crisis, he listened once again to his most partisan instincts instead of uniting Congress around a common solution so he could lay blame for that crisis on somebody else. Apparently no crisis is too big to be trumped by politics in the Obama White House. It is exasperating for those of us who want to work toward bipartisan solutions; it is confusing, I am sure, to the Democrats who share our desire to get something accomplished; and it is emboldening to Democrats who don't, including the Senate Democratic leadership.

When faced with a crisis, a President's job is to show Presidential leadership and to get his party on board with the reforms necessary to address it. Scuttling reform and prolonging the crisis is not part of the job description.

So what I am suggesting, Mr. President, is that you spend a little more time actually doing the job you were elected to do. Press "pause" on the nonstop photo-ops and start demonstrating some real leadership instead. The barbecue joints and the pool halls will still be there after we solve this problem.

Mr. President, it is a dangerous journey to the border. Children are suffering at the hands of some seriously bad actors down there. News reports suggest you even knew about this long before it started making national news. You could have intervened before this turned into a full-blown humanitarian crisis, but you didn't. You could have worked with us to get a bipartisan solution. You didn't.

Mr. President, you have a special responsibility to help us end this crisis in a humane and appropriate way. Congress cannot do it without your leadership or your engagement. It is literally impossible to do this without you. So pick up the phone you keep telling us about and call us. Call your fellow Democrats and lobby them to get on board. Work with us, and let's address this crisis.

FOREIGN POLICY

Recently I expressed deep concern that the President pursued a foreign policy based on withdrawing from America's forward presence and alliance commitments, hollowing out our Nation's conventional military forces, placing an overreliance upon personal

diplomacy and international organizations, and literally abandoning the war on terror. I believe this will leave his successor to deal with a more dangerous world and with fewer tools to meet the threats.

Later this morning several Members of Congress charged with leading national security committees and policy-making will meet with the President to discuss national security. I don't expect the President to brief us on his plan for rebuilding the military, especially in a way that would allow us to meet our commitments in Europe and the Middle East or that would allow for an effective strategic pivot to Asia, nor do I expect the President to lay out for us his plans to provide the intelligence community with all the tools it will need to deal with the threat of international terrorism from Al Qaeda and its affiliated groups over the next decade. Those are strategic threats best addressed by integrating all the tools of our Nation's power, and, candidly, it would require the President to revisit the policy stances he took as a candidate back in 2008.

I do hope that at a minimum the President will discuss two near-term issues:

First, I hope he will explain his plan or efforts to assist the Israelis in demilitarizing Gaza and ensuring that Hamas is not left with the ability to launch indirect fire attacks against the civilian populace or to infiltrate Israel through tunnels. In coordination with Israel, we can assist the Palestinian Authority with any programs to assume responsibility for monitoring those access points into Gaza.

Absent any active efforts by the administration, I would at least like assurances that the President is not working to impose a cease-fire upon Israel that is harmful to the objectives of the current military campaign.

Second, earlier this month a group of Republican Senators wrote to the President imploring him to craft a plan for containing the threat posed to Iraq and Jordan by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. Specifically, we asked the President to deploy an assessment team to Jordan to develop a plan to prevent the spread of ISIL in a way that threatened our ally Jordan.

Although Ambassador Susan Rice responded to our letter, her letter did not address how the administration intends to combat ISIL. Instead, Ambassador Rice renewed the administration's request for a new counterterrorism partnership fund. To this point, the administration has failed to provide the Congress with any plan for how this new counterterrorism fund would assist our ally, further our own interests, or train and equip a moderate opposition within Syria. That would be a good starting point for today's discussion with the President.

OPIATE ADDICTION IMPACTS

Prescription drug and heroin abuse have risen to epidemic levels in my home State of Kentucky. More Kentuckians now lose their lives to drug overdose—largely driven by painkillers—than to car crashes. It is a huge problem.

Earlier this year I convened a listening session in the Commonwealth to hear from those closest to the problem, from professionals across the medical, public health, and law enforcement spheres, as well as a brave young man who managed to break his heroin addiction after watching his own friends overdose. We discussed the extent of the problem, and one issue in particular that grabbed my attention was the increasing number of infants being born in Kentucky dependent on opiates. Researchers estimate that more than one baby every hour—one baby every hour—is now born dependent on drugs and suffering from withdrawal—a number that has increased in my home State by more than 3,000 percent since the year 2000. We have gone from 29 infants identified as suffering from drug withdrawal annually to more than 950. Experts believe there are even more cases that go unreported. This is heartbreaking. I say this especially as a father of three daughters. These children are the most innocent members of our society. We have to protect them.

Thankfully, the Commonwealth is taking this problem seriously. Both the Kentucky Perinatal Association and the Kentucky Perinatal Quality Initiative Collaborative have made as their primary focus reducing the number of infants born dependent on opiates and other drugs. I certainly commend their efforts, but there is more we can do at the Federal level.

Maternal addiction and infant opiate dependency are epidemics that can best be overcome by effective coordination between stakeholders at the State and Federal levels.

One bill that was recently introduced in the House, the CRIB Act, would help address the need for greater coordination between doctors, nurses, hospitals, and governments at the State and Federal level. I commend the sponsors of that legislation for their leadership.

Today in the Senate I will introduce the Protecting Our Infants Act, which seeks to address not only infants suffering from opiate withdrawal but maternal opiate addiction as well. It would help identify and disseminate recommendations for preventing and treating maternal addiction so that we can reduce the number of infants born dependent on opiates and other drugs.

My bill would also promote recommendations as to how to pinpoint those babies suffering from withdrawal and how best to treat them. Because I have heard from so many experts in Kentucky on the need for more research into infant withdrawal and its

long-term effects, my bill would shine a light on those areas as well.

The Protecting Our Infants Act would also encourage the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to work with States to improve the availability and quality of data so that they can respond more effectively to this public health crisis.

My legislation is certainly no silver bullet, but it is a step in the right direction, and it would help ensure that our public health system is better equipped to treat opiate addiction in mothers and in their newborn children. Together we can overcome this tragic problem. I am going to remain focused on it until we do.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE

Mrs. FISCHER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the need to strengthen American families and enhance workplace flexibility, and I am very pleased to be joined here on the floor of the Senate this morning by my good friend the junior Senator from Maine.

In Nebraska and all throughout the country, too many families continue to struggle in this weak economy. Even with moms and dads working two or three jobs, some families find it hard to get ahead. Household income has plummeted by more than \$3,300, and 3.7 million more women are in poverty. The average price for a gallon of gas has nearly doubled, and the labor force participation rate has declined by 2.9 percentage points since 2009.

Many economists agree that the surest way to generate sustained economic growth and empower struggling families is to pass comprehensive tax reform. Addressing overregulation should also be a top priority. Moreover, it is a simple truth that less government spending means families will keep more of their own money. Agreement on how exactly to achieve these needed fiscal reforms remains elusive and, unfortunately, unlikely in a Capitol paralyzed with election fever. Nonetheless, there are reasonable policy changes we can all agree on, and those changes will make life easier for families.

I have been working on a number of commonsense measures—my Strong Families, Strong Communities plan—to empower working families, increase take-home pay, and ensure flexibility in the workplace. Today I would like to discuss part of that plan.

The Strong Families Act is a bipartisan proposal I introduced with Senator KING to address the challenge of paid leave. It is no secret that balancing responsibilities at home with duties at work is a common struggle for working parents. For an increasing number of Americans these pressures include raising young children while also caring for aging parents.

While I believe we must do more to help these working families, the usual Washington answers of one-size-fits-all Federal mandates and higher taxes are not a part of the solution we are proposing. Instead, I believe we should focus on a more balanced approach that respects both family obligations and the employer's costs of doing business. There are ways to increase the options for working adults without hurting existing employment arrangements or threatening job security.

The Family and Medical Leave Act—FMLA—of 1993 requires employers of 50 or more employees to provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave, which can be used for events such as the birth or adoption of children, serious medical issues, or providing care to close family members.

The problem for many families is that current law does not require paid time off. Unpaid leave is practically impossible for countless Americans, especially hourly workers who live paycheck to paycheck. Many employers voluntarily offer generous compensation packages that include paid parental or medical leave. A survey of more than 1,100 employers found that 68 percent of large employers provide paid parental leave. At the same time not all workers enjoy these options despite increasingly complex family demands. Again, this is especially true for low-wage workers. With more than half of women working as the primary breadwinners, workplace flexibility has become a necessity for our 21st-century families.

It is not just children who require personal care and attention; it is also our aging parents. Nearly half of middle-aged adults have elderly parents, and they are still supporting their own children. Over 43 million Americans provide direct care to older family members, with women serving as 66 percent of all primary caregivers. As the baby boomer generation ages, the number of senior citizens requiring care will likely spike. Less take-home pay for these caregivers means tighter finances, more stress, and lost opportunities—all at a time when families are confronting health crises or dealing with unique challenges of starting a new family. With such events often coinciding with high medical bills, the last thing a stressed family needs is a smaller working budget.

Senator KING and I have offered a proposal that would enable working families to have continued access to pay while they are meeting necessary family obligations. Our plan would create a tax credit to encourage employers to voluntarily offer paid leave for workers. To be eligible for that tax credit, the employer must at a minimum offer 4 weeks of paid leave, but they could offer more. Paid leave would be available on an hourly basis and would be separate from the other vacation or sick leave. For each hour of

paid leave provided, the employer would receive a 25-percent nonrefundable tax credit. The more pay the employer offers, the greater the tax credit. This tax credit will be available to any employer with qualified employees regardless of size. Importantly, our bill is reasonable. It is a balanced solution that can make a real difference in the lives of working families.

When we do this without new mandates or new taxes, it creates an incentive structure to encourage employers to offer that paid leave, specifically targeting those who hire lower income hourly paid workers. This should not be just another election-year issue. This is a middle-class issue and our bill takes the partisan politics out of it and offers a meaningful solution we can pass.

I wish to thank my friend from Maine, Senator KING, who joined me in offering this bill.

Once again, this now famous surf-and-turf caucus is working together on a commonsense proposal, and it is a proposal that can help American families. I am grateful for the Senator's input, his hard work and friendship, and I look forward to closely working with him in the future so we can advance this measure in the Senate.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleague from Nebraska to introduce what I think is an important and commonsense and workable bill that could be passed in the next several weeks, and I think there will be broad agreement across the political spectrum.

The question we are answering is: What does Suriname, Papua-New Guinea, and the United States have in common? The answer is: They are the only three countries in the world that we have been able to turn up that don't have any provision for paid maternity leave. Every member of the industrialized world, except the United States, has some kind of coverage for paid maternity leave.

This chart gives the various levels. You will see in red is the United States, Suriname, Papua New Guinea, and that is it in the whole world. This is something we can do that will not affect our competitiveness, will not be a problem in our economic growth, and in fact I believe it will contribute to it.

Today a family who has a health crisis with an elderly parent, a child or has the joyful issue of a new child in their family has a terrible dilemma. The dilemma is: Do I stay home to take care of the child or the elderly parent in a health crisis or do I have to put food on the table by going to work because for every hour of work I miss I lose an hour of pay. That is a dilemma we should not put our people through.

As I have said, I believe this is a productivity issue. All of the discussions we have had in recent months about pay and gender inequity often come down to the issue of workplace flexibility, particularly in the case of women who are often the ones who are put in the dilemma I mentioned of having to choose between their earnings and family obligations. Women are the ones who are often trapped in this dilemma, and they are the ones who are asking for and seeking—quite reasonably—the same kind of flexibility that virtually every other working person in the world already enjoys.

I like this bill and agreed with my colleague from Nebraska to join in it because it is voluntary. It is not a mandate from Washington, it is not something that says every employer in the country has to do this, and there will be rules and bureaucracy and adjudications and all those kinds of things. No, this is a voluntary, incentive-based program that says every employer—not just those 50 and above or 100 and above or 500 and above—in the country will have this tax credit available to them that will allow them to offer paid leave to their employees.

I think this is the way we should approach this and not, as my colleague has said, with a one-size-fits-all mandate emanating from Washington. I think incentives are always better than mandates.

The other element that is important about this bill is it focuses on the people who are currently least likely to have some kind of paid leave available to them, and usually those are people who work on an hourly basis. That is whom this bill is focused on. The interesting aspect of the data is that as it goes up the income scale into salaried employees, more than two-thirds of American workers in this category already have a paid leave policy. It is when you get down into the working people—the hourly workers—that we have discovered the real problem lies. That is why I think this bill has an important focus on hourly workers, people who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and people who otherwise are not going to have this kind of protection.

This is about flexibility. As I have talked to and listened to women's groups and advocacy groups, flexibility is always first on the agenda, and that is exactly what we are talking about, so people—men or women—don't have to make that agonizing decision, people who are living paycheck to paycheck don't have to make the agonizing decision between being able to put food on the table and pay the rent or staying home to take care of an ill child or an elderly parent or to stay home a reasonable period after the joyous occasion of the arrival of a new child.

It is also about productivity. I believe we will see an increase in produc-

tivity because people will not be preoccupied when they are at work. They know they are going to be there and they know they are going to have this protection and it takes away that agonizing worry and anxiety. It also—by giving people paid leave—will enable them to continue to contribute to the economy, and I believe it will actually be a positive stimulus to our economy.

Of course everybody says we are in competition with the rest of the world. Not on this. Every place else in the world provides this level of benefits so we are in a catchup situation, and I believe, as I said, I think we will see an increase in productivity and in economic activity.

Finally, it is about fairness. Frankly, to some extent it is about gender fairness. It is about fairness to working women who are expected in our culture to be the ones to take care of a sick child. That may not be fair, that may not be the wave of the future, but that is a fact today. It is about fairness to those working women who have to make a choice between putting food on the table or taking care of a sick child or taking the necessary time off after the birth of a child in order to have that event be a happy one and not an economic strain on the family.

I am delighted to join my colleague from Nebraska—the leader of the surf-and-turf caucus—on her brilliant bill that I believe is something we can come together on, on a bipartisan basis, and actually do something about and not just talk about the problem of income equality and not just talk about the problem of fairness and not just talk about the problem of flexibility in the workplace but actually do something about it in a practical and commonsense way that I think will have tremendous ramifications across the country.

I am delighted to be able to join her. I compliment the Senator from Nebraska for her work in bringing this forward, and I look forward to what I hope will be an expeditious consideration of her bill in the Senate and in the Congress. This is a change we can make that will make a real difference in people's lives across America.

I thank the Presiding Officer and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the people of the United States have truly begged and pleaded with their lawmakers for years to create a lawful system of immigration—one that works, one that is fair, one that serves the national interest, one that we can believe

in. They have been justly and rightly convinced of that fact, and they have demanded it of their elected officeholders to secure their communities and protect the integrity of our national borders. Some say there is something wrong with that. I say there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. That is the right thing. That is the moral thing. That is the responsible thing. That is the decent thing. That is what any great nation should have—an immigration policy that serves its national interest and is fairly and lawfully conducted.

But these pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Our border is absolutely not secure. It is in a state of crisis. Our communities are not safe. Preventable crimes occur every day because our laws are not being enforced and our sovereignty, at its base level, is not being protected. And, we have a President planning to issue sweeping executive amnesty in violation of law, in ways in which he has no power, and threatens the constitutional separation of powers. Congress passes laws; the President must execute the laws. The President is not entitled to make laws, to conduct actions contrary to plain laws. The President simply cannot say Congress didn't act, so I have to act.

Well, Congress decided not to act in a way he wanted. They considered legislation, rejected it, and now he is going to—it appears from article after article—go forward and carry out an action anyway. It would be fundamentally wrong. This cannot stand. It will not stand.

My position has been and remains that Congress should not pass border legislation that does not foreclose the possibility of these unlawful Executive orders. As an institution, this Congress has a duty to protect this institution and our constituents.

Currently, the President has issued approximately half a million grants of administrative amnesty and work permits to individuals unlawfully present in the country up to 30 years of age. Now the President wants to issue another 5 to 6 million work permits to illegal immigrants of any age, despite a clear prohibition in the Immigration and Nationality Act. He is not entitled to do that. Plain law says you cannot employ someone in the country unlawfully.

People think: Well, it is one thing to say you will not deport somebody. But, colleagues, what was done previously was to provide, under the DACA legislation, an ID card with the words "Work Permit" across the top, "Work Authorization" across the top.

So the President is providing, in violation of plain law, the ability of people in the country to work who are not entitled to work, who will be able to take jobs from any American today. We have a lot of Americans today struggling for work. At a time when

millions of Americans are out of work, the President's plan is a direct affront to them—to every single unemployed American, to people around the world who have applied to come to the United States and have not been admitted, so they did not come unlawfully. What do we say to them when this happens?

It is particularly damaging to those in the poorest and most vulnerable communities in America. So who is speaking for them? Who will give them a voice in Congress? Will Members hear? Will we hear their pleas? I have been shocked that we have not seen a willingness in the Congress to resist more effectively than what we are seeing today.

So let's consider a bit more deeply for a moment what the President's Executive action would do to immigration enforcement in America. Let me say clearly, colleagues, we are not making this up. We are not having some idea that he might do something for 5 or 6 million more people. It has been repeatedly leaked from the White House—not leaked; they have discussed it. The President has promised it to activist groups like La Raza and the ACLU that he has been meeting with. He has told them he intends to do this. It is only a question of how and the time. The latest article yesterday in the Wall Street Journal—a big article—said it would happen shortly after Labor Day. Well, this is not something we are making up. It is a direct threat, a direct promise, a statement, it appears, from the White House.

I hope they will not go forward with it. Surely cooler heads in the White House will push back. Surely his Attorney General will say: Mr. President, you cannot do this. His legal counsel in the White House will say: Mr. President, do not do this. This is not lawful. The Department of Homeland Security needs to be saying: This would be devastating, Mr. President. How can we enforce any laws? Please do not do this.

I do not think it is absolutely certain to happen. But it seems to me that by every indication it is an absolute intention right now of the President to go forward with this or they would not have had at least a half a dozen articles on it—the National Journal, Time magazine, and others.

I have spoken many times with a great American by the name of Chris Crane, a former marine. He is also an ICE officer and president of the officers' ICE Council—the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Council. He has explained how his officers are ordered not to do their job. They have even sued the Secretary of Homeland Security for blocking them from fulfilling their oath to enforce the laws of the United States of America. Can you imagine that? I was in Federal law enforcement for 15 years. I have never heard of a situation in which a group of

law officers sue their supervisor saying, in Federal court: Mr. Judge, my supervisor is ordering me not to do what my duty and my oath requires on a daily basis.

That is a stunning development. Their morale for years has been one of the lowest in the Federal Government. Now I think it is the lowest because they have been demeaned and rejected in a duty they believe is worthwhile for them to carry out.

One of the things Mr. Crane explained is that the President's previous Executive amnesty for the so-called DREAMers basically halted enforcement for anyone who asserted protections under that new administration policy. Mr. Crane would report that ICE officers would come into contact with individuals unlawfully present in the country—individuals they would encounter in prisons and jails. They would be called by a local police department that they have arrested someone for a serious crime. They would tell the ICE officers. Routinely they are supposed to go and pick them up and deport them. They would encounter people in jail—that is one of the big jobs they have—and they would be forced to release them simply because they assert: I came here as a youth. Nobody is going to do any investigation on this. How do you investigate it? The effect is to demoralize and make it difficult, and almost impossible, to enforce the law.

Now imagine, then, what would happen if the President expands this administrative amnesty and work authorization program to cover millions of unlawful immigrants of all ages. Everyone ICE comes in contact with will assert these protections: I am qualified under the President's amnesty. And any who fail the application will say they are eligible for this amnesty.

So what then? Will the FBI open investigations, check when they entered the country or whom they entered the country with, and where they came from? They are not going to do that—of course not. The officers are going to be totally unable to resist false claims from applicants, who happen to be the people they have arrested. It is going to demoralize immigration enforcement officers. ICE officers will again be issued orders basically to stand down. No enforcement is going to occur. It will be the effective end of immigration enforcement in America, in my opinion.

You cannot maintain an effective, lawful, consistent, fair immigration enforcement policy with these kinds of regulations occurring and these kinds of orders from the White House, who is the Chief Executive Officer of America, who is empowered and directed to ensure that the laws of the United States are carried out—not empowered to violate the laws of the United States.

We have also heard from officers who have processed immigration applications. These are people who receive applications to come to the United States in a lawful way. These dedicated folks at the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services are people who have to process all of these millions of applicants if the President issues his order.

So let me read at length from a statement from the President of the USCIS Council, who represents these CIS officers who have an awesome duty. He wrote last year—this is what he said:

USCIS adjudications officers are pressured to rubber stamp applications instead of conducting diligent case review and investigation.

This is the officers saying that their bosses are pressuring them to just rubber stamp applications right now—not to investigate, not to ask questions—just approve them. He goes on:

The culture at USCIS encourages all applications to be approved, discouraging proper investigation into red flags and discouraging the denial of any applications. USCIS has been turned into an “approval machine.”

That is what the top CIS officer said in a statement last fall. They have been turned into an approval machine. No wonder the American people are unhappy with what goes on here. Does anyone really know how serious this is? It is amazing that we would undermine the very integrity, really, of the entire process, and that is why they have protested. That is why they have come forward. It hurts them. They feel bad to see the great laws of the United States being routinely eviscerated.

He went on to say this:

USCIS has created an almost insurmountable bureaucracy which often prevents USCIS adjudications officers from contacting and coordinating with ICE agents—

Who know something about these people, perhaps—

and officers in cases that should have their involvement. USCIS officers are pressured to approve visa applications for many individuals ICE agents have determined should be placed into deportation proceedings.

That is a very serious charge, and that is happening. He is not making that up. It goes on:

The USCIS officers who identify illegal aliens that, in accordance with law should be placed into immigration removal proceedings before a federal judge, are prevented from exercising their authority and responsibility to issue Notices To Appear.

This is a notice to appear in court. They are being obstructed and told not to do it. He goes on to say:

The attitude of USCIS management is not that the Agency serves the American public or the laws of the United States, or public safety and national security, but instead that the agency serves illegal aliens and the attorneys which represent them. While we believe in treating all people with respect, we are concerned that this agency tasked with such a vital security mission is too greatly influenced by special interest

groups—to the point that it no longer properly performs its mission.

What a devastating critique. Does anyone care? Has the President done one thing to respond to these allegations? Is the Senate bill that is offered by Senator REID and our Democratic colleagues, with the blessings of the President—does it do one thing to fix one of these problems? No. They have no intention of fixing these problems. They do not want to fix these problems. This is their policy: to foment more lawlessness and to see that the laws are undermined in such a way they cannot be effectively enforced.

It is just wrong, colleagues. Republicans and Democrats need to stand up to this. Don't we need to respond to the desires of the American people for a lawful system of immigration? Isn't that right and just and decent that they ask of us? Yet we go along in total ignorance and ignore these kinds of statements from our own enforcement officers, which anybody who looks at the border and sees what is happening could believe every bit of. And indeed it is true.

It goes on to say:

This agency is tasked with such a vital security mission is too greatly influenced by special interest groups—to the point that it no longer properly performs its mission.

In virtually every article we see the President is meeting with some group, such as La Raza, which has very extreme policies on immigration—basically an open borders policy. They have opposed every policy of lawfulness. Another similar group, the ACLU, was commenting recently on what they thought the President had told them he was going to do about not enforcing the law.

These are the kinds of groups he is meeting with. He is not meeting with the law officers. He never sat down with them to ask: Tell me what it is like on the border. Let's see if we fix this thing. Let's make this system work. He has never done that. That is very indicative. This legislation that would spend \$2.7 billion, proposed by the Democratic leadership in the Senate, and totally blessed by the President. This is the President's bill and it does nothing to fix any of the problems. It just asks for more money.

The President of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services wrote last year:

DHS and USCIS leadership have intentionally established an application process for DACA—

That is his first amnesty for DREAMers that the President issued.

—that bypasses traditional in-person investigatory interviews with trained USCIS adjudications officers. These practices were put in place to stop proper screening and enforcement,—

He is saying that these practices were put in place to stop proper screening and enforcement.

—and guarantee that applications will be rubber-stamped for approval, a practice that virtually guarantees widespread fraud and places public safety at risk.

This is the head of the USCIS Officers Association. He is laying out event after event, action after action, that demonstrates we are dealing with an administration that does not want the law enforced. Can you believe these words?

The president of USCIS goes on to say:

U.S. taxpayers are currently tasked with absorbing the cost of over \$200 million worth of fee waivers bestowed on applicants for naturalization during the last fiscal year. This is in addition to the strain put on our Social Security system that has been depleted by an onslaught of refugees receiving SSI benefits as soon as their feet touch U.S. soil.

So the story that there are no Social Security benefits is not correct. The refugees who enter our asylum system through the refugee program are entitled to these benefits when they hit the soil.

He goes on to say:

Large swaths of the Immigration and Nationality Act are not effectively enforced for legal immigrants and visa holders, including laws regarding public charges as well as many other provisions as the USCIS lacks the resources to adequately screen and scrutinize legal immigrants and non-immigrants seeking status adjustment. There is also insufficient screening and monitoring of student visas.

These are breathtaking reports from our top officers, from the front lines of law enforcement, from people who screen and review applications every day for the United States of America.

Now think—just imagine what will happen to our system if the President goes forward with his executive action. It would overwhelm a system that is already buckling under the weight of massive illegality on our southern border.

We must end this lawlessness. We can end this. We can do so. Let me repeat. I know it can be done. But to do so, we must first stop doing more damage. We must prevent the President's massive executive amnesty from going forward. The public, once riled to these issues, will not be ignored this time, in my opinion. They will not let the representatives of either party acquiesce to lawlessness. That is why I have said that Congress as an institution must not support any border bill that come forward that does not expressly prohibit the President's executive amnesty ideas that he has been talking about, and would block him from spending any money to execute an unlawful plan of this kind.

How can we not take this position, colleagues? What basis do we have to say we will not take any action when we were being told on a daily basis what the President plans to do? Are we ready to go to recess for August having done nothing, said nothing, offered

nothing to oppose the stated intentions of the President in this way?

There is currently no legislation pending for a vote in either Chamber, House or Senate, which passes this test. Senator CRUZ has offered language, but they are not willing to allow it to come up for a vote. As a result, both the House and Senate packages should not be supported. Congress should not adjourn until it has firmly stood against the President's unconstitutional and dangerous action.

The American people are asking for us to help. They are pleading with us to help. We must answer their call. We must fight for the lawful and just system of immigration that we can be proud of. Let's put this into a bigger picture. Wages are down. Labor force participation is declining. The percentage of people in the working ages who are actually working has been declining steadily. Indeed, it has not reached a level this low since the 1970s.

Since 2000, the Federal Government has lawfully issued nearly 30 million immigrant and foreign work visas—for people to come to this country to work—almost 30 million visas to legally work in the United States or permanently reside in the United States. During this time, the number of Americans with jobs—Americans with jobs—declined on net. On net, fewer U.S.-born workers ages 16 to 65 had jobs in 2014 than in 2000. Amazing.

There are fewer people working today—even though the population has increased—than in 2000. The President's planned work permits for illegal immigrants is in addition then to the already huge flow of low-wage labor into the United States.

We have a problem, colleagues, with Americans needing jobs. We do not have too few workers. We have too few jobs. I would contend that that is pretty clear because wages are down.

If we had a shortage of workers, wages would be up. When you have a surplus of labor and surplus of workers, wages decline. According to the Wall Street Journal, in 2007, a family income of 4 would amount to about \$55,000, on average. It has now dropped to \$50,000. That represents a huge diminishment of the wealth of America. Is it not time we did something for American workers? Who do we represent? Do we not represent the people of this country? Do we not know we cannot—while we believe in immigration, we respect and admire and love immigrants, we ought to have a lawful system. The number of people who come ought not to be so large that it destabilizes our labor market. Is that not the right policy for a great country to pursue? The American people have begged and pleaded for this system. I believe we ought to give it to them.

Let me sum up one more time here. What we are seeing in the bill presented by the majority, and demanding

that it pass the Senate today, is a bill that just provides money. It does not deal with any of the policy problems in any real way that would end the lawlessness and end the belief by people around the world that if they can just come to the United States, particularly if they come as a young person, they will be allowed to stay. We have not acted to end this belief in any effective way.

It could easily be done. We do not need a law to fix that. We have looked at it. Some legal changes could help. But, first of all, the President needs to act.

The House is putting up some money. They are saying it has got to be used for some of the things that would be beneficial to ending this flow. But even then, we have seen the President does not have to use it and does not have to comply with their vision to end immigration into America.

So the President has set this up. He issued his amnesty documents, his policies, and encouraged more people to come to America. If he does this new Executive order amnesty, it would encourage more adults to come to America. It just will. It will weaken the moral authority of all our immigration laws. You cannot take these kinds of actions—as somebody who has been in law enforcement for a long time, you cannot take these actions and think there are not ramifications on them, that there are not impacts throughout the entire world and throughout the entire law enforcement community, for our ICE officers and our USCIS officers working every day dealing with hundreds of these cases.

You have to have clarity. You have to have integrity. You have to have consistency. You have to mean what you say. You cannot say: I am for strong borders, and I am for legal immigration, and then present a bill that is going to do nothing to change the path we are on. It is something I hope our people will look at and pay attention to it.

This bill is going to go down. It is not going to pass. It should not pass. It will be blocked. It will have no chance to pass in the House if it were to get out of the Senate. What I want to say to colleagues is: It is indicative of the lack of seriousness from the majority party when they produce such a poor piece of legislation.

I wish to remind my colleagues of one more thing. The only way the administration can run out of money is if it refuses to spend the money that is currently available to it for the border disaster. There is no law, no regulation preventing the administration from spending money in the current fiscal year. Even the bill they submitted to us, when it was examined, showed it only asked for \$25 million for this fiscal year, through September 30. So it is not the kind of crisis we have to rush

out and pass a bill today, tonight, or the country is going to shut down. They can reallocate funds. But what we need is, and what Congress needs to do as a representative of the American people, is to say: We are prepared to provide some money, but we need to know, Mr. President, that you are serious. We need to know, Mr. President, you are going to let your officers do their duty and not block them from doing their duty. We need to know, Mr. President, you are not, in a few weeks, going to issue a massive administrative amnesty to millions of people who will be given work permits to compete in America for any job that is out there—any job.

We need to know where you stand on this. We represent our people. We cannot just throw money at this problem, which is what this legislation does.

Let me take a moment to go back and discuss how we got here. We have had the current law basically in effect for a number of years: 5, 6, 7 years. We did not see a spike in entries of young people until the President issued an Executive order basically legalizing people of youth—up to 30 years of age—who came to America. That was seen around the world as an invitation for young people to come. They have come in extraordinary numbers, overwhelming our system.

In 2011, it was 6,000. This year it is going to be 90,000. What a huge surge that is. It should never have happened. Now we are reduced to being here in the Congress and having the President come to us demanding billions of dollars to fund this program and deal with the crisis his policies created. Because it is true, and has been true, the young people who come to America turn themselves in to the immigration officers, who then take them to the Health and Human Services officers and turn them over to them. They go out and find housing. That is why we have seen this all over the country. Find housing for them. Months go by, or, if anyone comes to pick them up, they are turned over to them. They do not inquire if they are legally here, those who come to pick them up. They expect no proof that they are related to the child.

Maybe it is a 17-year-old. Most of them are older teenagers who pick them up, and they are released on a permit or bail and they never show up. Nobody has the time or the numbers or the capacity to begin to go look and see why they didn't show up in court. But if we get a traffic ticket and don't show up in court in Alabama, California, Texas, somebody is coming after us.

This is the way the system is being collapsed in America today. It is just a tragedy. It breaks my heart. The American people have never approved of this.

So word got out and we had this surge, and now the President, without

any real plan to fix it, comes forward and says: Give me \$4 billion—the bill here I think is \$2.7 billion—without any clear commitment or proof that we have any plan or any commitment from his leadership to alter the dynamics of the situation we are in.

This is not acceptable. The bill before us now is not acceptable. It will not pass. It will not become law. We need to insist—the American people will continue to insist—that this Congress and this White House do their duty to make sure we have good, sound immigration laws and then ensure they are faithfully and fairly executed to serve the national interests of the United States.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am glad that people have decided to speak about immigration reform.

This body passed overwhelmingly—Republicans and Democrats joined together—a comprehensive immigration bill last year.

We did it after six hearings during which we received testimony from 42 witnesses. We had five markups and 37 hours of debate, often late into the night, over three weeks. There were 212 amendments, of which 136 were adopted, all but three of them on a bipartisan bases. Staff and Senators, Republicans and Democrats, worked together throughout that time, and the Senate, by a better than 2-to-1 margin, passed a comprehensive immigration bill. It was supported by people from the right to the left.

It went over to the other body. In the other body there were enough votes to pass it. And what happened? The Republican leadership said: No, we will not bring it up. And so it died there.

Today, faced with a surge of migrants from Central America, they are giving great speeches: Oh, my God. We have to do something about immigration. Why don't we do something about immigration? And then they blame Democratic President Obama.

My response is: What are you doing? They could have brought up the bill. We would be a lot better off had they brought it up and voted on it. Vote yes or vote no. That is what we are supposed to do. The Senate did that, and we passed it.

The Republican leadership is so afraid they might actually have to take a stand on immigration. They might actually have to vote yes or no. It is so much easier to do nothing, just to let it sit there and say: Oh, it must be President Obama's fault. Oh, it must be the Senate's fault. Oh, it must be somebody else's fault. Or maybe it is the fault of these 6- and 7-year-old children who are trying to escape being killed or molested, the 12-year-old girls who are afraid they are going to be raped by gangs, the 12-year-old boys

who are going to be forced into gangs or be shot in front of their families.

It is so much easier to say: This is terrible. It has to be President Obama's fault. Let's sue him.

What I say is: Why don't you have the courage to vote yes or no on the immigration bill we sent you?

I defy any one of them to go home during August and say: Oh, we have to do something about immigration. I hope people ask: How did you vote? Well, they didn't vote yes and they didn't vote no. They didn't vote at all.

I spoke in this Chamber earlier this month about the importance of living up to our own principles and traditions by addressing the influx of unaccompanied Central American children because it is a humanitarian crisis.

While there is no easy solution, the Border Supplemental Appropriations Bill offers a chance to make a down-payment on a strategy to address this crisis comprehensively, in accordance with our legal obligations and moral values.

The supplemental was described by the Appropriations Committee chairwoman Senator MIKULSKI yesterday. We know it is significantly different than the bill put forward by the House Republican leadership this week. The House bill provides \$1 billion less than the Senate to help unaccompanied children currently in the United States and \$700 million less to support the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice so they can effectively address this issue and adjudicate these children's cases appropriately.

There is nobody in this body or the other body, if they have children or grandchildren, who has to worry about them going hungry or has to worry about them living in fear every day. Let's get out of our ivory tower and pay attention to what is happening.

As I said earlier, the House ignored our bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill. Thirty pages of policy reforms included in the House supplemental and all it does is support their enforcement-only agenda to get rid of these children. Just throw them out. Let's pretend we have no responsibility. Send them back to face whatever horrors back home.

While many of these children and families don't qualify for international protection and would be better off not risking the dangerous journey, which the Senate bill seeks to address, many others have legitimate claims to protection because of the violence and persecution they have suffered in their home countries.

That is why this is a humanitarian issue. That is why we can't expect other countries with far fewer resources—such as Jordan or Turkey or Ethiopia—to accept far larger numbers of refugees from outside their borders if we are not willing to do our part.

The little country of Jordan is being overwhelmed by hundreds of thousands

of refugees from Syria. We say: Oh, thank you for doing that. Here we are talking about a tiny percentage compared to the size of our country. We say we want other countries to do this—but, gosh, the wealthiest, most powerful nation in the world can't. That's not who we are as Americans.

That is why it is unconscionable that the House on the one hand recognizes these Central American countries are among the most dangerous in the world, where gangs and other violent crime is taking a horrific toll on children and families. They will give speeches on that, but on the other hand they will say: However, that is their problem. Send these children back. Eight-year-old, you can fend for yourself against the gangs with machine guns. Go back, and do it as quickly as possible because we have to go on recess. We don't want to be bothered about you.

That is why it is also unacceptable that the House would pay for their misguided approach in part by cutting nearly \$200 million from other programs in the foreign aid budget, the very funding needed to help reduce poverty, corruption, and violence in Central America so children won't flee in the first place.

Critics of the administration want to point fingers, but blame games aren't going to solve this problem. There is no single cause. It didn't occur overnight. It has been building for years as drug cartels, responding to the insatiable demand for illegal drugs in the United States, have migrated to Guatemala and Honduras and El Salvador.

It is caused by members of Central American gangs, arrested and imprisoned in the United States and then deported, who have resumed their threats and extortion and killing sprees with a vengeance.

It is caused by abusive and corrupt police forces and judges and the failure of the Central American governments to address the lawlessness and impunity in their own countries.

It is caused by the lack of educational and employment opportunities that are among the reasons Central American youth join the gangs.

So let's not play politics over something as complex and deadly as this. Let's vote for the Senate supplemental. It includes the funding needed to begin addressing some of the contributing causes of the migration and leaves intact the important legal protections in the Trafficking Victims Protections Act.

The \$300 million in the State and foreign operations chapter of this bill requires a multiyear strategy to support the efforts of Central American governments to dismantle their criminal gangs and combat extortion, human smuggling and trafficking and domestic and sexual abuse, strengthen their social services, law enforcement, and

judicial systems, develop child welfare services, and expand programs in education and get rid of the barriers to economic growth and opportunity.

It also provides funds for public information campaigns to discourage potential migrants from making the perilous journey in the first place, and it includes provisions that will ensure vigorous oversight of the aid we provide.

The emergency spending in this supplemental is needed to respond urgently and responsibly to this crisis. It is about what we stand for as Americans. Let's uphold our Nation's longstanding tradition of providing a safe haven for refugees that is engraved in the Statue of Liberty, for the well-being of thousands who have fled violence and risked everything to arrive at our borders, and for the millions in Central America who live every day in fear. Let's give them some hope for a better life. Let's pass this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEAHY for his extraordinary leadership on this issue. He serves on the Appropriations Committee that has brought us this supplemental appropriation. He is also the chair of the Judiciary Committee.

I had the great privilege for a short period of time to serve on the Judiciary Committee—too short a period of time—and saw his extraordinary leadership. I know it was his committee that brought together an immigration reform bill that would have dealt with some of the major problems we have in our immigration system. Through great work we got that bill passed in the Senate over 1 year ago.

I find it somewhat ironic that in the House they are now talking about how they can change the immigration law while we have a bill that is over there. Pass our bill and it would go a long way toward helping this issue.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on immigration issues and his passion on the humanitarian issues we have before us.

I join Senator LEAHY, and I hope the majority of this membership will, in support of the emergency supplemental. I hope we can pass it today, and I hope our colleagues in the House will also pass it.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI, my colleague from Maryland, for her leadership as chair of the Appropriations Committee and bringing forward a supplemental appropriation that deals with the humanitarian crisis on our border.

We all know about the unaccompanied children on our border. In fiscal year 2014 it will equal 60,000. That is an extraordinary number. But let me make it clear. It is not because of border security issues that we have this

problem. When these children approach our border they say: We are here. They are not trying to sneak into the United States. They are trying to get to our country and then they turn themselves in. We know most are coming from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, and we know the circumstances in those three Central American countries.

First and foremost, the information they have about the transit and welcome in America is different than reality. The reality is that if children are transited to our border, they are very likely to be at great risk, great risk because of the traffickers who could very well abuse them—certainly very costly transit—and give them information that is not accurate about the laws of our country.

If they make it to our border, what happens is they are put in deportation. There is no right to enter America. We have to evaluate their circumstance. Those are our immigration laws.

First and foremost, we want to make sure the people of Honduras and El Salvador and Guatemala understand the risk factors and that their children should remain in their country.

But the root cause, as Senator LEAHY pointed out, is also the current circumstances in these three Central American countries. It is not safe. Too many young people have the choice to either join a gang of violence or themselves be victimized by violence. The economic circumstances in these three countries give little hope for an economic future for these children. It is in our interests to partner with all three of these countries to deal with the root causes of why parents would put their children in transit to our borders at great risk or why families would try to come to America and leave their native country.

So it is in our interests to deal with that, and the supplemental appropriations bill that is now on the floor provides \$300 million of help that we can use to deal with root causes in the Central American countries. We can make a difference.

I will give the dollars for one second. Three hundred million dollars might seem like a lot of money, but it is not the billions we need to take care of the problems on our border as a result of families sending their children to our border.

We can make a difference. Our development assistance programs work. They work. It is part of our national security. We understand that if we have stable countries, it provides a more stable relationship and strategic partnership with us and other countries, helping our national security interests, and we can make a difference.

Let me remind my colleagues that under President George W. Bush, in a bipartisan manner in 2003, we passed the PEPFAR law which dealt with HIV/

AIDS because we recognized the security of the world was being jeopardized by the spread of HIV/AIDS. And guess what. Our PEPFAR initiative made a huge consequential difference. Today the landscape is totally different than it was just a decade ago. That is because we, the United States, showed leadership.

We can show the same kind of leadership in dealing with the root problems in Central America that can make our hemisphere safer—and, by the way, help children and help children of the future who could help their country and help the global economy. We have programs in these countries. We have the Partnership for Growth as one example in El Salvador.

But we have to make it consequential. We have to make it consequential to get rid of these gangs, to give economic hope, to deal with good governance. The first step is in this supplemental appropriation that provides \$300 million of help to these countries. These children at the border require a humanitarian response from the United States.

I have the honor of chairing the U.S. Helsinki Commission. It is known for many things. It is known for standing up for human rights globally.

We have talked about America asking the international community to have open borders when there is instability in their community—most recently the problems in Syria. We thank the people of Turkey and the people of Jordan for having open borders so people can find safe havens. We had better take care of our issues at home first.

We have humanitarian responsibilities, and this supplemental appropriation takes care of that, with \$1.2 billion to help human services to deal with adequate shelter for these children so they are properly cared for. That is our responsibility; they have certain rights.

The majority will be returned to the host country in a safe manner, but there are many who are entitled to asylum. There are many who have been victimized by the traffickers and are in fear of their life and there is no safe option and have a right to expect our country to reach out in a humanitarian way to take care of their needs.

This supplemental takes care of that—with moneys for HHS, moneys for the Department of Justice—\$124 million to deal with the judges so we can handle these issues in a prompt manner—to deal with adequate legal representation.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my comments, yes, we have to improve our immigration laws. We have already done it. The bill from the Senate is at the House. All they have to do is take up our bill, pass it, and in a balanced way, representing I think not only the philosophical views of the Congress—which can be a challenge at times—but

representing the views of most Americans.

I hope we will support the supplemental bill. I might also add it provides \$615 million for wildfires in the West. We know that is an emergency, an urgent situation that needs to be dealt with. It provides help to our ally and friend Israel, \$225 million to replenish the missiles that have been used in Iron Dome to shoot down the missiles coming into Israel. It is a well-balanced supplemental. It represents the best interests of this country, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I know the Senate is now considering whether we should vote on the motion to proceed to the emergency supplemental bill. That means under our rules of another century we actually don't get to the bill. We have a debate or even have a filibuster on whether we should even move to the bill. It was designed to cool the passions of the time so the Senate could be the greatest deliberative body in the world. However, these procedures now have been distorted. We are no longer the greatest deliberative body in the world; we are the greatest delaying body in the world. Delay has become not only a tactic to come up with better ideas, delay has become an outcome unto itself.

We are facing a serious problem in our country, and I hope we would vote on the motion to proceed so we could actually get on the legislation for the urgent supplemental funding to deal with three crises facing our country, one of which is wildfires burning in the West, in which property, communities, and livelihoods are being destroyed and first responders are being exhausted. While they are being exhausted, local and State funds are being exhausted, along with the Forest Service of our own government.

We need to stand with our neighbors in these Western States because this is a calamity. The Presiding Officer was the mayor of a great city in New Jersey—Newark. He knows what happens when a hurricane hits the city and hits a State. He could tell me and I know he has spoken frequently about how New Jersey is still trying to recover from Sandy.

Well, the fires raging in the Western States are their hurricane. It is their

tornado. It is their Sandy. I hope we would pass the \$615 million to help our own fellow citizens in the 8 Western States.

Then we have a treasured ally that is under attack by a terrorist organization and needs to defend itself using technology called the Iron Dome. They defend themselves by shooting interceptor rockets. It is not an offensive rocket, shoot to kill, it is shoot to defend. They are using up these rockets at an unprecedented rate, and the Secretary of Defense sent a letter to the Congress asking for \$225 million to be able to replenish their arsenal.

We also have a crisis in Central America and the violence by the narco-traffickers—or the narcoterrorists—that is causing a surge of children to come into our country. I hope we will pass the legislation which will allow us to get the money that is needed to address that situation, and I will elaborate on that in a moment.

After all is said and done, I hope this will not be another day where more gets said than gets done. We need to respond to the needs that are presented to us.

I wish to talk about the children at this time. Much has been said on the floor about the current situation, and much has been said about President Obama's failed immigration policy; we need to give the National Guard police powers.

I am proud many Senators went down to the border. I myself went to the border. I went to see the situation, as chair of the Appropriations Committee. No. 1, I wanted to see if there was an urgent need; No. 2, what would it take to meet that need; and No. 3, how we can work together on a bipartisan basis to protect the children and protect our own country. Well, I got an eyeful, and I have to tell you about it.

I traveled with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of HHS, Secretary Burwell, down to the border. We went to the McAllen Border Patrol station. We also went to Lackland Air Force Base, where children are temporarily housed. I had the opportunity to meet with great Border Patrol agents, a wonderful faith-based organization that is caring for the children, and fantastic young lawyers from the University of Texas at Austin campus and St. Mary's Law School. The law students and professors are there to make sure the kids have legal services on a pro bono basis. They are doing it on their own time. We saw a lot. I also had a chance to talk to the children.

First, I will talk about the number of children. There was talk on the floor that made it sound as if we were under siege rather than facing a surge. I think there is a big difference between feeling as if we are under siege and facing a surge. As of this minute, we are talking about 60,000 children. That is a

lot of children, but if you went to Baltimore to the Ravens stadium, the Ravens stadium holds 60,000 people. We are not talking 600,000 or 6 million children; we are talking about 60,000 children. Maybe it will swell to 90,000 children. All 90,000 children could still fit in the new Dallas stadium.

We are talking about a number so small that it could fit into an American stadium.

We are a country with 300 million people. We can certainly deal with 60,000 children who are fleeing traffickers, drugs, and sexual slavery. Are we not big enough, tough enough, and strong enough to be able to deal with that? I think we are. If you could see what has been going on, you would know what I mean.

Let's talk about these 60,000 children. It is literally a children's March across Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, through Mexico, and coming up the Rio Grande. They are not coming across all 1,900 miles of the border. They are going to a specific area, and they are crossing the river on rafts, swimming, and doing whatever they can to get to the border.

It starts like this: The children either come on their own or they come because a smuggler or coyote brings them here. That means some mother, father, or aunt in the United States of America, making minimum wage, is scraping together the \$3,000 to \$5,000 the smuggler is charging to deliver—kind of like a FedEx or UPS for human beings—these children to the Rio Grande border. The violence is so bad that they are willing to trust a crook to bring the children to this country.

These children trek through a jungle, through filth and dirt and danger. They stop at what they call safe houses. That is an oxymoron; there is nothing safe about a safe house. There are children with all kinds of different people on that road. These people take advantage of the children. I won't describe it.

From this safe house, they finally make it to the border by a train called The Beast. The Beast is a cargo train. This is not a lovely train that goes up and down our coast from Boston to Savannah. This is a train called The Beast. The children ride on the top of these trains, holding and clutching to each other. I talked to a 9-year-old girl who said that she rode for 2 days and had to stay awake for 48 hours because she was worried about falling off and losing an arm or leg or death itself.

Why would children risk this? Why would parents risk this? It is because of the danger, danger, danger in Central America. We are talking about arming the border more. We need to go after these criminals and arm our law enforcement officers so they can fight the narco-traffickers in Central America. We need to deal with our insatiable appetite for drugs that fuels and is driving this movement.

When they send the children back, what are they going to send them back to? We are sending them back to countries that are recruiting boys to engage in criminal activity, and girls are recruited into human trafficking. It is not as though we are going to send them back on a plane and Juan Diaz will be there with yellow roses saying: Welcome back, children of Honduras and El Salvador. They will go back to the very danger from which they ran.

When I went to the McAllen Border Patrol station, which is really a detention facility—it was designed to detain adults—underline that word. It was designed to hold up to 300 people, usually illegal immigrants trying to cross the Rio Grande. These really look like cells. They are cement cinder block facilities that were designed to hold 10 or 12 adults, and they hold as many as 20 or 30 children who are sleeping on the floor.

The Border Patrol is doing the best they can. The Border Patrol is taking care of children because we can't move them to humanitarian facilities as the law requires. The children are taking turns sitting on a cement block to even be able to rest. There are 20 or 30 in a room sleeping on the floor and using empty water bottles for pillows. They have blankets that look like aluminum foil. These are the lucky ones. They are able to come in from the overfilled outdoor area, where the boys are often put in a covered area where they sleep outside. The girls can be "inside," but they are in these holding cells. They have very limited showers and very limited hygiene.

The Border Patrol is doing everything they can. It is not something we are used to seeing in the United States.

I know there is another codel going to the border. Go, go, go, go. Go and see this.

I talked to a 12-year-old girl. She was in charge of bringing her 6-year-old sister to the border. Their parents sent them here to escape the gang violence. The mother told the older girl to watch out for her younger sister. They said to her: Don't let her out of your sight until you get to America, and then try to get to your aunt.

I talked to a 15-year-old girl from Honduras. Both of her parents had been killed by gang violence. She worked in a restaurant to save enough money to pay the coyote. It took her 2 months to get to the United States. She escaped violence along the route to get here.

Are you going to send her back? Are you going to send the 6-year-old back? Wow.

I then had the opportunity to see what the conditions were like for these children. If you talk to the border law enforcement agents, they want to be law enforcement guys. Gee, are they terrific. They know the surge at the border has been caused by the criminal activity here. They talked openly

about it. There are seven organized crime syndicates that are sparking a lot of this. They know about the false recruitment of young people who are promised a new way and new day to get to the United States of America. They know about that, and they want to be able to do what they were hired to do—law enforcement. But in order for them to be able to do what they need to do, we have to have the facilities for the children to be housed, clothed, and fed while their legal status is being determined under the law.

I went up to Lackland Air Force Base. The children are being cared for in unused dormitories that once housed our Air Force. We have new facilities for our enlisted personnel. Did you know we pay for that? The Department of Health and Human Services has to pay the Department of Defense to house those children. It is on a military base with all the rules and regulations associated with that. It is the most expensive housing we have, but it is the best housing we have right now because of this rejectionist fear that is being promulgated through our country that somehow or other these children pose a danger to us. It is the best we can do.

I will say that it is a very nice facility. It is operated by a faith-based organization, the Baptist Conference. My hat is off to them. I speak now as a professionally trained social worker. It is one of the most outstanding child welfare service organizations I have seen, from the nurses to the social workers.

They are doing a fabulous job, but they are under a contract. Although they are a voluntary, faith-based organization, they are being compensated for their time and services because that is what we should do. We want to be able to use such groups all over America. What was so heartwarming to me was that Catholic Charities, based in Oklahoma, came to Texas to see what the Baptists were doing because they were getting ready to take care of the kids. That is the American way—Catholic Charities learning from the Baptists.

They were all concentrating on the welfare of the children. They know these are all children in God's eyes and should be treated with dignity.

I then talked to the legal services people—the lawyers, law professors, law students from the University of Texas at Austin and St. Mary's College. The services they were providing were on their own time and their own dime. They are using their money and their summer vacation to help these children. There was no compensation, even for expenses, so they could begin the interview process to determine if any of these children had the opportunity to voluntarily return home. It is clear the coyotes misled them.

Well, we can't keep doing this on this emergency patchwork basis. We need

the urgent supplemental, No. 1, to help Homeland Security's law enforcement and help Health and Human Services. They need to crack this backlog, and they need to be able to place these children in a proper facility. They need to determine if they have a right to refugee status.

Even when you have volunteer legal services such as the outstanding work I saw in Texas—outstanding. I know the Presiding Officer is a lawyer and would have been proud of these volunteers and the way they were responding to these children. They also offered bilingual services. They need more help, for example, from paralegals.

They need help to pay for the backlog of cases. We need to make sure we have enough immigration judges.

There is so much myth, so much misinformation, and so much distortion out there that I am afraid we will end this day and still not have had a vote to proceed to the urgent supplemental. Debate it, discuss it, and then let's vote on it or else it will languish.

As a social worker, I want to say that what I have seen these children go through is unimaginable. They have come here to escape violence and death. They deserve to be treated with compassion and integrity, and they deserve for us to do our job. Anyone who thinks we should just deport these children without giving them every right afforded them under our law should go down to McClellan and look into their eyes and listen to their stories.

The time to act is now. Let's put together a comprehensive program, and I believe we can meet this surge, deal with the root cause, and be able to function in a way in which we are all proud.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

MR. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Internet has been possibly the most significant force driving our economy over the past 16 years. It is clearly this century's shipping lane and history's most powerful communications tool. Part of the reason the Internet has revolutionized American life is that it has been protected from discriminatory taxation, thanks to the Internet Tax Freedom Act, first enacted 16 years ago.

This law, as we might expect, is extraordinarily popular among the American people, and it has obviously been of enormous importance to the millions of families and businesses that use the Internet each day.

However, in a few short months the Internet Tax Freedom Act is set to expire. If it does, millions of American Internet users could face multiple and discriminatory taxes from thousands of state and local tax collectors around the country. That cannot be allowed to happen. Congress needs to come together on a bipartisan basis and say

clearly: Don't hit the Internet with discriminatory taxation.

Sixteen years ago I was the author of the Internet Tax Freedom Act, along with our former Republican colleague, Congressman Chris Cox. Along with our colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, and 52 bipartisan cosponsors, I am the author of the pending bill that would make that protection permanent. I believe if we were able to hold a vote on our bill today, it would pass with overwhelming support. Unfortunately, that is not a political reality. Yet the clock keeps ticking toward expiration.

Protecting the Internet and every Internet user in our country ought to be a matter that takes precedence over politics and partisanship. The Senate can move this short-term extension today while the Senate works on a bipartisan basis to deal with the issues raised by those who believe that allowing localities to collect taxes across the country is more important than a ban on discriminatory taxation.

I hope the Senate will join me in supporting the temporary extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act as a bridge to permanent legislation.

To reflect very briefly for a minute, we thought this law would work well 16 years ago. To describe what triggered my interest, 16 years ago, when I was a young Member of this body and I had a full head of hair and rugged good looks, we would hear for example about how if someone bought the newspaper—the online edition of the paper—they would face a stiff tax in some jurisdictions, but if they bought the snail mail edition they wouldn't face the tax. Democrats and Republicans coming together said that is discriminatory. That is discriminating against technology, against the future, against the promise of the Internet.

We thought this proposal would work well. It is quite clear. We just have to make sure what we do online is not more burdensome and an endeavor that involves more taxes than what we do offline. That is what the bill has been all about. So we thought it would be promising, but it has far exceeded our expectations in terms of what it has done to promote innovation and for small businesses and others who don't have political action committees and don't have big lobbies advocating for them. Ensuring they are not hammered by multiple and discriminatory taxes by thousands of localities has been a lifeline in terms of their being successful.

I could take more time this morning. We have colleagues and of course many matters still to deal with before we leave. I hope that given this history, which has been a bipartisan history—I so enjoyed working with our former colleague Chris Cox on this legislation 16 years ago. My take is that the overwhelming number of Senators would

like to permanently reauthorize this ban on multiple and discriminatory taxes on the Internet today, and that is what Senator THUNE and I have sought to do in our legislation, which has more than half of the Senate cosponsoring it. That is not possible today. But what is possible is that we act now so we don't bump up against that deadline that if reached our small businesses are subject—we have more than 5,000 taxing jurisdictions, and if even a small number of them were to inflict discriminatory taxes on Internet commerce, that would be a big blow in a fragile economy.

So for purposes of the temporary extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act as a bridge to permanent legislation, let us say loudly and clearly that we as a body—we as the U.S. Senate—are not going to hammer the Internet with multiple and discriminatory taxes.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today to urge support for a successful veterans health care program that will be extended if we pass this bipartisan package of Veterans Affairs reforms.

My colleague across the aisle Senator HELLER and I have joined to introduce legislation to extend the Assisted Living Program for Veterans with Traumatic Brain Injury, or AL-TBI, and give it the kind of support veterans with these severe brain injuries deserve.

I am grateful for the leadership of Senator HELLER and his partnership on this very important critical issue. I am proud to work with him, and I am hopeful all of our colleagues will join to pass the bipartisan package of VA reforms which now includes our legislation.

I thank Senator SANDERS, Ranking Member BURR, along with Senators MCCAIN, PRYOR, MURKOWSKI, LANDRIEU, JOHANNES, and BALDWIN for joining with us in this important effort.

This program places veterans suffering from moderate to severe traumatic brain injury, or TBI, in privately run facilities where they receive 24-hour team-based attention.

These are our veterans who stood for us, who answered the call to service, who went into harm's way, and have suffered traumatic brain injury, who now need to get the kind of care and attention they deserve.

They are immersed in this therapy that helps them with their movement, their memory, their speech, their gradual community integration. That last point is actually the key. This program does not just prepare veterans for transition from one health care setting to another health care setting; it is about giving them the practical skills they need to return to their communities and live independently.

That is what is so special about this program.

This is the kind of innovative work that Senator HELLER stands for in his community and I in New Jersey and that all of our veterans across the country should have. Congress should support this kind of work more often.

This past week I had the opportunity to visit a facility in Plainsboro, NJ—one of several facilities using this program. While I was there, I spoke with an incredible veteran named Gary.

Gary first enlisted in the military and completed his tour in the Navy after graduating from high school. Then 9/11 happened, and Gary stood up, reenlisted, this time with the National Guard, and served in Iraq.

During his time there he suffered a traumatic brain injury. Upon return home, Gary was confined to a wheelchair and the doctors told him he would never ever walk again. But then he began treatments through this program that Senator HELLER, myself, and others are trying to extend.

Now, because of this program, Gary can walk again. He, himself, and his family called it a miracle. He is now using a cane. When he is indoors he can walk without assistance.

Gary's sister told me that before receiving this unique care through the program, Gary was very negative, often depressed, often angry. But now that he has made progress, Gary's whole attitude has changed. He is more than upbeat. He is social and enjoys cooking. In fact, he offered to cook me a meal, which, I say to Senator HELLER, as a bachelor, I take all the meals I can get.

Another veteran named Duane sustained a traumatic brain injury in 2003 while serving our country in the Navy. Unable to live independently or get around without the aid of a wheelchair, this gentleman, this honorable veteran, who was not even 25 years old, found himself living in a nursing home alongside a population many decades his senior.

In 2011, through this program in our legislation, his life was changed. He moved into a specialized facility in New Jersey, where he still lives today and receives a range of treatments, including physical, occupational, speech therapies, as well as psychological counseling and residential assistance.

He is making incredible progress. I saw it with my own eyes, heard it from his family and his care workers. He has

actually also traded his wheelchair for a cane and manages a regime of his own chores, adding more dignity to his already exemplary life of courage. He has an active social life. He has friends and comrades, and he believes he has a country that has been there for him when he is in need.

These are the heroes who stepped up to serve our country when we needed them most, and now it is our responsibility to serve them with the extension of this incredible program.

This program means independence for these veterans with severe brain injuries. We cannot cut their or any other veterans' care short. This is a cost of war. We should not just be there to spend resources when we are sending them off; we should be there with open arms and support when we are welcoming them home.

The VA now offers no alternative program to the one I have described—no alternative program—that provides the same kind of comprehensive, rehabilitative, long-term care in a residential setting. These brave men and women who are benefiting from this specialized care were willing to put their lives on the line for our country. It should not be an option; it should be our obligation to take care of them when they return home.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Senate to do their duty, to pass this reform package, and extend this life-changing program.

I want to again thank Senator HELLER.

If I may yield to him, he has been a stalwart partner, a leader on this issue. I have been encouraged by this opportunity to work together with him. I am only disappointed that he would not shave his head, as I have. That would have shown true bipartisan camaraderie. But despite that, I look forward to his continued leadership on issues for our veterans, and now I look forward to his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, let me begin, if I may, by thanking my friend and colleague, Senator BOOKER, for partnering with me on this critical piece of legislation that helps our Nation's veterans, especially those suffering from traumatic brain injuries. I would urge him to participate in that meal from that veteran. I assure the Senator that in this city where the food is so rich, he will probably find the meal much healthier—much healthier. I know that is important to the Senator. Having said that, I know that Senator BOOKER and I have always viewed veterans issues to be truly a bipartisan issue. I am pleased we were able to work together and we were able to accomplish this work as partners.

I would also like to applaud my other colleagues, Senators SANDERS, MCCAIN, and BURR, for their work on the con-

ference report, and also House Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman MILLER and the rest of the conference members for reaching an agreement to ensure that Congress keeps its promise to our Nation's veterans.

The conference committee's bill is a good start to address problems with appointment wait times, VA scheduling practices, accountability, and overall quality of care provided at VA's medical facilities.

As my colleague Senator BOOKER discussed, there is a very critical provision in the conference report legislation that he and I took a lead on addressing; and that is the extension of the Assisted Living Program for Veterans with Traumatic Brain Injury. I applaud my friend. I applaud my colleague for the ability and the opportunity to work together. So I thank him for that.

As a member of the Senate Veterans Affairs' Committee, I was eager to resolve this issue because of its impact on Nevada's and our Nation's veterans, and together we were proud partners.

This program operates in two locations in Nevada and serves wounded warriors who are trying to restore their quality of life.

As the battlefield has changed over the years, so have the injuries that servicemembers and veterans sustain, including traumatic brain injuries. TBI is a complicated injury to treat because the effects can be both mental and physical—from headaches, dizziness, and irritation, all the way to speech difficulties, visual impairment, loss of memory, and severe depression.

Every traumatic brain injury is different, which is why some veterans need more advanced care to rehabilitate and regain their full independence.

That is why Congress created the assisted living TBI pilot program in 2008. Under that program, veterans can access a full range of rehabilitation services in a residential setting, including physical therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy, and other activities to prepare veterans to return home and live a productive life.

When I found out the program would be expiring and the VA was prepared to start kicking veterans out, I teamed up with Senator BOOKER to introduce legislation to extend authorization of this program for another 3 years.

At a time when the VA is facing a health care crisis and access to timely care, it would have been unacceptable to let this critical program expire, leaving veterans in Nevada without a comparable alternative to treating this serious injury.

I wish to thank the conference committee for listening to us when we expressed the urgency of extending this program so veterans could continue receiving residential rehabilitation. I am also pleased the conference committee provided a 3-year extension so veterans

can have the certainty that this program will remain in place for the next few years.

I also wish to thank Representative CASSIDY from Louisiana for his work in pushing this issue in the House of Representatives, as well as the veterans service organizations that fought alongside of us for this extension. It is our responsibility in Congress to ensure veterans across this Nation receive timely and quality care from the Veterans' Administration. Senator BOOKER and I share this commitment.

I am pleased we were able to work together to get our legislation into the final compromise. As the Senate prepares to vote on final passage of this critical VA reform bill, I hope my colleagues recognize the importance of this compromise bill at a time when veterans are losing faith in the VA system and need certainty that Congress will be there to provide oversight, accountability, and legislative action to approve the care they receive from the Nation they sacrificed for and served.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. REED. Madam President, I come to the floor today to once again press for action on my bipartisan legislation to restore emergency unemployment benefits. Over 3.5 million Americans have lost benefits since the program expired last December. The need to help these individuals, their families, and the economy remains compelling to all of us.

In April, Senator HELLER and I were able to draft a bipartisan bill, and with the help of many of our colleagues, the Senate acted to restore these benefits. Unfortunately, the House Republican leadership has refused to take up the Senate-passed bill or consider their own proposal. While the President has occasionally talked a good game about the need to extend this aid to job seekers, it has never been made a "must have" by the administration. Indeed, it is hard to understand why an extension of these benefits was not included in the President's supplemental appropriations request.

So as we consider this supplemental appropriations bill this week, which includes critically important emergency funding measures, it is somewhat disheartening that extending unemployment insurance, another emergency need, has once again been ignored.

In the past 6 months, the national unemployment rate has dropped from 6.7 to 6.1 percent. The long-term unemployment rate has dropped just below 2

percent. It is great to see these positive strides in our economy. But I strongly disagree with those who would argue that these signs of improvement suggest that emergency benefits are no longer needed. Let me underscore a few reasons why emergency unemployment benefits are still necessary.

First, while the long-term unemployment rate has dropped from 2.3 percent in January to just under 2 percent in June, the current level is still significantly higher than at any other point when emergency benefits were allowed to expire. In June 2008, under President George W. Bush, when the long-term unemployment rate was just 1 percent, a supermajority of Members in both Chambers voted to create emergency unemployment insurance benefits for the long-term unemployed. That was at 1 percent.

Now we are about twice that. Today our long-term unemployment rate of about 2 percent means over 3 million Americans are out of work through no fault of their own, and have been searching for work for more than 6 months. These individuals are struggling. With each passing month, their financial situation becomes increasingly dire. They should not be held to a different standard than those who were searching for work in 2008.

Second, the long-term unemployed are still struggling mightily to find work. According to a recent report by economists at the Federal Reserve, when you look at the likelihood that someone will find a job in a given month, the rate for the long-term unemployed is roughly the same as it was at the height of the great recession several years ago. In fact, someone who is long-term unemployed is almost twice as likely to stop looking for work altogether and fall out of the labor force as they are to get a job.

These difficulties in finding work are persistent across educational levels and age groups, although they are much more pronounced among the African-American and Latino communities. So we are seeing people who are trying very hard to find work but they are facing the same obstacles they were facing at the height of the great recession.

Again, I think this underscores the need to help these people. Some have argued that the improvement in the labor market is driven by Congress's failure to extend emergency benefits. According to this argument, taking away unemployment insurance benefits pushes people to step up their job search. I find this argument very difficult to accept when you face people back in my home State of Rhode Island who have been looking desperately, in a situation where there are usually three, four, five, six applicants, in some cases, for every job. They are looking and looking and looking. In Rhode Island, our unemployment rate is tied for

the highest in the Nation. It is not the position we want to be in.

To suggest that these people are not desperately searching for work really sort of, I think, demeans them unnecessarily. We all know, because we go home. There are people who have been looking. They are skilled. They are talented. They have worked for 20 years. They want to work. Getting the \$300 a week, perhaps, in benefits is nothing like the salary they commanded. It will not, in the long term, pay for their mortgage, pay for their children's education, pay for the necessities of life. They know that. They are in a desperate situation. This assistance helps a little bit.

Not only the contact we have with our constituents but recent research also demonstrates that this argument is flawed, that "just cut off the benefits and everybody goes right back to work."

We can use North Carolina to test the impact of cutting benefits, because that State took steps in July 2013 to terminate unemployment benefits for anyone who has been out of work for 20 weeks or more. If opponents of extending unemployment insurance are correct, North Carolina's policy change should have led to significantly sharp declines in its unemployment rate.

A recent article in the *New York Times* by Justin Wolfers, an economist with the University of Michigan and the Brookings Institution, explores evidence from North Carolina to assess this claim. According to his research, when North Carolina is compared with other Southern States that did not cut their programs, North Carolina's economic growth "looks quite similar to its peers, and certainly not better." The levels of job growth in North Carolina are similar to neighboring States such as South Carolina that did not change their programs. Dr. Wolfers concludes that, "There's simply no evidence . . . that cutting benefits cuts unemployment."

Others have argued that cutting UI at the State level will save money and help the economy of the States. In response, eight States decreased the number of weeks an individual could receive State-level unemployment insurance benefits. However, a recent report from the Economic Policy Institute suggests these States did not save significant amounts of money or boost employment. This is further evidence that cutting UI benefits is simply not a good idea.

The refusal by House Republicans to renew unemployment insurance benefits does not just hurt individuals and families for each week they do not get this modest support. The effects are more far reaching, with research suggesting that the long-term unemployed will be hurt for decades to come.

According to research by a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank

of Boston, "workers unemployed for more than 26 weeks experience a much larger negative income effect and have lower earnings even after 10 or 15 years than those workers that experienced shorter-duration unemployment spells."

Many are forced to rack up debt on their credit cards just to meet basic level needs.

A recent Gallup poll also shows that nearly 20 percent of individuals who were unemployed for 12 months have been treated for depression. This is a serious blow not just to your economic well-being but to your identity, to your sense of worth, to your sense of being able to help your family and provide for your family. These effects are long term and very serious.

This rate of depression is twice as high as for those who have been unemployed for just a few weeks. So there is, apparently, a correlation.

The impact is far-reaching for individuals, their families, and the economy as a whole. It undercuts, again, the notion that there is no cost or that there is some benefit to cutting these benefits. There is a long-term cost.

One of the aspects too, is in order to qualify for these benefits, you have to be actively searching for work. Without these benefits, the incentive to look for work is, in some respects, diminished. Indeed, other phenomena take place: the lack of resources, the increasing desperation and depression.

Again, it is encouraging to see that there are signs of economic improvement. It is encouraging to see that some of the long-term unemployed have found jobs. We dipped below that 2-percent level.

But that does not mean we should turn our backs on those who are still looking. That does not mean we should treat them differently than we did people in 2008 in the same position in a difficult economy looking for work. Those of us who continue to fight for the long-term employed—I must also say that Senator HELLER in this effort has been a stalwart. We have heard lots of excuses and a lot of discussion, in my view, of flawed arguments about how we should abandon the program, and, more pointedly, abandon these people. I don't think we should.

What is certain in terms of analysis is the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that our failing to renew this program last December will cost over the course of this year 200,000 jobs. And this emergency aid helps families make ends meet until they find work.

One of the great ironies here is that in refusing to extend these benefits, we basically shut down 200,000 jobs in this country. It is almost absurd. It is a catch-22: We are shutting the doors on the unemployed so we can get them to work, but yet the analysts will tell us that if we had extended benefits, we would have gained 200,000 jobs.

Why? Because these payments go right back into the economy. Someone who is unemployed is going to take that modest check, about \$300, \$350, and pay the phone bill so they can call about work, they are going to get the car repaired so they can get to the job interview, and they are going to do the things they have to do to help their children get through the day. They are not going to save it or buy French impressionist paintings. They are going to go right into the local economy and spend the money.

For many reasons this is why I think we have to do it. That is why Senator HELLER and I have filed an amendment to this emergency appropriations bill, on a bipartisan basis. The amendment will be the same as we have proposed previously, except for offsets, because for the second time offsets we have identified to pay for an extension of benefits have been used for another measure. I guess we must take some satisfaction that we have developed offsets for restoring emergency unemployment insurance and then another program grabs them and it gets passed here. But I would rather have the extension of benefits too.

So we are moving forward. I hope we can. I am committed to fighting for these American workers so they won't be left behind now and in the years to come.

Madam President, I encourage my colleagues to join us.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to talk about the crisis at our southern border and the need for unified action to deal with it and the need to come together on a commonsense enforcement approach that undoubtedly will need some additional resources, but also clearly demand some changes to the current law so we may quickly deal with the need to quickly deport folks illegally coming over our Mexican border back to their home country.

In the case of alien children, we need to get them out of the hands of criminal gangs and reunite them with their families in their home country. That is an obvious need in the eyes of the American people. I think a vast majority of Americans realize we need that sort of approach which starts with much better enforcement of our southern border, and, yes, if people do get across, they need to quickly deal with their situation and quickly and effec-

tively deport them. That is the approach we need. Sadly, that is not what the President has proposed, and that is not what HARRY REID is even allowing us to vote on on the Senate floor.

For a couple of weeks, at least, after this crisis hit the first page of the newspaper, President Obama constantly pointed to those parts of the law that he said tie his hands in terms of quickly and effectively deporting some of these individuals. He pointed to the 2008 changes of the law over and over and over again. The problem is that a couple of weeks after that—when he actually sent a proposal to Congress to deal with the crisis—any mention of that was gone. There was no suggestion of any change in the law in that regard or any other regard. The only request he made was for \$3.7 billion—a huge amount of additional money. The great majority of that money is to feed, house, and relocate these illegal aliens, including unaccompanied alien children, within our own country.

The problem with that is it will encourage this flow of illegal immigrants into our country and this problem will continue to grow. It will not discourage it and it will not end it. We need that comprehensive approach—including necessary changes to the law and enforcement—to quickly deport these folks to their home countries and reunite them with their families.

In the absence of the President leading us in that regard, I came up with my own legislation. I introduced it in the Senate, and I have now introduced it as a floor amendment to the spending bill which Senator REID is bringing to the Senate floor. It would change the aspects of the law that we need to change in order to streamline the process and allow us to quickly deport individuals within 72 hours so they can be safely reunited with their families in their home country. That is the only thing that will stem this increased tide, this increasing flow, and this increasing problem.

There has also been a lot of debate about the resources that are necessary and the increased spending that is clearly necessary. But before we pass the President's proposal, we need to marry it with these enforcement measures and these changes to the law. We need to pay for that enforcement and deportation and not simply pay to feed and house these illegal aliens within our country. We need to actually relocate them to other places within our country with no foreseeable end in sight. We can't do that unless we get the right enforcement measures.

I also have suggestions on how we can help pay for whatever increased enforcement, border security, and quick deportation we need. I have two suggestions in particular. I have two specific bills which I introduced some time ago in the Senate. I introduced

each of these bills this week as amendments to the spending bill that HARRY REID is bringing to the Senate floor.

One is S. 1176, which is a freestanding bill, but I also introduced it as a floor amendment. It is called the Remittance Status Verification Act of 2013. What is this about? This is about remittances by illegal aliens in this country and how they are sending money back to families and others in their home country.

The GAO—which is a respected non-partisan organization—previously noted that the United States is the largest remittance-sending country in the world, with the majority of funds being sent to Latin America and the Caribbean and substantial amounts of money also being sent to Asia and Africa.

In the past 10 years the total number of international remittances has increased by 8 percent in 2013, and is expected to grow 10.1 percent in 2014 and 10.7 percent in 2015. It is reaching an astronomical number. In 2015, it will be over half a trillion dollars.

If folks are working in this country legally, that is fine. We don't want to hassle them or make any problems for them. But, clearly, a significant portion of the folks we are talking about are here illegally and working illegally. That is wrong, and we need the legislation I am proposing to fix that, with four important goals in mind.

First of all, we need to see if the folks who are sending these remittances are here illegally; second, we need to ensure U.S. taxpayer fairness; third, we need to address inaccurate U.S. data on remittances and collect all the facts; and, fourth, we need to make sure that illegal aliens who are receiving U.S. benefits are—we need to see if they are remitting higher amounts abroad.

My legislation would address all of these goals and would fundamentally get a handle on the situation and make sure that those who are not in this country legally pay a substantial fee, and that fee would be used on border security and other immigration enforcement. That could grow a significant amount of revenue specifically dedicated to border and other enforcement.

The second proposal I have is in the form of other freestanding legislation, which I also introduced this week as a Senate floor amendment for the supplemental appropriations bill. It is about child tax credits. This amendment addresses a clear loophole in the IRS code that allows illegal aliens to access income-tax-based benefits, such as the child tax credit and the additional child tax credit.

According to the Treasury Department's inspector general—again, this is not some partisan Republican source, it is the Obama administration's inspector general for Treasury. They

issued a report recently that said \$4.2 billion—with a B—is sent each year to folks who are probably here illegally and do not qualify under these programs. We send them a check, a refundable tax credit, and it costs the taxpayers \$4.2 billion.

As the inspector general has said, there is a pretty simple way to fix this by requiring a valid Social Security number or other appropriate identification number. This approach is straightforward, it is simple, and it will fix the problem. It would cut down the \$4.2 billion—with a B—worth of spending that we are sending improperly and illegally to largely illegal aliens and illegal alien families. We can use those resources, instead, on enforcement.

Those are simply two specific suggestions that I filed this week in the form of Senate floor amendments that could help raise the additional resources we need to address this issue.

Again, I want to emphasize that we need to do a number of things, and it is not all about throwing money at the situation, particularly when most of that money under President Obama's proposal is simply to house and feed these folks who are here illegally and then distribute them throughout the country for an indefinite period of time. Fundamentally, we need to marry that with real enforcement measures, including those addressed and listed in my bill. I hope we take that approach. I hope Senator REID allows that debate and allows those votes. Right now he is lying across the tracks. The only thing he is allowing a vote on is this spending measure which just gives the President a blank check. That will not solve the problem. That is not the correct response. We need to do all of the things, broadly speaking, I have laid out. I hope we do that and come together—as, in fact, the American people have—around my common-sense approach with a clear consensus.

I thank the Presiding Officer, relinquish the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to speak about health insurance. We notice that nationally and back in our States, the angst over the Affordable Care Act—often derisively referred to as ObamaCare—has subsided. In part, that has occurred because more people are being covered. As a matter of fact, in the first tranche of signups of people who did not have insurance, over 8 million people—which exceeded the goal of 7 million—by the time the

cutoff came for signing earlier this year, over 8 million people had signed up. And that was just a narrow population of those who wanted insurance but could not afford it. Then they had it available through the State exchanges or the Federal exchange in the States.

Another part of the population that did not have health care was people who were actually in a low-income situation; therefore, there was no chance they could afford it. That is why we expanded Medicaid in the Affordable Care Act to up to 138 percent of poverty, which is a very low level of income. I believe, if I remember correctly, for a family of four, it is somewhere around \$32,499 of annual income. Well, we can imagine that with a family of four, people can't even think about having the money to provide health insurance with that kind of limited income, and that brings them up to 138 percent of poverty.

The only part of the Affordable Care Act, since it was declared by the Supreme Court as constitutional—the only part that was struck down as unconstitutional was the part of the law that was mandating upon the States to expand Medicaid, which is funded by a State and Federal joint program, up to 138 percent. So it made it voluntary. Well, half of the States have expanded it and about half of the States have refused, such as my State of Florida. The Republican Governor and the Republican legislature, not wanting to have anything to do with what they were condemning as ObamaCare, refused to expand Medicaid in Florida and thereby refused to give health care to a population, if my colleagues can believe this, of 1.2 million people in Florida—people who would have had health care but do not get it because the State legislature and the Governor refused to raise the level.

By the way, that was taking Floridians' Federal taxpayer dollars of 51 billion over the next several years that were allocated for that purpose and refusing to accept them for the health care of poor Floridians, over 1 million people. That seems unconscionable.

This stuff is so complicated. People don't realize that in large part that is, in fact, what happened over the course of the last two legislative sessions—that they could have expanded health care in Florida, and it is Floridians' tax dollars they are giving away instead of letting that apply to health care for Floridians.

Nationwide, if I recall correctly, it was somewhere around another 6.7 million people were brought on with the expansion of Medicaid even though States such as Florida were refusing to expand it, and that is in addition to getting health care to those who could afford it with subsidies or because of better rates could afford it in the first place. That was a group of another 8 million.

We can see we are starting to chip away at that group of people in the country who had no health care because they had no health insurance. Yet, when they got sick, where did they end up? They ended up in the emergency room. They couldn't pay. Of course, now it was an emergency because they had no preventive health care. And since they couldn't pay, who do my colleagues think pays? All the rest of us pay in our insurance premiums. It is estimated that in a State such as Florida, for the average family health insurance policy, people are paying upwards of \$800 to \$1,000 of their premiums per year just to take care of the group who ended up in the emergency room because they didn't have any health care. That is part of what the Affordable Care Act was intended to do.

Another part of the Affordable Care Act was to save Medicare from going into bankruptcy. Back in the early part of the last decade, we passed a nice-sounding law called the prescription drug bill. As its name suggests, it was to provide prescription drugs for senior citizens. Omitted in the explanation of it was that not only were people paying premium prices that the government had always gotten as a discount, but now the government was paying a premium price with no discount for all the drugs under Medicare. But a part of that was setting up Medicare being delivered by an insurance company with a fancy name called Medicare Advantage.

Always before, if we were going to deliver Medicare through a health maintenance organization—an HMO, which is an insurance company—one would expect it would bring the costs down per person. That is how it started out—about 95 percent of the per-person cost in Medicare, regular Medicare fee-for-service. But, no, in the prescription drug bill, this was turned upside down. Now they were going to offer Medicare through an HMO, but the reimbursement from Medicare was going to be 14 percent above Medicare fee-for-service per person, reimbursed to the insurance company at 114 percent of Medicare fee-for-service. As a result of that, Medicare was going broke.

That was another reason for the ACA—to stop Medicare from going broke by winnowing down that 14 percent and giving incentives to the insurance companies to do what ought to be the goal, which was quality of care instead of just paying a dollar percentage value per patient. Thus, we have the re-created Medicare Advantage, and it is being rated on its quality so that seniors can vote with their feet by going to the better rated insurance plans in Medicare Advantage.

Why am I retracing all of this? To get to this point: For this next round of Medicare Advantage, we are just getting to the point of having the insurance companies announce their rates.

Some of them are going to go up. Some of them are going to go down.

But I want the people of Florida to know that 2 years ago in their State legislature they took away the legal power of the insurance commissioner of Florida to approve the rate hikes. They took that away. I happen to understand something about this. Before I came to the Senate, I was the elected insurance commissioner of Florida, and I jealously guarded the ability to approve rate increases and decreases in order to protect the insurance consumer. The Florida Legislature stripped that ability of the insurance commissioner—now appointed, not elected—in Florida. Therefore, if they see rate hikes for Medicare Advantage in this next round just about to be announced—they took the ability of the State regulator to limit the rate hikes. That sounds unconscionable. It certainly does. Every year insurance companies are going to try to raise their rates. It is the job of a State regulator to regulate what happens to those rates. So the Florida Legislature last year passed senate bill 1842, and one of the things it did is it stripped the Office of Insurance Regulation of one of its chief responsibilities—regulating health insurance rates. That is after Florida had had some of the strongest laws governing insurance, and that was the case when I was insurance commissioner 15 years ago, where I could not only approve rates but I could reject rate increases.

Well, we saw this at the time a year ago. I contacted the Governor and urged him to veto the bill, but, sadly, it is the law of Florida. Therefore, that is why I come to the floor today, because I am disappointed in the news reports that are starting to say that these rate increases in Florida are being blamed on the Affordable Care Act. They are being blamed on ObamaCare.

Well, the insurance commissioner used to have an opportunity to look at those rates and say they were not right and to stop those rate increases or to give a rate increase that was actuarially sound. Not any more. There were a lot of other things that had been done in our State of Florida to stop the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. First of all, our State refused to accept a planning grant in order to get ready for the Affordable Care Act before it was ever starting to be implemented.

I have already told you about refusing to expand Medicaid to cover more than an additional million people in Florida who otherwise would not get health care.

What was the purpose of the ACA other than trying to save Medicare—which it has done—financially from disaster? It was to help make insurance coverage available and affordable. There were provisions in there, technical terms like “medical loss ratio,”

that said that an insurance company had to give 80 percent of the premium dollar back in health care instead of giving it off to CEOs’ salaries and executive perks; and if they did not, what the insurance company had to do—if they did not get 80 percent of the premium dollar back in health care to the patient—they had to return that part in refunds.

I can tell you that, happily, that law is working. One million Floridians last year received over \$41 million in refunds. It was an average of \$65 per family. Why? Because some insurance companies did not spend enough on medical care for their policyholders.

Another part that we had talked about was making private insurance—remember how they said this was going to be government health care—private insurance companies selling insurance. People could afford it because there were subsidies for families with income up to the level of 400 percent of poverty. Well, of the 1 million Floridians who enrolled—and remember, I gave you the figure that 8 million nationally enrolled. Of that 8 million, 1 million people needed and wanted insurance so much in our State alone that they enrolled, and 91 percent of them were able to receive a subsidy under the graduated subsidy level in order that they could purchase that private insurance. The folks who bought a plan using subsidies reduced their premiums through the subsidies by an average of 80 percent.

So what we had in health insurance before the Affordable Care Act was not—it was like the Wild West. Plans could deny you coverage. An insurance plan, if you had coverage and you were suddenly getting treatment, could cancel your coverage. They could also deny you coverage by saying you had a previous existing condition, and it could have been something as simple as a rash. You could not get health insurance. Now all of those things they cannot use as an excuse.

So what I see is the last throes of this resistance to the Affordable Care Act, and you are going to hear it again as insurance plans come out on Medicare Advantage and show that they are hiking their rates. Yet I want the people of Florida to know it was the State legislature that took away the ability of the Insurance Commissioner of Florida to regulate those rates.

Madam President, I would like to clarify my previous remarks. I was referring to the removal of the authority to regulate private insurance rates by the state insurance commissioner in SB 1842, not Medicare Advantage.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, this is my 10th year in the Senate. Every time we come to a close of the session for a summer break or for a holiday break all of a sudden we start hearing all these unanimous consent requests—they come to the Senate. For those of you who are listening to this and to my colleagues, these are requests that bills be passed without a vote. I am fine with that, as long as they meet certain characteristics and considerations.

But what the American public does not know is that about 70 percent of the work the Senate does happens by unanimous consent, with no recorded vote on the back of any one Senator. Today is no different. I have heard of five or six requests for unanimous consent. They are fine with a couple of provisions. The first provision is they ought to be within the powers of Congress as enumerated by the Constitution in the enumerated powers. The tendency is: Oh, we have to do this; it has to happen now. For some of the things that is true, but the reason it has to happen now is because we had not done it before now because we failed to do it. We utilize the end of the session to force people to give on positions they would never give on otherwise because they do not want to take the heat for being responsible for stopping something from happening, even though it might not fit within the enumerated powers, it might not be under our constitutional authority.

But the most egregious of all of this is the fact that we are going to be asked today, probably 7 or 10 times, to pass pieces of legislation the very cost of which will fall on the backs of our children and our grandchildren—not us. With over \$400 billion in waste per year in the Federal Government—waste, fraud, duplication—to ask us to spend \$200 million here or \$2 billion here or in the case of the veterans bill, \$17 billion, of which \$5 billion of it is actually paid for, without doing the hard work of not transferring more debt to our children is not acceptable to me.

So my rights as an individual Senator are going to be utilized today—until we go home—to make sure we do not transfer another penny, if I can stop it, onto the backs of our children. It would be different if we were efficient, if we did not have any waste, if we did not have any fraud, if we did not have any duplication. But you see, it is an excuse to not do the hard work we were sent to do.

So I am putting my colleagues on notice that if they want to pass any bill that is going to go by unanimous consent, they better find some waste somewhere to offset it with or I will object. I do not mind taking the heat, no matter what the issue. I have done it before, I will do it again. Our children and our grandchildren are worth any amount of heat that creates a future opportunity for them that is at least as equal to what we have had.

I wanted to say that before I start talking about the veterans bill. I voted for the veterans bill that went out of the Senate. My background as a physician and businessman—businessman first, a physician second, regrettably a politician third—but I voted for that because I thought in conference we would actually fix it. What is wrong with the VA? Leadership, a culture of corruption, a culture of not caring. That does not apply to all of the VA employees, it does not apply to all of the VA hospitals, but it certainly does apply to a number of them.

How did we get there? I would note for the record that VA spending is up 60 percent since 2009. Let's start in 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014. It is up 60 percent. Patient demand is up only 17 percent in that same period of time. The number of providers has increased by 40 percent. So it surely cannot be a problem of money.

If we look at the increased utilization of those services over the next progressive 10 years, it will be less than 20 percent. We did some good things in the bill in the Senate, most of which are capped, but we did not do enough. If we are going to manage the VA, we have to give the head of that organization the ability to be able to manage it. Senior Executive Service, the Secretary of the VA is going to have that capability to hire and fire. For a very limited number of title 38 employees—those are hospital managers, physicians—for a very limited number, he will have that as well. But for where we have seen a lot of the problems, he will not be able to fire people who have directly harmed our veterans.

So we have not given him the tools to create the environment and the change that has to happen and a cultural change that has to happen in the veterans organization.

The other thing I would note is that if we look at the requirement for primary care physicians and physician extenders—nurse practitioners and PAs—their load is about one-fourth of the load of private practitioners in this country. That is not true clinic to clinic, but on average that is true. In Oklahoma we have some great physicians who work every night until 10:00 taking care of veterans. We have great caregivers in lots of instances. But we have a lot of stinkers, and on average we are not demanding of them what the private sector routinely does.

One of the good things in the bill is we are going to finally have VA hospitals and clinics reporting outcomes, just as every other hospital in this country has to report. If they take Medicare or Medicaid dollars, they have to report to CMS their outcomes—their readmissions, their death rates, their infection rates, their quality of care. They have to be reported.

Also, physicians have to be credentialed. Not true in the VA. So if they are not credentialed, the VA patient is going to know what their credentials are—if they have lost their medical license.

Those are positive aspects of this bill. What is not positive is the fact that we won't fix the real problem, and we are going to say we did and we are going to spend our grandkids' money saying we did over a very short period of time, and we are still not going to hold the organization accountable.

It is unconscionable to me, after a 60-percent increase in funding over the last 4 years, that we would borrow against our children's future an additional \$12 billion when we have all this waste throughout the Federal Government and in the VA and say that is the best Congress could do. I think that is an incrimination upon Congress, and it is a dereliction of our duty—to our Republic but also our future.

So I will be doing a couple things:

No. 1, I will be raising a point of order against this bill; and No. 2, I will be voting against it.

Let me say a little bit about why I am voting against it. Yesterday I talked to a Vietnam veteran who is 100 percent disabled and presented to the emergency room of a major VA hospital in this country with chest pain. This patient was observed for 2 hours. She had no acute changes on her EKG, but she had—as any doctor would know—unstable angina. Her pain never went away. She was sent home. In less than 48 hours she presented to an emergency room in her local community and an hour after that had three stents placed in her left coronary artery. She was ignored medically. That is happening today as we have had this discussion.

Another wonderful retired veteran in Oklahoma had to have a knee replaced. She was service-connected. She went to the VA and had her knee replaced. It was a failure. She had to have it done again. A couple years later her other knee needed to be replaced. They replaced her knee. It failed. As they replaced the second knee, as can happen, they fractured her femur. Today she has a replaced knee, and she walks with a terrible limp because her left leg is 1½ inches shorter than her right one. The likelihood of that happening to one individual is about 1 in 10 billion, but the outcomes never get reported. A femur can break while doing a knee prosthesis, there is no question

about it. But five major surgeries? That means outcomes don't compare.

When this VA episode started soaking in, as a physician I went to the medical literature and looked at all the studies that have been published on VA care. I did a LexisNexis. I looked at them all. What did they show? VA care is better than anyplace in America. That is what the studies show. Except when we drill down on it, what we find is the way they were cheating on appointments is the way they were cheating on outcomes. In other words, the outcomes weren't accurate. So the culture is one of looking good, protecting those within the VA, and not protecting our veterans. Again, I would say that does not apply to all VA employees. The vast majority of them are great. But the leadership has stunk. We have to have a bill that fixes that. I don't believe this is going to do it.

I also wish to talk about whistleblowers because I have had a multitude of whistleblowers whose complaints I have investigated and found to be truthful. The culture at the VA against whistleblowers has been a channel in the past from whistleblowers back to management. And what happens to them? They get fired. They get demoted. They get harassed. They end up ultimately leaving. These are the people who care, who want to make it better.

There is a big job ahead of Secretary McDonald. He has the capability and he has the experience to fix this but only if we give him the tools. My fear is that we will not give him the tools with this bill.

The final point I would make, and I think we all ought to think about it—every American ought to think about it. Remember, we are an All-Volunteer Army right now. If somebody has served this country in combat, putting their life on the line to protect us, to protect our way of life, to protect the very freedoms we cherish, should that same individual ever be at the back of the line on anything related to health care that is associated with their service? They should be in the front. They should be ahead of every Senator, every President, every doctor. They should get the first care, not the last. They should get the best care, not the worst. That is how it ought to be. It is the veterans VA system, not ours. It is for them. And when they no longer are the object of service by this country, for them, for their sacrifice, then we are in a whole lot more trouble than any of us realize. We have turned things upside down. Union representation at the VA is more important than the VA patient. Benefits for VA managers are more important than the VA patient.

The one critical thing that really needs to happen to clean up the VA is to give veterans the absolute choice to go wherever they want, their freedom

to choose whatever care they want based on what they have done for us. By doing that, the VA will either have to become competitive and just as good or they should die. We have not done that in this bill. We need to do that in this bill.

We have centers of excellence in the VA that beat all the private industry, all the private health care. When it comes to prosthetics, when it comes to closed-head injuries, when it comes to traumatic brain injury, when it comes to post-traumatic stress disorder and depression, we are great. The VA is great, but in too many areas it is not. Tell me this bill will change all that, and I will vote for it even if it does sacrifice our children. But it won't.

I won't be here when the results are assessed, but I can predict what they will be—more of the same, too much money and not enough leadership.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, before I speak on the topic of Affordable Care Act, reports are emerging that the House of Representatives is going to adjourn without taking any votes on a border supplemental that would allow this country to humanely deal with a crisis of epidemic proportions on our border as over 50,000 children right now are being warehoused, shoulder to shoulder, without any sign from the Congress of help coming.

There are legitimate differences in what manner we provide this emergency funding to try to deal with this humanitarian crisis, but shame on the House of Representatives as they leave town today without even having attempted to take a vote on a supplemental appropriations bill for the border.

I was in the chair yesterday as I listened to about three or four of our Republican colleagues come down to the floor, as they often do, and register their ongoing complaints about the Affordable Care Act. As has been the trendline over the past 4 months, those complaints have moved from those rooted in data to those rooted in anecdote.

There is no doubt that there are people in every single State in this country who continue to have poor interactions with the American health care system. It is one-sixth of our economy, and as was the case before the Affordable Care Act, it will be the case after the Affordable Care Act. There are many people who will still pay too much, and there are still plenty of people who will not get enough in return.

But I wanted to spend a little bit of time on the floor today talking about what the actual data shows us, what the empirical evidence shows us. It is overwhelming in its conclusion that the Affordable Care Act is working—in many respects working better than anybody thought it would. So I want to take my colleague's arguments one at a time.

The first is a pretty simple one. Every bad interaction that happens in the American health care system is not the fault of the Affordable Care Act. I woke up a couple of days ago with a sore throat, but that wasn't President Obama's fault. That wasn't the fault of the Affordable Care Act. I had kind of a rough day. But I understand there are bad things that are going to continue to happen to me—especially when it comes to health care—that cannot necessarily be fixed by the Affordable Care Act. So one of the ongoing statistics that is used is the number of people who had their plans canceled. Well, most of the nonpartisan medical journals that have surveyed the number of cancellations before the Affordable Care Act and the number of cancellations after the Affordable Care Act suggest this has been a problem that has been ongoing for years, that there is substantial churn every single year in terms of the number of plans that were offered that then are stopped being offered. The Affordable Care Act is not solely responsible for the fact that plans are being cancelled. People will still pay a lot in premiums. The Affordable Care Act makes it better. There are a lot fewer premium increases of over 10 percent since the Affordable Care Act was passed than before it was passed. But every time somebody is paying more than they would like for the health care they receive, that is not the fault of the Affordable Care Act.

The second argument is the difference between data and anecdote. So let me just spend a few minutes talking about what the ongoing avalanche of information, of data, of statistics tells us. So many of my colleagues come down and talk about the huge rates that people are paying for health care and blame it on the Affordable Care Act. The average premium that individuals paid for a plan on one of the Affordable Care Act exchanges over the course of the first year of its implementation was \$82 per month—\$82 per month. Now, there are some people who are paying more, but the average is \$82 a month. That is a pretty sweet deal to get health care coverage in this country.

And they needed it. A study showed that 60 percent of adults with new coverage used it and 60 percent of those individuals say they could never have afforded to get the care had they not had insurance in the first place.

And people like it. Consumer survey after consumer survey shows that the

majority of people who are on these new plans want to keep them and have said their experience has been good, excellent or satisfactory. So that is the real story about what is happening on the exchanges.

What about cost? My colleagues say it really hasn't done anything to control costs. That is not the case. Health care inflation in this country is at a 50-year low. Medicare spending—that is the money that we all pay as federal taxpayers—is \$1,000 per beneficiary lower than it was projected to be in 2014. So \$1,000 in spending per individual has disappeared from the system, and a large part of the reason for that is the Affordable Care Act.

We had a bipartisan briefing sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund this week, and both the Republican economists and the Democratic economists believe the Affordable Care Act, though not solely responsible for that reduction in price, is a big, big part of that cost-reduction story.

People will say it is not coming through on premiums; we are still seeing premium increases that are bigger than we would like. Well, they are smaller than they were before the Affordable Care Act, but the Affordable Care Act also has this provision in it that requires insurance companies to spend a certain percentage of all the money they collect on care, and if they pad their profits with too much of your premiums, then they have to return that money to you. We just found out that consumers have already saved \$330 million in money that was directly returned to them, and over all have saved \$9 billion in savings on premiums because of this provision, which essentially says if you get charged too much, the insurance company now cannot keep that money for themselves. They have to return it to you. That is the best protection you can have from premiums that are too high. It is not theoretical; it is practical—the \$330 million in checks written by insurance companies and given to individuals.

The data continues to show us the Affordable Care Act is working, and I haven't even gotten into the data I have brought down here week after week, which is stunning in terms of the number of people who now have insurance: 8 million people insured on the exchanges—a 25-percent reduction in the number of uninsured in this country. Even the most optimistic of ACA supporters could never have thought we would have a 25-percent reduction in the number of uninsured in this country in the first 6 months of implementation. The numbers don't lie.

But here is my last point: Senators and Members of Congress who come down and complain about the performance of the Affordable Care Act in their State, when their State has done everything in its power to undermine the Affordable Care Act, have some explaining to do. The reality is there are

States such as Connecticut that are working hard to implement the Affordable Care Act, and there are other States that are working to undermine the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act works really well in States that want it to work, and it has a little bit more trouble in States that are trying to undermine it. Let me give you an example that comes from a speech given earlier on the floor by Senator NELSON. Senator NELSON talked about how Florida, through its Republican Governor and Republican legislature, has taken away from the insurance commissioner the ability to approve increases in insurance rates. And so, guess what. They are seeing premium increases that are rather unappetizing to Florida residents because the legislature has taken away from the government the ability to monitor, review, and approve those rates.

Compare that with the State of Connecticut, which is working hard to implement the Affordable Care Act and act on behalf of rate payers and consumers. Our biggest insurer a couple of months ago proposed a 12-percent increase in rates under the Affordable Care Act in Connecticut's exchange. We have the ability to review those rates in Connecticut. We did that, and the insurance commission in our State just 2 days ago came back and reduced that rate increase from 12 percent to 1 percent. Blue Cross Blue Shield is not going to stop offering insurance on the Connecticut exchange. They are just going to do it with a rate increase that is commensurate with the actual increase in costs of care to Anthem rather than a number that is not based on actual data.

So in a State such as Connecticut, where we have seen twice as many people enroll as we originally estimated, where we have seen Medicaid expansion provide access to insurance for thousands upon thousands of Connecticut residents who have insurance in a way that people in Florida do not because of their lack of Medicaid expansion, we also have taken steps to protect consumers from premium increases.

So for colleagues who are going to complain about high premium increases, you have to acknowledge there are steps that your State could have taken to make it better. For colleagues who are going to talk about the fact that there aren't enough people enrolled, well, then your State could have taken steps to enroll more people.

Not everything is the fault of the Affordable Care Act when things go wrong for families. The data does not back up the anecdotes that are brought to this floor. In States that are working to implement the law, it works a lot better than in States that are working to undermine it.

The story is clear. Whether it is a decrease in people that don't have insur-

ance, the decreasing rate of medical inflation all across the country or the improving quality of health care in every corner of this Nation, the Affordable Care Act is working.

I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I see two of my colleagues who are here, and I want to ask unanimous consent that Senator BARRASSO be given 10 minutes, then Senator SESSIONS be given 3 minutes, and then the remainder of the time be turned over to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Did the Chair rule?

Mr. MURPHY. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. HATCH. Madam President—

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I would ask that the Senator modify his request to allow Senator BENNET to alternate with one of the Republican speakers in this series of remarks.

Mr. HATCH. I was supposed to speak here at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I will withdraw my request for modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I have come to the floor to discuss some of the issues related to the health care law and the side effects of the health care law. I see my friend and colleague from the State of Connecticut—a place where I spent 5 years as part of my residency program training—has just spoken on this issue. So I followed the developments in that State quite a bit and talked to many of the physicians who practice there on a regular basis, some of whom I have studied with for up to 5 years. So they have routinely sent me articles about the failure of the President's health care law in Connecticut—because remember, the President said, actually, that the costs would go down, not go up under the President's health care law. I think he said \$2,500 per family per year. NANCY PELOSI on "Meet The Press" said costs would go down for everyone—down for everyone. She didn't say they would go up a little. She didn't say they would go up at all. She said they would go down for everyone, and this was in the last 2 years.

I come to the floor noting that just the other day in Hartford, CT, the headline story said that one of the insurance companies was seeking a 12½-percent rate increase. The Norwich Bulletin says: "Anthem seeks 12.5 percent rate increase."

I heard my colleague from Connecticut say the insurance commissioner wouldn't allow it to go up that much but did allow it to go up and said

it was going up; is that what my colleague just said on the floor? Perhaps not as much as this, but certainly the President said they were going to go down by \$2,500 a family. NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker of the House, said they were going to go down for everyone. And in Connecticut people who believed the President, people who believed the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, realized they weren't told the truth. Rates even after this 12.5-percent request was reviewed and lessened—the rates still went up.

So I look at these headlines.

Another story out in the Daily Caller: "Obamacare Update: Now EVEN MORE States Report Double-Digit Premium Hikes." They talk about Vermont and they talk about Arizona, States where premiums are going up over 10 percent.

I looked at the story in Politico last month: Connecticut exchange reports breach—breach of security of individual people, hundreds of names left on the sidewalk, with Social Security numbers, with addresses, with information about them.

A story coming out of the Connecticut Mirror: "CT's Latinos face hurdles in enrolling in ObamaCare." It says: "No group of people in Connecticut is more likely to be uninsured than the state's Latinos, and ObamaCare won't change that."

I just heard from my colleague that it is working. Not according to the press in his home State.

July 1, 2014, the Connecticut Mirror: Federal auditors question Access Health CT's internal controls.

Federal auditors reported Tuesday—

These are not individual stories of one person or another, because we know all across Connecticut there have been families who have been dropped, people who have had problems, individuals who are being hurt.

"Access Health CT says it will start calling thousands of customers Friday"—this was earlier this month—"... 5,784 customers were identified as having incorrect tax credits" under this program that my colleague says is working in his home State.

It says: "About 3,900 customers," in the State of Connecticut "were told that they qualified for government-funded Medicaid coverage when, in fact, they did not."

It says: "An unknown number of customers got a bill from their insurance company that was more than they expected..."

"... 903 customers were dropped by their insurer."

These are the facts.

So I hear that the Federal auditors are questioning Connecticut's internal controls, and then look at the many stories about doctors who are saying no to ObamaCare: "Report: Connecticut is Less Competitive After Federal Health Care Reform" in the Hartford Courant.

It just reminds me there are so many side effects of this health care law all across the country—stories from every State. Premiums are going up, people are having to pay more in copays, people are having to pay more in terms of their deductibles, and people continue to be offended that they were not told the truth.

The rates continue to go up. The President said they would go down. NANCY PELOSI said they would go down for everyone. That is not the case. And I think what I am hearing also is—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President—

Mr. BARRASSO. People believe that Washington is in control.

Mr. MURPHY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARRASSO. The Senator will yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARRASSO. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

I appreciate the amount of time the Senator has taken to educate my colleagues on Connecticut's success in adding 200,000 people to the rolls of the insured. But the chart the Senator just had up next to him for the majority of his remarks about Anthem's request to increase rates in Connecticut by 12 percent is, frankly, the best advertisement you can make for the Affordable Care Act because under the Affordable Care Act, States are given the ability to review these rate increases and modify them. Connecticut has taken advantage of that, and had you read the papers from 2 days ago, rather than taking the headline from several months ago, you would have seen that the Connecticut insurance commission rejected the 12-percent increase and actually approved a 1-percent increase.

Regardless of someone's claim that insurance premiums were going to go down, my constituents in Connecticut will be very welcome to take a 1-percent increase in premiums. Should you repeal the Affordable Care Act—parts or all of it—you would remove from many State the ability to offer these plans in the first place or to be able to monitor them. So I appreciate the Senator putting a month's old headline on the floor of the Senate, but yesterday's headline actually tells us that because of the Affordable Care Act rates under the exchange for the people in Connecticut will be at historic lows in terms of premium increases. Given the fact the Senator is putting up news about the State of Connecticut, I want to make sure that he is putting up the latest and most accurate news about our State.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I didn't hear a question posed in that, but I concur. And I mentioned in my remarks, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, that the rates were

not allowed to go up to the double-digit request, although I also mentioned they are going up by double-digits in many other States. Yet the President of the United States said the rates would go down by \$2,500 per family per year. Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI—who was Speaker when the Member from Connecticut was a Member of the House and voted for the health care law—said on “Meet the Press” that they would go down for everyone, and that is not the case. The case is, as I have continued to say on the floor of this body, rates are going up across the country even though the President promised something else. What people are seeing is higher premium rates, higher deductibles, higher copays, and loss of doctors. They feel Washington is taking control over their lives. We are also seeing lower paychecks in Connecticut as people try to comply with the 30-hour workweek requirements, which are causing school districts to have to choose whether to hire reading teachers as a result of the mandates of the health care law.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I understand there will be 3 minutes for the Senator from Alabama and then I will be able to deliver my full remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Alabama.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I just want to say how much I appreciate the work by all the Members who worked on the veterans bill. We had some difficulties of a very serious nature, and all of us wanted to fix that. I was not able to support the bill that came out of the Senate.

We learned minutes before the vote that the average cost in the out years would be \$50 billion a year if the program was funded, and there was no money to pay for that. It would really just be adding to the debt. It was sort of avoided by saying it would be a 3-year bill, but once you start these kinds of motions rolling, they never seem to end, and in the end we would be faced with a difficult situation financially.

The conference committee went to work, and I salute all the people who worked on this legislation. It has some good policy issues in it. Senator TOM COBURN, who spoke earlier, was engaged in that conference. He is a doctor. He understands these matters, he cares about them, and he was actively engaged, as we all know. In TOM COBURN we have one of the Senate's finest, most committed Senators. He loves this country. Every day he tries to save us money and make us more productive. There is nobody here who works harder or is more effective in ad-

ressing that issue than he is, and he says we need to do better. He is not able to support the conference report because it will add at least \$10 billion to the debt in 3 years. I will acknowledge that it is better than before. As a result, he will raise a point of order against it, and I have to say I will support that.

Our doctors there do not carry the kinds of patient caseloads private doctors do.

While we have some policy changes that are good, more are needed. We are going to have a new Administrator, and I am very impressed with him. He is a military academy graduate from West Point, spent 5 years in the military, and was a Procter & Gamble CEO. He has bipartisan support in the Senate. A lot of confidence and a lot of hope is being placed in him.

I think the better action for us today is to not try to establish big policy changes that continue indefinitely at great expense. The better choice for us today is to wait a bit, see how effective this new leader is, and see how much he can save without reducing benefits. Maybe we can get some ideas from this top-flight, world-class businessman, who can help us develop policies that serve our veterans. We have an absolute commitment to serve our veterans and fulfill our responsibilities.

I will support the budget point of order, but if it were to be sustained—and it probably will not be sustained because people want to go forward and do this—I am confident we would be able to work with the new Administrator and develop an even better plan for securing the benefits which our veterans have earned and to which they are entitled.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

STANDING STRONG

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, in recent days I have twice spoken here on the floor—not about a particular issue, bill, or nomination pending before the Senate, but about the Senate itself.

While issues, bills, nominations, and even partisan majorities come and go, the Senate as an institution must remain—and remain not only in some tattered form, some distorted shadow of its former self, but, rather, the Senate must remain as it was designed to be. The political winds may blow, but the institution must stand strong.

Unfortunately, in my 38 years of service in this body I have never seen it weaker than it is today. There once was a consensus here not only about the need to keep this institution strong but also about how to do it. That consensus evolved from how the Framers designed this body so that it could play its unique role in the system of government they inspirationally crafted.

James Madison, for example, remarked at the 1787 Constitutional Convention that the Senate's proceedings

could have more coolness, more system, and more wisdom than the House of Representatives. He was not talking about coolness in the way our teenagers talk about it today. The House is designed for more or less direct expression of the popular will and operates by simple majority. By contrast, the Senate is designed for deliberation. For more than two centuries it has operated by a supermajority and even unanimous consent. This fundamental difference between the House and the Senate is by express design and not historical accident. It is the conjunction of the two that makes the legislative branch work in the manner the Framers intended. This basic principle of bicameralism is above politics and above party.

This longstanding consensus about the importance of the Senate's unique design and how it must operate to fulfill its constitutional role has all but fallen apart over the last few years. I began addressing this problem in earnest last week and will continue to do so in the weeks ahead and, I might add, in the months to come, urging my colleagues to heed history's wisdom and change course.

I am not alone in this endeavor. My friend the senior Senator from Tennessee has also spoken with great passion on this issue and developed a thoughtful assessment of the Senate's institutional decay. Two longtime colleagues in this body—one Democrat and one Republican—offered similar critiques when leaving the Senate in the last few years.

For 30 years I served in this body with my friend from Connecticut, Senator Christopher Dodd. In his final speech on the Senate floor on November 30, 2010, he observed that the Senate was established as a place where every Member's voice could be heard and where a deliberation and even dissent would be valued and respected. Senator Dodd explained that "our Founders were concerned not only with what was legislated, but, just as importantly, with how we legislated." He urged Senators to resist the temptation to abandon the Senate's longstanding traditions to make it "more like the House of Representatives, where the majority can essentially bend the minority to its will."

Two years later Senator Olympia Snowe concluded her three terms in the Senate representing the State of Maine in this body with a reflection on the state of the Senate. She observed that a commitment to the rights of the minority helped ensure that the Senate would be a body where all voices are heard. Senator Snowe concluded, however, that "the Senate is not living up to what the Founding Fathers envisioned," in large part by ignoring the minority's rights.

Senator Dodd concluded his Senate service in the majority while Senator

Snowe concluded hers in the minority, but their assessment was the same—a leading Democrat and a leading Republican. That is what a consensus looks like. They shared an understanding of the unique role the Senate was designed to play in our system of government, and they knew from experience that the Senate is not operating by that design today.

Diagnosing our current institutional ills and prescribing a path back to health must begin by recognizing the primacy of the Senate's purpose, design, and place in our system of government. Without the anchor of these principles, which have throughout the Senate's history been shared throughout this body, across all partisan and ideological lines, the gamesmanship of politics and the quest for power will decimate our deliberate contribution to the legislative process. Unfortunately, that is exactly what is happening today.

In my previous remarks, I noted that many of the sage students of the Senate—from Vice President Adlai Stevenson in the 19th century to Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia in our time—all identified the same two features as critical to the Senate's proper functioning: the right of amendment and the right to debate. It is not difficult to see how they serve the critical function of setting the Senate apart from the House. These rights temper majority rule. They emphasize individuals over parties and factions. They ensure that all voices can be heard. They encourage deliberation and, yes, even beneficial compromise. These rights secure a substantive role for all Senators—even those in the minority—in how the Senate legislates, a feature that does not exist in how the House operates.

During my service throughout the past four decades, the Senate has often lived up to these ideals. For example, I worked with the junior Senator from Iowa on the Americans with Disabilities Act, which the Senate in 1989 passed by a vote of 76 to 8. At that time Democrats held 55 Senate seats, just as they do today. This body addressed amendments on the floor offered by both Democrats and Republicans on issues ranging from tax credits for small businesses to accessibility of buses. On a single day in September of 1989, the Senate adopted nearly twice as many minority amendments to this single bill than the Senate today has adopted in more than a year.

Today the majority leader uses his right to priority recognition to eliminate virtually all opportunities for amendments unless he agrees to them, and even then he generally stops amendments. He has used this procedural maneuver—called filling the amendment tree—more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined.

There is a time when you can fill the amendment tree, and that is after there has been a full and fair debate on all the reasonable amendments Members have brought to the floor and it is when a reasonable time has been given to a bill and there have been a number of votes.

Yet, when he was in the minority, even he condemned this tactic as "a very bad practice." He explained that "it runs against the basic nature of the Senate." He was right then, but he is wrong now. Perhaps the majority leader has reconsidered what he believes to be the basic nature of the Senate. Perhaps he now believes that denying the minority's right to offer amendments is a very good rather than a very bad practice. If he does, then I think he, of all people, owes the Senate an explanation. I don't think he believes that; otherwise, such an about-face is nothing more than a desire to rig the rules so he can win all the games, and in the process he is destroying the Senate itself. When I say games, I don't really mean games. It is so he can win all the votes. He can put the Senate on any motion he wants to without any real rights for the minority, and in the process he is destroying the Senate itself, destroying the institutional characteristics the Founders thought critical to our government's design, and destroying precisely those practices and traditions that have enabled the Senate to serve the common good throughout our Nation's history.

The other defining feature of this body—the right to unlimited debate—is also under attack. By empowering the minority, that right has always annoyed the majority whether we have been in the minority or whether we have been in the majority and vice versa. But a little history can provide a lot of perspective for us today.

For more than a century, ending debate on anything required unanimous consent. A single Senator could prevent a final vote on a matter by preventing an end to debate. The Senate adopted a rule in 1917 that lowered the threshold to two-thirds. Not until 1975 was the threshold lowered to three-fifths, where it stands today.

It is easier to end debate today than ever before in the Senate's history, but that is not enough for the current majority. Urged on by many of the 34 Senators who have not yet ever served in the minority, the majority apparently does not want any obstacle whatsoever to stand in its way—not even full and fair debate.

Last November the majority leader used a parliamentary maneuver to lower the threshold for any debate on most nominations from a supermajority to a simple majority. It took him only a few short minutes to end more than 200 years of Senate practice and effectively eliminate the minority's role in the confirmation process.

As I have detailed here on the Senate floor and in print, the minority leader's reasons for this revolution amounted to filibuster fraud. At the time he invoked the so-called nuclear option, the Senate had confirmed 98 percent of President Obama's nominations, and filibusters, of course, were on the decline. But 98 percent was not good enough for the majority.

I noted the current majority leader's about-face regarding the right to offer amendments. He defended that right when in the minority and actively suppressed it when in the majority. Similarly, when he was in the minority, he voted more than two dozen times for filibusters of Republican judicial nominees. The Democrats were the ones who started that. Then, last November, once in the majority, he abolished the right to debate nominations.

While the majority leader effectively neutralized the Senate cloture rule to stop the minority from debating nominations, he has also used that rule to stop the minority from debating legislation. He again uses his right of priority recognition to bring up a bill and, at the very same time, file a motion to end debate. But it makes no sense to speak of ending debate—ending what he wrongly characterizes as a Republican filibuster—when such debate had no chance to begin with. The majority leader uses this cloture rule not to end debate but to prevent it altogether.

Just like the practice of filling the amendment tree, the majority leader is using his position to prevent debate far more often than any of his predecessors. Unlike the current majority leader, most Senators on the other side of the aisle have never served in the minority. Most Senators in both parties—56, to be exact—have served here only under the current leadership. Unfortunately, this means that most Senators serving today have only witnessed leadership that prefers power to principle and is rapidly dismantling the longstanding practices and traditions of an institution that took centuries to build. The only leadership that most Senators serving today have experienced uses parliamentary maneuvers to deny senatorial rights so that the partisan ends justify the procedural means.

The current Senate leadership is wrong. The road we are on today leads only to one destination. Just as maintaining the integrity and foundation of the Senate's design and operation is essential to its proper role in our system of government, attacking that integrity and dismantling that foundation can only destroy that proper role. Since the Senate's proper role is essential for protecting the liberties of the American people, destroying those longstanding practices and traditions puts our liberties at risk.

The minority leader spoke here in January about the state of the Senate

and noted that what many call partisanship today is nothing new. But what I have been addressing in recent days is not the result of that ideological competition but how that competition is conducted.

At the beginning of my first term, there were only 38 Republican Senators—not even enough to end debate under Senate rules. Democrats have not been in such a small minority in nearly 60 years.

According to the Brookings Institution and American Enterprise Institute, 42 percent of all rollcall votes during my first 2 years here were so-called party unity votes, in which a majority of each party sticks together and votes in opposite ways. That means a majority of votes involve Senators reaching across the aisle.

In the last several years under the current leadership, however, even though the margin between the parties is narrower, the percentage of such party unity votes has risen to 62 percent. This trend of retreating to partisan corners is yet another indication that this body is becoming like the House and, therefore, abandoning the tradition of unlimited debate and amendment at the core of the Senate's identity.

The way Senator Snowe described it, the great challenge is to create and maintain a system “that gives our elected officials reasons to look past their differences and find common ground if their initial party positions fail to garner sufficient support.” The Senate's design provided those reasons and those incentives, and undermining that design destroys them.

Building is much harder and takes much longer than destroying. The current leadership's recklessness in choosing power over principle is dismantling what took centuries to establish.

That does not, however, mean it cannot be changed. Senator Dodd suggested a formula for a better course when he distinguished what we legislate from how we legislate. Restoring the Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body requires recommitting ourselves to the principles of how we legislate so that we can properly discuss and debate what we should legislate.

We must first restore the longstanding consensus about the rules, procedures, and traditions governing how the Senate is run. Only on that firm footing can we discuss, deliberate, and legislate in a constructive manner.

In addition to restoring many of this body's fundamental rights for amendment and debate, the minority leader spoke in January about restoring a vigorous and meaningful committee process. These elements of our legislative process are related and they are complementary.

Increasingly, bills are drafted in the leader's office and taken directly to

the full Senate for consideration where the majority leader will immediately fill the amendment tree and file a motion to end debate. In my 38 years in this body, I have never seen a consolidation of so much power in so few hands.

America's Founders were right in the principles of government they laid out and in the institutional design they built on those principles. But they did so at the beginning of this journey, creating the blueprint before anything had been built. I fear that returning to the right path may be even harder than embarking on it.

The majority today has engaged in a hostile takeover of the Senate for one simple reason: aggrandizing power. But remember the axiom that power tends to corrupt. It makes principle harder to see, fainter to hear, and tougher to grasp, and it makes principle very difficult to restore. Restoration will require believing in something greater than power, something more important than the bill or nomination on the calendar, something more significant than the latest polling numbers. It will require holding fast to a system that can provide power today but take that power away tomorrow.

Winston Churchill famously said, “Democracy is the worst form of government except for those other forms that have been tried from time to time.” There is certainly wisdom in that, but consider when Churchill said it. He was speaking on the floor of the British House of Commons on November 11, 1947, 2 years after his party lost half its seats in Parliament and the Labor Party led its first majority government. Churchill expressed his faith in the very form of government that had turned his party into a small minority.

We continue on the path the current Senate leadership has charted at our peril, not just the peril of this institution but the peril of our system of government and the liberties it makes possible for the American people. This may sound like a grand statement, but remember what Senator Byrd repeatedly told us—remember what he said: “So long as the Senate's defining features such as the rights of amendments and debate remain intact, the liberties of the people are secure.”

There is perhaps no greater statement of principle regarding this Nation than our Declaration of Independence, which asserts that the government exists to secure the inalienable rights of the people. That is why we are here, and that should be our reason to change course—not simply partisan advantage or ideological superiority but liberty. The liberty we enjoy in America did not occur by chance. It will not survive by neglect, and it cannot thrive by preferring power over principle.

My staff and I recently visited the National Archives and saw the words

engraved beneath in one of the statues at the entrance: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

I hope we can turn this around. I hope the leadership of the majority will wake up and realize that some day they may be in the minority. I don't know when, but some day they will be. If they were treated as we are being treated, I can just hear the fulminations up and down in the Senate. All I can say is that these principles are more important than either party. They are more important than either party, and whether Democrats or Republicans like them or not, the fact is, this is the greatest deliberative body in the world that is no longer the greatest deliberative body in the world, and that is because of what is going on. I hope we can end that and begin anew.

I think everybody enjoyed the debate over the highway bill. For once, we were able to have at least four amendments—on both sides, by the way. And I have to say it was kind of a thrill to vote again on amendments. It was kind of a thrill to pass a piece of legislation the right way. Whether a person likes or doesn't like the legislation, it was thrilling to be here. I would like to see more of that happening so that everybody here will feel that not only are they a part of the Senate but they are helping to keep the Senate the vibrant place it always has been up until now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today to support S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

I recently led a congressional delegation to McAllen, TX, and to Lackland Air Force Base to see firsthand what the administration was doing to handle this border crisis. It was clear to me that the hard-working men and women on the front lines of this crisis are doing the best they can under very difficult circumstances.

We should pass this important bill to provide the necessary resources to fairly address this humanitarian crisis. We should provide Customs and Border Protection the resources they need to pay their agents overtime when needed, and to provide the necessary food, water, and medical supplies to these children.

My colleagues and I saw children in these CBP facilities as young as 7. We learned that many of these children arrive severely malnourished and dehydrated. They are clearly desperate. They are not traveling here simply because they want to. They are fleeing mortal danger at the hands of violent drug gangs. These gangs have rendered their home countries some of the most dangerous places in the world to live. We should be working together to make sure these children are given proper care in our facilities and that

our CBP agents have the support they need.

It was also clear to me that these CBP facilities, meant to safely hold dangerous criminals, are no place for children to be held, even for just a few days. This is a view also shared by CBP officers on the ground who said this is no place for children.

That is why I believe it is so important to provide necessary funding to the Department of Health and Human Services so they can continue to maintain shelter capacity at places such as Lackland Air Force Base where we visited. At Lackland, I was given hope. I saw children being educated, being taught English, praying if they chose to, and learning the Pledge of Allegiance. I saw a place that reflected our values as a country.

This is why I strongly oppose altering the protections of the 2008 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. The answer is not expediting screenings and deporting these children as soon as possible at the border. All this will accomplish is to send these children back into harm's way—indeed, into the murder capitals of the world—even more quickly.

I have actually seen what these expedited screenings look like. During our trip we saw small children sitting on concrete blocks in a noisy and overwhelming CBP facility. In this environment, these children struggle to answer questions from uniformed Customs and Border Protection officers. Let me be clear. That officer was doing the best he could, but children arriving here after a dangerous journey are in no condition to quickly explain their reasons for coming to the United States, much less understand the legal basis for their claim to relief under U.S. law. When children are asked to provide that explanation in the kind of harsh environment we saw in McAllen, they have little chance of making a compelling case for asylum or other protection. At this facility children cannot access legal help to make their case. Many of these children have legitimate legal claims that they have been physically abused, raped, or victimized by gangs or human traffickers. We must give them a fair chance to tell their stories.

This bill, which I support, does not repeal these protections. Instead, it takes the important steps of funding our immigration courts to levels necessary to timely hear these children's claims.

This bill also helps with legal representation and orientation services—something the faith communities and other advocates we met with told us were necessary. This will help to speed up the legal process, while ensuring that the rights of these children are protected.

Just as importantly, this bill funds our efforts to address the root causes of

why these children are arriving in our country in the first place. It will help us stop drug trafficking from this region and will help stabilize these economies that have been ravaged by the narco-trafficking violence.

This past weekend, columnist and commentator George Will eloquently spoke on this issue. He said:

My view is that we have to say to these children welcome to America. You're going to go to school and get a job and become Americans.

We have 3,141 counties in this country. That would be 20 per county. The idea that we can't assimilate these 8-year-old criminals with their teddy bears is preposterous.

We can handle the problem is what I'm saying. We've handled what Emma Lazarus famously called: "the wretched refuse of your teeming shores," a long time ago, and a lot more people than this.

George Will is right. We are a country that welcomes refugees—as many of these children are—from all around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this important supplemental appropriations measure.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3086

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to speak in favor of a principle that should unite us all—the principle of Internet tax freedom. One of the great blessings of our modern economy is the productivity, the entrepreneurial spirit the Internet has created, the ability of anyone with an idea to jump online, to communicate, to create a business, to reach the world.

One of the reasons the Internet has been such an entrepreneurial haven is that Congress has wisely decided to keep it free from taxation, not to subject the Internet to taxation. Well, unfortunately, we are at the precipice of that long tradition changing. If the Senate refuses to take action, the Internet will be taxed this November.

For a decade and a half, Americans have been able to use the Internet all across the country free of taxes, and Republicans and Democrats have agreed on this basic principle. There is not a lot of agreement in this town on much of anything, including what time of day it is. Yet on Internet taxes—in 1998 President Bill Clinton signed the law banning Internet taxes. Congress has extended it three times—in 2001, 2004, and 2007.

Today there is a bipartisan coalition on the record to keep the Internet tax free. The senior Democratic Senator from New York and the senior Democratic Senator from Wisconsin both

publicly support keeping the Internet free from taxation. Conservatives in the Senate, such as the junior Republican Senator from Utah, the junior Republican Senator from Florida, and the senior Republican Senator from Louisiana, agree as well. There are 52 cosponsors in the Senate on the bill by the senior Democratic Senator from Oregon, who is here with us, to keep the ban on Internet taxes.

This should be easy. This should be a matter of easy agreement because rarely is there an issue that has united parties so broadly as keeping the Internet tax free. Yet, unfortunately, this session of the Senate is also seeing politicians who want to extend sales taxes to the Internet, who want to subject small businesses, mom-and-pops, businesses started by people just wanting to build a business, to crushing sales taxes from 9,600 jurisdictions nationwide.

I am passionate in saying we should fight against taxing the Internet, and we should not open the door to Internet taxes. The average tax rate right now on telephone services and other voice services is 17 percent. The average tax rate on cable and video services is 12 percent. If this Senate does not act, you are going to see consumers in States such as Montana and South Dakota and Massachusetts, on November 1, begin paying taxes for having basic Internet service. Those State laws are already in effect and will go into effect on Internet services.

I would note for the Senators who represent Montana and South Dakota and Massachusetts that come November 2—which, I might note, is right before an election day—anyone in those States should be prepared to answer questions from their citizens on why the Senate stood by and let taxes be raised on their citizens just for having an Internet connection.

Americans are struggling to pay their bills in the Obama economy. Life has gotten harder and harder for working men and women in this country. Life has gotten harder and harder for the most vulnerable among us—for young people, for Hispanics, for African Americans, for single moms. The last thing we should be doing is playing politics and jacking up taxes on people accessing the Internet.

I would note that the U.S. House of Representatives has already acted. On July 15 the House voice voted H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. It had 228 cosponsors. My friend Senator WYDEN has introduced the Senate version of it, S. 1431. It has 52 cosponsors, including 18 Democrats. This ought to be something where we stop playing games and say let's all come together and agree: Do not tax the Internet. Yet, unfortunately, we are not in that situation. Unfortunately, we are seeing an objection to the House-passed bill, to a bill that has

the support of a majority of Senators. Why? The only reason is because there is hope that by holding the Internet Tax Freedom Act hostage, it can become a vehicle to impose sales taxes on transactions over the Internet, to impose sales taxes on every small business.

I would note one of many wonderful things. It used to be that if you were a single mom and you wanted to start a small business, you wanted to make something, you wanted to sit down and make something, whether it was a computer program or sweaters for dogs or anything else, it used to be that to create a small business took time, it took money, it took infrastructure. You had to have in place warehouses and distributors. You had to have a mechanism to sell your products.

Do you know the great thing about the Internet? If you are a single mom and you have an idea to start a business, you can put up a Web site, and with FedEx you can deliver anywhere in the country.

Anyone all over the country can do it, if you have an idea. Let me tell you, my cousin had an idea to sell scarves. She thought she had some good design ideas. My cousin Beatriz worked with her best friend to design scarves.

If you put up a Web site, suddenly you can sell all over the country. Well, what would the Internet sales tax do? It would say that when you start your business, if you start getting customers, you have to collect taxes in 9,600 jurisdictions all over the country. If the school district across the country changes its tax rate from 4.5 percent to 4.75 percent, you have to know that and collect that differential tax. This does not make any sense.

We should stand together united in protecting the entrepreneurial haven that is the Internet. We should stand united against taxing the Internet.

I would note that my friend the Senator from New Hampshire has a long and passionate record on this issue as well, and I am happy to yield to her for a question on this important topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas for coming to the floor to talk about this incredibly important issue to the American people.

I ask the Senator, isn't it true that for 16 years the Internet Tax Freedom Act has prevented politicians nationwide from using the Web as a piggy bank and has helped commerce thrive by keeping it free from burdensome tax restrictions? And isn't it true that by making this permanent—the way the House bill does and the way the bill does that my colleague from Oregon has offered that has 52 cosponsors in the Senate—we never have to allow the people of this country again to feel uncertainty that suddenly this great free-

dom we have on the Internet is going to be gone, where they are going to be taxed when they access the Internet or that somehow we are going to use the Internet as a way to raise money and a way to hurt e-commerce?

I would ask that of my colleague from the State of Texas. Is this all true, that if we can pass the House bill right now—which is similar to the bill offered by my colleague from Oregon—we can give the American people certainty that we are not going to tax what they are doing on the Internet?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from New Hampshire. I would note that she is exactly right. We have the ability to do something productive, something that does not happen in Washington an awful lot. We have the ability right now to come together in a bipartisan way for the Senate to demonstrate that it can function productively to address the economic challenges in this country the way the House has.

The House is doing its job. The House has passed this bill. It is the Senate that has refused to take it up for a vote. It is the Senate that is refusing to do its job. We have an ability not just to protect the Internet from taxes but also to honor our word. How many Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, go to the tech community and say: We want to stand with tech. We want to stand for the entrepreneurial vibrancy of tech?

Yet I would note anyone objecting to this right now is setting the stage for a massive Internet tax. How many of us make the case to young people that we are standing for the future for young people, we are standing for greater opportunity, we are standing for the chance to help young people achieve the American dream? You know, young Americans, 18 to 29 years old, oppose an Internet sales tax by 73 percent to 27 percent.

Yet if this body refuses to stand together in a bipartisan manner, we are telling young people: What we say on the campaign trail is not backed by action on the floor.

We ought to come together on what should be an uncontroversial bill, a bill that has passed three times before, a bill that was signed by President Bill Clinton, a bill that in this body is introduced by a senior Democrat. We ought to come together in a bipartisan way to say: We stand in unison protecting Internet tax freedom.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3086, which was received from the House. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Reserving the right to object, I want to first make a couple

of points, which as we talk about this, I think it is clear to identify who is the taxing authority. The distinguished and very learned constitutional scholar from the State of Texas knows well that the imposition does not come from this body. The imposition comes from States and local governments which have 10th Amendment sovereign rights. They have the ability to finance their own government. They have the ability to make those decisions. Congress has the right to make decisions on their ability, based on a concept that Congress ultimately has the obligation to control and to deal with interstate commerce. Only in the rarest of circumstances when interstate commerce is critically involved has Congress stepped up. It is very rare that this body, or that any previous Congress, has actually dictated the constraints of that sovereign right of States and local governments under the 10th Amendment to impose their own taxes.

I can tell you the RRRR Act is probably one of the most glaring examples. During a time in the 1970s when the railroads were struggling and different kinds of transportation organizations were struggling, we saw this body step up with a unified approach to improving the railroads. Guess what. The railroads got better. The States know now what the constraints are, established by this body, very limited on their ability to do centralized assessments on the railroads.

We saw it in something called Public Law 86-272, regarding income taxes—a very narrow exemption to those sovereign rights. Yes, the Internet Tax Freedom Act is an exercise of this body's commerce clause responsibility to take a look at what is in the best interests of moving forward. But let's not forget, what we are doing is a very interesting balance responsibility to improve interstate commerce.

So when my distinguished colleague suggests that this body is imposing any tax, that clearly is a misstatement of the facts today. There is no locality, there is no organization, State organization or State body that is required to impose any tax on the Internet or required to impose any tax on sales tax. So, yes, I believe we too need to address the Internet tax moratorium which expires on November 1. But we also need to have a discussion in this context of commerce clause responsibility, to give the States the right to decide whether they are, in fact, going to collect State and local taxes and use taxes.

I would remind the Senator, the collection responsibility is on the use tax for remote sales. Congress's responsibility and failure to meet that responsibility, of creating an opportunity to level the playing field for Main Street businesses—what do I say? I tell you if you are selling a widget in North Da-

kota and you have bricks and mortar and you participate in the society, you provide dollars for the schools, you provide scholarship dollars, you collect a sales tax. But if you are a remote seller, taking advantage of the same marketplace and competing directly against that Main Street business, you no longer have that responsibility.

So to suggest that this body, by doing any of this, would be imposing any taxes on mom and pop ignores the fact that the imposition of this tax comes from State and local governments, which all too often my friends on the other side of the aisle say: Closer to the people, the more responsive those State governments are. I would suggest that in the great State of Texas, the current Governor, who is a Republican, certainly has the ability to decide tax policy. The legislatures are Republican and certainly can decide if they want to do any imposition of taxes.

So with all of that in mind, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2735

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I am going to be brief, having spoken on this already once today. I simply want to highlight my sense of where all of this is. Back in 1998, along with Congressman Chris Cox, a Republican Congressman from California, one of the most market-oriented individuals I have ever seen in public service, he and I came together to write the original Internet Tax Freedom Act. The reason we did is we were concerned about discrimination, which looked as though it could do enormous damage to innovation and the future of the Internet. For example, we saw early on that if someone bought the newspaper in some jurisdiction online, they would pay a hefty tax. But if they bought the snail-mail edition, they would pay no tax.

So Congressman Cox and I, on a bipartisan basis, came together and said: "We do not want to see that kind of discrimination against the future. We do not want to see that kind of discrimination against innovation and technology." So that is what the Internet Tax Freedom Act was all about in 1998. The subsequent reauthorizations were all about trying to build on that enormous success.

Congressman Cox and I thought the Internet tax freedom bill would be a success back in 1998. It has far exceeded expectations in terms of promoting innovation and small business and many of the concerns that all three colleagues have touched on.

So then to fast forward to today, I am the author of the legislation, with our colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, of the permanent Internet tax freedom extension. I will just say to colleagues: I would like nothing more—nothing more—than to be able

to stand here today to see this enormously valuable piece of legislation made permanent now.

The reality, however, is—and we have seen it and heard about it—there are objections on both sides at this point to seeing the bill I wrote with Senator THUNE—and Senator CRUZ correctly notes that more than half of the Senate has co-sponsored—we have objections to seeing that bill move today. So the best thing that can be done now, for the hundreds of millions of American Internet users and the economy for which the Internet is a lifeline, is to extend the current ban until it is possible to lock in a path to pass a permanent extension.

This is not a political issue. That point has been made. There are a number of Democrats and Republicans who join myself and Senator THUNE in supporting the permanent moratorium. There are a number of Republicans and Democrats opposing the extension of that moratorium, reluctantly. We will have that debate. They seem to think it is okay to impose discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

So it seems to me that no one who supports keeping the moratorium in place ought to object to a short-term extension now. Doing so only makes it more likely that Internet access and services would be subject to discriminatory taxation.

Let me now, in the interest of time, simply ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2735, a 2-month extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act, to December 31, 2014, the text of which is at the desk; that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, reserving the right to object. First of all, let me say to my colleague from Oregon, I share what you have described and the work that you did in bringing forth the Internet Tax Freedom Act. The success we have seen from keeping the Internet free from discriminatory taxes has been astounding. So I commend the Senator for that.

I am a proud cosponsor of your permanent act that you have with the Senator from South Dakota. I appreciate that you recognize how important it is that we keep this freedom for our Internet that has been so productive for the American people and, frankly, giving people from all walks of life access to this great tool on the Internet. So I thank my colleague from Oregon for that.

Unfortunately, I object. I want to note today that I am reserving my right to object because to extend this only to December 31 is to invite uncertainty to the American people.

I think the American people have had enough of these dramatic New Year's

Eve moments in this body where they are wondering: Are we going to act upon important things, like will we ensure that the Internet remains free from discriminatory taxes? I know my colleague from Oregon shares the same goals.

But to put this to December 31, the lameduck of this body, at a moment where we can all be sitting here on New Year's Eve and the American people again can be looking at us saying: Why do you all leave this to the very last minute on something that has 52 cosponsors and is the right thing to do for the American people? We should give them certainty now by extending this law permanently.

I also note that if this is going to be extended into the lameduck session, I am very worried about the shenanigans that are going to happen. The shenanigans are on an issue that the Senator from Oregon and I are quite passionate about, and that is the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act my colleague from North Dakota just referenced, which, instead of the Marketplace Fairness Act, I like to call the Internet Sales Tax Selection Act.

My colleague from North Dakota mentioned that this is about the State and local selecting taxes. I respect that State and localities should be able to collect taxes. But for States such as Oregon and New Hampshire which don't have a sales tax, why should our businesses or why should any Internet business in this country take on the responsibility which has traditionally been the responsibility of State and local governments to collect taxes?

Under the so-called Market Fairness Act, what would happen is Internet businesses across this country—including in States such as Oregon and New Hampshire—would become the sales tax collectors for almost 10,000 tax jurisdictions in this country, which is a bureaucratic nightmare for so many thriving Internet businesses. It is an anathema to States such as ours—Oregon and New Hampshire—which have chosen not to have a sales tax.

Most importantly, to subject our great online businesses to the potential that they could be subject to an audit in almost 10,000 taxing jurisdictions to me is the opposite of what I know my colleague from Oregon is trying to accomplish with all the work he has done in this body, not only on the Wyden-Thune Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act—which I fully support—but all the other work he has done to make sure the Internet remains free and prosperous in this country for the benefit of all the American people.

So I object to what my colleague from Oregon has offered. I think a short-term fix is no fix at all. In fact, it leaves the American people again uncertain that we will protect their rights against discriminatory taxes that can be imposed on them over the

Internet, and it also invites shenanigans with the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act that can get attached.

I know some of my colleagues have talked about the potential of attaching this unfair act, which I would like to call the Internet Sales Tax Collection Act, which makes our online businesses across this country the sales tax collectors for almost 10,000 tax jurisdictions in this Nation.

So, for those reasons, I object. I would like to see what my colleague from Oregon has put forth—which is excellent legislation, and I thank him for that—which is permanent tax freedom for the Internet.

With that, I believe the Senator from Texas would also like to be heard on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I wish to briefly explain to people watching the back-and-forth that just occurred what is going on here, because it is easy to not understand everything that is happening. There are three things going on here:

No. 1, what we are unfortunately seeing is the Senate holding one bill hostage in order to try to force through another unpopular bill.

There are two bills concerning the Internet. The first is the Internet Tax Freedom Act. That has been in place for over a decade. It has had bipartisan support. It has been championed by the Senator from Oregon who has been an outspoken and passionate advocate of making sure that when you and I go and sign up for the Internet, we don't face taxes for getting Internet service, and it has worked very well. That law has always been an area of bipartisan agreement.

But there is a second law that has been proposed in this body but not passed. The second law is the Internet sales tax, what its proponents call the Marketplace Fairness Act. The Internet sales tax is not focused on taxing someone just for signing up to the Internet. Rather, the people being punished by the Internet sales tax are all the small businesses trying to sell their wares online, and there are a number of Senators who very much want to impose taxes on those small businesses in 9,600 jurisdictions nationwide.

What is happening here, right now, is even though no one has serious objection to the Internet Tax Freedom Act, we are, unfortunately, seeing our colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle hold that bill hostage in an effort to try to force through the Internet sales tax.

I would note the reason my friend from New Hampshire had no choice but to object to the 2-month proposal is the 2-month time period was not picked out of a hat. Two months means the

Internet Tax Freedom Act would expire during a lameduck session. And why is that? Because in a lameduck session there are a bunch of Members who have been defeated, who aren't going to face voters ever again. A lameduck session is the session most likely to raise taxes.

So why is it there is an effort to extend this just 2 months? So when the Internet Tax Freedom Act expires in the lameduck, the Members of this body who lost their election and are immune from democratic accountability will all come together and say: OK, now let's pass the Internet sales tax. We shouldn't be holding the Internet hostage to the rapacious desire of tax collectors.

A second point I want to make about what is going on here—this is about discriminatory taxes, not about federalism. My friend, the Senator from North Dakota, was a learned attorney general who talked about the 10th Amendment and federalism. I welcome seeing friends of mine on the Democratic side of the aisle embrace the 10th Amendment. I look forward and hope aspirationally that friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will embrace the 10th Amendment on other issues.

I would note, however, that the constitutional history we were told was a little bit off, because if we look at the history of our country, originally we had the Articles of Confederation. The Articles of Confederation allowed States to enact discriminatory taxes against each other, and it led to chaos. It didn't work. One of the reasons our Constitution was adopted was to prevent discriminatory taxes, one State picking on another State.

So when Congress was given the authority to regulate interstate commerce, it is precisely to prevent a little mom and pop selling online from being forced by 9,600 jurisdictions nationwide to collect all of those taxes. If someone is living and working in the State of Texas, they shouldn't have to collect taxes for New York or California—for politicians they don't get to vote for. For politicians they don't get any input on, they shouldn't be forced to collect their taxes.

Indeed, for the approach of Members of this body who want to pass the Internet sales tax, recall President Reagan's famous admonition:

Government's view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases: If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it.

Why don't we stop it at the outset? The Internet is moving. It is generating entrepreneurial steam throughout this country. We haven't been taxing it. Let's not start now.

The third and final point I will make about what this exchange is about is, more than anything, this exchange is about crony capitalism.

I would note the Presiding Officer today has been quite passionate discussing the corruption in Washington that favors big business. What we just saw on this Senate floor illustrates that as powerfully as anything that has happened this year. Because what is the Internet sales tax all about? It is about a coalition of big businesses coming together, both big bricks-and-mortar retailers and big online retailers coming to their elected officials, saying: You know what. We don't like competition. These little guys, these little upstarts, these single moms who start businesses and compete with us, we don't like that. So let's go to our friends in Washington—our friends, mind you, whom we hold campaign fundraisers for, whose campaigns we contribute to—and let's get the Congress to come together and hammer every small online business we can.

That is what we are seeing. This is crony capitalism. This is a law designed to benefit big companies and hurt small startups.

The beauty of our country is that anybody can come to this country with nothing but a hope and a dream and a vision and achieve anything. It is because the entrepreneurial vibrancy of this country gives the little guy a chance. Yet I am sorry to say Washington more and more behaves as though it is for sale to the highest bidder.

Right now, today, the top 1 percent in our country earns a higher share of our income than any year since 1928. We ought to come together in a bipartisan way and say: Stop being the handmaidens of big business. Stop using government to make it harder for the little guy, for young people, for single moms, for Hispanic and African-American entrepreneurs. Stop making it harder for them to achieve the American dream. Stop pulling up the ladder so the big companies can say: We have got ours; nobody else gets theirs.

When big business comes to Washington and says: We want government's help stifling small business, both parties should stand together and say: Sorry. That is not what the Congress is for. We work for the American people. But, I am sorry to say, what we just saw was a powerful demonstration that this Senate right now is more interested in preserving crony capitalism than it is in protecting mom-and-pops, in protecting opportunity, in protecting Internet tax freedom.

But the great thing about our system is at the end of the day, the American people don't work for the 100 Members of this body. It is the other way around: All 100 of us work for the American people. And I will tell you, the American people are getting fed up. They are getting fed up with Members of both parties who spend more time giving in to the corruption of Wash-

ington and entrenching power than they do removing barriers to people achieving the American dream.

I am hopeful and confident that the voters are waking up, are standing up, and will hold every one of us accountable. Democrats and Republicans, every one of us, will be held accountable: Have you fought to make it easier to achieve the American dream or have you simply preserved the corrupt crony capitalism of Washington?

I hope we can together aspire to our better angels. I hope we can come together and keep and preserve in a bipartisan manner Internet tax freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, to briefly respond to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. If the Senator would yield for a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Kansas be recognized, following that I then be recognized, and then Senator SANDERS from Vermont would be following me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, just to be clear: Senator CORNYN would speak next, and then Senator SANDERS would speak after him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the unanimous consent would be the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Texas, and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WYDEN. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, very briefly to describe where I think the Internet tax debate is, we have Republicans and Democrats objecting to what I happen to think is in the country's national interest, and that is a permanent ban on Internet tax discrimination. So we have Republicans and Democrats objecting to that.

Now my colleague from Texas comes forward and says: OK, let's not do a 2-month extension because we don't want to consider this in the lame duck session. But, colleagues, if you don't do the 2-month extension, the Internet Tax Freedom Act will have expired and you are still in the lame duck session. And by the time you get to the lame duck, millions of Americans will be vulnerable to discriminatory Internet taxes.

I am going to close this discussion by saying that in my view neither of the options is exactly ideal, because I

think I made it very clear after 16 years that I would like to make permanent the ban against discriminatory taxes. Neither situation is ideal from my standpoint because Republicans and Democrats both object to doing that today. But what we know is that one option we have in front of us today is worse than the other, and the really bad option is to not do a short-term extension and leave millions of Americans vulnerable to discriminatory taxes.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Madam President.

I wish to speak for a few moments this afternoon on the topic of veterans and veterans affairs, knowing, or at least expecting a vote later today on a piece of legislation that has now been compromised between the House and Senate versions of the bill, and something that I look forward to supporting.

HONORING HERB SCHWARTZKOPF

First of all, though, I wish to take a moment to honor a Kansas veteran, a veteran who dedicated much of his life to serving our country, whether that was on active duty in the Navy or advocating on behalf of other veterans, Mr. Herb Schwartzkopf from Ransom, KS.

Mr. Schwartzkopf's many selfless acts began when he served in the Navy in Vietnam. After separating from the service, he returned to Kansas and joined the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the VFW, which he has been a member of now for more than 35 years. He is considered a life member of the VFW.

Last year the Hutchinson News asked Herb about his life and dedication to serving his fellow veterans. His response was, "I will talk about the 'V,' but I am not going to talk about me." The V is Herb's beloved VFW Post, because he is a humble man who has accomplished much and his priorities in life have been taking care of his country and taking care of the veterans who have served his country.

The countless contributions Herb Schwartzkopf has made over 35 years of advocacy for veterans has earned him the highest honor bestowed by the VFW, the All-American Commander of Post 7972 in Ransom, KS. Herb's VFW post serves as a meeting place and a community service hub for the Lions Club meetings and Thanksgiving feasts for the 296 residents of his hometown. It is also a place for raising funds for local cancer patients and victims, helping fund annual Honor Flights to come see the World War II Memorial by Kansas veterans. The 160 members of Post 7972 complete more than 250 service projects and volunteer more than 4,000 hours a year.

His leadership at the VFW post has deservedly won the National Community Service Post of the Year award five times, including 3 years in a row for 2009, 2010, and 2011.

The Ransom VFW's success is a result of true selflessness. As Herb put it: "If something comes up and somebody needs help, we just try to rise to the occasion." It seems only fitting that he has earned this prestigious award as All-American Post Commander.

I pay tribute to him, to his post, his service to our country, and his service to other Kansans, and thank him for that care and concern for other veterans across the country. So I say thank you for your selfless dedication. On behalf of all Kansans, we wish you well and we are fortunate to have you as a citizen of our State and a citizen of our Nation.

TOXIC EXPOSURE RESEARCH

I also want to speak about legislation today that has been introduced by Senator BLUMENTHAL and me. It is an issue that Senator BLUMENTHAL brought to my attention and today we have introduced the Toxic Exposure Research Act of 2014.

We unfortunately live in a nation where men and women volunteer their services to sacrifice and support us to have the strongest, freest, greatest Nation in the world. When servicemembers raise their right hand and take the oath of enlistment or commissioning, they commit their lives to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect the freedoms we hold dear.

Standing by their side through combat tours and multiple duty stations around the world is their family. We should and we must acknowledge that their family members are being called to sacrifice for our Nation as well.

The Toxic Exposure Research Act is about addressing the wounds of war that might impact a servicemember's family—wounds that may not be evident for decades later when it is passed on to the next person of their family or the next generation. This legislation would provide for the research on health conditions of dependents of veterans who were exposed to toxins during their service to our Nation such as Agent Orange in Vietnam, gulf war neurotoxins, burn pits in Iraq, or other chemicals from recent conflicts overseas.

I am not a veteran, but my life has been shaped by the fact that the Vietnam war took place during my high school years. Many of my conversations in high school were spent talking to those who were a few years older than I who were volunteering or being drafted, and for those who returned home to my hometown after their service in Vietnam.

During Vietnam, many of our veterans were exposed to Agent Orange and years later many veterans and

their families are still struggling with the side effects of that exposure. Agent Orange specifically has been shown to cause birth defects in children of military members who came in contact with the toxin during the Vietnam war. There are other poisons from wars since Vietnam that have led to life-altering health problems and painful tragedies among veterans and their families.

A story of Herb Worthington and his daughter Karen is compelling. Mr. Worthington was drafted to serve in Vietnam and was exposed to Agent Orange. Years after his service came to an end he suffered from many conditions as a proven result of his exposure to Agent Orange. His daughter has battled MS for more than 19 years and has been treated for other conditions such as melanoma and an extremely painful nerve condition. Her life has been handicapped by health problems and various kinds of illnesses which must be studied in connection with the exposure of her father and what he experienced with Agent Orange.

Stories like Mr. Worthington's and his daughter Karen's have been shared all across the country in townhall meetings. I have heard them in stories at home in Kansas and they have been collected by the Vietnam Veterans of America. This is an issue that is important to all veterans. It is important to all Americans that we live up to our commitment to those who serve, and it is time we take necessary steps to help and protect their families now and for generations to come. Many people we will never know may be affected by the consequences of their mother, father, grandmother, or grandfather's service to their country. Clear evidence of unsettling conditions and those personal stories warrant the need to collect data to research and study the consequences of these toxins.

I invite my colleagues to learn more about these conditions and the impact they are having on family members of veterans by checking out a social media page, Faces of Agent Orange, through the Vietnam Veterans Association, VVA. The fact is many symptoms from toxic exposure are misdiagnosed in descendants of veterans because of lack of understanding and lack of scientific proof.

I would ask my colleagues to join us in giving the authority to the Secretary—the new Secretary we confirmed earlier this week—a tool he needs so he can designate a VA medical center as a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of descendants of individuals or soldiers exposed to toxic substances during their service to our country, during their time as military members.

This legislation would establish an advisory board of experts to advise the national center and the VA Secretary

with determining the health conditions studied and those that are a result of toxic exposure.

The Department of Defense has a role to play here in this research, sharing incidents of military members who were exposed to substances, to enhance the studies and outcomes conducted by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Ultimately our hope is this medical research would determine those conditions that are the result of debilitating toxins and lead to appropriate support and benefits, cures and treatments for family members.

Military families support our Nation in their love and commitment to those who served in the Armed Forces, and they should not inherit the painful residual wounds of war that put their lives at risk long after the military operation is over. Toxic exposure research is a necessary step toward making certain our military men and women and their descendants will be properly cared for. It is also a step toward making certain that those toxins are not used in a way that causes this to be repeated again in any future war.

We must keep our promises to our veterans and to their families who have made the greatest sacrifice for the sake of our country, our security, our freedom, and our country's future.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, later on today I expect we would be voting on the emergency supplemental appropriation that the President had requested to deal with the humanitarian crisis on the Texas border. Over the past few weeks I have spoken about this and made several trips down to the valley. I will be leaving tonight along with colleagues. There is a bipartisan congressional delegation going down again to the valley and to Lackland Air Force Base where about 1200 children are currently being housed by the Department of Health and Human Services pending their placement with their relatives in the country.

As part of this discussion we have been having in the search for solutions to this unexpected flood of humanity in the form of unaccompanied children coming across the southwestern border, many of us are trying to figure out exactly what the cause of this flood is. In fact, I think it is probably more than one cause. I think perhaps it is the President's statements that he is going to defer action or refuse to enforce our current immigration laws against a certain class of immigrants that is known as the President's deferred executive action order of 2012.

But there is also another cause that has been recognized on a bipartisan basis, and this is a 2008 human trafficking law that passed essentially unanimously in 2008, because we were

focused on one problem; that is, human trafficking, but the unexpected consequences or unintended consequences of that created a business model that is being exploited by the transnational criminal organizations, or cartels, as they traffic in human beings coming from Central America through Mexico up to the Texas border.

Together with my colleague in the House, HENRY CUELLAR, a Democrat, we have introduced a bipartisan, bicameral reform, something we call the HUMANE Act, and it has been cosponsored by people who have supported the so-called Gang of 8 bill in the Senate and people who opposed the Gang of 8 bill.

I raise that point to note that this isn't about comprehensive immigration reform. We have a lot of work to be done. But this is actually intended to solve this immediate problem right in front of our eyes and to stop this hemorrhaging on our southwestern border. My hope is once we address that problem, we can come together in a bipartisan way and address the larger defects in our immigration system, of which there are many. This is, simply put, an attempt to tackle a national emergency.

Let me briefly recapitulate what I am talking about. Since October of last year 57,000 unaccompanied children have been detained on the southwestern border. Under current law—this 2008 law I mentioned—these children are processed by the Border Patrol and they are placed with the Department of Health and Human Services, as it turns out an average of 35 days, and then placed with a family member in the United States or, if not a family member, some sponsor.

Part of the problem is that they are given a notice to appear at a future court hearing and very few of them appear. Thus, they are successful in making their way from Honduras, El Salvador, or Guatemala up through Mexico into the United States, and end up successfully immigrating to the United States illegally, outside of our broken immigration system.

What we need to do in order to fix that gap in the law, that loophole which was unintended by those of us who voted to pass the 2008 law, is to require that these children be held in protective custody and given a speedy hearing in front of an immigration judge for those who want to make the claim for asylum or some other relief. But the truth is the vast majority of these children, like the adults, will not have a claim to stay under existing law and our bill doesn't change that existing law. But for those who do, they have a speedy opportunity to appear in front of a judge and make that claim. Those who do not have a valid claim will simply be returned to their home country, to their family.

This morning I was invited, along with Members of the House and the

Senate, to visit with the President about national security matters. He talked about Ukraine, he talked about Syria, he talked about Gaza, and all of the hot spots around the world. I used the opportunity to ask the President what he proposed that we do when this emergency supplemental bill goes down this afternoon.

The reason this bill will fail is because the majority leader simply is asking us to appropriate money and do nothing to fix the problem we have attempted to address in the HUMANE Act with Congressman CUELLAR that I mentioned a moment ago.

In essence, the President asked for a blank check, when he himself acknowledged this morning in my presence and the presence of a bipartisan group of Senators and Congressmen that he knows we need to address this problem or it will just get worse if we don't address it.

It is quite remarkable to me that the President of the United States acknowledges we have a problem we need to address. When the Secretary of Homeland Security, who is trying to use the tools available to him to solve this crisis but knows he needs more tools and more authority, at the same time the President makes that acknowledgment, and at the same time his Secretary of Homeland Security identifies the need for additional authority in order to address the problem, the President has reported he wants to actually expand this deferred action Executive order he issued in 2012 and say to the people who are coming to our country outside of our immigration laws: It is OK. You can stay here. There are no consequences associated with that.

The problem with that is the message that is being sent to the cartels who traffic in human beings and make a lot of money off of it—like I said a moment ago, this is part of their business model—by exploiting this loophole in the law.

What sort of message does this send to the families who would send their children on this horrific journey from Central America through Mexico on the back of a train called The Beast? They are willing to send their children on this journey even though they could be injured, sexually assaulted, kidnapped or held for ransom. We don't know how many of them start the journey but don't make it because of the horrific conditions by the criminal organizations, not to mention the exposure to the hot weather and difficult environmental circumstances.

By failing to address the root cause of the problem, what we are saying is: That is OK. Keep coming. Indeed, that is why it is projected that of the 57,000 unaccompanied children who have made it here so far and have been detained—by the way, they are not trying to evade detection by Border Patrol.

They are turning themselves in because they realize they will be processed and placed with Health and Human Services, and essentially, by and large, they will be able to stay. That is what we need to address.

Unfortunately, the House tried to work together today to pass a bill that would, I believe, have provided more money, as the President requested—not as much as he requested, but an emergency appropriation, together with the reforms to that 2008 law which would have addressed this problem.

Unfortunately, because the House of Representatives could not get any Democratic support, that bill failed and so the Speaker of the House pulled the bill from the floor. As a result, they will not be able to pass any legislation to send over to the Senate. That should not cause any of our colleagues here in the Senate much joy because the fact of the matter is the House has its independent duty to act and we have our own duty to act, and we can and should do that this afternoon.

We should do what the House attempted to do, which is to pass a slimmed-down appropriations bill on an emergency basis to help surge resources to the border but at the same time find a way to come together and plug the hole in this 2008 law, which is necessary to stop the problem—at least on this surgical basis.

What is so confusing is to listen to the President talk in his conference room at the White House about this and acknowledge the nature of the problem, and then to see that the White House threatened to veto the legislation that the House was considering. There are a lot of mixed messages, to say the least, with regard to the President's commitment to actually enforce the law. We know that in too many instances he has simply refused to enforce the law, and our immigration law is just one of those. But to hear such mixed messages out of the White House and the administration that yes, we need to act—we should not just write a blank check. We ought to do the policy reforms with it that would solve the problem.

I will just add that in talking to Secretary Johnson—I don't think I am disclosing any confidence he himself wouldn't repeat—there is actually an earlier experience we had in 2005 and 2006 which I think is very instructive and which we have discussed.

Secretary Chertoff was Secretary of Homeland Security when President Bush was in the White House and we had a surge of people coming from countries other than Mexico, so-called OTMs—in this case Brazilians. In 2005, we saw a surge of 30,000 Brazilian immigrants at the southwestern border. Upon investigation, they realized the reason we saw a surge in these numbers was because of a policy known as catch and release—colloquially.

In other words, people came to the country, were caught, given notice to appear at a future court hearing, and they simply disappeared and melted into the great American landscape, knowing they would successfully immigrate illegally into the United States.

It is the same policy of catch and release that is causing this surge of unaccompanied minors, not to mention single adults with young children. We don't have adequate detention facilities for them, so they are released, given a bus ticket, and told to come back for their court hearing a year or more later. And they simply never show up.

We have all been noticing with great concern this humanitarian crisis at the border and the conflicting and contradictory messages and actions coming out of Washington, DC. So it was not really all that surprising to me to see a new poll that was reported this morning where 68 percent of the respondents disapproved of the President's handling of the immigration issue—68 percent. According to the Washington Post this morning, no other single issue trumps immigration in terms of Presidential disapproval. That is a shocking number.

Unfortunately, when I asked the President today: What happens, Mr. President, when we leave for the August recess and nothing happens to address this problem? He said: Well, one thing we are going to have to do is reprogram money from other programs and use that money to address this hole and this surge needed at the southwestern border.

I was disappointed the President didn't say what I was hoping he would say, and that is: I am going to call majority leader HARRY REID, and I am going to tell him he needs to allow a vote on some of the amendments we are going to offer, such as the HUMANE Act, on this emergency supplemental, and give the Senate an opportunity to vote for a solution and not just another blank check. Unfortunately, I didn't hear that commitment from the President.

As a result, this afternoon we are going to leave this city and go back home without doing anything to address what the President himself has called a humanitarian crisis. The problem is just going to get worse. As long as the magnet exists, as long as this business model that the cartels have figured out continues to be lucrative and they continue to make money exploiting it and we don't do anything to fix it, the numbers will get worse and worse. And as we see children being placed in literally warehouse-type settings around the country, we are going to continue to see more and more backlash from the American people as they realize the Federal Government is failing in its most basic function, which is to secure our border and enforce our laws.

Unfortunately, this is what Presidential abdication of duty looks like.

The President identified a national emergency, but has done virtually nothing to address it. Indeed, he said: We have a problem, and we need to fix it. He then threatened to veto the very legislation the House proposed would fix it.

This is what happens when a President openly and proudly is contemptuous of his obligation to faithfully enforce the law of the land by not only issuing an Executive order in 2012 that is beyond his legal authority to do but also by saying that because Congress has not done what I want them to do as far as reforming our immigration laws, I am going to further expand my Executive order and refuse to enforce the law with regard to more and more people. That is not a secret. It is well reported in the newspapers and on television, and it is not lost on the people who make money exploiting this system nor the people who want to come to the United States outside of our immigration laws.

Sadly, I can only conclude that although the President plainly knows what we need to do, as do his cabinet members, and although prominent Democrats have plainly identified what we need to do to fix the problem, when he doesn't demand that the majority leader allow a vote and a solution to that problem, I can only conclude that he is listening to his political advisers and not making the best judgment that is in the best interest of the American people. I can't explain it any other way.

So on in one last attempt this afternoon to address this crisis, I, along with several of my colleagues, am introducing an alternative to this blank check that the President has requested and Majority Leader REID will set for a vote. It will include many of the reforms I mentioned earlier in the HUMANE Act, but specifically our legislation would treat all unaccompanied minors the same under the law. It would correct that loophole in the 2008 law that treats unaccompanied minors from Mexico differently from unaccompanied children from noncontiguous countries. It would give Federal, State, and local authorities the resources they need in order to manage the crisis. It would improve our detention capacity so we would end this catch and release which is being exploited, and it would ensure safe repatriation by filing for protective custody for all those children who don't qualify for an immigration benefit under current law.

Our bill would prevent the Obama administration also from unilaterally creating yet another deferred action program that would further add gasoline to this fire and cause these numbers to continue to grow and the humanitarian crisis to expand. In other words, our bill would help resolve the current crisis and would help prevent a similar crisis from occurring in the future.

Under the Senate procedures, the only person who can make the decision whether the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on such a reform is the majority leader, and he has already announced that he intends not to allow us to offer that reform. So I expect we will end up leaving here today having done nothing, in spite of the fact there is bipartisan and bicameral recognition that we are experiencing a crisis and the President and his own cabinet have identified the causes but refuse to do anything about them. To me that is the very definition of dysfunction and the very reason that the American people are absolutely disgusted with the refusal of Congress and the executive branch to do what we know needs to be done—and it is a tragedy.

I hope the majority leader will reconsider and give us a chance to vote on this reform to help solve the problem, and then we can move on and address other important problems that face our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Vermont.

VA CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the VA conference committee report, which I expect and hope will be on the floor here in a couple of hours. That conference committee report was passed yesterday by the House with an overwhelming vote of 420 to 5, and I hope very much our vote here in the Senate will be as strong as the vote in the House.

The conference committee legislation that we will be voting on, frankly, is certainly not the legislation I would have written. I think it is fair to say it is not the legislation that the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, JEFF MILLER, would have written; it is, in fact, a compromise, but it is a compromise I can strongly support, and I hope all of my Senate colleagues will support it as well.

This bill does a number of very important things to address the problems facing the veterans of our country. Right now veterans in many parts of this country are on very long waiting lists before they get VA health care. I think in the last month or so the VA has made a concerted effort to reach out to those veterans and to get them care when necessary in the private sector, and I think Acting Secretary Sloan Gibson did a good job in jumpstarting that process and saying to veterans we are going to do everything we can to get them quality care in a timely manner. Obviously, this is an expensive proposition, but it is one we have to address.

This legislation we will be voting on in a few hours provides \$10 billion to make sure every eligible veteran in this country will get timely health care, quality health care, and they will do that through the private sector,

through community health centers, through Department of Defense facilities, and Indian Health Service Clinics when those facilities work for veterans. If there is a community health center in a community, the veteran can go in there and the VA will pay that bill. That is the effort we are making to significantly reduce these long waiting lines.

This bill also provides a remedy for a condition many of us consider to be terribly important, and that is it gets to the root of why it is that we have long waiting periods in many VA facilities around the country. The reality is that in the last 4 or 5 years we have seen, as a result of the wars in Iraq and in Afghanistan, some 2 million more veterans coming into the VA, a net increase of about 1.5 million patients. That is a lot of people. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind or in the mind of the VA that if we are going to do justice to our veterans, we are going to need more doctors, more mental health counselors, more nurses, more medical personnel in general, so that when a veteran walks into a VA facility, that veteran will get quality care in a timely manner.

I have heard testimony in the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was very clear, and what virtually every major veterans organization has said is that when veterans get into the system, the quality of care they receive is good. It is good. That is not just what veterans are saying and what veterans organizations are saying; that is what a number of independent surveys and studies show us. The problem is access, and if we are going to on a long-term basis address that access problem, it is important to make sure we have the doctors, the nurses, and the medical personnel we should have. This bill provides \$5 billion to make sure we get that personnel.

In addition to that, there are many facilities all over the country where there are very serious space problems. There are not the examination rooms doctors need in order to work efficiently, and this legislation addresses that with a \$5 billion appropriation.

In addition, there has been legislation passed in the House overwhelmingly that says, quite correctly, we need to fund 27 major medical facilities all over this country in 18 States and in Puerto Rico, and this legislation does that as well.

In addition, what this legislation says—and this is mostly applicable to our rural States—is that if someone is a veteran living hundreds of miles away from a VA facility, when they are sick in the middle of winter or in the middle of summer, they are not going to have to travel hundreds of miles to get their physical therapy or to get the health care they need. If a veteran is living 40 miles away from a VA facility, they will be able to get their care

in their community, again through a private doctor, through a community health center, through an Indian Health Service facility, through a Department of Defense facility.

This is a big step forward for many veterans in rural communities who will now be able to get care in the area they live rather than having to travel long distances to get health care.

This legislation also addresses some other very important issues that have not gotten a whole lot of attention but they are important, and I will mention what they are. All of us know that one of the outrages we have seen in recent years within the military is the very high level of sexual assault against women and against men as well. This legislation provides funding for the VA to increase their capability so women and men who are sexually assaulted will be able to come into the VA and get the care they need to address the problems associated with that assault, and I think that is a very important step forward.

This legislation also takes action we should have taken some years ago. The post-9/11 GI bill has been enormously successful in providing educational opportunities for the men and women who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan and people who have served since 9/11. There was a gap in that legislation, and that gap was that a spouse of someone who died in Iraq or in Afghanistan was not eligible for all of the educational benefits of that post-9/11 GI bill. This legislation remedies that omission. It expands the John David Fry Scholarship Program to include surviving spouses of members of the Armed Forces who died in the line of duty. That means many young women out there will now have the opportunity to get a college education who otherwise would not have, and I think we owe that to all of those people who have already suffered so much.

This legislation also allows for veterans—all veterans eligible for the post-9/11 GI bill—to qualify for instate tuition under that legislation. This was part of a bill previously passed in the House, and we are going to pass it in the Senate.

There is another provision in here which is very important. A program which provides housing for veterans with traumatic brain injury was about to expire. This legislation extends that program for a number of years, which will be a real relief for people who were worried they would be out on the street and not have adequate housing.

It has been from day one—from my first day as chairman of the veterans committee—my belief that the cost of war in terms of what it does to the men and women who fight our battles is a lot greater than most Americans fully understand. We all mourn the 6,700-plus men and women who died in Iraq and in Afghanistan, but we should understand

the cost of war is much greater than that tragedy. The cost of war is the men and women who came home without legs, came home without arms, without eyesight, loss of hearing; the cost of war is the 500,000 men and women who came home from Iraq and Afghanistan with the signature illnesses of this war, which are post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. Those are the signature injuries of this war, and we are talking about 500,000 men and women coming home with those very serious problems. In fact, today—just today—and every day close to 50,000 veterans are going to get outpatient mental health care in VA facilities all over this country—close to 50,000.

It has also been my view that when we fully understand the costs of war and the needs of the veterans and their families, it is absolutely imperative that we do not make veterans into political pawns. We do not say, yes, we are going to fund veterans' needs, but we are going to cut Head Start, we are going to cut the National Institutes of Health or we are going to cut education. That is absolutely unfair to our veterans. A cost of war is the cost of planes and guns and tanks and aircraft carriers—those are a cost of war. An equally significant cost of war is the needs of men and women who fought our battles and who used those weapons. What this legislation says and what the House just passed by a 420-to-5 vote is that taking care of veterans is in fact a cost of war.

The CBO has come up with some recent estimates which lower the costs a little bit. But this bill will put close to—a little bit less than \$17 billion into VA health care over the next several years. There is \$5 billion in offsets from within the VA that I was comfortable with that will bring the total cost of this package down to somewhere around perhaps \$11 billion. Is that a lot of money? It is a lot of money. But that is the cost of war, and that is what happens when millions of veterans come home and need the care they are entitled to receive.

As I mentioned a moment ago, the House passed this legislation by an overwhelming vote of 420 to 5. I wish to thank Chairman MILLER in the House for the work he has done in getting that result. My understanding is that in a few hours we will be voting on that bill, and I hope we can pass this legislation with a very strong bipartisan vote.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

ISRAEL

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, early this week I joined with Senator BOXER to introduce the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014. This is an updated version of bipartisan legislation we introduced in March of last

year. It is designed to help the economic strength, the security cooperation between our two countries.

As of right now, Senator BOXER and I and 79 of our colleagues, including the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ, are cosponsors, so 81 Members have cosponsored this legislation at a very important time. I think it sends a message to the world and it sends a message to Israel that our partnership is strong. It sends the message that the Congress, starting with the Senate, is committed to that partnership. It says that not only do we want to have the kind of defensive understanding we have had so we have joint defense agreements, so we have the kind of equipment and supplies stationed in Israel that we need and use in a time of crisis or they could borrow from us in times of crisis, but also the economic partnerships in water, energy, in cybersecurity and other information. Certainly looking at what is happening in Gaza, looking at the unique relationship between our two countries, where at least two of the members of the Israeli Defense Forces who have been killed in the last few weeks have also been American citizens. Those two individuals, along with a number of others serving in the defense forces for Israel, backed up and supported by other Americans who go to Israel to support the defense of their country—this is a particularly important time to send this message. It is a message that there is broad agreement on in a bipartisan way, with virtually 81 Senators agreeing.

I will turn to my friend with whom I have worked on this for 2 years now, Senator BOXER, to make a unanimous consent request so our bill can be done and this message sent to Israel and the world before we leave this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2673

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Israel faces 100 rocket attacks a day from a terrorist organization called Hamas. Israel is trying to cope with getting rid of tunnels that have been built by this terrorist organization, with one purpose: to send terrorists through those tunnels so they can kidnap, torture, and kill Israeli citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 492, S. 2673; that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I just want to say the partnership Senator BLUNT and Senator BOXER have on this issue is one that I think is spectacular. I have

talked to both of them ad nauseam about this issue. Senator BLUNT and I have had multiple conversations this week. He is one of our great leaders in this body and is always trying to find a way to come to a solution. Senator BOXER and I have worked on another issue this week, and I cannot tell you how much I have enjoyed working with her office.

This is an actual bill. This is not a resolution. In order to try to expedite this being able to come to the floor before we go to the August recess, we had scheduled a committee meeting here today, one impromptu, but to go through the normal committee process. I thank Chairman MENENDEZ for his cooperation and willingness to do that.

As it was scheduled, it is my understanding that a number of Members had amendments to this bill. I know for that reason—and I understand this fully—the business meeting to actually have a markup in committee was then canceled. I know the chairman of EPW has committee protocol, and when committee members want to amend things they try to go through that protocol. I know Senator BLUNT, being the leader he has been in the House and here, understands that process.

I am going to, over the next hour or so—I have a little time here—check with committee members and see, relative to the normal protocols, how they might feel about this coming directly to the floor. I just tried to do that a minute ago, but knowing this is not the typical way of doing things and knowing that people actually had some amendments—I know there were some reservations about the visa waiver process and other things—I am going to have to object. I do so with total respect for these two Senators but also for respect for the committee process we all try to work through together. So with that, I object.

I do not know how long we are going to be in this evening but—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if you sense some emotion and anger in my voice, I have it. I am shocked and deeply saddened that my friend would come here and object, when for days and days and days he told me—he told me—he would not do this. My friend told me he would not object.

This bill has the support of 81 Senators. To come here and object that his committee, which I am so proud to be—as a matter of fact, I am a senior person on that committee. My chairman is one of the great chairmen of the U.S. Senate. We bent over backward. I wanted to offer this on Monday with Senator BLUNT. He was disappointed. I said: I am talking to Senator CORKER. We are trying to work together. Eighty

one Senators support this, and 1 Senator comes and says: Oh, it is a little bit—we need to go to the committee. There is a war going on. Hamas has put on its channel proudly showing terrorists going through tunnels.

This bill is absolutely critical. It is an updated version of the bipartisan legislation we introduced last March. We worked for 16 months. We had issues with the visa waiver. We tried to take it through the committee in May. They tried to attach amendments on Iran. We need to work hard with the administration on the Iran issue. It is critical. But there is a war going on. This bill is critical, and I am so grateful to Senator BLUNT and all of my cosponsors.

In passing this bill today, the Senate would send a clear and unequivocal message. Let's be clear. We are leaving town. I do not want to leave town, but we are leaving town, and we are not going to have a chance, with all due respect to my friend, to take a look at this for a long time. This is the time, on the way out the door, to send an unequivocal message to our ally.

Hamas continues to escalate through those tunnels. We all mourn every civilian life lost—every life lost on either side. Think about it. If in our country we had rockets coming over here from Canada or from Mexico or from the sea into our Nation, what would we do? What would we do?

Concrete that was meant to build up Gaza—and I stood at that line when Israel gave up Gaza, gave it up. I was proud they did it, and I thought: What a chance for the Palestinians. I feel for them because Hamas has taken over and they use that concrete that was meant to rebuild for tunnels. I watched the video. I saw the terrorists go through, proudly bearing their weapons, sneaking up on a post and killing five Israelis. They tried to kidnap their bodies but they were unable to do it.

So if not now, when is the time to pass this legislation? To say it is bipartisan is an understatement. Almost the entire Senate is on it. We all know there are a lot of important issues. My goodness. I am going to be standing here and talking about a lot of them.

This is an emergency. That is why this United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act is so critical, including our assistance for the Iron Dome missile defense system.

What is important in our bill is we increase by \$200 million the value of U.S. weapons we hold, we stockpile in Israel to a total of \$1.8 billion. At the rate these rockets are coming over, at the rate these tunnels need to be destroyed, we need to act. We need to act. We need to send a clear message to our friend Israel, and it sends a message to Hamas.

I have to say, yes, we have a visa waiver program in here. Guess what it does. It treats Israel the same way we

treat other countries. I will read the names of those countries: Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, Slovakia, Estonia, and the Czech Republic. Why shouldn't Israel have that same opportunity? We worked on this provision. I know my friend has problems, but we fixed those provisions. We have given maximum flexibility on those provisions.

So I am sad—that is an understatement—I am distressed, I am shocked and stunned that this afternoon, before we go out the door, with 81 Senators on a bill—a bill we actually passed a couple years ago, a similar bill, and the House passed a similar bill—that I have a friend, who is my friend—he is my friend—treating this Senator and the chairman in a way that I think is so unfair and to me betrays all the days that we talked about this, the weeks we talked about this, the way we have fixed this legislation.

Most of all, I think it is a dark moment—a dark moment—when we would walk away from this opportunity to take a stand against terrorism.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I would just like to say that, look, I do not know what happened. We had a committee meeting scheduled today. The Senator is right that I agreed not to object to this and also not to offer any amendments in committee, and if it came through committee I was perfectly fine with it being unanimously consented to.

For some reason, the Senator caused the committee hearing to be called off. So she is exactly right, I would not be down here objecting to something being discharged from committee had the committee meeting not been called off.

I say to the chairman—I talked to him late last night. I thank him for trying to make this process work in the right way, and I thank his staff for being willing to set up a committee meeting today. But for some reason, the Senator from California decided she did not want to have the committee meeting.

I am sorry she is sad. I am a little emotional now that she would suggest that I would agree to UC something, when I—yes, I will if it comes through committee. I do not understand why the committee was called off. But apparently the committee—the person sponsoring this bill apparently does not want to vote on amendments other members want to offer. Not me. I had no idea any members wanted to offer amendments, by the way, but they did, and I am sorry this has not worked out either. But that is the way it is. I have no idea why the committee meeting was called off. I would love for the Senator to tell me that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think my colleague knows absolutely the reason why. All this is just disingenuous. My friend knows—we discussed it—that if we load down this bill with extraneous amendments on other subjects it would never pass. We know that. I have been around here a long time. I know how a bill becomes a law, and thank God I learned it.

One thing I know. When you start loading down a very important piece of legislation that is emergency legislation with unrelated amendments, it is not going to be able to be done on the way out the door, and my friend knows it. We have—

Mr. CORKER. Well—

Mrs. BOXER. Excuse me. I have the time.

My friend can get emotional about process. Be my guest. I am not emotional about process. I am emotional about results. How would the Senator feel if he had a terrorist group digging tunnels under his cities? That is an issue separate and apart from our agreement we have to have a good agreement on Iran. But you know when you start amending these bills like that, they are not going to go through on unanimous consent.

So I am disheartened, disappointed, saddened, and I think everybody knows what has happened here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, let me say one more time, I have no amendments to offer to this bill. I was in no way going to load down this bill with any amendments. I just asked that it go through a committee process. By the way, if amendments should not be added to a bill, typically what happens is people vote them down. I would assume that had we had a committee meeting today—I know we had one scheduled earlier today—extraneous amendments would have been voted down. But with that, I am certainly, I can tell you at this point, ready to dismiss this issue. I have no desire to try to call members of the committee at this moment to try to resolve this. I am very disappointed that the Senator from California would take liberties to say such things that this Senator would come down and agree to a unanimous consent without it going through committee.

I thank the chairman again for agreeing to do that. But it was called off because there were amendments. I understand that. I really do. But that is the prerogative. I think the Senator from Wyoming—standing in the well—had an amendment he wanted to have heard. I have not even seen the amendment. But that is what people do in a committee process. Again, if they do not want it attached to a bill, what they typically do is vote down the amendment.

But I am very disappointed in the comments by the Senator from Cali-

fornia. It looks as if this will not be heard. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I came to the floor in the first instance to support Senator BOXER's unanimous consent request on the U.S.-Israel strategic partnership, which, as she has pointed out, has—in this institution we do not very often get 81 Members to agree that there is a course of action we want to take. She and Senator BLUNT have acquired 81 cosponsors—including me and a majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—to do exactly that.

Given the current situation in the region, I think the legislation sends the right message at the right time. Israel clearly has a right to self-defense. No country should stand by while thousands of rockets are being launched at it and a terrorist organization next door digs tunnels to funnel fighters into its country to kill its citizens. That is what is happening.

Part of the effort of this legislation, the U.S.-Israel cooperation—well, one example is an antimissile system called Iron Dome, which is an example of what our two countries can do together—save lives through technological advancement and defense cooperation. I think these are incredibly important opportunities.

Beyond that, given the advances in shared achievement that have resulted from this U.S.-Israel partnership, this bill authorizes the President to further enhance cooperation in the fields of water, energy, homeland security, agriculture, and alternative-fuel technology.

But the U.S.-Israel partnership extends far beyond our excellent security partnership. Senator BOXER's legislation does just that. It authorizes increased, enhanced, and enriched cooperation that reflects the critical importance of our bilateral relationship. It goes into Israel's energy security.

Not long ago Israel was completely dependent on energy imports, but given recent discoveries they may soon be energy independent. But they need help. Thanks in part to work by Senator LANDRIEU, this bill would help provide the technical know-how on how to regulate a responsible natural gas extraction industry, how to charge and collect royalties, and how to plan for distribution and export networks. In other words, this bill can help make Israel an energy provider for the region and for Europe, greatly enhancing Israel's energy security and forming important economic ties with its neighbors.

There are a lot of reasons for the Senate to pass this legislation and particularly to do so now.

Let me address the process question. The ranking member did ask me late yesterday to have a markup. When we

talk about process, we called for a markup in short order, without the regular timeframe, but also with what was, for me, an understanding that there were going to be no amendments. It was going to be an up-or-down vote on the legislation. If I had understood there were going to be amendments offered, then we would have had to have a timeframe to know what amendments they were going to be so Members could consider what those amendments are and could judge them—not at the spur of the moment when we sat down and convened a meeting but so they could make an informed judgment.

Because it was a truncated process, which I was trying to accommodate the ranking member on, and because I felt we were going to go through basically an up-or-down vote, I called for the meeting. But then, unbeknownst to us, all of a sudden we were told there were going to be a series of amendments—amendments which were not even filed and for which there was no timeframe and therefore would come at a moment's notice when the meeting was convened and with no one having had the opportunity to understand the nature, substance, or consequences of those amendments. In my mind, that is not regular order.

So maybe there was a misunderstanding, but because there was a clear understanding, from my perspective, to do it in an irregular fashion—very short notice, with no amendment filing deadlines—but in order to accommodate the concern that legislation should not come but through the committee and onto the floor, I agreed to a special session, a special business meeting. Unfortunately, I do not know whether there is a misunderstanding of agreements here, but that is the nature under which I agreed.

When I found out there were going to be all types of amendments, including amendments that are extraneous to the subject matter, I decided we could not do that in good order and in reasonable conscience, so we pulled down the business meeting.

Let me say that I understand we have two concurrent resolutions pending before the Senate on the use of human shields by Hamas and supporting Israel's security. I support the substance of both of those Republican resolutions. However, I am not willing to allow them to move and provide lip-service to Israel's security when Members of the same party are preventing us from taking real action to support Israel's security by objecting to this bill, even though I do not question my distinguished colleague, who has worked incredibly well with me over the last year and a half, about what his concerns are about process. But we can't have Members want to offer all types of amendments, including extraneous amendments to this bill, and

then say "But we are asking the chairman to release the resolutions on human shields"—which I in substance support—"from the committee," but when we can really do something for Israel, which is to pass this legislation, to say "No, we cannot go through this process because it is not regular order." It is also not regular order to allow resolutions not to come through the committee as well. I hope that maybe in the timeframe there might be a way to consult with Members on both sides of the aisle to see if there can be a resolution.

I do not judge anybody's purposes. But let me make it clear for the record that, yes, we did have a special business meeting. It was out of the regular order as to how we would call such a meeting and the procedures we would have for such a meeting. But it was done in good faith in order to accommodate the ultimate goal, which is passing an incredible piece of legislation at an incredibly important period of time.

I see my colleague wants to say something. I have something else to say that is not related.

I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to say that everything the chairman has said is absolutely correct. Of course, the committee can meet with the consent of everyone willing to do so. I appreciate him and his willingness to do that.

I will say one of the members—I am actually speaking through the Chair to the chairman, if I could. I just had one of the members on the floor walk by and share with me that he really was not going to ask for a vote on amendments; he just wanted to share some thoughts but was going to pull them.

I understand how the chairman would want to pull down a committee meeting if there were going to be lots of amendments, and I assure you I had no idea there would be any amendments. But I know some people brought some forward. My sense is that there may not have been a desire to have a vote on those, especially based on one of the Senators on our committee just walking by and sharing that with me. So what I might do in the interim is get on the phone and see if the committee members who had amendments actually wanted a vote on those or just wanted to express concerns. Maybe it is possible, within the time left, to handle this in a way that works for all.

But I very much appreciate the chairman's willingness. I want to say to him again that I had no idea people had amendments to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If I may through the Chair—I appreciate that.

Let me just say we were told there were amendments for the purposes of votes. Maybe that did not end up being the ultimate intention of some; others may have wanted votes. But I will say to the distinguished ranking member that if there are colleagues who want to express a reservation but are not seeking a vote, they would have the opportunity to come to the floor. I am sure we could carve out some time under which we could talk about what those reservations are. They would be fully on the record, and we might find a pathway forward to being able to cast a vote on this bill. But I will leave that for my colleague and his conversations with his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. CORKER. I will close by saying that I think it is perfectly fair for the chairman to say that if we can't have a bill like this discharged on the floor, then other resolutions which sometimes do come to the floor without going through committee because they do not have a binding effect—I can understand why he would take that position.

But I really do appreciate the way the chairman has worked with me on so many occasions. Again, I am disappointed in the comments that were made earlier. But this is the understanding we have had. I think had the committee process gone forward, we probably would not have had votes. But we will just see.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, before Senator CORKER leaves the floor, I want to make sure I understand because maybe there is a window of opportunity to revisit this. I want to make sure I heard what he said.

It was my clear understanding—and the Senator said he does not know why I thought this—that my friend would not object to this if it came to the floor. I had staff conversations. I know the Senator is saying after it came out of committee, but there were other conversations I am privy to staff to staff. So let me say that.

Is it my friend's interest to go and talk to Senator BARRASSO in particular—a friend of mine—and see whether he was just going to use these amendments as talking points? If, in fact, he was not going to do that, call for a vote, and he stands down, would my friend allow us to get this done tonight just given the moment in time in which we find ourselves at this late hour?

Mr. CORKER. Well, I would say that every time I get a sense I want to do that, the Senator from California says something that challenges the integrity of another Senator, so it makes me not wish to do that. So I don't know.

I will say that I am going to leave here and take into account—I have always understood that if it went through the committee, even though there are some issues I have with this legislation, because of the fact that we have so many cosponsors, I do not want to be one Senator who holds up a piece of legislation. I want the will of the body to work. I always have. But I did want it to go through the committee process, and it was called off.

I wish the Senator from California would quit saying things that I do not believe to be the case. We tried to make it go through the right way today. I really did. I appreciate so much the chairman and the way he works with me in that regard. But we will see. I get disappointed every time another word is said about this, and sort of characterizing not the way I understand we were going to do this. But we will see. I appreciate everybody's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would say to my dear friend and distinguished ranking member that I know how he feels about his integrity and the process. I respect that. Only because the stakes are so high are the passions so strong with what is going on with Israel right now. So I would urge my distinguished ranking member to maybe have that informal survey with members and see if there is a way in which reservations could be expressed, and we might be able to move this legislation on the floor.

I have worked with the Senator other times and on other issues and we have worked with each other, and I hope this might be a moment in which we could actually achieve that as well. I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the Senator's work and cooperation.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

I wish to move to another equally important topic and in part respond to my colleague from Texas. That is the question of the supplemental and the comments made that we are unwilling to do what the House has been incapable of doing so far—at least the last time I checked. I do not know if something has happened since I came to the floor, but the House has been incapable of even sending what they viewed as their supplemental.

I do not know exactly why we would be blamed for not voting on something the House has not even passed, No. 1.

Yes, there are many of us who will oppose what the House is sending because, No. 1, it doesn't even provide the resources necessary for an emergency—an emergency of unforeseen dimension: a refugee crisis and a humanitarian crisis that needs to be dealt with.

When we look at the proposals that are contemplated in the House, not only do they not fund appropriately to

meet the challenge, they misappropriate how they are going to do funding to meet this crisis.

I don't know that we need to militarize the border, because no one is threatening the border so far as the consequences of any violence. I don't know that a National Guardsman with a rifle is necessary against an 8-year-old. I really don't. We heard our colleague from Texas say: Well, these children are actually submitting themselves to the Border Patrol, not trying to flee them.

So part of what the House of Representatives wants is to spend millions of dollars for the National Guard. I would rather spend it on the Border Patrol, not the National Guard. We don't need to militarize our border.

I would like to make sure that when a child does come over, having fled 2,000 miles because they were raped or a child was told by the gang to join us or die or a child who saw their father or mother killed before them and thought they would be the next one—that if that happens to be the case for that child, that they would have the opportunity to make their case, and they can't do that in 72 hours.

I was at the same meeting earlier today with the President, which was really about national security. But the Senator from Texas raised this question—and it is a legitimate question to raise—and I didn't hear the same response in the context that the Senator from Texas characterized that response.

The President said there has to be due process; but yet we need to find a way to try to accelerate that process but within the context of due process, and not to strip away the law that was passed in a bipartisan process and signed by a Republican President because he understood, as did the Congress at the time, that if you flee 2,000 miles and actually get here, it must be a lot more than an economic refugee. It must be because you have a credible fear of the loss of your life or your safety. That is what is at stake here.

Now, it boggles my mind that we cannot get a successful vote. I don't know if we will or we won't, but I get a sense from what I hear from my Republican colleagues that they won't cast a positive vote for the type of supplemental that would give the resources to meet the challenge. To do what? To put more people on the border in terms of Border Patrol. To do what? To create more immigration judges, to create more prosecutors.

What are they going to all do, coddle the child? No. They are going to be enforcing the border—the border in States where some of my colleagues seem to be the biggest opponents of the supplemental. I don't get it.

Now, I have never voted for a supplemental that is enforcement only, but I am ready to do it because this is an

emergency. I understand the gravity of the situation, both on the human side as well as the national security question. But I can't fathom, for the life of me, the views that say: No, let's vote against the money and create a crisis which basically is going to leave us in a situation in which, if we do not pass the supplemental prior to leaving on this recess, monies for the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Health and Human Services for these purposes will run out. The crisis won't have been abated, but the situation will continue to exist and the monies will have run out, which means what the President said: Well, I am going to have to reallocate resources from within those Departments for other purposes; which means that other national security, homeland security, and other health issues are not going to have the resources to meet the challenges they are presently meeting. That is not in the collective interests of the country.

So I am strongly going to support a supplemental that I would have never voted for because of the emergent nature of what we have. But at the same time we can't be about putting the National Guard at the border. It can't be about militarizing the border when there is no military threat, and it cannot be about stripping a law that was passed in a strong bipartisan vote and signed by a Republican President because they understood the nature of the potential challenge and they understood the very essence of a child fleeing 2,000 miles and having a shot—only a shot, no guarantee—that they in fact make their case.

That would send a message across the globe, as we are telling other countries in the world—in Africa; in Jordan, where we tell them to handle the Syrian refugees; in Turkey, where we tell them to handle the Syrian refugees; in the Dominican Republic, when there was the hurricane and we said let the Haitians come on over—we can't handle the humanitarian needs of children who have a credible sense and a credible case about fear for their life. Not every child will have that case, and those will be deported. But not every child should be automatically denied either.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to engage with my friend in a bit of a colloquy here.

I listened to the Senator from Texas, Senator CORNYN—who is working to try to solve these problems—lament the fact that Democrats in the House would not go along with the Republican version of this emergency appropriation. So I went back and I asked my staff to detail—and my friend did that.

I want to make sure that he agrees with what I think basically was in there: First of all, a change in the 2008 law that President George W. Bush signed, written by Senator FEINSTEIN and others—quite bipartisan—to treat

these children with human dignity and ascertain that in fact they had a real problem. If they didn't have a real problem, send them back home; and if they did have a real problem, make sure they were safe here. So that was in there. Then, as my friend said, the National Guard piece was in there.

Now, what is really interesting is these children are coming over, and they are saying to the Border Patrol: Take me.

So I don't mind having the National Guard at the border if we really have to defend, et cetera. I have come after that in the past.

But it just seems to me—and my friend made the point—it is one thing to put Border Patrol on and it is another thing to send down the military to face off with these children.

The other thing is, of course, they strip down the money dramatically so that these kids may well have to remain in some of the worst conditions in these customs facilities.

Now, the question I really want to talk to my friend about is this. I researched this today and asked to find out, every year, how many foreign nationals become legal residents under current law even without changing our law. We know the immigration bill didn't pass over there. It is 1 million a year. Every year, we take 1 million foreign nationals, and they become legal residents in America.

Doesn't my friend believe that since we take 1 million people a year in legally, we can deal with 56,000 children, that we can do that, that we have the capacity to do that? We know, if it follows trends, that most of them will be placed with relatives or caring friends, a few may not be, and some will be sent back.

But doesn't my friend believe, in this great Nation of immigrants—I am a first-generation American on my mother's side. My mother was born in Europe and her whole family escaped before the Holocaust. I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber, unless they are Native American, who can say truly at one time their relatives weren't immigrants.

My friend is so eloquent on the point. We handle 1 million foreign nationals becoming permanent legal residents every year. Don't we think America has the capacity to handle 56,000 children?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I appreciate my colleague's point. I would say America certainly has the capacity to give the legal opportunity for those children to make the case that they have asylum. And when we fail to do so, I think we undermine our own principles. We undermine our own history, we undermine our own legal obligation under existing law, and we also undermine our standing in the world when we ask others to take in refugees but we say in our case that we cannot.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, before I get on to my remarks regarding immigration, I wish to echo briefly the sentiments expressed by my friends, Senators AYOTTE and CRUZ, who spoke on the floor earlier this afternoon.

I believe the Senate should immediately take up and pass the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act—a bill that cleared the House with a bipartisan voice vote and 228 House cosponsors—instead of manufacturing a crisis with a short-term extension that will let this very popular, very bipartisan policy be taken hostage.

The situation at the border is indeed heartbreaking. Tens of thousands of single adults, families, and children have made an incredibly dangerous journey north from countries such as Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. They are leaving these countries because they offer too little opportunity and are mired in poverty and violence. No one begrudges them for wanting to find a better place to live.

Americans are compassionate and they are generous. The American people have always extended and always will extend a helping hand to every other corner of the world. And even as the number of illegal border crossings has exploded over the past year, we have treated these individuals with dignity and respect.

Today we have on our southern border a multifaceted crisis that faces the entire country. But President Obama is not interested in solving the humanitarian problem or the security problem or the legal problem or the fiscal problem. He is interested only in solving a personal political problem—avoiding blame for this crisis which he himself has created.

For years the President's clear message to the world has been that he is not interested in enforcing or fixing America's immigration laws. He is unconcerned about strengthening our border, improving our entry-exit system or bolstering the workplace verification. He has made no effort to fix our visa system so that we have an efficient process to serve immigrants trying in good faith to obey the law. He has ignored serious immigration reforms that would solve these problems.

So what has the President been doing on immigration? Systematically undermining the rule of law by ignoring the laws that are already on the books, taking action he has no authority to take, and blaming others for the consequent failures.

That is what has led us here today, considering what hypothetical actions Congress can take to address the real crisis the President has created.

But the solutions to this immediate crisis and our longer term immigration

needs as well begin with the President finally enforcing the law. There is no amount of money that Congress can spend. There is no new law that can solve this crisis if the President and the leadership of his party continue down their current path.

There are several steps the President can take immediately that do not require any action by Congress or another dime from the American people.

He can stop abusing what he refers to as "prosecutorial discretion." He can end the DACA program, which provides administrative amnesty and work permits to those who enter the United States illegally as minors. He can close the door to any further expansion of DACA to millions of additional adults. And he can signal his commitment to this solution by quickly returning those who entered the United States illegally to their home countries.

But by announcing to the world—the entire world—that he will not enforce laws requiring DHS to process and return those who come here unlawfully, the President is encouraging hundreds of thousands of children and adults to make this very dangerous journey to come to the United States illegally. He is encouraging families to pay coyotes controlled by drug cartels thousands of dollars to smuggle their children into the United States. That is truly the humanitarian crisis.

The President's threats to widen the scope of DACA are only going to make this crisis worse. That is why I agree with my friends TED CRUZ, JEFF SESSIONS, DAVID VITTER, JIM INHOFE, and MIKE JOHANNIS that at the very least we must take steps to prevent the President from providing any more Executive amnesty.

I understand the desire for Members of Congress to want to pass some kind of legislation. Members want to be able to go home to their constituents over the August recess armed with talking points that suggest they have done something about the border crisis. But I would argue that the bill before the Senate today is just a distraction from the true cause of and true solution to the crisis.

Congress could send the President a bill with billions of dollars in aid and multiple policy changes, but none of these will work unless the President makes a commitment to enforce our laws and secure our southern border. Congress could do that, but none of it will work unless Congress does what needs to be done.

As with so many bills Congress takes up these days, this legislation does not solve the American people's problems; it only solves Washington's problems.

President Obama already has the authority to correct the failed policy, to restore the rule of law to our immigration system and solve the crisis on the border. He just doesn't want to, and the American people are paying the price.

One of the reasons we have a constitution of separated powers is that when Presidents try to be legislators too, they tend to be bad at both jobs. The crisis on the border is of the President's own making, and its solution is already in his own power.

I stand ready to work with the President and members of his party to craft solutions to these problems—we all do—but until President Obama enforces the laws he is sworn to administer, those solutions will remain out of reach.

For all the good intentions, all the good will, with all the compromises in the world, Congress cannot do its job until the President finally does his.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that once I finish speaking—I will talk for less than 10 minutes, and I ask that the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, be recognized next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I would like to say to the Senator from Utah, who is a dear friend and the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee, that something magical happened here about 48 hours ago right here in this Chamber. What happened is we saw the Senate evolve in a very good way. We saw Senators bringing amendments to the floor, Democratic and Republican. We saw them having a chance to offer amendments, debate the amendments, and get votes on the amendments. And it was on an important issue. The issue was how we were going to provide and fund the transportation system for our country, which includes roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, transit systems, and more.

At the end of the day, 79 Senators, Democratic and Republican, a majority of Republicans and Democrats, voted to say we would like to make sure we don't run out of money in the Federal transportation trust fund this year. We are going to replenish that trust fund but not for a year or a year and a half but for a relatively short period of time—until the end of the year, really until the end of December. Why would we stop there? It is because we believe that if we keep on going—for example, one of the proposals coming over from the House was to fund the transportation program until maybe next May or next June. Our fear and the fear of 79 Senators who voted—I think with their conscience—our fear was that we will get to next May 31 and say: Well, we can't make these votes. It is too tough to pass a 6-year transportation program for our country. Let's just cobble together enough revenues from disparate sources that have nothing to do with transportation, do what my friend Senator BOB CORKER calls gener-

ational theft and steal 10 years' of revenues and use it to fix highways and bridge problems for 3 or 4 or 5 months. That is what we have been doing for the last 5 years. We have done it 11 times.

What we have done is we said to Governors and State departments of transportation and others who are trying to build highways, roads, and transportation highway systems: We are going to give you a little bit of money, and you can count on it for a couple of months. If it runs out, we will try to do it some more.

Stop and go. It is hugely inefficient. It is hugely inefficient. I speak as on old Governor—not that old—as a recovering Governor, a former Governor, and have some idea of all the work put into these projects. Take, for example, when you plan your highway, bridge, or transit system. You have to plan the project, you have to fund the project, you have to contract the project, and you have to get permits for the project. It takes years. And providing that we have the revenues—or won't we—will the Federal Government be there as a partner? The kind of system we have is wasteful—or at least the kind of system we have shown in recent years.

A bunch of us say: Why don't we Senators—Democratic and Republican—do our job and fund a 6-year transportation program for our country?

For the most part, I think for myself and for many, why don't we stop using sources of revenue that have absolutely nothing to do with transportation? Why don't we just stop taking money from the general fund, which borrows money from China and all kinds of other places around the world? Why don't we fund it ourselves? For projects that are worth having, we ought to pay for them.

Last Tuesday night, 2 nights ago, this Senate worked, and it was a joy to behold. At the end of the day we passed and sent over to the House of Representatives legislation that said we are going to not let the transportation trust fund run out of money this year. We are not going to kick the can down the road. We will keep this on a short leash and make sure that when we come back after the election, we will be likely to actually fund a 6-year transportation program.

It is a smart approach and a principled approach.

I want to say a big thank-you to a couple of people. I want to say to Senator BOB CORKER, the Republican from Tennessee, and Senator BARBARA BOXER, Democrat from California, who chairs the Environment and Public Works Committee on which I serve as the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, I thank you for your leadership. Thank you for standing up for doing the right thing.

Andrew Jackson used to say, "One man with courage makes a majority."

Mr. Jackson, I would like to say said one woman with courage makes a majority. But in this case we had a courageous Republican from Tennessee and a courageous Democrat from California, and they let me draft it. The three of us put together this proposal. We worked with Senator RON WYDEN, who chairs the Finance Committee. We appreciate very much his support for our proposal as well.

At the end of the day, 79 Senators said it was the right thing to do. It went over to the House. The House, to my disappointment—not to my surprise but to my disappointment—said: No, we are going to strip off what the Senate has done in a bipartisan way, and we are just going to go back to what we sent to you some time ago—which, I must say, is not likely to get a 6-year transportation program funded anytime soon—not this year and probably not anytime soon. They said that to us.

But there is good news. There is good news. Seventy-nine Senators—again, over half of the Republicans and almost all the Democrats—said: We want to do our job and we want to do it this year. We want to fully fund the transportation plan for the next 6 years.

That is what the people want us to do. That is what State and local governments want us to do, what mayors and Governors want us to do. People who work and build roads, highways, bridges, transit systems—that is what they want us to do. Contractors, the business community, labor unions—that is what they want us to do. Do our job. And we are prepared to do it.

The good news out of all of this is 79 of us are prepared to do that, and I suspect some others who may have voted the other way Tuesday night are prepared as well.

I thank BOB CORKER and BARBARA BOXER and RON WYDEN and others who are part of this vote of 79 for the leadership they provided.

I want to say to my friend Senator ORRIN HATCH, whom I love and love working with and with whom I am pleased to serve on the Finance Committee—I have admired him forever—that when we come back into session after the election, the lameduck session, my hope and prayer is that we will all be able to work together and get this job done. I know Senator HATCH, and I think he is the kind of person who will help get it done.

Let me close with this thought, if I could, and then I will yield to the Senator from Utah. To my pleasure, one of the things that happened during the last several weeks and months was the establishment of a broad-based coalition of business, labor, State and local governments, all kinds of organizations and people who came together and said: Do the right thing. They told us to do the right thing. They have been terrific supporters and have encouraged our

colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to join with Senators CORKER, BOXER, WYDEN, and me to do what we did Tuesday night.

That coalition is not going away. They worked the House of Representatives very hard in the last 2 days,—the last 48 hours—and they are not going away. When we come back here after the election, they will come back strong, and we will too. We are not going to go away on this issue.

One of the most important things we do as Senators and Representatives is to provide a transportation system that is worthy of this country. It helps with the movement of people and goods that we need to be a strong and efficient economy and nation.

I will close with the words of Mark Twain. I used them the other night, and Senator HATCH has heard these words before. The words of Mark Twain all those years ago: When in doubt, do what is right. You will confound your enemies and astound your friends.

Seventy-nine of us the other night did what we thought was right and what I am sure was right, and we are going to come back in a couple of months and we will have a chance to have our colleagues join us and really, as a whole body—hopefully with the House of Representatives and the President too—do our job, make sure we have the roads, highways, bridges, and transportation systems we need in this country.

Again, my thanks to the Senator from Utah for letting me ramble on a bit, and I want to express once again my admiration for him. I look forward to working with him not just on this issue but on many others in the years to come.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my dear friend for his kind remarks, and I understand how much zeal he has for the things he does here on the floor. He is a fine man, and I really appreciate it.

Madam President, earlier today—just a little while ago, in fact—the House of Representatives once again passed legislation extending funding for the Federal highway trust fund. This is the latest step in the process for which the final outcome has been known for some time. The bill the House passed today is virtually identical to the one they passed last week. It is basically the very same bill.

Earlier this week the Senate passed its own version of the highway bill and sent it to the House. Of course, we did so knowing full well the House would not accept the Senate bill. I don't think there was ever any real doubt in this Chamber as to what was going to happen, but in my view it is good that the Senate acted.

I was particularly pleased to see that the version of the highway bill re-

ported by the Senate Finance Committee received such strong bipartisan support when it came up for a vote. Senator WYDEN and I worked hard on that bill. The effort was bipartisan from the outset, and in the end we produced a product that both parties could support. Of course, I was a little less pleased that the Senate on the very next vote opted to strike the Finance Committee's language and replace it with what is, in my view, a less viable vehicle for funding the highway trust fund, but in the end that is the direction a majority of the Senators decided to go, and I accepted it and am proud of everybody who participated.

As I said, it is good that the Senate acted. But now the House has acted again. It is good that the Senate had some amendments for a change, and I think we all felt good about that. I felt a renewed spirit in the Senate because of this since it had been a year without having real amendments in a real process. Of course there were only four of them, but compared to what we have had over the last year, that still was an amazing occurrence. But now the House has acted again, and although there are likely to be a number of Senators who do not like the House bill, there doesn't appear to be enough time for the Senate to try once again to go in a different direction.

As we all know, we are on the verge of a crisis with regard to funding for the highway trust fund. Congress needs to act immediately to prevent a shortfall in the trust fund and to ensure that the States can continue to plan and implement their highway projects. Thousands of jobs are at stake. If Congress doesn't pass a bill and get it to the President before we leave for recess, we will be doing a great disservice to a lot of people. We all know this. It is not a secret. It is not a surprise.

As far as I can see, the only viable solution before the Senate today is to take up the House bill and pass it as is. Once again, we have all known this was the most likely outcome for some time now. It is time we accept it and move on. That is not to say that I am disappointed that we have to pass the House bill. As I said a number of times, if you compare the House bill with the one reported by the Senate Finance Committee—which, once again, received broad bipartisan support when it was voted on in the Senate earlier this week—you will see that the bills are not all that far apart in terms of policy. The core funding mechanisms are the same.

The principal difference is that the Senate bill raises some revenue through some tax compliance provisions that are not in the House bill. The House bill goes a little further on pension smoothing than the Finance Committee bill does, and this has brought heartburn to a number of us in both bodies.

These are not fundamental differences. Any Senator who supported the Finance Committee's bill should be able to support the House bill, which is a good thing, because as I said we don't have many other options if we want to get this done before the recess.

I plan to support the House-passed highway bill. I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Finally, I wish to take a moment to address a major setback we encountered with regard to the temporary highway extension that passed in the Senate earlier this week. As we learned yesterday, the Senate-passed bill has a shortfall of about \$2.4 billion due to a drafting error. Some have suggested that this error originated in the Finance Committee's version of the legislation. However, anyone who takes the time to compare our language with that of the subsequently passed substitute amendment will find this is not the case.

I am not here to point fingers or try to embarrass anyone, but I will say these are the types of mistakes that happen when tax policy is written outside of the tax-writing committee, and we should all be careful of that.

The Finance Committee has an open and transparent process that allows for all of our numbers to be scrutinized well in advance. The committee has all the necessary expertise at its disposal to prevent these types of mishaps.

I am well aware that mistakes happen. I would just like to suggest that fewer of these types of mistakes will happen in the future if the Finance Committee is allowed to do its work when it comes to writing tax policy. That is all I have to say on that matter.

Once again, we are at a critical juncture. We need to get a temporary highway bill over the finish line. As far as I can see, the only way to do that is for us to take up and pass the House bill. As I stated earlier, this should not be a difficult lift. I think we can get this done in short order.

It was a lot of fun to be on the floor—for the first time in about a year—where anybody who wanted to at least had a shot at being able to bring up an amendment for a vote. Four of our colleagues did get amendments up, and they were thrilled. Isn't it amazing we were thrilled about something the Senate ought to be doing every time we bring up a bill? We can get both sides together on a limited number of amendments, but we should not have either side demanding to approve or disapprove the amendments in advance, and that has been happening all too often in the Senate with the way it is being run.

I love all of my colleagues. I love my friends on the other side. There is no use trying to kid about it, I care for everybody in this body, and I cared for everybody I have served with. I admit

that occasionally there have been Members whom I cared a little less for than most of the others, but the fact is this is a great body. We have had some great people on both sides of the aisle over the 38 years I have been in the Senate.

We need to allow our committees to work. Let's allow our individual Senators to work too. Let's understand that we don't all come from the same State or the same jurisdiction. Each of us has a desire to represent his or her jurisdiction in the best possible manner. Frankly, we need to get this Senate back to where it is the greatest deliberative body in the world rather than just something that is run for the benefit of the majority. I don't want it to run for the benefit of the minority either.

We can get together—just as we did on this bill—and do much better around here than we have been doing. I hope that as we go into the future, everybody in this body will want to work better together and quit playing politics with everything.

We understand this is a political body, and we understand there will be politics played from time to time. It is kind of fun sometimes but not on everything, and especially not when it prevents what the Senate is truly all about, which is wide-open debates and wide-open amendments, and we certainly need to find a bipartisan way of working together.

I particularly enjoyed working with Senator WYDEN. He has made a distinguished effort to try to make things as bipartisan as he can, and that is hard to do around here anymore in both the House and Senate. The House is supposed to be a body that fights over everything, I guess, because it is a majoritarian body. But even then the House has had many Democratic amendments they could have stopped. While they have had many amendments, we have basically been stopped from being able to act as the Senate should act, which is to allow people the right to bring up their amendments and try to make points that maybe all of us would do well to consider from time to time.

I am grateful I am a Member of this body, and I am grateful for the people I have served with all these years on both sides of the aisle. In all the time I have been here, there were only two people whom I thought had no redeeming value. I should not have said that, I guess, but there were two people whom I thought truly didn't have the Senate at heart and truly didn't do what I thought they should do. I have loved all the rest and appreciated them very much.

I appreciate the leadership on both sides, but I just hope we can get past all of this bickering and start running the Senate as it has always been run. A lot of it started when you break the

rules to change the rules, and this is what happens. It was a real mistake on the part of the majority to do that. They might not think so because they are packing the Federal courts with judges—most of whom would have gotten through. About 98 percent of the President's nominees were getting through and very few were even contested. The fact is that some have gotten through and others should never have gotten through to the Federal bench, and it is because of breaking the rules to change the rules. It is not right for either side to do that, but it has been done. Let's overcome it, and let's be the most deliberative body in the world today, and I think we can do it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All postcloture time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2648) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3750

Mr. REID. I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3750.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3751 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3750

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3751 to amendment No. 3750.

In the amendment, strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3752

Mr. REID. I have a motion to commit S. 2648, with instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with Instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 3752.

The amendment (No. 3752) is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3753

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3753 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3754 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3753

Mr. REID. I have a second amendment now at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3754 to amendment No. 3753.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "4" and insert "5".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move

to bring to a close debate on S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2104, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara Mikulski, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Richard J. Durbin, Bernard Sanders, Barbara Boxer, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Tim Kaine, Christopher A. Coons, Mark L. Pryor, Ron Wyden, Michael F. Bennet, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

MAKING EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 2648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 6:45 be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that at 6:45 this evening, it be in order for Senator McConnell or his designee to be recognized for the purpose of moving to table amendment No. 3751; that if the motion to table is not agreed to, Senator Sessions or his designee be recognized for the purpose of raising a budget point of order against the bill; that if a point of order is raised, then Senator Mikulski or her designee be recognized for a motion to waive; that if the motion to waive is made, the Senate immediately proceed to vote on the motion to waive; that if that motion to waive is agreed to, then, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate immediately proceed to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill; that if cloture is not invoked, the bill be returned to the calendar; if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the pending amendments be withdrawn

and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of S. 2648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, after consultation with Senator McConnell, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3230, the Veterans Access to Care Act; that Senator Coburn or his designee be recognized for the purpose of raising a budget point of order against the conference report; that if the point of order is raised, then Senator Sanders or his designee be recognized for a motion to waive; that if the motion to waive is made, there be up to 10 minutes equally divided between Senators Coburn and Sanders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to waive; that if the motion to waive is agreed to, the Senate immediately proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report; that the vote on adoption be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that if the conference report is adopted, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 111; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3230, the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 5021; that following the reporting of the message, I be recognized to make a motion to recede from the Senate amendment; that following the leader's motion, Senator Sessions or his designee be recognized for the purpose of raising a point of order against the bill; that if the point of order is raised, Senator Wyden or his designee be recognized to move to waive the point of order; that no other motions be in order to the bill; that if the motion to waive is made, there be up to 20 minutes equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and the Senate immediately proceed to vote on the motion to waive; that if the motion to waive is agreed to, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to recede from its amendment to H.R. 5021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 6:45 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we expect the votes to begin about 6:45 tonight, but they could come earlier, so everyone should be aware of that.

Seeing no one here to speak, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are now in the closing hours of this session of the Congress. We are getting ready to take our break. I am rising to exhort our Members to vote for the urgent supplemental. I appreciate the fact that we have adopted the motion to proceed.

I remind our colleagues what is in the urgent supplemental. First, it is to fight wildfires in our own country: \$615 million to fight 27 large fires that are sending homes and communities up in smoke in eight Western States.

Second, it fortifies Israel's anti-missile defense system, Iron Dome, by providing \$225 million to enable Israel to purchase interceptor rockets that they have utilized in their own self-defense. It is lifesaving technology. It is defensive technology.

Third, and not at all least, it is to deal with issues on the border, providing \$2.7 billion to deal with the surge of children coming through Central America, through a treacherous route through Mexico, presenting themselves to our border, asking that we consider their petition for refugee or asylum status. This bill is a reduction by \$1 billion of what the President asked for. The President originally asked for \$3.7 billion for the surge of the children all by itself and then additional funds for Iron Dome and the wildfires.

When we looked at the request for the surge at the border, we felt we could reduce that by \$1 billion, and to ensure the taxpayers that we are doing rigorous and vigorous oversight, we have money in there for the inspector general.

This is an emergency spending bill, which means no offsets are required.

Also, it is meant to deal with humanitarian crises, both in our own country with firefighting and then a crisis a treasured ally is dealing with and then a crisis in Central America, where the violence is so severe that children are on the march to be able to escape it. These funds will pay for additional law enforcement for our Border Patrol, humanitarian assistance for HHS to house, clothe, and feed the children on a temporary basis while we find a relative and their legal status is determined; that is, do they qualify for asylum or refugee status.

Much has been said about the backlog and even a mockery—some States mocked the current system because they said there were so many awaiting

these types of hearings. Maybe if we passed regular appropriations, which we haven't done in 3 years, we wouldn't be in this crisis. But this supplemental includes money for additional immigration judges to be able to expedite the determination of these children's legal status.

Also, it goes after the drug smugglers, the human smugglers, the drug traffickers, the human traffickers, and the coyotes who are exploiting, creating the misery and violence in Central America, and also, while they are doing that, exploiting these children who are on the move and on the march.

I understand there is a great deal of reluctance to either vote for the money or to weaken our asylum laws. I would caution us in weakening our asylum refugee laws, particularly as it affects children. I hope we can pass this bill and begin to move forward with it.

I want everyone to be aware we are talking about a surge of children—approximately 60,000 children, not 600,000 children—just barely enough to fill Ravens stadium. We are a country of 300 million; we are talking only about this.

I hope we can move on this bill, meet our responsibilities to our neighbors in the West facing wildfires and an ally who is running out of interceptor rockets to protect itself and not only deal with the children and their request to determine asylum status, but at the same time we put the money in the Federal checkbook to go where the crime and the criminals are, which is the narcotraffickers in Central America.

I will have more to say before we wrap up, but I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland has described the President's request and what she has proposed, the Appropriations Committee has proposed in response. The problem with the response is it does not solve the underlying problem, which is a loophole in a 2008 law, which is now being exploited as part of the business model of the cartels that smuggle children and other immigrants illegally from Central America through Mexico into South Texas.

It makes no sense to me just to write a check for this surge, which I agree that there is money needed for additional judges, additional detention facilities, and the like in some dollar figure. But if you do not solve the underlying problem, we are going to be back here months later and doing this all over again. This, of course, is an emergency supplemental. We will be doing this emergency every 2 or 3 months because what we have seen over the last couple years is that the numbers of children coming into the country because of this loophole in the 2008 law I

described a moment ago—the numbers have nearly doubled over the last couple of years, and there are projections that there will be not just the 57,000 unaccompanied children who have been detained so far this year but that the number could grow as high as 90,000 by the end of this year and 145,000 next year. We are going to be in deep trouble, not to mention the crisis for these children. Our capacity to deal with them at the border and in local communities there is overtaxed, and there is the fact that the Border Patrol is diverted from interdicting illegal drug traffic and other necessary activities because they are taking care of these children, who deserve to be taken care of, at least while they are in our protective custody. So this is not a solution to the problem.

I know from meeting with the President—I see the distinguished majority leader and the majority whip here. We all were invited over to the White House this morning to talk to the President about national security matters. My distinct impression was the President understands the nature of the problem, and he conceded that we cannot endlessly accept people who want to come to the United States from troubled regions of the world because it would simply overtax and overwhelm our capacity to deal with it. That is why it is so important to have legal immigration. I agree that we need immigration reform. I do not agree that we need the Gang of 8 bill. But I am committed to trying to fix our broken immigration system on a step-by-step basis when we next have an opportunity to do so.

But right now we have an emergency that is disproportionately affecting my State, the State of Texas, and our local communities and our State are being overwhelmed. It is the Federal Government's responsibility and the Federal Government needs to step up. That is why I agree some amount of money—I do not agree it is \$2.7 billion, as an emergency, but at some level we do need to come up with the money to deal with this emergency. But we cannot just write a check because, as I said, we will continue to come back. This crisis will be unabated and, in fact, it will get worse.

I mentioned earlier today the polling that I saw that miraculously said 68 percent of the American people disapprove of the way the President is handling this immigration crisis, which is a rather dramatic development. I think all that the American people expect and deserve from us is that we try to work together to solve this problem. Congressman HENRY CUELLAR, my friend from Laredo, TX, a Democrat, a self-described blue dog Democrat, and I have come up with one suggestion: The HUMANE Act. It is our proposal, and if anybody has a better idea, we are all ears and all willing to

consider it. But so far we have heard no alternative proposals and only a request to write a check for \$2.7 billion. I think it would be irresponsible for us to only appropriate money and not deal with the underlying cause.

So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment No. 3747, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MIKULSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President—

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if I may, I hold the floor, if I am not mistaken. I just have a couple concluding comments and then I will turn it back over.

What we need to do is learn the lesson that we learned in 2005 and 2006. In talking with Secretary Johnson, he understands this problem very well. I know the Senator from Arizona remembers this. In 2005, we saw a surge of what were at the time called OTMs, immigrants from countries other than Mexico. Strangely enough, we saw a surge of 30,000 Brazilians who were detained at our southwestern border.

What Secretary Chertoff came to learn is that a loophole they were exporting was the so-called catch and release at the time. They did not have detention facilities. What would be done is they would be released, essentially based on their own recognizance, and we would never hear from them again. They would escape into the great American landscape.

Well, the same phenomenon is happening now with these unaccompanied children because of that 2008 law that needs to be addressed so that they will remain in protective custody pending any court hearing, which we would give on an expedited basis. If they have a legal claim to stay, an asylum claim, a victim of human trafficking and the like, then the judge would determine that. And those who do not would have to be returned to their home country. I think I heard the President say as much today. I certainly have heard Secretary Johnson and others say the same thing.

That is what my amendment would do. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Maryland has seen fit to object to it. I think this virtually guarantees that we will leave here today without having solved the problem, and that is a tragic circumstance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, if I could respond to the Senator from Texas, first of all, I do not want my objection to be interpreted by him or by the Senate or those watching as a pugnacious dismissal of the Senator's request. The distinguished Senator from

Texas has always stood for Texas and he has also stood for the protection of the border. He comes with an incredible background where he was a judge, a former judge of the highest court in Texas. So I understand. And I have also heard him speak repeatedly about the plight of these children, and he has spoken with great compassion. He and I both agree that we should not have open borders and open wallets, that we have to deal with this.

But I say to my colleague, this bill is a money bill. It is an appropriations bill. We do not legislate on appropriations. There is no legislative language in this bill. What the Senator is proposing, working with the administration, with the Judiciary Committee, on a bipartisan basis—because I think there is a sentiment perhaps we could arrive at some other language, but on this bill I objected because this would be legislating on appropriations. The type of pragmatic approach the Senator from Texas is proposing—and we have perhaps some ideas—cannot be done on this bill tonight with the urgent nature of it.

So I want the Senator from Texas to know my great respect for him and his advocacy on this issue, and I know of his heartfelt compassion for the children and his desire to have a broader immigration policy. I look forward to working with him on legislative matters in a different forum.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator will yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, here is the conundrum I think we find ourselves in. The President has made a request for the money. The Secretary of Homeland Security has said he needs more authority in order to deal with the problem, and what my proposal would do is to give him that authority necessary to solve the problem.

The Senator from Maryland has always been very kind and gracious, and I appreciate her response, and I know of her compassion, given her background, particularly in social work, that she has great compassion for these children, as we all do. But we have a problem and we need to solve the problem.

What is so confusing to me is, when the House was considering a proposal which would combine both policy changes together with some money to deal with them, the White House issued a notice the President would veto it if it were passed. So it seems to me that—well, it is confusing, to say the least. I am not sure how we get out of this place we are in.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Is that the Senator's question?

Mr. CORNYN. The fact is, we are dysfunctional. But if the Senator has a

suggestion for how we get out of this dysfunction, I would love to hear it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. First I would like to respond—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much. We are eager to engage in conversation with each other.

It is the belief of the members of the Judiciary Committee—at least the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee—that the President has enough current authority to provide what Secretary Johnson is asking. I too have heard what Secretary Johnson has. So there is a dispute about whether he needs more authority or whether the President can exercise the authority he has. We believe he already has enough authority.

Then there are two large issues. The two large issues are: immigration reform, commonsense, sensible, along the lines that passed the Senate—Senator MCCAIN of Arizona and others have worked on this, Senator DURBIN—and then the other is what is going on in Central America with these drug traffickers.

Quite frankly, the fact is we need to start to pay attention to our own hemisphere. I note that when everybody talks about how much money this is, it is less money than we are going to spend to give to the Afghan security force. OK. We give \$4 billion to the Afghan security force. Let's hope they are going to use it and shoot in the right direction.

I am looking at making sure our country goes in the right direction, and I am going to work on a bipartisan basis. I say pass this bill. Let's put together a bipartisan task force and see if we can deal with these two problems of both immigration reform—to move it through both bodies—and also bring our focus back to our own hemisphere and deal with the issues in Central America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as I was watching the back and forth here on the floor of the Senate, I could not help but notice that my three colleagues on the other side of the aisle there and I have roughly the same amount of time here in the Senate. In fact, the distinguished majority leader and my friend from Illinois and I came to the House together way back more than 30 years ago.

When I came to this body, and when they came to this body, we had leaders. We had leaders. Do you know what those leaders used to do? They would say at the beginning of the week: We are going to take up a certain piece of legislation, and we are going to work through it. We are going to do what the Senate does. We are going to have amendments proposed, and we are

going to have votes on those amendments, and we are going to have the Senate be a deliberative and debating organization, praised as the greatest debating institution in the world, although that probably is not true—and Senator Byrd, a distinguished majority leader, Senator Mitchell, a distinguished majority leader—do you know what they would say—Senator Lott, Senator Dole—do you know what they would say They would say: We are going to take up a bill and we are going to have amendments and we are going to have debate and we are going to have votes, and then we are going to vote on final passage. For 30 years that is how I have watched the Senate function.

Now we have a humanitarian crisis on our border, a humanitarian crisis of incredible proportion, where thousands of young people—while they are being transported by these coyotes, young women are being raped, they are falling off trains, terrible things are happening—and what are we presented here in the Senate? I say shame on you. I say shame on you for not allowing those of us who represent the States that are most affected by this to have an amendment, an amendment voted on. That is unbelievable to me. We put together—and I say with great respect to the Senator from Maryland, saying that we do not legislate on appropriations—excuse me. Excuse me.

We have legislated a lot on appropriations, mostly to my dismay. Year after year I have watched legislating on appropriations. On the Defense authorization bill, it has caused me heartburn time after time. So please don't—please. I have been around here too long for you to tell me we do not legislate on appropriations.

I want to have some amendments debated. I want to be able to tell the people of my State that are being flooded by immigrants—I want to be able to tell them that I had a proposal representing them here in the Senate and I wanted it debated and I wanted it voted on. Is that a hell of a lot to ask? I do not think so. I do not think so.

This is a crisis of proportions that we have seldom seen the likes of. I am sure the majority leader will come over and talk about Republican obstructionism and how we cannot get anything done around here. We have now compiled a record, according to the experts, as the least productive Congress in history—in history. So I am supposed to go back to my home State of Arizona, which is experiencing terrific problems, horrific problems—my constituents are really angry. They expect me to come here and represent them in the Senate and debate and have their views and their desires and their ambitions and their reputation here in the Senate.

What have we done? The parliamentary situation is that there will be no

amendments that will be allowed to be debated or voted on no matter what.

The Senator from Maryland said: Well, we do not legislate on appropriations.

We have some amendments on money that would either reduce or increase the amount of funding. Are we going to be able to have that amendment voted on? Hell no. We are not going to be able to have a single thing voted on. Everyone wants to get out of town. So sometime tonight or maybe tomorrow we are going to close up shop and we are going to go home. The humanitarian crisis goes on. It goes on.

What about these children? Are they going to be enticed by coyotes for their families to give a year's salary to transport them from one of these countries to the United States of America? Are an untold number of young women going to be raped along the way? Are there going to be kids who fall off these trains? Is that what is going to happen? We are going to go for 5 weeks without debate on a single amendment, not a single one. What kind of an institution is this? What has happened since the days when the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland and I came to this body proud—proud to be a Member of this institution?

I can remember time after time the junior Senator being able to come down here, propose an amendment, have it disposed of—usually losing but at least I was representing the people of my State. Now I cannot represent them. I cannot give them what they believe they deserve here in the Senate.

In a second I will stop and I will ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that the amendment Senator FLAKE, my colleague from Arizona, and I have put together after visiting our border, after talking to all of our constituents, after discussing the issue with our Governor—we came here to represent them. How can I represent them if I am not allowed to express their beliefs and their ambitions and their desires to help solve this problem?

How do I go down to the ranchers in the southern part of my State and say: I am sorry there are people crossing your property every night. What do I say to the families of those people who are being separated? What am I supposed to tell my citizens whom I represent—that I came here to ask for something that I know is going to be objected to? What has happened to this body? What has happened to the Senate, I ask my colleagues?

The approval rating of Congress, the last time I checked, was either a single digit or low double digits. Everybody kind of thinks, well, that is normal. It is not normal. I hearken back again to the days when we first came here. Our approval rating with the people of our country was 70 percent, 80 percent,

maybe even a little lower. Is all the fault on that side of the aisle? No. But I would say that the people in charge here have an obligation to allow all of us to represent the people who sent us here. That is not happening today. It has not happened all year. It may not happen until next January, where I am committed and I believe the majority of my conference is committed to bringing up legislation and having debate and having votes. That is the way the Senate was supposed to function.

I know what is going to happen here in about 30 seconds. I say to my colleagues, this is not right. This is not right. This is not the way we are supposed to represent the people we asked to send us here and let us represent them.

Senator FLAKE and I have pretty simple legislation. It has to do with the fact that, as the President said, it would modify the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. It would do some other things. It would provide for funds—and I will not go through all of the details of it except to say that I know what is going to happen, but it is not right. It is not the right way for this institution to function. We all should be a bit embarrassed.

I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up amendment No. 3742, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me say at the outset that I have the highest respect for my colleague from Arizona. We are friends. We came to Congress at the same time, as has mentioned on the floor, and spent month after month together on the comprehensive immigration bill. I believe there were 130 amendments that were considered to that bill. I thought that was an orderly, thoughtful process. I hope we can return to it.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is what we are facing: The President has come to us facing a crisis at the border. He has asked us for the resources for the Border Patrol that has to process these children coming in and for Health and Human Services so that once these children—some of whom are toddlers and infants—are in our country, they can be treated humanely. He has asked us for the resources for that purpose.

He has also asked us initially for some resources to get to the heart of the problem, which Senator CORNYN of Texas has acknowledged. The heart of the problem is not in the United States; the problem is in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. There is clearly a crisis situation there.

What Senator MIKULSKI, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, has done is reduced the President's budget request by \$1 billion, if I am not mistaken, and said: We will respond to this emergency request with these resources and realize that more is going to be done.

On the other side of the aisle, the senior Senator from Texas has come in and talked about changing immigration law. He was kind enough to acknowledge that we made an effort to change the immigration law right here on the floor of the Senate over a year ago with 68 votes. Fourteen Republicans joined the Democrats in a comprehensive immigration bill. The Senator from Texas acknowledged he did not vote for it. Had he voted for it, he would have voted for the most dramatic increase in border security in American history. But he voted against it. That is his choice. I respect his judgment. But to come to us today and say: Now we have to vote again on border security—we had a chance. The Senate passed it. What happened to the comprehensive immigration reform bill? It made it over to the House of Representatives and disappeared into vapor. It was never called for consideration.

So it is not as if we have ignored the problems of immigration. We addressed them forthrightly in a bipartisan fashion, in a comprehensive fashion, and the House of Representatives refused to even call the bill.

Let's go to this particular issue. The heart of the problem is clearly in three Central American countries that are so lawless that people are desperately sending their children to the United States of America. We have to deal with that issue. We are. The President has dealt with it. The Vice President has visited those countries. Last week the Presidents of all three countries came here. So to say the President is doing nothing about the cause of the crisis is not accurate. The President is addressing it directly to discourage any more children from making this dangerous, deadly journey. No. 1.

No. 2, I hope we all agree: No mercy for these smugglers. No mercy for those coyotes who are exploiting these families and sadly abusing many of these children.

No. 3—and the President has made this point—we have an obligation. When a child is entrusted to you, people stand in judgment of how you treat that child. We have many children now entrusted to us on a temporary basis. The President has asked for money so that they can be treated humanely on a temporary basis. Not an unreasonable request.

Time and again America has responded to crises around the world—families and children who are victims of war, earthquakes, tsunamis. For virtually every natural disaster, we have

been there. America has a reputation for being there. Now that children are at our border, will we do anything less?

What we are doing with the bill before us, the supplemental bill, is providing enough money for humanitarian care and still working on the root causes of the problem. I think that is responsible.

I hope we do not leave here this week having failed to come up with this money. I hope we provide the resources to this administration. I hope my colleagues on a bipartisan basis will do two things: Vote for this emergency appropriation and, secondly, let's join in a thoughtful discussion about how to pass a comprehensive immigration bill which includes this aspect—asylees and refugees.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I think I have said enough with enough emotion. But I will say to my friend from Illinois that the way you have a thoughtful discussion is to have debate and amendments and votes. That is generally the accepted way. You want a thoughtful discussion; I want a thoughtful discussion. Why can't we just accept the fact that we should go forward with our amendments and have debate? That way we can best serve the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, the problem we have at the border today is a direct result of the actions of the President of the United States. In 2011 we had 6,000 young people coming to America unlawfully. They were apprehended. Now we have 60,000. It was because of his DACA program and his open statement that was heard throughout the world as: If you come to America as a young person, you will be able to stay.

That was exactly and I think to some degree remains the situation.

If you come to America as a young person from Central America, not Mexico, and you turn yourself in, you will be released on a permiso or bond or promise to reappear.

People come and pick up the children and they stay.

This is no way to run a lawful system of immigration. You know, it was said: Well, we offered a comprehensive bill to fix it.

That bill was flawed. I opposed that bill. It was rejected by the House of Representatives.

I would say with great confidence that because the House of Representatives rejected the bill that Members of this Senate supported and that the

President of the United States supported does not thereby mean the President of the United States can do what the bill says when it was rejected and did not become law. It takes both Houses to pass a piece of legislation.

The bill would not have worked. It would not have been effective. The people of the United States, through their elected representatives, did not allow it to become law.

I would point out that this administration amazingly has announced its intention to bypass Congress and to implement an executive amnesty by fiat. This would include, as has been widely reported, 5 million to 6 million work permits and legal status for illegal immigrants into America.

This is contrary to Congress's decision. Congress has not approved that. But Congress has approved a law that says it is unlawful for somebody in the country, for example, to work if they are not here lawfully. They can't work in the United States. They are not approved for work.

The President is saying he is going to give them legal status and permission to work contrary to plain law. This is very serious. This action would be in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It would be an executive nullification of our laws and the protections that American workers are entitled to. Congress must not surrender to such lawlessness.

It has been in half a dozen papers. The Wall Street Journal 2 days ago: Millions of people by executive action of the President—it is unbelievable to be so open and bold about this, as if he thinks maybe this would intimidate Congress to force us to adopt legislation Congress has rejected.

We have the power—the power of the purse—to stop it. That is the appropriate response of Congress. When the President proposes something that is improper and outside of law, when we have powers as coequal branches of government, we can respond, and we should use the power of the purse.

Senator CRUZ has filed an amendment to this bill that would prohibit the executive expenditures by the President of any funds for administrative amnesty or work authorization for unlawful immigrants. However, the majority leader, with the support of his conference, has blocked all amendments to this border supplemental. If we do not stop this Presidential action, we will ensure that the border crisis continues a catastrophe.

The President's planned action would also represent a total breach of our constitutional system, and it would be a hammer blow to millions of unemployed American citizens. We do have the power to stop this. We ought to stop it. We have a duty to Congress, we have a duty to the rule of law, and we have a duty to the Constitution.

What we can do today by voting yes on my motion to clear the amendment

tree and to consider and pass Senator CRUZ's amendment would fix this problem. It would say: Mr. President, you are not authorized to utilize any money of the U.S. Government to spend on a program to grant amnesty and work permits to millions.

The vote we are about to have will be a vote on whether to support the President's illegal amnesty or to block it. It will be a vote to allow us to vote on it, because right now the tree is filled and we can't vote.

I am going to be asking to table what is on the tree and clear that amendment out so we can vote on this amendment, and we will have a vote on it. Everyone in this Chamber will cast a vote before this whole Nation and reveal whether they stand for our laws, for our border sovereignty or whether they stand in support of the President's illegal activities, in truth.

A number of cosponsors support this amendment. I think it is the right thing to do, and we will be asking for that later today.

Colleagues, in addition, the administration has announced its intention to bypass Congress, according to the Associated Press, the Wall Street Journal, Time Magazine, and others, with as many as 5 million to 6 million of these work permits.

Unfortunately, the bill before us is merely a blank check to perpetuate the failure of this administration to fix the problems at the border. This can be done, colleagues. It is not impossible. It is not hopeless. We simply need a President who wants it to happen.

He has been sued by his own ICE officers, saying that they are being blocked from doing their duty. They asked a court to give them relief and tell their supervisors to quit telling them to violate the law and not enforce the law. That is amazing. Their morale is in the tank.

The current crisis on the border can be attributed to specific actions taken unilaterally by the President. After his 2012 Executive order, the number of unaccompanied minors apprehended at the border jumped from 7,100 in 2011 to nearly 15,000 in 2012, and now we have already hit more than 57,000 heading to 90,000. Estimates suggest approximately 32,000 unaccompanied minors are projected to cross the border in the remaining months of this fiscal year.

We have this egregious funding supplemental before us that would equal more than \$110,000 per child who is coming into the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank my colleagues. We do have good colleagues here, and we have great robust debate,

and I appreciate the chairman of the committee, Senator MIKULSKI.

Moreover, this border supplemental provides the Department with unlimited transfer authority of \$1.1 billion—an unlimited ability of up to \$1 billion. It becomes, really, a slush fund in that sense. They can use it for anything. Finally, the border supplemental would provide an additional \$1.2 billion to the Department of Homeland Security.

So I am raising a point of order. And I am sure a motion to waive will be heard. But make no mistake. A vote to suspend the budget rules and to block our point of order is a vote for the President's amnesty; it is a vote for continued chaos. I urge my colleagues to sustain it.

The bill before us today is in clear violation of the budget. All the money is borrowed money, it violates the budget, and I raise that point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, a parliamentary question: Did the Senator from Alabama raise a budget point of order? Did the Senator from Alabama raise a budget point of order?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I have not raised it at this point, but I do intend to. I thought we had an understanding so we could make the votes occur at the agreed-upon time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I say to the Senator from Alabama, do you want to raise it now or do you want to raise it later?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would raise it later.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I note that the Senator from Maryland wishes to respond.

How much time do the Democrats have in this debate?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois have 4 minutes to offer a rebuttal and I have 5 minutes for the wrapup debate before we move to vote.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senator from Alabama now joins the Senator from Texas, coming to the floor of the Senate complaining about the state of immigration laws in America. They have in common the fact that they both voted against comprehensive immigration reform.

When we had a chance in committee—which the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas serve on—and on the floor to offer amendments and change the bill accordingly, both of them at the end of the day voted against comprehensive immigration reform. Now, over a year later, they come and complain about the

state of law when it comes to immigration in America. They can't have it both ways.

They could have participated with us in changing the law in a positive fashion. They chose not to. They wanted to wait until a year later and complain about President Obama not meeting his obligation.

When it comes to comprehensive immigration reform, the Senate met its obligation, and those who voted for it did as well. It was the House of Representatives that failed to call the bill.

Now the Senator from Alabama says, well, the reason these children are coming to our border is because President Obama signed an Executive order which said that if you were a child brought to the United States by August 15, 2007, you could qualify to be benefited by this order and not deported, under DACA on a temporary basis.

Now, that has nothing to do with any child that comes after that date. They are not covered by that order. They are not protected by that order. To blame President Obama for the children coming to the border is to ignore the obvious. The law that brings these children to the border was a law signed by President George W. Bush in 2008. That is the law that governs the treatment of these children. Everything has to be blamed on President Obama from that side of the aisle. In this case, the law was signed by President George W. Bush.

I happen to believe that this DACA Executive order by the President was thoughtful and humane. Here is what it said: If you were brought to the United States before the age of 16, as a child, you lived in the United States and finished high school, with no criminal record of any magnitude, you would be allowed to stay in the United States on a temporary basis and not deported.

I have met these children. There are many of them who are growing into magnificent contributors to America—doctors, engineers, teachers. They beg to join our military. They are not what they are characterized to be. These are young people who believe this is their homeland, this is their country, and all they are asking for is a chance.

President Obama gave them that chance, and the Republicans time and again—Senator SESSIONS now, later Senator CRUZ—can't wait to deport all these children who have gone through high school, gone through college, and only aspire to be contributors to the future of America. That is the Republican party position for some: Deport these children; we don't want them in our country any longer. That is their position. That is not the position of a majority of Americans. They deserve a chance to prove themselves and earn their way to legal status. And to blame them for this border crisis is unfair.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the majority leader has brought a \$3.5

billion emergency supplemental spending bill to the floor at the request of President Obama. This bill, while it shaves off \$1 billion from the President's original request, is still a blank check that does not solve the crisis along our southern border.

This Democratic spending bill isn't a solution, and it is not a reasonable or responsible request. The majority in the Senate want taxpayers to fund a bandaid that is needed because of the President's own policies and practices.

Not only does the President want a blank check, but he wants unfettered authority to keep people unlawfully in the country from being returned to their home country. While we are facing a crisis, President Obama is looking at ways to weaken our immigration laws.

I understand that there are a variety of reasons that people come here—to be with family, to find work, and to have a better life. We are a compassionate country, and we provide a safe haven for people who need it. But we are also a country based on the rule of law.

That rule of law has been a principle of our country since its founding. This principle means that the government will enforce the laws it writes. People need to be able to trust their government and trust that it will be fair.

Today, people don't trust the government to enforce the laws. They see lawlessness at the border. Individuals—including both children and adults—are crossing the border without repercussions, and instead of taking responsibility for it, the President wants to fuel the fire and provide them with more benefits.

Instead of providing a blank check, Republicans have come forward with solutions. Today, Senators CORNYN, MCCONNELL, FLAKE and I are introducing a humanitarian solution to the problem. We provide funding while changing the law to ensure speedy repatriation of unaccompanied minors to their home country.

We provide equal treatment to young children of noncontiguous countries to voluntarily return to their home country when apprehended by a border agent. Today, these young people can't voluntarily return. They wait 6 or 12 months until they go before an immigration judge. They are released, and we can only hope that they will show up for their court date.

Our bill provides a new and special process for unaccompanied children to have an immediate court proceeding. This new process would be conducted within 7 days, and children would remain in protective custody.

We also require expedited removal—meaning, no opportunity for formal removal proceedings—of criminals, gang members, those who have previously violated our immigration laws, and those who have fraudulently claimed to be an unaccompanied alien child. Expedited removal is a tool that will help

border agents return people who don't have a right to be here, and it will avoid an influx of individuals going through our lengthy court system.

Our efforts, unfortunately, are only worthwhile if the home countries cooperate. We would require the President to certify that the Governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras are cooperating in taking back their nationals. Moreover, we tie taxpayer dollars to their cooperation.

In addition to fixing the immigration court system for children, our alternative approach requires information sharing between Federal partners, including the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services.

It requires information sharing between the Federal Government and States, providing transparency and notice to States about individuals released. This administration has an abysmal record with transparency, and many States are left wondering how they are going to deal with the influx of undocumented children in their schools and health systems.

By the end of this fiscal year, up to 90,000 children will have entered the country. People are rightly concerned that they are being released into our communities. They are also being released to nonrelatives and people without lawful immigration status. Our bill fixes that. It requires children to be in the government's protective custody unless their parent is in legal status and undergoes a criminal background check.

Our bill prohibits the government from placing children with sex offenders or traffickers. Doesn't that just make sense. We are talking about vulnerable young people, and we need to be careful about who is taking custody of them.

Why are these young people coming? Aside from President Obama's weak policies, there is reason to believe that they are being trafficked and used as a commodity by drug traffickers. There are serious gang issues in some of these countries. And these issues are seeping into our country.

Our bill ensures that alien gang members are not provided a safe haven in the United States by rendering them inadmissible and deportable, requiring the government to detain them, and it prohibits alien gang members from gaining U.S. immigration benefits such as asylum or temporary protected status.

Border Patrol agents are being strained during this crisis. They are being taken off the line to care for children and adults. States along the border are stepping up and paying the price. Our bill supports State and local governments by reimbursing the costs they have had to bear.

Our bill ensures that Customs and Border Protection agents are provided

access to Federal lands along the border. It also increases the penalties for smuggling offenses.

Finally, our bill deals with the lawless policies of this President and his administration. Over the last few years, the President has shown an astonishing disregard for the Constitution, the rule of law, and the rights of American citizens and legal residents. He has made promises and threats to go around Congress by using his phone and pen.

Well, today we are exercising our constitutional right in cutting off funding for the President to expand his administrative amnesties. Our bill would stop him from expanding the deferred action for childhood arrivals. It would stop other legalization programs that President Obama is contemplating. Congress has a role to play in reforming our immigration system. He should not circumvent the process and go against the will of the American people.

Again, our bill is a reasonable alternative to a blank check. We have a solution that provides due process for minors who illegally enter our country. We are being responsible and showing leadership on this issue, and I encourage my fellow colleagues to seriously consider our proposal so that we can humanely deal with this crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, as we begin to close out this part of the debate, I would just say that the issues I am advocating are deeply personal to me and, I believe, deeply personal to all Senators.

When I talk about the fact that we have to fund help for wildfires in several States and help them be able to help themselves by replenishing the money for the Forest Service, I am reminded of the fact that a great writer by the name of de Tocqueville came to the United States to hear: What is this thing called democracy? He wrote that famous book, "Democracy in America." In it he called for something that he observed. He said what sets America apart is its habits of the heart, that it helps neighbor helping neighbor.

Now, we used to do that through barn raising and pancake suppers. But, my gosh, these issues have gotten too big, too horrific. We now have thousands of acres burning, homes being destroyed, businesses being destroyed. We need to be able to help our neighbors in the West.

And I say to my colleagues from the West: I appreciate all the support you have given us on the East Coast who faced hurricanes. We didn't say we practice ZIP Code politics, that we only help one part of the country when they are facing a disaster.

Habits of the heart, de Tocqueville said that is what defines us. We now need to help that.

This issue now in terms of the Israelis and Iron Dome began for me right after I was elected to the Congress. When I traveled to Poland I went to Auschwitz and saw forever and a day—6 million Jews exterminated—why they needed a homeland, forever—a homeland safe and secure. Now they are asking for help to replenish their interceptor rockets on the eve of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, where people fought with sticks and stones and children crawled through sewers to defend themselves.

We are not going to fool around here. We are not going to delay until we come back from the 5-week break. Israel is the homeland for the Jews. We need to help them defend themselves.

My journey in Central America began as a brand new Member of Congress, with four Maryknoll nuns and a woman named Jean Donovan, who were raped and killed by the death squads in El Salvador. I watched a gallant, brilliant, charismatic bishop named Oscar Romero killed, gunned down in his own cathedral. Then we finally got around to looking at Central America and what was going on. We were worried more about communism than the rise of violence. For 30 years we have been up and down in Central America. We have inherited the winds. Our way of ignoring these three countries is by turning a blind eye, by always looking elsewhere in the world. If we have \$4 billion to arm the Afghan security forces, I think we ought to back our Border Patrol, back our FBI, back our law enforcement to go after organized crime in Central America, because if we don't, it will be an additional threat and it will not only be the children—and now we have 60,000 children crossing the border.

I understand Texas and Arizona, the border States, are facing these problems. We do want to work together. But could we in the final minutes of this Congress get ourselves together enough to meet the urgent supplemental request to do this? This is what America is. This is who we are, helping our neighbors in the West, helping the country fighting for its survival, and also helping our own country dealing with the crisis in Central America facing our border.

I think it is time we pass this legislation, move forward, and come back and deal with the crisis there and also at the same time take a good look at immigration reform and do it in the way I think we can do it.

How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KAINE). The Senator has 10 seconds remaining.

Ms. MIKULSKI. With that I urge the adoption of this bill and hope we could move forward as a united bipartisan Congress.

I yield the floor. I yield what time I would have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this is a \$2 billion bill, all the money borrowed as a result of a crisis the President has created at the border, money this country does not have, and there are zero policy changes in it.

Republicans on the floor today have filed and argued for a number of amendments and attempted to offer those that are focused on critical policy changes to strengthen this legislation and make it more effective.

Unfortunately, the parliamentary maneuvering has been executed, the amendment tree is filled, and we have been prevented from offering any amendments at all that are necessary to establish a lawful system of immigration that works and that we can be proud of.

So I move to table the Reid amendment on the tree, 3751, for the purpose of offering the Cruz amendment. That amendment would prohibit the President of the United States from expending any funds to unilaterally provide amnesty and work authorizations for millions of people as has been reported in the press. The Cruz amendment is No. 3720.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 251 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Ayotte	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeben	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	
Fischer	McConnell	

NAYS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Levin	Udall (CO)
Casey	Markey	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Walsh
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hagan	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Harkin	Schatz
Cochran	Roberts	

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all remaining votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the pending measure, S. 2648—a bill providing emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2014—contains a number of provisions in violation of the Budget Act and spends in violation of the Budget Act. Specifically, it contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee that was not reported or discharged from the Budget Committee. Therefore, I raise a point of order against the measure pursuant to section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending bill, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, first of all, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will come to order.

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes in support of my motion to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The bill that is before the Senate contains \$3.57 billion of emergency spending, a reduction of \$1 billion, to help fund and care for the children who seek refuge and to fight the criminal traffickers at the border.

We fund fighting wildfires for our States and we also help Israel replenish its interceptor rockets.

What happens if the motion to waive fails? If the Senate fails to waive the point of order, the bill will go back to the Appropriations Committee, but the urgent need will remain. If the Senate fails to waive the point of order, agencies will take from other programs to fund this compelling need. What does that mean?

It means that HHS, which has already cut \$138 million from the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and others—we could have an ebola crisis in the world, and maybe even come to our border, and we are fooling around cutting HHS and CDC and other agencies. Please, let's look at what we are doing.

Homeland Security is also spending resources that would otherwise be used to secure the border, such as FEMA disaster relief money has to be there if we have a hurricane.

Simply put, failing to act is irresponsible. Let's waive the Budget Act, let's get on with the bill, and let's do our job.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I respect the remarks of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but I would note that every penny of this bill is borrowed. None of it is funded through any offsets or other sources of income. This country has to be more careful. The bill needs to go through the Budget Committee. It did not get approved properly there. I would note, again, it is all borrowed. It does not make any policy changes. I think we all should stand firm to reject this bill, and to sustain the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 252 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NAYS—44

Ayotte	Flake	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heller	Portman
Chambliss	Hoeven	Risch
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Landrieu	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Manchin	Wicker
Fischer	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Hagan	Roberts
Cochran	Harkin	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 50, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected and the point of order is sustained.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is regretful that the Republicans have blocked the Senate from addressing urgent needs.

Senator MIKULSKI has worked very hard on this urgent supplemental. It is very regrettable that we are not able to move forward on it. I would like to address at least two of what I believe are urgent needs. I understand that Republican Senators are unwilling to fund a proposed response to the crisis we have at the border. But certainly could we not agree that we have situation in the western part of the United States that is very difficult.

We responded when we had problems in the South with the hurricanes, in the East with the hurricanes. We have a problem in the West. We have fires that are raging all over the West. We have a fire in Washington that has been burning for weeks. Hundreds of homes have been burned. In Oregon, we have 400,000 acres that are burning. California has a couple of big fires. Nevada has a fire. A fire started, I understand, in Idaho a day or two ago. Thousands and thousands of firefighters are there. With temperatures rising, we have a drought all over the western part of the United States. Fires have gotten more and more difficult to fight

and more expensive. They have been easier and easier to start.

We are in dire need of additional funds. That is why this is part of the emergency supplemental. This is an emergency. The West is burning. The funds we seek would ensure that we protect life and property in the West without draining funds from other programs that help us stop this destructive wildfire cycle.

Another urgent need. We have all watched as the tiny state of Israel, our friend who is with us on everything, they have had in the last 3 weeks 3,000 rockets fired into their country—3,000. Iron Dome, as I have spoken here on the floor, has done a good job, but it does not cover Israel. They are mobile units. They move them around as well as they can. They depend on Iron Dome. The system works 90 percent of the time, not all of the time.

Last week Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel asked for \$225 million in emergency funding so that Israel's arsenal as it relates to the Iron Dome could be replenished. It is clear this is an emergency. We should be able to agree on that. That is why I make the following unanimous consent request.

First of all, so everyone understands, I am going to make a request that we have emergency funding for the wildfires in the West and the money I have talked about for Israel and Iron Dome.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.J. RES. 76

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 220, H.J. Res. 76; that a Mikulski substitute amendment at the desk providing emergency appropriations for the Iron Dome defense system in Israel and combating wildfires in the Western States be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the President has called the crisis at the border a humanitarian crisis. If that is not an emergency, I do not know what is. But as a result of the majority leader's refusal to allow us to offer any constructive suggestions to reform the law to stop this flow of humanity across our borders and actually solve the problem, the supplemental has now fallen to a budget point of order.

Likewise, this unanimous consent request to fund Iron Dome and wildfires exceeds the budget caps and the Budget Control Act. It is subject to a budget point of offer. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am frankly not surprised that this objection has

been made. It is too bad. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 220, H.J. Res. 76; that a Mikulski substitute amendment at the desk providing emergency appropriations for combating wildfires in the Western States be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

This relates just to the wildfires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree, like the crisis at the border, the wildfires in the Western States represent a genuine emergency and something we should address. But inasmuch as this consent asks for money that would break the budget caps and the Budget Control Act, it is subject to a budget point of order. I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is an emergency. There are no budget caps involved with an emergency. Everyone knows that. I am shocked that anyone in this Chamber would stop us from getting these critical funds to fight these fires that I have outlined on a very preliminary basis, and, of course, to help defend Israel.

By requesting this amendment, I am disappointed that it has been rejected. I have one more and then we can go on to something else.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 220, that a Reid-McConnell-Mikulski substitute amendment at the desk providing emergency funding for the Iron Dome defense system in Israel be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator from Nevada, the majority leader, consider an amendment that would modify his request that would provide an offset for this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader agree to modify his request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an emergency. Our No. 1 ally, at least in my mind, is under attack. If this is not an emergency, I do not know anything that is. So I refuse to modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. COBURN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would cut the United States assessed contribution to NATO and the World Health Organization. Now as we speak, they are fighting to control an Ebola outbreak in Central Africa. Peace Corps volunteers have been called home from three different countries.

The amendment of the Senator, my friend from Oklahoma, would cut the International Civil Aviation Organization, which is now investigating what took place in Ukraine, killing 298 people. So even if you do not like the U.N., the Senator's amendment would cut UNICEF funds to help the world's poorest children. The Senator's amendment would cut the U.N. Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture.

Now, that says it all. I have no more to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I would note—everybody should know that the U.N. gets well over \$7 billion of money every year from this Congress, the American people, with absolutely no accountability. There is no transparency on how it is spent. There is no accountability. They are not held accountable for how it is spent. The oversight that we have done over the past 6 or 7 years shows that the waste associated with the money that is sent to the U.N. is at least 30 percent—at least 30 percent when you do the actual oversight of it.

So we can talk about specifics. We can take a small portion from everywhere. I do not care. Or I will offer another pay-for. But the fact is, we do not get any accountability of the money this country sends to the U.N. today. Go see if you can find it. You cannot. You will not be able to find it. I want to fund Israel. I want to supply them. I also want to make sure our children have a future. It is not hard to find \$225 million out of \$4 trillion.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the previous order, I call for the Senate to proceed to the veterans conference report.

VETERANS ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 3230, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a Govern-

ment shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 28, 2014.)

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is to be recognized to raise a budget point of order.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, let me say, first of all, I voted for the bill when it left here with the hope that we could accomplish something. We did accomplish some things. But it came back with \$12 billion unpaid for. Because of that, I raise a point of order against the emergency designation provision contained in section 8803(b) of the conference report for H.R. 3230, the Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014 pursuant to section 403(e)(1) of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 13.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, and section 4(g)(3) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, I move to waive all applicable sections of those acts and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the pending conference report.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I will speak very briefly. Mainly, I come here on the floor to thank the Senator from Vermont and my good friend from North Carolina on the hard work they and members of the Veterans Affairs' Committee have done on this issue. I greatly respect my dear friend from Oklahoma and his concern. But I would have to say to my colleagues: If there was ever a definition of an emergency, that emergency faces us today because our veterans are not receiving the care we owe them as a nation.

There are veterans who are dying as we speak for lack of care. There is gross mismanagement. There are problems that will take our new Secretary of Veterans Affairs literally years to fix. I am proud that in this legislation

there is choice, and there is the ability of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to fire people who are not doing their job.

Those are the important aspects, most important to me, because I think we can change the Veterans Administration. But the present situation cries out for immediate action. Obviously there were parts of this legislation that I did not agree with. Obviously there were parts that the Senator from Vermont did not agree with. But the hard work put together by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Vermont—I am very proud to say we bring before you a way to put a final stamp on beginning to end. This is not the beginning of the end. This is the beginning of the beginning of our effort to help those men and women who have defended our Nation with honor and dignity. We owe them that.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the waiver of the Budget Act and to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, yesterday the House voted 420 to 5 for this conference report. They understood that taking care of veterans, as Senator MCCAIN just indicated—the men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend us, who have sacrificed so much—is a cost of war, and in fact what we are talking about is an emergency. That is what the House said overwhelmingly yesterday.

On June 11, 2014, 6 or so weeks ago, by a vote of 93 to 3, the Senate supported the Sanders-McCain bill and it was emergency funded as a cost of war.

This bill, as Senator COBURN indicated, is about one-third of the cost of what we voted on in the original Sanders-McCain bill.

Let us defeat this point of order. Let us stand with the veterans of this country, let us reform the VA, and let us go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I will be very quick.

What our colleagues should know is, since 2009, the VA budget has increased 58.7 percent, a 40-percent increase in the number of providers, with a 17-percent increase in the number of veterans using those providers. The problem is not money at the VA. The problem is management, accountability, and culture. So we are going to borrow \$12 billion from our children and reward the poor behavior and charge it to our children.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would say in response to my dear friend from Oklahoma, I agree with every single thing that he has said. But we must embark on fixing this problem. The choice and the ability to give the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the authority to hire and fire people is important to me that I believe they deserve our support.

I would also ask my friend from Oklahoma, can we leave here for 5 weeks and not address this issue? There are 50 veterans in my State that have probably died—at least allegations are such. Can we leave here and not act?

If I had written this bill with only you and me, I would say to my friend from Oklahoma, it would probably be \$10 billion less and all of it paid for. But we had to negotiate, not only with the other side of the aisle but with the other side of the Capitol.

So this is not perfect legislation. But for us not to pass it at this time would send a message to the men and women who have served this country that we have abandoned them. We can't do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I first thank everybody who worked on this. I know there are a lot of political conundrums that people find themselves in. We have an August recess. This issue has come up. But I wonder if I could ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma, who knows so much about these issues.

Our staff has looked at the CBO report, and people keep talking about \$10 billion on the floor, but the Choice Program is only funded for 3 years. It looks to me as if this bill is really creating an unfunded liability. It is a \$250 billion cost over the next decade. I can't verify that based on the CBO numbers that have come out. But as we look at them, it looks as if the Choice Program continues and grows, and the number we are talking about is massive.

So I do wish we had more detailed information from CBO, the kind of information we got on the first bill after the fact. For some reason, we are not getting it on this.

But it appears to me that if this choice concept continues and we don't do those things to actually wind down and backfill—wind down VA for not providing services to these people because they are seeking it elsewhere—the cost of this could well be \$250 billion over the next 10 years unpaid for.

I would like for somebody to answer that. I don't know if Senator COBURN or someone else could. But we are not talking about \$10 billion is all I am saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. What we are talking about is an errant CBO score that doesn't fit with reality or the information given to them by the VA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what we are talking about, really, is rather than get in a car or van and drive for 40 miles and hours and have that all reimbursed and paid for, a person will go

to the local care provider. Common sense shows that costs one heck of a lot less, I would say to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator COBURN forgot to mention one point when talking about the increase in VA funding. He forgot to mention that we were in two wars.

He forgot to mention that 500,000 men and women came back from Iraq and Afghanistan with posttraumatic stress disorder and TBI, not to mention the loss of legs, the loss of arms, eyesight and hearing.

He forgot to mention that many of the veterans from World War II, Korea, and Vietnam are getting older and need more detailed care.

So I think it is important that we put \$5 billion into the VA to provide the doctors, the nurses, the personnel they need, so that the veterans can get into the VA and have quality and timely care. That is what this legislation is about.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 253 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Ayotte	Durbin	Levin
Baldwin	Feinstein	Manchin
Begich	Fischer	Markey
Bennet	Franken	McCain
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Blunt	Graham	McConnell
Booker	Grassley	Menendez
Boozman	Hatch	Merkley
Boxer	Heinrich	Mikulski
Brown	Heitkamp	Moran
Burr	Heller	Murkowski
Cantwell	Hirono	Murphy
Cardin	Hoeven	Murray
Carper	Inhofe	Nelson
Casey	Isakson	Paul
Chambliss	Johanns	Portman
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Collins	Kaine	Reed
Coons	King	Reid
Cornyn	Kirk	Risch
Crapo	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cruz	Landrieu	Rubio
Donnelly	Leahy	Sanders

Schumer	Thune	Warner
Scott	Toomey	Warren
Shaheen	Udall (CO)	Whitehouse
Shelby	Udall (NM)	Wicker
Stabenow	Vitter	Wyden
Tester	Walsh	

NAYS—8

Barrasso	Enzi	Lee
Coburn	Flake	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Hagan	Roberts
Cochran	Harkin	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion to waive, the yeas are 86, the nays are 8. The motion to waive is agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate confirmed Bob McDonald as the new Secretary of the VA and today we passed a compromise veterans bill that will help repair the overwhelmed Veterans Health Administration. These are two steps in the right direction to help the men and women who serve in our military receive the care they need when they come home.

Bob McDonald is an excellent choice to head the VA. I met with McDonald soon after he was nominated for this position and there is no doubt he is eager to take on the task of seeing that the VA honors its promise to the men and women of our armed services. McDonald ran Proctor and Gamble for several years and knows what it means to put the customer first. At the VA, veterans are the customers and we have to provide them with the best service possible. McDonald is a veteran, a West Point grad, and best of all, he is from Arlington Heights, IL. I am confident he is the right person for this difficult job.

After an internal audit, the VA confirmed whistleblower assertions that many VA employees manipulated waitlists to make wait times look better than they really were. The agency found that in some cases, staff intimidated schedulers into falsifying data. This is unacceptable.

I visited the Hines VA Hospital near Chicago last Friday where I met with Joan Ricard, director of the facility, and Rob Nabors, President Obama's Deputy Chief of Staff, who is overseeing the investigation into problems at the VA. We discussed some problems identified by whistleblowers at Hines pertaining to waitlists and other issues.

I am pleased that the Senate adopted the Veterans bill conference report. The House passed the bill 420-to-5 yesterday. VA Committee Chairman SANDERS worked very hard both with Members across the aisle and in the House to put this bill together. It will begin to fix some of the problems identified by the various investigations into misconduct at VA medical facilities.

This bill will allow the Secretary to fire senior staff who are not doing their job or who lied about secret waitlists.

It will create 27 new VA health facilities to expand capacity, including a new research lab at Hines in Chicago. That research lab is 100-years-old and in dire need of repair. The new lease will help make it usable again.

This legislation will make it easier for veterans to get the care they need outside the VA system if necessary. Now, any enrolled veteran who lives more than 40-miles from the nearest VA facility or who would have to wait too long for an appointment will be able to go to a private doctor. We need to get those waitlists down, and this is one way to make sure veterans are seen.

The IG investigation has cited a shortage of doctors, nurses, and other staff as being partly to blame for the waitlist problem. There simply is not enough staff to see all the veterans who need treatment. The bill also provides \$5 billion to hire new staff.

These are improvements we can all agree on.

Some have expressed concern about the cost of this bill but caring for veterans is part of the cost of going to war. We spent \$1.7 trillion in the Iraq War alone. We can spend \$12 billion to honor the promise we made to our servicemembers.

When we talk about war, we are not just talking about the thousands of people who died in Iraq and Afghanistan. We're talking about 200,000 men and women who came home with major injuries, both those we can see and some we cannot. We are talking about people with post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury, people missing limbs and those who lost hearing or eyesight. Veterans who are entitled to healthcare services should get the best healthcare they can, and they should get it in a timely manner.

There is no question that we need to fix this health care system. Where misconduct has been identified, those responsible should face the consequences, criminal or otherwise. The Sanders-Miller compromise is a good step in that direction. Secret waitlists and failures to provide care do not reflect the promise we made to the men and women who serve this country. Wars create veterans and veterans need medical care. Caring for servicemembers is part of the cost of going to war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on adoption of the conference report.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, before we vote, I wish to take this opportunity to thank Senator MCCAIN for his intervention and making sure that we had serious negotiations.

I thank the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee: Steve Robertson, Dahlia Melendrez, Travis Murphy, Jason Dean, Carlos Fuentes, Becky Thowman, Ann Vallandingham, Janet

Gehring, Elizabeth Austin-Mackenzie, Kathryn Monet, Katie Van Haste, Shanna Lawrie, Raphael Anderson, and Shannon Jackson. These guys worked really hard for months, and I very much appreciate what they did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hatch	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Paul
Bennet	Heitkamp	Portman
Blumenthal	Heller	Pryor
Blunt	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Hoeven	Reid
Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Boxer	Isakson	Rockefeller
Brown	Johanns	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Scott
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Kirk	Shelby
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Markey	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Moran	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—3

Coburn	Corker	Sessions
--------	--------	----------

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Hagan	Roberts
Cochran	Harkin	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of the conference report, the conference report is agreed to.

MAKING CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3230

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of H. Con. Res. 111 which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3230.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) is agreed to and the motion to reconsider will be considered made and laid upon the table.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following disposition of the House message related to H.R. 5021, the highway bill, the Senate vote on cloture on Calendar No. 848, the Pryor nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be expired at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014, the Senate resume executive session and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will have two more votes.

We will be in session tomorrow. There will be no votes tomorrow, but there will be some activity here that we have to complete. So the next vote will be Monday, September 8.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to H.R. 5021.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5021) entitled "An Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the highway trust fund and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I move to recede in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we request 2 minutes of debate on this side, 1 minute for the chairman of the Finance Committee and 1 minute for the chairman of the public works committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Following that, I ask that 18 minutes be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is no secret that this Transportation bill is not the Senate's first choice. However, the alternative to acting tonight on transportation is to put at risk America's economy, our communities, and our quality of life. As Senator HATCH noted earlier tonight, the Senate had a real transportation debate this week with amendments, alternatives, and bipartisan initiatives. This will serve us well as we begin to work as soon as the Senate returns to develop a long-term, bipartisan transportation plan that ensures that our big-league economy is not plagued by little-league infrastructure.

I urge the Senate to support the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Senators, I will be brief. It is so unfortunate that the House walked away from the work we did, the bipartisan work we did together—79 votes. My goodness. We can't get that these days for Mother's Day. So it was fantastic what we did: the work of Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH, the work of Senator CARPER and Senator CORKER, the work of Senator VITTER in our committee that I as chair. It is very sad because what we wanted to do was to take care of this problem this year, in this Congress, on our watch, not kick the can down the road. That is what they chose to do in the House. It is most unfortunate, and their pay-fors were just a lot of smoke and mirrors.

Having said all of that, we all know—and colleagues have asked me how am I going to vote—that we can't walk away from the highway trust fund. We can't let it stagger and fall. Millions of jobs and thousands of businesses depend on it.

So I will be voting aye, and I will be working with Senator WYDEN and the rest of my friends and colleagues to make sure we get a multiyear bill as soon as possible.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 255 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Moran
Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murphy
Begich	Hatch	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blunt	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Boxer	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Kirk	Tester
Coats	Klobuchar	Thune
Collins	Landrieu	Toomey
Coons	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—13

Carper	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Coburn	Lee	Scott
Corker	McCain	Sessions
Cruz	Paul	
Flake	Portman	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Hagan	Roberts
Cochran	Harkin	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recede from the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021 is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United State Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Maria Cantwell, Jack Reed, Bill Nelson, Elizabeth Warren, Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Barbara Boxer, Tom Harkin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, for the fifth year in a row, more than a dozen qualified, consensus judicial nominees pending before the full Senate will remain on the Executive Calendar during the August recess. Each year, I have come before the Senate to remind my fellow Senators that their refusal to take action on these nominations prior to the August recess is an unfortunate departure from Senate tradition and to urge them to stop their obstructive practices and delay tactics. Again, I am disappointed to see partisanship and senseless obstruction continue to keep the Senate from fulfilling its constitutional duty of advice and consent.

We could be voting today to confirm 13 nominees to serve on our Federal courts, 12 of whom were reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee by unanimous voice vote. Instead, we are voting to invoke cloture on only one nomination, that of Jill Pryor, to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. She has received the American Bar Association's highest rating of unanimously "well qualified" and has the support of both of her Republican home State Senators. She will no doubt be confirmed unanimously, or near unanimously, when we return in September. As the senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS, noted at her confirmation hearing, "Jill Pryor has been in private practice in Atlanta for nearly 25 years. During that time she has played a pivotal role in some of the largest and most complex cases in Georgia history." We have before us an outstanding candidate to serve on the Federal bench. Yet her nomination is being filibustered by Senate Republicans who are delaying her vote for the sake of obstruction.

Despite this unyielding and irrational partisan strategy, the Senate has made great strides to fill vacancies on courts around the Nation by confirming 61 circuit and district court nominees this year. I have heard some Republican Senators point to these confirmations to claim that today's Senate is treating judicial nominees fairly. These Senators overlook an important truth: This progress was made because of the persistent dedication of the majority leader and Democratic Senators to confront vacancies on the Federal bench and despite the unprecedented levels of opposition and obstruction from Republican Senators.

Because of our Democratic leadership in the Senate, there are now fewer vacancies on the Federal courts than at any time since January 2009. Since the beginning of this year, we have reduced the vacancies on our Federal courts by over a third, from 92 to 57, and reduced the number of judicial emergency vacancies by nearly half, from 37 to 19. There are now only eight vacancies on the U.S. courts of appeals. Not since December 1990—over 23 years ago—have there been so few. This is real progress for the millions of Americans who depend on our courts for justice.

Many of these confirmations were of nominees to courts that began the year with record-high numbers of vacancies. In Arizona, I worked with Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE to confirm six nominees to fill judicial emergency vacancies on their district court. In Florida, I worked with Senator NELSON and Senator RUBIO to confirm seven nominees to fill judicial emergency vacancies in the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida as well as on the Eleventh Circuit. These States are success stories, and the people of Arizona and Florida are better served for having trial and appellate judges ready to hear their cases.

No Senator should believe, however, that our work is done. There are 13 judicial nominees pending on the Senate floor who should be confirmed without delay. Yet, even if the Senate were to confirm these nominees today, the Federal judiciary would remain understaffed. In addition to the 57 current vacancies, the Judicial Conference has identified the need for 91 new judgeships in some of America's judicial districts and circuits with the most burdensome caseloads. Last year, Senator COONS and I introduced the Federal Judgeship Act of 2013 to enact these recommendations into law. The timely administration of justice should not be a partisan issue. It is an issue that affects all Americans and the Senate should take it seriously by passing this bill.

The recommendations of the Judicial Conference only underscore how, despite the 61 judicial confirmations so far in 2014, the Senate continues to fall short of its obligations to the Federal judiciary and the American people. I have heard some Republican Senators claim the opposite by citing the total judicial confirmation figures of current and former Presidents. It is true that the Senate has now confirmed 277 of President Obama's circuit, district, and U.S. Court of International Trade nominees, compared to 253 confirmations at the same point in the last administration. Yet these numbers are meaningless without providing their proper context. These confirmations were sorely needed. There remain 57 vacancies on the Federal bench—far more than the 42 vacancies at this point during the Bush administration.

There are an additional 24 announced future vacancies on our Federal courts that will also need to be filled in the coming months.

Vacancies remain high not because of a failure of Senate Democrats or President Obama to make judicial confirmations a priority; Americans seeking justice around the country face delays because of the endless obstruction of partisan Republicans who take every opportunity they can to shut down the important work of the Senate. Last year, no longer content to block individual judges, Senate Republicans attempted a wholesale filibuster of three nominees to the DC Circuit, without even considering their qualifications. Then, instead of confirming the consensus judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar prior to the end of the congressional session, Republicans forced the President to renominate each nominee and the Senate Judiciary Committee to report them again this year.

This year, Senate Republicans have proceeded to filibuster each and every judicial nominee. After today, the Senate will have taken 62 cloture votes on judicial nominations so far this year, amounting to well over 400 wasted hours the Senate should have spent considering legislation to help the American people. Never before has the Senate seen the systematic filibuster of every judicial nominee, or such unfair treatment of qualified, consensus nominees.

The result of these tactics has been high vacancy levels on the Federal courts. The implications of these vacancies were made clear by a recent Brennan Center for Justice paper titled "The Impact of Judicial Vacancies on Federal Trial Courts." In it, judges and attorneys in districts with high levels of vacancies describe the way empty court rooms slow the administration of justice, "raise the cost of litigation, cause evidence to go stale, make it harder to settle civil cases, and even put pressure on criminal defendants to plead guilty." Chief Judge Leonard Davis in the Eastern District of Texas said the impact of vacancies comes down to "simple math." Vacancies lead to heavier caseloads and judges "have less time to give to [an individual] case . . . It affects the quality of justice that's being dispensed and the quantity of work you can complete."

The incredible burden facing Federal courts in Texas is understandable with its nine current district court vacancies—more than any other State. Therefore, I hope that Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, including both Senators from Texas, will be ready to proceed with a hearing on the three pending Texas district court nominees as soon as the Senate returns to session in September. I also hope that the Texas Senators will continue to work with the administration on

nominees to fill the six other current district vacancies in their State as well as the four known future district court vacancies.

The continued high number of vacancies across our Federal courts is unacceptable to me and should be unacceptable to every Member of this body. The Senate should act quickly to confirm the consensus nominees pending on the Senate floor. The Senate should also pass the Federal Judgeship Act of 2013 to ensure that our coequal branch of government has the resources it needs to serve its constitutionally mandated function.

I am glad that we are voting to overcome the Republican filibuster of the nomination of Jill Pryor, and I thank the majority leader for taking action on her nomination. If the Senate were operating as it once did, without this partisan treatment of judicial nominations, she would have been confirmed weeks ago.

I hope that in the weeks following the August recess Senators will start working together to continue the progress we have made so far in 2014. The American people deserve courts capable of providing access to swift justice, not empty courtrooms and delays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN, I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted "nay."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 33, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 256 Ex.)

YEAS—58

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Isakson	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Landrieu	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Udall (CO)
Chambliss	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Collins	Markey	Walsh
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Graham	McConnell
Blunt	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hatch	Paul
Burr	Heller	Portman
Coats	Hoehn	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cruz	Kirk	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Vitter
Flake	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Hagan	Schatz
Cochran	Harkin	Scott
Cornyn	Roberts	Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 58, the nays are 33. The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 76

Mr. REID. Madam President, I renew the request I made earlier this evening.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 220; that a Reid-McConnell-Mikulski substitute amendment at the desk providing emergency appropriations for the Iron Dome defense system in Israel be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in support of all of the career Foreign Service officers whose nominations have been held up in the Chamber until there is a crisis somewhere in the world, until there is a Presidential or Vice Presidential trip to some part of the world that suddenly demands our attention, and then miraculously holds are lifted and nominees are approved.

On a Thursday, Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 crashed in eastern Ukraine. On the following Monday, the Senate confirmed Michael Lawson as the U.S. Ambassador to the International Civil

Aviation Organization. He had been pending before the Senate. His first day on the job, his first time meeting his colleagues, he was forced to grapple with this crisis.

In the last week or 10 days, two more plane crashes have occurred in Taiwan and in Mali, an Algerian plane. Random events around the world cannot determine when the Senate acts on nominees. We cannot continue to follow a policy of confirmation by crisis. It took the President to travel to Saudi Arabia—an important ally—and the Vice President to travel to Chile for the Senate to confirm the nominees to those countries. In the case of Chile, Ambassador Hammer was taken to his new office in Santiago for his first day on the job on Air Force Two because the Senate approved his nomination just before the Vice President was to visit Chile. It should not require flying on Air Force Two to get to your posting for your first day of work as a U.S. Ambassador. Take the case of our Ambassador to Qatar. She waited for months, and then Bergdahl was exchanged for five Guantanamo detainees released to Qatar, and suddenly she was approved. It almost required the President to be “wheels up” on Air Force One on his way to Riyadh before we confirmed an Ambassador to Saudi Arabia.

I repeat, the criteria for confirming nominees should not be determined by a sudden just-breaking crisis, with the urgent need to fill a vacant post. Confirmation-by-crisis is not a strategy. It is not in the national security interests of the United States.

Now the Foreign Relations Committee has moved judiciously—in some cases with record-setting speed—to confirm nominees. In the face of obstructionism on the floor of the Senate, the committee has proven that bipartisanship is not only possible but it can thrive when American national security interests are put first.

It is my view that we must lift up our Ambassadors and their families, not put them down. These individuals are serving our Nation. Their families are sacrificing for our Nation. They deserve better. Our career Foreign Service officers serve Democratic and Republican Presidents. They should not, must not be treated as political pawns.

We cannot continue to allow the pulpits where we preach American values to remain vacant. No Nation can listen to us if we are not present to speak for ourselves. American leadership can only occur if American leaders are present on the international stage.

The Senate standoff that has left so many career Foreign Service nominees in political and personal limbo is damaging our credibility, undermining our national security, and it has to end now.

I rise today for the career ambassadors who have not gotten the de-

cency of a vote in the Senate, career ambassadors who are waiting, along with their families, for months, some more than a year, to take their posts. They are trapped on the Executive Calendar, unable to assume their appointed posts because the leadership on the Republican side has chosen to hold them hostage as a political tool. They have consciously chosen a strategy to do nothing, pass nothing, approve nothing, and leave key diplomatic posts unfilled for months, threatening national security and our ability to conduct foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominees: Calendar No. 524, Adam M. Scheinman to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador; Calendar No. 533, Karen Stanton to be the Ambassador to the Republic of Timor-Leste; Calendar No. 536, Eric Schultz to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia; Calendar No. 540, Donald Lu to be the Ambassador to the Republic of Albania; Calendar No. 542, Amy Hyatt to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau; Calendar No. 544, John Hoover to be the Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone; Calendar No. 546, Matthew Harrington to be the Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho; Calendar No. 548, Thomas Daughton to be the Ambassador to Namibia; Calendar No. 637, Arnold Chacon to be Director General of the Foreign Service; Calendar No. 696, Luis Moreno to be Ambassador to Jamaica; Calendar No. 699, Maureen Cormack to be the Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina; Calendar No. 707, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, an Assistant Secretary of State of African Affairs, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation; Calendar No. 898, Ted Osius to be Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam; Calendar No. 902, Gentry O. Smith to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions and have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure; Calendar No. 927, Leslie Bassett to be Ambassador to Paraguay; Calendar No. 953, George Albert Krol to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan; Calendar No. 954, Marcia Stephens Bloom Bernicat to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh; Calendar No. 955, James D. Pettit to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova; Calendar No. 956, John R. Bass to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey; Calendar No. 957, Allan P. Mustard to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan; Calendar No. 958, Todd Robinson to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala; Calendar No. 961, Erica J. Barks Ruggles to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda; Calendar No. 962, Brent Robert Hartley to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia; Calendar No. 966, Michele Jeanne Sison to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of

America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the Security Council of the United Nations; finally, Calendar No. 967, Michele Jeanne Sison to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I don't think he is finished with his unanimous consent request.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I appreciate that.

Further, that their nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, we used to pass ambassadors and all kinds of people en bloc like that. But we have this nuclear option that the majority chose, so it takes a little longer to do the whole process.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I don't know about nuclear options, but I do know about national security.

When we have objections to some career ambassadors—I am not even talking about other nominees who are equally as important to places in the world where we face a challenge. But when I extract those out of the list that are also pending before the Senate in critical places in the world and just say, my God, if a career ambassador—someone who serves under Democratic and Republican administrations and has committed their life to the service of our country in the foreign service—cannot get to their places, I don't understand.

I don't understand how we can actually object to places like Guatemala where we are having the crisis that we just debated right now. Wouldn't it be great to have a U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala to direct the Guatemalan Government as to our concerns about how children are coming here? Wouldn't it be great to have the Ambassador to Turkey at a time when we have all of these challenges in the region, where Turkey has a huge number of Syrian refugees. And we say we ob-

ject to those? Or Vietnam, where we are looking at a 123 nuclear agreement and where we are concerned about what China is doing in the South China Sea as it ultimately challenges Vietnam in international waters for drilling purposes? And the list goes on and on.

So let me at least try some. If I can't do them as a bloc, let's see if we can get somebody confirmed here at the end of the day to critical positions.

So let me ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider this following nomination: Calendar No. 968, John Tefft to be Ambassador to Russia, a career ambassador.

Now, imagine if we cannot send a United States Ambassador to Russia in the midst of the enormous challenges.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider nomination Calendar No. 968, John Tefft, Ambassador to Russia; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that there be no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to that nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, this is the procedure the majority set up. And the majority is going to be stuck with their decision to delay people, thinking they could speed them up and take away some of the minority rights.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, this is not a procedure the majority set up. The procedure that is being set up is one where career nominees and critical nominees are being held on the floor as a procedure that the Republicans have decided to do.

Let me try once again. Let's see whether there is a more important place than Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Mark Lippert to be Ambassador to South Korea, Calendar No. 893; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be made in order to that nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, this is a political appointment, not a career appointment. If I objected to a career appointment, I certainly object to a political appointment.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is true it is a political appointment, but to the Republic of South Korea. At a time when we are facing challenges in the South China Sea, where there is a dispute between China and Korea, where we have critical interests, where we are dealing with North Korea, we can't have an Ambassador to South Korea?

Let me just say that I could go through a list of critical countries. And it is pretty amazing to me. I have some of my colleagues who have come to the floor to talk about national security. Well, national security isn't only about having a trigger and a gun. National security is also about having an ambassador in a country to ultimately press our case and our concerns as it relates to our bilateral relationship with that country.

So places like Russia, which was objected to, places like South Korea, places like Guatemala, where we are having the crisis, and a whole bunch of African countries that were in the career list—we are going to have the African leader come here next Monday and Tuesday, but we are not going to have ambassadors to a whole bunch of their countries—career ambassadors to a whole bunch of their countries. That is not in the national interests and security of the United States.

I hope that after having waited quite some time in order to finally get to this point where I felt the necessity to come to the floor and ask for unanimous consent, that instead of the trickle that we occasionally get because there is a crisis and therefore there is a response to the crisis, that we can avoid responding by crisis and having people in places that maybe would help us to ensure that the crisis doesn't take place.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CARPER. Would the chairman tell us again the name of the ambassador nominated by the President to be Ambassador to Guatemala?

Mr. MENENDEZ. The gentleman who is nominated, a career nominee to be the Ambassador to Guatemala is Todd D. Robinson.

Mr. CARPER. I would say to my colleagues, as chairman of the homeland security committee, I have been down to a number of Central American countries—Mexico, Colombia, Guatemala, El Salvador. If there is anybody that needs a U.S. ambassador down there, it

is Guatemala. We see all these young people, not so young people, coming to this country, trying to get in this country. The reason they are coming up here is there is no hope—no economic hope, crime, lack of opportunity—and we have no ambassador there. We haven't had an ambassador there for months.

I would just make a plea for the chairman to make a unanimous consent if only for the Ambassador to Guatemala. And I would just plead with my colleague, my friend from Wyoming, not to object.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I say to my distinguished colleague from Delaware that I already included the Ambassador to Guatemala in my list and there was objection. If the Senator from Wyoming, who I believe is not doing this in his own course but on behalf of his leadership, has an indication that he would accept that, I would be happy to do it; otherwise, I think we would further not be able to achieve it.

Mr. CARPER. I would ask, would the Senator one more time make the unanimous consent request for Todd Robinson.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 958, Todd D. Robinson to be the Ambassador to Guatemala; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table; that no intervening action or debate or further motions be in order to that nomination; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. We have been through this nomination and the others before. There is a procedure that was set up that is recognized now by both sides but that our side feels forced into because of the nuclear option where the other side broke the rules in order to change the rules. And the way that works, the majority leader is still the one that has every power within this body—except the Congressional Review Act—and he hasn't chosen to bring these up in the normal order, instead asking to bring them up en bloc.

My college roommate was a career ambassador, and I helped him get assignments and brought a lot of people through en bloc at the same time. But that was before we had the nuclear option.

So on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I will close on this. Look, the reality is

that if each of these ambassadors was going to be brought up and had to go through cloture and go through the whole process of time or the debate time that would be attributed to each one of them, we would spend the rest of this congressional session doing exactly that. That would not help our national security interests in terms of getting these people in place.

I want to get these people in place. I have limited the requests to countries that have career individuals and to countries that also are critical for our national security. I just hope that, in the national interest of the United States, we can come to a better position at some other time.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked on the Pryor nomination, the Chair directs the clerk to report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator from Wyoming consider modifying that request to include me to follow on, following his remarks?

Mr. ENZI. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. COBURN. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Senator RUBIO has been waiting all day to offer a unanimous consent request on a bill he has. I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes that Senator RUBIO would like to have be available between Senator ENZI and Senator MERKLEY.

Mr. MERKLEY. I have absolutely no objection to that.

Mr. ENZI. I revise my unanimous consent request for my speech, then Senator RUBIO for 2 minutes, then Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I will be very brief. I want to join Senator RUBIO, if I can have 2 minutes as well, before going to Senator MERKLEY.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modified request is agreed to.

The Senator from Wyoming.

RETIREMENT OF ROBIN BAILEY

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, the speech I need to give now is not one of my favorite speeches. It is a very important speech.

There is an old saying we have all heard before: Good help is hard to find. Here is my experience: Good help is not only hard to find, it is almost impossible to replace. Those words have come to my mind quite often in the days since my State director Robin Bailey told us she had decided to retire.

As we began our search for a new State director, it soon became apparent that you can't replace Robin Bailey.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5195. An act to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

At 4:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2709. A bill to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4450. An act to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 2772. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

S. 2773. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 31, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1799. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6686. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9912-92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6687. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of one (1) officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6688. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, (9) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6689. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, (25) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6690. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and

Regulations, Office of Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Refinancing an Existing Cooperative Under Section 207 Pursuant to Section 223(f) of the National Housing Act" (RIN2502-A192) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6691. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6692. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2014" ((RIN3150-AJ32) (NRC-2013-0276)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6693. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Redesignation Requests, Associated Maintenance Plans, and Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for the Delaware Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE Non-attainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards, and the 2007 Comprehensive Emissions Inventory for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9914-53-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6694. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nebraska; Fine Particulate Matter New Source Review Requirements" (FRL No. 9914-52-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6695. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska; Interstate Transport of Pollution" (FRL No. 9914-48-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6696. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9914-45-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6697. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Navajo Nation; Regional Haze Requirements for Navajo Generating Station" (FRL No. 9914-62-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6698. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Export Controls and Physical Security Standards" ((RIN3150-AJ33) (NRC-2014-0007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6699. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2013-2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6700. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Compliance, United States Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a biennial report to Congress entitled "Americans with Disabilities Act Inspections Relating to Public Services and Accommodations"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6701. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Zone Buffalo" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0081)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6702. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Lake Michigan; Winnetka, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0259)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6703. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Patapsco River; Baltimore, MD" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0201)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6704. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Columbus Road Bridge Installation, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0556)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6705. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; 2014 Fireworks Displays in Northern New England" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0491)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6706. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Belt Parkway Bridge Construction, Gerritsen Inlet; Brooklyn, NY—Correction" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0471)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6707. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Marine Week Seattle Seahawks Demonstration, Lake Washington; Seattle, WA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0574)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6708. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of the Upper Hiwassee Highlands Viticultural Area" (RIN1513-AC02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6709. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6710. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6711. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6712. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (NFS): Contractor Whistleblower Protections" (RIN2700-AE08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6713. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2014 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications" (RIN0648-XD092) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6714. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Suncoast Offshore Grand Prix; Gulf of Mexico, Sarasota, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2013-

0789)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6715. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events and Fireworks Displays within the Fifth Coast Guard District" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0095)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6716. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Venice, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0848)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6717. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments" ((RIN1625-AC13) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0410)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6718. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area and Safety Zone: Tappan Zee Bridge Construction Project, Hudson River; South Nyack and Tarrytown, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00; 1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0705)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6719. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lifesaving Equipment: Production Testing and Harmonization with International Standards" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2010-0048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6720. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Quarterly Listings; Safety Zones, Security Zones, Special Local Regulations, Drawbridge Operation Regulations and Regulated Navigation Areas" (Docket No. USCG-2014-0567) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6721. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of the Malibu Coast Viticultural Area" (RIN1513-AC01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1771. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-225).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1800. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets (Rept. No. 113-226).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1946. A bill to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to modify the authorization of appropriations (Rept. No. 113-227).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1965. A bill to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services (Rept. No. 113-228).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2010. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-229).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 2019. A bill to reauthorize and update certain provisions of the Secure Water Act (Rept. No. 113-230).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-231).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 2741. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-233).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2250. A bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-234).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 231. A bill to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp (Rept. No. 113-235).

S. 1214. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of

America for use by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 113-236).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1486. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service (Rept. No. 113-237).

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1961. A bill to protect surface water from contamination by chemical storage facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-238).

S. 2042. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-239).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2519. A bill to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity (Rept. No. 113-240).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 606. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

H.R. 1671. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office".

H.R. 2291. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office".

H.R. 3472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3765. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building".

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 4194. A bill to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

S. 2117. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

*D. Nathan Sheets, of Maryland, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*Robert W. Holleyman II, of Louisiana, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

*Ramin Toloui, of Iowa, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*Cary Douglas Pugh, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. 2714. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the alternative simplified research credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2716. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of adding the sites associated with the forced relocation and confinement of the Aleut people during World War II in the State of Alaska as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a refundable credit for costs associated with Information Sharing and Analysis Organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2718. A bill to promote youth athletic safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2719. A bill to emphasize manufacturing in engineering programs by directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. 2720. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 2721. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to weight limita-

tions for natural gas vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 2722. A bill to facilitate identification and dissemination of evidence-informed recommendations for addressing maternal addiction and neonatal abstinence syndrome and to provide for studies with respect to neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2723. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 2724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2725. A bill to address noncompliance by the Russian Federation of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2726. A bill to clarify the definition of nonadmitted insurer under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2727. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2728. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide community-based medical education payments to primary care teaching centers, to provide for a Medicare indirect medical education performance adjustment, and to increase Medicare graduate medical education transparency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2729. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to publish and make available for public comment a draft economic analysis at the time a proposed rule to designate critical habitat is published; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2730. A bill to establish or integrate an online significant event tracker (SET) system for tracking, reporting, and summarizing exposures of members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components thereof, to traumatic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2731. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the application of Medicare secondary payer rules to certain workers' compensation settlement

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Finance.

*Maria Cancian, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

agreements and qualified Medicare set-aside provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 2732. A bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2733. A bill to establish a certification process for opting out of the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2734. A bill to improve timber management of Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2735. A bill to provide for an extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent identity theft related tax refund fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2737. A bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2738. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make qualified biogas property eligible for the energy credit and to permit new clean renewable energy bonds to finance qualified biogas property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2740. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a voluntary national directory of veterans to support outreach to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2741. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2742. A bill to provide for public notice and input prior to the closure, consolidation, or public access limitation of field or hearing offices of the Social Security Administra-

tion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2743. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. HAGAN:

S. 2744. A bill to authorize a settlement in accordance with the agreement entered into by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and counties within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHANNES (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2745. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2746. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 2747. A bill to require Federal agencies to review certain rules and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2748. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2749. A bill to establish a board of directors and CEO to oversee the Federal Exchange and State Exchanges, and to provide health insurance oversight; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 2750. A bill to encourage investments in airports through public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2751. A bill to provide payments to States for activities to expand early voting access, provide for an equitable distribution of early voting polling locations, including early voting polling locations on Indian tribal land, and to implement voter registration reforms for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2752. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the disclosure of certain expenditures under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 2753. A bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school counselors, school social workers, and school psychologists by low-income local educational agencies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2754. A bill to provide limits on bundling, to reform the lobbyist registration process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2755. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2756. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2757. A bill to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2758. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C-130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2759. A bill to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2760. A bill to extend National Highway Traffic Safety Administration authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2761. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the consolidation of metropolitan planning organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2762. A bill to prevent future propane shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2763. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to create a collaborative network with a single point of entry for services and supports, to improve programs to prevent elder financial exploitation, to create a community care wrap-around support demonstration program, and to create a national campaign to raise awareness of the aging network and promote advance integrated long-term care planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2764. A bill to support country-of-origin labeling, ban imports of fresh meat and meat food products from countries with foot-and-

mouth disease, reform certain livestock programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2765. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2766. A bill to combat terrorism and promote reform in the Palestinian Authority and the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 2767. A bill to prohibit the fraudulent transfer of custody of unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2768. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to expand the use of categorical exclusions for hazardous fuel reduction projects; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2769. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2770. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2771. A bill to establish a WaterSense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2772. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2773. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 531. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis

Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 532. A resolution designating the week beginning September 7, 2014, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 533. A resolution designating September 2014 as "National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 534. A resolution designating September 6, 2014, as "Everett McKinley Dirksen and Marigold Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 535. A resolution to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JOHANNES (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Con. Res. 42. A concurrent resolution recognizing caregiving as a profession and the extraordinary contributions of paid and family caregivers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 234

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 240

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize

the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to improve the retirement of American families by strengthening Social Security.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 754

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 754, a bill to amend the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to include farmed shellfish as specialty crops.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a

spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1012

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1012, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1030

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy investment credit for energy storage property connected to the grid, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1323

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1406

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1410

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1477

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1477, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a delay in the implementation schedule of the reductions in disproportionate share hospital payments, and for other purposes.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1904

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1904, a bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1974

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1974, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of non-prescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2143

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2143, a bill to increase access to capital for veteran entrepreneurs to help create jobs.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of

personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capscicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2333

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2333, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for certain behavioral health treatment under TRICARE for children and adults with developmental disabilities.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes.

S. 2359

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2359, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2396

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2396, a bill to establish the veterans' business outreach center program, to improve the programs for veterans of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ENZI, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to establish a demonstration project for competency-based education.

S. 2520

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2520, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 2527

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2527, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2547

At the request of Ms. HETTKAMP, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2547, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 2552

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2552, a bill to enhance beneficiary and provider protections and improve transparency in the Medicare Advantage market, and for other purposes.

S. 2567

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2567, a bill to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 2591

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2591, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 2631

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2631, a bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

S. 2650

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2650, a bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 2659

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2659, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their services, and for other purposes.

S. 2660

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2660, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the special rules for accident and

health plans of certain governmental entities, and for other purposes.

S. 2664

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2664, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to modernize the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, a bill to prohibit the exercise of any waiver of the imposition of certain sanctions with respect to Iran unless the President certifies to Congress that the waiver will not result in the provision of funds to the Government of Iran for activities in support of international terrorism, to develop nuclear weapons, or to violate the human rights of the people of Iran.

S. 2685

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2685, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2687

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2687, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2693

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2693, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to establish eligibility, assignment, training, and certification requirements for sexual assault forensic examiners for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2709

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana

(Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2709, a bill to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2709, *supra*.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain philanthropic enterprises which are independently supervised, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 513, a resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

S. RES. 522

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 522, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to be held in Washington, DC, from August 4 through 6, 2014.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 3588

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3588 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3719

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3719 intended to be proposed to S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3720

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3720 intended to be proposed to S. 2648, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 2722. A bill to facilitate identification and dissemination of evidence-informed recommendations for addressing maternal addiction and neonatal abstinence syndrome and to provide for studies with respect to neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2722

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Our Infants Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. EVIDENCE-INFORMED RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MATERNAL ADDICTION AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall coordinate and facilitate the—

(1) identification and compilation of evidence-informed recommendations for physicians, nurses, and hospital facilities with respect to neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(2) identification of any gaps, as appropriate, in such evidence-informed recommendations that may require additional research or analysis with respect to—

(A) screening and intervention for maternal substance abuse, including the misuse or abuse of prescription drugs in women of childbearing age and pregnant women;

(B) treatment for pregnant and postpartum women with a substance use disorder, including the misuse or abuse of prescription drugs;

(C) screening of infants for neonatal abstinence syndrome and for the risk of developing neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(D) treatment for infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome, including evidence-informed recommendations surrounding evaluation and treatment with pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions; and

(E) ongoing treatment, services, and supports for postpartum women with a substance use disorder, including misuse or abuse of prescription drugs, and infants and children with neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(b) INPUT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider input from stakeholders, such as health professionals, public health officials, and law enforcement.

(c) **DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall disseminate to appropriate stakeholders in States and local communities the evidence-informed recommendations identified under subsection (a).

(d) **ADDRESSING RESEARCH NEEDS FOR MATERNAL ADDICTION AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.**—The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate—

(1) factors related to the increased prevalence of maternal opiate misuse and abuse;

(2) factors related to maternal misuse and abuse of opiates, including—

(A) barriers to identifying and treating maternal misuse and abuse of opiates; and

(B) the most effective prevention and treatment strategies for pregnant women and other women of childbearing age who are at risk for or dependent on opiates; and

(3) factors related to neonatal abstinence syndrome, including—

(A) epidemiological studies concerning neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(B) the most effective methods to diagnose and treat neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(C) the long-term effects of neonatal abstinence syndrome and the need for a longer-term study on infants and children at risk for developing neonatal abstinence syndrome or diagnosed with neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives the findings from the study under subsection (d) and a report that identifies the gaps in evidence-informed recommendations that require additional research or analysis, and priority areas for additional research.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING DATA ON NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall provide technical assistance to States to improve the availability and quality of data collection and surveillance activities regarding neonatal abstinence syndrome, including—

(1) incidence and prevalence of neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(2) the identification of causes for neonatal abstinence syndrome, including new and emerging trends; and

(3) the identification of demographics and other relevant information associated with neonatal abstinence syndrome.

SEC. 4. PAIN MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Director of the National Institutes of Health should continue research with respect to pain management, including for women of childbearing age.

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study evaluating—

(1) the availability and effectiveness of federally-facilitated substance abuse treatment programs for pregnant women and their children;

(2) the availability and effectiveness of Federal programs that encourage State adoption and implementation of programs to ensure—

(A) the safety and health of mothers who have a substance use disorder; and

(B) the safety and health of children with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(3) the effectiveness of Federal data systems and surveillance programs used to mon-

itor or track drug utilization and resulting trends, including whether information on neonatal abstinence syndrome is incorporated into such data systems; and

(4) the identification of the use of all discretionary funds to address maternal substance abuse, including the misuse and abuse of prescription drugs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2736. A bill to clarify the definition of nonadmitted insurer under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I introduce the Captive Insurers Clarification Act. This simple, common-sense legislation will clarify terms included in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that stand to threaten the viability of the captive insurance industry in Vermont, South Carolina, and across the country. I am glad to have Senator GRAHAM's support in this effort.

Vermont is one of the leading on-shore captive insurance domiciles in the country, with over 1000 licensed captive insurance companies. I have heard from the captive industry in Vermont, understandably concerned that language included in the Dodd-Frank Act may result in the double taxation of captives that operate in states where their headquarters are not domiciled. The Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act, NRRRA, as included in Dodd-Frank, intended to facilitate the proper collection and allocation of self-procurement taxes. Captives are taxed and regulated in the state in which they are domiciled, not necessarily where their corporate headquarters are located. However, due to the ambiguity of the NRRRA, captive insurers are concerned that both the state in which a captive is headquartered, and the state in which the captive is domiciled, may claim the premium tax.

The Captive Insurers Clarification Act would simply clarify that such companies were never intended to be included under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act. Applying the NRRRA to captives would eliminate the specialized regulation of the captive industry that states like Vermont have worked to cultivate.

This is commonsense legislation to clarify the intention of Congress in passing the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act, and I hope Members of Congress will support its enactment.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent identity theft related tax refund fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ETC.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Tax Refund Theft Prevention Act of 2014”.

(b) **AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; etc.
- Sec. 2. Safe harbor for de minimis errors on information returns and payee statements.
- Sec. 3. Internet platform for Form 1099 filings.
- Sec. 4. Requirement that electronically prepared paper returns include scannable code.
- Sec. 5. Single point of contact for identity theft victims.
- Sec. 6. Criminal penalty for misappropriating taxpayer identity in connection with tax fraud.
- Sec. 7. Extend Internal Revenue Service authority to require truncated social security numbers on Form W-2.
- Sec. 8. Improvement in access to information in the National Directory of New Hires for tax administration purposes.
- Sec. 9. Password system for prevention of identity theft tax fraud.
- Sec. 10. Increased penalty for improper disclosure or use of information by preparers of returns.
- Sec. 11. Increase electronic filing of returns.
- Sec. 12. Increased real-time filing.
- Sec. 13. Limitation on multiple individual income tax refunds to the same account.
- Sec. 14. Identity verification required under due diligence rules.
- Sec. 15. Report on refund fraud.

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR FOR DE MINIMIS ERRORS ON INFORMATION RETURNS AND PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 6721 is amended—

(1) by striking “EXCEPTION FOR DE MINIMIS FAILURE TO INCLUDE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION” in the heading and inserting “EXCEPTIONS FOR CERTAIN DE MINIMIS FAILURES”;

(2) by striking “IN GENERAL” in the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting “EXCEPTION FOR DE MINIMIS FAILURE TO INCLUDE ALL REQUIRED INFORMATION”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN DE MINIMIS ERRORS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, with respect to an information return filed with the Secretary—

“(i) there are 1 or more failures described in subsection (a)(2)(B) relating to an incorrect dollar amount, and

“(ii) no single amount in error differs from the correct amount by more than \$25,

then no correction shall be required and, for purposes of this section, such return shall be treated as having been filed with all of the correct required information.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to returns required under section 6049.

“(C) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may issue regulations to prevent the abuse of the safe harbor under this paragraph, including regulations providing that this subparagraph shall not apply to the extent necessary to prevent any such abuse.”.

(b) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Subsection (c) of section 6722 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) SAFE HARBOR FOR CERTAIN DE MINIMIS ERRORS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, with respect to any payee statement—

“(i) there are 1 or more failures described in subsection (a)(2)(B) relating to an incorrect dollar amount, and

“(ii) no single amount in error differs from the correct amount by more than \$25, then no correction shall be required and, for purposes of this section, such statement shall be treated as having been filed with all of the correct required information.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to payee statements required under section 6049.

“(C) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may issue regulations to prevent the abuse of the safe harbor under this paragraph, including regulations providing that this subparagraph shall not apply to the extent necessary to prevent any such abuse.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (i) of section 408 is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(2) Paragraph (5) of section 3406(b) is amended—

(A) by striking “\$10” both places it appears and inserting “\$25”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following flush text:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to payments of interest to which section 6049 applies.”.

(3) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 6042(a)(1) are each amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(4) Paragraph (2) of section 6042(a) is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(5) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6044(a) are each amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(6) Paragraph (1) of section 6047(d) is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(7) Subsection (a) of section 6050B is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(8) Subsection (a) of section 6050E is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(9) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6050N(a) are each amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(10) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6652(a) are each amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(11) The heading of subsection (a) of section 6652 is amended by striking “\$10” and inserting “\$25”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to information returns required to be filed, and payee statements required to be provided, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INTERNET PLATFORM FOR FORM 1099 FILINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury (or such Sec-

retary's delegate) shall make available an Internet website or other electronic media, similar to the Business Services Online Suite of Services provided by the Social Security Administration, that will provide taxpayers access to resources and guidance provided by the Internal Revenue Service and will allow taxpayers to—

(1) prepare and file (in batches of not more than 50) Forms 1099,

(2) prepare Forms 1099 for distribution to recipients other than the Internal Revenue Service, and

(3) create and maintain necessary taxpayer records.

(b) EARLY IMPLEMENTATION FOR FORMS 1099-MISC.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Internet website under subsection (a) shall be available in a partial form that will allow taxpayers to take the actions described in such subsection with respect to Forms 1099-MISC required to be filed or distributed by such taxpayers.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT THAT ELECTRONICALLY PREPARED PAPER RETURNS INCLUDE SCANNABLE CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 6011 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS PREPARED ELECTRONICALLY AND SUBMITTED ON PAPER.—The Secretary shall require that any return of tax which is prepared electronically, but is printed and filed on paper, bear a code which can, when scanned, convert such return to electronic format.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 6011(e) is amended by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) and (5)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns of tax the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR IDENTITY THEFT VICTIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury (or such Secretary's delegate) shall establish new procedures to ensure that any taxpayer whose return has been delayed or otherwise adversely affected due to misappropriation of the taxpayer's taxpayer identity (as defined in section 6103(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) has a single point of contact who—

(1) is an individual employee of the Internal Revenue Service, and

(2) tracks the case of the taxpayer from start to finish and coordinates with other specialized units to resolve case issues as quickly as possible.

(b) CHANGE OF CONTACT.—The procedures under subsection (a) shall provide that the single point of contact may be changed—

(1) upon request of the taxpayer, or

(2) in any case where the individual employee ceases employment or is otherwise unavailable for any period, or a change is required to meet agency staffing needs, but only if the taxpayer is notified of any such change within 5 business days.

SEC. 6. CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR MISAPPROPRIATING TAXPAYER IDENTITY IN CONNECTION WITH TAX FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7206 is amended—

(1) by striking “Any person” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) MISAPPROPRIATION OF IDENTITY.—Any person who willfully misappropriates an-

other person's taxpayer identity (as defined in section 6103(b)(6)) for the purpose of making any list, return, account, statement, or other document submitted to the Secretary under the provisions of this title shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$250,000 (\$500,000 in the case of a corporation) or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution.”.

(b) AGGRAVATED IDENTITY THEFT.—Section 1028A(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting “; or”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) section 7206(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to misappropriation of identity in connection with tax fraud).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to offenses committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. EXTEND INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE TRUNCATED SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ON FORM W-2.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6051(a) is amended by striking “his social security number” and inserting “an identifying number for the employee”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. IMPROVEMENT IN ACCESS TO INFORMATION IN THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 453(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL TAX LAWS RELATING TO FRAUD.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall have access to the information in the National Directory of New Hires for the sole purpose of identifying and preventing fraudulent tax return filings and claims for refund under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. PASSWORD SYSTEM FOR PREVENTION OF IDENTITY THEFT TAX FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall implement an identity theft tax fraud prevention program under which any individual taxpayer may elect to be provided with a unique password which, as a result of such election, will be required to be included on any Federal tax return filed by such individual before the return will be processed. Such program shall be available not later than January 1 of the first calendar year beginning on or after the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall conduct a study of the program under subsection (a) and, not later than 3 years after the January 1 date under such subsection, shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on the efficacy of such program in reducing tax refund fraud. Such report shall include a recommendation as to whether the program under subsection (a) should be made mandatory, rather than elective, for all taxpayers.

SEC. 10. INCREASED PENALTY FOR IMPROPER DISCLOSURE OR USE OF INFORMATION BY PREPARERS OF RETURNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6713 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE RELATING TO IDENTITY THEFT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a disclosure or use described in subsection (a) that is made in connection with a crime relating to the misappropriation of another person's taxpayer identity (as defined in section 6103(b)(6)), whether or not such crime involves any tax filing, subsection (a) shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘\$1,000’ for ‘\$250’, and

“(B) by substituting ‘\$50,000’ for ‘\$10,000’.

“(2) SEPARATE APPLICATION OF TOTAL PENALTY LIMITATION.—The limitation on the total amount of the penalty under subsection (a) shall be applied separately with respect to disclosures or uses to which this paragraph applies and to which it does not apply.”.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Section 7216(a) is amended by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$1,000 (\$100,000 in the case of a disclosure or use to which section 6713(b) applies)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures or uses after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. INCREASE ELECTRONIC FILING OF RETURNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 6011(e)(2) is amended by striking “250” and inserting “the applicable number of”.

(b) APPLICABLE NUMBER.—Subsection (e) of section 6011, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) APPLICABLE NUMBER.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(A), the applicable number is—

“(A) in the case of returns and statements relating to calendar years before 2015, 250,

“(B) in the case of returns and statements relating to calendar year 2015, 100,

“(C) in the case of returns and statements relating to calendar year 2016, 50, and

“(D) in the case of returns and statements relating to calendar years after 2016, 20.”.

(c) RETURNS FILED BY A TAX RETURN PREPARER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 6011(e)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require that—

“(i) any individual income tax return, and

“(ii) any return or statement under subpart B, C, or E of part III of this subchapter, which is prepared by a tax return preparer be filed on magnetic media. The Secretary may waive the requirement of the preceding sentence if the Secretary determines, on the basis of an application by the tax return preparer, that the preparer cannot meet such requirement based on technological constraints (including lack of access to the Internet).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3) of section 6011(e) is amended by striking subparagraph (B), and by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 12. INCREASED REAL-TIME FILING.

(a) ACCELERATED FILING OF FORMS W-2 AND W-3.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6071 is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) RETURNS RELATING TO EMPLOYEE WAGE INFORMATION.—Returns and statements made under sections 6051 and 6052 shall be filed on or before February 15 of the year following the calendar year to which such returns relate.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 6071 is amended by striking “subparts B and C” and inserting “section 6053 and subpart B”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns and statements relating to calendar years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ACCELERATED FILING FOR CERTAIN FORMS 1099.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 6071, as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking “WAGE INFORMATION” in the heading and inserting “WAGE INFORMATION AND FORMS 1099-MISC”, and

(B) by inserting “, and any return which is filed on Form 1099-MISC,” after “6052”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 6071, as amended by this Act, is amended by striking “section 6053 and subpart B of part III of this subchapter” and inserting “subpart B of part III of this subchapter (other than returns filed on Form 1099-MISC)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns relating to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(c) STUDY REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than January 1, 2017, the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives including—

(1) a recommendation of whether the due dates for filing Forms W-2 and W-3 with the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration should be accelerated to January 31 to match the due date for furnishing copies of such forms to the recipient of the reported income,

(2) recommendations for processes—

(A) to match the information reported on Forms W-2 and Forms 1099-MISC for the effective processing of returns and accurate determination of refunds, and

(B) to correct errors on such documents, and

(3) any other recommendations such Secretary may have for accelerating information reporting, including the identification of any other forms that should be due on an accelerated schedule in order to prevent tax refund fraud.

SEC. 13. LIMITATION ON MULTIPLE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REFUNDS TO THE SAME ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue regulations that restrict the delivery or deposit of multiple individual income tax refunds from the same tax year to the same individual account or mailing address.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The regulation promulgated under subsection (a) shall provide that the restrictions shall not apply in cases and situations where the Secretary of the Treasury determines there is not a likelihood of tax fraud.

SEC. 14. IDENTITY VERIFICATION REQUIRED UNDER DUE DILIGENCE RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 6695 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such due diligence re-

quirements shall include a requirement that such preparer verify (in such manner and with such documentation as the Secretary shall provide) the identity of the taxpayer with respect to such return or claim for refund.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to returns or claims for refund filed after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 15. REPORT ON REFUND FRAUD.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on the extent and nature of fraud involving the use of a misappropriated taxpayer identity with respect to claims for refund under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 during the preceding completed income tax filing season, and the detection, prevention, and enforcement activities undertaken by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to such fraud, including—

(1) the development of fraud detection filters and how they are or may be updated and improved;

(2) the effectiveness of fraud detection activities, and the ways in which such effectiveness is measured; and

(3) the methods by which such Service categorizes of refund fraud, and the amounts of fraud that are associated with each category.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2740. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a voluntary national directory of veterans to support outreach to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help new veterans get information about the programs, benefits and services available to them as they transition back to civilian life. The Connect with Veterans Act will make it easier for cities, counties and tribes, as well as the State Departments of Veterans Affairs, to interact directly with new veterans.

Since I joined the Senate in January 2013, I have traveled all across North Dakota, listening to our veterans. One thing I heard, time and time again, was the need for more information about programs and services. Recently, I hosted my first Native American Veterans Summit in Bismarck, ND. One of the things which struck me at the Summit was how the Department of Veterans Affairs and other agencies simply weren't connecting with the veterans who wanted information about health care options and other benefits. It is clear that we, as a society, must do better.

In June 2013, I was proud to form the Senate Defense Communities Caucus along with my co-chair, Senator JOHN-ny ISAKSON. We found that people and communities all across the nation are passionate about helping our military perform its mission. Through my work with the Caucus, I found these communities are equally passionate about

helping our veterans as well. I heard, through a close partnership with the Association of Defense Communities, that folks wanted to do more, at the local level, to help veterans.

From those ideas, the Connect with Veterans Act was created. It is a simple bill, and one that is entirely voluntary. Separating servicemembers can choose to share their contact information with the communities they are moving to after their military service. Interested cities, counties and tribes can request the contact information for the new veterans moving to their area and then provide them with information about services and benefits. Throughout this process, the veterans contact information will be kept secure.

It is critical that we provide veterans with access to the benefits and services they have earned once they leave the military and—knowing what services and benefits are available to them is the first step. This bill will expand the sources of information available to veterans. It is not just the VA that has the responsibility to help veterans. We all share that responsibility.

I have heard from North Dakotans, in particular, about how this bill would be incredibly beneficial as many communities in my state have unmet employment needs. Veterans have proven to be great employees. And, with good-paying jobs in North Dakota, this program can provide a way to bring veterans into these open positions. But this bill gives local control of what information is provided to veterans. Communities throughout the nation will be able to make this program fit their needs.

Our Nation must do a better job of taking care of our veterans. A great first step is figuring out how best to welcome new veterans into our communities. I know my bill will help that critical process.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 2743. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2743

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for “Administrative Review and Appeals”, \$63,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, as follows:

(1) \$54,000,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review to hire 54 Immigration Judge Teams, which shall be trained and assigned to adjudicate juvenile cases.

(2) \$6,700,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review for the purchase of video teleconferencing equipment, digital audio recording devices, and other technology that will enable expanded immigration courtroom capacity and capability.

(3) \$2,500,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review’s Legal Orientation Program, of which not less than \$1,000,000 shall be for the Legal Orientation Program for Custodians:

Provided, That not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall submit a reorganization plan to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes detailed plans for prioritizing the adjudication of non-detained, unaccompanied alien children and specific plans to reassign Immigration Judge Teams to expedite the adjudication of juveniles on the non-detained docket:

Provided further, That the submitted plan shall ensure that juveniles will appear before an immigration judge for an initial hearing not later than 10 days after the juvenile is apprehended.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities”, \$1,100,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied children and adults with children at the southwest border and related activities, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U. S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” to cover necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and adults with children at the Southwest border and related activities, including the acquisition, construction, improvement, repair, and management of facilities, and for necessary expenses related to border security, \$71,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

U. S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS

ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” to cover necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and adults with children at the Southwest border and related activities, and for the necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs law, detention and removals of adults with children crossing the border unlawfully, and

investigations, \$398,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which, \$50,000,000 shall be expended for 50 additional fugitive operations teams and not less than \$14,000,000 shall be expended for vetted units operations in Central America and human smuggling and trafficking investigations: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall support no fewer than an additional 3,000 family and 800 other beds and substantially increase the availability and utilization of detention space for adults with children.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) For an additional amount for meeting the data collection and reporting requirements of this Act, \$5,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding section 503 of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), funds made available under subsection (a) for data collection and reporting requirements may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose.

(c) The Secretary may not make a transfer described in subsection (b) until 15 days after notifying the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of such transfer.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Refugee and Entrant Assistance”, \$150,000,000, to be merged with and available for the same period and purposes as funds appropriated in Public Law 113-76 “for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235”: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may also be used for other medical response expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services in assisting individuals identified under subsection (b) of such section 235: *Provided further*, That, the Secretary may, in this fiscal year and hereafter, accept and use money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or other donation for carrying out such sections: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading for medical response expenses may be transferred to and merged with the “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”: *Provided further*, That transfer authority under this heading is subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 301. Of the funds made available for performance bonus payments under section 2105(a)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(a)(3)(E)), \$1,700,000,000 is rescinded.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION

SEC. 401. (a) Of the funds appropriated in titles III and IV of division K of Public Law 113-76, and in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign

operations, and related programs, for assistance for the countries in Central America, up to \$40,000,000 shall be made available for such countries for repatriation and reintegration activities: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to this section may be obligated notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e) of section 7045 of division K of Public Law 113–76.

(b) Prior to the initial obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section, but not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section by country and the steps taken by the government of each country to—

- (1) improve border security;
- (2) enforce laws and policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States;
- (3) enact laws and implement new policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States, including increasing penalties for human smuggling;
- (4) conduct public outreach campaigns to explain the dangers of the journey to the Southwest Border of the United States and to emphasize the lack of immigration benefits available; and
- (5) cooperate with United States Federal agencies to facilitate and expedite the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the Southwest Border of the United States.

(c) The Secretary of State shall suspend assistance provided pursuant to this section to the government of a country if such government is not making significant progress on each item described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b): *Provided*, That assistance may only be resumed if the Secretary reports to the appropriate congressional committees that subsequent to the suspension of assistance such government is making significant progress on each of the items enumerated in such subsection.

(d) Funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives and the Senate.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS — THIS ACT

SEC. 501. Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, working in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to individuals whose cases will be adjudicated by the Executive Office for Immigration Review that ensures that—

- (1) the Department of Justice is capable of electronically receiving information from the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services related to the apprehension, processing, detention, placement, and adjudication of such individuals, including unaccompanied alien children;
- (2) case files prepared by the Department of Homeland Security after an individual has been issued a notice to appear are electronically integrated with information collected by the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review during the adjudication process;

(3) cases are coded to reflect immigration status and appropriate categories at apprehension, such as unaccompanied alien children and family units;

(4) information pertaining to cases and dockets are collected and maintained by the Department of Justice in an electronic, searchable database that includes—

- (A) the status of the individual appearing before the court upon apprehension;
- (B) the docket upon which the case is placed;
- (C) the individual's presence for court proceedings;
- (D) the final disposition of each case;
- (E) the number of days each case remained on the docket before final disposition; and
- (F) any other information the Attorney General determines to be necessary and appropriate; and

(5) the final disposition of an adjudication or an order of removal is electronically submitted to—

- (A) the Department of Homeland Security; and
- (B) the Department of Health and Human Services, if appropriate.

SEC. 502. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, working in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to individuals who are apprehended or encountered for immigration enforcement purposes by the Department of Homeland Security that ensures that—

- (1) case files prepared by the Department of Homeland Security after an individual has been issued a notice to appear are electronically transmitted to—
- (A) the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review for integration with case files prepared during the adjudication process; and

(B) to the Department of Health and Human Services, as appropriate, if the files relate to unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the Department of Homeland Security is capable of electronically receiving information pertaining to the disposition of an adjudication, including removal orders and the individual's failure to appear for proceedings, from the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review; and

(3) information is collected and shared with the Department of Justice regarding the immigration status and appropriate categories of such individuals at the time of apprehension, such as—

- (A) unaccompanied alien children or family units;
- (B) the location of their apprehension;
- (C) the number of days they remain in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security;
- (D) the reason for releasing the individual from custody;
- (E) the geographic location of their residence, if released from custody;
- (F) any action taken by the Department of Homeland Security after receiving information from the Department of Justice regarding an individual's failure to appear before the court;

(G) any action taken by the Department of Homeland Security after receiving information from the Department of Justice regarding the disposition of an adjudication; and

(H) any other information that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 503. Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, working in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to unaccompanied alien children that ensures that—

(1) the Department of Health and Human Services is capable of electronically receiving information from the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice related to the apprehension, processing, placement, and adjudication of unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the Department of Health and Human Services shares information with the Department of Homeland Security regarding its capacity and capability to meet the 72-hour mandate required under section 235(b)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)(3)); and

(3) information is collected and shared with the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security regarding—

(A) the number of days a child remained in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services;

(B) whether the child was placed in a facility operated by the Department of Defense;

(C) for children placed with a sponsor—

- (i) the number of children placed with the sponsor;
- (ii) the relationship of the sponsor taking custody of the child;
- (iii) the type of background check conducted on the potential sponsor; and
- (iv) the geographic location of the sponsor; and

(D) any other information the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 504. The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 505. This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Children and America's Homeland Act of 2014".

DIVISION B—UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AND BORDER SECURITY

TITLE X—UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN

Subtitle A—Protection and Due Process for Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1001. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: "RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—";

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: "AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—"; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "countries contiguous to the United

States" and inserting "Canada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(3) inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) **MANDATORY EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF CRIMINALS AND GANG MEMBERS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall place an unaccompanied alien child in a proceeding in accordance with section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225a) if, the Secretary determines or has reason to believe the alien—

"(A) has been convicted of any offense carrying a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 180 days;

"(B) has been convicted of an offense which involved—

"(i) domestic violence (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

"(ii) child abuse and neglect (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

"(iii) assault resulting in bodily injury (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

"(iv) the violation of a protection order (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

"(v) driving while intoxicated (as defined in section 164 of title 23, United States Code); or

"(vi) any offense under foreign law, except for a purely political offense, which, if the offense had been committed in the United States, would render the alien inadmissible under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

"(C) has been convicted of more than 1 criminal offense (other than minor traffic offenses);

"(D) has engaged in, is engaged in, or is likely to engage after entry in any terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)), or intends to participate or has participated in the activities of a foreign terrorist organization (as designated under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189));

"(E) is or was a member of a criminal gang (as defined in paragraph (53) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a));

"(F) provided materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information regarding age or identity to the United States Government with the intent to wrongfully be classified as an unaccompanied alien child; or

"(G) has entered the United States more than 1 time in violation of section 275(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1325(a)), knowing that the entry was unlawful." and

(4) in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (6), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: "EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—";

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2), shall be—" and inserting "who meets the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)—";

(C) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

"(i) shall be placed in a proceeding in accordance with section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which shall commence not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (4);";

(D) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(E) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

"(ii) may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the immediate custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child—

"(I) is the subject of an order under section 235B(e)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

"(II) is placed or released in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(C) of this section.";

(F) in clause (iii), as redesignated, by inserting "is" before "eligible"; and

(G) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting "shall be" before "provided".

SEC. 1002. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) **HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 235A the following:

"SEC. 235B. HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

"(a) **ASYLUM OFFICER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term 'asylum officer' means an immigration officer who—

"(1) has had professional training in country conditions, asylum law, and interview techniques comparable to that provided to full-time adjudicators of applications under section 208; and

"(2) is supervised by an officer who—

"(A) meets the condition described in paragraph (1); and

"(B) has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications.

"(b) **PROCEEDING.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child under section 235(a)(5) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(5)), an immigration judge shall conduct and conclude a proceeding to inspect, screen, and determine the status of the unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission to the United States.

"(2) **TIME LIMIT.**—Not later than 72 hours after the conclusion of a proceeding with respect to an unaccompanied alien child under this section, the immigration judge who conducted such proceeding shall issue an order pursuant to subsection (e).

"(c) **CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING.**—

"(1) **AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.**—The immigration judge conducting a proceeding under this section—

"(A) shall administer oaths, receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the unaccompanied alien child and any witnesses;

"(B) may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and presentation of evidence;

"(C) is authorized to sanction by civil money penalty any action (or inaction) in contempt of the judge's proper exercise of authority under this Act; and

"(D) shall determine whether the unaccompanied alien child meets any of the criteria

set out in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (3) of section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)), and if so, order the alien removed under subsection (e)(2) of this section.

"(2) **FORM OF PROCEEDING.**—A proceeding under this section may take place—

"(A) in person;

"(B) at a location agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the unaccompanied alien child;

"(C) through video conference; or

"(D) through telephone conference.

"(3) **PRESENCE OF ALIEN.**—If it is impracticable by reason of the mental incompetency of the unaccompanied alien child for the alien to be present at the proceeding, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien.

"(4) **RIGHTS OF THE ALIEN.**—In a proceeding under this section—

"(A) the unaccompanied alien child shall be given the privilege of being represented, at no expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien's choosing who is authorized to practice in the proceedings;

"(B) the alien shall be given a reasonable opportunity—

"(i) to examine the evidence against the alien;

"(ii) to present evidence on the alien's own behalf; and

"(iii) to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government;

"(C) the rights set forth in subparagraph (B) shall not entitle the alien—

"(i) to examine such national security information as the Government may proffer in opposition to the alien's admission to the United States; or

"(ii) to an application by the alien for discretionary relief under this Act; and

"(D) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence produced at the proceeding.

"(5) **WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION.**—An unaccompanied alien child applying for admission to the United States may, and at any time prior to the issuance of a final order of removal, be permitted to withdraw the application and immediately be returned to the alien's country of nationality or country of last habitual residence.

"(6) **CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO APPEAR.**—An unaccompanied alien child who does not attend a proceeding under this section, shall be ordered removed, except under exceptional circumstances where the alien's absence is the fault of the Government, a medical emergency, or an act of nature.

"(d) **DECISION AND BURDEN OF PROOF.**—

"(1) **DECISION.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—At the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be—

"(i) admissible to the United States; or

"(ii) eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act.

"(B) **EVIDENCE.**—The determination of the immigration judge under subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the evidence produced at the hearing.

"(2) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In a proceeding under this section, an unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission has the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alien—

"(i) is likely to be entitled to be lawfully admitted to the United States or eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act; or

“(ii) is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to a prior admission.

“(B) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—In meeting the burden of proof under subparagraph (A)(ii), the alien shall be given access to—

“(i) the alien’s visa or other entry document, if any; and

“(ii) any other records and documents, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to the alien’s admission or presence in the United States.

“(e) ORDERS.—

“(1) PLACEMENT IN FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has met the burden of proof under subsection (d)(2), the immigration judge shall—

“(A) order the alien to be placed in further proceedings in accordance with section 240; and

“(B) order the Secretary of Homeland Security to place the alien on the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detained docket for purposes of carrying out such proceedings.

“(2) ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has not met the burden of proof required under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien claims—

“(A) an intention to apply for asylum under section 208; or

“(B) a fear of persecution.

“(3) CLAIMS FOR ASYLUM.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (2) claims an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution, the immigration judge shall order the alien referred for an interview by an asylum officer under subsection (f).

“(f) ASYLUM INTERVIEWS.—

“(1) CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘credible fear of persecution’ means, after taking into account the credibility of the statements made by an unaccompanied alien child in support of the alien’s claim and such other facts as are known to the asylum officer, there is a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum under section 208.

“(2) CONDUCT BY ASYLUM OFFICER.—An asylum officer shall conduct the interviews of an unaccompanied alien child referred under subsection (e)(3).

“(3) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—If the asylum officer determines at the time of the interview that an unaccompanied alien child has a credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) during further consideration of the application for asylum.

“(4) REMOVAL WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW IF NO CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the asylum officer determines that an unaccompanied alien child does not have a credible fear of persecution, the asylum officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review.

“(B) RECORD OF DETERMINATION.—The asylum officer shall prepare a written record of a determination under subparagraph (A), which shall include—

“(i) a summary of the material facts as stated by the alien;

“(ii) such additional facts (if any) relied upon by the asylum officer;

“(iii) the asylum officer’s analysis of why, in light of such facts, the alien has not established a credible fear of persecution; and

“(iv) a copy of the asylum officer’s interview notes.

“(C) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

“(i) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process by which an immigration judge will conduct a prompt review, upon the alien’s request, of a determination under subparagraph (A) that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution.

“(ii) MANDATORY COMPONENTS.—The review described in clause (i)—

“(I) shall include an opportunity for the alien to be heard and questioned by the immigration judge, either in person or by telephonic or video connection; and

“(II) shall be concluded as expeditiously as possible, to the maximum extent practicable within 24 hours, but in no case later than 7 days after the date of the determination under subparagraph (A).

“(D) MANDATORY PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—Any alien subject to the procedures under this paragraph shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b))—

“(i) pending a final determination of an application for asylum under this subsection; and

“(ii) after a determination under this subsection that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution, until the alien is removed.

“(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f)(4)(C) and paragraph (2), a removal order entered in accordance with subsection (e)(2) or (f)(4)(A) is not subject to administrative appeal.

“(2) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process for the prompt review of an order under subsection (e)(2) against an alien who claims under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, after having been warned of the penalties for falsely making such claim under such conditions to have been—

“(A) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(B) admitted as a refugee under section 207; or

“(C) granted asylum under section 208.

“(h) LAST IN, FIRST OUT.—In any proceedings, determinations, or removals under this section, priority shall be accorded to the alien who has most recently arrived in the United States.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 235A the following:

“Sec. 235B. Humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children.”

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—Section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 235(b)(1)” and inserting “section 235(b)(1) or an order of removal issued to an unaccompanied alien child after proceedings under section 235B”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(B)(1)”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “section 235(b)(1)(B),” and inserting “section 235(b)(1)(B) or 235B(f);” and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(B)(1)”; and

(B) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” each place it appears;

(C) in subparagraph (2)(C), by inserting “or section 235B(g)” after “section 235(b)(1)(C);” and

(D) in subparagraph (3)(A), by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)”.

SEC. 1003. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) SPECIAL MOTIONS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—

(1) FILING AUTHORIZED.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, permit an unaccompanied alien child who was issued a notice to appear under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) to appear, in-person, before an immigration judge who has been authorized by the Attorney General to conduct proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002;

(B) to attest that the unaccompanied alien child desires to apply for admission to the United States; and

(C) to file a motion—

(i) to replace any notice to appear issued between January 1, 2013, and the date of the enactment of this Act under such section 239 that has not resulted in a final order of removal; and

(ii) to apply for admission to the United States by being placed in proceedings under such section 235B.

(2) ADJUDICATION OF MOTION.—An immigration judge may, at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the judge, grant a motion filed under paragraph (1)(C) upon a finding that—

(A) the petitioner was an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232)) on the date on which a notice to appear was issued to the alien under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229);

(B) the notice to appear was issued during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(C) the unaccompanied alien child is applying for admission to the United States; and

(D) the granting of such motion would not be manifestly unjust.

(3) EFFECT OF MOTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the granting of a motion to replace a notice to appear under paragraph (2), the immigration judge who granted such motion shall—

(A) while the petitioner remains in-person, immediately inspect and screen the petitioner for admission to the United States by conducting a proceeding under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002;

(B) immediately notify the petitioner of the petitioner’s ability, under section 235B(c)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to withdraw the petitioner’s application for admission to the United States

and immediately be returned to the petitioner's country of nationality or country of last habitual residence; and

(C) replace the petitioner's notice to appear with an order under section 235B(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(4) **PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.**—An unaccompanied alien child who has been granted a motion under paragraph (2) shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232).

SEC. 1004. CHILD WELFARE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—

“(A) **IMMIGRATION STATUS.**—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services considers placement of an unaccompanied alien child with a potential sponsor, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services the immigration status of such potential sponsor prior to the placement of the unaccompanied alien child.

“(B) **OTHER INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General any relevant information related to an unaccompanied alien child who is or has been in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including the location of the child and any person to whom custody of the child has been transferred, for any legitimate law enforcement objective, including enforcement of the immigration laws.”

SEC. 1005. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CHILDREN AND TAXPAYERS.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)), as amended by section 1004, is further amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(6) **INSPECTION OF FACILITIES.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall conduct regular inspections of facilities utilized by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide care and custody of an unaccompanied alien children who are in the immediate custody of the Secretary to ensure that such facilities are operated in the most efficient manner practicable.

“(7) **FACILITY OPERATIONS COSTS.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that facilities utilized to provide care and custody of unaccompanied alien children are operated efficiently and at a rate of cost that is not greater than \$500 per day for each child housed or detained at such facility, unless the Secretary certifies that compliance with this requirement is temporarily impossible due to emergency circumstances.”

SEC. 1006. CUSTODY OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN IN FORMAL REMOVAL PROCEEDING.

Section 235(c) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by inserting at the end the following:

“(C) **CHILDREN IN FORMAL REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**—

“(i) **LIMITATION ON PLACEMENT.**—An unaccompanied alien child who has been placed in a proceeding under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a)

may not be placed in the custody of a non-governmental sponsor or otherwise released from the immediate custody of the United States Government unless—

“(I) the nongovernmental sponsor is a biological or adoptive parent of the unaccompanied alien child;

“(II) the parent is legally present in the United States at the time of the placement;

“(III) the parent has undergone a mandatory biometric criminal history check; and

“(IV) the Secretary of Health and Human Services has determined that the unaccompanied alien child is not a danger to self, danger to the community, or risk of flight.

“(ii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that an unaccompanied alien child is a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)), a special needs child with a disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)), a child who has been a victim of physical or sexual abuse under circumstances that indicate that the child's health or welfare has been significantly harmed or threatened, or a child with mental health needs that require ongoing assistance from a social welfare agency, the unaccompanied alien child may be placed with a grandparent or adult sibling if the grandparent or adult sibling meets the requirements set out in subclauses (II), (III), and (IV) of clause (i).

“(iii) **MONITORING.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—An unaccompanied alien child who is 15, 16, or 17 years of age placed with a nongovernmental sponsor or, in the case of an unaccompanied alien child younger than 15 years of age placed with a nongovernmental sponsor, such nongovernmental sponsor shall—

“(aa) enroll in the alternative to detention program of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(bb) continuously wear an electronic ankle monitor while the unaccompanied alien child is in removal proceedings.

“(II) **PENALTY FOR MONITOR TAMPERING.**—If an electronic ankle monitor required by subclause (I) is tampered with, the sponsor of the unaccompanied alien child shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$150 for each day the monitor is not functioning due to the tampering, up to a maximum of \$3,000.

“(iv) **EFFECT OF VIOLATION OF CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall remove an unaccompanied alien child from a sponsor if the sponsor violates the terms of the agreement specifying the conditions under which the alien was placed with the sponsor.

“(v) **FAILURE TO APPEAR.**—

“(I) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—If an unaccompanied alien child is placed with a sponsor and fails to appear in a mandatory court appearance, the sponsor shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$250 for each day until the alien appears in court, up to a maximum of \$5,000.

“(II) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—The sponsor is not subject to the penalty imposed under subclause (I) if the sponsor—

“(aa) appears in person and proves to the immigration court that the failure to appear by the unaccompanied alien child was not the fault of the sponsor; and

“(bb) supplies the immigration court with documentary evidence that supports the assertion described in item (aa).

“(vi) **PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child

under this subparagraph in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of, or the Secretary has reason to believe was otherwise involved in the commission of—

“(I) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)); or

“(II) a crime involving severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(vii) **REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.**—A biometric criminal history check required by clause (i)(IV) shall be conducted using a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifier through—

“(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

“(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences; and

“(III) any other State or Federal database or repository that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines is appropriate.”

SEC. 1007. FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1041. Fraud in connection with the transfer of custody of unaccompanied alien children

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for a person to obtain custody of an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)) by—

“(1) making any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

“(2) making or using any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry.

“(b) **PENALTIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person who violates, or attempts or conspires to violate, this section shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 1 year.

“(2) **ENHANCED PENALTY FOR TRAFFICKING.**—If the primary purpose of the violation, attempted violation, or conspiracy to violate this section was to subject the child to sexually explicit activity or any other form of exploitation, the offender shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 15 years.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1040 the following:

“1041. Fraud in connection with the transfer of custody of unaccompanied alien children.”

SEC. 1008. NOTIFICATION OF STATES, REPORTING, AND MONITORING.

(a) **NOTIFICATION.**—Section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **NOTIFICATION TO STATES.**—

“(1) **PRIOR TO PLACEMENT.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall notify the Governor of a State not later than 48 hours prior to the placement of an unaccompanied alien child from in custody of such Secretary in the care of a facility or sponsor in such State.

“(2) **INITIAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human

Services shall submit a report to the Governor of each State in which an unaccompanied alien child was discharged to a sponsor or placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Secretary during the period beginning October 1, 2013 and ending on the date of the enactment of the Protecting Children and America's Homeland Act of 2014.

“(3) MONTHLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a monthly report to the Governor of each State in which, during the reporting period, unaccompanied alien children were discharged to a sponsor or placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(4) CONTENTS.—Each report required to be submitted to the Governor of a State by paragraph (2) or (3) shall identify the number of unaccompanied alien children placed in the State during the reporting period, disaggregated by—

“(A) the locality in which the aliens were placed; and

“(B) the age of the aliens.”.

(b) MONITORING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) require all sponsors to agree—

(A) to receive approval from the Secretary of Health and Human Services prior to changing the location in which the sponsor is housing an unaccompanied alien child placed in the sponsor's custody; and

(B) to provide a current address for the child and the reason for the change of address;

(2) provide regular and frequent monitoring of the physical and emotional well-being of each unaccompanied alien child who has been discharged to a sponsor or remained in the legal custody of the Secretary until the child's immigration case is resolved; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to Congress a plan for implementing the requirement of paragraph (2).

SEC. 1009. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 100 immigration judges, including through the temporary or permanent hiring of retired immigration judges, magistrate judges, or administrative law judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, that are dedicated to—

(1) conducting humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002; or

(2) reducing existing backlogs in immigration court proceedings initiated under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that sufficient immigration judge resources are dedicated to the purpose described in subsection (a)(1) to comply with the requirement under section 235B(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002.

SEC. 1010. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS ON CARE OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD.—Not later than December 31, 2014 and September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that includes—

(1) a detailed summary of the contracts in effect to care for and house unaccompanied alien children, including the names and loca-

tions of contractors and the facilities being used;

(2) the cost per day to care for and house an unaccompanied alien child, including an explanation of such cost;

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been released to a sponsor, if any;

(4) a list of the States to which unaccompanied alien children have been released from the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the care of a sponsor or placement in a facility;

(5) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been released to a sponsor who is not lawfully present in the United States, including the country of nationality or last habitual residence and age of such children;

(6) a determination of whether more than 1 unaccompanied alien child has been released to the same sponsor, including the number of children who were released to such sponsor;

(7) an assessment of the extent to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is monitoring the release of unaccompanied alien children, including home studies done and ankle bracelets or other devices used;

(8) an assessment of the extent to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is making efforts—

(A) to educate unaccompanied alien children about their legal rights; and

(B) to provide unaccompanied alien children with access to pro bono counsel; and

(9) the extent of the public health issues of unaccompanied alien children, including contagious diseases, the benefits or medical services provided, and the outreach to States and localities about public health issues, that could affect the public.

(b) REPORTS ON REPATRIATION AGREEMENTS.—Not later than February 31, 2015 and August 31, 2015, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) any repatriation agreement for unaccompanied alien children in effect and a copy of such agreement; and

(B) any such repatriation agreement that is being considered or negotiated; and

(2) describes the funding provided to the 20 countries that have the highest number of nationals entering the United States as unaccompanied alien children, including amounts provided—

(A) to deter the nationals of each country from illegally entering the United States; and

(B) to care for or reintegrate repatriated unaccompanied alien children in the country of nationality or last habitual residence.

(c) REPORTS ON RETURNS TO COUNTRY OF NATIONALITY.—Not later than December 31, 2014 and September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that describes—

(1) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have voluntarily returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, disaggregated by—

(A) country of nationality or habitual residence; and

(B) age of the unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, including assessment of the length of time such children were present in the United States;

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have not been returned to their

country of nationality or habitual residence pending travel documents or other requirements from such country, including how long they have been waiting to return; and

(4) the number of unaccompanied alien children who were granted relief in the United States, whether through asylum or any other immigration benefit.

(d) REPORTS ON IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS.—Not later than September 30, 2015, and once every 3 months thereafter, the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that describes—

(1) the number of unaccompanied alien children who, after proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002, were returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, disaggregated by—

(A) country of nationality or residence; and

(B) age and gender of such aliens;

(2) the number of unaccompanied alien children who, after proceedings under such section 235B, prove a claim of admissibility and are placed in proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a);

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who fail to appear at a removal hearing that such alien was required to attend;

(4) the number of sponsors who were levied a penalty, including the amount and whether the penalty was collected, for the failure of an unaccompanied alien child to appear at a removal hearing; and

(5) the number of aliens that are classified as unaccompanied alien children, the ages and countries of nationality of such children, and the orders issued by the immigration judge at the conclusion of proceedings under such section 235B for such children.

Subtitle B—Cooperation With Countries of Nationality of Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1021. IN-COUNTRY REFUGEE PROCESSING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with section 101(a)(42)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)(B)) and section 207(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(e)), special circumstances currently exist due to grave humanitarian concerns throughout the travel, and attempts to travel, to the United States by unaccompanied children sufficient to justify and require, for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the allowance of processing of in-country refugee applications in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras in order to prevent such children from undertaking the long and dangerous journey across Central America and Mexico.

(2) Grave humanitarian concerns exist due to—

(A) at least 60,000 unaccompanied children having undertaken the long and dangerous journey to the United States from Central America in fiscal year 2014 alone;

(B) substantial reports of unaccompanied children becoming, during the course of their journey intended for the United States, victims of—

(i) significant injury, including loss of limbs;

(ii) severe forms of violence;

(iii) death due to accident and intentional killing;

(iv) severe forms of human trafficking;

(v) kidnap for ransom; and

(vi) sexual assault and rape; and

(C) the likelihood that the vast majority of the unaccompanied children seeking admission or immigration relief, including through application as a refugee or claims of asylum, do not qualify for such admission or relief, and therefore will be repatriated.

(3) While special circumstances currently exist to justify in-country refugee application processing for El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, it is appropriate to determine the admissibility of individuals applying for refugee status from those countries according to current law and granting administrative relief in instances in which refugee or asylum applications are denied, or are expected to be denied, would exacerbate the grave humanitarian concerns described in paragraph (2) by further encouraging attempts at migration.

(b) **AUTHORITY FOR IN-COUNTRY REFUGEE PROCESSING.**—Notwithstanding section 101(a)(42)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)(B)), for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall process an application for refugee status—

(1) for an alien who is a national of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras and is located in such country; or

(2) in the case of an alien having no nationality, for an alien who is habitually residing in such country and is located in such country.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as a grant of immigration benefit or relief, nor as a change to existing law regarding the eligibility for any individual for such benefit or relief, other than to the extent refugee applications shall be permitted in-country in accordance with this section.

SEC. 1022. REFUGEE ADMISSIONS FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, in determining the number of refugees who may be admitted under section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(a))—

(1) for fiscal year 2014, may —

(A) allocate the unallocated reserve refugee number set out in the Presidential Memorandum on Refugee Admissions for Fiscal Year 2014 issued on October 2, 2013 to admit refugees from Central America; and

(B) allocate any unused admissions allocated to a particular region for Central American refugee admissions; and

(2) for fiscal year 2015, shall include Central America among the regional allocations included in the Presidential determination for refugee admissions that fiscal year.

SEC. 1023. FOREIGN GOVERNMENT COOPERATION IN REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall make a certification of whether the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras—

(A) is actively working to reduce the number of unaccompanied alien children from that country who are attempting to migrate northward in order to illegally enter the United States;

(B) is cooperating with the Government of the United States to facilitate the repatriation of unaccompanied alien children who are removed from the United States and returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence; and

(C) has negotiated or is actively negotiating an agreement under section 235(a)(2)(C) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(2)(C)), as amended by section 1001.

(2) **INTERIM CERTIFICATION.**—If prior to the date an annual certification is required by paragraph (1) the President determines the most recent such certification for the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras is no longer accurate, the President may make an accurate certification for that country prior to such date.

(b) **LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.**—The Federal Government may not provide any assistance (other than security assistance) to El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras unless in the most recent certification for that country under subsection (a) is that the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras, respectively, meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a)(1).

TITLE XI—CRIMINAL ALIENS

SEC. 1101. ALIEN GANG MEMBERS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(53)(A) The term ‘criminal gang’ means an ongoing group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons—

“(i) that has as 1 of its primary purposes the commission of 1 or more of the criminal offenses described in subparagraph (B); and

“(II) the members of which engage, or have engaged within the past 5 years, in a continuing series of offenses described in subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) that has been designated as a criminal gang under section 220 by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, or the Secretary of State.

“(B) The offenses described in this subparagraph, whether in violation of Federal or State law or foreign law and regardless of whether the offenses occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Children and America’s Homeland Act of 2014, are the following:

“(i) A ‘felony drug offense’ (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)).

“(ii) An offense under section 274 (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens), section 277 (relating to aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter the United States), or section 278 (relating to importation of alien for immoral purpose).

“(iii) A crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code).

“(iv) A crime involving obstruction of justice, tampering with or retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant, or burglary.

“(v) Any conduct punishable under sections 1028 and 1029 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents or access devices), sections 1581 through 1594 of such title (relating to peonage, slavery and trafficking in persons), section 1952 of such title (relating to interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), section 1956 of such title (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments), section 1957 of such title (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), or sections 2312 through 2315 of such title (relating to interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles or stolen property).

“(vi) A conspiracy to commit an offense described in clauses (i) through (v).

“(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any effective date), the term ‘criminal gang’ applies regardless of whether the conduct occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph.”.

(b) **INADMISSIBILITY.**—Section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) **ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.**—Any alien is inadmissible who a consular officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

“(i) is or has been a member of a criminal gang; or

“(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal gang knowing or having reason to know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.”.

(c) **DEPORTABILITY.**—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) **ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.**—Any alien is deportable who the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

“(i) is or has been a member of a criminal gang; or

“(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal gang knowing or having reason to know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.”.

(d) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 219 the following:

“SEC. 220. DESIGNATION OF CRIMINAL GANGS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, or the Secretary of State may designate a group or association as a criminal gang if their conduct is described in section 101(a)(53) or if the group or association conduct poses a significant risk that threatens the security and the public safety of nationals of the United States or the national security, homeland security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States.

“(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—A designation made under subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the designation is revoked after consultation between the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State or is terminated in accordance with Federal law.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 219 the following:

“220. Designation of criminal gangs.”.

(e) **MANDATORY DETENTION OF CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 236(c)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(D)) is amended—

(A) by striking “section 212(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(J) or (3)(B) of section 212(a)”;

(B) by striking “237(a)(4)(B),” and inserting “paragraph (2)(G) or (4)(B) of section 237(a),”.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than March 1 of each year (beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the Committee on

the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the number of aliens detained under the amendments made by paragraph (1).

(f) ASYLUM CLAIMS BASED ON GANG AFFILIATION.—

(1) **INAPPLICABILITY OF RESTRICTION ON REMOVAL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.**—Section 241(b)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)(B)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “who is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i) or who is” after “to an alien”.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.**—Section 208(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (v), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the alien is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i) (relating to participation in criminal gangs); or”.

(g) **TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.**—Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place that term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in subparagraph (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “States, or” and inserting “States;”;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the alien is, or at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal gang.”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of Homeland Security may detain an alien provided temporary protected status under this section whenever appropriate under any other provision of law.”.

(h) **SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE VISAS.**—Section 101(a)(27)(J)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “and”;

(2) in subclause (II), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) no alien who is, or was at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal gang shall be eligible for any immigration benefit under this subparagraph.”.

(i) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to acts that occur before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1102. MANDATORY EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS CRIMINALS, TERRORISTS, AND GANG MEMBERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an immigration officer who finds an alien described in subsection (b) at a land border or port of entry of the United States and determines that such alien is inadmissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) shall treat such alien in accordance with section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225).

(b) **THREATS TO PUBLIC SAFETY.**—An alien described in this subsection is an alien who the Secretary of Homeland Security determines, or has reason to believe—

(1) has been convicted of any offense carrying a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 180 days;

(2) has been convicted of an offense which involved—

(A) domestic violence (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

(B) child abuse and neglect (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

(C) assault resulting in bodily injury (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

(D) the violation of a protection order (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

(E) driving while intoxicated (as defined in section 164 of title 23, United States Code); or

(F) any offense under foreign law, except for a purely political offense, which, if the offense had been committed in the United States, would render the alien inadmissible under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(3) has been convicted of more than 1 criminal offense (other than minor traffic offenses);

(4) has engaged in, is engaged in, or is likely to engage after entry in any terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)), or intends to participate or has participated in the activities of a foreign terrorist organization (as designated under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189));

(5) is or was a member of a criminal street gang (as defined in paragraph (53) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)), as added by section 1101(a); or

(6) has entered the United States more than 1 time in violation of section 275(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1325(a)), knowing that the entry was unlawful.

SEC. 1103. FUGITIVE OPERATIONS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to hire 350 U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention officers that comprise 50 Fugitive Operations Teams responsible for identifying, locating, and arresting fugitive aliens.

SEC. 1104. ADDITIONAL DETENTION CAPACITY FOR FAMILY UNITS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall increase the number of detention beds available for aliens placed in removal proceedings under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) by not less than 5,000, including such detention beds available for family units.

TITLE XII—BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 1201. REDUCING INCENTIVES FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION.

No Federal funds or resources may be used to issue a new directive, memorandum, or Executive Order that provides for relief from removal or work authorization to a class of individuals who are not otherwise eligible for such relief under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) or such work authorization, including expanding deferred action for childhood arrivals.

SEC. 1202. BORDER SECURITY ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LANDS.**—The term “Federal lands” includes all land under the control of the Secretary concerned that is located within the Southwest border region in the

State of Arizona along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(2) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **SUPPORT FOR BORDER SECURITY NEEDS.**—To achieve effective control of Federal lands—

(1) the Secretary concerned, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall authorize and provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel with immediate access to Federal lands for security activities, including—

(A) routine motorized patrols; and

(B) the deployment of communications, surveillance, and detection equipment;

(2) the security activities described in paragraph (1) shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that the Secretary determines will best protect the natural and cultural resources on Federal lands; and

(3) the Secretary concerned may provide education and training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the natural and cultural resources present on individual Federal land units.

(c) **PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After implementing subsection (b), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretaries concerned, shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to analyze the impacts of the activities described in subsection (b).

(2) **EFFECT ON PROCESSING APPLICATION AND SPECIAL USE PERMITS.**—The pending completion of a programmatic environmental impact statement under this section shall not result in any delay in the processing or approving of applications or special use permits by the Secretaries concerned for the activities described in subsection (b).

(3) **AMENDMENT OF LAND USE PLANS.**—The Secretaries concerned shall amend any land use plans, as appropriate, upon completion of the programmatic environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1).

(4) **SCOPE OF PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The programmatic environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1)—

(A) may be used to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on the impact on natural and cultural resources on Federal lands; and

(B) shall not control, delay, or restrict actions by the Secretary of Homeland Security to achieve effective control on Federal lands.

(d) **INTERMINGLED STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—This section shall not apply to any private or State-owned land within the boundaries of Federal lands.

SEC. 1203. STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE TO ALLEVIATE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS.

(a) **STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall enhance law enforcement preparedness, humanitarian responses, and operational readiness along the international border between the United States and Mexico through Operation Stonegarden.

(b) **GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts made available to carry out this section shall be allocated

for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments in Border Patrol Sectors on the along the international border between the United States and Mexico for—

(A) costs personnel, overtime, and travel;

(B) costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling; and

(C) costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and family units who have entered the United States.

(2) **FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Allocations for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments under this paragraph shall be made by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency through a competitive process.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 1204. PREVENTING ORGANIZED SMUGGLING.

(a) **UNLAWFULLY HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, OR CUSTOMS CONTROLS.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls

“(a) **ILLCIT SPOTTING.**—Any person who knowingly transmits to another person the location, movement, or activities of any Federal, State, or tribal law enforcement agency with the intent to further a Federal crime relating to United States immigration, customs, importation of controlled substances, agriculture products, or monetary instruments, or other border controls shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) **DESTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES BORDER CONTROLS.**—Any person who knowingly and without lawful authorization destroys, alters, or damages any fence, barrier, sensor, camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the international border of the United States or a port of entry, or otherwise seeks to construct, excavate, or make any structure intended to defeat, circumvent or evade any such fence, barrier, sensor camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the international border of the United States or a port of entry—

“(1) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both; and

“(2) if, at the time of the offense, the person uses or carries a firearm or, in furtherance of any such crime, possesses a firearm, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) **CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.**—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) or (b) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.”

(B) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 555 the following:

“556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls.”

(2) **PROHIBITING CARRYING OR USE OF A FIREARM DURING AND IN RELATION TO AN ALIEN SMUGGLING CRIME.**—Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence” each place such term appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘alien smuggling crime’ means any felony punishable under section 274(a), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a), 1327, and 1328).”

(3) **STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.**—Section 3298 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “556 (hindering immigration, border, or customs controls), 1598 (organized human smuggling),” before “1581”.

(b) **ORGANIZED HUMAN SMUGGLING.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.**—Chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1598. Organized human smuggling

“(a) **PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.**—It shall be unlawful for any person, while acting for profit or other financial gain, to knowingly direct or participate in an effort or scheme to assist or cause 3 or more persons—

“(1) to enter, attempt to enter, or prepare to enter the United States—

“(A) by fraud, falsehood, or other corrupt means;

“(B) at any place other than a port or place of entry designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security; or

“(C) in a manner not prescribed by the immigration laws and regulations of the United States;

“(2) to travel by air, land, or sea toward the United States (whether directly or indirectly)—

“(A) knowing that the persons seek to enter or attempt to enter the United States without lawful authority; and

“(B) with the intent to aid or further such entry or attempted entry; or

“(3) to be transported or moved outside of the United States—

“(A) knowing that such persons are aliens in unlawful transit from 1 country to another or on the high seas; and

“(B) under circumstances in which the persons are seeking to enter the United States without official permission or legal authority.

“(b) **CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.**—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.

“(c) **BASE PENALTY.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), any person who violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

“(d) **ENHANCED PENALTIES.**—Any person who violates subsection (a) or (b)—

“(1) in the case of a violation causing a serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365) to any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(2) in the case of a violation causing the life of any person to be placed in jeopardy, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(3) in the case of a violation involving 10 or more persons, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(4) in the case of a violation involving the bribery or corruption of a United States or foreign government official, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(5) in the case of a violation involving robbery or extortion (as such terms are defined in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of section 1951(b)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(6) in the case of a violation causing any person to be subjected to an involuntary sexual act (as defined in section 2246(2)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(7) in the case of a violation resulting in the death of any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both;

“(8) in the case of a violation in which any alien is confined or restrained, including by the taking of clothing, goods, or personal identification documents, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; or

“(9) in the case of smuggling an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **EFFORT OR SCHEME TO ASSIST OR CAUSE 3 OR MORE PERSONS.**—The term ‘effort or scheme to assist or cause 3 or more persons’ does not require that the 3 or more persons enter, attempt to enter, prepare to enter, or travel at the same time if such acts are completed during a 1-year period.

“(2) **LAWFUL AUTHORITY.**—The term ‘lawful authority’—

“(A) means permission, authorization, or license that is expressly provided for under the immigration laws of the United States; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) any authority described in subparagraph (A) that was secured by fraud or otherwise unlawfully obtained; or

“(ii) any authority that was sought, but not approved.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1597 the following:

“1598. Organized human smuggling.”

(c) **STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN SMUGGLING.**—

(1) **HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS OF HUMAN SMUGGLING DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “high traffic areas of human smuggling” means the United States ports of entry and areas between such ports that have relatively high levels of human smuggling activity, as measured by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement a strategy to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(3) **COMPONENTS.**—The strategy referred to in paragraph (2) shall include—

(A) efforts to increase coordination between the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) an identification of intelligence gaps impeding the ability to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States;

(C) efforts to increase information sharing with State and local governments and other Federal agencies;

(D) efforts to provide, in coordination with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, training for the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States; and

(E) the identification of the high traffic areas of human smuggling.

(4) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report that describes the strategy to be implemented under paragraph (2), including the components listed in paragraph (3), to—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(B) FORM.—The Secretary may submit the report required under subparagraph (A) in classified form if the Secretary determines that such form is appropriate.

(5) ANNUAL LIST OF HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS.—Not later than February 1st of the first year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a list of the high traffic areas of human smuggling referred to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2755. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, in an effort to decrease the rate of drug overdose deaths, I am pleased to be joined by Senators DURBIN, MARKEY, WHITEHOUSE, and LEAHY in introducing the Overdose Prevention Act. Representative DONNA EDWARDS has introduced a similar bill in the House.

Throughout the country, the death rate from drug overdoses has been rapidly climbing. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, drug overdose death rates have more than tripled since 1990, and more than 110 Americans died each day from drug overdoses in 2011. More than half of these deaths are attributable to opioids, like prescription pain relievers or heroin. Indeed, this tragic epidemic has hit particularly hard in my home State of Rhode Island, where already in 2014, more than 100 individuals have died from apparent and confirmed drug overdoses.

Americans aged 25 to 64 are now more likely to die as a result of a drug overdose than from injuries sustained in motor vehicle traffic crashes. While overdoses from illegal drugs persist as a major public health problem, fatal overdoses from prescribed opioid pain medications such as oxycodone account for more than 40 percent of all overdose deaths.

It is clear that we must do more to stop these often preventable deaths. Fortunately, the drug naloxone, which has no side effects and no potential for abuse, is widely recognized as an important tool to help prevent drug overdose deaths. Naloxone can rapidly reverse an overdose from heroin and opioid medications if provided in a timely manner. Overdose prevention programs, including those that utilize naloxone, have been credited with saving more than 10,000 lives since 1996, according to the CDC.

Opioid abuse and overdose is not an abstract threat found in far-off corners. It is a national public health crisis and it's taking place right here at home in our communities and our neighborhoods.

Rhode Island is taking steps to combat this scourge and is leading the way in adopting innovative solutions. Through a "collaborative practice agreement," some Rhode Island pharmacies are dispensing naloxone, along with training about its proper use, to anyone who walks in and requests the treatment, no prescription necessary. In addition, the Rhode Island State Police now carry naloxone in every cruiser. However, there's more work to be done at the federal level.

The Overdose Prevention Act, which I am introducing today, would complement Rhode Island's efforts and take important steps towards addressing this issue and increasing access to naloxone in our communities. The legislation aims to establish a comprehensive national response to this epidemic that emphasizes collaboration between State and Federal officials and employs best practices from the medical community, as well as programs and treatments that have been proven effective to combat this startling national trend. This is an emergency and it requires a coordinated and comprehensive response.

Specifically, the bill would authorize the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to award funding through cooperative agreements to eligible entities—like public health agencies or community-based organizations with expertise in preventing overdose deaths. As a condition of participation, an entity would use the grant to purchase and distribute naloxone, and carry out overdose prevention activities, such as educating and training prescribers, pharmacists, and first responders on how to recognize the signs of an overdose, seek emergency medical help, and administer naloxone and other first aid.

As rates of overdose deaths continue to spike, public health agencies, law enforcement, and others are struggling to keep up without accurate and timely information about the epidemic. Therefore, the Overdose Prevention Act would also require HHS to take steps to improve surveillance and re-

search of drug overdose deaths, so that public health agencies, law enforcement, and community organizations have an accurate picture of the problem.

It would also establish a coordinated federal plan of action to address this epidemic. The Overdose Prevention Act brings together first responders, medical personnel, addiction treatment specialists, social service providers, and families to help save lives and get at the root of this problem.

I am pleased that the Overdose Prevention Act has the support of the American Association of Poison Control Centers, the Drug Policy Alliance, the Harm Reduction Coalition, and the Trust for America's Health. I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders, as well as Representative EDWARDS and the rest of our colleagues in passing this crucial legislation. Many of these overdose deaths are preventable, and it is time for Congress to act to give communities the help they need to stop this epidemic.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2761. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the consolidation of metropolitan planning organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about our Nation's infrastructure and how Congress needs a long-term transportation bill that empowers local and regional planning authorities.

Infrastructure drives our economy. New Jersey alone has more than 38,000 miles of public roads, and nearly 1,000 miles of rail freight lines, connecting every corner of my State to consumers and networks throughout the region.

This means jobs. It means quality of life. It means investment in our communities and moving us forward.

Currently, just 8 percent of our Federal highway dollars are controlled by regional and local interests.

In order to increase the role of local communities in our transportation policy decisions, I introduced today The Local Empowerment Act, which would reward high-performing Metropolitan Planning Organizations, MPO's, with additional, directly-allocated funds.

MPO's that coordinate well with other MPOs in the region, consider performance goals as part of their planning, have equitable approaches to decision making, and demonstrate high technical capacity would be rewarded with additional resources to support their local priorities.

Consider the fact that ¾ of GDP is generated from within metro areas, 65 percent of the population resides in metro areas, and 95 percent of all public transportation passenger miles traveled take place in metro areas.

As the mayor of Newark, NJ, I learned through first-hand experience

how important it is that the federal government partner with local communities to make substantial, long-term investments in our transportation infrastructure.

Federal transportation policy must provide local and regional stakeholders with resources and decision-making power, and take into account how local communities are being impacted by congestion, air pollution and our broader investment decisions.

At all levels of government, there is a dire need for additional, creative policy options that will find more projects, create more jobs, and rehabilitate and rebuild our crumbling infrastructure.

I would like to highlight the leadership of Anthony Foxx, Secretary of Transportation, for proposing a program along the lines of this legislation.

Secretary Foxx, like me a former mayor, understands how important it is that Federal programs empower local entities and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 531—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF LOUIS ZAMPERINI AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES ON HIS PASSING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 531

Whereas Louis Silvie "Lou" Zamperini was born on January 26, 1917, to Anthony and Louise Zamperini, in Olean, New York;

Whereas Louis Zamperini represented the United States in the 1936 Olympics in Berlin as a distance runner;

Whereas Louis Zamperini graduated from the University of Southern California in 1940 and enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps in 1941, earning the rank of lieutenant;

Whereas in May 1943, Louis Zamperini's B-24 bomber malfunctioned and crashed during a search-and-rescue mission over the Pacific Ocean, leaving him and 2 other individuals stranded;

Whereas Louis Zamperini survived for 47 days adrift in a life raft with Second Lieutenant Russell Phillips before being captured by Japanese forces and placed in a prisoner of war camp;

Whereas for more than 2 years, during his imprisonment, Louis Zamperini endured brutal treatment and forced labor with courage and resilience;

Whereas upon the conclusion of World War II, Louis Zamperini was released from the prisoner of war camp in September 1945;

Whereas Louis Zamperini was promoted to captain and awarded multiple distinguishing military honors, including the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Prisoner of War Medal;

Whereas Louis Zamperini was given the honor of carrying the Olympic flame in 1984, 1996, and 1998;

Whereas in the years after World War II, Louis Zamperini traveled as an inspirational

public speaker, using his experiences to inspire a message of forgiveness;

Whereas the airport in Torrance, California was named "Zamperini Field" in honor of Louis Zamperini; and

Whereas Louis Zamperini leaves a legacy as a national hero and an inspiration to future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini;

(2) extends heartfelt sympathies and condolences to the family of Louis Zamperini; and

(3) requests the President to identify an appropriate and lasting program of the United States Government to honor the legacy of Louis Zamperini.

SENATE RESOLUTION 532—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 7, 2014, AS "NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS RECOGNITION WEEK"

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 532

Whereas direct care workers, personal assistants, personal attendants, in-home support workers, and paraprofessionals (referred to in this preamble as "direct support professionals") are the primary providers of publicly-funded long-term support and services for millions of individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals must build a close, respectful, and trusted relationship with individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals assist individuals with disabilities with intimate personal care assistance on a daily basis;

Whereas direct support professionals provide a broad range of individualized support, including—

(1) preparation of meals;
(2) helping with medications;
(3) assisting with bathing and dressing;
(4) assisting individuals with physical disabilities with access to their environment;
(5) providing transportation to school, work, religious, and recreational activities; and

(6) helping with general aspects of daily living, such as financial matters, medical appointments, and personal interests;

Whereas direct support professionals provide essential support to help keep individuals with disabilities connected to family, friends, and community;

Whereas direct support professionals support individuals with disabilities in making choices that lead to meaningful, productive lives;

Whereas direct support professionals are the key to helping individuals with disabilities to live successfully in the community, and to avoid more costly institutional care;

Whereas the participation of direct support professionals in medical care planning is critical to the successful transition from medical events to post-acute care and long-term support and services;

Whereas the majority of direct support professionals are the primary financial pro-

viders for their families and often work multiple jobs to make ends meet;

Whereas direct support professionals are a critical element in supporting individuals who are receiving health care services for severe chronic health conditions and individuals with functional limitations;

Whereas while direct support professionals work and pay taxes, many direct support professionals earn poverty-level wages and are therefore eligible for the same Federal and State public assistance programs on which individuals with disabilities served by direct support professionals must also depend;

Whereas Federal and State policies assert the right of certain individuals with a disability to live in a residential setting in the community, or an institutional setting of their choice, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), confirmed that right for certain individuals;

Whereas, as of 2014, the majority of direct support professionals are employed in home and community-based settings and this majority is projected to increase over the next decade;

Whereas there is a documented and increasing critical shortage of direct support professionals throughout the United States; and

Whereas many direct support professionals are forced to leave their jobs due to inadequate wages and benefits and limited opportunities for advancement, creating demonstrated high turnover and vacancy rates, which adversely affect the quality of support and the safety and health of individuals with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 7, 2014, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week";

(2) recognizes the dedication of direct support professionals and the vital role direct support professionals have in enhancing the lives of individuals with disabilities of all ages;

(3) appreciates the contribution of direct support professionals in supporting individuals with disabilities and their families in the United States;

(4) identifies direct support professionals as integral to long-term support and services for individuals with disabilities; and

(5) finds that the successful implementation of the public policies affecting individuals with disabilities in the United States depends on the dedication of direct support professionals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 533—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS "NATIONAL SPINAL CORD INJURY AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 533

Whereas over 1,275,000 individuals in the United States are estimated to live with a spinal cord injury and cost society billions of dollars in health care and lost wages;

Whereas 100,000 of the individuals in the United States with a spinal cord injury are estimated to be veterans who suffered the spinal cord injury while serving as members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas accidents are the leading cause of spinal cord injuries;

Whereas motor vehicle crashes are the second leading cause of spinal cord and traumatic brain injuries;

Whereas 70 percent of all spinal cord injuries that occur in children under the age of 18 are a result of motor vehicle accidents;

Whereas every 48 minutes a person becomes paralyzed, underscoring the urgent need to develop new neuroprotection, pharmacological, and regeneration treatments to reduce, prevent, and reverse paralysis; and

Whereas increased education and investment in research are key factors to improving outcomes for victims of spinal cord injuries, improving the quality of life of victims, and ultimately curing paralysis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2014 as “National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Spinal Cord Injury Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, more effective therapies, and a cure for paralysis;

(4) supports clinical trials for new therapies that offer promise and hope to people living with paralysis; and

(5) commends the dedication of local, regional, and national organizations, researchers, doctors, volunteers, and people across the United States that are working to improve the quality of life of people living with paralysis and their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 534—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 6, 2014, AS “EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN AND MARIGOLD DAY”

Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 534

Whereas the great Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Pekin, Illinois, has passed from the halls of the United States Capitol;

Whereas the current Senators wish to honor Senator Dirksen;

Whereas, upon the passing of Senator Dirksen, his contemporaries and peers stated that—

(1) Senator Dirksen—

(A) provided sage advice and counsel and wholehearted wisdom;

(B) provided support that made the civil rights legislation of the 1960s a fact rather than a dream during that decade; and

(C) was known as an American who cultivated a high sense of honor; and

(2) when Senator Dirksen spoke, the country listened, and his eloquence was a source of national strength;

Whereas, as the obituary for Senator Dirksen in the New York Times noted, Senator Dirksen “was ever constant to the marigold, which he sought to make the national flower and which he grew profusely in his garden”;

Whereas, as Senator Dirksen said on the Senate floor on April 17, 1967, the marigold “is a native of North America and can in truth and in fact be called an American flower”;

Whereas, as Senator Dirksen said in that speech, the marigold “is national in character, for it grows and thrives in every one of the fifty states of this nation”;

Whereas, as Senator Dirksen said in that speech, the marigold’s “robustness reflects the hardihood and character of the generations who pioneered and built this land into a great nation”;

Whereas, beginning in 1973, Pekin has held the Pekin Marigold Festival each year to honor Pekin’s favorite son, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen; and

Whereas the 40th Pekin Marigold Festival will be held during the first week of September 2014, which includes Saturday, September 6: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 6, 2014, as “Everett McKinley Dirksen and Marigold Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 535—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 535

Resolved, That—

(1) the Committee on Rules and Administration shall prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 113th Congress;

(2) the manual shall be printed as a Senate document; and

(3) in addition to the usual number of copies, 1,500 copies of the manual shall be bound, of which—

(A) 500 paperbound copies shall be for the use of the Senate; and

(B) 1,000 copies shall be bound (550 paperbound; 250 nontabbed black skiver; 200 tabbed black skiver) and delivered as may be directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42—RECOGNIZING CAREGIVING AS A PROFESSION AND THE EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF PAID AND FAMILY CAREGIVERS

Mr. JOHANNIS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 42

Whereas 10,000 individuals in the United States turn 65 years old each day;

Whereas it is estimated that 40,000,000 individuals in the United States, 13 percent of the population of the United States, are 65 years of age or older;

Whereas in 2056, for the first time, the population of individuals in the United States who are age 65 or older is projected to outnumber the population of individuals in the United States who are under age 18;

Whereas by 2060, the population of individuals in the United States who are age 65 or older is projected to increase from 1 out of 7 individuals to 1 out of 5 individuals;

Whereas the population of individuals in the United States who are age 85 or older is projected to increase from 5,900,000 to 18,200,000 by 2060;

Whereas the population of individuals in the United States who are age 85 or older is projected to comprise 4.3 percent of the total population of the United States by 2060;

Whereas more than 5,000,000 individuals in the United States have Alzheimer’s disease;

Whereas by 2050, as many as 16,000,000 individuals in the United States are projected to have Alzheimer’s disease;

Whereas it is estimated that 60 percent to 70 percent of individuals in the United States who have Alzheimer’s disease or dementia live at home, and such individuals may need assistance in their homes with activities of daily living;

Whereas 1 out of 5 of individuals in the United States who are older than 65 years of age need assistance from a caregiver to complete activities of daily living;

Whereas in order to address the surging population of seniors who have significant needs for in-home care, the field of senior caregiving must continue to grow;

Whereas it is estimated that there are 65,700,000 adults in the United States who provide care to an individual who is ill, disabled, or aged;

Whereas it is estimated that there are 1,800,000 paid caregivers in the United States;

Whereas both unpaid family caregivers and paid caregivers work together to serve the daily living needs of seniors who live in their own homes;

Whereas employment of caregivers is projected to grow 49 percent from 2012 to 2022, much faster than the projected average growth of all occupations; and

Whereas as a senior is able to assume responsibility for more of his or her own care, the burden on public payment systems in the Federal government and State governments decreases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the valuable contributions of caregivers;

(2) supports paid caregivers, the private home care industry, and the efforts of family caregivers in the United States by encouraging individuals to provide care to family, friends, and neighbors;

(3) encourages accessible and affordable self-directed care for seniors;

(4) should review Federal programs that address the needs of seniors and the family caregivers of seniors; and

(5) encourages the Secretary of Health and Human Services to continue efforts to educate the people of the United States on the impact of aging and the importance of knowing the options available to seniors when seniors need care to meet their personal needs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3723. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3724. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3725. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3726. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3727. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3728. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for

military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3729. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3730. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3731. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3732. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1233, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3733. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3734. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3735. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3736. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3737. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3738. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3739. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3740. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3741. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3742. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, mak-

ing emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3743. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3744. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3745. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3746. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3747. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3748. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3749. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3750. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

SA 3751. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3750 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, supra.

SA 3752. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2648, supra.

SA 3753. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3752 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, supra.

SA 3754. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3753 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3752 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, supra.

SA 3755. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3756. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3757. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3758. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3759. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3760. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3761. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3762. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3763. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3764. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3765. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3766. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3767. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3768. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3769. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3770. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3771. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3772. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3060 proposed by Mr. WYDEN to the bill H.R. 3474, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3773. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3774. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3775. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3776. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3777. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3778. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3779. Mr. PRYOR (for Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 520, condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3723. Mr. McCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) It is the policy of the United States that unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) should be—

- (1) treated humanely; and
- (2) expeditiously repatriated to their country of origin.

(b) No funds appropriated under this Act or any other Act may be used to transport, or facilitate the transport of, any unaccompanied alien child into a State unless, at least 30 days before such use, the following preconditions are met:

(1) The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Governor of the affected State, has certified, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction, that the unaccompanied alien children will not have a burdensome economic impact or negative public health impact on the State or affected localities.

(2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security have jointly certified to the Speaker

of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction that the transportation of unaccompanied alien children will not delay their immediate repatriation.

(c) The certification under section (b)(1) shall include—

- (1) the number of unaccompanied alien children involved;
- (2) the proposed localities and facilities involved; and
- (3) the approximate length of stay within the State.

SA 3724. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Before placing an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) with an individual, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide the Secretary of Homeland Security with the following information regarding the individual with whom the child will be placed:

- (1) The name of the individual.
- (2) The social security number of the individual.
- (3) The date of birth of the individual.
- (4) The location of the individual's residence in which the child will be placed.
- (5) The immigration status of the individual, if known.

(6) Contact information for the individual.

(b) If a child who was apprehended on or after June 15, 2012, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, was placed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services with an individual, the Secretary shall provide the information listed in subsection (a) to the Secretary of Homeland Security not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Not later than 30 days after receiving the information listed in subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

- (1) investigate the immigration status of any individual with whom a child is placed whose immigration status is unknown; and
- (2) share the results of such investigation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SA 3725. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Not later than 24 hours before the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Health and Human Services places unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g))) in a facility, or with a sponsor, in a State, the Secretary who has custody of such child shall notify—

(1) the Governor of each State in which the children are placed of the number of such children who are being placed in such State, broken down by age and placement county; and

(2) the chief law enforcement officer of each county in which the children are placed of the number of such children who are being placed in such county, broken down by age.

(b) If an unaccompanied alien child fails to appear at an immigration proceeding that he or she was legally required to attend, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Governor of the State and the chief law enforcement officer of the county in which such child was temporarily placed of such failure to appear.

SA 3726. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of chapter 5 of title I, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (6) through (8), respectively; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014, \$1,000,000,000;

“(3) for fiscal year 2016, \$800,000,000;

“(4) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,000,000,000;”.

SA 3727. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(c) LIMITATION ON ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and during each of the subsequent 10 full fiscal years, none of the funds made available to the Secretary under any law may be used—

(A) to survey land for future acquisition as Federal land; or

(B) to enter into discussions with non-Federal landowners to identify land for acquisition as Federal land.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the use of funds—

(A) to complete land transactions underway on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) to exchange Federal land for non-Federal land; or

(C) to accept donations of non-Federal land as Federal land.

(3) OFFSETTING USE OF FUNDS.—Funds that would otherwise have been used for purchase of non-Federal land by the Forest Service shall be used to carry out the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

SA 3728. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. Kaine) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, the following:

SEC. 557. PRIVILEGE AGAINST DISCLOSURE OF COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN USERS AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SAFE HELPLINE AND USERS AND PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SAFE HELPROOM.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Military Rules of Evidence shall be modified to establish a privilege against the disclosure of communications between users and personnel of the Department of Defense Safe Helpline, and between users and personnel of the Department of Defense Safe Helproom.

SA 3729. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. _____. PROCEDURES FOR PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO STATE VETERANS AGENCIES TO FACILITATE THE TRANSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM MILITARY SERVICE TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) **PROCEDURES REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop procedures to share the information described in subsection (b) on members of the Armed Forces who are separating from the Armed Forces with State veterans agencies in electronic data format as a means of facilitating the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life.

(b) **COVERED INFORMATION.**—The information described in this subsection with respect to a member is as follows:

- (1) Military service and separation data.
- (2) A personal email address.
- (3) A personal telephone number.
- (4) A mailing address.

(c) **CONSENT.**—The procedures required by subsection (a) shall include a requirement for consent of a member before sharing information about the member.

(d) **USE OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the information shared with State veterans agencies in accordance with the procedures required by subsection (a) is only shared by such agencies with county government veterans service offices for such purposes as the Secretary shall specify for the administration and delivery of benefits.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of the Secretary on sharing information with State veterans agencies as described in subsection (a).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the procedures developed under subsection (a).

(B) A description of the activities carried out by the Secretary in accordance with such procedures.

(C) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislative or adminis-

trative action to improve the sharing of information as described in subsection (a).

SA 3730. Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. NATIONAL DESERT STORM AND DESERT SHIELD MEMORIAL.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ASSOCIATION.**—The term “Association” means the National Desert Storm Memorial Association, a corporation that is—

(A) organized under the laws of the State of Arkansas; and

(B)(i) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(ii) exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code.

(2) **MEMORIAL.**—The term “memorial” means the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial authorized to be established under subsection (b).

(b) **AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.**—The Association may establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work, on Federal land in the District of Columbia to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

(c) **COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.**—The establishment of the memorial under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”).

(d) **USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial under this section.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITY OF ASSOCIATION.**—The Association shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial.

(e) **DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.**—If, on payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), or on expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Association shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

SA 3731. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 557. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAMINERS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **PERSONNEL ELIGIBLE FOR ASSIGNMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the individuals who may be assigned to duty as a sexual assault forensic examiner (SAFE) for the Armed Forces shall be members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense or Department of Homeland Security who are as follows:

- (A) Physicians.
- (B) Nurse practitioners.
- (C) Nurse midwives.
- (D) Physician assistants.
- (E) Registered nurses.

(2) **INDEPENDENT DUTY CORPSMEN.**—An independent duty corpsman or equivalent may be assigned to duty as a sexual assault forensic examiner for the Armed Forces if the assignment of an individual specified in paragraph (1) is impracticable.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF EXAMINERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall ensure the availability of an adequate number of sexual assault forensic examiners for the Armed Forces through the following:

(A) Assignment of at least one sexual assault forensic examiner at each military medical treatment facility under the jurisdiction of such Secretary, whether in the United States or overseas.

(B) If assignment as described in subparagraph (A) is infeasible or impracticable, entry into agreements with facilities, whether Governmental or otherwise, with appropriate resources for the provision of sexual assault forensic examinations, for the provision of sexual assault forensic examinations for the Armed Forces.

(2) **NAVAL VESSELS.**—The Secretary concerned shall ensure the availability of an adequate number of sexual assault forensic examiners for naval vessels through the assignment of at least one sexual assault forensic examiner for each naval vessel.

(c) **TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary concerned shall establish and maintain, and update when appropriate, a training and certification program for sexual assault forensic examiners under the jurisdiction of such Secretary. The training and certification programs shall apply uniformly to all sexual assault forensic examiners under the jurisdiction of the Secretaries.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each training and certification program under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) Training in sexual assault forensic examinations by qualified personnel who possess—

(i) a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner—adolescent/adult (SANE-A) certification or equivalent certification; or

(ii) training and clinical or forensic experience in sexual assault forensic examinations similar to that required for a certification described in clause (i).

(B) A minimum of 40 hours of coursework for participants in sexual assault forensic examinations of adults and adolescents.

(C) Ongoing examinations and evaluations on sexual assault forensic examinations.

(D) Clinical mentoring.

(E) Continuing education.

(3) **NATURE OF TRAINING.**—The training provided under each training and certification program under this subsection shall incorporate and reflect current best practices and

standards on sexual assault forensic examinations.

(4) **APPLICABILITY OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.**—An individual may not be assigned to duty as a sexual assault forensic examiner for the Armed Forces after the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the individual has completed all training required under the training and certification program under this subsection at the time of assignment.

(5) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CERTIFICATION.**—It is the sense of Congress that each participant who successfully completes all training required under the certification and training program under this subsection should obtain a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner—adolescent/adult certification or equivalent certification by not later than five years after completion of such training.

(6) **EXAMINERS UNDER AGREEMENTS.**—Any individual providing sexual assault forensic examinations for the Armed Forces under an agreement under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall possess training and experience equivalent to the training and experience required under the training and certification program under this subsection.

(d) **SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

(e) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 1725 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 971) is amended by striking subsection (b) (10 U.S.C. 1561 note).

SA 3732. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1233, to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 33, after the matter following line 7, add the following:

SEC. 11. ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DECLASSIFICATION CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall take appropriate actions to enhance the authority and capacity of the National Declassification Center under Executive Order No. 13526, or any successor Executive order, in order to facilitate, enhance, and advance a government-wide strategy for the declassification of information.

(b) **REQUIRED ACTIONS.**—The actions taken under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A requirement that Federal agencies complete the review of Presidential and Federal records proposed for declassification, in accordance with priorities established by the National Declassification Center, within one year of the start of the declassification process, except that agencies may complete such review within two years of the start of the declassification process upon the written approval of the Director of the National Declassification Center.

(2) A requirement that Federal agencies with authority to classify information share

their declassification guidance with other such Federal agencies and with the National Declassification Center.

SEC. 12. PUBLIC CONSULTATION WITH ADVISORY PANEL TO THE NATIONAL DECLASSIFICATION CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Declassification Center shall provide for consultation between the advisory panel to the National Declassification Center and the public.

(b) **FREQUENCY.**—Consultations under subsection (a) shall occur not less frequently than the frequency of the regular meetings of the advisory panel to the National Declassification Center and, to the extent practicable, shall occur concurrently with the meetings of the advisory panel.

SEC. 13. EXTENSION OF PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Section 710(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 14. PRESERVATION AND ACCESS TO HISTORICALLY VALUABLE RECORDS.

Federal agencies shall take appropriate actions to identify and designate historically valuable records as soon as possible after their creation in order to ensure the preservation and future accessibility of such documents and records.

SA 3733. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 725. PRESCRIPTION DRUG TAKE-BACK PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, THEIR DEPENDENTS, AND VETERANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, prescribe regulations that allow for prescription drug take-back under which members of the Armed Forces and their dependents may deliver controlled substances to military medical treatment facilities, and veterans may deliver controlled substances to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, in accordance with section 302(g) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(g)). The delivery of such substances shall be subject to such requirements as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall specify in the regulations.

SA 3734. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may

be used to place an unaccompanied alien child pursuant to section 235(c) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)) in any setting other than a secure facility.

SA 3735. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “under this section to a taxpayer” and all that follows and inserting “under this section to any taxpayer unless—

“(1) such taxpayer includes the taxpayer’s valid identification number (as defined in section 6428(h)(2)) on the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(2) with respect to any qualifying child, the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on such return of tax.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3736. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE .—EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN

SEC. .01. EQUAL TREATMENT OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(II) in clause (ii), by inserting “not later than 72 hours after the child is screened under paragraph (4) by placing the child on the next available flight to such country, subject to determinations of cost, feasibility and any repatriation agreements with such country” before the period at the end; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), by striking “countries contiguous to the United States” and inserting “countries from which large numbers of unaccompanied alien children are unlawfully entering the United States”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “Within 48 hours of” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 48 hours after”;

(ii) by striking “Nothing in this paragraph” and inserting the following:

“(B) GANG AFFILIATION.—If an immigration officer determines that an unaccompanied alien child is, or has been, affiliated with a criminal street gang (as defined in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code), the child shall be treated in accordance with paragraph (2)(B).

“(C) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this paragraph”; and

(C) in paragraph (5)(D), by striking “from a contiguous country subject to exceptions under subsection (a)(2)” and inserting “described in paragraph (2)(A)”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (2) through (4);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) MANDATORY DETENTION FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—An unaccompanied alien child who is apprehended by U.S. Border Patrol or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall be detained and remain in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security until the child—

“(A) voluntarily departs from the United States in accordance with section 240B of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229c);

“(B) is expeditiously removed from the United States in accordance with—

“(i) an order of removal issued in accordance with section 235(b)(1) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)); or

“(ii) a final order of removal issued at the conclusion of special removal proceedings conducted pursuant to section 240 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a); or

“(C) is legally admitted into the United States as—

“(i) a refugee under section 207 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1157); or

“(ii) an asylee under section 208 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1158).”.

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after section 235A the following:

“SEC. 235B. HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ‘asylum officer’ means an immigration officer who—

“(1) has had professional training in country conditions, asylum law, and interview techniques comparable to that provided to full-time adjudicators of applications under section 208, and

“(2) is supervised by an officer who—

“(A) meets the condition described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications.

“(b) PROCEEDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child under section 235(a)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(4)), an immigration judge shall conduct a proceeding to inspect, screen, and determine the status of an unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission to the United States.

“(2) BIOMETRIC DATA COLLECTION.—The inspection and screening required under paragraph (1) shall include the collection of biometric data from each unaccompanied alien child, including photographs and fingerprints.

“(3) TIME LIMIT.—Not later than 72 hours after the conclusion of a proceeding with respect to an unaccompanied alien child under this section, the immigration judge who conducted such proceeding shall issue an order pursuant to subsection (e).

“(c) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING.—

“(1) AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.—The immigration judge conducting a proceeding under this section—

“(A) shall administer oaths, receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the alien and any witnesses;

“(B) may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and presentation of evidence; and

“(C) is authorized to sanction by civil money penalty any action (or inaction) in contempt of the judge’s proper exercise of authority under this Act.

“(2) FORM OF PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under this section may take place—

“(A) in person;

“(B) at a location agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the alien;

“(C) through video conference; or

“(D) through telephone conference.

“(3) PRESENCE OF ALIEN.—If it is impracticable by reason of an alien’s mental incompetency for the alien to be present at the proceeding, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien.

“(4) RIGHTS OF THE ALIEN.—In a proceeding under this section—

“(A) the alien shall be given the privilege of being represented, at no expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien’s choosing who is authorized to practice in such proceedings;

“(B) the alien shall be given a reasonable opportunity—

“(i) to examine the evidence against the alien;

“(ii) to present evidence on the alien’s own behalf; and

“(iii) to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government;

“(C) the rights set forth in subparagraph (B) shall not entitle the alien—

“(i) to examine such national security information as the Government may proffer in opposition to the alien’s admission to the United States; or

“(ii) to an application by the alien for discretionary relief under this Act; and

“(D) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence produced at the proceeding.

“(5) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION.—In the discretion of the Attorney General, an alien applying for admission to the United States may, and at any time, be permitted to withdraw such application and immediately be returned to the alien’s country of nationality or country of last habitual residence.

“(d) DECISION AND BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(1) DECISION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be—

“(i) admissible to the United States; or

“(ii) eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act.

“(B) EVIDENCE.—The determination of the immigration judge under subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the evidence produced at the hearing.

“(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In a proceeding under this section, an alien who is an applicant for admission has the burden of establishing, by

a preponderance of the evidence, that the alien—

“(i) is likely to be entitled to be lawfully admitted to the United States or eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act; or

“(ii) is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to a prior admission.

“(B) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—In meeting the burden of proof under subparagraph (A)(ii), the alien shall be given access to—

“(i) the alien’s visa or other entry document, if any; and

“(ii) any other records and documents, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to the alien’s admission or presence in the United States.

“(e) ORDERS.—

“(1) PLACEMENT IN FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has met the burden of proof under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien to be placed in further proceedings in accordance with section 240.

“(2) ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has not met the burden of proof required under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien claims—

“(A) an intention to apply for asylum under section 208; or

“(B) a substantiated fear of persecution.

“(3) CLAIMS FOR ASYLUM.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (2) claims an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a substantiated fear of persecution, the officer shall order the alien referred for an interview by an asylum officer under subsection (f).

“(f) ASYLUM INTERVIEWS.—

“(1) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term ‘substantiated fear of persecution’ means, after taking into account the credibility of the statements made by the alien in support of the alien’s claim and such other facts as are known to the officer, there is a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum under section 208.

“(2) CONDUCT BY ASYLUM OFFICER.—An asylum officer shall conduct interviews of aliens referred under subsection (e)(3).

“(3) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—If the officer determines at the time of the interview that an alien has a substantiated fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) during further consideration of the application for asylum.

“(4) REMOVAL WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW IF NO SUBSTANTIATED FEAR OF PERSECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the asylum officer determines that an alien does not have a substantiated fear of persecution, the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review.

“(B) RECORD OF DETERMINATION.—The officer shall prepare a written record of a determination under subparagraph (A), which shall include—

“(i) a summary of the material facts as stated by the applicant;

“(ii) such additional facts (if any) relied upon by the officer;

“(iii) the officer’s analysis of why, in light of such facts, the alien has not established a substantiated fear of persecution; and

“(iv) a copy of the officer’s interview notes.

“(C) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

“(i) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process by which an immigration judge will conduct a prompt review, upon the alien’s request, of a determination under subparagraph (A) that the alien does not have a substantiated fear of persecution.

“(ii) MANDATORY COMPONENTS.—The review described in clause (i)—

“(I) shall include an opportunity for the alien to be heard and questioned by the immigration judge, either in person or by telephonic or video connection; and

“(II) shall be conducted—

“(aa) as expeditiously as possible;

“(bb) within the 24-hour period beginning at the time the asylum officer makes a determination under subparagraph (A), to the maximum extent practicable; and

“(cc) in no case later than 7 days after such determination.

“(D) MANDATORY PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—Any alien subject to the procedures under this paragraph shall be held in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security—

“(i) pending a final determination of substantiated fear of persecution; and

“(ii) after a determination that the alien does not have such a fear, until the alien is removed.

“(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f)(4)(C) and paragraph (2), a removal order entered in accordance with subsection (e)(2) or (f)(4)(A) is not subject to administrative appeal.

“(2) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process for the prompt review of an order under subsection (e)(2) against an alien who claims under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, after having been warned of the penal ties for falsely making such claim under such conditions to have been—

“(A) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(B) admitted as a refugee under section 207; or

“(C) granted asylum under section 208.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 235A the following:

“Sec. 235B. Humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children.”.

SEC. 03. ASYLUM SEEKERS.

(a) REFUGEE DEFINED.—Section 101(a)(42) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of” and inserting “the alien’s life or freedom would be threatened in that country because of the alien’s”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “who is persecuted or who has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of” and inserting “the person’s life or freedom is threatened if the person remains in that country because of the person’s”.

(b) MANDATORY DETENTION.—Section 208(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) DETENTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall detain any alien seeking asylum under this section until the alien—

“(A) is removed from the United States in accordance with—

“(i) an order of removal issued in accordance with section 235(b)(1); or

“(ii) a final order of removal issued at the conclusion of special removal proceedings conducted pursuant to section 240; or

“(B) granted asylum under subsection (b).”.

SEC. 04. EXTENSION OF BAR TO REENTRY.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i)(I), by striking “3 years” and inserting “10 years”.

SEC. 05. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit an annual report to Congress that identifies, for the previous 12-month period—

(1) the number of aliens unlawfully present in the United States who were apprehended by, or placed in the physical custody of, U.S. Border Patrol or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

(2) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who were deported from the United States pursuant to a final order of removal;

(3) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who departed from the United States without an order of removal (voluntary departures); and

(4) the number of aliens who were granted refugee status or asylum.

SA 3737. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 26, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

TITLE VI—VERIFICATION OF STATUS FOR REMITTANCE TRANSFERS

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Remittance Status Verification Act of 2014”.

SEC. 602. STATUS VERIFICATION FOR REMITTANCE TRANSFERS.

Section 919 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (relating to remittance transfers) (12 U.S.C. 1692o–1) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) STATUS VERIFICATION OF SENDER.—

“(1) REQUEST FOR PROOF OF STATUS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each remittance transfer provider shall request from each sender of a remittance transfer, the recipient of which is located in any country other than the United States, proof of the status of that sender under the immigration laws, prior to the initiation of the remittance transfer.

“(B) ACCEPTABLE DOCUMENTATION.—Acceptable documentation of the status of the sender under this paragraph—

“(i) shall be, in any State that requires proof of legal residence—

“(I) a State-issued driver’s license or Federal passport; or

“(II) the same documentation as required—

“(aa) by the State for proof of identity for the issuance of a driver’s license;

“(bb) by the Department of State for a citizen to obtain a Federal passport; or

“(cc) for a citizen of a foreign country to enter the United States and obtain the rel-

evant and necessary visa issued by the Department of State for any foreign citizen who—

“(AA) is a nonimmigrant; or

“(BB) has entered the United States temporarily for business (visa category B-1), tourism, pleasure, or visiting (visa category B-2), or a combination of both purposes (B-1/B-2);

“(ii) shall be, in any State that does not require proof of legal residence, such documentation as the Bureau shall require, by rule; and

“(iii) does not include any matricula consular card.

“(2) FINE FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Each remittance transfer provider shall impose on any sender who is unable to provide the proof of status requested under paragraph (1) at the time of transfer, a fine equal to 7 percent of the United States dollar amount to be transferred (excluding any fees or other charges imposed by the remittance transfer provider).

“(3) SUBMISSION OF FINES TO BUREAU.—All fines imposed and collected by a remittance transfer provider under paragraph (2) shall be submitted to the Bureau, in such form and in such manner as the Bureau shall establish, by rule.

“(4) ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS.—The Bureau shall use fines submitted under paragraph (3) to pay the administrative and enforcement costs to the Bureau in carrying out this subsection.

“(5) USE OF FINES FOR BORDER PROTECTION.—Amounts from the collection of fines under this subsection that remain available after the payment of expenses described in paragraph (4), shall be transferred by the Bureau to the Treasury, to be used to pay expenses relating to United States Customs and Border Protection for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology.

“(6) DEFINITION RELATING TO IMMIGRATION STATUS.—In this subsection, the term ‘immigration laws’ has the same meaning as in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).”.

SEC. 603. STUDY AND REPORT REGARDING REMITTANCE TRANSFER PROCESSING FINES AND IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the effects of the enactment of section 919(g) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, as amended by this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1) that includes—

(1) an analysis of the costs and benefits of complying with section 919(g) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, as amended by this Act; and

(2) recommendations about whether the fines imposed under that section 919(g) should be extended or increased.

SA 3738. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, after line 22, add the following:

CHAPTER 6—BORDER SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS

SEC. 1601. MEASURES USED TO EVALUATE BORDER SECURITY.

(a) BORDER SECURITY REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an annual comprehensive review of the following:

(A) The security conditions in each of the following 9 Border Patrol sectors along the Southwest border:

- (i) The Rio Grande Valley Sector.
- (ii) The Laredo Sector.
- (iii) The Del Rio Sector.
- (iv) The Big Bend Sector.
- (v) The El Paso Sector.
- (vi) The Tucson Sector.
- (vii) The Yuma Sector.
- (viii) The El Centro Sector.
- (ix) The San Diego Sector.

(B) Update on the new and existing double layered fencing built and in place, broken down on an annual basis since the date of the enactment of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-367), with the goal of completing the fence not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) Progress towards the completion of an effective exit and entry program at all points of entry that tracks visa holders.

(D) Progress towards the goal of a 95 percent apprehension or turn back rate.

(E) A 100 percent incarceration until trial rate for newly captured illegal entrants and overstays.

(F) Progress towards the goal ending of illegal immigration, as measured by census data and the Department.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress containing specific results of the review conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed as prohibiting the Secretary from proposing—

(i) alterations to boundaries of the Border Patrol sectors; or

(ii) a different number of sectors to be operated on the Southern border.

(B) REPORTING.—The Secretary may not make any alteration to the Border Patrol sectors in operation or the boundaries of such sectors as of the date of the enactment of this Act unless the Secretary submits, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, a written notification and description of the proposed change not later than 120 days before any such change would take effect.

(b) UNQUALIFIED OPINION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that contains—

(A) an unqualified opinion of whether each of the sectors referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) has achieved “total operational control” of the border within its jurisdiction; and

(B) the following criteria and goals of the Department:

(i) Transparent data relating to the success of border security and immigration enforcement policies.

(ii) Improved accountability to the people of the United States.

(iii) 100 percent surveillance capability on the border not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(iv) An apprehension or turn back rate of more than 95 percent not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(v) Increasing annual targets for apprehensions, which shall be adapted to the unique conditions of each Border Patrol sector.

(vi) Uniformity in data collection and analysis for each Border Patrol sector.

(vii) An update on the new and existing double layered fencing built and in place, broken down on an annual basis since the date of the enactment of the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

(2) TOTAL OPERATIONAL CONTROL DEFINED.—In this chapter, the term “total operational control”, with respect to a border sector, occurs if—

(A) the fence construction requirements required under this chapter have been completed;

(B) the infrastructure enhancements required under this chapter have been completed and deployed;

(C) there has been verifiable increases in personnel dedicated to patrols, inspections, and interdiction;

(D) U.S. Customs and Border Protection has achieved 100 percent surveillance capacity throughout the entire sector;

(E) U.S. Customs and Border Protection has achieved an apprehension rate of at least 95 percent for all attempted unauthorized crossings;

(F) uniform data collection standards have been adopted across all sectors; and

(G) U.S. Customs and Border Protection is tracking the exits of 100 percent of the visitors to the United States visitors through land points of entry.

(3) METRICS DESCRIBED.—The Secretary shall use specific metrics to assess the progress toward, and maintenance of, total operational control of the border in each Border Patrol sector, including—

(A) with respect to resources and infrastructure—

(i) a description of the infrastructure and resources deployed on the Southwest border, including physical barriers and fencing, surveillance cameras, motion and other ground sensors, aerial platforms, and unmanned aerial vehicles;

(ii) an assessment of the Border Patrol’s ability to perform uninterrupted surveillance on the entirety of the border within each sector;

(iii) an assessment of whether the Department of Homeland Security has attained a 100 percent surveillance capability for each sector; and

(iv) a specific analysis detailing the miles of fence built, including double-layered fencing, pursuant to the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-367), as amended by this chapter.

(B) with respect to illegal entries between ports—

(i) the number of attempted illegal entries, categorized by—

(I) number of apprehensions;

(II) people turned back to country of origin (turn-backs); and

(III) individuals who have escaped (got away);

(ii) the number of apprehensions, including data on unique apprehensions to capture individuals who attempted to enter multiple times;

(iii) the apprehension rate as a percentage of total attempted illegal entries;

(iv) an estimate of the number of successful illegal entries, based on reliable supporting evidence;

(v) the prevalence of drug and contraband smuggling, categorized by—

(I) the frequency of attempted crossings;

(II) successful evasions of law enforcement;

(III) the value of smuggled contraband;

(IV) successful discoveries and arrests; and

(V) arrest rate trends related to violent criminals crossing the border;

(vi) physical evidence of crossings not otherwise tied to a pursuit, including fence-cuttings; and

(vii) transparent data that reports if the numbers include actual physical capture or turn-backs witnessed by border control and a segregation of data that includes evidence of individuals going back, including but not limited to footprints, food and torn clothing;

(C) with respect to illegal entries at ports—

(i) the number of attempted illegal entries, categorized by the number of apprehensions, turn-backs, and got aways;

(ii) the number of apprehensions, including data on unique apprehensions to capture individuals who attempt to enter multiple times;

(iii) the apprehension rate as a percentage of total attempted illegal entries;

(iv) an estimate of the number of successful illegal entries, based on reliable supporting evidence; and

(v) the prevalence of drug and contraband smuggling, categorized by—

(I) the frequency of attempted entries;

(II) successful discovery methods;

(III) the use of falsified official travel documents;

(IV) evolving evasion tactics; and

(V) arrest rate trends related to persons apprehended attempting to smuggle prohibited items;

(D) with respect to repeat offenders, data and analysis of recidivism trends, including the prevalence of multiple arrests and repeated attempts to enter illegally;

(E) with respect to smuggling—

(i) updated information on U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Consequence Delivery System;

(ii) progress made in creating uniformity in the punishment of unlawful border crossers relative to their crimes for the purposes of deterring smuggling;

(iii) the percentage of unlawful immigrants and smugglers who are subject to a uniform punishment; and

(iv) data breaking down the treatment of, and consequences for, repeat offenders to determine the extent to which the Consequence Delivery System serves as an effective deterrent;

(F) with respect to visa overstays, data for each year, categorized by the type of visa issued to the alien;

(G) with respect to the unlawful presence of aliens—

(i) the total number of individuals present in the United States, which will be correlated in future years with normalization participants;

(ii) net migration into the United States, including legal and illegal immigrants;

(iii) deportation data, categorized by country and the nature of apprehension;

(iv) individuals who have obtained or who seek legal status; and

(v) individuals without legal status who have died while in the United States;

(H) the number of Department agents deployed to the border each year, categorized by staffing assignment and security function;

(I) progress made on the implementation of a full exit tracking capabilities for land, sea, and air points of entry;

(J) progress towards the goal of 100 percent incarceration until trial rate for newly captured illegal entrants and overstays; and

(K) progress towards the goal ending of illegal immigration, as measured by data collected by the United States Census Bureau and the Department.

SEC. 1602. REPORTS ON BORDER SECURITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2014, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that contains a comprehensive review of the security conditions in each of the Border Patrol sectors along the Southwest border.

(2) PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR REPORT.—Congress shall hold public hearings with the Secretary and other individuals responsible for preparing the report submitted under paragraph (1) to discuss the report and educate the United States public on border security from the perspective of such officials. Congress shall allow differing views on the conclusions of the report to be expressed by outside groups and interested parties for purposes of analyzing data through a transparent and deliberative committee process.

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of each report under subsection (a), the Inspector General of the Department shall submit a report to Congress that provides an independent analysis of the report submitted under subsection (a)(1) to analyze—

(A) the accuracy of the report; and

(B) the validity of the data used by the Department to issue the report.

(2) PARTICIPATION.—The Inspector General should participate in any hearings relating to the assessment of the border security report of the Department.

(c) GOVERNORS REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Governor of each of the States along the Southern border may submit an independent report to Congress that provides the perspective of the Governor and other officials of such State tasked to law enforcement on the security conditions along that State's border with Mexico.

(2) PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR STATE REPORTS.—Congress shall hold public hearings with the Governor and other officials from each State that submits a report under paragraph (1) to discuss the report and educate the United States public on border security from the perspective of such officials.

(d) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF REPORTS.—Upon the receipt of a report submitted under this section, the Senate and the House of Representatives shall—

(1) provide copies of the report to the Chair and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of such House, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate; and

(2) make the report available to the public.

SEC. 1603. REQUIREMENT FOR PHYSICAL BORDER FENCE CONSTRUCTION.

(a) CONSTRUCTION OF BORDER FENCING.—Using funds made available to the Secretary under this Act, and except as provided under subsection (d), the Secretary shall construct not fewer than 140 miles of double-layer fencing on the Southern border during each 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Except as provided in subsection (d), not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annu-

ally thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a written certification that construction of not fewer than 140 miles of double-layer fencing has been completed in the preceding year to—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(c) DETERMINATION OF MILES OF FENCING CONSTRUCTED.—

(1) INCLUDED ITEMS.—In determining the number of fencing miles constructed in the preceding year, the Secretary may apply, toward the requirement under subsection (a), the number of miles of—

(A) new double-layer fencing that have been completed; and

(B) a second fencing layer that has been added to an existing, single-layered fence.

(2) EXCLUDED ITEMS.—In determining the number of fencing miles constructed in the preceding year, the Secretary may not apply, toward the requirement in subsection (a)—

(A) vehicle barriers;

(B) ground sensors;

(C) motion detectors;

(D) radar-based surveillance;

(E) thermal imaging;

(F) aerial surveillance platforms;

(G) observation towers;

(H) motorized or nonmotorized ground patrols;

(I) existing single-layer fencing; or

(J) new construction of single-layer fencing.

(d) SUNSET.—The Secretary shall no longer be required to comply with the requirements under subsection (a) and (b) on the earliest of—

(1) the date on which the Secretary submits the 5th affirmative certification pursuant to subsection (b); or

(2) the date on which the Secretary certifies the completion of not fewer than 700 miles of double-layer fencing on the Southern border.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(b)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note) is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

SEC. 1604. ONE HUNDRED PERCENT EXIT TRACKING FOR ALL UNITED STATES VISITORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, the United States will continue its progress toward full biometric entry-exit capture capability at land, air, and sea points of entry.

(2) No capability exists to fully track whether non-United States persons in the United States on a temporary basis have exited the country consistent with the terms of their visa, whether by land, sea, or air.

(3) No program exists along the Southwest border to track land exits from the United States into Mexico.

(4) Without the ability to capture the full cycle of a visitor's trip to and from the United States, it is possible for persons to remain in the United States unlawfully for years without detection by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(5) Because there is no exit tracking capability, there is insufficient data for an official assessment of the number of persons

who have overstayed a visa and that remain in the United States. Studies have estimated that as many as 40 percent of all persons in the United States without lawful immigration status entered the country legally and did not return to their country of origin or follow the terms of their entry.

(6) Despite a legal mandate to track visitor exits, more than a decade without any significant capability to do so has—

(A) degraded the Federal Government's ability to enforce immigration laws;

(B) placed a greater strain on law enforcement resources; and

(C) undermined the legal immigration process in the United States.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR OUTBOUND TRAVEL DOCUMENT CAPTURE AT LAND POINTS OF ENTRY.—

(1) OUTBOUND TRAVEL DOCUMENT CAPTURE AT FOOT CROSSINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a mandatory exit data system for all outbound lanes at each land point of entry along the Southern border that is only accessible to individuals on foot or by nonmotorized means.

(B) DATA COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS.—The system established under subparagraph (A) shall require the collection of data from machine-readable visas, passports, and other travel and entry documents for all categories of aliens who are exiting the United States through an outbound lane described in subparagraph (A).

(2) OUTBOUND TRAVEL DOCUMENT CAPTURE AT ALL OTHER LAND POINTS OF ENTRY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a mandatory exit data system at all outbound lanes not subject to paragraph (1) at each land point of entry along the Southern border.

(B) DATA COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS.—The system established under subparagraph (A) shall require the collection of data from machine-readable visas, passports, and other travel and entry documents for all categories of aliens who are exiting the United States through an outbound lane described in subparagraph (A).

(3) INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR COLLECTION.—While collecting information under paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary shall collect identity-theft resistant departure information from the machine-readable visas, passports, and other travel and entry documents.

(4) RECORDING OF EXITS AND CORRELATION TO ENTRY DATA.—The Secretary shall integrate the records collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) into any database necessary to correlate an alien's entry and exit data.

(5) PROCESSING OF RECORDS.—Before the departure of outbound aliens at each point of entry, the Secretary shall provide for cross-reference capability between databases designated by the Secretary under paragraph (4) to determine and record whether an outbound alien has been in the United States without lawful immigration status.

(6) RECORDS INCLUSION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall maintain readily accessible entry-exit data records for immigration and other law enforcement and improve immigration control and enforcement by including information necessary to determine whether an outbound alien without lawful presence in the United States entered the country through—

(A) unauthorized entry between points of entry;

(B) visa or other temporary authorized status;

- (C) fraudulent travel documents;
- (D) misrepresentation of identity; or
- (E) any other method of entry.

(7) PROHIBITION ON COLLECTING EXIT RECORDS FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS.—

(A) **PROHIBITION.**—While documenting the departure of outbound individuals at each point of entry along the Southern border, the Secretary may not—

- (i) process travel documents of United States citizens;
- (ii) log, store, or transfer exit data for United States citizens;
- (iii) create, maintain, operate, access, or support any database containing information collected through outbound processing at a point of entry under paragraph (1) or (2) that contains records identifiable to an individual United States citizen.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition set forth in subparagraph (A) does not apply to the records of an individual if an officer processing travel documentation in the outbound lanes at a point of entry along the Southern border—

- (i) has a strong suspicion that the individual has engaged in criminal or other prohibited activities; or
- (ii) needs to verify an individual's identity because the individual is attempting to exit the United States without approved travel documentation.

(C) **VERIFICATION OF TRAVEL DOCUMENTS.**—Subject to the prohibition set forth in subparagraph (A), the Secretary may provide for the confirmation of a United States citizen's approved travel documentation validity in the outbound lanes at a point of entry along the Southern border.

(C) INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AT LAND POINTS OF ENTRY.—

(1) **FACILITATION OF LAND EXIT TRACKING.**—The Secretary may improve the infrastructure at, or adjacent to, land points of entry, as necessary, to implement the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by—

- (A) expanding or reconfiguring outbound road or bridge lanes within a point of entry;
- (B) improving or reconfiguring public roads or other transportation infrastructure leading into, or adjacent to, the outbound lanes at a point of entry if—

(i) there has been a demonstrated negative impact on transportation in the area adjacent to a point of entry as a result of projects carried out under this section; or

(ii) the Secretary, in consultation with State, local, or tribal officials responsible for transportation adjacent to a point of entry, has submitted a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that projects proposed under this section will have a significant negative impact on transportation adjacent to a point of entry without such transportation infrastructure improvements; and

(iii) the total of funds obligated in any year to meet the requirements of subsection (b)(1)(B) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total funds obligated to meet the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) in the same year;

(C) where possible, construction of, expansion of, or improvement of access to secondary inspection areas;

(D) physical structures to accommodate inspections and processing travel documents described in subsection (b)(3) for outbound aliens, including booths or kiosks at exit lanes;

(E) transfer, installation, use, and maintenance of computers, software or other net-

work infrastructure to facilitate capture and processing of travel documents described in subsection (b)(3) for all outbound aliens; and

(F) performance of outbound inspections outside of secondary inspection areas at a point of entry to detect suspicious activity or contraband.

(2) **REPORT ON INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO CARRY OUT 100 PERCENT LAND EXIT TRACKING.**—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, a report that assesses the infrastructure needs for each point of entry along the Southern border to fulfill the requirements under subsection (b), including—

- (A) a description of anticipated infrastructure needs within each point of entry;
- (B) a description of anticipated infrastructure needs adjacent to each point of entry;
- (C) an assessment of the availability of secondary inspection areas at each point of entry;
- (D) an assessment of space available at or adjacent to a point of entry to perform processing of outbound aliens; and
- (E) an assessment of the infrastructure demands relative to the volume of outbound crossings for each point of entry.

(d) PROCEDURES FOR EXIT PROCESSING AND INSPECTION.—

(1) **INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO OUTBOUND SECONDARY INSPECTION.**—Officers performing outbound inspection or processing travel documents may send an outbound individual to a secondary inspection area for further inspection and processing if the individual is—

- (A) determined or suspected to have been in the United States without lawful status during processing under subsection (b) or at another point during the exit process;
- (B) found to be subject to an outstanding arrest warrant;
- (C) suspected of engaging in prohibited activities at the point of entry;
- (D) traveling without approved travel documentation; or
- (E) subject to any random outbound inspection procedures, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **LIMITATIONS ON OUTBOUND SECONDARY INSPECTIONS.**—The Secretary may not designate an outbound United States citizen for secondary inspection or collect biometric information from a United States citizen under outbound inspection procedures unless criminal or other prohibited activity has been detected or is strongly suspected.

(3) OUTBOUND PROCESSING OF PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT LAWFUL PRESENCE.—

(A) **PROCESS FOR RECORDING UNLAWFUL PRESENCE.**—If the Secretary determines, at a point of entry along the Southern border, that an outbound alien has been in the United States without lawful presence, the Secretary shall—

- (i) collect and record biometric data from the individual;
- (ii) combine data related to the individual's unlawful presence with any other information related to the individual in the interoperable database, in accordance with paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b); and
- (iii) except as provided in clause (ii), permit the individual to exit the United States.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—An individual shall not be permitted to leave the United States if, during outbound inspection, the Secretary detects previous unresolved criminal activity by the individual.

SEC. 1605. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this chapter, or in the amendments made by this chapter, may be construed as replacing or repealing the requirements for biometric entry-exit capture required under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208).

SA 3739. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 1503. ENSURING THAT REFUGEES, ASYLEES, AND OTHER ALIENS ARE NOT DEPENDENT ON WELFARE.

(a) **INELIGIBLE PERSON DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “ineligible person” means a noncitizen who—

(1) is in the custody of the Federal Government on the basis of a violation of immigration law;

(2) is subject to a removal order; or

(3) is not otherwise eligible for permanent residency in the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(b) **NO ACCESS TO WELFARE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an ineligible person is not eligible for any of the following:

(1) Any assistance or benefits provided under a State program funded under the temporary assistance for needy families program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(2) Any medical assistance provided under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or under a waiver of such plan, other than emergency medical assistance provided under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1903(v), and any child health assistance provided under a State child health plan under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.) or under a waiver of such plan.

(3) Any benefits or assistance provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(4) Supplemental security income benefits provided under title XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1381).

(5) Federal Pell Grants under section 401 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a).

(6) Housing vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f).

(7) Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).

(8) Health insurance benefits for the aged and disabled under the medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(9) Assistance or benefits provided under the program of block grants to States for social services under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

(c) **NO WELFARE FOR REFUGEES OR ASYLEES AFTER 1 YEAR OF DATE OF ADMISSION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien admitted to the United States as a refugee under section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157) or granted asylum under section 208 of such Act (8

U.S.C. 1158) shall not be eligible for any assistance or benefits described in paragraphs (1) through (8) of subsection (b), and shall not be allowed the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the alien is so admitted or granted asylum.

(d) **NO CITIZENSHIP FOR ALIENS WHO APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE WELFARE.**—Any alien, refugee, asylee, nonimmigrant admitted to the United States under a permanent or temporary visa, or ineligible person who is prohibited under this section or any other provision of law from applying for, or receiving, assistance or benefits described in subsection (b) or from claiming the earned income tax credit allowed under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any other credit allowed under subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code, and who applies for and receives any such assistance or benefits, or who claims and is allowed any such credit, shall be permanently prohibited from becoming naturalized as a citizen of the United States.

(e) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **STATE DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Each State shall implement the verification procedures listed in paragraph (5) to prevent noncitizens from receiving the assistance or benefits described in subsection (b) and from being allowed the earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. To the extent that the State is not responsible for the administration of such assistance, benefits, or tax credit, the procedures implemented by the State shall be designed to assist the head of the Federal agency responsible for administering such assistance, benefits, or tax credit in ensuring that noncitizens do not receive the assistance, benefits, or tax credit.

(3) **PENALTY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to a State, each head of the Federal agency responsible for administering a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in paragraph (4) shall reduce the annual amount of federal financial payments that would otherwise be made to the State under the program by 10 percent, beginning with the payments for fiscal year 2015.

(B) The reduction under subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to any fiscal year that begins after the date on which the State certifies to the Secretary of the Homeland Security that the State has complied with paragraph (2).

(4) **FEDERAL MEANS-TESTED BENEFIT PROGRAMS.**—The Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The temporary assistance for needy families program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(B) The Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(C) The State children’s health insurance program under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(D) The supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(E) The program of block grants to States for social services under subtitle A of title

XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

(5) **VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.**—The verification procedures listed in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Requiring proof of citizenship as a condition for receipt of assistance or benefits under the Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in paragraph (4).

(B) Verifying the proof of citizenship provided as a condition for receipt of assistance or benefits under the Federal means-tested benefit programs listed in paragraph (4), including by using the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements Program of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to confirm that an individual who has presented proof of citizenship as a condition for receipt of assistance or benefits under a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in paragraph (4) is not an alien.

(C) Requiring officers and employees of State agencies that administer a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in paragraph (4) to report to the Secretary of Homeland Security any suspicious or fraudulent identity information provided by an individual applying for assistance or benefits.

(6) **MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.**—

(A) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF THE PRIVACY ACT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Privacy Act”) may not be construed as prohibiting an officer or employee of a State from verifying a claim of citizenship for purposes of eligibility for assistance or benefits under a Federal means-tested benefit program listed in paragraph (4).

(B) **INCLUSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN SAVE.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall certify that the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements Program of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services has the ability to establish verifiable ineligibility for any Federal means-tested benefit program listed in paragraph (4) for any ineligible person.

SA 3740. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1247. EXTENSION OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE MILITARY POWER OF IRAN.

Section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2544) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

SA 3741. Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. OBSERVANCE OF VETERANS DAY.

(a) **TWO MINUTES OF SILENCE.**—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 145. Veterans Day

“The President shall issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe two minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation, beginning at—

“(1) 3:11 p.m. Atlantic standard time;

“(2) 2:11 p.m. eastern standard time;

“(3) 1:11 p.m. central standard time;

“(4) 12:11 p.m. mountain standard time;

“(5) 11:11 a.m. Pacific standard time;

“(6) 10:11 a.m. Alaska standard time; and

“(7) 9:11 a.m. Hawaii-Aleutian standard time.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“145. Veterans Day.”.

SA 3742. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, after line 22, add the following:

CHAPTER 6—PREVENTION OF ORGANIZED SMUGGLING

SEC. 1601. SHORT TITLE.

This chapter may be cited as the “Children Returning on an Expedited and Safe Timeline Act” or the “CREST Act”.

SEC. 1602. DEFINED TERM.

For purposes of this chapter, the term “unaccompanied alien child” means an alien who—

(1) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

(2) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(3) attempts to enter or has entered the United States unaccompanied by a parent or legal guardian.

SEC. 1603. REDUCING THE NUMBER OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN FROM EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, AND HONDURAS.

(a) **RESTRICTIONS ON FOREIGN AID TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.**—

(1) **INITIAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Government shall not provide any non-security assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras until the President certifies that the government of El Salvador, of Guatemala, or of Honduras, respectively is—

(A) actively working to reduce the number of unaccompanied alien children from such country who are attempting to migrate northward in order to illegally enter the United States; and

(B) cooperating with the Government of the United States to facilitate the repatriation of unaccompanied alien children who are removed from the United States and returned to their country of origin.

(2) **SUBSEQUENT CERTIFICATIONS.**—The restriction under paragraph (1) shall take effect beginning on the date that is 1 year

after the President issued the latest certification in accordance with paragraph (1) unless the President recertifies that the governments referred to in paragraph (1) are meeting the requirements set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such paragraph.

(b) IN-COUNTRY REFUGEE PROCESSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 101(a)(42)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)(B)), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall carry out in-country processing of refugee applications in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out paragraph (1).

SEC. 1604. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF REFUGEE ADMISSIONS FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, in determining the number of refugees who may be admitted under section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(a)) for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, shall authorize the admission, in each such fiscal year, of—

- (1) up to 5,000 refugees from El Salvador;
- (2) up to 5,000 refugees from Guatemala; and
- (3) up to 5,000 refugees from Honduras.

SEC. 1605. PREVENTING ORGANIZED SMUGGLING.

(a) UNLAWFULLY HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, OR CUSTOMS CONTROLS.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls

“(a) ILLICIT SPOTTING.—Any person who knowingly transmits to another person the location, movement, or activities of any Federal, State, or tribal law enforcement agency with the intent to further a Federal crime relating to United States immigration, customs, controlled substances, agriculture, monetary instruments, or other border controls shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) DESTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES BORDER CONTROLS.—Any person who knowingly and without lawful authorization destroys, alters, or damages any fence, barrier, sensor, camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the border or a port of entry, or otherwise seeks to construct, excavate, or make any structure intended to defeat, circumvent or evade any such fence, barrier, sensor camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the border or a port of entry—

“(1) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both; and

“(2) if, at the time of the offense, the person uses or carries a firearm or, in furtherance of any such crime, possesses a firearm, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) or (b) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 555 the following:

“556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls.”.

(2) PENALTY FOR CARRYING OR USE OF A FIREARM DURING AND IN RELATION TO AN ALIEN SMUGGLING CRIME.—Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence” each place such term appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘alien smuggling crime’ means any felony punishable under section 274(a), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a), 1327, and 1328).”.

(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Section 3298 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “or under” and inserting “, under section 2 or subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 556, or under”.

(b) ORGANIZED HUMAN SMUGGLING.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1598. Organized human smuggling

“(a) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—It shall be unlawful for any person, while acting for profit or other financial gain, to knowingly direct or participate in an effort or scheme to assist or cause 5 or more persons—

“(1) to enter, attempt to enter, or prepare to enter the United States—

“(A) by fraud, falsehood, or other corrupt means;

“(B) at any place other than a port or place of entry designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security; or

“(C) in a manner not prescribed by the immigration laws and regulations of the United States;

“(2) to travel by air, land, or sea toward the United States (whether directly or indirectly)—

“(A) knowing that the persons seek to enter or attempt to enter the United States without lawful authority; and

“(B) with the intent to aid or further such entry or attempted entry; or

“(3) to be transported or moved outside of the United States—

“(A) knowing that such persons are aliens in unlawful transit from 1 country to another or on the high seas; and

“(B) under circumstances in which the persons are seeking to enter the United States without official permission or legal authority.

“(b) CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.

“(c) BASE PENALTY.—Except as provided in subsection (d), any person who violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

“(d) ENHANCED PENALTIES.—Any person who violates subsection (a) or (b)—

“(1) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which a serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365) occurs to any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(2) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which the life of any person is placed in jeopardy, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(3) in the case of a violation involving 10 or more persons, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(4) in the case of a violation involving the bribery or corruption of a United States or foreign government official, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(5) in the case of a violation involving robbery or extortion (as such terms are defined in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of section 1951(b)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(6) in the case of a violation during and in relation to which any person is subjected to an involuntary sexual act (as defined in section 2246(2)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not fewer than 5 years and not more than 30 years, or both;

“(7) in the case of a violation resulting in the death of any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not fewer than 5 years and up to life, or both;

“(8) in the case of a violation in which any alien is confined or restrained, including by the taking of clothing, goods, or personal identification documents, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not fewer than 5 years and not more than 10 years, or both; and

“(9) in the case of smuggling an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EFFORT OR SCHEME.—The term ‘effort or scheme to assist or cause 5 or more persons’ does not require that the 5 or more persons enter, attempt to enter, prepare to enter, or travel at the same time if such acts are completed during a 1-year period.

“(2) LAWFUL AUTHORITY.—The term ‘lawful authority’—

“(A) means permission, authorization, or license that is expressly provided for under the immigration laws of the United States; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) any authority described in subparagraph (A) that was secured by fraud or otherwise unlawfully obtained; or

“(ii) any authority that was sought, but not approved.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1597 the following:

“1598. Organized human smuggling.”.

(c) STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN SMUGGLING.—

(1) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term “high traffic areas of human smuggling” means the United States ports of entry and areas between such ports that have the most human smuggling activity, as measured by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement a strategy to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(3) COMPONENTS.—The strategy referred to in paragraph (2) shall include—

(A) efforts to increase coordination between the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) an identification of intelligence gaps impeding the ability to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States;

(C) efforts to increase information sharing with State and local governments and other Federal agencies;

(D) efforts to provide, in coordination with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, training for the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States; and

(E) the identification of the high traffic areas of human smuggling along the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(4) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report that describes the strategy to be implemented under paragraph (2), including the components listed in paragraph (3), to—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(B) FORM.—The Secretary may submit the report required under subparagraph (A) in classified form if the Secretary determines that such form is appropriate.

(5) ANNUAL LIST OF HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS.—Not later than February 1st of the first year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a list of the high traffic areas of human smuggling referred to in paragraph (3)(A) to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1606. EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 235(a)(2) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES”; and

(B) by striking “countries contiguous to the United States” and inserting “Canada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any unaccompanied alien child who was apprehended on or after October 1, 2013.

SEC. 1607. EXPEDITED REMOVAL AUTHORITY FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a)(5)(D) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reau-

thorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(5)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “EXPEDITED REMOVAL FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by inserting “described in paragraph (2)(A) who is” after “Any unaccompanied alien child”; and

(B) by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to exceptions under subsection (a)(2),”; and

(3) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) placed in a proceeding in accordance with section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225).”.

SEC. 1608. MANDATORY SAFE FEDERAL CUSTODY.

Section 235(c) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “shall be promptly placed in the least restrictive setting that is in the best interest of the child. In making such placements, the Secretary may consider danger to self, danger to the community, and risk of flight. Placement of child trafficking victims may include placement in an Unaccompanied Refugee Minor program pursuant to section 412(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(d)), if a suitable family member is not available to provide care.” and inserting “may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated or has been adjudicated to be admissible or subject to an exception to removal.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that an unaccompanied alien child is a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons, a special needs child with a disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)), a child who has been a victim of physical or sexual abuse under circumstances that indicate that the child’s health or welfare has been significantly harmed or threatened, or a child with mental health needs that require ongoing assistance from a social welfare agency, the child may be placed with a biological parent if—

“(I) the parent can prove that he or she is lawfully residing in the United States;

“(II) the parent has submitted to a mandatory biometric criminal history check; and

“(III) the Secretary completes a safety and suitability study of the parent’s household.

“(ii) MONITORING.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in clause (i) is between 15 and 18 years of age and the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that such child is not a danger to self, a danger to the community, or a risk of flight, the child shall—

“(I) enroll in the alternative to detention program of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(II) continuously wear an electronic ankle monitor while his or her immigration case is pending.

“(iii) EFFECT OF VIOLATION OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall remove an unaccompanied alien minor

from a parent who has violated the terms of the agreement specifying the conditions under which the unaccompanied alien child was placed in his or her custody.

“(iv) FAILURE TO APPEAR.—

“(I) CIVIL PENALTY.—If an unaccompanied alien child is placed with a parent and fails to appear in a mandatory court appearance, the parent shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$250 per day, up to a maximum of \$5,000.

“(II) BURDEN OF PROOF.—The parent is not subject to the penalty imposed under subsection (I) if the parent—

“(aa) proves to the immigration court that the failure to appear by the unaccompanied alien child was not the fault of the parent; and

“(bb) supplies the immigration court with documentary evidence that supports such assertion.

“(v) UNACCOMPANIED REFUGEE MINORS PROGRAM.—An unaccompanied alien child described in clause (i) who is a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons may be placed in the Unaccompanied Refugee Minors Program authorized under section 412(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1522(d)) if a parent is not available to provide care for the child in accordance with this subparagraph.

“(C) INFORMATION SHARING.—In verifying the legal presence of parents under subparagraph (B)(i)(I), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide information on those determined to be unlawfully present in the United States to the Secretary of Homeland Security.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “individual” and inserting “parent”.

SEC. 1609. TRAINING.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that U.S. Border Patrol agents receive appropriate training in immigration laws relating to screening, identifying, and addressing vulnerable populations, such as children, victims of crime and human trafficking, and individuals fleeing persecution or torture.

SEC. 1610. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PERSONNEL; NATIONAL JUVENILE DOCKET.

(a) GOAL.—It shall be the goal of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review to use the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (f) to bring a resolution to immigration cases, from the issuance of a notice to appear through the exhaustion of appeals, within 30 days.

(b) EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGES.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 100 temporary immigration judges, with renewable 6-month terms, including through the hiring of retired immigration judges, magistrate judges, administrative law judges, or other qualified attorneys using the same criteria as applied to the hiring of permanent immigration judges.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that sufficient immigration judge resources are dedicated to the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(c) IMMIGRATION LITIGATION ATTORNEYS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall hire 150 new immigration litigation attorneys in the Field Legal Operations of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with particular focus on the Office of Chief Counsel attorneys in the areas of need.

(d) ASYLUM OFFICERS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall hire 100 new asylum

officers to be placed in the Refugee, Asylum, and International Operations Directorate of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

(e) JUVENILE DOCKET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall establish a separate juvenile docket in every immigration court in the United States to facilitate the processing of immigration cases involving unaccompanied alien children.

(2) EXEMPTION.—The Director may exempt an immigration court from the requirement under paragraph (1) upon its application for exemption based on its juvenile caseload. The Director shall make a determination under this paragraph after reviewing the court's latest 2 quarters of juvenile cases. An exemption may be awarded if the Director determines that a juvenile docket is not warranted.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 1611. REPORTING AND MONITORING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to each State in which unaccompanied children were discharged to parents or placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services that provides the number of children placed in the State since Oct. 1, 2013, broken down by location and age.

(2) MONTHLY DISCHARGE REPORTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a monthly report to each State in which unaccompanied alien children, during the reporting period—

(A) were discharged to their parents; or

(B) were placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(3) CONTENTS.—The reports required under paragraph (2) shall identify the number of children placed in the State during the reporting period, broken down by—

(A) location; and

(B) age.

(b) MONITORING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) require all parents to agree—

(A) to notify and receive approval from the Department of Health and Human Services prior to an unaccompanied alien child placed in their custody changing addresses from that in which he or she was originally placed; and

(B) to provide a current address for the child and the reason for the change of address;

(2) provide regular and frequent monitoring of the physical and emotional well-being of unaccompanied alien children who have been discharged to a parent or remain in the legal custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services until their respective immigration cases are resolved; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to Congress a plan for implementing the requirement set forth in paragraph (2).

(c) NOTIFICATION TO STATES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall notify each State in which potential facilities are being reviewed to house unaccompanied alien children who will remain in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(d) FAILURE TO APPEAR.—The Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall—

(1) track the number of unaccompanied alien children who fail to appear at a removal hearing that they were required to attend; and

(2) make the information described in paragraph (1) available to the public on a quarterly basis.

SA 3743. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle E—Never Contract With the Enemy

SEC. 1271. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Never Contract With the Enemy Act”.

SEC. 1272. PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING FUNDS TO THE ENEMY.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in conjunction with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Secretary of State, establish in each covered combatant command a program to identify persons and entities within the area of responsibility of such command that—

(1) provide funds, including goods and services, received under a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity; or

(2) fail to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds, including goods and services, received under a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(b) NOTICE OF IDENTIFIED PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—

(1) NOTICE.—Upon the identification of a person or entity as being described by subsection (a), the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) or the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) shall be notified, in writing, of such identification of the person or entity.

(2) RESPONSIVE ACTIONS.—Upon receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) or the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) may notify the heads of contracting activities, or other appropriate officials of the agency or command, in writing of such identification.

(3) MAKING OF NOTIFICATIONS.—Any written notification pursuant to this subsection shall be made in accordance with procedures established to implement the revisions of regulations required by this section.

(c) AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE OR VOID CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND TO RESTRICT FUTURE AWARD.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Account Requirements for

Federal Awards shall be revised to provide that, upon notice from the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) or the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) pursuant to subsection (b), the head of contracting activity of an executive agency, or other appropriate official, may do the following:

(1) Restrict the award of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement would provide funds received under such contract, grant, or cooperative agreement directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(2) Terminate for default any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, has failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds received under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(3) Void in whole or in part any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement provides funds directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(d) CLAUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Account Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised to require that—

(A) the clause described in paragraph (2) shall be included in each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that is awarded on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that is awarded before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be modified to include the clause described in paragraph (2).

(2) CLAUSE DESCRIBED.—The clause described in this paragraph is a clause that—

(A) requires the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds, including goods and services, received under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity; and

(B) notifies the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, of the authority of the head of the contracting activity, or other appropriate official, to terminate or void the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, in whole or in part, as provided in subsection (c).

(3) TREATMENT AS VOID.—For purposes of this section:

(A) A contract, grant, or cooperative agreement that is void is unenforceable as contrary to public policy.

(B) A contract, grant, or cooperative agreement that is void in part is unenforceable as contrary to public policy with regard to a segregable task or effort under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

(4) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The President shall ensure that the process for amending regulations required by paragraph (1) shall include an opportunity for public comment, including an opportunity for comment on standards of due diligence required by this Act.

(e) **REQUIREMENTS FOLLOWING CONTRACT ACTIONS.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Account Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised as follows:

(1) To require that any head of contracting activity, or other appropriate official, taking an action under subsection (c) to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement notify in writing the contractor or recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, as applicable, of the action.

(2) To permit the contractor or recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement subject to an action taken under subsection (c) to terminate or void the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, as the case may be, an opportunity to challenge the action by requesting an administrative review of the action under the procedures of the executive agency concerned not later than 30 days after receipt of notice of the action.

(f) **ANNUAL REVIEW; PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—

(1) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Secretary of State shall, on an annual basis, review the lists of persons and entities previously covered by a notice under subsection (b) as having been identified as described by subsection (a) in order to determine whether or not such persons and entities continue to warrant identification as described by subsection (a). If a determination is made pursuant to such a review that a person or entity no longer warrants identification as described by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall notify the head of an executive agency (or designee) or commander (or deputy), as the case may be, in writing of such determination.

(2) **PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—Classified information relied upon to make an identification in accordance with subsection (a) may not be disclosed to a contractor or a recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement with respect to which an action is taken pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (c), or to their representatives, in the absence of a protective order issued by a court of competent jurisdiction established under Article I or Article III of the Constitution of the United States that specifically addresses the conditions upon which such classified information may be so disclosed.

(g) **DELEGATION OF CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **COMBATANT COMMAND RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The commander of a covered combatant command may delegate the responsibilities in this section to any deputies of the commander specified by the commander for purposes of this section. Any delegation of responsibilities under this paragraph shall be made in writing.

(2) **NONDELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS.**—The authority provided by subsection (c) to terminate, void, or restrict contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, in whole or in part, may not be delegated below the level of head of contracting activity, or equivalent official for purposes of grants or cooperative agreements.

(h) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.**—

(1) **SHARING OF INFORMATION ON SUPPORTERS OF THE ENEMY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, carry out a program through which agency components may provide information to heads of executive agencies (or the designees of such heads) and the commanders of the covered combatant commands (or the specified deputies of the commanders) relating to persons or entities who may be providing funds, including goods and services, received under contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agencies directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity. The program shall be designed to facilitate and encourage the sharing of risk and threat information between executive agencies and the covered combatant commands.

(2) **INCLUSION OF INFORMATION ON CONTRACT ACTIONS IN FAPIIS AND OTHER SYSTEMS.**—Upon the termination, voiding, or restriction of a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency under subsection (c), the head of contracting activity of the executive agency shall provide for the inclusion in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), or other formal system of records on contractors or entities, of appropriate information on the termination, voiding, or restriction, as the case may be, of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

(3) **REPORTS.**—The head of contracting activity that receives a notice pursuant to subsection (b) shall submit to the head of the executive agency (or designee) concerned or the appropriate covered combatant command, as the case may be, a report on the action, if any, taken by the head of contracting activity pursuant to subsection (c), including a determination not to terminate, void, or restrict the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement as otherwise authorized by subsection (c).

(i) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of the authorities in this section in the preceding calendar year, including the following:

(A) For each instance in which an executive agency exercised the authority to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, and cooperative agreement pursuant to subsection (c), based on a notification under subsection (b), the following:

(i) The executive agency taking such action.

(ii) An explanation of the basis for the action taken.

(iii) The value of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement voided or terminated.

(iv) The value of all contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agency in force with the person or entity concerned at the time the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement was terminated or voided.

(B) For each instance in which an executive agency did not exercise the authority to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, and cooperative agreement pursuant to subsection (c), based on a notification under subsection (b), the following:

(i) The executive agency concerned.

(ii) An explanation why the action was not taken.

(2) **FORM.**—Any report under this subsection may, at the election of the Director—

(A) be submitted in unclassified form, but with a classified annex; or

(B) be submitted in classified form.

(j) **NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in this section shall apply to the authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States Government.

(k) **CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—Except as provided in subsection (l), the authorities in this section shall be in addition to, and not to the exclusion of, any other authorities available to executive agencies to implement policies and purposes similar to those set forth in this section.

(l) **COORDINATION WITH CURRENT AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY RELATED TO CENTCOM.**—Effective 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1513; 10 U.S.C. 2313 note) is repealed.

(2) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY RELATED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—Effective 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 810; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is repealed.

(3) **USE OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITIES IN DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENTS.**—In providing for the discharge of the requirements of this section by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may use and modify for that purpose the regulations and procedures established for purposes of the discharge of the requirements of section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

(m) **SUNSET.**—The provisions of this section shall cease to be effective on December 31, 2019.

SEC. 1273. ADDITIONAL ACCESS TO RECORDS.

(a) **CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, applicable regulations shall be revised to provide that, except as provided under subsection (c)(1), the clause described in paragraph (2) may, as appropriate, be included in each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that is awarded on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **CLAUSE.**—The clause described in this paragraph is a clause authorizing the head of the executive agency concerned, upon a written determination pursuant to paragraph (3), to examine any records of the contractor, the recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement, or any subcontractor or subgrantee under such contract, grant, or cooperative agreement to the extent necessary to ensure that funds, including goods and services, available under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are not provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(3) **WRITTEN DETERMINATION.**—The authority to examine records pursuant to the contract clause described in paragraph (2) may be exercised only upon a written determination by the contracting officer or comparable official responsible for a grant or cooperative agreement, upon a finding by the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) or the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) that there is reason to believe that funds, including goods and services, available under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement concerned

may have been provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(4) FLOWDOWN.—A clause described in paragraph (2) may also be included in any subcontract or subgrant under a covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement if the subcontract or subgrant has an estimated value in excess of \$50,000.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of the authority provided by this section in the preceding calendar year.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall identify, for the calendar year covered by such report, each instance in which an executive agency exercised the authority provided under this section to examine records, explain the basis for the action taken, and summarize the results of any examination of records so undertaken.

(3) FORM.—Any report under this subsection may be submitted in classified form.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO CENTCOM.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not apply to contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements covered under section 842 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note).

(2) EXTENSION OF CURRENT AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO CENTCOM.—Section 842 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “date of the enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

SEC. 1274. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTINGENCY OPERATION.—The term “contingency operation” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) CONTRACT.—The term “contract” includes a contract for commercial items but is not limited to a contract for commercial items.

(4) COVERED COMBATANT COMMAND.—The term “covered combatant command” means the following:

- (A) The United States Africa Command.
- (B) The United States Central Command.
- (C) The United States European Command.
- (D) The United States Pacific Command.
- (E) The United States Southern Command.

(5) COVERED CONTRACT, GRANT, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT DEFINED.—The term “covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement” means a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with an estimated value in excess of \$50,000 that is performed outside the United States, including its possessions and territories, in support of a contingency operation.

(6) COVERED PERSON OR ENTITY.—The term “covered person or entity” means a person

or entity that is actively opposing United States or coalition forces involved in a contingency operation in which members of the Armed Forces are actively engaged in hostilities.

(7) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(8) HEAD OF CONTRACTING ACTIVITY.—The term “head of contracting activity” has the meaning given that term in subpart 601 of part 1 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

SA 3744. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 544 and insert the following:

SEC. 544. ACCESS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) DESIGNATION; PURPOSES.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall designate legal counsel (to be known as ‘Special Victims’ Counsel’) for the purpose of providing legal assistance to an individual described in paragraph (2) who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense, regardless of whether the report of that offense is restricted or unrestricted.

“(2) An individual described in this paragraph is any of the following:

“(A) An individual eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title.

“(B) An individual who is—

“(i) not covered under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) a member of a reserve component of the armed forces; and

“(iii) a victim of an alleged sex-related offense as described in paragraph (1)—

“(I) during a period in which the individual served on active duty, full-time National Guard duty, or inactive-duty training; or

“(II) during any period, regardless of the duty status of the individual, if the circumstances of the alleged sex-related offense have a nexus to the military service of the victim, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title” each place it appears and inserting “described in subsection (a)(2)”.

SA 3745. Mr. DONNELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2813. INDEMNIFICATION OF TRANSFEREES OF PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED SINCE OCTOBER 24, 1988, THAT REMAIN UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 330(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(B) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (3) contributed to any such release or threatened release, paragraph (1) or (2)”;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify in full certain persons and entities described in paragraph (3) also applies with respect to any military installation (or portion thereof) that—

“(A) was closed during the period beginning on October 24, 1988, and ending on the date of the enactment of this paragraph, other than pursuant to a base closure law; and

“(B) remains under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph.”.

SA 3746. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1069. REPORT ON GENDER INTEGRATION IN THE PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF MILITARY OPERATIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES ABROAD.

(a) STUDY ON GENDER INTEGRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall conduct a study on the integration of gender considerations into the planning and execution at all levels of military operations of the Armed Forces abroad.

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study under this subsection, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall—

(A) determine whether existing Department of Defense campaign, security cooperation, and contingency plans for operations abroad adequately address security and operational challenges related to gender;

(B) identify means of improving the integration of gender considerations into future Department of Defense planning for campaign, security cooperation, and contingencies for operations abroad;

(C) identify the elements of defense doctrine, if any, that should be revised to reflect lessons learned regarding women and gender as a result of experiences engaging with female populations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other operations abroad;

(D) evaluate the need for a gender advisor training program for the Armed Forces, including the length of training, proposed curriculum, and location of training for such a program;

(E) determine the extent to which personnel qualified to advise on women and gender are available within the Department of Defense, and assess the development of a billet description for gender advisors;

(F) determine how to best educate military command leadership on the integration of attention to women and gender in military operations across all lines of effort; and

(G) evaluate where to assign gender advisors in strategic, operational, and tactical commands, including, in particular in assignment to field operations and the planning staffs of the combatant commands.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 3747. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for “Administrative Review and Appeals”, \$63,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, as follows:

(1) \$54,000,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review to hire 54 Immigration Judge Teams, which shall be trained and assigned to adjudicate juvenile cases.

(2) \$6,700,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review for the purchase of video teleconferencing equipment, digital audio recording devices, and other technology that will enable expanded immigration courtroom capacity and capability.

(3) \$2,500,000 for the Executive Office for Immigration Review’s Legal Orientation Program, of which not less than \$1,000,000 shall be for the Legal Orientation Program for Custodians:

Provided, That not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall submit a reorganization plan to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House

of Representatives that includes detailed plans for prioritizing the adjudication of non-detained, unaccompanied alien children and specific plans to reassign Immigration Judge Teams to expedite the adjudication of juveniles on the non-detained docket:

Provided further, That the submitted plan shall ensure that juveniles will appear before an immigration judge for an initial hearing not later than 10 days after the juvenile is apprehended.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities”, \$1,100,000, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied children and adults with children at the southwest border and related activities, to remain available until September 30, 2014.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U. S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” to cover necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and adults with children at the Southwest border and related activities, including the acquisition, construction, improvement, repair, and management of facilities, and for necessary expenses related to border security, \$71,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015.

U. S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” to cover necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and adults with children at the Southwest border and related activities, and for the necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs law, detention and removals of adults with children crossing the border unlawfully, and investigations, \$398,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which, \$50,000,000 shall be expended for 50 additional fugitive operations teams and not less than \$14,000,000 shall be expended for vetted units operations in Central America and human smuggling and trafficking investigations: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall support no fewer than an additional 3,000 family and 800 other beds and substantially increase the availability and utilization of detention space for adults with children.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) For an additional amount for meeting the data collection and reporting requirements of this Act, \$5,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding section 503 of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), funds made available under subsection (a) for data collection and reporting requirements may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose.

(c) The Secretary may not make a transfer described in subsection (b) until 15 days after notifying the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of such transfer.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Refugee and Entrant Assistance”, \$150,000,000, to be merged with and available for the same period and purposes as funds appropriated in Public Law 113-76 “for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235”: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may also be used for other medical response expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services in assisting individuals identified under subsection (b) of such section 235: *Provided further*, That, the Secretary may, in this fiscal year and hereafter, accept and use money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or other donation for carrying out such sections: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading for medical response expenses may be transferred to and merged with the “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”: *Provided further*, That transfer authority under this heading is subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 301. Of the funds made available for performance bonus payments under section 2105(a)(3)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(a)(3)(E)), \$1,700,000,000 is rescinded.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION

SEC. 401. (a) Of the funds appropriated in titles III and IV of division K of Public Law 113-76, and in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, for assistance for the countries in Central America, up to \$40,000,000 shall be made available for such countries for repatriation and reintegration activities: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to this section may be obligated notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e) of section 7045 of division K of Public Law 113-76.

(b) Prior to the initial obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section, but not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section by country and the steps taken by the government of each country to—

- (1) improve border security;
- (2) enforce laws and policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States;
- (3) enact laws and implement new policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States, including increasing penalties for human smuggling;
- (4) conduct public outreach campaigns to explain the dangers of the journey to the

Southwest Border of the United States and to emphasize the lack of immigration benefits available; and

(5) cooperate with United States Federal agencies to facilitate and expedite the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the Southwest Border of the United States.

(c) The Secretary of State shall suspend assistance provided pursuant to this section to the government of a country if such government is not making significant progress on each item described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b): *Provided*, That assistance may only be resumed if the Secretary reports to the appropriate congressional committees that subsequent to the suspension of assistance such government is making significant progress on each of the items enumerated in such subsection.

(d) Funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of House of Representatives and the Senate.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 501. Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, working in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to individuals whose cases will be adjudicated by the Executive Office for Immigration Review that ensures that—

(1) the Department of Justice is capable of electronically receiving information from the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services related to the apprehension, processing, detention, placement, and adjudication of such individuals, including unaccompanied alien children;

(2) case files prepared by the Department of Homeland Security after an individual has been issued a notice to appear are electronically integrated with information collected by the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review during the adjudication process;

(3) cases are coded to reflect immigration status and appropriate categories at apprehension, such as unaccompanied alien children and family units;

(4) information pertaining to cases and dockets are collected and maintained by the Department of Justice in an electronic, searchable database that includes—

(A) the status of the individual appearing before the court upon apprehension;

(B) the docket upon which the case is placed;

(C) the individual's presence for court proceedings;

(D) the final disposition of each case;

(E) the number of days each case remained on the docket before final disposition; and

(F) any other information the Attorney General determines to be necessary and appropriate; and

(5) the final disposition of an adjudication or an order of removal is electronically submitted to—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) the Department of Health and Human Services, if appropriate.

SEC. 502. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, working in coordination with the Attorney General and the Sec-

retary of Health and Human Services, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to individuals who are apprehended or encountered for immigration enforcement purposes by the Department of Homeland Security that ensures that—

(1) case files prepared by the Department of Homeland Security after an individual has been issued a notice to appear are electronically transmitted to—

(A) the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review for integration with case files prepared during the adjudication process; and

(B) to the Department of Health and Human Services, as appropriate, if the files relate to unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the Department of Homeland Security is capable of electronically receiving information pertaining to the disposition of an adjudication, including removal orders and the individual's failure to appear for proceedings, from the Department of Justice's Executive Office for Immigration Review; and

(3) information is collected and shared with the Department of Justice regarding the immigration status and appropriate categories of such individuals at the time of apprehension, such as—

(A) unaccompanied alien children or family units;

(B) the location of their apprehension;

(C) the number of days they remain in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security;

(D) the reason for releasing the individual from custody;

(E) the geographic location of their residence, if released from custody;

(F) any action taken by the Department of Homeland Security after receiving information from the Department of Justice regarding an individual's failure to appear before the court;

(G) any action taken by the Department of Homeland Security after receiving information from the Department of Justice regarding the disposition of an adjudication; and

(H) any other information that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 503. Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, working in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall institute a process for collecting, exchanging, and sharing specific data pertaining to unaccompanied alien children that ensures that—

(1) the Department of Health and Human Services is capable of electronically receiving information from the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice related to the apprehension, processing, placement, and adjudication of unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the Department of Health and Human Services shares information with the Department of Homeland Security regarding its capacity and capability to meet the 72-hour mandate required under section 235(b)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)(3)); and

(3) information is collected and shared with the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security regarding—

(A) the number of days a child remained in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services;

(B) whether the child was placed in a facility operated by the Department of Defense;

(C) for children placed with a sponsor—

(i) the number of children placed with the sponsor;

(ii) the relationship of the sponsor taking custody of the child;

(iii) the type of background check conducted on the potential sponsor; and

(iv) the geographic location of the sponsor; and

(D) any other information the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 504. The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 505. This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Children and America's Homeland Act of 2014".

DIVISION B—UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN AND BORDER SECURITY TITLE X—UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN

Subtitle A—Protection and Due Process for Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1001. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: "RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—";

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: "AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—"; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "countries contiguous to the United States" and inserting "Canada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and any other foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(3) inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) **MANDATORY EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF CRIMINALS AND GANG MEMBERS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall place an unaccompanied alien child in a proceeding in accordance with section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225a) if, the Secretary determines or has reason to believe the alien—

"(A) has been convicted of any offense carrying a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 180 days;

"(B) has been convicted of an offense which involved—

"(i) domestic violence (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

"(ii) child abuse and neglect (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a));

"(iii) assault resulting in bodily injury (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

“(iv) the violation of a protection order (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

“(v) driving while intoxicated (as defined in section 164 of title 23, United States Code); or

“(vi) any offense under foreign law, except for a purely political offense, which, if the offense had been committed in the United States, would render the alien inadmissible under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

“(C) has been convicted of more than 1 criminal offense (other than minor traffic offenses);

“(D) has engaged in, is engaged in, or is likely to engage after entry in any terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)), or intends to participate or has participated in the activities of a foreign terrorist organization (as designated under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189));

“(E) is or was a member of a criminal gang (as defined in paragraph (53) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a));

“(F) provided materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information regarding age or identity to the United States Government with the intent to wrongfully be classified as an unaccompanied alien child; or

“(G) has entered the United States more than 1 time in violation of section 275(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1325(a)), knowing that the entry was unlawful.”; and

(4) in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (6), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: “EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—”;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2), shall be—” and inserting “who meets the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)—”;

(C) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) shall be placed in a proceeding in accordance with section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which shall commence not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (4);”;

(D) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively;

(E) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the immediate custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child—

“(I) is the subject of an order under section 235B(e)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

“(II) is placed or released in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(C) of this section.”;

(F) in clause (iii), as redesignated, by inserting “is” before “eligible”; and

(G) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting “shall be” before “provided”.

SEC. 1002. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.

1221 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 235A the following:

“SEC. 235B. HUMANE AND EXPEDITED INSPECTION AND SCREENING FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

“(a) ASYLUM OFFICER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘asylum officer’ means an immigration officer who—

“(1) has had professional training in country conditions, asylum law, and interview techniques comparable to that provided to full-time adjudicators of applications under section 208; and

“(2) is supervised by an officer who—

“(A) meets the condition described in paragraph (1); and

“(B) has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications.

“(b) PROCEEDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 7 days after the screening of an unaccompanied alien child under section 235(a)(5) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(5)), an immigration judge shall conduct and conclude a proceeding to inspect, screen, and determine the status of the unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission to the United States.

“(2) TIME LIMIT.—Not later than 72 hours after the conclusion of a proceeding with respect to an unaccompanied alien child under this section, the immigration judge who conducted such proceeding shall issue an order pursuant to subsection (e).

“(c) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING.—

“(1) AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.—The immigration judge conducting a proceeding under this section—

“(A) shall administer oaths, receive evidence, and interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the unaccompanied alien child and any witnesses;

“(B) may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and presentation of evidence;

“(C) is authorized to sanction by civil money penalty any action (or inaction) in contempt of the judge’s proper exercise of authority under this Act; and

“(D) shall determine whether the unaccompanied alien child meets any of the criteria set out in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (3) of section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)), and if so, order the alien removed under subsection (e)(2) of this section.

“(2) FORM OF PROCEEDING.—A proceeding under this section may take place—

“(A) in person;

“(B) at a location agreed to by the parties, in the absence of the unaccompanied alien child;

“(C) through video conference; or

“(D) through telephone conference.

“(3) PRESENCE OF ALIEN.—If it is impracticable by reason of the mental incompetency of the unaccompanied alien child for the alien to be present at the proceeding, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien.

“(4) RIGHTS OF THE ALIEN.—In a proceeding under this section—

“(A) the unaccompanied alien child shall be given the privilege of being represented, at no expense to the Government, by counsel of the alien’s choosing who is authorized to practice in the proceedings;

“(B) the alien shall be given a reasonable opportunity—

“(i) to examine the evidence against the alien;

“(ii) to present evidence on the alien’s own behalf; and

“(iii) to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government;

“(C) the rights set forth in subparagraph (B) shall not entitle the alien—

“(i) to examine such national security information as the Government may proffer in opposition to the alien’s admission to the United States; or

“(ii) to an application by the alien for discretionary relief under this Act; and

“(D) a complete record shall be kept of all testimony and evidence produced at the proceeding.

“(5) WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION.—An unaccompanied alien child applying for admission to the United States may, and at any time prior to the issuance of a final order of removal, be permitted to withdraw the application and immediately be returned to the alien’s country of nationality or country of last habitual residence.

“(6) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO APPEAR.—An unaccompanied alien child who does not attend a proceeding under this section, shall be ordered removed, except under exceptional circumstances where the alien’s absence is the fault of the Government, a medical emergency, or an act of nature.

“(d) DECISION AND BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(1) DECISION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the conclusion of a proceeding under this section, the immigration judge shall determine whether an unaccompanied alien child is likely to be—

“(i) admissible to the United States; or

“(ii) eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act.

“(B) EVIDENCE.—The determination of the immigration judge under subparagraph (A) shall be based only on the evidence produced at the hearing.

“(2) BURDEN OF PROOF.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In a proceeding under this section, an unaccompanied alien child who is an applicant for admission has the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the alien—

“(i) is likely to be entitled to be lawfully admitted to the United States or eligible for any form of relief from removal under this Act; or

“(ii) is lawfully present in the United States pursuant to a prior admission.

“(B) ACCESS TO DOCUMENTS.—In meeting the burden of proof under subparagraph (A)(ii), the alien shall be given access to—

“(i) the alien’s visa or other entry document, if any; and

“(ii) any other records and documents, not considered by the Attorney General to be confidential, pertaining to the alien’s admission or presence in the United States.

“(e) ORDERS.—

“(1) PLACEMENT IN FURTHER PROCEEDINGS.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has met the burden of proof under subsection (d)(2), the immigration judge shall—

“(A) order the alien to be placed in further proceedings in accordance with section 240; and

“(B) order the Secretary of Homeland Security to place the alien on the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detained docket for purposes of carrying out such proceedings.

“(2) ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has not met the burden of proof required under subsection (d)(2), the judge shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien claims—

“(A) an intention to apply for asylum under section 208; or

“(B) a fear of persecution.

“(3) CLAIMS FOR ASYLUM.—If an unaccompanied alien child described in paragraph (2) claims an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 or a fear of persecution, the immigration judge shall order the alien referred for an interview by an asylum officer under subsection (f).

“(f) ASYLUM INTERVIEWS.—

“(1) CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘credible fear of persecution’ means, after taking into account the credibility of the statements made by an unaccompanied alien child in support of the alien’s claim and such other facts as are known to the asylum officer, there is a significant possibility that the alien could establish eligibility for asylum under section 208.

“(2) CONDUCT BY ASYLUM OFFICER.—An asylum officer shall conduct the interviews of an unaccompanied alien child referred under subsection (e)(3).

“(3) REFERRAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—If the asylum officer determines at the time of the interview that an unaccompanied alien child has a credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) during further consideration of the application for asylum.

“(4) REMOVAL WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW IF NO CREDIBLE FEAR OF PERSECUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), if the asylum officer determines that an unaccompanied alien child does not have a credible fear of persecution, the asylum officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review.

“(B) RECORD OF DETERMINATION.—The asylum officer shall prepare a written record of a determination under subparagraph (A), which shall include—

“(i) a summary of the material facts as stated by the alien;

“(ii) such additional facts (if any) relied upon by the asylum officer;

“(iii) the asylum officer’s analysis of why, in light of such facts, the alien has not established a credible fear of persecution; and

“(iv) a copy of the asylum officer’s interview notes.

“(C) REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—

“(i) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process by which an immigration judge will conduct a prompt review, upon the alien’s request, of a determination under subparagraph (A) that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution.

“(ii) MANDATORY COMPONENTS.—The review described in clause (i)—

“(I) shall include an opportunity for the alien to be heard and questioned by the immigration judge, either in person or by telephonic or video connection; and

“(II) shall be concluded as expeditiously as possible, to the maximum extent practicable within 24 hours, but in no case later than 7 days after the date of the determination under subparagraph (A).

“(D) MANDATORY PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—Any alien subject to the procedures under this paragraph shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b))—

“(i) pending a final determination of an application for asylum under this subsection; and

“(ii) after a determination under this subsection that the alien does not have a credible fear of persecution, until the alien is removed.

“(g) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (f)(4)(C) and paragraph (2), a removal order entered in accordance with subsection (e)(2) or (f)(4)(A) is not subject to administrative appeal.

“(2) RULEMAKING.—The Attorney General shall establish, by regulation, a process for the prompt review of an order under subsection (e)(2) against an alien who claims under oath, or as permitted under penalty of perjury under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, after having been warned by the penal ties for falsely making such claim under such conditions to have been—

“(A) lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(B) admitted as a refugee under section 207; or

“(C) granted asylum under section 208.

“(h) LAST IN, FIRST OUT.—In any proceedings, determinations, or removals under this section, priority shall be accorded to the alien who has most recently arrived in the United States.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 235A the following:

“Sec. 235B. Humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children.”.

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF REMOVAL.—Section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 235(b)(1)” and inserting “section 235(b)(1) or an order of removal issued to an unaccompanied alien child after proceedings under section 235B”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” each place it appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(B)(1)”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “section 235(b)(1)(B),” and inserting “section 235(b)(1)(B) or 235B(f)”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “OR 235B” after “SECTION 235(B)(1)”; and

(B) by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)(1)” each place it appears;

(C) in subparagraph (2)(C), by inserting “or section 235B(g)” after “section 235(b)(1)(C)”; and

(D) in subparagraph (3)(A), by inserting “or section 235B” after “section 235(b)”.
SEC. 1003. EXPEDITED DUE PROCESS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) SPECIAL MOTIONS FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—

(1) FILING AUTHORIZED.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, permit an unaccompanied alien child who was issued a notice to appear under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) to appear, in-person, before an immigration judge who has been authorized by the Attorney General to conduct proceedings

under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002;

(B) to attest that the unaccompanied alien child desires to apply for admission to the United States; and

(C) to file a motion—

(i) to replace any notice to appear issued between January 1, 2013, and the date of the enactment of this Act under such section 239 that has not resulted in a final order of removal; and

(ii) to apply for admission to the United States by being placed in proceedings under such section 235B.

(2) ADJUDICATION OF MOTION.—An immigration judge may, at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the judge, grant a motion filed under paragraph (1)(C) upon a finding that—

(A) the petitioner was an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232)) on the date on which a notice to appear was issued to the alien under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229);

(B) the notice to appear was issued during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(C) the unaccompanied alien child is applying for admission to the United States; and

(D) the granting of such motion would not be manifestly unjust.

(3) EFFECT OF MOTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the granting of a motion to replace a notice to appear under paragraph (2), the immigration judge who granted such motion shall—

(A) while the petitioner remains in-person, immediately inspect and screen the petitioner for admission to the United States by conducting a proceeding under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002;

(B) immediately notify the petitioner of the petitioner’s ability, under section 235B(c)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to withdraw the petitioner’s application for admission to the United States and immediately be returned to the petitioner’s country of nationality or country of last habitual residence; and

(C) replace the petitioner’s notice to appear with an order under section 235B(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(4) PROTECTIVE CUSTODY.—An unaccompanied alien child who has been granted a motion under paragraph (2) shall be held in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services pursuant to section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232).

SEC. 1004. CHILD WELFARE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(A) IMMIGRATION STATUS.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services considers placement of an unaccompanied alien child with a potential sponsor, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services the immigration status of such potential sponsor prior to the placement of the unaccompanied alien child.

“(B) OTHER INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General any relevant information related to an unaccompanied alien child

who is or has been in the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including the location of the child and any person to whom custody of the child has been transferred, for any legitimate law enforcement objective, including enforcement of the immigration laws.”.

SEC. 1005. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CHILDREN AND TAXPAYERS.

Section 235(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(b)), as amended by section 1004, is further amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(6) INSPECTION OF FACILITIES.—The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall conduct regular inspections of facilities utilized by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide care and custody of an unaccompanied alien children who are in the immediate custody of the Secretary to ensure that such facilities are operated in the most efficient manner practicable.

“(7) FACILITY OPERATIONS COSTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that facilities utilized to provide care and custody of unaccompanied alien children are operated efficiently and at a rate of cost that is not greater than \$500 per day for each child housed or detained at such facility, unless the Secretary certifies that compliance with this requirement is temporarily impossible due to emergency circumstances.”.

SEC. 1006. CUSTODY OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN IN FORMAL REMOVAL PROCEEDING.

Section 235(c) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by inserting at the end the following:

“(C) CHILDREN IN FORMAL REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—

“(i) LIMITATION ON PLACEMENT.—An unaccompanied alien child who has been placed in a proceeding under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a) may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the immediate custody of the United States Government unless—

“(I) the nongovernmental sponsor is a biological or adoptive parent of the unaccompanied alien child;

“(II) the parent is legally present in the United States at the time of the placement;

“(III) the parent has undergone a mandatory biometric criminal history check; and

“(IV) the Secretary of Health and Human Services has determined that the unaccompanied alien child is not a danger to self, danger to the community, or risk of flight.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that an unaccompanied alien child is a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)), a special needs child with a disability (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)), a child who has been a victim of physical or sexual abuse under circumstances that indicate that the child’s health or welfare has been significantly harmed or threatened, or a child with mental health needs that require ongoing assistance from a social welfare agency, the unaccompanied alien child may be placed with a grandparent or adult sibling if the grandparent or adult sibling meets the requirements set out in subclauses (II), (III), and (IV) of clause (i).

“(iii) MONITORING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—An unaccompanied alien child who is 15, 16, or 17 years of age placed with a nongovernmental sponsor or, in the case of an unaccompanied alien child younger than 15 years of age placed with a nongovernmental sponsor, such nongovernmental sponsor shall—

“(aa) enroll in the alternative to detention program of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(bb) continuously wear an electronic ankle monitor while the unaccompanied alien child is in removal proceedings.

“(II) PENALTY FOR MONITOR TAMPERING.—If an electronic ankle monitor required by subclause (I) is tampered with, the sponsor of the unaccompanied alien child shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$150 for each day the monitor is not functioning due to the tampering, up to a maximum of \$3,000.

“(iv) EFFECT OF VIOLATION OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall remove an unaccompanied alien child from a sponsor if the sponsor violates the terms of the agreement specifying the conditions under which the alien was placed with the sponsor.

“(v) FAILURE TO APPEAR.—

“(I) CIVIL PENALTY.—If an unaccompanied alien child is placed with a sponsor and fails to appear in a mandatory court appearance, the sponsor shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$250 for each day until the alien appears in court, up to a maximum of \$5,000.

“(II) BURDEN OF PROOF.—The sponsor is not subject to the penalty imposed under subclause (I) if the sponsor—

“(aa) appears in person and proves to the immigration court that the failure to appear by the unaccompanied alien child was not the fault of the sponsor; and

“(bb) supplies the immigration court with documentary evidence that supports the assertion described in item (aa).

“(vi) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child under this subparagraph in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of, or the Secretary has reason to believe was otherwise involved in the commission of—

“(I) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)); or

“(II) a crime involving severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(vii) REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A biometric criminal history check required by clause (i)(IV) shall be conducted using a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifier through—

“(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

“(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences; and

“(III) any other State or Federal database or repository that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines is appropriate.”.

SEC. 1007. FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRANSFER OF CUSTODY OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1041. Fraud in connection with the transfer of custody of unaccompanied alien children

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a person to obtain custody of an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section

462(g) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)) by—

“(1) making any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

“(2) making or using any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry.

“(b) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates, or attempts or conspires to violate, this section shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 1 year.

“(2) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR TRAFFICKING.—If the primary purpose of the violation, attempted violation, or conspiracy to violate this section was to subject the child to sexually explicit activity or any other form of exploitation, the offender shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 15 years.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1040 the following:

“1041. Fraud in connection with the transfer of custody of unaccompanied alien children.”.

SEC. 1008. NOTIFICATION OF STATES, REPORTING, AND MONITORING.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—Section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) NOTIFICATION TO STATES.—

“(1) PRIOR TO PLACEMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall notify the Governor of a State not later than 48 hours prior to the placement of an unaccompanied alien child from in custody of such Secretary in the care of a facility or sponsor in such State.

“(2) INITIAL REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to the Governor of each State in which an unaccompanied alien child was discharged to a sponsor or placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Secretary during the period beginning October 1, 2013 and ending on the date of the enactment of the Protecting Children and America’s Homeland Act of 2014.

“(3) MONTHLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a monthly report to the Governor of each State in which, during the reporting period, unaccompanied alien children were discharged to a sponsor or placed in a facility while remaining in the legal custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(4) CONTENTS.—Each report required to be submitted to the Governor of a State by paragraph (2) or (3) shall identify the number of unaccompanied alien children placed in the State during the reporting period, disaggregated by—

“(A) the locality in which the aliens were placed; and

“(B) the age of the aliens.”.

(b) MONITORING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) require all sponsors to agree—

(A) to receive approval from the Secretary of Health and Human Services prior to changing the location in which the sponsor is housing an unaccompanied alien child placed in the sponsor’s custody; and

(B) to provide a current address for the child and the reason for the change of address;

(2) provide regular and frequent monitoring of the physical and emotional well-being of each unaccompanied alien child who has been discharged to a sponsor or remained in the legal custody of the Secretary until the child's immigration case is resolved; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to Congress a plan for implementing the requirement of paragraph (2).

SEC. 1009. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 100 immigration judges, including through the temporary or permanent hiring of retired immigration judges, magistrate judges, or administrative law judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, that are dedicated to—

(1) conducting humane and expedited inspection and screening for unaccompanied alien children under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002; or

(2) reducing existing backlogs in immigration court proceedings initiated under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that sufficient immigration judge resources are dedicated to the purpose described in subsection (a)(1) to comply with the requirement under section 235B(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002.

SEC. 1010. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORTS ON CARE OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD.—Not later than December 31, 2014 and September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that includes—

(1) a detailed summary of the contracts in effect to care for and house unaccompanied alien children, including the names and locations of contractors and the facilities being used;

(2) the cost per day to care for and house an unaccompanied alien child, including an explanation of such cost;

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been released to a sponsor, if any;

(4) a list of the States to which unaccompanied alien children have been released from the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the care of a sponsor or placement in a facility;

(5) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been released to a sponsor who is not lawfully present in the United States, including the country of nationality or last habitual residence and age of such children;

(6) a determination of whether more than 1 unaccompanied alien child has been released to the same sponsor, including the number of children who were released to such sponsor;

(7) an assessment of the extent to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is monitoring the release of unaccompanied alien children, including home studies done and ankle bracelets or other devices used;

(8) an assessment of the extent to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services is making efforts—

(A) to educate unaccompanied alien children about their legal rights; and

(B) to provide unaccompanied alien children with access to pro bono counsel; and

(9) the extent of the public health issues of unaccompanied alien children, including contagious diseases, the benefits or medical services provided, and the outreach to States and localities about public health issues, that could affect the public.

(b) REPORTS ON REPATRIATION AGREEMENTS.—Not later than February 31, 2015 and August 31, 2015, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) any repatriation agreement for unaccompanied alien children in effect and a copy of such agreement; and

(B) any such repatriation agreement that is being considered or negotiated; and

(2) describes the funding provided to the 20 countries that have the highest number of nationals entering the United States as unaccompanied alien children, including amounts provided—

(A) to deter the nationals of each country from illegally entering the United States; and

(B) to care for or reintegrate repatriated unaccompanied alien children in the country of nationality or last habitual residence.

(c) REPORTS ON RETURNS TO COUNTRY OF NATIONALITY.—Not later than December 31, 2014 and September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that describes—

(1) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have voluntarily returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, disaggregated by—

(A) country of nationality or habitual residence; and

(B) age of the unaccompanied alien children;

(2) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have been returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, including assessment of the length of time such children were present in the United States;

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who have not been returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence pending travel documents or other requirements from such country, including how long they have been waiting to return; and

(4) the number of unaccompanied alien children who were granted relief in the United States, whether through asylum or any other immigration benefit.

(d) REPORTS ON IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS.—Not later than September 30, 2015, and once every 3 months thereafter, the Director of the Executive Office for Immigration Review shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report that describes—

(1) the number of unaccompanied alien children who, after proceedings under section 235B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 1002, were returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence, disaggregated by—

(A) country of nationality or residence; and

(B) age and gender of such aliens;

(2) the number of unaccompanied alien children who, after proceedings under such section 235B, prove a claim of admissibility and are placed in proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a);

(3) the number of unaccompanied alien children who fail to appear at a removal hearing that such alien was required to attend;

(4) the number of sponsors who were levied a penalty, including the amount and whether the penalty was collected, for the failure of an unaccompanied alien child to appear at a removal hearing; and

(5) the number of aliens that are classified as unaccompanied alien children, the ages and countries of nationality of such children, and the orders issued by the immigration judge at the conclusion of proceedings under such section 235B for such children.

Subtitle B—Cooperation With Countries of Nationality of Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1021. IN-COUNTRY REFUGEE PROCESSING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with section 101(a)(42)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)(B)) and section 207(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(e)), special circumstances currently exist due to grave humanitarian concerns throughout the travel, and attempts to travel, to the United States by unaccompanied children sufficient to justify and require, for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the allowance of processing of in-country refugee applications in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras in order to prevent such children from undertaking the long and dangerous journey across Central America and Mexico.

(2) Grave humanitarian concerns exist due to—

(A) at least 60,000 unaccompanied children having undertaken the long and dangerous journey to the United States from Central America in fiscal year 2014 alone;

(B) substantial reports of unaccompanied children becoming, during the course of their journey intended for the United States, victims of—

(i) significant injury, including loss of limbs;

(ii) severe forms of violence;

(iii) death due to accident and intentional killing;

(iv) severe forms of human trafficking;

(v) kidnap for ransom; and

(vi) sexual assault and rape; and

(C) the likelihood that the vast majority of the unaccompanied children seeking admission or immigration relief, including through application as a refugee or claims of asylum, do not qualify for such admission or relief, and therefore will be repatriated.

(3) While special circumstances currently exist to justify in-country refugee application processing for El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, it is appropriate to determine the admissibility of individuals applying for refugee status from those countries according to current law and granting administrative relief in instances in which refugee or asylum applications are denied, or are expected to be denied, would exacerbate the grave humanitarian concerns described in paragraph (2) by further encouraging attempts at migration.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR IN-COUNTRY REFUGEE PROCESSING.—Notwithstanding section 101(a)(42)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)(B)), for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall process an application for refugee status—

(1) for an alien who is a national of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras and is located in such country; or

(2) in the case of an alien having no nationality, for an alien who is habitually residing

in such country and is located in such country.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed as a grant of immigration benefit or relief, nor as a change to existing law regarding the eligibility for any individual for such benefit or relief, other than to the extent refugee applications shall be permitted in-country in accordance with this section.

SEC. 1022. REFUGEE ADMISSIONS FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, in determining the number of refugees who may be admitted under section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157(a))—

(1) for fiscal year 2014, may—

(A) allocate the unallocated reserve refugee number set out in the Presidential Memorandum on Refugee Admissions for Fiscal Year 2014 issued on October 2, 2013 to admit refugees from Central America; and

(B) allocate any unused admissions allocated to a particular region for Central American refugee admissions; and

(2) for fiscal year 2015, shall include Central America among the regional allocations included in the Presidential determination for refugee admissions that fiscal year.

SEC. 1023. FOREIGN GOVERNMENT COOPERATION IN REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall make a certification of whether the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras—

(A) is actively working to reduce the number of unaccompanied alien children from that country who are attempting to migrate northward in order to illegally enter the United States;

(B) is cooperating with the Government of the United States to facilitate the repatriation of unaccompanied alien children who are removed from the United States and returned to their country of nationality or habitual residence; and

(C) has negotiated or is actively negotiating an agreement under section 235(a)(2)(C) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(2)(C)), as amended by section 1001.

(2) **INTERIM CERTIFICATION.**—If prior to the date an annual certification is required by paragraph (1) the President determines the most recent such certification for the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras is no longer accurate, the President may make an accurate certification for that country prior to such date.

(b) **LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.**—The Federal Government may not provide any assistance (other than security assistance) to El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras unless in the most recent certification for that country under subsection (a) is that the Government of El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras, respectively, meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a)(1).

TITLE XI—CRIMINAL ALIENS

SEC. 1101. ALIEN GANG MEMBERS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(53)(A) The term ‘criminal gang’ means an ongoing group, club, organization, or association of 5 or more persons—

“(i)(I) that has as 1 of its primary purposes the commission of 1 or more of the criminal offenses described in subparagraph (B); and

“(II) the members of which engage, or have engaged within the past 5 years, in a continuing series of offenses described in subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) that has been designated as a criminal gang under section 220 by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, or the Secretary of State.

“(B) The offenses described in this subparagraph, whether in violation of Federal or State law or foreign law and regardless of whether the offenses occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Children and America’s Homeland Act of 2014, are the following:

“(i) A ‘felony drug offense’ (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)).

“(ii) An offense under section 274 (relating to bringing in and harboring certain aliens), section 277 (relating to aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter the United States), or section 278 (relating to importation of alien for immoral purpose).

“(iii) A crime of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code).

“(iv) A crime involving obstruction of justice, tampering with or retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant, or burglary

“(v) Any conduct punishable under sections 1028 and 1029 of title 18, United States Code (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents or access devices), sections 1581 through 1594 of such title (relating to peonage, slavery and trafficking in persons), section 1952 of such title (relating to interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises), section 1956 of such title (relating to the laundering of monetary instruments), section 1957 of such title (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity), or sections 2312 through 2315 of such title (relating to interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles or stolen property).

“(vi) A conspiracy to commit an offense described in clauses (i) through (v).

“(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any effective date), the term ‘criminal gang’ applies regardless of whether the conduct occurred before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph.”

(b) **INADMISSIBILITY.**—Section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) **ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.**—Any alien is inadmissible who a consular officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

“(i) is or has been a member of a criminal gang; or

“(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal gang knowing or having reason to know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.”

(c) **DEPORTABILITY.**—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) **ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIMINAL GANGS.**—Any alien is deportable who the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe—

“(i) is or has been a member of a criminal gang; or

“(ii) has participated in the activities of a criminal gang knowing or having reason to

know that such activities will promote, further, aid, or support the illegal activity of the criminal gang.”

(d) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 219 the following:

“SEC. 220. DESIGNATION OF CRIMINAL GANGS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, or the Secretary of State may designate a group or association as a criminal gang if their conduct is described in section 101(a)(53) or if the group or association conduct poses a significant risk that threatens the security and the public safety of nationals of the United States or the national security, homeland security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States.

“(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—A designation made under subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the designation is revoked after consultation between the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State or is terminated in accordance with Federal law.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 219 the following:

“220. Designation of criminal gangs.”

(e) **MANDATORY DETENTION OF CRIMINAL GANG MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 236(c)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1)(D)) is amended—

(A) by striking “section 212(a)(3)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(J) or (3)(B) of section 212(a)”;

(B) by striking “237(a)(4)(B),” and inserting “paragraph (2)(G) or (4)(B) of section 237(a),”

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than March 1 of each year (beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the number of aliens detained under the amendments made by paragraph (1).

(f) **ASYLUM CLAIMS BASED ON GANG AFFILIATION.**—

(1) **INAPPLICABILITY OF RESTRICTION ON REMOVAL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.**—Section 241(b)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(b)(3)(B)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “who is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i) or who is” after “to an alien”.

(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.**—Section 208(b)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (v), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (vi) as clause (vii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the alien is described in section 212(a)(2)(J)(i) or section 237(a)(2)(G)(i) (relating to participation in criminal gangs); or”.

(g) **TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.**—Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place that term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in subparagraph (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “States, or” and inserting “States;”;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the alien is, or at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal gang.”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of Homeland Security may detain an alien provided temporary protected status under this section whenever appropriate under any other provision of law.”.

(h) **SPECIAL IMMIGRANT JUVENILE VISAS.**—Section 101(a)(27)(J)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking “and”; and

(2) in subclause (II), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) no alien who is, or was at any time after admission has been, a member of a criminal gang shall be eligible for any immigration benefit under this subparagraph.”.

(i) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to acts that occur before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1102. MANDATORY EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS CRIMINALS, TERRORISTS, AND GANG MEMBERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an immigration officer who finds an alien described in subsection (b) at a land border or port of entry of the United States and determines that such alien is inadmissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) shall treat such alien in accordance with section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225).

(b) **THREATS TO PUBLIC SAFETY.**—An alien described in this subsection is an alien who the Secretary of Homeland Security determines, or has reason to believe—

(1) has been convicted of any offense carrying a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 180 days;

(2) has been convicted of an offense which involved—

(A) domestic violence (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)));

(B) child abuse and neglect (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)));

(C) assault resulting in bodily injury (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

(D) the violation of a protection order (as defined in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code);

(E) driving while intoxicated (as defined in section 164 of title 23, United States Code); or

(F) any offense under foreign law, except for a purely political offense, which, if the offense had been committed in the United States, would render the alien inadmissible under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(3) has been convicted of more than 1 criminal offense (other than minor traffic offenses);

(4) has engaged in, is engaged in, or is likely to engage after entry in any terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii))), or intends to participate or has participated in the activities of a foreign terrorist organization (as designated under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189));

(5) is or was a member of a criminal street gang (as defined in paragraph (53) of section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)), as added by section 1101(a)); or

(6) has entered the United States more than 1 time in violation of section 275(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1325(a)), knowing that the entry was unlawful.

SEC. 1103. FUGITIVE OPERATIONS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to hire 350 U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention officers that comprise 50 Fugitive Operations Teams responsible for identifying, locating, and arresting fugitive aliens.

SEC. 1104. ADDITIONAL DETENTION CAPACITY FOR FAMILY UNITS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall increase the number of detention beds available for aliens placed in removal proceedings under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) by not less than 5,000, including such detention beds available for family units.

TITLE XII—BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 1201. REDUCING INCENTIVES FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION.

No Federal funds or resources may be used to issue a new directive, memorandum, or Executive Order that provides for relief from removal or work authorization to a class of individuals who are not otherwise eligible for such relief under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) or such work authorization, including expanding deferred action for childhood arrivals.

SEC. 1202. BORDER SECURITY ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LANDS.**—The term “Federal lands” includes all land under the control of the Secretary concerned that is located within the Southwest border region in the State of Arizona along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(2) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **SUPPORT FOR BORDER SECURITY NEEDS.**—To achieve effective control of Federal lands—

(1) the Secretary concerned, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall authorize and provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel with immediate access to Federal lands for security activities, including—

(A) routine motorized patrols; and

(B) the deployment of communications, surveillance, and detection equipment;

(2) the security activities described in paragraph (1) shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that the Secretary determines will best protect the natural and cultural resources on Federal lands; and

(3) the Secretary concerned may provide education and training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the natural and cultural resources present on individual Federal land units.

(c) **PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After implementing subsection (b), the Secretary, in consultation

with the Secretaries concerned, shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register a notice of intent to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to analyze the impacts of the activities described in subsection (b).

(2) **EFFECT ON PROCESSING APPLICATION AND SPECIAL USE PERMITS.**—The pending completion of a programmatic environmental impact statement under this section shall not result in any delay in the processing or approving of applications or special use permits by the Secretaries concerned for the activities described in subsection (b).

(3) **AMENDMENT OF LAND USE PLANS.**—The Secretaries concerned shall amend any land use plans, as appropriate, upon completion of the programmatic environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1).

(4) **SCOPE OF PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—The programmatic environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1)—

(A) may be used to advise the Secretary of Homeland Security on the impact on natural and cultural resources on Federal lands; and

(B) shall not control, delay, or restrict actions by the Secretary of Homeland Security to achieve effective control on Federal lands.

(d) **INTERMINGLED STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—This section shall not apply to any private or State-owned land within the boundaries of Federal lands.

SEC. 1203. STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE TO ALLEVIATE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS.

(a) **STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall enhance law enforcement preparedness, humanitarian responses, and operational readiness along the international border between the United States and Mexico through Operation Stonegarden.

(b) **GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts made available to carry out this section shall be allocated for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments in Border Patrol Sectors on the along the international border between the United States and Mexico for—

(A) costs personnel, overtime, and travel;

(B) costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling; and

(C) costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and family units who have entered the United States.

(2) **FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Allocations for grants and reimbursements to State and local governments under this paragraph shall be made by the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency through a competitive process.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 1204. PREVENTING ORGANIZED SMUGGLING. (a) UNLAWFULLY HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, OR CUSTOMS CONTROLS.

(1) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls

“(a) **ILLICIT SPOTTING.**—Any person who knowingly transmits to another person the location, movement, or activities of any Federal, State, or tribal law enforcement agency with the intent to further a Federal

crime relating to United States immigration, customs, importation of controlled substances, agriculture products, or monetary instruments, or other border controls shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) DESTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES BORDER CONTROLS.—Any person who knowingly and without lawful authorization destroys, alters, or damages any fence, barrier, sensor, camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the international border of the United States or a port of entry, or otherwise seeks to construct, excavate, or make any structure intended to defeat, circumvent or evade any such fence, barrier, sensor camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control the international border of the United States or a port of entry—

“(1) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both; and

“(2) if, at the time of the offense, the person uses or carries a firearm or, in furtherance of any such crime, possesses a firearm, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) or (b) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 555 the following:

“556. Unlawfully hindering immigration, border, or customs controls.”.

(2) PROHIBITING CARRYING OR USE OF A FIREARM DURING AND IN RELATION TO AN ALIEN SMUGGLING CRIME.—Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence” each place such term appears; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by inserting “, alien smuggling crime,” after “crime of violence”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘alien smuggling crime’ means any felony punishable under section 274(a), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a), 1327, and 1328).”.

(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Section 3298 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “556 (hindering immigration, border, or customs controls), 1598 (organized human smuggling),” before “1581”.

(b) ORGANIZED HUMAN SMUGGLING.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1598. Organized human smuggling

“(a) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—It shall be unlawful for any person, while acting for profit or other financial gain, to knowingly direct or participate in an effort or scheme to assist or cause 3 or more persons—

“(1) to enter, attempt to enter, or prepare to enter the United States—

“(A) by fraud, falsehood, or other corrupt means;

“(B) at any place other than a port or place of entry designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security; or

“(C) in a manner not prescribed by the immigration laws and regulations of the United States;

“(2) to travel by air, land, or sea toward the United States (whether directly or indirectly)—

“(A) knowing that the persons seek to enter or attempt to enter the United States without lawful authority; and

“(B) with the intent to aid or further such entry or attempted entry; or

“(3) to be transported or moved outside of the United States—

“(A) knowing that such persons are aliens in unlawful transit from 1 country to another or on the high seas; and

“(B) under circumstances in which the persons are seeking to enter the United States without official permission or legal authority.

“(b) CONSPIRACY AND ATTEMPT.—Any person who attempts or conspires to violate subsection (a) shall be punished in the same manner as a person who completes a violation of such subsection.

“(c) BASE PENALTY.—Except as provided in subsection (d), any person who violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

“(d) ENHANCED PENALTIES.—Any person who violates subsection (a) or (b)—

“(1) in the case of a violation causing a serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365) to any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(2) in the case of a violation causing the life of any person to be placed in jeopardy, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(3) in the case of a violation involving 10 or more persons, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(4) in the case of a violation involving the bribery or corruption of a United States or foreign government official, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(5) in the case of a violation involving robbery or extortion (as such terms are defined in paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of section 1951(b)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(6) in the case of a violation causing any person to be subjected to an involuntary sexual act (as defined in section 2246(2)), shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or both;

“(7) in the case of a violation resulting in the death of any person, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both;

“(8) in the case of a violation in which any alien is confined or restrained, including by the taking of clothing, goods, or personal identification documents, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; or

“(9) in the case of smuggling an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)), shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EFFORT OR SCHEME TO ASSIST OR CAUSE 3 OR MORE PERSONS.—The term ‘effort or scheme to assist or cause 3 or more persons’ does not require that the 3 or more persons enter, attempt to enter, prepare to enter, or travel at the same time if such acts are completed during a 1-year period.

“(2) LAWFUL AUTHORITY.—The term ‘lawful authority’—

“(A) means permission, authorization, or license that is expressly provided for under the immigration laws of the United States; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) any authority described in subparagraph (A) that was secured by fraud or otherwise unlawfully obtained; or

“(ii) any authority that was sought, but not approved.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1597 the following:

“1598. Organized human smuggling.”.

(c) STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN SMUGGLING.—

(1) HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS OF HUMAN SMUGGLING DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “high traffic areas of human smuggling” means the United States ports of entry and areas between such ports that have relatively high levels of human smuggling activity, as measured by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall implement a strategy to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

(3) COMPONENTS.—The strategy referred to in paragraph (2) shall include—

(A) efforts to increase coordination between the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) an identification of intelligence gaps impeding the ability to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States;

(C) efforts to increase information sharing with State and local governments and other Federal agencies;

(D) efforts to provide, in coordination with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, training for the border and maritime security components of the Department of Homeland Security to deter, detect, and interdict human smuggling across the international land and maritime borders of the United States; and

(E) the identification of the high traffic areas of human smuggling.

(4) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report that describes the strategy to be implemented under paragraph (2), including the components listed in paragraph (3), to—

(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(B) FORM.—The Secretary may submit the report required under subparagraph (A) in classified form if the Secretary determines that such form is appropriate.

(5) ANNUAL LIST OF HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS.—Not later than February 1st of the first year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a list of the high traffic areas of human smuggling referred to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SA 3748. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 141. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DIVESTMENT OR TRANSFER OF KC-10 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended during such fiscal year to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, KC-10 aircraft.

SA 3749. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1105. PAY PARITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT JOINT BASES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term “joint military installation” means 2 or more military installations reorganized or otherwise associated and operated as a single military installation;

(2) the term “locality” or “pay locality” has the meaning given that term by section 5302(5) of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the term “locality pay” refers to any amount payable under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **PAY PARITY AT JOINT BASES.**—Whenever 2 or more military installations are reorganized or otherwise associated as a single joint military installation, but the constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality, all Department of Defense employees of the respective installations constituting the joint installation (who are otherwise entitled to locality pay) shall receive locality pay at a uniform percentage equal to the percentage which is payable with respect to the locality which includes the constituent installation then receiving the highest locality pay (expressed as a percentage).

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall be effective with respect to pay periods beginning on or after such date (not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section) as the Secretary of Defense shall determine in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section shall apply to any joint military installation created as a result of the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission in the 2005 base closure round.

SA 3750. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 3751. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3750 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 3752. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 3753. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3752 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 3754. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3753 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3752 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “4” and insert “5”.

SA 3755. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. ROLE OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU IN ASSIGNMENT OF DIRECTORS AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 10506(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “selected by the Secretary of the Army” and inserting “recommended by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, from not less than three candidates identified by the Secretary of the Army,”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “selected by the Secretary of the Air Force” and inserting “recommended by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, from not less than three candidates identified by the Secretary of the Air Force,”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “The officers so selected” and inserting “The Director and Deputy Director, Army National Guard, and the Director and Deputy Director, Air National Guard,”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS REGARDING APPOINTMENT.**—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “The President” and inserting “Consistent with paragraph (1), the President”;

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (D); and

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

SA 3756. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 912. ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN NEW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2463 the following new section:

“§ 2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency

“(a) **ASSIGNMENTS BASED ON DETERMINATIONS OF COST-EFFICIENCY.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subject to subsection (b), the assignment of performance of a new requirement by the Department of Defense to military personnel, civilian personnel, or contractor personnel shall be based on a determination of which sector of the Department’s workforce can perform the services in the most cost-efficient manner, based on an analysis of the costs to the Federal Government in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04 (‘Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Active Duty Military Manpower and Contract Support’) or successor guidance.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a new requirement that is inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, critical, or required by law to be performed by military personnel or civilian personnel.

“(3) Nothing in this section may be construed as affecting the requirements of the Department of Defense under policies and procedures established by the Secretary of Defense under section 129a of this title for determining the most appropriate and cost-efficient mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to perform the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(b) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of a military department, the commander of a combatant command, or the head of a Defense Agency or activity may waive such

subsection and assign performance of a new requirement without a determination of cost-efficiency as required by such subsection if—

“(A) the Secretary, commander, or head certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the time required to conduct the determination of cost-efficiency would result in a gap in service that would significantly undermine performance of the mission of the Department of Defense or pose an unacceptable risk; and

“(B) a period of 30 days has expired after such certification is so submitted to the committees.

“(2) A waiver of subsection (a) may be in effect for a period of not greater than 180 days.

“(3) The waiver authority under this subsection may not be exercised after September 30, 2015.

“(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO ASSIGNMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.—If a new requirement is assigned to civilian personnel consistent with the requirements of this section—

“(1) the Secretary of Defense may not—

“(A) impose any constraint or limitation on the size of the civilian workforce in terms of man years, end strength, full-time equivalent positions, or maximum number of employees; or

“(B) require offsetting funding for civilian pay or benefits or require a reduction in civilian full-time equivalents or civilian end-strengths; and

“(2) the Secretary may assign performance of such requirement without regard to whether the employee is a temporary, term, or permanent employee.

“(d) NEW REQUIREMENT DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, a new requirement is an activity or function that is not being performed, as of the date of consideration for assignment of performance under this section, by military personnel, civilian personnel, or contractor personnel at a Department of Defense component, organization, installation, or other entity. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an activity or function that is performed at such an entity and that is re-engineered, reorganized, modernized, upgraded, expanded, or changed to become more efficient but is still essentially providing the same service shall not be considered a new requirement.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2463 the following new item:

“2463a. Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency.”.

SA 3757. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1015. NATIONAL GUARD DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1989, the National Guard has worked with law enforcement agencies and

community-based organizations through the National Guard Counterdrug Program to address the gap between Department of Defense and State and local institutions to perform interdiction and anti-drug activities that contribute to the defense of the United States against narco-trafficking and transnational organized crime threats.

(2) The link between drug trafficking organizations and criminal networks is well documented, as drug traffickers have diversified their activities to include trafficking in weapons, humans, cash, and counterfeit goods. These criminal networks have grown in size and influence posing a significant threat to national security.

(3) According to the National Guard Association of the United States, the five National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers located throughout the United States have provided essential training to over 680,000 law enforcement officials, military personnel, and coalition forces since their inception.

(4) The Department of Defense has continually reduced the funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Program since its fiscal year 2013 request and has eliminated funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers in the fiscal year 2015 request.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers’ mission of providing combatant commands, law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations, and military personnel with training and support to enhance their capabilities to detect, interdict, disrupt, and curtail drug trafficking plays a role in United States efforts to combat narcotics trafficking and transnational organized crime;

(2) a sustainable funding solution that keeps the National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers operational and that meets the requirement for training and support for law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations, and military personnel to combat narcotics trafficking and transnational organized crime is needed;

(3) the Secretary of Defense should consult with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and as appropriate, with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, on—

(A) how best to meet the requirement for training and support for law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations, and military personnel to combat narcotics trafficking and transnational organized crime;

(B) what role the National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers should play; and

(C) whether a partnership between the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the National Guard Bureau, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security is appropriate;

(4) efforts should be made to align National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers’ activities with key United States counternarcotics policies and programs, including the Department of Defense Counternarcotics and Global Threats strategy, the President’s National Drug Control Strategy, and the President’s Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime; and

(5) the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the existing National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers continue operations to achieve their full mission until a sustainable funding solution is developed and implemented.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—Section 112 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The operation of five regionally located National Guard Counterdrug Training Centers within the United States for the purposes of providing counter-drug related training to Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel, as well as for foreign law enforcement personnel participating in the National Guard State Partnership Program.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(1), by inserting “and activities that counter threats posed by local, State, and transnational criminal organizations engaged in drug smuggling and associated illicit activities within and on their borders, as” after “drug demand reduction activities”.

SA 3758. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, \$122,250,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the United States Southern Command: *Provided*, That not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the use of funds made available by this paragraph, including the amounts provided to any military or security forces of a foreign country and the use of amounts so provided by such forces: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SA 3759. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

SEC. 21. LIMITATION ON ACQUISITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subsection (b), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and during each of the subsequent 10 full fiscal years, none of the funds made available to the Secretary under any law may be used—

(1) to survey land for future acquisition as Federal land; or

(2) to enter into discussions with non-Federal landowners to identify land for acquisition as Federal land.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the use of funds—

(1) to complete land transactions underway on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) to exchange Federal land for non-Federal land; or

(3) to accept donations of non-Federal land as Federal land.

(c) OFFSETTING USE OF FUNDS.—Funds that would otherwise have been used for the purchase of non-Federal land by the Forest Service shall be used to carry out the supplemental funding for wildland fire management provided under this title.

SA 3760. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 737. ENHANCEMENT OF GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE AND RESPONSE ACTIVITIES REGARDING EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASES.

(a) ENHANCEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH MEDICAL TRACKING OF MEMBERS DEPLOYED OVERSEAS.—As part of the ongoing development of the medical tracking system for members of the Armed Forces deployed overseas under section 1074f of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may extend and enhance the engagement of the geographic combatant commands and overseas laboratories of the Department of Defense with international infectious disease surveillance partners in order to provide such partners with training, laboratory equipment, and supplies used by the Department to identify and develop force health protection measures. The objective of the extension and enhancement of such engagement shall be to enhance the capacity of such partners to engage in surveillance and response activities regarding emerging infectious diseases overseas.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a plan for the exercise of the authority in subsection (a).

SA 3761. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “annuity” includes a survivor annuity of a widow or widower;

(2) the term “unfunded liability” has the meaning given the term under section 8331 of title 5, United States Code; and

(3) the terms “widow” and “widower” have the meanings given those terms under section 8341 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

“(18) any period of service performed—

“(A) not later than December 31, 1977;

“(B) while a citizen of the United States;

“(C) in the employ of—

“(i) Air America, Inc.; or

“(ii) any entity associated with, predecessor to, or subsidiary to Air America, Inc., including—

“(I) Air Asia Company Limited;

“(II) CAT Incorporated;

“(III) Civil Air Transport Company Limited; and

“(IV) the Pacific Division of Southern Air Transport; and

“(D) during the period that Air America, Inc. or any other entity described in subparagraph (C) was owned and controlled by the United States Government.”; and

(D) in the second undesignated paragraph following paragraph (18) (as added by subparagraph (C)), by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this subchapter, service of the type described in paragraph (18) shall be considered to have been service as an employee.”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM DEPOSIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 8334(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) any period of service for which credit is allowed under section 8332(b)(18) of this title.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to annuities commencing on or after the effective date of this section.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CURRENT ANNUITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (D) or paragraph (4), any individual who is entitled to an annuity for the month in which this section becomes effective may elect to have the amount of the annuity recomputed as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or may be based.

(B) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An election to have an annuity recomputed under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section.

(C) PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF RECOMPUTATION.—A recomputation under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the date of the first payment under the annuity that is made after the later of—

(i) the date of the recomputation; or

(ii) the effective date of this section.

(D) NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS.—An individual may not receive payments for any additional amounts that would have been payable, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is

or may be based, for periods before the first month for which recomputation is reflected in the regular monthly annuity payments of the individual.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR (BUT NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING) AN ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) ELECTION.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B)(ii) or paragraph (4), an individual not described in paragraph (2) who becomes eligible for an annuity or for an increased annuity as a result of the enactment of this section may elect to have the rights of the individual under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, determined as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or would be based.

(ii) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under clause (i) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the later of—

(I) the effective date of this section; or

(II) the date on which the individual separates from service.

(B) COMMENCEMENT DATE; RETROACTIVITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), any entitlement to an annuity or to an increased annuity resulting from an election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the date on which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section.

(ii) NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS.—An individual may not receive payments for any amounts that would have been payable, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity or increased annuity is or may be based, for periods before the first month for which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section.

(iii) RETROACTIVITY FOR PURPOSES OF ENTITLEMENT TO ANNUITY.—Any determination of the amount of any annuity, all the requirements for entitlement to which (including separation, but not including any application requirement) would have been satisfied before the effective date of this section if this section had been in effect (but would not then otherwise have been satisfied absent this section) shall be made as if application for the annuity had been submitted as of the earliest date that would have been allowable, after the date on which the individual separated from service, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout the periods of service referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

(4) SURVIVOR ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES ONLY.—Notwithstanding section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an individual other than a widow or a widower shall not be entitled to an annuity or increased annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83 of such title based on service described in section 8332(b)(18) of such title (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) performed by a deceased individual.

(d) FUNDING.—Any increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System attributable to the enactment of this section shall be financed in accordance with section 8348(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) REGULATIONS AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations necessary to carry out this section, which shall include provisions under

which rules similar to those established under the amendments made by section 201 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 588) shall be applied with respect to any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) that was subject to title II of the Social Security Act.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of any application for any benefit which is computed or recomputed taking into account any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)), section 8345(i)(2) of such title shall be applied by deeming the reference to the date of the “other event which gives rise to title to the benefit” to refer to the effective date of this section, if later than the date of the event that would otherwise apply.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section.

SA 3762. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “unfunded liability” has the meaning given the term under section 8331 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

“(18) any period of service performed—

“(A) not later than December 31, 1977;

“(B) while a citizen of the United States;

“(C) in the employ of—

“(i) Air America, Inc.; or

“(ii) any entity associated with, predecessor to, or subsidiary to Air America, Inc., including—

“(I) Air Asia Company Limited;

“(II) CAT Incorporated;

“(III) Civil Air Transport Company Limited; and

“(IV) the Pacific Division of Southern Air Transport; and

“(D) during the period that Air America, Inc. or any other entity described in subparagraph (C) was owned and controlled by the United States Government.”; and

(D) in the second undesignated paragraph following paragraph (18) (as added by subparagraph (C)), by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this subchapter, service of the type described in paragraph (18) shall be considered to have been service as an employee.”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM DEPOSIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 8334(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) any period of service for which credit is allowed under section 8332(b)(18) of this title.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to annuities commencing on or after the effective date of this section.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CURRENT ANNUITANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (D) or paragraph (4), any individual who is entitled to an annuity for the month in which this section becomes effective may elect to have the amount of the annuity recomputed as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or may be based.

(B) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An election to have an annuity recomputed under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section.

(C) PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF RECOMPUTATION.—A recomputation under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the date of the first payment under the annuity that is made after the later of—

(i) the date of the recomputation; or

(ii) the effective date of this section.

(D) NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS.—An individual may not receive payments for any additional amounts that would have been payable, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or may be based, for periods before the first month for which recomputation is reflected in the regular monthly annuity payments of the individual.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR (BUT NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING) AN ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) ELECTION.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B)(ii) or paragraph (4), an individual not described in paragraph (2) who becomes eligible for an annuity or for an increased annuity as a result of the enactment of this section may elect to have the rights of the individual under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, determined as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or would be based.

(ii) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under clause (i) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the later of—

(I) the effective date of this section; or

(II) the date on which the individual separates from service.

(B) COMMENCEMENT DATE; RETROACTIVITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), any entitlement to an annuity or to an increased annuity resulting from an election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the date on which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section.

(ii) NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS.—An individual may not receive payments for any amounts that would have been payable, if the amendments made by this section had

been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity or increased annuity is or may be based, for periods before the first month for which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section.

(iii) RETROACTIVITY FOR PURPOSES OF ENTITLEMENT TO ANNUITY.—Any determination of the amount of any annuity, all the requirements for entitlement to which (including separation, but not including any application requirement) would have been satisfied before the effective date of this section if this section had been in effect (but would not then otherwise have been satisfied absent this section) shall be made as if application for the annuity had been submitted as of the earliest date that would have been allowable, after the date on which the individual separated from service, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout the periods of service referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

(4) NO RIGHT TO SURVIVOR ANNUITY.—Notwithstanding section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an individual shall not be entitled to an annuity or increased annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83 of such title based on service described in section 8332(b)(18) of such title (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) performed by a deceased individual.

(d) FUNDING.—Any increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System attributable to the enactment of this section shall be financed in accordance with section 8348(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations necessary to carry out this section, which shall include provisions under which rules similar to those established under the amendments made by section 201 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 588) shall be applied with respect to any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) that was subject to title II of the Social Security Act.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section.

SA 3763. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “annuity” includes a survivor annuity; and

(2) the terms “survivor”, “survivor annuitant”, and “unfunded liability” have the meanings given those terms under section 8331 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8332(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

“(18) any period of service performed—

“(A) not later than December 31, 1977;

“(B) while a citizen of the United States;

“(C) in the employ of—

“(i) Air America, Inc.; or

“(ii) any entity associated with, predecessor to, or subsidiary to Air America, Inc., including Air Asia Company Limited, CAT Incorporated, Civil Air Transport Company Limited, and the Pacific Division of Southern Air Transport; and

“(D) during the period that Air America, Inc. or such other entity described in subparagraph (C) was owned and controlled by the United States Government.”; and

(D) in the second undesignated paragraph following paragraph (18) (as added by subparagraph (C)), by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this subchapter, service of the type described in paragraph (18) of this subsection shall be considered to have been service as an employee.”.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM DEPOSIT REQUIREMENT.—Section 8334(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) any period of service for which credit is allowed under section 8332(b)(18) of this title.”.

(C) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to annuities commencing on or after the effective date of this section.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CURRENT ANNUITANTS.—

(A) ELECTION.—Any individual who is entitled to an annuity for the month in which this section becomes effective may elect to have the amount of such annuity recomputed as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or may be based.

(B) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under subparagraph (A) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RECOMPUTATION; RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A recomputation under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the commencement date of the annuity.

(ii) RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—Any additional amounts becoming payable, due to a recomputation under subparagraph (A), for periods before the first month for which the recomputation is reflected in the regular monthly annuity payments of an individual shall be payable to the individual in the form of a lump-sum payment.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR (BUT NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING) AN ANNUITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) ELECTION.—An individual not described in paragraph (2) who becomes eligible for an annuity or an increased annuity as a result of the enactment of this section may elect to have the rights of the individual under sub-

chapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, determined as if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout all periods of service on the basis of which the annuity is or would be based.

(ii) SUBMISSION OF ELECTION.—An individual shall make an election under clause (i) by submitting an appropriate application to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the later of—

(I) the effective date of this section; or

(II) the date on which the individual separates from service.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ENTITLEMENT; RETROACTIVITY.—

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), any entitlement to an annuity or an increased annuity resulting from an election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective as of the commencement date of the annuity.

(II) RETROACTIVE PAY AS LUMP-SUM PAYMENT.—Any amounts becoming payable for periods before the first month for which regular monthly annuity payments begin to be made in accordance with the amendments made by this section shall be payable to the individual in the form of a lump-sum payment.

(ii) RETROACTIVITY.—Any determination of the amount, or of the commencement date, of any annuity, all the requirements for entitlement to which (including separation, but not including any application requirement) would have been satisfied before the effective date of this section if this section had been in effect (but would not then otherwise have been satisfied absent this section) shall be made as if application for the annuity had been submitted as of the earliest date that would have been allowable, after the date on which the individual separated from service, if the amendments made by this section had been in effect throughout the periods of service referred to in subparagraph (A)(i).

(4) RIGHT TO FILE ON BEHALF OF A DECEDENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (e)(1) shall include provisions, in accordance with the order of precedence under section 8342(c) of title 5, United States Code, under which a survivor of an individual who performed service described in section 8332(b)(18) of such title (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) shall be allowed to submit an application on behalf of and to receive any lump-sum payment that would otherwise have been payable to the decedent under paragraph (2)(C)(ii) or (3)(B)(i)(II) of this subsection.

(B) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—An application under this paragraph shall not be valid unless it is filed not later than the later of—

(i) 2 years after the effective date of this section; or

(ii) 1 year after the date of the decedent's death.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—Any lump-sum payment under paragraph (2)(C)(ii) or (3)(B)(i)(II) of subsection (c) shall be payable out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

(2) UNFUNDED LIABILITY.—Any increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement System attributable to the enactment of this section shall be financed in accordance with section 8348(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(e) REGULATIONS AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate

any regulations necessary to carry out this section, which shall include provisions under which rules similar to those established under the amendments made by section 201 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 588) shall be applied with respect to any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)) that was subject to title II of the Social Security Act.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of any application for any benefit which is computed or recomputed taking into account any service described in section 8332(b)(18) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (b)(1)(C)), section 8345(i)(2) of such title shall be applied by deeming the reference to the date of the “other event which gives rise to title to the benefit” to refer to the effective date of this section, if later than the date of the event that would otherwise apply.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3764. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 626. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) RESTATEMENT OF CURRENT CONCURRENT PAYMENT AUTHORITY WITH EXTENSION OF PAYMENT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and subsection (b), a member or former member of the uniformed services who is entitled for any month to retired pay and who is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (hereinafter in this section referred to as ‘qualified retiree’) is entitled to be paid both for that month without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38.

“(2) ONE-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH TOTAL DISABILITIES.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2004, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is any of the following:

“(A) A qualified retiree receiving veterans' disability compensation for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(B) A qualified retiree receiving veterans' disability compensation at the rate payable

for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by reason of a determination of individual unemployability.

“(3) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2013, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans’ disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated not less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(4) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (d) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans’ disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs but is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.”.

(b) PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) PHASE-IN OF FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, retired pay payable to a qualified retiree that pursuant to subsection (a)(4) is subject to this subsection shall be determined as follows:

“(1) CALENDAR YEAR 2016.—For a month during 2016, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the amount (if any) of retired pay in excess of the current baseline offset plus the following:

“(A) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 40 percent disabling, \$ ____.

“(B) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 30 percent disabling, \$ ____.

“(C) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 20 percent disabling, \$ ____.

“(D) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 10 percent disabling, \$ ____.

“(2) CALENDAR YEAR 2017.—For a month during 2017, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 10 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that member’s disability.

“(3) CALENDAR YEAR 2018.—For a month during 2018, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 20 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree.

“(4) CALENDAR YEAR 2018.—For a month during 2019, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 30 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree.

“(5) CALENDAR YEAR 2020.—For a month during 2020, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 40 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree.

“(6) CALENDAR YEAR 2021.—For a month during 2021, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 50 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree.

“(7) CALENDAR YEAR 2022.—For a month during 2022, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 60 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree.

“(8) CALENDAR YEAR 2023.—For a month during 2023, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 70 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree.

“(9) CALENDAR YEAR 2024.—For a month during 2024, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 80 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree.

“(10) CALENDAR YEAR 2025.—For a month during 2025, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 90 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree.

“(11) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Retired pay determined under this subsection for a qualified retiree, if greater than the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree, shall be reduced to the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection caption, by inserting “FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER” after “FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT”; and

(2) by striking “the second sentence of subsection (a)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a)(3)”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation”.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 627. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1414(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

“(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

“(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member’s retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member’s years of creditable service multiplied by the member’s retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 3765. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 626. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS’ DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CONCURRENT RECEIPT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation”.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 627. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **QUALIFIED RETIREES.**—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 626(a) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by striking "a member or" and all that follows through "retiree"; and inserting "a qualified retiree"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) **QUALIFIED RETIREES.**—For purposes of this section, a qualified retiree, with respect to any month, is a member or former member of the uniformed services who—

"(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 12731b of this title); and

"(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation."

(2) **DISABILITY RETIREES.**—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.**—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 3766. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 626. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED 40 PERCENT DISABLING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "means" and all that follows and inserting "means the following:

"(A) During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on June 30, 2015, a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated

as not less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

"(B) After June 30, 2015, a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated as not less than 40 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs."

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation rated 40 percent or higher: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation"

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation rated 40 percent or higher: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 627. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) **AMENDMENT TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.**—Paragraph (2) of section 1414(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.**—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SA 3767. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 306 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 186) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) **PERSONNEL APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In appointing employees to positions in the Directorate of Science and Technology, the Secretary shall have the hiring and management authorities described in section 1101 of the Strom Thur-

mond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note; Public Law 105-261) (referred to in this subsection as 'section 1101').

"(2) **TERM OF APPOINTMENTS.**—The term of appointments for employees under subsection (c)(1) of section 1101 may not exceed 5 years before the granting of any extension under subsection (c)(2) of that section."

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 307(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (6); and

(2) redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to limit the authority granted under paragraph (6) of section 307(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3768. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 113, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 115, line 2, and insert the following:

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION COMPONENT ONLINE.**—

(1) **MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program is available to members of the Armed Forces on an Internet website of the Department of Defense so that members have an option to complete such component electronically and remotely.

(2) **VETERANS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program is available to veterans and their dependents on an Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs so that veterans and their dependents have an option to complete such component electronically and remotely.

(c) **NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION COMPONENT UPON REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF ENTITLEMENT TO CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **TUITION ASSISTANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever a member of the Armed Forces requests a certificate from the Secretary of Defense to prove entitlement to educational assistance under section 2007 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary shall notify the member of the availability of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program online pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(B) **GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out this paragraph with such guidance as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) **POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever a veteran or a dependent of a veteran requests a certificate from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prove entitlement to educational assistance

under chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary shall notify the veteran or dependent of the availability of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program online pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(B) **GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out this paragraph with such guidance as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) **TRACKING COMPLETION OF HIGHER EDUCATION COMPONENT ONLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall develop a mechanism to track the completion by veterans and their dependents of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program made available online pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(2) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—When the Secretary of Veterans Affairs has completed development of the mechanism required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress notice of such completion.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits notice under subsection (d)(2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the number of veterans and the number of dependents to whom the Secretary of Veterans Affairs provided notice pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A); and

(2) the number of veterans and the number of dependents who completed the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program electronically and remotely.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “institution of higher learning” has the meaning given such term in section 3452 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “type of institution of higher learning” means the following types of institutions of higher learning:

(A) An educational institution described in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) An educational institution described in subsection (b) of section 102 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(C) An educational institution described in subsection (c) of such section.

SEC. 534. SHARING OF INFORMATION AMONG DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO FACILITATE ASSESSMENT.

(a) **SHARING OF INFORMATION TO ASSESS STUDENT LOAN DEBT.**—

(1) **PLAN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly develop and implement a plan to share information that will enable the Secretary of Education to distinguish members of the Armed Forces and veterans in the student loan databases of the Department of Education for the purposes of determining aggregate information on student loan debt incurred by the member and veteran populations.

(2) **ELEMENTS OF INFORMATION SHARED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—Information to be shared by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from databases of the Department of Veterans Affairs under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The type and extent of educational assistance provided under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, including chapters 30 and 33 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) The names of the educational institutions at which individuals pursue programs of education with educational assistance provided under such laws.

(C) The extent of assistance provided under the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program.

(D) The degree of exhaustion of entitlement to such assistance.

(E) To what degree an overpayment of such assistance is made.

(F) Such other information as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Education consider appropriate.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT ON STUDENT LOAN DEBT INCURRED BY VETERANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report on debt incurred by veterans to pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The extent of debt incurred by veterans to pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning, disaggregated by type of institution of higher learning, including the following:

(i) How the debt compares to the debt incurred by individuals who are not veterans.

(ii) The status of repayment of and default on such debt and how that compares to the repayment of and default on debt incurred by individuals who are not veterans to pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning.

(iii) The proportion of veterans who do not incur any Federal student loan debt to pursue a program of education at an institution of higher learning.

(B) Assessment and analysis of the factors that contribute to the debt incurred by veterans in their pursuit of programs of education at institutions of higher learning, disaggregated by type of institution of higher learning, including the following:

(i) The extent of coverage of educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(ii) The exhaustion of entitlement to educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(iii) The availability of assistance under the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program.

(iv) Such other factors as the Secretary of Education considers appropriate.

(C) Such recommendations as the Secretary of Education may have for legislative or administrative action to address such issues as the Secretary of Education may have identified concerning debt incurred by veterans to pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning.

(c) **SHARING OF INFORMATION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall establish an automated system to enable the Department of Education, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Defense to more efficiently share information pertaining to the same institutions of higher learning.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “institution of higher learning” has the meaning given such term in section 3452 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “type of institution of higher learning” means the following types of institutions of higher learning:

(A) An educational institution described in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) An educational institution described in subsection (b) of section 102 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1002).

(C) An educational institution described in subsection (c) of such section.

SA 3769. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 864. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROTEST TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS UNDER CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.

Section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SA 3770. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle I—Federal Information Security

SEC. 1091. FISMA REFORM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“§ 3551. Purposes

“The purposes of this subchapter are to—

“(1) provide a comprehensive framework for ensuring the effectiveness of information security controls over information resources that support Federal operations and assets;

“(2) recognize the highly networked nature of the current Federal computing environment and provide effective governmentwide management and oversight of the related information security risks, including coordination of information security efforts throughout the civilian, national security, and law enforcement communities;

“(3) provide for development and maintenance of minimum controls required to protect Federal information and information systems;

“(4) provide a mechanism for improved oversight of Federal agency information security programs;

“(5) acknowledge that commercially developed information security products offer advanced, dynamic, robust, and effective information security solutions, reflecting market solutions for the protection of critical information infrastructures important to the national defense and economic security of the nation that are designed, built, and operated by the private sector; and

“(6) recognize that the selection of specific technical hardware and software information security solutions should be left to individual agencies from among commercially developed products.

“§ 3552. Definitions

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the definitions under section 3502 shall apply to this subchapter.

“(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subchapter:

“(1) The term ‘binding operational directive’ means a compulsory direction to an agency that is in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines issued by the Director.

“(2) The term ‘incident’ means an occurrence that—

“(A) actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information or an information system; or

“(B) constitutes a violation or imminent threat of violation of law, security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies.

“(3) The term ‘information security’ means protecting information and information systems from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction in order to provide—

“(A) integrity, which means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity;

“(B) confidentiality, which means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information; and

“(C) availability, which means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

“(4) The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40.

“(5) The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(6)(A) The term ‘national security system’ means any information system (including any telecommunications system) used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency, or other organization on behalf of an agency—

“(i) the function, operation, or use of which—

“(I) involves intelligence activities;

“(II) involves cryptologic activities related to national security;

“(III) involves command and control of military forces;

“(IV) involves equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons system; or

“(V) subject to subparagraph (B), is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; or

“(ii) is protected at all times by procedures established for information that have been specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order or an Act of Congress to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

“(B) Subparagraph (A)(i)(V) does not include a system that is to be used for routine administrative and business applications (including payroll, finance, logistics, and personnel management applications).

“(7) The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“§ 3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary

“(a) DIRECTOR.—The Director shall oversee agency information security policies, including—

“(1) developing and overseeing the implementation of policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including through ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(2) requiring agencies, consistent with the standards promulgated under such section 11331 and the requirements of this subchapter, to identify and provide information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(A) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(B) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(3) ensuring that the Secretary carries out the authorities and functions under subsection (b);

“(4) coordinating the development of standards and guidelines under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) with agencies and offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency) to assure, to the maximum extent feasible, that such standards and guidelines are complementary with standards and guidelines developed for national security systems;

“(5) overseeing agency compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including through any authorized action under section 11303 of title 40, to enforce accountability for compliance with such requirements;

“(6) coordinating information security policies and procedures with related information resources management policies and procedures; and

“(7) consulting with the Secretary in carrying out the authorities and functions under this subsection.

“(b) SECRETARY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall oversee the operational aspects of agency information security policies and practices for information systems, except for national security systems and information systems described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e), including—

“(1) assisting the Director in carrying out the authorities and functions under subsection (a);

“(2) developing and overseeing the implementation of binding operational directives to agencies to implement the policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director under subsection (a)(1) and the requirements of this subchapter, which may be repealed by the Director if the operational directives issued on behalf of the Director are not in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director, including—

“(A) requirements for reporting security incidents to the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

“(B) requirements for the contents of the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1);

“(C) requirements for the mitigation of ex-
igent risks to information systems; and

“(D) other operational requirements as the Director or Secretary may determine necessary;

“(3) monitoring agency implementation of information security policies and practices;

“(4) convening meetings with senior agency officials to help ensure effective implementation of information security policies and practices;

“(5) coordinating Government-wide efforts on information security policies and practices, including consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603;

“(6) providing operational and technical assistance to agencies in implementing policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including implementation of standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, including by—

“(A) operating the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

“(B) upon request by an agency, deploying technology to assist the agency to continuously diagnose and mitigate against cyber threats and vulnerabilities, with or without reimbursement;

“(C) compiling and analyzing data on agency information security; and

“(D) developing and conducting targeted operational evaluations, including threat and vulnerability assessments, on the information systems; and

“(7) other actions as the Secretary may determine necessary to carry out this subsection on behalf of the Director.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to Congress a report on the effectiveness of information security policies and practices during the preceding year, including—

“(1) a summary of the incidents described in the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1), including a summary of the information required under section 3554(c)(1)(A)(iii);

“(2) a description of the threshold for reporting major information security incidents;

“(3) a summary of the results of evaluations required to be performed under section 3555;

“(4) an assessment of agency compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40; and

“(5) an assessment of agency compliance with the policies and procedures established under section 3559(a).

“(d) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Except for the authorities and functions described in subsection (a)(4) and subsection (c), the authorities and functions of the Director and the Secretary under this section shall not apply to national security systems.

“(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SYSTEMS.—(1) The authorities of the Director described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be delegated to the Secretary of Defense in the case of systems described in paragraph (2) and to the Director of National Intelligence in the case of systems described in paragraph (3).

“(2) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by the Department of Defense, a contractor of the Department of Defense, or another entity on behalf of the Department of Defense that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by an element of the intelligence community, a contractor of an element of the intelligence community, or another entity on behalf of an element of the intelligence community that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of an element of the intelligence community.

“§ 3554. Federal agency responsibilities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall—

“(1) be responsible for—

“(A) providing information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of the agency; and

“(ii) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(B) complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines, including—

“(i) information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(ii) operational directives developed by the Secretary under section 3553(b);

“(iii) policies and procedures issued by the Director under section 3559; and

“(iv) information security standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(C) ensuring that information security management processes are integrated with agency strategic and operational planning processes;

“(2) ensure that senior agency officials provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets under their control, including through—

“(A) assessing the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information systems;

“(B) determining the levels of information security appropriate to protect such information and information systems in accordance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, for information security classifications and related requirements;

“(C) implementing policies and procedures to cost-effectively reduce risks to an acceptable level; and

“(D) periodically testing and evaluating information security controls and techniques to ensure that they are effectively implemented;

“(3) delegate to the agency Chief Information Officer established under section 3506 (or comparable official in an agency not covered by such section) the authority to ensure compliance with the requirements imposed on the agency under this subchapter, including—

“(A) designating a senior agency information security officer who shall—

“(i) carry out the Chief Information Officer's responsibilities under this section;

“(ii) possess professional qualifications, including training and experience, required to administer the functions described under this section;

“(iii) have information security duties as that official's primary duty; and

“(iv) head an office with the mission and resources to assist in ensuring agency compliance with this section;

“(B) developing and maintaining an agencywide information security program as required by subsection (b);

“(C) developing and maintaining information security policies, procedures, and control techniques to address all applicable requirements, including those issued under section 3553 of this title and section 11331 of title 40;

“(D) training and overseeing personnel with significant responsibilities for information security with respect to such responsibilities; and

“(E) assisting senior agency officials concerning their responsibilities under paragraph (2);

“(4) ensure that the agency has trained personnel sufficient to assist the agency in complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines;

“(5) ensure that the agency Chief Information Officer, in coordination with other senior agency officials, reports annually to the agency head on the effectiveness of the agency information security program, including progress of remedial actions;

“(6) ensure that senior agency officials, including chief information officers of component agencies or equivalent officials, carry out responsibilities under this subchapter as directed by the official delegated authority under paragraph (3); and

“(7) ensure that all personnel are held accountable for complying with the agencywide information security program implemented under subsection (b).

“(b) AGENCY PROGRAM.—Each agency shall develop, document, and implement an agencywide information security program to provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source, that includes—

“(1) periodic assessments of the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency;

“(2) policies and procedures that—

“(A) are based on the risk assessments required by paragraph (1);

“(B) cost-effectively reduce information security risks to an acceptable level;

“(C) ensure that information security is addressed throughout the life cycle of each agency information system; and

“(D) ensure compliance with—

“(i) the requirements of this subchapter;

“(ii) policies and procedures as may be prescribed by the Director, and information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(iii) minimally acceptable system configuration requirements, as determined by the agency; and

“(iv) any other applicable requirements, including standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President;

“(3) subordinate plans for providing adequate information security for networks, facilities, and systems or groups of information systems, as appropriate;

“(4) security awareness training to inform personnel, including contractors and other users of information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, of—

“(A) information security risks associated with their activities; and

“(B) their responsibilities in complying with agency policies and procedures designed to reduce these risks;

“(5) periodic testing and evaluation of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, to be performed with a frequency depending on risk, but no less than annually, of which such testing—

“(A) shall include testing of management, operational, and technical controls of every information system identified in the inventory required under section 3505(c); and

“(B) may include testing relied on in an evaluation under section 3555;

“(6) a process for planning, implementing, evaluating, and documenting remedial action to address any deficiencies in the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency;

“(7) procedures for detecting, reporting, and responding to security incidents, consistent with standards and guidelines described in section 3556(b), including—

“(A) mitigating risks associated with such incidents before substantial damage is done;

“(B) notifying and consulting with the Federal information security incident center established in section 3556; and

“(C) notifying and consulting with, as appropriate—

“(i) law enforcement agencies and relevant Offices of Inspector General;

“(ii) an office designated by the President for any incident involving a national security system;

“(iii) the committees of Congress described in subsection (c)(1)—

“(I) not later than 7 days after the date on which the incident is discovered; and

“(II) after the initial notification under subclause (I), within a reasonable period of time after additional information relating to the incident is discovered; and

“(iv) any other agency or office, in accordance with law or as directed by the President; and

“(8) plans and procedures to ensure continuity of operations for information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency.

“(c) AGENCY REPORTING.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall submit to the Director, the Secretary, the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the appropriate authorization and appropriations committees of Congress, and the Comptroller General a report on the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, including—

“(i) a description of each major information security incident or related sets of incidents, including summaries of—

“(I) the threats and threat actors, vulnerabilities, and impacts relating to the incident;

“(II) the risk assessments conducted under section 3554(a)(2)(A) of the affected information systems before the date on which the incident occurred; and

“(III) the detection, response, and remediation actions;

“(ii) the total number of information security incidents, including a description of incidents resulting in significant compromise

of information security, system impact levels, types of incident, and locations of affected systems;

“(iii) a description of each major information security incident that involved a breach of personally identifiable information, including—

“(I) the number of individuals whose information was affected by the major information security incident; and

“(II) a description of the information that was breached or exposed; and

“(iv) any other information as the Secretary may require.

“(B) UNCLASSIFIED REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(ii) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The head of an agency shall ensure that, to the greatest extent practicable, information is included in the unclassified version of the reports submitted by the agency under subparagraph (A).

“(2) OTHER PLANS AND REPORTS.—Each agency shall address the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices in management plans and reports.

“(d) PERFORMANCE PLAN.—(1) In addition to the requirements of subsection (c), each agency, in consultation with the Director, shall include as part of the performance plan required under section 1115 of title 31 a description of—

“(A) the time periods; and

“(B) the resources, including budget, staffing, and training, that are necessary to implement the program required under subsection (b).

“(2) The description under paragraph (1) shall be based on the risk assessments required under subsection (b)(1).

“(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Each agency shall provide the public with timely notice and opportunities for comment on proposed information security policies and procedures to the extent that such policies and procedures affect communication with the public.

“§ 3555. Annual independent evaluation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each year each agency shall have performed an independent evaluation of the information security program and practices of that agency to determine the effectiveness of such program and practices.

“(2) Each evaluation under this section shall include—

“(A) testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems;

“(B) an assessment of the effectiveness of the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency; and

“(C) separate presentations, as appropriate, regarding information security relating to national security systems.

“(b) INDEPENDENT AUDITOR.—Subject to subsection (c)—

“(1) for each agency with an Inspector General appointed under the Inspector General Act of 1978, the annual evaluation required by this section shall be performed by the Inspector General or by an independent external auditor, as determined by the Inspector General of the agency; and

“(2) for each agency to which paragraph (1) does not apply, the head of the agency shall engage an independent external auditor to perform the evaluation.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—For each agency operating or exercising control

of a national security system, that portion of the evaluation required by this section directly relating to a national security system shall be performed—

“(1) only by an entity designated by the agency head; and

“(2) in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(d) EXISTING EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation required by this section may be based in whole or in part on an audit, evaluation, or report relating to programs or practices of the applicable agency.

“(e) AGENCY REPORTING.—(1) Each year, not later than such date established by the Director, the head of each agency shall submit to the Director the results of the evaluation required under this section.

“(2) To the extent an evaluation required under this section directly relates to a national security system, the evaluation results submitted to the Director shall contain only a summary and assessment of that portion of the evaluation directly relating to a national security system.

“(f) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Agencies and evaluators shall take appropriate steps to ensure the protection of information which, if disclosed, may adversely affect information security. Such protections shall be commensurate with the risk and comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

“(g) OMB REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Director shall summarize the results of the evaluations conducted under this section in the report to Congress required under section 3553(c).

“(2) The Director's report to Congress under this subsection shall summarize information regarding information security relating to national security systems in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(3) Evaluations and any other descriptions of information systems under the authority and control of the Director of Central Intelligence or of National Foreign Intelligence Programs systems under the authority and control of the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to Congress only through the appropriate oversight committees of Congress, in accordance with applicable laws.

“(h) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall periodically evaluate and report to Congress on—

“(1) the adequacy and effectiveness of agency information security policies and practices; and

“(2) implementation of the requirements of this subchapter.

“(i) ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Comptroller General may provide technical assistance to an Inspector General or the head of an agency, as applicable, to assist the Inspector General or head of an agency in carrying out the duties under this section, including by testing information security controls and procedures.

“§ 3556. Federal information security incident center

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure the operation of a central Federal information security incident center to—

“(1) provide timely technical assistance to operators of agency information systems regarding security incidents, including guidance on detecting and handling information security incidents;

“(2) compile and analyze information about incidents that threaten information security;

“(3) inform operators of agency information systems about current and potential information security threats, and vulnerabilities;

“(4) provide, as appropriate, intelligence and other information about cyber threats, vulnerabilities, and incidents to agencies to assist in risk assessments conducted under section 3554(b); and

“(5) consult with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, agencies or offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency), and such other agencies or offices in accordance with law and as directed by the President regarding information security incidents and related matters.

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall share information about information security incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with the Federal information security incident center to the extent consistent with standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President.

“§ 3557. National security systems

“The head of each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall be responsible for ensuring that the agency—

“(1) provides information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of the information contained in such system;

“(2) implements information security policies and practices as required by standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(3) complies with the requirements of this subchapter.

“§ 3558. Effect on existing law

“Nothing in this subchapter, section 11331 of title 40, or section 20 of the National Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) may be construed as affecting the authority of the President, the Office of Management and Budget or the Director thereof, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or the head of any agency, with respect to the authorized use or disclosure of information, including with regard to the protection of personal privacy under section 552a of title 5, the disclosure of information under section 552 of title 5, the management and disposition of records under chapters 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, the management of information resources under subchapter I of chapter 35 of this title, or the disclosure of information to the Congress or the Comptroller General of the United States.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code is amended by striking the matter relating to subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“3551. Purposes.

“3552. Definitions.

“3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary.

“3554. Federal agency responsibilities.

“3555. Annual independent evaluation.

“3556. Federal information security incident center.

“3557. National security systems.

“3558. Effect on existing law.”.

(2) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT.—Section 8(d)(1) of the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406) is amended by striking “section 3534” and inserting “section 3554”.

(3) HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—Section 1001(c)(1)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 511) by striking “section 3532(3)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(4) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT.—Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 3532(1)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(2)”;

and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(5) TITLE 10.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 2222(j)(5), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in section 2223(c)(3), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(C) in section 2315, by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(c) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(1) CIRCULAR A-130.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall revise Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130 to eliminate inefficient or wasteful reporting.

(2) ISPAB.—Section 21(b) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-4(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Institute”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Secretary of Commerce”.

SEC. 1092. FEDERAL DATA BREACH RESPONSE GUIDELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, as added by this subtitle, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3559. Privacy breach requirements

“(a) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish and oversee policies and procedures for agencies to follow in the event of a breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information, including requirements for—

“(1) timely notice to affected individuals based on a determination of the level of risk and consistent with law enforcement and national security considerations;

“(2) timely reporting to the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556 or other Federal cybersecurity center, as designated by the Director;

“(3) timely notice to committees of Congress with jurisdiction over cybersecurity; and

“(4) such additional actions as the Director may determine necessary and appropriate, including the provision of risk mitigation measures to affected individuals.

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Director shall consider recommendations made by the Government Ac-

countability Office, including recommendations in the December 2013 Government Accountability Office report entitled ‘Information Security: Agency Responses to Breaches of Personally Identifiable Information Need to Be More Consistent’ (GAO-14-34).

“(c) REQUIRED AGENCY ACTION.—The head of each agency shall ensure that actions taken in response to a breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information under the authority or control of the agency comply with policies and procedures established under subsection (a).

“(d) TIMELINESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the policies and procedures established under subsection (a) shall require that the notice to affected individuals required under subsection (a)(1) be made without unreasonable delay and with consideration of the likely risk of harm and the level of impact, but not later than 60 days after the date on which the head of an agency discovers the breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information.

“(2) DELAY.—The Attorney General, the head of an element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), or the Secretary may delay the notice to affected individuals under subsection (a)(1) for not more than 180 days, if the notice would disrupt a law enforcement investigation, endanger national security, or hamper security remediation actions from the breach of information security involving the disclosure of personally identifiable information.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, as added by this Act, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3558 the following:

“3559. Privacy breach requirements.”.

SA 3771. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, add the following:

Subtitle I—National Cybersecurity Communications Integration Center

SEC. 1091. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 210G. OPERATIONS CENTER.

“(a) FUNCTIONS.—There is in the Department an operations center, which may carry out the responsibilities of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H) with respect to security and resilience, including by—

“(1) serving as a Federal civilian information sharing interface for cybersecurity;

“(2) providing shared situational awareness to enable real-time, integrated, and operational actions across the Federal Govern-

ment; “(3) sharing cybersecurity threat, vulnerability, impact, and incident information and analysis by and among Federal, State, and local government entities and private sector entities;

“(4) coordinating cybersecurity information sharing throughout the Federal Government;

“(5) conducting analysis of cybersecurity risks and incidents;

“(6) upon request, providing timely technical assistance to Federal and non-Federal entities with respect to cybersecurity threats and attribution, vulnerability mitigation, and incident response and remediation; and

“(7) providing recommendations on security and resilience measures to Federal and non-Federal entities.

“(b) COMPOSITION.—The operations center shall be composed of—

“(1) personnel or other representatives of Federal agencies, including civilian and law enforcement agencies and elements of the intelligence community, as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)); and

“(2) representatives from State and local governments and other non-Federal entities, including—

“(A) representatives from information sharing and analysis organizations; and

“(B) private sector owners and operators of critical information systems.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and every year thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the operations center, which shall include—

“(1) an analysis of the performance of the operations center in carrying out the functions under subsection (a);

“(2) information on the composition of the center, including—

“(A) the number of representatives from non-Federal entities that are participating in the operations center, including the number of representatives from States, nonprofit organizations, and private sector entities, respectively; and

“(B) the number of requests from non-Federal entities to participate in the operations center and the response to such requests, including—

“(i) the average length of time to fulfill such identified requests by the Federal agency responsible for fulfilling such requests; and

“(ii) a description of any obstacles or challenges to fulfilling such requests; and

“(3) the policies and procedures established by the operations center to safeguard privacy and civil liberties.

“(d) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of the operations center.

“(e) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The provision of assistance or information to, and inclusion in the operations center of, governmental or private entities under this section shall be at the discretion of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H).

The provision of certain assistance or information to, or inclusion in the operations center of, one governmental or private entity pursuant to this section shall not create a right or benefit, substantive or procedural, to similar assistance or information for any other governmental or private entity.”

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210F the following:

“Sec. 210G. Operations center.”.

SA 3772. Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3060 proposed by Mr. WYDEN to the bill H.R. 3474, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(c) **ENCOURAGEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES BY NATIVE CORPORATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 170(b) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN NATIVE CORPORATIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Any qualified conservation contribution (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) which—

“(I) is made by a Native Corporation, and

“(II) is a contribution of property which was land conveyed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act,

shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer’s taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) **CARRYOVER.**—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(2)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 15 succeeding years in order of time.

“(iii) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘Native Corporation’ has the meaning given such term by section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 170(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (B) applies” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) or (C) apply”.

(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to modify any existing property rights conveyed to Native Corporations (within the meaning of section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act) under such Act.

SA 3773. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for

military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1035. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE MAY 31, 2014, TRANSFER OF FIVE DETAINEES FROM THE DETENTION FACILITY AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) In enacting the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), Congress provided the executive branch with clear guidance and requirements for transferring or releasing individuals from the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(2) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 states the Secretary of Defense may transfer an individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, if the Secretary determines, following a review conducted in accordance with the requirements of section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 801 note) and Executive Order No. 13567, that the individual is no longer a threat to the United States, or the individual is ordered released by a United States court, or such an individual can be transferred if the Secretary determines that actions have been or are planned to be taken which will substantially mitigate the risk of the individual engaging or re-engaging in any terrorist activity or other hostile activity that threatens the United States or United States persons or interests and the transfer is in the national security interest of the United States.

(3) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 states that the Secretary of Defense must notify the appropriate committees of Congress of such a determination not later than 30 days before the transfer or release of the individual concerned from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(4) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 states that such a notification must include a detailed statement of the basis for the transfer or release, an explanation of why the transfer or release is in the national security interests of the United States, a description of any actions taken to mitigate the risks of reengagement by the individual to be transferred or released, a copy of any Periodic Review Board findings relating to the individual, and a description of the evaluation conducted pursuant to factors that must be considered prior to such a transfer or release.

(5) The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76) states that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in that Act may be used to transfer covered individuals detained at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, except in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

(6) On May 31, 2014, detainees Khairullah Khairkhwa, Abdul Haq Wasiq, Mohammed Fazl, Noorullah Noori, and Mohammed Nabi Omari were transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar.

(7) The appropriate committees of Congress were not notified of the transfers as re-

quired by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 prior to the transfers.

(b) **SENSE OF SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the transfers of detainees Khairullah Khairkhwa, Abdul Haq Wasiq, Mohammed Fazl, Noorullah Noori, and Mohammed Nabi Omari from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar on May 31, 2014, violated the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76); and

(2) Congress should—

(A) investigate the actions taken by President Obama and his administration that led to the unlawful transfer of such detainees, including an evaluation of other options considered to reach the desired common defense policy outcome of the President; and

(B) determine the impact of the transfer of such detainees on the common defense of the United States and measures that should be taken to mitigate any negative consequences.

SA 3774. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 737. PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS BECOMING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§520d. Preliminary mental health assessments

“(a) **PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.**—Before any individual enlists in an armed force or is commissioned as an officer in an armed force, the Secretary concerned shall provide the individual with a mental health assessment.

“(b) **USE OF ASSESSMENT.**—(1) The Secretary shall use the results of a mental assessment conducted under subsection (a) as a baseline for any subsequent mental health examinations of the individual, including such examinations provided under sections 1074f and 1074m of this title.

“(2) The Secretary may not consider the results of a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in determining the assignment or promotion of a member of the armed forces.

“(c) **APPLICATION OF PRIVACY LAWS.**—With respect to applicable laws and regulations relating to the privacy of information, the Secretary shall treat a mental health assessment conducted under subsection (a) in the same manner as the medical records of a member of the armed forces.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 520c the following new item:

“520d. Preliminary mental health assessments.”.

(c) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of Defense a report on preliminary mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) Recommendations with respect to establishing a preliminary mental health assessment of members of the Armed Forces to bring mental health screenings to parity with physical screenings of members.

(ii) Recommendations with respect to the composition of the mental health assessment, evidenced-based best practices, and how to track assessment changes relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions.

(iii) Recommendations with respect to overcoming limitations experienced during previous efforts to conduct preliminary mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces.

(C) COORDINATION.—The National Institute of Mental Health shall carry out subparagraph (A) in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the surgeons general of the military departments, and other relevant experts.

(2) PERIODIC REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary of Defense begins providing preliminary mental health assessments under section 520d(a) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every three years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the efficacy of such preliminary mental health assessments.

(B) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An evaluation of the parity between mental health screenings and physical health screenings of members of the Armed Forces.

(ii) An evaluation of the evidence-based best practices used by the Secretary in composing and conducting preliminary mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces under such section 520d(a).

(iii) An evaluation of the evidence-based best practices used by the Secretary in tracking mental health assessment changes relating to traumatic brain injuries, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other conditions among members of the Armed Forces.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF PRELIMINARY MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may not provide a preliminary mental health assessment under section 520d(a) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), until the Secretary receives and evaluates the initial report required by subsection (c)(1).

SEC. 738. PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS AND MENTAL HEALTH SCREENINGS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS UNDERGOING SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE NOT OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE FOR SUCH EXAMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall provide a comprehensive physical examination (including a screening for Traumatic Brain Injury) and a mental health screening to each member of the Armed Forces who, after a period of active duty of more than 180 days, is undergoing separation from the Armed Forces and is not otherwise provided such an

examination or screening in connection with such separation from the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) NO RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.—The provision of a physical examination or mental health screening to a member under subsection (a) shall not, by itself, be used to determine the eligibility of the member for any health care benefits from the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) FUNDING.—Funds for the provision of physical examinations and mental health screenings under this section shall be derived from funds otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the military department concerned for the provision of health care to members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 739. REPORT ON CAPACITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE ELECTRONIC COPY OF MEMBER SERVICE TREATMENT RECORDS TO MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the capacity of the Department of Defense to provide each member of the Armed Forces who is undergoing separation from the Armed Forces an electronic copy of the member's service treatment record at the time of separation.

(b) MATTERS RELATING TO THE NATIONAL GUARD.—The assessment under subsection (a) with regards to members of the National Guard shall include an assessment of the capacity of the Department to ensure that the electronic copy of a member's service treatment record includes health records maintained by each State or territory in which the member served.

SA 3775. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2648, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 24, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for “Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, \$122,250,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the United States Southern Command: *Provided*, That not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the use of funds made available by this paragraph, including the amounts provided to any military or security forces of a foreign country and the use of amounts so provided by such forces.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 3101. Of the unobligated balance available for “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief Fund”, \$122,250,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on a budget or the Balanced Budget and

Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SA 3776. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. ADDITIONAL APPOINTING AUTHORITIES FOR COMPETITIVE SERVICE.

(a) SELECTION FROM CERTIFICATES.—Section 3318 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) CERTIFICATE SHARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 240-day period beginning on the date of issuance of a certificate of eligibles under section 3317(a), an appointing authority other than the appointing authority requesting the certificate may select an individual from that certificate in accordance with paragraph (2) for an appointment to a position that is—

“(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the ‘original position’); and

“(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The selection of an individual under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be made in accordance with subsection (a); and

“(B) may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

“(3) APPLICABILITY.—An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

“(4) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71.”

(b) ALTERNATIVE RANKING AND SELECTION PROCEDURES.—Section 3319(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (6);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

“(2) An appointing official other than the appointing official described in paragraph (1) may select an individual for appointment to a position that is—

“(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the ‘original position’); and

“(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

“(3) The selection of an individual under paragraph (2)—

“(A) shall be made in accordance with this subsection; and

“(B) may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

“(4) An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

“(5) Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71.”; and

(3) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2)”; and

(B) by striking “3318(b)” and inserting “3318(c)”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations to carry out the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9510(b)(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “3318(b)” and inserting “3318(c)”.

SA 3777. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, insert the following:

Subtitle I—Cybersecurity Workforce

SEC. 1091. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the end of subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.), add the following:

“SEC. 226. CYBERSECURITY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘collective bargaining agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 7103(a)(8) of title 5, United States Code.

“(3) EXCEPTED SERVICE.—The term ‘excepted service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2103 of title 5, United States Code.

“(4) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE.—The term ‘preference eligible’ has the meaning given that term in section 2108 of title 5, United States Code.

“(5) QUALIFIED POSITION.—The term ‘qualified position’ means a position, designated by the Secretary for the purpose of this section, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the responsibilities of the Department relating to cybersecurity.

“(6) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—The term ‘Senior Executive Service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2101a of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISH POSITIONS, APPOINT PERSONNEL, AND FIX RATES OF PAY.—

“(A) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may—

“(i) establish, as positions in the excepted service, such qualified positions in the Department as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Department relating to cybersecurity, including positions formerly identified as—

“(I) senior level positions designated under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(II) positions in the Senior Executive Service;

“(ii) appoint an individual to a qualified position (after taking into consideration the availability of preference eligibles for appointment to the position); and

“(iii) subject to the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3), fix the compensation of an individual for service in a qualified position.

“(B) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LAWS.—The authority of the Secretary under this subsection applies without regard to the provisions of any other law relating to the appointment, number, classification, or compensation of employees.

“(2) BASIC PAY.—

“(A) AUTHORITY TO FIX RATES OF BASIC PAY.—In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall fix the rates of basic pay for any qualified position established under paragraph (1) in relation to the rates of pay provided for employees in comparable positions in the Department of Defense and subject to the same limitations on maximum rates of pay established for such employees by law or regulation.

“(B) PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS.—The Secretary may, consistent with section 5341 of title 5, United States Code, adopt such provisions of that title as provide for prevailing rate systems of basic pay and may apply those provisions to qualified positions for employees in or under which the Department may employ individuals described by section 5342(a)(2)(A) of that title.

“(3) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION, INCENTIVES, AND ALLOWANCES.—

“(A) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION BASED ON TITLE 5 AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may provide employees in qualified positions compensation (in addition to basic pay), including benefits, incentives, and allowances, consistent with, and not in excess of, the level authorized for, comparable positions authorized by title 5, United States Code.

“(B) ALLOWANCES IN NONFOREIGN AREAS.—An employee in a qualified position whose rate of basic pay is fixed under paragraph (2)(A) shall be eligible for an allowance under section 5941 of title 5, United States Code, on the same basis and to the same extent as if the employee was an employee covered by such section 5941, including eligibility conditions, allowance rates, and all other terms and conditions in law or regulation.

“(4) PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this subsection.

“(5) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to impair the continued effectiveness of a collective bargaining agreement with respect to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department that is a successor to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department covered by the agreement before the succession.

“(6) REQUIRED REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of

the Office of Personnel Management, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and every year thereafter for 4 years, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report that—

“(1) discusses the process used by the Secretary in accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans’ preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by an individual for a qualified position;

“(2) describes—

“(A) how the Secretary plans to fulfill the critical need of the Department to recruit and retain employees in qualified positions;

“(B) the measures that will be used to measure progress; and

“(C) any actions taken during the reporting period to fulfill such critical need;

“(3) discusses how the planning and actions taken under paragraph (2) are integrated into the strategic workforce planning of the Department;

“(4) provides metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period, including—

“(A) the number of employees in qualified positions hired by occupation and grade and level or pay band;

“(B) the placement of employees in qualified positions by directorate and office within the Department;

“(C) the total number of veterans hired;

“(D) the number of separations of employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band;

“(E) the number of retirements of employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band; and

“(F) the number and amounts of recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives paid to employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band; and

“(5) describes the training provided to supervisors of employees in qualified positions at the Department on the use of the new authorities.

“(d) THREE-YEAR PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—The probationary period for all employees hired under the authority established in this section shall be 3 years.

“(e) INCUMBENTS OF EXISTING COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual serving in a position on the date of enactment of this section that is selected to be converted to a position in the excepted service under this section shall have the right to refuse such conversion.

“(2) SUBSEQUENT CONVERSION.—After the date on which an individual who refuses a conversion under paragraph (1) stops serving in the position selected to be converted, the position may be converted to a position in the excepted service.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter following subparagraph (E)—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) any position established as a qualified position in the excepted service by the Secretary of Homeland Security under section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.”.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 225 the following:

“Sec. 226. Cybersecurity recruitment and retention.”.

SEC. 1092. HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(2) CYBERSECURITY WORK CATEGORY; DATA ELEMENT CODE; SPECIALTY AREA.—The terms “Cybersecurity Work Category”, “Data Element Code”, and “Specialty Area” have the meanings given such terms in the Office of Personnel Management’s Guide to Data Standards.

(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE MEASUREMENT INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) identify all cybersecurity workforce positions within the Department;

(B) determine the primary Cybersecurity Work Category and Specialty Area of such positions; and

(C) assign the corresponding Data Element Code, as set forth in the Office of Personnel Management’s Guide to Data Standards which is aligned with the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework report, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) EMPLOYMENT CODES.—

(a) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish procedures—

(i) to identify open positions that include cybersecurity functions (as defined in the OPM Guide to Data Standards); and

(ii) to assign the appropriate employment code to each such position, using agreed standards and definitions.

(b) CODE ASSIGNMENTS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assign the appropriate employment code to—

(i) each employee within the Department who carries out cybersecurity functions; and

(ii) each open position within the Department that have been identified as having cybersecurity functions.

(3) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a progress report on the implementation of this subsection to the appropriate congressional committees.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF CYBERSECURITY SPECIALTY AREAS OF CRITICAL NEED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date on which the employment codes are assigned to employees pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(B), and annually through 2021, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall—

(A) identify Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas of critical need

in the Department’s cybersecurity workforce; and

(B) submit a report to the Director that—

(i) describes the Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) substantiates the critical need designations.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Director shall provide the Secretary with timely guidance for identifying Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas of critical need, including—

(A) current Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas with acute skill shortages; and

(B) Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas with emerging skill shortages.

(3) CYBERSECURITY CRITICAL NEEDS REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall—

(A) identify Specialty Areas of critical need for cybersecurity workforce across the Department; and

(B) submit a progress report on the implementation of this subsection to the appropriate congressional committees.

(d) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STATUS REPORTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) analyze and monitor the implementation of subsections (b) and (c); and

(2) not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of such implementation.

SEC. 1093. UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1599e. Cyber operations recruitment and retention

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may—

“(A) establish, as positions in the excepted service, such qualified positions in the Department as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the United States Cyber Command relating to cyber operations, including positions formerly identified as—

“(i) senior level positions designated under section 5376 of title 5; and

“(ii) positions in the Senior Executive Service;

“(B) appoint an individual to a qualified position (after taking into consideration the availability of preference eligibles for appointment to the position); and

“(C) subject to the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), fix the compensation of an individual for service in a qualified position.

“(2) The authority of the Secretary under this subsection applies without regard to the provisions of any other law relating to the appointment, number, classification, or compensation of employees.

“(b) BASIC PAY.—(1) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall fix the rates of basic pay for any qualified position established under subsection (a)—

“(A) in relation to the rates of pay provided for employees in comparable positions in the Department, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the cyber mission of the Department; and

“(B) subject to the same limitations on maximum rates of pay established for such employees by law or regulation.

“(2) The Secretary may—

“(A) consistent with section 5341 of title 5, adopt such provisions of that title as provide for prevailing rate systems of basic pay; and

“(B) apply those provisions to qualified positions for employees in or under which the Department may employ individuals described by section 5342(a)(2)(A) of such title.

“(c) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION, INCENTIVES, AND ALLOWANCES.—(1) The Secretary may provide employees in qualified positions compensation (in addition to basic pay), including benefits, incentives, and allowances, consistent with, and not in excess of the level authorized for, comparable positions authorized by title 5.

“(2) An employee in a qualified position whose rate of basic pay is fixed under subsection (b)(1) shall be eligible for an allowance under section 5941 of title 5 on the same basis and to the same extent as if the employee was an employee covered by such section, including eligibility conditions, allowance rates, and all other terms and conditions in law or regulation.

“(d) PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this section.

“(e) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in subsection (a) may be construed to impair the continued effectiveness of a collective bargaining agreement with respect to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department that is a successor to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department covered by the agreement before the succession.

“(f) REQUIRED REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

“(g) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and not less frequently than once each year thereafter until the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report on the administration of this section during the most recent one-year period.

“(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

“(A) A discussion of the process used by the Secretary in accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans’ preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by an individual for a qualified position.

“(B) A description of the following:

“(i) How the Secretary plans to fulfill the critical need of the Department to recruit and retain employees in qualified positions.

“(ii) The measures that will be used to measure progress.

“(iii) Any actions taken during the reporting period to fulfill such critical need.

“(C) A discussion of how the planning and actions taken under subparagraph (B) are integrated into the strategic workforce planning of the Department.

“(D) The metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period, including the following:

“(i) The number of employees in qualified positions hired, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(ii) The placement of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by directorate and office within the Department.

“(iii) The total number of veterans hired.

“(iv) The number of separations of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation and grade and level or pay band.

“(v) The number of retirements of employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(vi) The number and amounts of recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives paid to employees in qualified positions, disaggregated by occupation, grade, and level or pay band.

“(E) A description of the training provided to supervisors of employees in qualified positions at the Department on the use of the new authorities.

“(h) **THREE-YEAR PROBATIONARY PERIOD.**—The probationary period for all employees hired under the authority established in this section shall be three years.

“(i) **INCUMBENTS OF EXISTING COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.**—(1) An individual serving in a position on the date of enactment of this section that is selected to be converted to a position in the excepted service under this section shall have the right to refuse such conversion.

“(2) After the date on which an individual who refuses a conversion under paragraph (1) stops serving in the position selected to be converted, the position may be converted to a position in the excepted service.

“(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(2) The term ‘collective bargaining agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 7103(a)(8) of title 5.

“(3) The term ‘excepted service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2103 of title 5.

“(4) The term ‘preference eligible’ has the meaning given that term in section 2108 of title 5.

“(5) The term ‘qualified position’ means a position, designated by the Secretary for the purpose of this section, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the responsibilities of the United States Cyber Command relating to cyber operations.

“(6) The term ‘Senior Executive Service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2101a of title 5.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter following subparagraph (E)—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) any position established as a qualified position in the excepted service by the Secretary of Defense under section 1599e of title 10.”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1599d the following new item:

“Sec. 1599e. United States Cyber Command recruitment and retention.”

SA 3778. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) **THIRTY-YEAR LIMIT ON NUCLEAR EXPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) and except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), no license to export pursuant to an agreement that has entered into force pursuant to the requirements of such section 123 may be issued after the date that is 30 years after the date of entry into force of such agreement.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The restriction in paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) any agreement with a country that is a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or Australia, Israel, Japan, the Republic of Korea, New Zealand, the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO), or the International Atomic Energy Agency;

(B) any agreement that had entered into force as of August 1, 2014; or

(C) any amendment to an agreement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(b) **EXTENSION OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS.**—Congress may, in the final five years of the 30-year time limit applicable to the issuance of export licenses pursuant to an agreement under subsection (a)(1), enact a joint resolution permitting the issuance of such licenses for an additional period of not more than 30 years without the President submitting a new agreement pursuant to the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Each proposed export pursuant to an agreement described under this section shall be subject to United States laws and regulations in effect at the time of each such export.

SA 3779. Mr. PRYOR (for Mr. MURPHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 520, condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims; as follows:

In the fourth whereas clause of the preamble, insert “more than” before “10 additional aircraft”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Financial Products for Students: Issues and Challenges.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building a hearing entitled “Domestic Challenges and Global Competition in Aviation Manufacture.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 31, 2014, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining the GAO Report on Expectations of Government Support for Bank Holding Companies.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RAFAEL J. LOPEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE BRYAN HAYES SAMUELS, RESIGNED.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

CARMEN AMALIA CORRALES, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2015, VICE MATTHEW MAXWELL TAYLOR KENNEDY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MANSON K. BROWN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

ALLISON DALE BURROUGHS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE RYA W. ZOBEL, RETIRED.
AMIT PRIYAVADAN MEHTA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN L. KWAST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TERRENCE J. O'SHAUGHNESSY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. SCOTT G. PERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH J. HECK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK S. INCH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. PHILIP S. DAVIDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DIXON R. SMITH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LISA L. ADAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

RICHARD D. MINK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PETER BRIAN ABERCROMBIE II

MATTHEW P. ACER
GREGORY M. ADAMS
JEFFREY S. ADAMS
MICHAEL J. ADAMS
SCOTT L. ADAMS
SHILETTE M. ADDISON REED
STACEY L. ADORISIO
RAJ AGRAWAL
COREY M. AKIYAMA
CARMELO ALAMO, JR.
DANZEL W. ALBERTSEN
FREDERICK V. ALDRICH
MICHAEL C. ALFARO
MATTHEW R. ALLEN
WILLIAM H. ALLEN, JR.
MAELI A. ALLISON
MATTHEW R. ALTMAN
LAWRENCE JAMES ANDERLEY
ANTHONY W. ANDERSON
CHRISTOPHER A. ANDERSON
JASON R. ANDERSON
JAY K. ANDERSON

JEFFREY P. ANDERSON
STEPHEN P. ANDERSON
MICHAEL R. ANDREWS
SOUNDER R. ANDREWS
TEDORO G. APALISOK
DARRELL M. APILADO
JERRETT A. ARCHER
DANIEL J. ARKEMA
ADONIS C. ARVANTAKIS
MARK L. ASHMAN
MATTHEW A. ASTROTH
JAMES W. ATCHLEY, JR.
JASON E. ATTAWAY
RANDALL R. AUSTILL
DANNY AVILA
ALAN B. AVRIETT, JR.
ERIK M. AXT
MANUEL J. AYALA
STEVEN J. AYRE
SARAH S. BABBITT
JASON R. BACHELOR
CRAIG S. BAILEY
GREGORY P. BAILEY
BLAINE L. BAKER
LUKE A. BAKER
SARAH NELSON BAKHTIARI
BRIAN A. BALAZS
NICHOLAS J. BALDWIN
JASON W. BALES
JOHN I. BALL
GREGORY M. BARNES
RENAE BARNES
RICHARD D. BARNHART
CRAIG R. BARRINGTON
BRENDON C. BARTHOLOMEW
CASEY J. BARTHOLOMEW
JEFF K. BARTLETT
PAUL G. BATISH
MELVIN I. BAYLON
THERESA D. BEAVER
TIMOTHY D. BECK
MARIA T. BEECHER
BERNIE E. BEIGH
JENNIFER B. BEISEL
ALPHONZO R. BELCHER
ZDRAVKO BELIC
ISAAC T. BELL
JONATHAN B. BELL
SHAUN G. BELLAMY
MATTHEW M. BELLE
BRIAN J. BENJAMIN
NELSON P. BENNETT
CARLOS E. BERDECIA
CHRISTIAN M. BERGTHOLDT
ALULA B. BERHANE
GAVIN A. BERNE
JAY A. BERTSCH
ANGEL E. BETANCOURT TOYENS
DAVID A. BETHEL
MARK C. BETTERS
THOMAS E. BIERLY
MARK C. BIGLEY
ADAM DEWAIN BINGHAM
ERIC M. BISSONETTE
ERIC R. BIXBY
ANDREW H. BLACK
JOHN D. BLACKMAN
FELICIA A. BLAIR
MICHAEL R. BLISS
ANQUENETTA BLOUNT
TIMOTHY R. BOBINSKI
SEAN BOLDT
JOEL ANDREW BOLINA
WILLIAM H. BONES
DAVID E. BONN
JOSEPH M. BONNER
SANDRA A. BONNEY
TIMOTHY E. BOOK
STEPHEN F. BOOTH
DAVID A. BOPP
DENNIS M. BORRMAN
RAFAEL A. BOSCH
GREGORY D. BOSCHERT
DEREK M. BOUGHNER
CHAD T. BOWDEN
THOMAS R. BOWMAN
CHRISTOPHER D. BOYD
MICHAEL M. BOYNTON
DAVID J. BOYTIM
DENVER M. BRAA
ANDRE R. BRADLEY
PATRICK L. BRADYLEE
WILLIAM D. BRAGG
BRADLEY L. BRANDT
COLE L. BRAY
MICHAEL P. BRAZDA
CHRISTOPHER W. BREFFITT
ADAM C. BRIGHT
JUSTIN E. BRIGHT
ROBERT J. BROOKS
TROY J. BROSKOVETZ
AHAVE E. BROWN, JR.
ANDRE L. BROWN
DAVID M. BROWN
JOEL N. BROWN
KIRK C. BROWN
MICHAEL W. BROWN
STEVEN P. BRUMMITT
ELAINE M. BRYANT
MICHAEL T. BRYANT
PARKIN C. BRYSON
AARON R. BUCK

CHRISTOPHER J. BUCKLEY
CHRISTOPHER J. BUECHLER
JAMES J. BUSSING, JR.
LAURA M. BUNYAN
ROBERT A. BURDETTE
JAMES L. BURGESS
JEREMIAH J. BURGESS
SIERRA C. BURGESS
KRISTINA C. BURNE
WILLIAM ROBERT BURNS
ANDREW L. BURROUGHS
MICHAEL S. BURTON
MATTHEW L. BUSCH
RODERIC K. BUTZ
KEVIN W. BYRD
JOSE L. CABRERA
CHRISTOPHER GARY CAIN
LUIS N. CAIRO
JOHN D. CALDWELL
MICHAEL B. CAMPBELL
ERIC W. CANNELL
JERALD M. CANNY
JOHN T. CANTY
MICHAEL A. CAPOZZI
NICOLE L. CAPOZZI
BRIAN W. CAPPS
RICHARD A. CAREY
THOMAS K. CARR
ERIC M. CARRANO
CHRISTOPHER D. CARROLL
KENDRICK L. CARROLL
CHARLES L. CARTER
JASON R. CASE
JONATHAN P. CASEY
JOSE L. CASTANEDA
JOSHUA A. CATES
HILBURN B. CAULDER
JASON P. CECCOLI
DAVID J. CHABOYA
DAVID S. CHADSEY
JASON D. CHAMBERS
BRIAN D. CHANDLER
MICHAEL D. CHARLES
RAYMOND H. CHESTER, JR.
JUSTEN D. CHILBERT
KEVIN R. CHILDS
MATTHEW S. CHISAM
RYAN PATRICK CHMIELEWSKI
BRIAN D. CHRISTENSEN
CHAD KENNETH CISEWSKI
BRANT CLARK
BRENT CLARK
MATTHEW J. CLAUSEN
ROBERT C. CLAY
RYAN D. CLEVELAND
JAMES L. CLINE
JOSHUA R. CLOSE
ROBERT N. J. CLOUSE
MAX A. COBERLY, JR.
SANDRA J. COBLE
CHRISTOPHER B. COCHRAN
ROBERT P. M. COCKE
RICO C. CODY
MITCHELL J. COK
JASON M. COLBORN
JAMES W. COLE III
SHAD K. COLGATE
CHRISTOPHER W. COLLINS
RANDY C. COMBS
RYAN P. COMBS
LEE A. COMERFORD
BRIAN S. CONFER
MICHAEL A. CONTARDO
JAMES H. COOKE
THOMAS M. COOKE
WILLIAM G. COOLEY
CORY A. COOPER
ALAN F. COPELAND
JERRYMAR J. COPELAND, JR.
CHRISTOPHER SINCLAIR CORBETT
SHAWN P. COREY
DARYL G. CORNEILLE
MICHAEL S. CORNELIUS
JAMES F. CORRIGAN, JR.
JOSEPH D. COUGHLIN
ADAM J. COURT
BRUCE A. COX
JOSHUA R. CRAIG
TODD M. CRAIG
JAMES F. CRAWFORD, JR.
KIM M. CRAWFORD
NATHAN A. CREECH
NIGEL H. CRISP
HEATHER R. CROOKS
RYAN A. CROWLEY
FERNANDO J. CRUZ
KEVIN CUARTAS
DENNIS C. CUMMINGS
ANDREW B. CUNNAR
DEREK M. CUNNINGHAM
MARCUS A. CUNNINGHAM
SCOTT R. CUNNINGHAM
ROBERT C. CUSTER
JAMES H. DAILEY
CORY M. DAMON
RAYMOND L. DANIEL
BRADLEY D. DARLING
JOHN M. DAUTEL
PAUL T. DAVIDSON
DENNY R. DAVIES
DARRIN B. DAVIS
TASSIKA M. DAVIS

WALLACE B. DAVIS
 JOHN P. DAVITT
 KAREN M. DAYLEHORSLEY
 BRETT A. DEANGELIS
 MICHAEL E. DEAEVER
 KENNETH S. DEGON
 ANTHONY J. DEGREGORIA
 MONIQUE C. DELAUTER
 NICHOLAS E. DELCOUR
 LEWIS A. DEMASO
 RYAN T. DERZON
 PATRICK T. DIERIG
 NATHAN E. DILLON
 BRANT A. DIXON
 DOUGLAS J. DODGE
 FREDERICK W. DOHNKE
 JEREMY A. DOMB
 DAVID H. DONATELLI II
 MICHAEL J. DOOLEY
 CRAIG L. DORN
 JOEL KENT DOUGLAS
 DAVID L. DRUMMOND
 PATRICK J. DUBE
 APRIL M. DUCOTE
 CHRISTOPHER M. DUFFETT
 PETER J. DUFFY
 BRYAN D. DUKE
 GREGORY C. DURHAM
 RYAN E. DURHAM
 BEN T. DUSTMAN
 BRYAN J. DUTCHER
 RICOCARLO C. DY
 CHESLEY L. DYCUS
 KEVIN J. EBERHART
 CHRISTOPHER J. EBERTH
 JASON T. EDDY
 RYAN G. EDDY
 ANGELA C. EDMONDSON
 MICHAEL A. EDMONSTON
 JOSHUA C. EGAN
 ROBERT F. EHASZ
 MATHEW W. ELLEBY
 GARRY L. ELLIOTT
 OLIVIA S. ELLIOTT
 TYLER J. ELLISON
 JONATHAN J. ELZA
 WENDY I. ENDERLE
 TAONA A. ENRIQUEZ
 JOSEPH M. ESLER
 N. KEIBA J. ESTELLE
 MATTHEW W. ESTOUP
 JOHN T. ETHRIDGE
 JASON R. EVANS
 MARCY R. EVANS
 JILL M. EVENSKI
 STEWART A. EYER
 CHRISTOPHER G. EYLE
 ALEXANDER B. FAFINSKI
 DAVID A. FAGGARD
 MATTHEW T. FARLEY
 ROBERT A. FAUSTMANN
 ALLAN J. FECK
 TIFFANY A. FEET
 RONALD G. FEHLEN
 LARRY FENNER
 EDWARD G. FERGUSON
 ADRIANA M. FERNANDEZ
 GABRIEL J. FERNANDEZ
 CHRISTOPHER A. FERNENGEL
 JAMES CECIL FIELDS II
 AMANDA R. FIGUEROA
 ISRAEL FIGUEROA RODRIGUEZ
 JEFFREY J. FINCH
 WILLIAM F. FISH, JR.
 ERIK S. FISHER
 KATHRYN E. FITZGERALD
 ERIC A. FLATTEM
 SCOTT M. FLEMING
 CHARLES R. FLETCHER
 FRANCISCO A. FLORES
 BRIAN M. FLUSCHE
 SCOTT E. FOREMAN
 JOSEPH D. FORTIN II
 ROBERT W. FOWLER
 IAN M. FRADY
 MICHAEL U. FRANCIS
 ABIGAIL A. FRANDER
 AARON J. FRANKLIN
 JAMEY K. FRAZIER
 SCOT A. FRECHETTE
 BENJAMIN S. FREEBORN
 MARK J. FRIESEN
 CARL E. FROHMAN
 KASEY L. FRY
 TIMOTHY B. FUHRMAN
 BUD M. FUJITAKAMOTO
 CHARISE J. FULLER
 BREANNA D. FULTON
 MICHAEL S. FURMAN
 LARRY W. GABE
 ANDREW J. GABRIELSKI
 STEVEN J. GADOURY
 DEREK P. GALLAGHER
 MICHAEL S. GALLAGHER
 JUDE I. GAMEL
 DAVID A. GARAY
 CHRISTOPHER P. GARDNER
 DAVID M. GARNER
 DAVID K. GARON
 MICHAEL C. GARZA
 STEVE J. GARZA II
 JOHN F. GAUGHAN

JOHN A. GAZZAWAY
 BRIAN D. GEBO
 EMILY D. GEBO
 CHAD A. GEMEINHARDT
 CHRISTOPHER D. GENTILE
 BENJAMIN E. GEORGE
 BRIAN M. GEORGE
 EDWIN GERMOSSEN
 BRIAN S. GERWE
 ANDREW J. GEYER
 GAVIN G. GIGSTEAD
 HARDY T. GILES II
 MICHELLE MYRTIS GILL
 SCOTT A. GILLER
 MICHAEL J. GILMORE
 JOSEPH L. GILPIN
 RICHARD S. GLADE
 NATHAN E. GLAUVITZ
 BRADLEY C. GLENISTER
 AMY M. GLISSON
 JEFFREY M. GODZIK
 CRISTIN A. GOERLITZ
 AMY L. GOFF
 RUSSELL D. GOHN
 DANIEL M. GOLDSMITH
 JOSE A. GONZALEZ
 STEVEN J. GORMAN
 RICHARD A. GRAB
 STEPHEN C. GRAHAM
 THOMAS JERROLD GRAHAM
 MICHAEL E. GRAHN
 KEVIN A. GRANT
 ROBERT L. GRANT
 ERIK B. GRATTEAU
 BRIAN S. GREANIA
 BRENT A. GREER
 YADIRA C. GREESON
 JEREMY R. GREY
 BRIAN D. GRIFFIN
 AARON B. GRIFFITH
 ROBERT E. GRIMMETT III
 ROFELIO LAVENON GRINSTON
 PATRICK E. GRUBER
 KYLE B. GRYGO
 BRUCE T. GUEST
 COLE W. GULYAS
 ANTHONY M. GURRIERI
 SAMANTHA M. HABERLACH
 DOUGLAS E. HABERSTROH
 NATHAN D. HAGERMAN
 LEE D. HAGES
 MICHAEL L. HAIRE
 EDWARD W. HALE
 ERIC D. HALER
 JEFFREY J. HALL
 PATRICK G. HALL
 SCOTT B. HALL
 SHAWN TRAVIS HALL
 PETER S. HALSEY
 DENNIS J. HAMILTON
 HENRY J. HAMILTON
 REBECCA A. HAMILTON
 TUCKER R. M. HAMILTON
 JEREMIAH J. HAMMILL
 JACOB L. HAMMONS
 JOSHUA M. HAMPTON
 CHARLES R. HANCOX
 GUNNAR J. HANKINS
 TIMOTHY B. HANKS
 KIRK M. HANSEN
 CHRISTOPHER A. HANSON
 BRADLEY J. HARBAUGH
 BRIAN L. HARDEMAN
 WILLIAM M. HARDIE
 MARIBEL HARMON
 JOEL T. HARPER
 CHAD A. HARRIS
 FENCISCO N. HARRIS
 TYLER B. HARRIS
 JOHN M. HARRISON
 MICHAEL R. HARRISON
 AARON HART
 WILLIAM B. HARTMAN
 WALTER B. HARVEY
 CHARLES E. HASSELL
 DORY L. HASSON
 KATHLEEN M. HASSON
 MATTHEW C. HASSON
 JIMMY DALE HATAWAY
 RYAN T. HAYES
 CHARLES A. HEBERT
 DAVID A. HEINITZ
 TIMOTHY M. HELFRICH
 JOHARI J. HEMPHILL
 DANIEL C. HENDERSON
 ERIC K. HENDRICKSON
 JAMES M. HENDRICKSON
 DANIEL M. HERVAS
 ALEXANDER L. HEYMAN
 PATRICK N. HICKS
 KEVIN D. HICOK
 RHETT S. HIERLMEIER
 TRAVIS J. HIGGS
 LORI M. HINDERER
 CONOR W. HINEY
 DANIEL J. HINGLEY
 PETER L. HINRICHSSEN
 PAUL H. HINSON
 NATHAN J. HIPPE
 CATHERINE E. HOARD
 HOUSTON B. HODGKINSON
 BRAD K. HOFFMAN

DAVID A. HOFFMAN
 GREG J. HOFFMAN
 GREGORY S. HOFFMAN
 BRYAN M. HOKE
 WILLIAM D. HOLL
 DOUGLAS R. HOLLIDAY
 CHIP W. HOLLINGER
 JOHN C. HOLLISTER
 TAMMY L. HOLLISTER
 RAYMOND G. HOLSTEIN III
 AUSTIN D. HOOD
 JAMES T. HORNE
 CHARLOTTA D. HORNIG
 JASON P. HOUSTON
 CHRISTOPHER J. HUBBARD
 JAMES A. HUDNELL
 JASON E. HUFF
 CHRISTOPHER M. HUGHES
 COLIN P. HUGHES
 BOBBY L. HUNT
 THOMAS A. HUTTON
 JOHN R. HUTZEL
 MATTHEW T. HYLAND
 CHRISTOPHER V. IAVARONE
 DAVID P. ILGENFRITZ
 DENISE N. ILKAY
 JOSHUA J. IMME
 THAROMMONY T. IN
 JOSEPH A. INGRAM
 DUSTIN R. IRELAND
 IAN M. IRVINE
 SARAH E. ISBILL
 RYAN L. ISMIRLE
 JASON D. JACKSON
 KENNETH L. JACKSON, JR.
 ERIC D. JACOBS
 ANGELA M. JACOBSON
 KEVIN M. JAMES
 NICHOLAS C. JAMESON
 JAMMIE LYNN HIMSL JAMIESON
 MARCUS W. JANECEK
 ERIC J. JANSKI
 JESSE JARAMILLO
 JORGE F. JARAMILLO
 JACOB S. JAWORSKI
 ALVIN J. JENKINS
 KENT R. JENSEN
 SCOTT A. JENSEN
 JIMMY J. JEOUN
 DANIEL S. JERDAN
 DAVID F. JOHN
 ANDRE M. JOHNSON
 BRANDON E. JOHNSON
 CAREY F. JOHNSON
 CHRISTOPHER A. JOHNSON
 DANIEL C. JOHNSON
 ERIK S. JOHNSON
 JOHN A. JOHNSON, JR.
 KIP E. JOHNSON
 KIRK W. JOHNSON
 MATTHEW K. JOHNSON
 MISTY G. JOHNSON
 PETER MATHIAS JOHNSON
 SCOTT G. JOHNSON
 TREAVOR G. JOHNSON
 MATTHEW R. JOHNSTON
 DAVID W. JONES
 GREG L. JONES
 JUDSON B. JONES
 MICHAEL W. JONES
 STEVEN C. JONES
 WILLIAM J. JONES
 JOEL T. JORGENSEN
 CHRISTOPHER T. JOYCE
 KEVIN W. JUSTICE
 MARSEY K. JUSTICE
 ANDREW J. JUTTE
 DOUGLAS A. KABEL
 TETSUO KAIEDA
 JASON M. KALIN
 JASON M. KALMAN
 KARIE DENISE KAPISE
 PETER E. KASARSKIS
 JEFFERY S. KASSEBAUM
 ANDREW V. KATZ
 MICHAEL D. KAUN
 RYAN B. KAY
 RYAN M. KEHOE
 CRAIG DOUGLAS KEITER
 MATTHEW R. KENKEL
 JOANN N. KENNEALLY
 HARRY L. KENNER
 JAMES GREGORY KERLEY
 TYLER SCOTT KERN
 EDWARD KIM
 TORY D. KINDRICK
 MARY M. KING
 TIMOTHY A. KIPP
 SHAMEKA N. KIRK
 TROY A. KIRK
 THOMAS C. KISIO
 BRANIN W. KLAUSMAN
 MARK P. KLEEMAN
 DAVID J. KLEIN
 JASON W. KLINKEL
 MICHAL KLOEFFLER HOWARD
 JOSHUA J. KLOTH
 BRIAN L. KNAUF
 RICHARD A. KNISELEY II
 BRIAN K. KOCH
 CHAD D. KOHOUT
 ROBERT J. KONGAIKA

ANDREAS T. KONHAUSEUR
 CARISSA N. KORAN
 NATHAN C. KORAN
 WILLIAM C. KOSTAN
 MICHAEL A. KOVALCHEK
 RICHARD R. KOVSKY
 BENJAMIN R. KOWASH
 ALEX E. KRAUSE
 MIA L. KREIMEIER
 CHRISTOPHER M. LACEK
 JAMES A. LADD
 JAMES M. LAFERRIERE
 JEFFREY R. LAFLEUR
 MARK R. LAHEY
 JESSE W. LAMARAND
 STEVEN N. LAMB
 ROBERT L. LAMORE
 MICHAEL S. LANDERS
 NADINE C. LANDRUM
 SHAUN J. LANDRY
 BETH C. LANE
 BRIAN D. LANE
 CRAIG A. LANE
 REBECCA S. LANGE
 AARON C. LAPP
 PETER F. LARRABEE
 BENJAMIN J. LAUSCHER
 ERIC W. LAZENBY
 DAVID C. LEAUMONT
 MATTHEW T. LEBLANC
 GREGORY S. LECRONE
 CHRISTOPHER B. LEDFORD
 DARRYL B. LEE
 KEVIN R. LEE
 KIMBERLY E. LEE
 PETER J. S. LEE
 ANDREW R. LEGAULT
 JEREMY C. LEIGHTON
 JOHN SCOT C. LEMKE
 BRETT M. LENT
 STEPHEN H. LEPRELL
 STEVEN J. LEUTNER
 ANDRE PIERRE A. LEVESQUE
 MICHAEL B. LEWIS
 TY C. LEWIS
 CHAD R. LICHTY
 JAN P. LINCH
 LONNIE N. LINGAFELTER
 BREEA J. LISKU
 JEROME C. LITZO, JR.
 VINCENT B. LIVIE
 JUSTIN A. LONGMIRE
 RICARDO J. LOPEZ
 ROBERT M. LOPEZ
 RICHARD A. LOPEZDEURALDE
 CHRISTOPHER J. LOVETT
 ALBERT F. LOWE
 RAYNA W. LOWERY
 JOHN LUCAS
 GRANT E. LUDEMAN
 ANGEL J. LUGO
 WILLIAM S. LUSSIER
 RICHARD H. LYON
 CLARK C. MABRY
 TONYA Y. MACK
 JUSTIN D. MACKEY
 WILLIAM T. MACLIN
 MICHAEL J. MADDOX
 MICHAEL D. MAGINNESS
 STEPHEN J. MAILE
 DONALD P. MAMMANO
 JON A. MANCUSO
 MATTHEW L. MANNING
 ZACHARY D. MANNING
 NICOLE C. MANSEAU
 NATHAN L. MANSFIELD
 MIHAI MANTA
 JOSHUA K. MARCUS
 KEVIN A. MARES
 JAMES M. MARION
 MICHAEL J. MARLIN
 CHRISTOPHER M. MARONEY
 JENNINGS B. MARSHALL
 STEVEN A. MARSHALL
 TONY L. MARSHALL
 VERNON P. MARTENS
 ANDREW A. MARTIN
 JAROD MARTIN
 NICHOLAS H. MARTIN
 ALFRED P. MARTZ
 ANTHONY P. MASSETT
 PETER C. MASTRO
 AARON J. MATE
 ELIZABETH B. MATHIAS
 BROOKE P. MATSON
 TODD A. MATSON
 ETHAN W. MATTOX
 SEWARD E. MATWICK
 DAVID M. MAX
 SCOTT H. MAY
 MICHAEL H. MAYO
 MICHAEL G. MCCARTHY
 ANTHONY S. MCCARTY
 TIMOTHY K. MCCARTY
 KEVIN K. MCCASKEY
 BRYON E. C. MCCLAIN
 SCOTT H. MCCLAIN
 MICHAEL L. MCCONNELL
 BARBARA L. MCCOY
 BRIAN M. MCCREARY
 WILLIAM G. MCCULLLEY
 JASON E. MCDONALD

DAVID P. MCDONNELL
 WILLIAM A. MCDOWELL II
 RICHARD F. MCELHANEY, JR.
 KELLY D. MCELVENY
 STEPHEN D. MCFADDEN
 JOHNNY RAYMOND MCGONIGAL
 WADE H. MCGREW
 KEITH C. MCGUIRE
 LANCE H. MCINNISH
 BRIAN P. MCINTYRE
 JOSHUA M. MCINTYRE
 BRIAN E. MCKAY
 MATT G. MCKINNEY
 STEVEN E. MCMENAMIN
 JOHN D. MCMILLEN
 AMANDA R. MCMILLIAN
 ALFRED J. MCNABB
 GRANT W. MCNELIS
 SHAWN M. MCPHERSON
 CLARENCE F. MCRAE, JR.
 ADRIAN A. MEADOWS
 ROBERT S. MEANLEY, JR.
 MICHAEL S. MEDGYESSY
 JASON W. MEDSGER
 JEURNEY KRISTOPHA MEEKINS
 CHRISTOPHER A. MEHLHAFF
 TYSON S. MEINHOLD
 MARTIN A. MENTCH
 TODD P. MERCER
 MICHAEL J. MERIDITH
 CHRISTOPHER M. METHVIN
 STEAVEN A. MEYER
 KEVIN R. MEYERS
 JOSEPH R. MICHAELSON
 MARC J. MIEDZIAK
 JOHN A. MIKAL
 ALEXANDER J. MILLER
 BRANDON L. MILLER
 JAKE L. MILLER
 MARC K. MILLIGAN
 MATTHEW D. MINKLEY
 GENEVIEVE N. MINZYK
 MICHAEL S. MINZYK
 WAYLON SAMUEL MITCHELL
 BROCK D. MOLDEN
 ALLEN H. MONROE
 ADAM E. MOORE
 GARY B. MOORE
 JASON P. MOORE
 JOHANNES C. MOORE
 RACHAEL M. MOORE
 SHANNON E. MOORE
 DAVID J. MORALES
 ROBIN D. MOREE
 CLIFFORD W. MORGAN
 BRIAN C. MORITZ
 YOSEF A. MORRIS
 LAMONT C. MORROW
 KLIFFORD W. MOSLEY
 JOSEPH J. MUHLBERGER
 GREGORY D. MULLEN
 CHRISTOPHER REID MULLINS
 STEVEN P. MULLINS
 MICHAEL P. MURPHY
 ANNA M. MURRAY
 CRISTIAN A. MURRAY
 JAMES P. MURTHA
 DAYLIN S. MYERS
 JOHN P. MYERS
 RYAN J. NASH
 EARL D. NAST
 NORA J. NELSON
 DAN ARON NEWTON
 BEAU M. NICEWANNER
 BARRY C. NICHOLS
 GEORGE E. NICHOLS
 BRIAN M. NICOSIA
 STEVEN M. NIEWIAROWSKI
 JOHN S. NOLAN, JR.
 ANDREW E. NORDIN
 JAMES D. NORMAN
 JORDAN P. NORMAN
 IVAN G. NORMANDIA
 VICTOR R. NORRIS
 PETER CHARLES NORSKY
 REID J. NOVOTNY
 DAVID P. NUCKLES
 THOMAS F. NUGENT II
 JANA R. A. NYERGES
 STEVEN R. OBANNAN
 PHILLIP B. OBRIANT
 BRIAN R. OCONNELL
 VINCENT J. OCONNOR
 ROBERT L. ODOM
 BRIAN J. OGRADY
 CHRISTIAN J. OGROSKY
 JUN S. OH
 KEITH A. OHALLORAN
 KENDRA B. OHLSON
 BURT N. OKAMOTO
 JOSEPH E. OKASINSKI
 LLOYD D. OLINGER
 STEVEN W. OLIVER
 KIRK M. OLSON
 PETER T. ONEILL
 MATTHEW P. OSTERHAGE
 CHRISTOPHER R. OTT
 EVART B. OUTLAW
 BRIAN C. OWEN
 JAMES P. OWEN
 THOMAS J. OZIEMBLOWSKY
 ANDREW T. PACIONE

DEBORAH A. PACKLER
 BRIAN M. PALMER
 CLINT TINEI PALMER
 STEWART J. PARKER
 JARED D. PASLAY
 ALLISON M. PATAK
 DANIEL J. PATAK
 ERIC S. PATTON
 SCOTT R. PAUL
 DAMIEN F. PAVLIK
 CARL R. PAWLING
 KATHRYN A. PAYNE
 TODD D. PEARSON
 JOSHUA C. PECK
 NICHOLAS R. PEDERSON
 STEVEN J. PENNA
 IVAN A. PENNINGTON
 CARLOS M. PERAZZA
 FRANCISCO PEREZ DE ARMAS
 DWAYNE S. PEREZ
 OLEXIS O. PEREZ
 GUY PERROW
 TY A. PERSCHBACHER
 JAVIN C. PETERSON
 JOSHUA W. PETRY
 RYAN THONG V. PHAM
 KENRIC L. PHILLIPS
 MATTHEW T. PHILLIPS
 JUSTIN W. PICCHI
 BENJAMIN L. PIERCE
 ANTHONY J. PINTO
 JOHN I. PLATT
 CHARLES G. PLOETZ
 PHILIP W. POEPPPELMAN
 JEREMY M. PONN
 JOHN D. POOLE
 BILLY E. POPE, JR.
 JOSHUA M. POPE
 PATRICK A. PORTELE
 OSCAR F. PORTILLO
 JASON F. POWELL
 MICHAEL A. POWELL
 CHRISTOPHER D. POWER
 KEVIN C. PRATTE
 AMY R. PREDMORE
 FRANK E. PREDMORE
 GREGORY J. PREISSER
 MATTHEW S. PUCKETT
 TIMOTHY D. PURCELL
 AARTI U. PURI
 NATHAN R. PURTLE
 JEREMY S. PUTMAN
 DEREK A. RACHEL
 JUSTIN B. RADFORD
 RAZVAN N. RADOESCU
 JUSTIN L. RAMEY
 CHRISTIAN E. RANDALL
 DAVID L. RANSOM
 BRYAN F. RARIDON
 OMAR T. RASHID
 JONATHAN D. RATCHICK
 ANDREW BRIAN RAY
 ROBERT P. RAYNER
 ERIC M. REAGAN
 JASON A. REED
 JOHN C. REED
 ROBERT W. REED
 JASON H. REGISTER
 CHRISTOPHER K. REID
 JASON H. REID
 REGGIE T. REID
 JADE N. REIDY
 JEREMY L. RENKEN
 ADAM G. RESSLER
 SHELTON A. RESSLER
 RYAN S. REYNOLDS
 DEREK R. RHINESMITH
 ERIC A. RICE
 MICHAEL P. RICHARD
 CAMERON RICHARDSON
 SERGIO RIOS
 AMY M. RIVERA
 DELBERT R. RIVERA
 AARON J. RIVERS
 JOSEPH W. ROACH
 MICHAEL J. ROBBERSON
 DAVID VERNON ROBERTS
 GREGORY R. ROBERTS
 CHRISTOPHER J. ROBINSON
 CRAIG S. ROBLER
 LARRY L. ROCHAT
 GEOFFREY J. ROCHE
 JAMES F. ROCHE
 JOSHUA H. ROCKHILL
 BRENT A. ROCKOW
 ANIBAL J. RODRIGUEZ
 JULIO E. RODRIGUEZ
 KATHRYN N. ROMAN
 JULIUS C. ROMASANTA
 CHRISTOPHER G. RONESS
 JASON J. ROSS
 BRADLEY A. ROTHWELL
 NATHAN P. ROWAN
 JEFFREY S. ROWSEY
 JOHN W. ROYAL
 JAY L. RUESCHHOFF
 BRADLEY A. RUETER
 MATTHEW C. RUSSELL
 ROBERT M. RUSSELL
 DANIEL M. RUTTENBER
 LISA B. RYAN
 SCOTT B. RYAN

FRANCIS M. SAAVEDRA
CHRISTOPHER J. SAETTEL
STEVEN SAKS
ANTONIO V. SALAZAR
ABRAHAM D. SALOMON, JR.
ANTHONY J. SAMPSON
MICHAEL J. SANDER
GEORGE R. SANDERLIN
SARAH C. SANTORO
JARED M. SANTOS
MATTHEW P. SATTLER
GREGORY M. SAVELLA II
EVAN T. SCAGGS
JOHN N. SCARLETT
ERIC A. SCHAFER
HENRY B. SCHANTZ
MATHEWS C. SCHARCH
DANIEL E. SCHERDT
RICHARD B. SCHERMER
JACOB D. SCHERRER
DYANN L. SCHILLING
JAMES L. SCHLABACH
ERIC W. SCHMIDT
JAYSON H. SCHMIEDT
LUKE J. SCHNEIDER
PETER J. SCHNOBRICH
JOSHUA B. SCHORE
JEFFREY J. SCHRUM
CHARLES E. SCHUCK
PATRICK J. SCHULDT
RANDY D. SCHWINLER
MICHAEL J. SCIANNA
AMY N. SCOTT
BRIAN L. SEALOCK
LUIS A. SEGURA
JAMES M. SELL
TAPAN SEN
DANIEL F. SEVIGNY
RICHARD S. SEYMOUR
BRANDON G. SHADE
BILLY SHAW
DENISE A. SHEA
JOHN D. SHELL
GARON L. SHELTON
ADAM C. SHUCKS
KENNETH W. SHINN
KENNETH M. SHIRLEY
JEREMIAH A. SHOCKLEY
LEONARD M. SHORES III
ROBERT E. SHRADER
JASMIN SILENCE
JAMES D. SILVA
CHARLES R. SILVANIC, JR.
JASON W. SIMMONS
DAVID W. SIMPSON
BRIANA J. SINGLETON
JENNIFER J. SITZ
LORENZO SLAY, JR.
JASON J. SLEGER
MARK ANDREW SLETTEN
NISHAWN S. SMAGH
CLAYTON A. SMALL
PATRICK H. SMILEY
KRISTOFFER SMITH RODRIGUEZ
ANDREW R. SMITH
BRIAN C. SMITH
BRIAN D. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER D. SMITH
JEFFREY A. SMITH
JEREMY J. SMITH
JESSE L. SMITH
MARTY T. SMITH
TREVOR K. SMITH
VINCENT B. SMITS
PATRICK S. SMYTH
DOUGLAS A. SNEAD
LESLIE R. SNODGRASS, JR.
KEITH H. SNOOK, JR.
JON M. SNYDER
BRANDON H. SOKORA
JOHN T. SOPHIE
WALTER J. SORENSEN
SHAWN T. SOUTH
SETH W. SPANIER
MATTHEW R. SPEARS
ALLEN M. SPECHT
HUGH P. SPONSELLER
SIDNEY S. SQUIRES
BRIAN D. SROUFE
THOMAS C. STADY
DAVID I. STAMPS
MATTHEW S. STANFORD
JOSEPH M. STANGL
FREDERICK M. STANLEY
WESLEY B. STARK
JOHN G. STAUDT III
GEOFFREY M. STEEVES
CHADWICK M. STEIPP
CHANSE D. STEPHENS
CHRISTOPHER R. STEPHENS
DARRYLE STEPHENS
JON B. STEVENS
GERALD A. STEVENSON
STERLING M. STEWART
JONATHAN U. STICKA
TODD M. STINCHFIELD
SAMUEL CLAIRE STITT
WILLIAM F. STORMS
KENNETH A. STREMMEL
MARLON J. STRICKLAND
JUSTIN L. SUTHERLAND
ROSS H. SUTHERLAND

WILLIAM K. SWAN
NICHOLAS J. SWEENEY
SCOTT R. SWEENEY
ANTHONY SYLVAIN
MEGHAN M. SZWARC
FRANK A. TARAVELLA
ERIK M. TARNANEN
REGINA J. TATE
JEFFREY L. TAYLOR
LATRESE M. TAYLOR
SCOTT M. TAYLOR
JASON M. TEAGUE
AARON H. TELTSCHIK
LAURA C. TERRY
NATHAN B. TERRY
JOHN C. THARP
RYAN L. THEISS
ERIC D. THERIAULT
LIZA MOYA THERIAULT
JAY C. THOMAS
MARK R. THOMAS
RONALD L. THOMAS
STEVEN J. THOMAS
SCOTT THOMASON
ERIC D. THOMPSON
HARLEY P. THOMPSON
JASON I. THOMPSON
JEFFREY R. THOMPSON
JACOB M. THORNBURG
THOMAS M. THORP
CRAIG A. THORSTENSON
ROBERT S. THROWER
ANTHONY L. TILLMAN
MATTHEW P. TINKER
BRYAN M. TITUS
JAMES P. TOBIN
SHAMEKIA N. TOLIVER
TYLER C. TOLLMAN
CHRISTOPHER A. TOOMAN
AARON O. TORCZYNSKI
NICHOLAS A. TORRES
BRENT J. TOTH
ROBERT C. TOURNAY
TODD E. TRACY
BRYAN E. TRINKLE
PETER A. TRITSCH, JR.
MATTHEW R. TROVINGER
ANTHONY A. TRUETTE
TRAVIS C. TRUSSELL
ERIC A. TUCKER
WILLIAM D. TUCKER
CHRISTOPHER A. ULIBARRI
BRYAN T. UNKS
NICHOLAS D. UNRUH
EMILIO J. URENA
LEAH B. VANAGAS
BRIAN H. VANCE
DAVID ALLEN VANPELT
MARK F. VANWEEZENDONK
JASON C. VAP
JENNIFER L. VARGA
RAFAEL A. VARGASFONTANEZ
MARC A. VASSALLO
WILLIAM J. VAUSE
FRANCISCO VEGA
JEREMY D. VERBOUT
MARIO O. VERRETT
BRIAN P. VESEY
ROBERT D. VIDOLOFF
CHRISTINA DUNN VILE
DAVID W. VILLARREAL
DANIEL J. VISOSKY
GREGORY S. VOELKEL
ROBERT A. VOLESKY
DAMON C. VORHEES
GREGORY W. VOTH
ELWOOD T. WADDELL
JAMIE M. WADE
AARON D. WALENGA
TOBY LOUIS WALKER
TODD A. WALKER
CAROLYN J. WALKOTTE
KIMBERLY Y. WALLACE
LONZO E. WALLACE
DANIEL P. WALLICK
LEON H. WALT, JR.
TERRY L. WANNER, JR.
JASON T. WARD
THOMAS C. WARD
DAVID M. WARE
DOUGLAS M. WARREN
THOMAS C. WASHBURN
ANA C. WATKINS
WARREN B. WATKINSON II
JOSEPH C. WATSON
DAVID T. WATTS
JEFFERY C. WATTS
NEAL A. WATTS
CEDRIC D. WEATHERLY
CHRISTOPHER J. WEATON
STEPHANIE L. WEAVER
VANESSA C. WEED
THOMAS F. WEGNER
WILLIAM L. WEIFORD III
KENNETH H. WEINER
MATTHEW R. WEINSCHENKER
JOHN S. WELCH
CHRIS T. WELLBAUM
JAMES E. WELLS
RACHEL A. WELLS
FRANK W. WELTON
REBECCA M. WELTON

AMANDA J. G. WERKHEISER
JASON E. WEST
TONI J. WHALEY
NEIL D. WHELDEN
ANTHONY D. WHITE
JUSTIN D. WHITE
MICHELLE M. H. WHITFIELD
JOSEPH E. WHITTINGTON, JR.
STEVEN P. WICK
KEVIN W. WIERSCHKE
GEORGEREECO J. WIGFALL
JASON W. WILD
SHAUN M. WILLHITE
DANIEL L. WILLIAMS
JASON EDWARD WILLIAMS
JEREMY E. WILLIAMS
DANIEL P. WILLISON, JR.
CARL C. WILSON
DAVID J. WILSON
ERIC W. WILSON
MARCUS D. WILSON
RICHARD G. WILSON
SHEENA L. WINDER
JAMES M. WINNING
DOUGLAS R. WITMER
RANDOLPH B. WITT
JAMES D. WOMBLE
CHRISTOPHER C. WOOD
NICHOLAS S. WOODROW
TANNER G. WOOLSEY
RICHARD H. WORCESTER
CHRISTOPHER M. WRIGHT
NORMAN P. WRIGHT
PAUL B. WURSTER
REID J. WYNANS
NICHOLAUS A. YAGER
SEAN E. YARBROUGH
MARK L. YARIAN
STEVEN D. YELVERTON
CHRISTIAN C. YERXA
MARK T. YOUKEY
KEITH A. YOUNG
ROBERT M. YOUNG
RONNIE B. YOUNG
EVER O. ZAVALA
RYAN A. ZEITLER
ERIC D. ZION
MICHAEL E. ZISKA
ERIC J. ZUHLSDORF
JASON C. ZUMWALT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID L. ALLISON
MELANIE N. ASBURY
ANDREW M. BRUTON
ANTHONY COCHET
ANDREW L. CORNELIUS
LARRY E. MYLES II
DAVE C. PRAKASH
KENNETH R. RICHMOND
KIRSTEN J. SJOSTRAND
LAVANYA VISWANATHAN
KWANI D. WILLIAMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

CLAUDIA D. HENDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JESSE ABREU
GERARD M. ACOSTA
TOD A. ADDISON
TRAVIS D. ADKINS
KEVIN W. AGNESS
RICKY L. ALLBRITTON
STEPHEN R. ALLYN
PATRICK B. ALMOND
WILLETTE L. ALSTONWILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER W. ANDERSON
KEVIN W. C. ANDERSON
MATTHEW S. ARBOGAST
DAPHNE H. AUSTIN
BRETT A. AYVAZIAN
JOHN M. BALBUENA
PAUL R. BAMONTE
STEFAN R. BANDAS, JR.
GRANT B. BANKO
DACHELLE D. BANKS
ROB W. BARNHILL
AARON T. BARTH
KARL J. BEIER
SHARI R. BENNETT
SCOTT M. BISHOP
PAUL M. BONANO
ERIC L. BOOKER
ERIC L. BOWEN
LUCAS J. A. BRAXTON
ANDRE L. BROWN
JACOB M. BROWN
MARVIN J. BROWN, JR.

YVETTE L. BROWN
TAVI N. BRUNSON
NATHANAE L. BRYANT
LAVERN T. BURKES
JULIE L. BURMEISTER
BEIRE D. CASTRO
DAVID A. CENTENO, JR.
EDGAR A. CERDA
FAITH M. CHAMBERLAIN
MARIA CHAMORRO
DAVID C. CHANDLER, JR.
MARK A. CHEATHAM
JILL N. CHENEY
ROBERT E. CICCOLELLA
MICHAEL C. CIMATO
BONNIE B. B. CLEMENTE
BYRON T. COLEMAN
MELISSA R. COLEMAN
CHRISTOPHER F. CONLEY
BRIAN T. COURTER
RODNEY O. CRENSHAW
GEORGE S. CROCKATT
ELIZABETH H. CURTIS
JOHN R. CUVA
KANDACE M. DAFFIN
WILLIAM R. DAILEY III
SCOTT E. DAVIDSON
MELVIN T. DAVIS III
LAURA C. DECLOUETSMITH
ERIC B. DENNIS
LESLIE A. DESANDER
KHANH T. DIEP
BRIAN T. DOERR
JORGE A. DOLMO
ANTHONY E. DOUGLAS
RICHARD T. DOWNS
ANDREW J. DUUS
ERIK J. DYE
C M. DYER III
BOYCE L. EDWARDS, JR.
MEKELLE L. EPPERSON
ANGEL R. ESTRADA
JOSEPH EVANS
NICOLE E. FISCHER
MICHAEL S. FLETCHER
KELLY L. FRENCH
MICHAEL R. GAINES
JAMES M. GALLAGHER
BRUCE P. GANNAWAY
CEDRIC D. GASKIN, JR.
MATTHEW A. GIERTZ
ERIN M. GILLIAM
JACQUELINE M. GLAZE
KELVIN L. GRAVES
HENRY S. GROULX
ANH H. HA
MICHAEL D. HAGERTY, JR.
MICHAEL F. HAMMOND
SHERRIE L. HANCOCK
CHRISTOPHER HARVEY, SR.
CHAD B. HAYES
KEVIN G. HEINONEN
RICHARD D. HELLING
HAROLD P. HENDERSON, JR.
CONNIE V. HERBIN III
JOSEPH M. HERMAN
ROBERT M. HICKS
DARIUS M. HIGHSMITH
CHRISTOPHER P. HILL
CRYSTAL M. HILLS
ROBERT D. HILTON, JR.
LETICIA M. HINES
JOSHUA D. HIRSCH
STEVEN W. HOLDEN
NED C. HOLT
DANIEL L. HORN
ANDREW T. HOTALING
YU K. HU
GEORGE K. HUGHES
ANTHONY E. HUGHEY
ROBIN D. HUSTED
ADRAIN C. JACKSON
FRANK E. JEFFERSON, JR.
JEYANTHAN JEYASINGAM
DAVID A. JIMENEZ
BENJAMIN G. JOHNSON
ROBIN A. JOHNSON
DALE A. JONES
DAMAR K. JONES
NATASHA S. JONES
RHONDA E. JONES
SHAWN L. KADLEC
JASON M. KAHNE
JOSHUA M. KEENA
ROBERT L. KELLAM
ROLAND A. KELLER, JR.
HOWELL M. KELLY
SEAN P. KELLY
BRIAN J. KETZ
DAVID P. KEY
ROBERT G. KLARENBACH
JEFFREY M. KUTTER
JOSHUA J. LAMOTTE
MICHAEL A. LAPORTE
ANDREW D. LEE
JIM A. LEE
GREGORY W. LEIPHART
EDWARD LEWIS
PETER LIN
PHILLIP R. LOPEZ
ANDREW S. LUNOFF
ANDREW P. MACK

DARCY S. MANION
SARAH K. MARSHREAD
TIMOTHY E. MATTHEWS
CHRISTOPHER L. MAY
THOMAS G. MCFALL
CRAIG M. MCILWAIN
JAMES W. MCKENNA
BRETT M. MEDLIN
MATTHEW S. METCALF
ETHAN J. MILLS
SANDRA D. MINGWILKS
DAMIKO K. MOORE
MARK S. MORGAN
STEVEN W. MORRIS
DETRICE D. MOSBY
BRIAN S. NEILL
TERRANCE R. NEWMAN
JARED P. NOVAK
ROBERT L. OBER
TRACEY J. A. OLSON
EMMITT K. OSBORNE II
JAMES T. OUTLAND
MARK D. OWENS
AARON A. PARKER
KARRIE M. PATTERSON
BRIDGETTE L. PAYTON
DOUGLAS J. PELUSO
JOHNNY A. PEREZ
TODD D. PERODEAU
PETER M. PERZEL
JAMES P. PETE
ROBERT L. PETROSKY, JR.
JAMIE M. PHELPS
GEORGE M. PLANSKY
KEVIN M. POLOSKY
LISA M. PRUITT
STEVE L. RAGEL
GRETA A. RAILSBACK
ROLAND E. RAMIREZ
EFRAIN RAMOS
JOE A. RATLIFF
HARVEY R. RAVENHORST
JAMES W. READ
JONATHAN D. REEVES
BENJAMIN B. REX
PERCY W. RHONE, JR.
MICHAEL A. RICCIARDI
DOUGLAS C. RICHTER
TONI M. RIEKE
MARK D. RIPLEY
ROBERT G. RIVERS
ERIC C. ROBINSON
MELISSA M. ROSOL
SHAWN C. ROSS
DANIEL A. ROWELL
JOSEPH J. RUSH, JR.
RIZALDO D. L. SALVADOR
GINA D. SANNICOLAS
PATRICK L. SCHACHLE
JUSTIN C. SCHAEFFER
JOHN L. SCHIMMING
MICHAEL G. SCHOONOVER
JAY S. SCHRODER
TONYA L. SEBOLD
ROD W. SECOR
JUSTIN R. SHELL
ANTHONY R. SHERRILL
SHANE D. SIMS
EDWARD L. SLEEPER
SHAWANTA D. SMART
ADAM D. SMITH
RODNEY C. SMITH
RYAN D. SMITH
SEAN D. SMITH
STEVEN R. SMITH
TAURUS D. SMITH
LANCE M. SNEED
CHRISTIAN SOLINSKY
KENNETH E. SOSA
BRIAN M. SPURLOCK
MELISSA A. SQUIZZEROLEE
GEORGE J. STEFFENS
SCOTT H. STEPHENSON
MICHAEL C. SUAREZ
TIMOTHY SUGARS
BRETT C. SWANKE
JASON F. TATE
STACY M. TOMIC
TRAVIS D. TRAINER
KECIA M. TROY
ROCKY R. VAIRA
SANTÉE B. VASQUEZ
LISA A. VILLARREALRENNARD
WALLY VIVESOCASIO
JEFFREY E. WAGSTAFF
FRANCES K. WALKER
RALPH L. WARE
DAVID G. WATSON
DAVID M. WEESE
GAIL L. WEGE
GINGER L. WHITEHEAD
TREVOR D. WIECK
BRYAN J. WILEY
MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS
MICHELLE M. WILLIAMS
JULIA A. WILSON
ROBERT B. WILSON
NATHAN N. WINN
ROBERT J. WOLFE
DAVID J. YOUNG
JOSEPH W. YOUNG
JAMES J. ZACCHINO, JR.

RYAN B. ZACHRY
D001385
D011286
D011399
D011933
D003102
D011406
D011861
D012122
D011533

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

SUN S. MACUPA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIAN S. ADAMS
JOHN A. ADAMS
STEPHAN E. ADAMS
EDWARD M. ALLEN III
VINCENT A. AMERENA
LEIGHTON W. ANGLIN
RONALD E. ANZALONE
CHE T. AROSEMENA
THOMAS J. ARRIAGA
JASON B. AVERY
DUSTIN J. BAADE
BRETT A. BAIR
MICHAEL B. BAKA
MICHELLE L. BALDANZA
DAVID A. BARBER
JAMES A. BARBER
ANTHONY P. BARBINA
JAMES R. BARROWS
STEPHEN L. BATTLE
ANDREW M. BEAL
BENNY R. BEASLEY
KEVEN P. BEATTIE
HENRY M. BENNETT, JR.
HOLLI A. BENNETT
PHILLIP A. BERGERON
JOHN M. BERGMAN
ROBERT P. BEUERLEIN
BRANDON A. BISSELL
JEREMY N. BLACK
CHRISTOPHER T. BLAIS
AARON D. BOHRER
MANDI L. BOHRER
GARY S. BONHAM
JAMES L. BOOTH
KEVIN D. BRADLEY
KELBY V. BRAKE
JOSEPH S. BRANNON
MATTHEW A. BREITBACH
THOMAS J. BROCK, JR.
JAY W. BROOKE
SCOTT T. BROOME
CHRISTOPHER D. BROUGH
JASON S. BROWN
LOYD W. BROWN
SEAN M. BROWN
DANFORD W. BRYANT II
KEITH D. BRYANT
JOSEPH P. BUCCINO
AMY L. BURROWS
MICHAEL A. BUSBY
SHAWN D. BUTLER
THOMAS A. CALDWELL
GREGORY V. CAMPION
SCOTT C. CAPEHART
PAUL S. CARLOCK
DARRELL W. CARR
JOHN P. CARSON IV
TANEHA N. CARTER
STEPHEN V. CARUSO
JOHN M. CASIANO
CHARLES B. CAUDILL
JON C. CECALUPO
SCOTT B. CHENEY
JUSTIN M. CHEZEM
JASON A. CLARKE
KAREN L. CLARKE
DAVID S. CLUKEY
CHARLES J. COGGER
BRYAN K. COHOON
FORREST V. COOK
JASON T. COOK
DONALD E. CRAWFORD II
KEVIN G. CROOKS
JOHN C. CROTZER
JESSE T. CURRY
JAMES R. CUTCHIN
MATTHEW P. CUVIELLO
ADAM J. CZEKANSKI
HERBERT A. DANIELS, JR.
MICHAEL R. DAVIS
RICHARD J. DAVIS
WILLIAM L. DAVIS
JAMES C. DAYHOFF
DAMON A. DELAROSA
MATTHEW B. DENNIS
ANDREW T. DEPONAI
DAVID S. DIAZ
CARL D. DICK
JEREMY J. DIGIOIA

BYRON A. DOBSON
 DWIGHT D. DOMENGEAUX, JR.
 ARAM M. DONIGIAN
 JOHN C. DONLIN
 SEAN P. DONNELLY
 BRYAN T. DONOHUE
 PATRICK A. DOUGLAS
 ROBERT F. DOUGLAS
 STEPHEN E. DOUGLAS
 JAMES W. DOWNING
 EARL DOYLE
 TIMOTHY H. DRAVES
 BRIAN M. DUCOTE
 ANDREW R. DUPREY
 JONATHAN A. EASLEY
 PAUL B. EBERHARDT
 SAMUEL G. EDWARDS
 JAMES M. EGAN
 RYAN J. ELLIS
 BARRETT M. EMENHEISER
 SCOTT J. EMMEL
 JOEY L. ERRINGTON
 JOHNNY A. EVANS, JR.
 MATTHEW S. FARMER
 ALAN E. FAYE
 JOHN M. FERNAS
 EUGENE J. FERRIS
 BRIAN J. FICKEL
 SHANE F. FINN
 MICHAEL T. FITZPATRICK
 JANUS T. FRALEY
 AARON L. FREEMAN
 RECELLA S. L. PROBE
 CHAD A. FROEHLICH
 CHRISTOPHER FUHRMAN
 MARC P. GAGUZIS
 BRYON G. GALBRAITH
 JON R. GARDNER
 MATTHEW B. GARNER
 RUBEN GARZA
 DARIN L. GAUB
 JOSEPH R. GEARY
 JOHN J. GEIS III
 JASON T. GENTILE
 BRIAN J. GERBER
 WADE A. GERMAN
 DANIEL C. GIBSON
 JOHN B. GILLIAM
 TIMOTHY L. GITTINS
 PHILIP W. GODDARD III
 MICHAEL GOMEZ
 MATTHEW J. GOMLAK
 MATTHEW F. GOODING
 EVAN H. GOTKIN
 JAMES M. GRANDY
 SCOTT W. GRECO
 ROBERT G. GREEN
 ANGELA M. GREENEWALD
 WILLIAM M. GRIESHABER
 TIMON D. GROVES
 STEVEN E. GVENTER
 JEREMY T. GWINN
 RAYMOND L. HAKEY, JR.
 JEFFREY D. HALL
 MICHAEL J. HALL
 BRIAN P. HALLBERG
 SALLY C. HANNAN
 ERIC W. HARRELSON
 BRYAN M. HARRIS
 JONATHAN L. HARVEY
 JOSEF S. HATCH
 JOHN J. HAWBAKER
 MARCUS C. HAY
 MALCOLM G. HAYNES
 RALPH D. HEATON
 SEAN C. HEIDGERKEN
 STEPHEN A. HEINZ
 MICHAEL D. HELTON
 JASON A. HENDERSON
 WADE D. HERMAN
 BRIAN D. HEVERLY
 BRENDAN R. HOBBS
 GEORGE A. HODGES
 BRIAN T. HOFFMAN
 KYLE M. HOGAN
 ROBERT J. HOLCOMBE
 DEXTER A. HOLLEY
 EDWARD L. HOLLIS
 BERNARD HOUSE
 ROBERT C. HOWARD
 JUSTIN R. HOWE
 SCOTT L. HOWELL
 RONALD J. HUGHES
 RICHARD C. HYDE
 RICHARD J. IKENA, JR.
 JEFFREY E. IVEY
 SEDRICK L. JACKSON
 TRAVIS A. JACOBS
 ERIC JACOBSON
 JASON R. JAJACK
 JEREMY W. JAMES
 RANDY P. JAMES, JR.
 ANDREW JASSO
 NICHOLAS C. JENKINS
 BJORN D. A. JOHNSON
 RODNEY D. JOHNSON
 HARRY H. JONES IV
 ANDREW Q. JORDAN
 CHRISTOPHER E. JUDGE
 MARK A. KAPERAK
 STEPHEN M. KAPLACHINSKI
 CHRISTOPHER G. KASKER

EDWARD W. KEEL
 BLAKE W. KEIL
 DEREK R. KELLER
 ZACHARY D. KERNS
 RYAN D. KEYS
 JAMES A. KIEVIT
 ROSS A. KILBURN
 ROBERT C. KIMMEL
 LIAM J. KINGDON
 CHRISTOPHER J. KIRK
 ANDREW J. KISER
 DAMON M. KNARR
 JEFFREY R. KNUDSON
 ERIC J. KUNAK
 STEVEN J. KURCZAK
 ADAM J. LACKEY
 DONALD J. LAGRANGE
 PHILLIP H. LAMB
 CHRISTOPHER V. LANE
 THOMAS E. LAYBOURN
 JEFFREY J. LESPERANCE
 CHRISTOPHER M. LEUNG
 RYAN P. LEVESQUE
 ADAM J. LEWIS
 ALEXANDER C. LOVASZ
 ADAM L. LOWMASTER
 SHARON R. LYGH
 EDWARD J. LYNCH
 GARY J. LYSAGHT
 TRENT J. LYTHGOE
 THOMAS N. MACMILLIN
 TIMOTHY M. MAHONEY
 JOHN A. MAILMAN, JR.
 MICHAEL J. MANNION
 LAFRAN MARKS
 CHRISTOPHER M. MARQUEZ
 DAVID C. MARTIN
 ELIZABETH A. MARTIN
 TIMOTHY S. MARZANO
 JARRET D. MATHEWS
 EDWIN D. MATTHADESS III
 ROBERT W. MATTHEWS
 RAYMOND M. MATTOX
 JAMES D. MAXWELL
 MICHAEL R. MCCARSON
 BRIAN E. MCCARTHY
 PATRICK M. MCCARTHY
 GINAMARIE MCCLOSKEY
 TRAVIS E. MCCRACKINE
 CHRISTOPHER C. MCGARRY
 SEAN P. MCGEE
 WILLIAM P. MCGLOTHLIN
 KASI E. MCGRAW
 TIM M. MCGREW
 GEOFFREY M. MCKENZIE
 THURMAN C. MCKENZIE
 SCOTT W. MCLELLAN
 KALI A. MCMURRAY
 ROBERT B. MCNELLIS
 STEVEN R. MEEK
 JUAN R. MEJIA
 JON W. MEREDITH
 MATTHEW A. MERTZ
 KEYES M. METCALF
 CARY J. METZ
 RYAN M. MIEDEMA
 JACOB W. MILLER
 SCOTT D. MILLER
 TIMOTHY M. MILLER
 DUSTIN R. MITCHELL
 JAMES M. MITCHELL
 PATRICK C. MOFFETT
 CHANDA I. MOFU
 JOHN J. MONTGOMERY
 PETER J. H. MOON
 RYAN I. MOORE
 RODNEY J. MORGAN
 JOHN D. MORIS
 JASON C. MORITZ
 CHRISTOPHER S. MORRIS
 MICHAEL G. MOUROUZIS
 CARLOS E. MOYA
 JEFFREY M. MUNN
 JENNIFER A. MYKINS
 BRIAN J. NEWILL
 JASON M. NIERMAN
 DAVID A. NORRIS
 LANCE A. O'BRYAN
 SEAN M. O'CONNELL
 MARTIN L. O'DONNELL
 CHRISTOPHER W. OGWIN
 DAVID R. OLSEN
 EMANUEL L. E. ORTIZCRUZ
 MARK A. PACZYNSKI
 DANIEL W. PADGETT
 DAVID J. PAINTER
 JAMES T. PALMER
 WAYNE D. PARE
 FREDRICK B. PARKER
 MICHAEL S. PARSONS
 SHAWN M. PATRICK
 ROBERT J. PAWLAK
 MARC E. PELINI
 SCOTT A. PENCE
 ROBERT E. V. PETTY
 ROBERT W. PHILLIPS
 JUSTIN D. PIERSON
 ESTHER S. PINCHASIN
 CHIP POTTER
 JEFFREY M. PRAY
 WILLIAM C. PRUETT
 JUSTIN B. PUTNAM

LANDON M. RABY
 ISAAC J. RADEMACHER
 FREDERICK D. RAMIREZ
 CARLOS A. RAMOS
 JONATHAN R. RASTALL
 MATTHEW C. RAWLINS
 DANIEL P. RAYCA
 OTIS E. REGISTER III
 ANDREW R. RIES
 JOHN J. RIPA
 ALEXIS RIVERAESPADIA
 BRIAN C. ROEDER
 JOSE E. ROSARIOMENENDEZ
 SIDNEY D. ROSENQUIST
 JASON H. ROSENSTRAUCH
 ROBERT J. ROSS
 MATTHEW L. ROWLAND
 JOSHUA R. RUISANCHEZ
 KEVIN L. RUNKLE
 ROBERTO SALAS
 ROSA C. SANCHEZ
 JOHN W. SANDOR
 VICTOR R. SATTERLUND
 ERIC M. SAULSBURY
 BRIAN P. SCHOELLHORN
 CORY E. SCHOWENGERDT
 GREGORY M. SCHREIN
 GERALD P. SCHUCK
 WALKER W. SCOTT III
 JEFFREY A. SEARL
 EDWARD A. SEDLOCK, JR.
 JONATHAN K. SHAFFNER
 KEVIN R. SHARP
 JAMES E. SHERIDAN
 MICHAEL J. SHOUSE
 JASON C. SHROPSHIRE
 MICHAEL J. SIEBER
 KEVIN W. SIEBOLD
 MICHAEL A. SINES
 KURT N. SISK
 CHARLES E. SLAGLE III
 JAMES J. SMITH
 MATTHEW E. SNELL
 DAVID J. SNODDERLY
 PAUL H. SNYDER
 KENT G. SOLHEIM
 REYNALDO F. SOLIZ, JR.
 MORGAN G. SOUTHERN
 SEAN A. SPENCE
 DAVID K. SPENCER
 SCOTT R. SPURRIER
 CHRISTOPHER D. STANGLE
 JOHN E. STEEN II
 MICHAEL P. STEWART
 TED L. STOKES, JR.
 MARK T. STONE
 DEREK P. STORY
 DENNIS P. SUGRUE
 JOEY J. SULLINGER
 NATHAN S. SURREY
 JARED J. SUTTON
 DANIEL L. SWANSON
 JOSEPH L. SWINDLE
 KELVIN P. SWINT
 ANTHONY E. TANGEMAN
 ASHLEY F. THAMES
 DOUGLAS M. THOMAS
 CHRISTIAN A. THOMPSON
 BEAU W. TIBBITTS
 JOHN E. TIEDEMAN
 TERRY R. TILLIS
 GREGORY S. TILY
 PAUL J. TOOLAN
 JASON C. TOWNSEND
 CLINT E. TRACY
 KEVIN M. TRUJILLO
 MATTHEW P. TUCKER
 RICHARD P. TUCKER
 JAMES E. TULLY
 JEREMY R. TURNER
 BILLY J. VANCUREN
 JAMES M. VANG
 LOUIS VENEZIANO
 ERIC P. VETRO
 WILLIAM D. VICKERY
 DARYL S. VONHAGEL
 WILLIAM D. WADE
 DAVID M. WARD
 MATTHEW D. WASHBURN
 KARIN L. WATSON
 MARK C. WEAVER
 THAD D. WEIST
 JOHN C. WELCH
 MARCUS S. WELCH
 RANDALL D. WENNER
 JASON L. WEST
 ERIC A. WESTPHAL
 SETH A. WHEELER
 SCOTT C. WHITE
 MICHAEL T. WHITNEY
 KIRK J. WHITTENBERGER
 RICHARD T. WILLBANKS
 EDWARD O. WILLIAMS
 EVERETT C. WILLIAMS
 TIMIKA M. WILSON
 CHRISTOPHER W. WINGATE
 ROBERT J. WISHAM
 JOHN P. WISHART
 KARL M. WOJTKUN
 JOHN S. WOO
 MICHAEL L. WOOD
 TIMOTHY L. WOODRUFF

MARCUS W. WRIGHT
 RYAN E. YEDLINSKY
 JAYSEN A. YOCHIM
 ANDREW P. YODER
 DANIEL R. YOUNG
 JUDD K. YOUNG
 PATRICK R. YOUNG
 WILLIAM M. YUND
 WILLIAM J. ZIELINSKI
 MATTHEW T. ZIGLAR
 JOHN J. ZOLLINGER

D002263
 D011237
 D012184
 D002129
 D006292
 D011134
 D002302
 D011350
 D011956
 D005922
 D011554
 D010207
 D012106
 G010266

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CLARK C. K. ADAMS II
 LEONARDO ADAMS
 MICHAEL J. ADAMSKI
 KRISTOPHER S. ALEXANDER
 MICHAEL P. ANDERSON
 KRISTIN M. ARNEY
 MICHAEL A. AVILA
 CHRISTOPHER H. BACHMANN
 STEPHEN J. BANKS
 THEODORE A. BANNER
 JACQUELYN M. BARCOMB
 LEE A. BARNARD
 MATTHEW C. BENIGNI
 DEREK S. BICKLER
 JOSEPH C. BILBO
 WADE C. BIRDWELL
 DONALD E. BISHOP
 RICHARD A. BLACKBURN, JR.
 TIMOTHY P. BLANCH
 KATIE J. BLUE
 KENNETH N. BOOK
 JOSHUA J. BRADLEY
 LOUIVE B. BROGAN
 CHRISTOPHER P. BROOKE
 DONALD K. BROOKS
 ANDREW P. BROSNAN
 ANDRE M. BROWN
 ANDREW R. BROWN
 KEVIN P. BUETTNER
 DAVID H. BURNHAM
 BOBBY R. BURRUS
 MATTHEW D. BUTT
 ANDREW D. BYRD
 NATHAN E. R. BYRNES
 KATHLEEN S. CAGE
 ERICA L. CAMERON
 JASON L. CAMPBELL
 STUART B. CATE
 JAMES C. CHENEY
 KWOK F. CHIU
 ANDREW P. CLARK
 SEAN P. COAKLEY
 DUDLEY J. COBB
 JOHN A. COFIELD
 JUSTIN K. COLBERT
 ROBERT L. COLLINS III
 JOSHUA B. COMSTOCK
 JUSTIN D. CONSIDINE
 JONATHAN D. CORNETT
 EDWARD L. COX
 ZACHARY W. COYAN
 ROBERT R. CRAIG
 MELLYORA K. CRAWFORD
 JUAN R. CUELLAR
 STEVEN B. CUNNINGHAM
 STEPHEN M. DAIL
 ILYA DASHEVSKY
 ANNA M. DAVIS
 JEFFREY A. DAYTON
 VICTOR M. DEEKENS
 CHRISTOPHER S. DENHAM
 MARK A. DENTON
 PAUL K. DONNELL
 JOHN C. DRAKE
 ANDREW A. DUGGER
 CHRISTOPHER J. DUNCAN
 PATRICK D. DUNCAN
 JOHNATHAN K. EASLER
 JOSEPH H. EVANS, JR.
 PAUL J. EWALD
 BRETT T. FEHRENBACHER
 BRIAN P. FLEMING
 BRENT D. FOGLEMAN
 BRYCE E. FREDERICKSON
 SEAN J. GALLAGHER
 BRIAN M. GELLMAN
 ROBERT T. GERALD
 JEFFREY T. GIBBONS
 JOSHUA A. GILLEN
 MICHAEL D. GOSSETT
 AARON M. GOULD
 BRYAN N. GROVES

JOSEPH C. GUIDO, JR.
 STEPHEN M. HALL
 BRIAN K. HAMILTON
 JOSHUA J. HAMILTON
 ROBERT J. HANNAH
 BRETT I. HANSON
 EDMOND A. HARDY
 MATTHEW D. HASTING
 ANTON J. HEDRICK
 GLEN R. HEES
 MATTHEW W. HEIM
 WILLIAM D. HEMPHILL
 ANDREW J. HIERSTETTER
 JIMMY W. HILL
 JOHN P. HILTZ
 KEITH D. HOCKMAN
 JOHN J. HOSEY, JR.
 ROBERT R. HOUSTON
 SAMUEL H. HUDDLESTON
 MIKEL E. HUGO
 NATHAN C. HURT
 JOHN M. IVES
 BRIAN P. JACOBSON
 CRAIG S. JAYSON
 ROBERT J. JOHANEK
 BYRON G. JOHNSON
 JAMES R. JOHNSON
 JERAMIE D. JOHNSON
 ROBERT R. JOHNSTON II
 DAMIAN M. JONES
 LEONARD E. JONES
 MICHAEL R. JONES
 JEFFREY C. KACALA
 BRIAN M. KADET
 CHARLES J. KARELS
 CARLOS J. KAVETSKY
 GREGORY P. KEENEY
 RICHARD A. KIPHUTH
 DIANE E. KLEIN
 MATTHEW D. KOEHLER
 ERIK E. KOENIG
 JONATHAN P. KOERNIG
 MICHAEL T. KOSUDA
 THOMAS J. KUCIK
 KANAME K. KUNIYUKI II
 YUKIO A. KUNIYUKI III
 SHAWN W. KYLE
 BRYAN D. LAKE
 MICHAEL A. LANDIN
 KARLTON L. LANE
 PATRICK J. LANE
 MARK J. LAVIN II
 MATTHEW J. LENNOX
 CHRISTIAN T. LEWIS
 THEODORE T. LIEBREICH
 BRETT D. LINDBERG
 KELLEY D. LITZNER
 CHARLES S. LOCKWOOD
 GARY M. L. LYKE
 NEILL A. MACLEOD III
 MICHAEL I. MAHARAJ
 CHRISTOPHER E. MARKS
 CHRISTOPHER M. MARTINEZ
 DANIEL I. MATTEI
 ROBERT L. MAY
 MICHAEL E. MCCARTHY
 TARA L. MCCARTY
 DAVIS K. MCELWAIN
 CHARLES J. MCGARRY
 PHILIP J. MCGOVERN
 ROBERT E. MCGUIRE
 KRISTIAN MCKENNEY
 KEITH D. MCMANUS
 DOUGLAS J. MCNAIR
 ROBERT A. MCVEY, JR.
 PAUL C. MEAUX
 ANDREW J. MEETZE
 RICHARD E. MICHAEL
 STEPHEN J. MIKO
 ZACHARY F. MILLER
 GREGORY R. MITCHELL
 ROBERT G. MITCHELL
 BASEL M. MIXON IV
 MATTHEW J. MOAKLER
 GEORGE L. MOORE
 DANIEL R. MORRIS
 BRIAN M. MURNOCK
 IAN H. MURRAY
 RICHARD J. NOWINSKI
 TERRENCE J. OCONNOR
 MARTIN H. OKADA
 FREDERICK H. ORNDORFF
 CHRISTOPHER J. ORTONA
 CASSANDRA M. OWENS
 DAVID E. OWENS
 DUSTIN M. OWENS
 JOSHUA G. PARRISH
 BYRON C. PATERAS
 CLAUDIA P. PENAGUZMAN
 GLEN D. PENROD
 KRISTY K. PERRY
 JONATHAN T. PETTY
 GREGORY D. PIPES
 ANTHONY F. PISANO
 BRANDON A. PRESSLEY
 BRYAN C. PRICE
 WAYNE E. PRINCE
 NICHOLAS E. PRISCO
 MATTHEW R. PROVOST
 ROMEO QUREISHI
 PABLO A. RAGGIO
 JOSE A. RAMIREZ

MANUEL F. RAMIREZ
 KLAUDIUS K. ROBINSON
 SHAWNETTE M. ROCHELLE
 JOSE R. RODRIGUEZ, JR.
 MELBERT V. ROLDAN
 JOSEPH A. ROMAN
 JAMES M. ROSS
 JASON K. ROUNDY
 KELLIE S. ROURKE
 JOHN A. RUCKAUF
 PHILIP R. RUSIECKI
 KENNETH J. RUTKA, JR.
 TONI K. SABO
 CADE M. SAIE
 MELAN P. SALAS
 FRANKLIN B. SCHERRA, JR.
 JAMES A. SHAW
 BRYAN P. SHRANK
 CHRISTOPHER M. SIEGRIST
 BENJAMIN R. SIMMS
 JAMES A. SINK
 KENNETH P. SIVERSON, JR.
 CHARLES M. SMITH
 DONALD E. SMITH II
 BERNARD L. SNOW, SR.
 SANG M. SOK
 GENE R. SOUZA
 MICHAEL P. STACHOUR
 RYAN P. STAMATIS
 THOMAS L. STJOHN, JR.
 MICHAEL STURDIVANT
 WILLIAM E. SYMOLON
 CHRISTOPHER S. SYNOWIEZ
 JEAN P. G. TARMAN
 MARK A. TERRELL
 MICHAEL D. TETER
 KRIST G. THODOROPoulos
 CHRISTOPHER M. THOMAS
 DAVID C. THOMAS
 DARIN A. TIBBETTS
 JAMES D. TOLBERT
 CHRISTOPHER G. TURNER
 JAMES O. TURNER, JR.
 NICOLE E. VINSON
 DAVID E. VIOLAND
 VICTOR A. VOGEL III
 ROBERT T. VOLK
 JASON D. VULCAN
 STEVEN B. WALDROP
 JASON M. WARD
 LATISHA M. WAYNE
 JASON R. WHIPPLE
 MARK R. WHITEMAN
 SHANNON J. WHITEMAN
 GEORGE B. WHITTENBURG
 CHIKE T. WILLIAMS
 DERRICK B. WILLIAMS
 KRISTINA M. WILLIAMS
 CARL J. WINOWIECKI II
 TIMOTHY E. WOLFE
 DANIEL C. WOOD II
 PRINCETON D. WRIGHT
 BRUNO A. ZITTO
 BRENDA D. ZOLLINGER
 D001245
 D001992
 D003840
 D003879
 D006536
 D010105
 D010490
 D010740
 D010779
 D011333
 D011359
 D011367
 D012109
 D012186
 G001008
 G001232
 G001288
 G001298
 G010051
 G010059
 G010212
 G010269

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

EDWARD J. EDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM A. BURNS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN L. BELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

CLAYTON M. PENDERGRASS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*CASEY D. FERGUSON
ANTHONY K. TOBIAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CRYSTAL R. AANDAHL
TUESDAY L. ADAMS
KIMBERLY ALBERO
BRANDI M. ALFORD
TIMOTHY J. BENJAMIN
MOHNEKE V. BROUGHTON
SARA M. BROWN
MARK C. BUENO
STEPHANIE L. BURLISON
JEFFREY K. BURNEY
ERA P. BURROWS
MICHAEL D. BUSHEY
ARVELLA M. CASE
EDWARD R. CAVANAUGH
SARAH M. CHAMBERAS
KATHERINE M. CHIU
MARK W. CLARK, JR.
MARY S. CLEMENTS
CHRISTOPHER J. DAVIS
JEFFERY L. DEWEY
BRIAN P. DRZEWIECKI
ERIN M. EICKHOFF
BRANDI A. EPPERSON
COLLEEN L. FISHER
LADONYIA L. GRAHAM
DARCY R. GUERRICAGOTTIA
MONICA L. HALL
WADE C. HANSON
KRISTEN A. HARDING
JUSTIN B. HEFLEY
MARIE J. HOOD
SACHIKO M. IKARI
ANGELA M. KELLY
GEORGE C. KRAFT III
MICHELLE L. LIND
KRISTIE L. LINDER
LAUREN B. LOGAN
JUBAL L. MARLATT
MICHELLE M. MCCORMICK
JOSEPH C. McDONALD
MICHELLE K. MCKENNA
ELAINE F. MEDLEY
JEFFREY A. MILES
KATHERINE C. MONAGHAN
RACHEL E. NEWNAM
MELODY A. OCONOR
NICHOLAS G. PEREZ
BYRON J. PETERSON
NICKY S. PETERSON
CHAD E. PHIPS
SUSANNE M. PICKMAN
WOODY PIERRE
KELLY P. RICKETTS
JOSEPH I. ROMAN
MICHAEL T. RUCKER
RAMIR C. SALCEDO
JULIE M. SCHAUB
SONIA C. SCOTT
JAMIE E. SHERRY
KATHERINE E. STOWELL
SARAH J. T. TALLENT
JOSEPH A. UKE
TRACI J. VANDERMOLLEN
TERRY D. VINCENT
MEGHAN L. WEAVER
STELLA J. WEISS
ALLYSON E. WHALEN
AHMON R. WHITE
JAMES H. WHITE
LILLIAN W. WHITE
LINA M. YECOPOT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CYNTHIA N. ABELLA
KENDAL J. ALLMANBAILEY
MICHAEL R. ANDERSEN
SALIM M. AQIL
ROBERT B. ARTHUR
CHRISTINE M. BAKER
ANNA E. I. W. BECK
SCOTT P. BLACKHART
MATTHEW S. BOLDUC
CHRISTOPHER D. BRADLEY
TODD G. BRINGHURST
HEATHER M. BROWN
ANGEL J. CALVO
JOSEPH F. CAREY
SARA A. CHILCUTT
KATIANA CRUET
CHAD E. CUCA
JEFFREY K. DEAN
CHRISTOPHER D. DINDAL

JAMES K. DOLL
CARLA L. EPPEL
TODD A. EPPEL
DANIEL J. FUHRMANN
MORGEN Y. GARDNER
DEREK B. GATTA
JEREMY R. GIES
JOAN M. GONZALEZ
THOMAS D. GRUBBS
NICHOLAS J. HAMLIN
CHRISTOPHER M. HANSON
AARON G. HASSELL
DREW B. HAVARD
JASON L. HICKS
DANIEL J. HONL
ERIC M. HOWARD
JEFFREY T. HOYLE
SHAWNA L. JACKSON
STEPHEN W. JOHNDREAU
DORIS K. LAM
DEVIN J. LANGGUTH
KATHY A. LIGON
BRYAN S. MAY
MICHELLE M. MAYER
MATTHEW J. MILLER
DANIELLE T. MUCKENTHALER
JOSEPH R. MUCKENTHALER
DAVID A. MYERS
CODY J. NELSON
ANDREW J. PAKCHOIAN
ERIN R. PALMER
PHILIP PARK
JENNIFER M. PILBY
ALLEN D. RASMUSSEN
DAVID M. RASMUSSEN
CLAYTON T. RAU
FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ
NOEL RODRIGUEZ
PAUL M. RUSSELL
DAVID J. RUSTHOVEN
LESLEY A. SACRAMENTO
YOUNGSEOK SEO
KAMBEZ SHUKOOR
MICHAEL A. SMITH
JULIE K. SUGUITAN
MICHAEL R. SYAMKEN
CHRISTOPHER E. VERZOSA
ERIC D. VILLARREAL
JAMES D. WARD
CHRISTOPHER P. WERMERSON
RACHEL L. WERNER
SHAUN T. WHITE
BARAK A. WRAY
YU ZHENG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS
JENNIFER H. ANDERSON
DONALD A. BAKER III
STEVEN T. BENEFIELD
SHAWN L. BOOTSMA
GENEVIEVE M. F. CLARK
STEPHEN L. CLOER
GREGORY R. COATES
JASON M. CONSTANTINE
BRYAN J. DAVENPORT
DAVID S. DEESE
JAMES O. DEWEY
JASON M. DIPINTO
DAVID L. DUPREY
DEVON H. FOSTER
TODD D. FOWLER
CALVIN B. GARDNER, SR.
JASON A. GREGORY
ANDREW J. HAYLER
PAUL A. HYDER
GLEN D. KITZMAN
AARON E. KLEINMAN
JOHN M. MABUS
WAYNE J. MASON
ROBERT E. MILLS
DAVID L. MOWBRAY
DAVID T. NELSON
MATTHEW G. PRINCE
BRYAN E. PURVIS
DANIEL R. SPIES
JONATHAN D. STEPHENS
GREGORY D. UVILA
JASON D. WEATHERWAX
MARLIN WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JESSE D. ADAMS
MATTHEW C. ANDERSON
KATHERINE R. CALLAN
PARKER S. CARLISLE
ERIK A. CARLSON
CALEB CHRISTEN
DAVID A. CHRISTENSON
JOSHUA L. CORNTHWAITE
NEIL R. DARCO
BRADLEY L. DAVIS
BRYAN M. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER M. FLETCHER
RYAN G. FORBES

BENJAMIN B. M. GARCIA
MANDY L. GARDNER
LINDSAY P. GEISELMAN
WILLIAM L. GERATY
JOSEPH T. GRIFFO
LAUREN F. HANZEL
TRACY L. HARP
JONATHAN K. HULLIHAN
MIKAEL P. JOHNSON
NICHOLAS J. KASSOTIS
DAYTON A. KRIGBAUM
ANDREA J. LEAHY
SAMANTHA F. LIPPOFF
JOCELYN E. LOFTUSWILLIAMS
DARREN E. MYERS
BYRON M. NAKAMURA
BRANDI R. ORTON
JESSICA L. PYLE
MARK T. RASMUSSEN
ALEXANDER R. SEVALD
ROBERT C. SINGER
NICHOLAS B. STAMPFLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JON A. ANGLE
NICHOLAS C. BROWN
KIMBERLY M. CAUDLE
PAULSTEPHEN CHIERICO
VINCENTO J. CIARAVINO III
DAVID C. COLLINS
THOMAS J. DILL
MICHAEL L. DOBLING
JAMES R. W. GALLOWAY
SHAWN C. GORMAN
AMY J. HONEK
JONATHAN R. HORNER
TIMOTHY P. JAMES
DALONE T. JENKINS
JAMES D. JOHNSON
CLIFFORD L. KELSEY, JR.
ROBERT W. LEFTWICH
MATTHEW M. MATTIVI
ROBERT E. MCCHAREN
DANNY B. MCMASTER
SANDRANELL L. MOERBE
WILLIAM E. MOILES
STEVEN H. PARKS
JEFFREY D. PATTON
JOHN K. PERGERSON
JEREMY M. SCHWARTZ
RILEY W. SMITH
LAVELL B. WALSON
KEVIN E. WESTBROOK
KHALID J. WOODS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TODD A. ANDERSON
EBENEZER ANIAGYEI
JOELLE L. ANNANDONO
JAMES L. ARMITAGE
KISHLA A. ASKINS
YESENIA ASTORGA
SHANDA F. AVENT
JEFFREY D. BATEMAN
JOSEPH A. BAUGH
DAVID G. BENNETT
NEVON R. BURNEY
MICHAEL J. BUYSKE
LANCE CALHOUN
KATHLEEN R. DAGHER
MATTHEW W. DESHAZO
SHARON K. DOERSOM
JAMES C. DUNFORD
JOSEPH M. FROMKNECHT
HEATH G. GASIER
CHERYL A. GRISWOLD
NICHOLAS P. GUZMAN
JOSHUA P. HALFPAP
KAREN B. HARMAN
SHANI K. HENRY
HANNAH L. HOOTEN
CHRISTOPHER A. JACKSON
KENNETH R. JENKINS
SANDRA P. JIMENEZ
JAMES A. LAGGER
JEREMY D. LAMB
JAKE S. LEHMAN
JESSE D. LOCKE
JAMAAL D. LOFTON
ORLANDO LOPEZ
ANDREA J. MCCOY
JENNIFER G. MCNAB
ROBERT M. NOSEK
OLUSEGUN A. OLABODE
KENNETH C. PADGETT
MELISSA K. PARKES
BENJAMIN B. PARKS
FRANK G. PERCY, JR.
COBEY B. PETE
YARON RABINOWITZ
SETH A. REINI
BERNARDINO RODRIGUEZ
IRINA ROMAN
DOMINIC J. ROMANOWSKI
DOUGLAS R. SANTILLO

MICHAEL D. SCHWARTZ
ALALEH K. SELKIRK
CHRISTOPHER R. SHARPE
PHILIP M. SHERRICK, JR.
JUDITH A. SILVA
THOMAS J. SLOCUM
CAROLYN N. SMITH
EUGENE SMITH, JR.
JAMES D. SPEITEL
ADAM C. STRONG
CHERYL D. SWINK
MICHAEL L. TAPIA
CHAD M. THOEMKE
JONE L. TILLMAN
DAVID VALENTINE III
DAVID M. VIAYRA
ANDREW J. WEISS
SHEVONNE K. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

AUSTIN G. ALDRIDGE
LINDSAY R. ANDERSON
JAMES F. BABCOCK
JACOB T. BAKER
ANJAIL F. BELTON
WARREN K. BLACKBURN
JASON E. BLANCHARD
LAMONT A. BROWN
WILLIAM C. BUFFINGTON
CHRISTOPHER S. BURT
CURTISS BUTLER
CURTIS P. CEASER
JON K. CHRISTENSEN
HYONG Y. CHU
MATTHEW C. CLUTE
JOSEPH M. COZART
JENNIFER L. CUSTARD
JASON F. DELEON
CHARLES M. DONALDSON
JEREMY J. DUKE
MATTHEW E. DUNCAN
NATHANIEL S. EDGE
DANNY L. EWING, JR.
JEFFGERARD C. FERNANDEZ
ERIC C. FOLKERS
GIOVANNI FORERO
JAMES L. FOSTER
ANDREW R. HALEY
JOSHUA R. HARDING
RICHARD P. HARTL
LINORA C. HAYES
DAVID M. HENTON
SAMUEL A. HULL
MARK C. JACKSON
BRIAN J. KENDRICK
DAVID C. KNOBEL
NOEL K. KOENIG
KONRAD R. KRUPA
SUNEET KUNDRA
KARA B. LANGFORD
HEATHER E. K. LEE
DAVID S. LEWIS
JAMES R. MARSH
SCOTT M. MCCARTHY
GREGORY T. MCCLEERY
SCOTT R. MILLIET
ALEXANDER S. MOLNAR
SEAN R. MOODY
ARTHUR C. NELSONWILLIAMS
ERIC J. NEWSOME
KURTIS A. NOACK
PAUL C. NOTARNICOLA
JAMAL M. OSMAN
WILFREDO OTEROMATOS
CARRIE L. PABEN
ROBERT W. PAUL
BRADY R. PETERS
KEVIN M. PETERS
JASON J. PFAFF
JACOB M. PRENTISS
DOMINIC M. RAIGOZA
MICHAEL P. RIGONI
MICHAEL P. SARGENT
JASON A. SHAW
CHRISTOPHER G. SMITH
FREDERICK M. STAINES
WENDELL K. STEPHENS
GARRETT D. STONE
BRENT L. SUMMERS
RYAN M. TOBIN
EDWARD E. TUCKER III
PETER L. VAPOR
NATHAN T. WOODWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ALWIN L. ALBERT
PAUL C. ALGRA
ART A. AMBROSIO
DAVID R. ANDRES
MICHAEL J. ANZEN
FRANK J. ARNOLD
ARNEH BABAKHANI
BRIAN T. BARLOW
ERIC V. BARTON
ANDREW M. BASNETT

LYNN L. BEAUCHAMP
ANDREW S. BERNHARDSON
KEVIN M. BERNSTEIN
ERICA L. BERRY
NIKUNJ A. BHATT
BENJAMIN A. BOGRAD
PATRICK L. BOOTHE
JOEL A. BRAMAN
JASON B. BRILL
JOSEPH V. BROWN
TAM BUI
JOHN M. BURGER
MARY C. CARONITTI
ERIC T. CARROLL
CHRISTOPHER A. COCHRAN
GLEN A. COOK
CHRISTOPHER P. COSENTINO
WILLIAM A. CRONIN
JAMEY D. CROSS
DEREK J. DAVIES
CHRISTINE A. DEFOREST
THEODORE J. DEMETRIU
JONATHAN R. DETTMER
NATHAN J. DETTORI
JILLIAN M. DORSAM
SIBYL M. DUNCAN
NICHOLAS S. DUROCHER
CICELY A. DYE
KEVIN T. ELWELL
ROBERT R. ENLOE
SHALIMAR J. ENRIGHT
SHARON C. ENUJOKE
WILLIAM J. EPPS
CHRISTIAN E. ESQUIVEL
MATTHEW P. FEIST
HUCKELBERRY A. FINNE
GAVIN W. FORD
ADAM J. FORREST
IZHAK FRIDMAN
RYAN M. FUGATE
JAMIL L. GANN
GABRIEL T. GIZAW
GALE K. GOODLOW II
DAVID L. GRIFFIN
GEORGE R. GRIMES
MATHEW R. GUGGENBILLER
JONATHAN L. HALBACH
DAVID M. HANRAHAN
TODD P. HANSEN
ROBERT S. HANSON
SARA N. HANSON
CURTIS L. HARDY
RASHEED HASSAN
LESLEY A. HAWLEY
EDWARD E. HEARN
MARA H. HEGEL
CHRISTOPHER D. HELMAN
MATTHEW D. HENRY
AMY A. HERNANDEZ
COLLEEN T. HIEBENTHAL
MAUREEN M. HIGGS
TIMOTHY J. HILL II
CURTIS A. HIMES
DUY T. HOANG
SEQUAIA A. HOLLAND
TIFFANY N. HOLLAND
MANJU S. HURVITZ
DANIEL S. HWANG
WILLIAM W. IDE
CHRISTY Y. INAE
JOHANES M. ISMAWAN
CODY R. JACKSON
MICHAEL L. JACKSON
HARBRINDER S. KALON
SUMMANTHER A. KAVIRATNE
STEPHEN A. KECK
JOHN E. KEHOE
EAMON C. KELEHER
TAMARA L. KEMP
JOSHUA J. KUHN
COLLEEN F. LAHEY
DAVID S. LAW
MICHAEL A. LEE
MICHAEL M. LEE
TIDA K. LEE
TRACY J. LEE
COURTNEY L. LENNON
ROBERT P. LENNON
KATRINA M. LESHANSKI
LOUIS R. LEWANDOWSKI
RADHAMES E. LIZARDO
BRYAN E. LONG
DONALD J. LUCAS, JR.
VERNON E. MACKIE, JR.
CLIFFORD M. MADSEN
BRIAN J. MANNINO
GORDON T. MARKHAM
CHARLES D. MARTIN
BLAKE A. MARVIN
LAUREN H. MATTINGLY
BRENDAN J. MCCLUNEY
MELISSA M. MCCORMACK
VICTORIA S. D. MCDONALD
ANNE E. MCLENDON
BRANDI N. MILMO
LAURA M. MORGAN
ROSS A. MULLINAX
KENNETH E. NEEDHAM
LUKE S. OAKLEY
ANDREW J. OBARA
BRENDAN M. OCONNOR
KRISTINA W. OCONNOR

ROBERT J. OLD T III
JARED M. PATTON
JOSHUA R. PAUL
ASHLEY B. PENN
DAVID E. PIKE
DUSTIN M. PORTER
LINDSEY M. PRESCHER
KENNETH R. PRINCE, JR.
JACOB F. QUAIL
STEPHEN T. RACHAEL
PATRICIA A. REICHERT
DANIELLE M. ROBINS
GABRIEL A. RODRIGUEZ
KATHERINE J. ROSS
BRANDI L. SAKAI
KERMIT C. SALIVIA
PAUL M. SCHMIDT
MARGARET E. SCOTT
JONATHAN G. SEAVEY
DANIEL N. SHIPPY
VIKAS SHRIVASTAVA
ANDREA N. SIMS
MOHENISH K. SINGH
ROBERT V. SKLAR
CHARLES T. SMARK
STEPHANIE L. SMITH
JOSEPH SPINELLI
PAUL A. STICKELS
JUSTIN P. STOCKS
ERIN B. STORIE
SCOTT G. STORY
DANIEL D. TARMAN
BRYON D. THOMSON
BRENDON G. TILLMAN
DENISE R. TORBERT
VISONG TRING
DIEGO A. VICENTE
JOHN A. VIGILANTE IV
JEREMY D. WALDRAM
MARCUS A. WALTON
JACK C. WANG
CHRISTINA M. WARD
DANIEL E. WARREN
STEVEN R. WEATHERSPOON
XIN WEI
SCOTT M. WEITZEL
SHANNON M. WELTER
SARAH M. WIED
CLIFTON J. WILCOX
MARCIE S. WILDE
MATTHEW C. WILLETT
BENJAMIN C. WILLIAMS
LAWRENCE L. WILLIAMS, JR.
JUSTIN D. WILSON
KERRY E. WILSON
JIAN XU
JAMES A. YODER
KAREN G. ZEMAN
JANIE A. ZUBER
JACK M. ZUCKERMAN

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BRODI L. FONTENOT, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

LOURDES MARIA CASTRO RAMIREZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE SANDRA BROOKS HENRIQUEZ.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

ANDREW LAMONT EANES, OF KANSAS, TO BE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2019, VICE CAROLYN W. COLVIN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARI CARMEN APONTE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ROBERT T. YAMATE, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNION OF THE COMOROS.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MARY LUCILLE JORDAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

P. DAVID LOPEZ, OF ARIZONA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LAURA JUNOR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN FRANCIS TEFFT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CLARENCE ERVIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES L. GABLE

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN L. DANNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL PATRICIA M. ANSLOW
BRIGADIER GENERAL ELIZABETH D. AUSTIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER E. FOUNTAIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD J. GALLANT
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT A. GRONWALLD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY H. HOLMES
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER T. LORD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHNNY R. MILLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL GLEN E. MOORE
BRIGADIER GENERAL LESTER SIMPSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL REX A. SPYTLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROY S. WEBB
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID E. WILMOT
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID C. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK W. PALZER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. NEAL G. LOIDLDT

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS P. BUMP
COL. JEFFREY E. IRELAND
COL. ISABELO RIVERA
COL. WALLACE N. TURNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. ULSES

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY S. PAUL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GLENN A. GODDARD

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL GREGORY C. BACON
COLONEL DARYL D. JASCHEN
COLONEL DAVID S. WERNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. HOWELL, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KERRY M. METZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GENE F. PRICE
CAPT. LINNEA J. SOMMERWEDDINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAWN E. CUTLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN ACKLEY AND ENDING WITH AARON ALLEN WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD EDWARD ALFORD AND ENDING WITH DYLAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM J. ANNEXSTAD AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. WESTERN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ROBERT P. MCCOY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. COGHLAN AND ENDING WITH AJAY K. OJHA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 22, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF BURTON C. GLOVER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL A. THOMAS, TO BE MAJOR. ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEKSANDR BARON AND ENDING WITH RYAN D. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARLO J. ALPHONSO AND ENDING WITH JORDAN E. YOKLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DESIREE S. DIRIGE, TO BE MAJOR. ARMY NOMINATION OF NEALANJON P. DAS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH YONG K. CHO AND ENDING WITH THOMAS A. STARKOSKI, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 22, 2014.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN I. ACTKINSON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT E. ZUBECK II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER W. ACOR AND ENDING WITH RICHARD P. ZABAWA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATE W. AERANDIR AND ENDING WITH JACQUELINEMAR W. WRONA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN G. ACORD AND ENDING WITH BRIAN P. WORDEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON N. AARON AND ENDING WITH CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN F. BRESHEARS AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. ZIEMBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL J. BRADSHAW AND ENDING WITH ROSS W. PETERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON AND ENDING WITH TIFFANI B. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES C. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH AMANDA J. WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC S. KINZBRUNNER AND ENDING WITH ERIC M. ZACK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERMAINE A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH JEREMIAH J. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEMAR R. BALLESTEROS AND ENDING WITH ANNE L. ZACK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. CEGIELSKI, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA D. WEISS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FERDINAND D. ABRIL AND ENDING WITH ALLEN E. WILLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL D. AMEDICK AND ENDING WITH DENNIS M. WHEELER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KERRY E. BAKER AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. WINN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENNETH R. BASFORD AND ENDING WITH JOHN P. ZALAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR. AND ENDING WITH SYLVAIN W. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN S. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH THEODOR A. ZAINAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BELL, JR. AND ENDING WITH NATHAN J. WONDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBEN D. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH DAVID M. YOU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 17, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADAM J. RAINS, TO BE COMMANDER.

RETIREMENT OF ROBIN BAILEY— Continued

Mr. ENZI. There is only one Robin Bailey. I was fortunate to have the original on my team since I first came to Washington to represent the people of the State of Wyoming in the Senate.

Robin's story and her service in the Senate began in 1977 in Cheyenne. She heard there was an opening on Malcolm Wallop's staff. It sounded like an interesting job. It would give her a chance to work on behalf of the people of Wyoming. She submitted an application for the position of office manager. Fortunately, Malcolm made the perfect

choice and added her to his staff. He was fortunate Robin was there to make sure everything was done and done well.

After serving on Malcolm Wallop's staff for a few years, Robin's husband Ron accepted a job in Rock Springs. They packed their bags and moved there. That was not to be the end of Robin's Senate career. In 1984, Senator Al Simpson chose her to take the challenges of his office in Rock Springs. Later, the Baileys moved to Gillette, my hometown, and Senator Simpson just changed where she worked.

Here is where I come in. I will never forget 1996 and the decision my wife Diana and I made to run for the Senate. Things came together for us and soon after the victory parties were over it became apparent I had a bigger issue to contend with—putting my staff together. Now that the campaign had ended I had to make sure we continued to provide the people of Wyoming the support and assistance to which they had come to rely on over the years.

I started to go through the stacks of résumés and then visited with my predecessor Al Simpson. Over the years he put together a remarkable staff. Some of them were willing to stay on. I was delighted Robin Bailey was willing to continue to serve the people of Wyoming out of the Gillette office.

Over the years my staff and I have noticed that Robin has two responses to most questions. Either she knows the answer or she knows how to find the answer. I don't think anyone has a better or more extensive system of resources and contacts than she does. Having her on my staff came in handy when in 2000 I had to find a new State director. Dee Rodekohr, who was Senator Simpson's State director and then my State director, decided to retire and enjoy all she earned with her service to the people of the State. Fortunately, she and I and all my staff knew we had someone already prepared who would be a perfect fit and it was Robin Bailey.

We extended her duties and we put her in charge of all the State offices. She not only exceeded our expectations, she took everything to the next level. She was a constant source of support, guidance, and direction for the people in my State offices, and she was always there with a word of good advice or suggestion about how to take on a problem. She was a great mentor to my staff—the new ones and the more seasoned veterans because of her great love of and knowledge about Wyoming. She is the kind of resource every office needs to have if we are to do the best possible job of taking care of the people of our home State.

My chief of staff has often said that Robin is the best and most natural supervisor he had ever met, and every day she has been on our staff she has proven the truth of those words and her

value as one of my team leaders. Robin is one of the people who stands out from all the rest. She is known and respected by all. She has a talent for not only knowing what is going on in Wyoming but also understanding what it means in the short and long term. Robin has never worked for me. She has always worked with me. That is part of what made her a great asset for Senator Malcolm Wallop, Senator Al Simpson, and me. That makes three generations of Wyoming congressional delegation and family.

She could write a book about being an effective State director. It would be the how-to manual of all time. It would help a person to learn how to be an effective leader, help others, be the eyes and ears of what is happening, and enjoy the job—all at the same time.

A big part of the job has been traveling around the State to see what is going on and how people feel about it. In my office I relied on Robin to travel around Wyoming and represent me at a long list of meetings, hearings, and presentations. We wanted her there because she is a good listener. She not only hears what the people have to say, she has an uncanny sense of understanding what they are driving at and how to best address that. She would let me know what she saw and heard and it was the next best thing to being there myself. You have heard the expression, "You cannot be everywhere at once." Robin has been my solution to that problem.

Her travels allowed her to get to know people in every corner of the State. She not only enjoys meeting people but welcomes the chance to get to know them and to help them with their problems. That is why she has been able to make a difference over the years in more ways than we will ever know.

Her life has not been without challenges, however. One such challenge came about when her husband Ron began to have serious issues with his heart and then Alzheimer's. It was a difficult time for her, but she never complained about what she had to do. She just did it. She honored her commitment to her husband and she continued to provide him with the support, care, and attention that had always been a hallmark of their relationship. When he passed away and she lost this great love of her life, she thought it might be time to consider making changes in the rest of her life as well. When Robin told Diana and me that she felt it was time for her to retire and follow a different path in life, we did what most every one of us would do. We told her to take a few years to make up her mind. Unfortunately, that didn't work and now she is making plans for the next chapter of her life.

She will be spending more time with her family, especially her grandchildren. She has already shown she is

a very special—in fact, a spectacular—grandmother. I know her family will enjoy having her take a more active role in their lives.

I know she will continue to make a difference helping others and she will continue to be a great gift for all who know her and for all those she is soon to meet. I don't think Diana and I have ever met someone who is more focused or determined to help others. For Robin every day that is spent making life easier for someone else is a good day.

We are all sorry to see Robin close this chapter of her life, but we know she is doing it for all the right reasons. She said she had reached a point in her life when it seemed to be a time to try something new. We will miss her wealth of resources, knowledge, skills, and abilities that cannot be replaced. Over the years she has set such a high mark of excellence. Her achievements, the milestones she established in my office for outstanding effort and accomplishment, and her determination to make Wyoming a better place to live from one corner to the other will be the legacy of her service to the Senate, to the people, the State of Wyoming, and to our Nation.

In the years to come, each member of my staff will take away a different favorite memory of working with Robin. For my chief of staff it will always be the way in which she brought a solution with her to any discussion of any problem. For others it will be the way she would always find a way to handle an issue no matter how difficult or perplexing or how she seemed to not only be familiar with someone's issue, she also seemed to know almost everyone who was involved. For my part, I will always remember how much it meant to me to know I could ask her to take on an assignment and leave it with her knowing it would be done well. She always found a way to do what was needed and expected and then some more.

Perhaps her greatest gift is her ability to effectively manage time and resources. For Robin it is not a problem if there is only 24 hours in a day because she makes the best use of every minute of every hour.

Good luck, Robin, and may God continue to bless you and all those who come into your life in the years to come. You will be missed, but we will know where to find you. It is good to know you will never be more than a phone call away. We hope you fully enjoy your retirement.

You have earned it and then some.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MR. RUBIO. Thank you, Madam President.

I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

SANCTIONS IN VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Thank you, and I know Senator MENENDEZ is going to speak on this topic as well. We intended to come to the Senate floor and offer a unanimous consent agreement to pass sanctions in Venezuela. First of all, let me thank the White House for what they announced yesterday: sanctions against human rights violators and corrupt government officials in Venezuela who have been involved for a very long time—but especially since the 4th of February—in grotesque human rights violations against young people and all people in Venezuela.

It is a topic that is not often talked about unfortunately these days, given all the issues that are going on around the world. What is happening in Venezuela in our own hemisphere is startling.

First, you have the complete erosion of democracy which has been going on since the reign of Hugo Chavez and now with Nicolas Maduro it has gotten progressively worse. We have been seeing this and talking about this since earlier this year, when thousands of young people in Venezuela took to the streets to protest what was happening and they were met with some of the most brutal attacks we have seen in this hemisphere for quite a while. We documented that on the floor consistently.

So beginning from that moment forward, we have worked in this body to seek sanctions against those individuals, against the people responsible for those human rights violations who also happened to be, by the way, incredibly corrupt. I would go so far as to say that almost every major political figure in Venezuela today in the ruling party is corrupt. It is absolutely amazing how these individuals in charge of government in that country are systemically stealing the funds of the Venezuelan people, and the cases are extraordinary.

There are times, for example, when the President of that country—who, by the way, was elected in an illegitimate election—is benefiting from the currency exchange rate and manipulating that, top-level members of his Cabinet are skimming off the top of the country's oil company and pocketing money, and what is even more outrageous about that is that they and the people who surround them in the private sector are taking those funds and investing them and enjoying them here in the United States of America.

So I felt for a very long time—as have my colleagues—that this was an important issue that needed to be addressed, and it needed to be addressed by sanctioning those individuals and we have named many of them. So yesterday the White House announced that many of these individuals will

now be denied visas to travel to the United States. In fact, just yesterday a government official from Venezuela who was headed here toward America was not able to come because of these visa sanctions.

So we are grateful for that, and we are grateful for the administrations' implementation of this. But while we are grateful for the denial of visas, it does not go far enough. We also need to sanction their assets. That is why earlier this year I, in conjunction with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and Senators NELSON, MCCAIN, and KIRK proposed legislation to authorize both visa restrictions and also financial sanctions against these individuals, and we have been extraordinarily patient in working through the process to ensure that happens.

The ranking member of the committee, the Senator of Tennessee Mr. CORKER had initial reservations about it, and they were legitimate reservations, and as a result the chairman was kind and wise enough to hold a hearing where we heard testimony about the reality on the ground in Venezuela.

We then proceeded to vote on this in the committee, and the committee voted and approved it by a vote of 13 to 2, if I recall correctly, and that happened on May 22.

Then we patiently worked with our colleagues to try to bring this to the floor, understanding that with all the issues going on it would be difficult to schedule a rollcall vote on it, but we would try to pass it by a process in the Senate we call unanimous consent, where we ask all of our colleagues to approve it and we worked patiently to do that. While he had initial reservations earlier this week, Senator CORKER lifted those reservations and I thank him for that and the way he has taken this so seriously and his cooperation in that matter.

My intention this evening was to come to the Senate floor and ask for unanimous consent of this body to pass this resolution, but some of my colleagues expressed concern about some of the costs that are potentially embedded in this. Let me explain those costs for point of clarification. There were two, in general.

The first was a \$15 million funding for a democracy program in Venezuela, which I believe is a worthy endeavor. But for purposes of overcoming those objections and getting this done, I agreed, and I think the other sponsors did as well, that we would be willing to suspend that in an effort to get this accomplished.

The second is a little bit more nebulous. The second describes administrative costs basically for identifying these assets and implementing the sanctions. The costs are not unique to this. They are not real costs in the way you and I would think of costs. You don't have to write an additional check

or borrow money from China to pay for it. It is the same thing that you would have to do if the President had announced these sanctions, which he has the power to do.

What we did as a result of that is we looked at it. The total cost of it is between \$6 and \$8 million, even though that number is probably not that high, but it would basically involve identifying the individuals and identifying the assets they have that we could sanction. There was concern about that. We were willing to find an additional measure to sunset the implementation of these sanctions in 2016 to lower the costs even further, and yet we still heard there might be some objections. Over the last few minutes, however, and in consultation with the Senator from Oklahoma, we have tried to craft what I believe we hope we can arrive at in the next hours, a solution to this problem that assuages his concern and allows us to get this done.

So in the interest of trying to achieve it in that manner, I am going to withhold asking unanimous consent today for purposes of hopefully arriving at that agreement over the next few hours or early tomorrow morning so we can attempt to get this done in a way that achieves what we are trying to do.

This is critically important.

I point out for purposes of my point of comparison, the Senate in April approved a bill which I supported—and I am glad we did—that authorized virtually identical sanctions against human rights violators in Ukraine. That bill authorized \$50 million for funds for the Democracy Program. That bill authorized \$100 million in security assistance and visa and financial sanctions on human rights violators. In implementing the sanctions in the Ukrainian human rights bill, the cost was \$10 million. None of those funds, by the way, were offset in the way that term is used here. There was no objection to that. There was no objection to that. By the way, the total cost of that bill was \$160 million. This bill that is before us is much more modest in its implications, and I would argue that the costs—at the end of the day, while it has what we call around here a CBO score, the costs are not real. It is basically what they would have to do anyway.

We are looking for language that assures our colleagues who are rightfully concerned about the debt and deficit but also addresses the grotesque human rights violations occurring in Venezuela today.

I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey in a moment, who has shown extraordinary leadership on this and every single issue involving democracy and human rights issues in this region and around the world.

I know there are things going on in the Middle East that are of critical importance to our country. I know there

are things going on vis-a-vis Russia and Ukraine that are of extraordinary importance to our country. But I hope people understand that what is happening in Venezuela matters too because even as we speak, there are millions of people in that country whose rights are being systematically violated.

Just this week the majority regime began a show trial against Mr. Leopoldo Lopez, a popular opposition leader, a mayor of one of the municipalities there. Do you know what his only crime was? Urging Venezuelans to demand a constitutional and peaceful solution to President Maduro's violent repression of demonstrations.

In case anyone needs to understand the true nature of the Venezuelan regime, it is not just human rights violations or corruption or the fact that the cronies of the Maduro administration parade up and down the streets of South Florida bragging about their ill-earned gains without consequence. Venezuela projects itself as a defender of every single human rights-violating country on the planet. Anytime there is a vote on Iran or Assad in Syria or on any human rights violation, you can count on Venezuela's Government being on the side of the human rights violator—every single time. Just recently we have seen them again repeatedly pronounce themselves in opposition to Israel and Israel's right to defend itself.

On top of everything else, we are not just sanctioning corruption and human rights violations; we are sanctioning individuals who at every opportunity they get seek to undermine the national security and the national interests of our country.

So I think this is a worthy endeavor, and my hope is that tomorrow when the Senate gets into session we can reach a conclusion on this item and achieve it. I think it would be critically important as we go into August to show that the Senate made progress in this endeavor. The House has its own version of sanctions that are different from ours. That will have to be reconciled. But I think passage of this in the next few hours will send a powerful message to the people of Venezuela that the people of America, speaking through our Senate, are firmly on their side and for their aspirations for freedom and liberty and on the side of human rights.

Madam President, I will yield the floor now for the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I thank my distinguished colleague from

Oregon for his courtesy in allowing me to do so.

I agree with everything my colleague from Florida Senator RUBIO has said about this issue, and I appreciate his leadership alongside with us. He has been following Venezuela intimately. So many people in the State of Florida have exiled there, and so he personally understands this issue and he has been a tremendous champion.

Since February of this year, hundreds of thousands of Venezuelan citizens have protested about the lack of security from rampant crime and violence and an inflation rate that is the highest in the world and a scarcity of food and basic consumer goods that has become part of their daily lives. But instead of listening to the legitimate concerns of its people, the Government of Venezuela has responded with a deplorable display of force and brutality that was seen around the world. To date there have been more than 40 deaths, more than 50 documented cases of torture, and more than 2,000 unlawful detentions.

In May of this year Human Rights Watch released a report on these human rights violations. The report documented how Venezuelan security forces systematically violated the rights of students, women, men, members of the political opposition, and journalists. They said they did so "to punish people for their political views."

Last week the Venezuelan Government opened its show trial against opposition leader and prisoner of conscience Leopoldo Lopez. After spending 5 months in a military prison just for speaking his mind, Mr. Lopez and his attorney were barred from presenting any evidence in his defense—none. No defense allowed.

If that were not enough, we saw that recent events showed that the Venezuelan Government is even willing to threaten regional stability to get its way.

Last week law enforcement officials in Aruba picked up Hugo Carvajal, the former head of the Venezuelan military intelligence and an individual who was designated as a drug kingpin by the U.S. Department of Treasury back in 2008. When indictments were unsealed last week, the world saw evidence of how a senior Venezuelan Government official was deeply involved in the international drug trade, allowing traffickers to operate freely in Venezuelan territory and even coordinating drug shipments himself.

When this official was arrested, what did the Venezuelan Government do? It threatened to cut off flights from Venezuela to Aruba and Curacao. It threatened to end a contract with Curacao's oil refinery, and it moved naval vessels into the waters surrounding these islands. In short, it resorted to every form of blackmail and coercion at its

disposition until the Dutch Government released Mr. Carvajal.

We should be clear that democracy has had its opportunity. In recent months foreign ministers from across South America and the Vatican have attempted to mediate dialogue between President Maduro and his allies and the political opposition, and they have not been able to accomplish it.

It is time to move more vigorously forward with the types of sanctions and other efforts envisioned in the other legislation I and Senator RUBIO have offered, and if we do that tomorrow we will send a message to the hemisphere and to the people of Venezuela that, in fact, they have a real opportunity to have their voices heard, and we will stand on the right side of human rights and democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OREGON WILDFIRES

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, at this moment in my home State of Oregon 500,000 acres are ablaze. Sometimes it is hard to get your hands around numbers, particularly large numbers, so I will give a sense of this. If you were to add up all of the fires in Oregon and if they were in one place, it would cover an area roughly 20 miles by 40 miles. That is an enormous section of a State to be aflame.

Because there are so many devastating fires at once, crews are coming from all over to help with all kinds of aircraft and all kinds of hotshot crews. They are doing all they can, but it is not just Oregon that has fires; other States have fires too. There are over 250,000 acres ablaze in Washington State to the north in a single fire. I believe it is the largest single fire in Washington State's history.

As a result of fires in Oregon and fires in Washington and other fires, we are draining our fire funds at an expansive rate, and thus we have a big problem: We are running out of funds to pay for fighting these fires.

Tonight we had before our Chamber an emergency supplemental bill to provide 615 million more dollars to fight fires this season across the United States of America. A procedural tactic was used to kill this bill. Quite frankly, that is enormously shortsighted.

Here is what has been happening in the past: The fires are being fought, and then the funds run out, and then the Forest Service has to pull the funds from every other department—from departments involving forest health, from departments providing efforts to prevent fires and create conditions in which they will not happen in the future. We are continuing a vicious cycle

of robbing fire prevention and forest management funds to fight emergency fires, and that cycle will go forward now that we have failed to pass this emergency supplemental up front.

I will give a little flavor of what I am talking about across our State. We have the Ochoco complex east of Post, 10,000 acres aflame. The Logging Unit complex northwest of Warm Springs, 6,600 acres; the Kitten Canyon complex west of Vale, 23,000 acres; the Bridge 99 complex north of Sisters, 5,700 acres; the Hurricane Creek fire southwest of Joseph, 900 acres; we have the Buzzard complex in southeast Oregon, nearly 400,000 acres; the Reeves Creek complex southwest of Grants Pass, 200 acres; the China Cap fire east of La Grande, 200 acres—by the way, zero percent contained—the Black Rock fire east of Antelope, 36,000 acres; the Sniption fire north of Fossil, 12,000 acres; and the Bingham complex east of Marion Forks, 450 acres. We also have two more fires that have just arisen, and those are the Haystack complex, 1,700 acres, and the Salt Creek fire northwest of Medford 100 acres.

Here is the thing. We have the conditions for more fires to come—more lightning, a forecast of more hot weather, and we have incredibly dry timber on the floor of the forest.

This situation in which these fires are going to be fought—by pulling funds from every other part of the Forest Service—is unacceptable. It is not good stewardship of the complex operations that occur within the Interior Department and within the Forest Service.

Think about the need to plan the timber harvest to sustain the lumber industry. That is a complex process. It involves a lot of folks who have to go out and evaluate the forests and work it out so those timber sales can occur on schedule. All of that gets stopped when you have to rob the fund in order to pay for fighting these fires.

Let's think about the millions of acres of second-growth forest that are overgrown. It is very good for disease, it is very good for fires, and it needs to be thinned, but how do you plan for the thinning if you rob the funds to do so? The list goes on and on and on.

I am deeply disappointed and frustrated with what happened tonight, and I urge my colleagues to exercise a little thoughtfulness, a little wisdom, and a little stewardship regarding our national forest. The next time this comes up, let's pass it unanimously so we can provide the funds that are needed to fight this national emergency.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last week I came to the floor to talk about the FBI's extensive use of flawed evi-

dence in thousands of cases. It is tragic just days later there is yet another scandal involving bad science used to send people to jail and some to death row.

According to an internal investigation by the FBI and the Department of Justice, nearly 2,600 convictions and 45 death row cases from the 1980s and 1990s may have involved flawed forensic evidence. Specifically, these cases involved microscopic hair matches, a form of forensic science that has been discredited. The scope of this scandal, which is the focus of a front-page article in the Washington Post yesterday, goes well beyond the problems we have previously seen when it comes to forensic evidence. Even more troubling than the statistics outlined in the Post's story is that the FBI, after recognizing these egregious mistakes, stopped their full review after examining just a small fraction of these cases. The Department of Justice has rightly ordered the FBI to resume its internal review, but the FBI's conduct is inexcusable.

Once again, we are reminded that our criminal justice system is not infallible and that we are all less safe when the system fails. FBI investigators should have redoubled their efforts to uncover these mistakes and rushed to tell those affected defendants. Instead it appears they dragged their feet and stopped their review. I intend to get to the bottom of this. I have a lot of questions for the Bureau, and I will not stop until they are answered.

When we have evidence that could prove that someone is innocent, we must get it processed immediately. It is not only the right thing to do for that person wrongfully accused but it is the right thing to do to keep our communities safe. That is why I again urge the Senate to take up and pass the Justice for All Reauthorization Act, a bill I introduced with Senator CORNYN last year. This bipartisan legislation includes the Kirk Bloodsworth Post Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, named for the first person exonerated from a death row crime through the use of DNA evidence. This program seeks to correct these most grievous mistakes. Senate minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL is a cosponsor of the bill. All Senate Democrats support passage of this legislation. There is no reason why the Senate should not take up and pass this important bill without further delay.

I also will continue my efforts to pass commonsense forensic science reform legislation. The Criminal Justice and Forensic Science Reform Act that I introduced earlier this year with Senator CORNYN would improve the use of forensic science in criminal cases and ensure that labs throughout the Nation are operating according to the highest scientific standards.

I thank the many law enforcement, victim services, and criminal justice

organizations that continue to highlight the need for reform to ensure the proper application of forensic evidence in criminal cases, and who have urged the Senate to pass the Justice for All Reauthorization Act.

I ask that the Washington Post article by Spencer Hsu be printed in the RECORD, and I urge all Senators to join me in getting to the serious business of providing justice to the wrongfully convicted and passing the Justice for All Reauthorization Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 2014]

REVIEW FINDS TWO DECADES OF FORENSIC
ERRORS BY FBI

(By Spencer S. Hsu)

Nearly every criminal case reviewed by the FBI and the Justice Department as part of a massive investigation started in 2012 of problems at the FBI lab has included flawed forensic testimony from the agency, government officials said.

The findings troubled the bureau, and it stopped the review of convictions last August. Case reviews resumed this month at the order of the Justice Department, the officials said.

U.S. officials began the inquiry after The Washington Post reported two years ago that flawed forensic evidence involving microscopic hair matches might have led to the convictions of hundreds of potentially innocent people. Most of those defendants never were told of the problems in their cases.

The inquiry includes 2,600 convictions and 45 death-row cases from the 1980s and 1990s in which the FBI's hair and fiber unit reported a match to a crime-scene sample before DNA testing of hair became common. The FBI had reviewed about 160 cases before it stopped, officials said.

The investigation resumed after the Justice Department's inspector general excoriated the department and the FBI for unacceptable delays and inadequate investigation in a separate inquiry from the mid-1990s. The inspector general found in that probe that three defendants were executed and a fourth died on death row in the five years it took officials to reexamine 60 death-row convictions that were potentially tainted by agent misconduct, mostly involving the same FBI hair and fiber analysis unit now under scrutiny. "I don't know whether history is repeating itself, but clearly the [latest] report doesn't give anyone a sense of confidence that the work of the examiners whose conduct was first publicly questioned in 1997 was reviewed as diligently and promptly as it needed to be," said Michael R. Bromwich, who was inspector general from 1994 to 1999 and is now a partner at the Goodwin Procter law firm.

Bromwich would not discuss any aspect of the current review because he is a pro bono adviser to the Innocence Project, which along with the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers is assisting the government effort under an agreement not to talk about the review. Still, he added, "Now we are left 18 years [later] with a very unhappy, unsatisfying and disquieting situation, which is far harder to remedy than if the problems had been addressed promptly."

Deputy Attorney General James M. Cole this month ordered that reviews resume under the original terms, officials said.

According to the FBI, the delay resulted, in part, "from a vigorous debate that occurred within the FBI and DOJ about the appropriate scientific standards we should apply when reviewing FBI lab examiner testimony—many years after the fact."

"Working closely with DOJ, we have resolved those issues and are moving forward with the transcript review for the remaining cases," the FBI said.

Emily Pierce, a Justice Department spokeswoman, said: "The Department of Justice never signed off on the FBI's decision to change the way they reviewed the hair analysis. We are pleased that the review has resumed and that notification letters will be going out in the next few weeks."

During the review's 11-month hiatus, Florida's Supreme Court denied an appeal by a death-row inmate who challenged his 1988 conviction based on an FBI hair match. James Aren Duckett's results were caught up in the delay, and his legal options are now more limited.

Revelations that the government's largest post-conviction review of forensic evidence has found widespread problems counter earlier FBI claims that a single rogue examiner was at fault. Instead, they feed a growing debate over how the U.S. justice system addresses systematic weaknesses in past forensic testimony and methods.

"I see this as a tip-of-the-iceberg problem," said Erin Murphy, a New York University law professor and expert on modern scientific evidence.

"It's not as though this is one bad apple or even that this is one bad-apple discipline," she said. "There is a long list of disciplines that have exhibited problems, where if you opened up cases you'd see the same kinds of overstated claims and unfounded statements."

Worries about the limitations and presentation of scientific evidence are "coming out of the dark shadows of the legal system," said David H. Kaye, a law professor at Penn State who helped lead a Justice Department-funded study of fingerprint analysis and testimony in 2012. "The question is: What can you do about it?"

Courts and law enforcement authorities have been reluctant to allow defendants to retroactively challenge old evidence using newer, more accurate scientific methods.

The Justice Department and FBI inquiry, which examines convictions before 2000, could provide a way for defendants to make that challenge. Because the government is dropping procedural objections to appeals and offering new DNA testing in flawed cases if sought by a judge or prosecutor, results could provide a measure of the frequency of wrongful convictions.

Responding to the FBI review, the accreditation arm of the American Society of Crime Lab Directors last year recommended that labs determine whether they needed to conduct similar reviews, and New York, North Carolina and Texas are doing so.

According to a Justice Department spokesman, officials last August completed reviews and notified a first wave of defendants in 23 cases, including 14 death-penalty cases, that FBI examiners "exceeded the limits of science" when they linked hair to crime-scene evidence.

However, concerned that errors were found in the "vast majority" of cases, the FBI restarted the review, grinding the process to a halt, said a government official who was briefed on the process. The Justice Department objected in January, but a standoff went unresolved until this month.

After more than two years, the review will have addressed about 10 percent of the 2,600 questioned convictions and perhaps two-thirds of questioned death-row cases.

The department is notifying defendants about errors in two more death-penalty cases and in 134 non-capital cases over the next month, and will complete evaluations of 98 other cases by early October, including 14 more death-penalty cases.

No crime lab performed more hair examinations for federal and state agencies than the 10-member FBI unit, which testified in cases nationwide involving murder, rape and other violent felonies.

Although FBI policy has stated since at least the 1970s that a hair association cannot be used as positive identification, like fingerprints, agents regularly testified to the near-certainty of matches.

In reality, there is no accepted research on how often hair from different people may appear the same. The FBI now uses visual hair comparison to rule out someone as a possible source of hair or as a screening step before more accurate DNA testing.

This month, the inspector general reported that inattention and foot-dragging by the Justice Department and the FBI led them to ignore warnings 15 years ago that scientifically unsupported and misleading testimony could have come from more than a single hair examiner among agents discredited in a 1997 inspector general's report on misconduct at the FBI lab.

The report said that as of 1999, Justice Department officials had enough information to review all hair unit cases—not just those of former agent Michael P. Malone, who was identified as the agent making the most frequent exaggerated testimony.

By 2002, Maureen Killion, then director of enforcement operations, had alerted senior criminal division officials to "the specter that the other examiners in the unit" were as sloppy as Malone, the inspector general said.

"This issue has been raised with the FBI but not resolved to date," Killion wrote to then-Assistant Attorney General Michael Chertoff and his principal deputy, John C. Keeney, in July 2002, the report said.

Twelve years later, the Florida case shows the continued inadequacy of officials' response.

Duckett, then a rookie police officer in Mascotte, Fla., was convicted of raping and strangling Teresa McAbee, 11, and dumping her into a lake in 1987.

After a state police examiner was unable to match pubic hair found in the victim's underwear, prosecutors went to Malone, who testified at trial that there was a "high degree of probability" that the hair came from Duckett.

Such testimony is scientifically invalid, according to the parameters of the current FBI review, because it claims to associate a hair with a single person "to the exclusion of all others."

The Florida court denied Duckett's request for a new hearing on Malone's hair match. The court noted that there was other evidence of Duckett's guilt and that the FBI had not entirely abandoned visual hair comparison.

Duckett attorney Mary Elizabeth Wells confirmed this week that Duckett's case was under the FBI's review. Both Wells and Whitney Ray, a spokeswoman for Florida Attorney General Pam Bondi, said Thursday that parties had not been notified of results, but they otherwise declined to comment.

Duckett's case was eligible for the 1996 review as a Malone case but was omitted, even

though the inspector general stated that "it was important to the integrity of the justice system" that all of Malone's death-penalty cases be immediately reviewed.

The Justice Department declined to comment on the omission.

RECOGNIZING HOARD'S DAIRYMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would like to applaud Hoard's Dairyman for shining a light on an important and sometimes overlooked problem in rural America.

The article in their July 2014 issue, "When Life Turned Ugly," written by Andrea Stoltzfus, focused on the unique challenges that rural victims of domestic violence face in overcoming their abusers. They are often geographically isolated and unaware of the resources available to them or they lack the ability to reach a crisis center due to a lack of public transportation. There also may not be a local shelter to help them or they may not have the financial means to set out on their own. These obstacles can make it particularly difficult for women in rural areas, like the dairy farm wives cited in the article, to escape abusive relationships.

From my days as a prosecutor in Vermont, I still vividly remember seeing the aftermath of this type of violence firsthand. I will never forget arriving on the scenes of domestic violence crimes. These experiences have spurred me in my roles as the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and as a senior member of the Senate Appropriations Committee to work to prevent domestic violence and sexual assault. Most recently I was proud to sponsor the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, which the President signed into law in March 2013. Since VAWA was first enacted in 1994, it has helped to lower the annual incidence of domestic violence by more than half, it has raised awareness, and it has increased reporting of these crimes. VAWA has also improved the criminal justice system's ability to keep victims safe and hold perpetrators accountable. But there is still more that we can and should do.

One in every four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime. That rate is even higher in rural areas. That is why I have worked to ensure that the domestic violence programs are adequately funded. In particular, I have pushed for increased funding for the Rural Domestic Violence Program. This program was established by the first VAWA to address the unique challenges faced by victims of domestic violence and dating violence in rural jurisdictions. This program supports the safety of rural victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking by funding projects uniquely designed to address and prevent rural crimes. It encourages cooperation among law enforcement and

victim service providers, among others, to investigate criminal incidents and to offer treatment, education and prevention strategies.

As a husband, father, grandfather, and as a former prosecutor, I know we can and must do everything we can to combat domestic violence. I hope that the Hoard's Dairyman article will help raise awareness. No woman should feel trapped in an abusive relationship, and we must all work to ensure they are not.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Hoard's Dairyman, July 2014]

WHEN LIFE TURNED UGLY

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IS AN ALL TOO COMMON OCCURRENCE IN RURAL AMERICA

(By Andrea Stoltzfus)

From the road, the farm looks well kept, the fields prosperous. The animals are content, the garden is flourishing. But behind the closed doors, away from the curious on-lookers, the helpful neighbors, a different scene unfolds—that of domestic violence among rural farm women.

What follows is a real-life conversation with a dairy farm wife who was a victim of domestic violence. As we move through the article, we will discuss the multiple layers of the issue and how women can find help.

"I ended up with this man because I wanted my dreams to come true of being married to a farmer, enjoying the farm and quality of life I had growing up on a dairy farm. I was after the same relationship my parents had. In my mind, it was all going to be so blissful. We would do chores together and share life together, enjoy being together and live happily ever after. I could not have been more wrong. I have learned that chasing dreams can be very costly, and I don't necessarily mean money."

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Domestic abuse in rural areas is just as likely to happen as in other communities, but women living in remote areas face other barriers to reporting the abuse or escaping the situation. The isolation of farms or ranches from towns can make it hard for emergency services to respond in a timely manner. Phone service may be spotty or even obsolete. "Going to town" could mean hours, not minutes, of travel time.

According to the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence website, the rural culture plays a role in making abuse reporting difficult.

"A 'rural culture' often includes everyone working together and knowing what is going on in each other's lives. It is likely that law enforcement, judges, social services and health care workers, faith leaders, and others know both the victim and the abuser. As a result, it may be more uncomfortable to share what is happening behind closed doors. Victims may feel that people won't take their situation seriously. In addition, there may be strong ties among extended families that mean breaking up the family is frowned upon."

"The people I got most of my help from were strangers. Neighbors, friends, family acted like I had the plague. How could this happen in our family, in our neighborhood, in our safe small town?"

Additionally, women may be partners in the farm, not only in the marriage, but in the daily workload and the financial end of the business. The farm or ranch may be the only source of family income, and the victim may be reluctant to leave as she has no other economic resources available.

Rural women have strong emotional ties to the land and livestock. Leaving could mean neglect or harm for the animals she cares for. Living on farms means more access to things that could be used as weapons—axes, chains, pitchforks, guns—working with farm equipment can be a ready excuse for injuries.

"I even ended up driving myself to the ER the morning of my daughter's 8th birthday getting five staples placed in my scalp where I got hit with a pipe for some stupid reason, then returned home to finish milking cows. There were several events like this. I had a bruise all down my arm, and I told people at work that the milk tank cover fell on my arm, and that's why it was all black."

Domestic abuse isn't always about physical abuse—it can also mean sexual abuse, emotional abuse or financial abuse. According to the Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition, it is important to know there is not "one way" an individual is abusive. When one abuse tactic no longer provides the abuser the results he/she wants, they will change to another to get the desired results.

"The milk price had nothing to do with it—he hit before we had our own herd. The crops, the weather, nothing had a thing to do with it. My husband loved the control, the power he had over me.

"It started basically the day after I married him. At that point, I became property. I remember the chute to the gutter cleaner breaking into many pieces and me not being able to shut the gutter cleaner off fast enough.

The memory of being screamed at, called vulgar names, made to feel totally worthless and brought down to tears for the first time are etched in my mind. It seemed like whenever stressful events such as this happened, he would transfer his anger at the situation to me. I would frequently get pushed and kicked.

He gradually progressed from just name calling, screaming and physical abuse to making threats of killing me, pointing his finger at my forehead and saying 'bang.'

OPTIONS SEEM FEW

Why don't victims leave the situation?

The reasons are many—including the inability to actually leave the farm—as they may not have access to a vehicle or public transportation. A shelter or services could be miles away, with no advocates or access to legal aid. Even if a victim decides to pursue legal assistance, it may not be as easy as it seems.

"I know it seems like this is a black and white issue, but it's really not. There were lots of things to think about—I knew I could not run this farm without him here, and most of all I never wanted at any point to see the farm fail. Many thoughts raced through my mind:

Do I call the police? No. If he gets arrested, when he gets out, it will only be worse.

Do I tell people? No. That only means embarrassment and people knowing that I am not as strong as I seem to be.

When I threatened to divorce him and tell him he would have to sell out to get my name off loans, he would threaten to kill me and kill my family."

Most victims' services groups recommend having an "escape plan" in place, which in-

cludes the actions to get to a safe place and the items to take with them. Making a primary care provider aware of the home situation can be part of the plan.

"I must also add that, through it all, when I had doctor appointments, the doctor and I always discussed the issues, but I always told the doctor that I felt safe and always had an escape plan. The doctor recommended I go see a psychiatrist, which helped me through a lot of it and gave me the inner strength to actually leave.

I realized that, when it got to the point of me saying that the day he died would be the happiest day in my life, this was no place to be mentally or physically. I also went to the county resources for domestic abuse, but all it seemed they wanted to do was rush me in front of a judge to get a restraining order, which was not the route I wanted to take. I was also told that I should go to the police from the threats of death he would constantly make, but once again I knew I could not run the farm, and I knew the consequences would be far worse."

Phone hotlines, internet sites and local community members can be a lifeline to an abuse victim. However, limited phone coverage, the threat of the abuser finding the sites viewed or neighbors who "don't want to get involved" can all be barriers to finding help.

"Even though resources are out there, it's not as simple as just utilizing them, as every situation is different, the fears are different and at different intensities, the degree of abuse is different, the inner strength of the victim is different, the family support is different, the family dynamics are different, so sometimes it's just not that simple as seeking out resources."

CRISIS IN GAZA

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the crisis in Gaza is extremely distressing, particularly to those who had hope for Secretary of State Kerry's years of shuttle diplomacy between the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

After seeing several similar attempts fail in the past, we know that for such diplomacy to succeed over the long term it will require the participation not only of representatives of the Israeli and Palestinian parties to the conflict but also the active support of Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and the other Arab states.

Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas are not able to reach an agreement to end the conflict themselves. Also, any agreement that lacks the support of Hamas or that cannot withstand the active opposition of Hamas will almost certainly fail.

According to the Government of Israel, at least 2,600 Hamas rockets and mortars have been fired indiscriminately toward Israel, forcing thousands of Israelis into basements and bomb shelters. Fortunately, most have landed harmlessly, and the U.S.-supplied Iron Dome missile defense system has intercepted many others.

The latest report of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs paints a chilling

picture of death and destruction in Gaza.

Hamas has placed rocket launchers, ammunition, and tunnels in the midst of densely populated residential areas, even in mosques and U.N. facilities, and they are being targeted by Israeli bombs, missiles, and tank shells. Of course, civilians are literally trapped in the crossfire. As of today, at least 1,118 Palestinians have been killed, 6,233 injured, and 240,000 displaced from their homes, many of which have been damaged or destroyed. The overwhelming majority of the victims have been civilians.

It is clear that Hamas's leaders, who specialize in terrorist tactics, care far more about their fighters than the safety of Gaza's civilian population. Yet even safe havens, such as clearly marked United Nations schools and hospitals, have been hit by Israeli bombs or missiles, and at least one may have been hit by a Hamas rocket. Many people, including children, seeking shelter have been killed and injured as a result.

During this same period, 56 Israeli soldiers have been killed, 400 have been wounded, and 3 Israeli civilians have died.

I sympathize with the argument that Israel had little choice but to respond forcefully to Hamas's rocket attacks. It is hard to imagine any government faced with a similar threat to its citizens not responding.

I also support, as we all do, the Israeli Government's goal of eliminating Hamas's heavy weapons and destroying the dozens of tunnels that are used to smuggle them into Gaza and to enable Hamas fighters to sneak into Israel to kill Israelis.

But this is not the first time Israel has sought to achieve these goals only to fall short, at great human cost. Operation Cast Lead in 2008 resulted in 1,400 Palestinian deaths and the deaths of 3 Israeli civilians and 6 Israeli soldiers. Then in 2012 there was Operation Pillar of Defense. Each time, despite the destruction of Hamas's weapons, launchers, and command posts, Hamas remained in control of Gaza.

After each of these operations, Hamas rearmed and is as determined today as it was 2 years ago. It does not appear that either goal, even if justified and laudable, can be achieved for the long term—if at all—without inflicting unacceptable civilian casualties.

Israeli authorities stress that its army tries its best to avoid civilian casualties. They know the impact each innocent death has on world opinion and on the Palestinian people. Thousands of Palestinians in the West Bank, many of whom despise Hamas, have joined in demonstrations against Israel because of the loss of civilian lives in Gaza.

But what is often ignored in the impassioned debate over this issue, in-

cluding by those who rightly point out that the Israeli military at times provides prior warning to civilians of an imminent attack, is that Gaza is not like anywhere else. Its residents cannot flee to safety in a neighboring country, as millions of Syrians have done. They cannot even escape by boat. Shelters in Gaza that should be safe are not safe. The people of Gaza are, for all practical purposes, defenseless, trapped, and unable to avoid the violence.

Hamas has insisted that it will not cease its attacks until Israel ends its export, import, and border restrictions on Gaza, which the people of Gaza, who lack safe water, sanitation, reliable electricity, and other basic necessities, say have made their daily lives nearly impossible. With each passing day, condemnation of the violence has intensified. Yet the death toll has continued to rise.

I commend Secretary Kerry for his efforts to broker a humanitarian ceasefire. There never has been a military solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and there is not one today. He deserves our strong support.

If the ceasefire announced today holds and if the United States continues to serve as the principle diplomatic intermediary, there needs to be some new thinking regarding our negotiating strategy. We cannot afford another dozen years with nothing to show for it, with the chasm between Israelis and Palestinians even deeper, with radical extremists further emboldened, and yet another calamity like the one we are witnessing today.

It is difficult to see how that will be prevented if Hamas continues to reject Israel's right to exist and refuses to renounce terrorism, which is fundamental to any solution that brings lasting peace and security to both Israelis and Palestinians, nor is it likely to be prevented absent a decision by Israel to substantially ease its economic restrictions on Gaza. That may be the only way to eliminate Hamas's excuse for its rocket attacks, to bring desperately needed economic development to Gaza, and to create the necessary conditions for the disarming of Hamas.

With each passing day, the grave consequences for the people of Gaza and Israel, for stability in the region, and for the security of the United States have become more apparent. The White House should use every ounce of its influence to help bring this tragic chapter of history finally to an end.

CYPRUS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of Cyprus in July 1974, which resulted in the division of Cyprus.

In 1974, a Turkish military invasion divided Cyprus into two de facto re-

gions, forcing tens of thousands of Cypriots to flee their homes. Today, Turkish troops continue to occupy northern Cyprus and, after four decades, the country remains divided.

This month, the United States remembers those who were forced to flee their homes and lost their property, and we acknowledge the economic, political, and humanitarian impacts of this division. I stand to reaffirm our commitment and support for a comprehensive agreement to achieve reunification.

I am proud of the strong relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus, and of our mutual commitment to democracy, counterterrorism, and economic development. I look forward to the day when this important partnership is made even stronger by a unified Cyprus.

I am encouraged by the February 2014 announcement that Cypriot President Nicos Anastasiades and Turkish Cypriot leader Dervis Eroglu would resume long-stalled reunification talks. I am hopeful that these meetings will lay the groundwork for peaceful negotiations that will result in a fair and lasting solution.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of the George Washington University Native American Political Leadership Program and the INSPIRE Pre-College Program.

The Native American Political Leadership Program, NAPLP, provides Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian college students the opportunity to spend a semester living, working, and studying in Washington, DC. The promising young leaders who participate in this invaluable program gain rich academic, professional, and life experiences in part through congressional internships on Capitol Hill, including the Senate. Through one-of-a-kind programs, such as NAPLP, Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian students learn about American Government and the public policy process with an emphasis on Federal Indian policy, which is important to protecting tribal sovereignty.

This year, the George Washington University NAPLP hosted their first INSPIRE Pre-College summer session, which offered a similar educational opportunity to Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian junior and senior high school students. Exemplary high school students traveled to Washington, DC, to participate in the program's intensive 3-week curriculum that motivates Native teens to become more active in the political process and teaches Native youth about the Federal trust relationship between Indian tribes and the Federal Government. I am pleased that NAPLP organizers

were able to offer the first-ever INSPIRE Pre-College program for Native high school students this summer.

Hailee Brown of the Navajo Nation; Robert Charles of the Native Village of Koyuk; Lisa Chavez of the Ak-Chin Indian Community; Delilah Coleman of the Navajo Nation; Lacayah Engebretson, Tlingit and Athabaskan; Ethan Dan, Yupik; Jessica Petty of the Smith River Rancheria of the Tolowa Indian Tribe; Devin Jensen of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians; Warren Mountain of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians; Kara Roanhorse of the Navajo Nation; Christie Wildcat of the Northern Arapaho Tribe were among the first high school students to participate in the INSPIRE Pre-College Summer Program.

During my time in Congress, I have worked hard to ensure that the Senate staff and workforce better reflect the diversity of our great Nation. I am proud that the Senate Democratic Diversity Initiative maintains a strong partnership with the NAPLP, and I hope that the experiences gained while participating in these important programs will continue to provide these outstanding students with profound knowledge, academic success, and a pathway to careers in government both on and off of Capitol Hill. I commend the hard work and dedication of the NAPLP and the INSPIRE Program organizers as well as the many young scholars. I look forward to welcoming more Native leaders to the INSPIRE Pre-College program and the NAPLP program in the future.

REMEMBERING DAVID GORDON HARMON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, today I rise to report some sad news to my Senate colleagues. David Gordon Harmon—a Kentuckian and U.S. Air Force veteran—passed away last week at the age of 78.

David was born on April 28, 1936, to William Thomas and Sarah Boyd Harmon in Dunbar, KY. When he was only 17, he left school to serve his country in the Air Force. After completing basic training, David served on Active Duty for 4 years, which included 18 months in the Philippine Islands and service in the Korean war.

Following his service in the Air Force, David returned home to take over the family business, Harmon Construction, from his father, which he ran until he passed down the responsibility to his three sons in 1989.

Outside of his business, David was an active member of the Manchester Christian Church, served as commander of the DAV Chapter 137 in Manchester, and played a leading role in the construction of the Clay County Veterans Memorial. He is a Kentucky Colonel, and was named Clay County's Man of the Year in 2013.

David is survived by his three sons, as well as his daughter and his loving wife Elsie Collins Harmon whom he married in 1958.

David served his country with honor, and was a devoted member of his family, church, and community. He will be missed by all who knew and loved him.

I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in paying tribute to the life of David Gordon Harmon.

Rominger Funeral Home recently published an obituary for Mr. Harmon. I ask unanimous consent that the obituary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From romingerfuneralhome.com, July 25, 2014]

MR. DAVID GORDON HARMON

Mr. David Gordon Harmon, age 78, went home to be with the Lord on Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at the Manchester Memorial Hospital. He was born on Tuesday, April 28, 1936, in Dunmore, Kentucky, to the union of William Thomas and Sarah Boyd Harmon. He was owner of Harmon Construction, a member of the Manchester Christian Church, a member of Oneida Masonic Lodge #736, a Veteran of the United States Air Force where he served in the Korean War, and was a member of the local DAV chapter for over 25 years where he served as commander for over 18 years. He was also selected as Clay County's Man of the Year in 2013.

He leaves to mourn his passing his wife: Elsie Collins Harmon, whom he united with in marriage on Saturday, July 12, 1958. To this union four children were born: Alice Pearl Harmon, Tommy Lynn Harmon and his wife Lillie Mae, Michael Harmon and his wife Margie, and Lester Harmon and his wife Sandy. He is survived by his grandchildren: Joshua Lyndon Jones, Naketa Harmon, David G. Harmon II, Rachyl Lynn Harmon, and his great-grandchild Haley Alexis Jones. Also surviving are his sisters: Bessie Whitehead and Bonnie Kathryn Bowling.

He is preceded in death by his parents: William Thomas and Sarah Harmon, and these brothers and sisters: William T. Harmon II, John Green Harmon, James Harmon, Tommy Joe Harmon, Ernestine Murphy, and Cleo Howard.

Funeral Services for Mr. David Gordon Harmon will be conducted on Saturday, July 26, 2014 at 1 p.m. at the Rominger Funeral Home Chapel. Rev. Brad Stevens and Judge Oscar Gayle House will be officiating. Burial will follow in the Manchester Memorial Gardens with full military honors.

Pallbearers will be: Terry Davidson, Jason Harris, Jimmy Jr. Smith, Rodney Wagers, Bill Ed White, Clayton Russell Howard, Lee Tyler Brown, and Justin Gay.

Visitation will be held on Friday evening starting at 6 p.m. at the Rominger Funeral Home Chapel. A Masonic service will begin at 8 p.m. on Friday evening.

TRIBUTE TO MIGUEL RIVAS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a proud member of the U.S. Marine Corps, Miguel Rivas. Rivas hails from Magoffin County, KY, and served his country with honor in two tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Only 18 years old, and having just graduated from Magoffin County High School, Rivas joined the Marine Corps in 2004. He did so out of a sense of duty to the country as well as to obtain an education and employment.

In January of 2006, he was deployed to Camp Fallujah, Iraq with the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force. During this tour he worked on administrative support duties in addition to holding long, 16-hour shifts on tower duty.

Rivas was deployed on a second tour in November of 2012, this time in Kabul, Afghanistan, where he was a part of the "drive team" that is responsible for transporting civilians, military employees and high-ranking officials from bases.

Rivas served his country honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan. For his service, he is well deserving of our praise here in the Senate.

Therefore, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Miguel Rivas.

The Salyersville Independent recently published an article detailing Rivas' service in Iraq and Afghanistan. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salyersville Independent, July 3, 2014]

RIVAS SERVES TWO TOURS TO THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Heather Oney)

Miguel A. Rivas, a graduate of Magoffin County High School, joined the United States Marine Corps in May 2004 at the age of 18, wanting to fight for America's freedom, as well as secure an education and employment. Rivas said he also joined because he wanted to travel, which the Marines have allowed him to do, serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as all over the U.S.

On the same day he enlisted, Rivas left for recruit training in Parris Island, South Carolina, and in July went to a school of infantry in Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, for basic training.

"We dug man holes and stayed in them for 24 hours," Rivas remembers. "This was one of my favorite parts of being a Marine."

In September 2004 he was sent to Camp Johnson, North Carolina, for Personal Administration School to learn basic administration procedures of the Marines. Then in November the same year he went to the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force Headquarters Group, in Camp Pendleton, California, where Rivas worked on a daily basis in administration.

Rivas was deployed to Camp Fallujah, Iraq, in January 2006 with the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force Headquarters Group. While there, he held administrative support duties, as well as tower duty, where they would stand for 16-hour shifts in the tower, watching to make sure no one entered the base from their positions. He worked at a gate on the base, scanning all the eyes of the Local Nationals that would enter the base to work.

"The living conditions were not so bad," Rivas said. "We had hard-standing buildings to sleep in at night and then we had trailers that had showers and bathrooms. We had a

chow facility to eat so we didn't have to eat the MRE's unless we were out on patrols for a few days. So, overall, the living conditions were okay."

After returning from Iraq, he held multiple administrative and supervisory positions at Camp Pendleton, California, Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Yuma, Arizona.

In November 2012, Rivas was deployed for his second tour, this time sent to Kabul, Afghanistan, with the United States Forces Afghanistan, working with the Navy and Air Force to make sure every servicemember received their awards before departing to the U.S.

Also in Afghanistan, Rivas was on the drive team, responsible for safely transporting civilian military employees, servicemembers and high-ranking officers around to different bases in Afghanistan.

Living in a five-story building that included everything inside, such as a gym, their rooms (with a restroom in each one), and Wi-Fi connections, Rivas said this was the best living conditions he had ever had.

Rivas is married to Elizabeth Chaves Rivas and they have four kids, Lizette Marie Arizmendi, Ruben Fernando Arizmendi, Antonio Miguel Rivas and Kaylani Aziana Rivas.

"I want everyone to know she is the reason that I had a long successful Marine Corps career," Rivas said. "My kids are my life and the greatest joy in the world is being a father."

TRIBUTE TO JAMES P. SIMONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to U.S. Army veteran and former CPT James P. Simons, one of our Nation's and the Commonwealth of Kentucky's brave heroes from the Vietnam war.

From June 1966 to June 1967, Mr. Simons served as a lieutenant in Troop A, 1st Squadron, 9th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division, Airmobile, in South Vietnam. During the first 9½ months of his deployment, then-Lieutenant Simons flew unarmed OH-13 helicopters as a scout pilot, flying deep into enemy territory, above the jungle, to search for insurgents below. Lieutenant Simons would radio back enemy locations to his post, and American forces would move in.

Lieutenant Simons logged an incredible 1,430 flight hours during the first 9½ months of his deployment. He often flew four and five missions per day, landing every few hours to refuel and returning to the air a short time later. Ten- and 12-hour days spent flying in enemy territory were not uncommon. During a period in which scout pilots were scarce, Lieutenant Simons remarkably flew missions on 27 consecutive days.

Captain Simons has received numerous medals for his heroism and service during the Vietnam war. They include: the Vietnam Campaign Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and two Air Medals—a rarity—which were needed to appropriately represent the 625 combat missions Lieutenant Simons flew in Vietnam. In addition to these med-

als, former Captain Simons has received three Purple Hearts, the Bronze Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Distinguished Service Cross.

Mr. Simons received Purple Hearts for each of the combat wounds he sustained; he was injured twice when the helicopters he was piloting were shot down by enemy fire. The third injury occurred when the enemy launched a nighttime mortar attack and a mortar exploded in Lieutenant Simons' tent. Following the attack, Lieutenant Simons was transported to a field hospital where he had 26 pieces of shrapnel removed. After sustaining his third combat injury, Lieutenant Simons was no longer permitted to fly due to the number of times he had been wounded. He spent the remaining 10 weeks of his tour in Vietnam serving our military and our country in other capacities.

Mr. Simons received the prestigious Distinguished Flying Cross due to his valiant action on November 24, 1966, during a search-and-destroy mission near Bong Son, Vietnam. Lieutenant Simons was flying ahead of U.S. ground forces to locate areas concentrated with enemies when he took on machine gun fire. In the face of this attack, Lieutenant Simons conducted reconnaissance of the area to assist with the ground mission. As he took on heavy enemy fire his helicopter eventually was shot down. Lieutenant Simons fortunately was not wounded, and he bravely assisted an injured crewmember in seeking cover before the two were evacuated.

Less than 1 month later, on December 17, 1966, Lieutenant Simons carried out acts of bravery for which he ultimately was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the military's second-highest decoration for a member of the U.S. Army. He received this award for his "extraordinary heroism" during yet another ground search-and-destroy mission near Bong Son, Vietnam.

Lieutenant Simons was leading a helicopter scout group screening ahead for U.S. forces on the ground. During heavy exchanges of ground fire, Lieutenant Simons flew low and in harm's way to mark enemy positions with smoke grenades. As the battle continued, Lieutenant Simons saw that U.S. troops below him had become stranded. In response, he dropped grenades on enemy bunkers and continued to fly low to attract enemy fire so his fellow American servicemembers could be rescued. Lieutenant Simons took a number of actions at tremendous personal risk, and his heroism and selflessness ultimately saved the lives of three of his fellow comrades.

Former Captain Simons' courageous military service on behalf of the United States during the Vietnam war deserves the recognition of this body. Thus, I ask that my Senate colleagues join me in honoring Mr. James P. Simons today.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY OLKEWICZ

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, I want to talk about the worst kept secret in the Senate. Nancy Olkewicz is really great at her job. I have depended on her many times as have many others in this Chamber. She has had many roles in the Senate, and she has been spectacular with all of them. She has served under chairmen like the late Senator Robert C. Byrd, Senator HARRY REID, and me. Over the years, she has been given many challenging assignments, and she has never failed to deliver. It is with great pride and some sadness that Nancy has announced her plans to leave the Senate Sergeant at Arms and retire from the Senate this summer. We celebrate her 36 years with us. She will be very much missed.

Many people in Washington see their professions as just jobs. For Nancy, her work has meant much more than that. The agencies she helped fund and the people she has worked with are her second family. She has been working in the Senate since she was 19 and an aide to Senator Paul Sarbanes. Nancy practically grew up in the Senate. Her countless friends and the respect she has earned from both sides of the aisle are a testament to her accomplishments and her demeanor.

If you want to see a monument to Nancy's work here, look no further than the Senate rain garden. This innovation has been capturing and filtering runoff from parking lots to reduce storm water flooding and keep pollutants from entering local streams and rivers for 10 years now. This remarkable project could not have happened without Nancy's work for the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee. Thanks to her tenacity and pleasant—but stern—oversight, the Senate rain garden was completed on time and under budget. Today, the Senate rain garden stands as a constant reminder of sustainability and stewardship every day for the visitors and staffers on Capitol Hill.

I could go on much longer talking about Nancy. She is accomplished, humble, and kind. Many of us in the Senate, from the men and women responsible for maintaining these hallowed halls to the most senior Senators, have been on the receiving end of her bright smile and cheerful greetings. Three million annual visitors and thousands of staffers are unknowing beneficiaries of years of work she contributed quietly behind the scenes, playing a pivotal role in the construction of Capitol Visitor Center.

So what is Nancy going to do now? She is excited about joining the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, where she will contribute her considerable skills to conservation efforts across the country.

While I wish her continued success in her new job, I have a suspicion her future also will involve a certain baseball

team not too far from here, the Washington Nationals. Nancy is a fourth generation Washingtonian, and she is all in for the Nats. I hope Bryce Harper and Jayson Werth understand that they will have to up their game. Because Nancy will be there, coaching them from the stands.

It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Nancy for her long career in the Senate and celebrating the many contributions she has made here. Her extraordinary work will be remembered by many. Thank you, Nancy Olkewicz.

UKRAINE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the world was united in horror at the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 over Ukraine. Subsequent events have only intensified that horror, as we have learned the airliner and its nearly 300 passengers and crew were shot out of the sky by a sophisticated missile and radar system, a system operated from territory that rebels occupy in eastern Ukraine. We do not know if Russia played any direct role in downing the jetliner, but we do know that Russia supplied the equipment, and that it fomented the unlawful insurrection that led to this horrific event.

The world has been unified in its condemnation of this atrocity. There is strengthened support, both in the United States and among our allies, for stronger action to confront Russian aggression, restore stability in Ukraine, reassure our friends in the region, and allow the Ukrainian people a future they choose, rather than one dictated from Moscow. I commend President Obama's action this week to lead a coalition that has further strengthened sanctions against Russia and those who seek to destabilize Ukraine.

But we need to do more. We need to do more because so far, every time President Putin has had the opportunity to veer off his destructive course, he has chosen instead obfuscation, denial and further aggression. The United States has already provided some nonlethal military support to Ukraine. But I believe it is time for us and our allies to intensify that support, and to help Ukraine exercise sovereignty and maintain its territorial integrity while dissuading Russia from further intervening.

The Ukrainian military has achieved important successes in recent weeks against the rebels who would dismantle Ukraine, significantly shrinking rebel-controlled territory. Left on its own, it appears the Ukrainian government will be able to reassert control over eastern Ukraine. But this job has been more difficult because of the backing of Russia for the rebels, including its provision of heavy weapons. It will become all but impossible if Russia decided to cross the border with its own troops.

We should take additional steps to help Ukraine reclaim sovereignty in eastern Ukraine and try to deter Russia from crossing the border.

As part of this effort we should provide Ukraine with defensive weapons—such as anti-tank weapons—that can help Ukraine reclaim its territory and deter Russian aggression, without being needlessly provocative to the Russians. These are defensive weapons, not provocative weapons.

There is a clear path out of this violence, violence whose impact we now tragically know is not limited to Ukraine's borders. Russia can end its backing for rebels whose fighting capabilities are wholly dependent on Russian support. Russia can join the world in calling on those rebels to participate in the Ukrainian's government's good-faith efforts to resolve political disputes by peaceful means. Russia can allow Ukraine to exercise sovereignty over territory it lawfully controls.

Russia can choose that path. But we may not know its choice until it is too late. We should provide the military assistance that can help Ukraine defend itself, reclaim its sovereign territory and hopefully deter further Russian intervention.

CLOSING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LOOPHOLES

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, studies have estimated that over one in three American women will face some form of domestic abuse in their lifetime, and that when guns are present during incidents of domestic violence, the risk of homicide escalates over 500 percent.

As the statistics suggest, the combination of domestic violence and firearms can lead to horrific tragedies. Like in May 2014, when Lori Jackson of Oxford, CT filed for a restraining order against her abusive, estranged husband. The court granted her a temporary restraining order while she waited 2 weeks for a hearing to obtain a permanent restraining order. In the meantime, fearful of her husband, Ms. Jackson took her twin 18-month-olds and fled. But before Ms. Jackson could obtain a permanent order, her husband found her, stormed the house where she was staying, fatally shot her and wounded her mother.

This is a tragedy that could have been prevented. The Violence Against Women Act, which Congress first passed in 1994, included a common-sense provision to prevent people subject to a permanent restraining order from buying or possessing a gun. Since 1994, this provision has saved countless lives.

But there is a critical loophole in this law: while people subject to a permanent restraining order are prohibited from having a weapon, this safeguard does not apply to those subject

to a temporary restraining order. This loophole left Ms. Jackson, who had obtained a temporary restraining order against her husband and was awaiting a permanent order, perilously vulnerable in the dangerous days immediately after she left her spouse.

It is long past time to close this loophole. That is why I am a cosponsor of the Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act of 2014. This bill would prevent individuals subject to temporary restraining orders—like Ms. Jackson's husband—from buying or possessing a gun for the duration of that temporary order. It also would expand the legal definition of 'intimate partner' to include individuals who are simply dating partners.

But closing the temporary restraining order loophole is just the first step. Sadly, a patchwork of inadequate State and local resources hamstrings the effectiveness of these lifesaving laws. In reality, just issuing a permanent restraining order that legally disqualifies a person from purchasing a firearm does not necessarily mean the person's name will be added to the National Instant Criminal Background Check, NICS system. Nor does it mean that law enforcement will be notified of the urgent need to remove firearms from that dangerous person's possession.

That is why I am also a cosponsor of the Domestic Violence Gun Homicide Prevention Act. This bill would establish new grants to assist States in carrying out policies that, among other things, encourage State and local courts to account for whether a domestic abuser possesses a gun that they may use against their victims and to order the recovery of those guns, when appropriate. The grants created by this bill would provide vital assistance to the law enforcement professionals we trust with the safety of our communities, and would go a long way toward better enforcement of the gun safety laws we already have on the books.

The decision to flee from an abusive partner or spouse is extraordinarily difficult and courageous. Congress should honor the people who have taken this step by passing common-sense legislation to protect those who may need to do it in the future. I urge my colleagues to move quickly to pass these urgently-needed measures.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I previously filed budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for budget years 2014 and 2015 pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. Today, I am adjusting those levels.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while

sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act allow the Chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Senate will be considering legislation that is eligible for adjustments under the Congressional Budget Act: S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014, which includes \$3.571 billion in budget authority and \$2.913 billion in outlays that is designated as emergency funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2014 by a

total of \$3.571 billion in budget authority and \$25 million in outlays. I am also revising the budgetary aggregates for 2015 by a total of \$2.888 billion in outlays. In addition, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Appropriations Committee for 2014 by \$3.346 billion in nonsecurity budget authority, \$225 million in security budget authority, and \$25 million in total outlays. I am revising the outlay allocations to the appropriations committee for 2015 by \$2.888 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—

[Pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974]

\$s in millions	2014	2015
Current Spending Aggregates: *		
Budget Authority	2,842,558	3,015,208
Outlays	2,819,514	3,035,686
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	3,571	0
Outlays	25	2,888
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,846,129	3,015,208
Outlays	2,819,539	3,038,574

* 2014 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for the farm bill and unemployment insurance. 2015 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for disaster, overseas contingency operations, and terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

In millions of dollars	Current allocation/ limit	Adjustments *	Adjusted allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2014:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority	605,882	225	606,107
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	504,843	3,346	508,189
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,201,186	25	1,201,211
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority	1,110,725	3,571	1,114,296

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

In millions of dollars	Current allocation/ limit	Adjustments *	Adjusted allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2015:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority	579,851	0	579,851
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	508,872	0	508,872
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,191,903	2,888	1,194,791
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority	1,088,723	0	1,088,723

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2014 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

\$s in billions	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Total
S. 2648, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act 2014 *					
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	3.571	0.000	3.571
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.025	0.000	0.025
Total	0.000	0.000	3.571	0.000	3.571
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category					
Revised Security Category Budget Authority ***	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.000	0.225
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	3.346	0.000	3.346
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.025	0.000	0.025

* This table reflects the Congressional Budget Office estimate of S. 2648, the Emergency Appropriations Act, 2014 as introduced in the Senate on July 23, 2014.

** S. 2648 includes \$3.567 billion in total outlays from 2014–2020. Outlays total \$654 million from 2016–2020.

*** The Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act includes \$225 million in function 050 (Defense) spending for Iron Dome.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2015 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

\$s in billions	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Overseas Contingency Operations	Total
S. 2648, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014 *					
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	2.888	0.000	2.888
Total	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category					
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	2.888	0.000	2.888

* This table reflects the Congressional Budget Office estimate of S. 2648, the Emergency Appropriations Act, 2014 as introduced in the Senate on July 23, 2014.

** S. 2648 includes \$3.567 billion in total outlays from 2014–2020. Outlays total \$654 million from 2016–2020.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I previously filed budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for budget years 2014 and 2015 pursuant to section

116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. In addition, earlier today, I filed revisions to those levels for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropria-

tions Act, 2014. Those adjustments were made as a result of funding designated as emergency requirements in S. 2648 pursuant to section

251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Because the Senate did not pass S. 2648, I am now reversing the adjustments I filed earlier today.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2014 by a total of $-\$3.571$ billion in budget authority and $-\$25$ million in outlays. I am also revising the budgetary aggregates

for 2015 by a total of $-\$2.888$ billion in outlays. In addition, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Appropriations Committee for 2014 by $-\$3.346$ billion in nonsecurity budget authority, $-\$225$ million in security budget authority and $-\$25$ million in total outlays. I am revising the outlay allocations to the

appropriations committee for 2015 by $-\$2.888$ billion.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	2014	2015
Current Spending Aggregates:*			
Budget Authority		2,846,129	3,015,208
Outlays		2,819,539	3,038,574
Adjustments:**			
Budget Authority		$-3,571$	0
Outlays		-25	$-2,888$
Revised Spending Aggregates:			
Budget Authority		2,842,558	3,015,208
Outlays		2,819,514	3,035,686

* 2014 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for the farm bill and unemployment insurance. 2015 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for disaster, overseas contingency operations, terrorism risk insurance, and the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

** This adjustment removes the amounts previously filed for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because the bill did not pass the Senate.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	In millions of dollars	Current allocation/ limit	Adjustments*	Adjusted allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2014:**				
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority		606,107	-225	605,882
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		508,189	$-3,346$	504,843
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays		1,201,211	-25	1,201,186
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority		1,114,296	$-3,571$	1,110,725

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

** This adjustment removes the amounts previously filed for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because the bill did not pass the Senate.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	In millions of dollars	Current allocation/ limit	Adjustments*	Adjusted limit allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2015:**				
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority		579,851	0	579,851
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		508,872	0	508,872
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays		1,194,791	$-2,888$	1,191,903
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority		1,088,723	0	1,088,723

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

** This adjustment removes the amount previously filed for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because the bill did not pass the Senate.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2014 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

	\$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
S. 2648, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014*						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	− 3.571	0.000	− 3.571	
Outlays	0.000	0.000	− 0.025	0.000	− 0.025	
Total						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	− 3.571	0.000	− 3.571	
Outlays	0.000	0.000	− 0.025	0.000	− 0.025	
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category						
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	− 0.225	0.000	− 0.225	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	− 3.346	0.000	− 3.346	
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	− 0.025	0.000	− 0.025	

* The table reflects the adjustment to remove the amounts previously filed for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because the bill did not pass the Senate.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2015 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

	\$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
S. 2648, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014*						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	- 2.888	0.000	0.000	- 2.888
Total						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	- 2.888	0.000	0.000	- 2.888
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category						
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	- 2.888	0.000	0.000	- 2.888

* The table reflects the adjustment to remove the amounts previously filed for S. 2648, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, because the bill did not pass the Senate.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF EVERETT ALVAREZ'S CAPTIVITY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, today I honor a superb leader, intrepid warrior, and outstanding role model. Fifty years ago on August 4, then-LTJG Everett "Ev" Alvarez, was shot down in his A-4 Skyhawk during a bombing mission in the Gulf of Tonkin. Everett was the first U.S. pilot shot down over North Vietnam and served 8½ years—the second-longest tenure of any U.S. prisoner of war. Over the years, hundreds of other American prisoners joined him in Hoa Lo prison and similar detention centers around the country. Despite starvation and other significant health challenges, Everett had the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual strength to endure the harshest conditions imaginable until his release on February 12, 1973.

Mr. Alvarez went on to complete a 20-year career in the Navy, retiring as a Commander in 1980. His service to our Nation, however, did not end there. Upon retirement, Everett earned a law degree and in 1981 was appointed by President Reagan to be the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps. Quickly proving his ability to lead outside of the military, a year later President Reagan nominated him in 1982 to be the Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, serving 6 years. Everett went on to serve on several boards, including the board of regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, is a lifetime member on the board of fellows of his alma mater, Santa Clara University, and earlier this year was asked by Secretary Hagel to be a member of the Vietnam War Commemoration Advisory Council.

His performance in and out of uniform has been widely recognized, to include the Silver Star, two Legions of Merit, two Bronze Stars, the Distinguished Flying Cross, as well as the Lone Sailor Award, an honor bestowed to sea service veterans for exceptional civilian leadership. Everett has made an indelible impact on his fellow prisoners, service members, and organizations he has been associated with over his lifetime. He is the co-author of two seminal works on the experience of living in captivity—"Chained Eagle" and "Code of Conduct."

Committing a lifetime of service to our Nation, Ev personifies the indomitable American spirit and is a shining example of strength through adversity. In an interview he once famously said, "Together we stepped into the dungeons and we faced the dragon, and we came out of it." On this occasion, I believe it is fitting to recognize Everett Alvarez's 50 years of distinguished service to our Nation.

U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today, July 31, 2014, marks the 225th anniversary of the signing by President George Washington of legislation establishing the U.S. Customs Service, the oldest legacy agency of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, currently within the Department of Homeland Security. The U.S. Customs Service was created by the 5th Act of the 1st Congress.

The U.S. Customs Service placed controls on imports and exports and on shipping and trade, which were deemed essential by the founders of the Republic, and would have been impossible without implementation by an honest, resourceful, and efficient Customs Service. The original Customs collectors, the Customs houses, and today's CBP officers have stood for 225 years as the embodiment of Federal authority at our ports of entry.

After 225 years, the ever more complex demands of our economy and our society require CBP officers to remain alert and ready to perform on short notice a widening variety of tasks. Today's dedicated CBP personnel, and their predecessor Customs inspectors, have been the first line of defense against the entry into the United States of terrorists, terrorist weapons, illicit drugs and other contraband goods, while protecting the economic well-being of the Nation, and supporting American jobs, by facilitating legitimate trade and travel, and protecting this country's intellectual property rights.

ISRAEL

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of the State of Israel, our closest and most critical ally in the Middle East. The escalating violence between Israel and Hamas is extremely disheartening. At this time of extreme instability and conflict in the region, the clear and unyielding support of the United States for Israel is more critical than ever. While we all hope for a peaceful ceasefire and a return to negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, we cannot ignore the current situation.

For weeks now, Israel has been responding to Hamas militants in Gaza whose clear mission is to exact a civilian death toll. It is an often-used tactic of Hamas, a designated foreign terrorist organization, to launch rockets into Israel at civilian targets. In doing so, they not only harm innocent Israelis but put Palestinian civilians in danger as well. Hamas's exposure of their own population to danger is made worse when they use civilians in Gaza as human shields. When Hamas used cement for the construction of tunnels to attack and kidnap civilians instead

of using it for the construction of peaceful infrastructure projects, they literally chose the path of conflict over the path of peace. Israel has the undeniable right to defend itself against these threats to their civilians, and we must stand by our friend and help protect innocent lives in any way we can.

One thing we can do to continue to support Israel is to continue to support the Iron Dome missile defense system. The United States has provided financial support for this state-of-the-art defense system for years, and I, and many of my colleagues from both parties, have been strong and continual supporters since its inception. The technology is extraordinarily effective at stopping rockets fired at civilian targets in Israel from Gaza; according to some estimates, it has intercepted about 90 percent of rockets, which otherwise could have hit major population centers in Israel. Ultimately, the Iron Dome protects innocent lives, and I shudder to think of what this conflict's death toll in Israel might be without it. I am reassured that the Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee doubled the administration's funding request for the Iron Dome recently, and I commend my colleagues for this tangible show of support for Israel.

I, along with many of my colleagues, am deeply committed to the security of Israel, and I am saddened by the loss of civilian lives on both sides of the current conflict. Too much innocent blood has been shed already.

CHINESE DRYWALL

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to join my colleague, Senator NELSON, in expressing frustration over the Chinese Government's failure to remedy the damages to homeowners, businesses, and contractors caused by Chinese drywall companies.

Beginning some 10 years ago, drywall manufactured by Chinese companies was imported to the United States. A significant amount of the imported Chinese drywall proved to be defective. In my State, this drywall was mostly used in homes and businesses that had suffered substantial damages from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. In total, there were thousands of cases in the gulf coast area.

The drywall emitted sulfur gases, which caused physical damage to the homes and significant health problems for the residents. The sulfur gas severely corroded metals found in plumbing, electrical wiring, air-conditioning systems, and household appliances. Health issues included skin irritation, persistent cough, bloody noses, and asthma attacks. For many families who lived through these hurricanes, having to completely rebuild a home again was yet another obstacle to their recovery.

I have maintained that the Consumer Product Safety Commission should

have served as the first line of defense in preventing this inferior product from entering the U.S. market. Nevertheless, manufacturers, no matter where they are located, have a responsibility to consumers harmed by defective products.

The homeowners sought relief in court, and most of the cases were consolidated in the Eastern District of Louisiana, where the court identified two companies as the primary perpetrators; Knauf Entities and Taishan Entities. Knauf Entities participated in litigation and paid damages. Unfortunately, Taishan Entities has refused to appear to defend lawsuits in U.S. courts and will not negotiate with those harmed by the defective sheet-rock.

The Honorable Judge Eldon Fallon of the Eastern District of Louisiana issued an order holding Taishan in both civil and criminal contempt on July 17, 2014. The order also enjoined Taishan and its affiliates from conducting business in the United States until it participates in the judicial process. Although this is a win for Taishan's victims, they deserve and require tangible compensation for their losses.

The Chinese Government has shown no willingness to hold this company accountable. Meanwhile, thousands of families are still waiting for justice. We cannot allow Taishan Entities to hide from the United States judicial process and further injure those who have suffered.

I urge this body to call on Taishan Entities to do the right thing and respect international law. Additionally, we should continue to pressure the Chinese Government to hold companies within its borders accountable for their actions.

EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to reiterate my longstanding support for employee stock ownership plans or ESOPs. During my time in the Senate, I have been dedicated to building on the lasting contributions of my Louisiana predecessors, including Senator Russell B. Long, who, as Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, championed tax provisions to encourage corporations to adopt ESOPs. Senator Long advocated for employee stock ownership as an "issue that cuts across party lines in an attempt to bring out the best in our free enterprise system." He believed that "it is only fair and right that those who work to make this economy succeed should have an opportunity to share in that success . . . [i]t is a matter of simple common sense and basic equity." I couldn't agree more.

Designed to expand employee ownership of firms through stock distribution to employees, over time, ESOPs

have a proven track record of encouraging capital expansion and economic equality for American workers. The National Center for Employee Ownership estimates that 11 million people are employed by the roughly 12,000 companies that have adopted ESOP and ESOP-like plans and estimates that ESOP participants have about 2.5 times the retirement assets of individuals who do not participate.

Last year, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I convened a roundtable to provide small business owners, policy experts and other stakeholders an opportunity to express their views and to solicit their ideas on making tax reform work for small businesses. Participants argued in favor of a Tax Code that rewards employer and employee ownership as a means of providing continuity of business ownership and opportunities for employees of businesses to build wealth. Specifically, participants favored retaining the current Tax Code's ESOP provisions, noting that during the most recent economic downturn, ESOPs, which are predominately small businesses, were able to retain more employees as they weathered the crisis than conventionally owned companies.

Companies in Louisiana have embraced ESOPs and as a result have seen both businesses and their employees realize the benefits. One prime example is Acadian Ambulance, a Lafayette, Louisiana-based company, and the Nation's largest private, employee-owned ambulance service. Acadian Ambulance became a 30 percent-employee-owned company in 1993 and subsequently became a majority employee-owned company in 1998. Today, Acadian Ambulance is a thriving business whose employee owners have retirement security because of Acadian Ambulance's employee stock ownership plan. Its ESOP Committee has been recognized as one of the best in the Nation, having won 25 regional and national awards since 2001. Acadian Ambulance has grown to over 200 ambulances, a \$180 million budget, and 2,000 employees who have retirement security.

Earlier this year, the New York Times published an article describing the research of three labor economists who have focused their work on promoting ESOPs as a "new perspective on how to resolve the disparities in wealth and income." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article, dated February 11, 2014, and titled, "Whatever Happened to 'Every Man a King'?" These experts, Dr. Joseph Blasi and Dr. Richard Kruse of Rutgers University, and Dr. Douglas Freeman of Harvard University, argue in their book, "The Citizen's Share", that policies promoting employee ownership date back to the era of the Founding Fathers and have garnered support from politicians

and stakeholders across the political spectrum—from Ronald Reagan to Senator BERNIE SANDERS.

Quite simply, policies that promote ESOPs are policies that merit this Chamber's bipartisan support, and I will continue the work of my Louisiana predecessors to ensure retirement security for working Americans.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 2014]

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO "EVERY MAN A KING"?

(By Thomas B. Edsall)

A passionate group of labor economists has taken up a cause championed 40 years ago by Senator Russell Long of Louisiana: to turn every worker into a capitalist. Long, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee from 1966 to 1981, inherited a populist commitment from his father, Huey Long, the Louisiana governor who famously campaigned on the slogan "Every Man a King."

In 1973, Long became intrigued by the idea of granting corporations generous tax incentives to distribute stock to employees through Employee Stock Ownership Plans, or ESOPs. Long's question was, could ESOPs "make haves out of the have-nots without taking it away from the haves?" Working on assurances that this was indeed the case, Long said, "That's the kind of populism I can buy."

Beginning in 1974, Long won enactment of a series of bills establishing tax incentives favorable to corporations that transferred company stock into ESOPs. In 2012, the National Center for Employee Ownership estimated that the number of ESOPs had grown to 12,000, covering 11 million workers with \$858 billion in assets. Companies employing at least 10,000 workers with ESOPs include Publix Supermarkets; WAWA; WinCo Foods; and the employee-owned private equity firm, Alliance Holdings.

After Long retired in 1987, however, some of the tax breaks he sponsored were eliminated or weakened as Democratic and Republican administrations sought new federal revenues to reduce the deficit.

Robert Hockett, a law professor at Cornell, wrote in 2006 that ESOPs had expanded employee ownership of firms, but that "there is indeed a gap to be filled—that firm ownership remains nowhere near as widespread as home and human capital ownership."

Now three prominent labor policy experts have taken up Long's cause. They are convinced that a major expansion of employee ownership is the most effective tool available to remediate inequality. The three experts—Richard B. Freeman of the economics department at Harvard, and Douglas L. Kruse and Joseph R. Blasi, both professors at the School of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers—have been promoting worker capitalism in numerous papers and books. Together they edited "Shared Capitalism at Work: Employee Ownership, Profit and Gain Sharing and Broad-Based Stock Options" and last year they released "The Citizen's Share: Putting Ownership Back into Democracy."

In "The Citizen's Share," Blasi, Freeman and Kruse make a broad, ideologically cross-cutting case on behalf of profit sharing and employee ownership: "It offers a new way to address the concentration of both economic and political power that many citizens believe is distorting the country. It offers a

new perspective on how to fight the links between the Washington politicians, K Street lobbyists, big corporations, and political donors that fuel many Tea Party members' opposition to government. It offers a new perspective on how to resolve the huge disparities in wealth and income."

They make the following specific arguments.

First, they contend that policies promoting employee ownership have strong public support and that these policies reflect the convictions of the founders, including Thomas Jefferson and James Madison.

Politicians on both sides of the partisan divide support ESOP proposals.

Senators from the left, including Democrats Ben Cardin of Maryland, Amy Klobuchar of Minnesota, Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana and Debbie Stabenow of Michigan, and senators from the right, including Republicans Roy Blunt of Missouri, Pat Roberts of Kansas and John Thune of South Dakota, are, for example, co-sponsors of the Promotion and Expansion of Private Employee Ownership Act of 2013.

As far back as 1974, Ronald Reagan, then governor of California, strongly endorsed the concept, telling Young Americans for Freedom that "capitalism can work to make everybody a 'have.'" In an analysis reminiscent of Russell Long's, Reagan said:

"Income, you know, results from only two things. It can result from capital or it can result from labor. If the worker begins getting his income from both sources at once, he has a real stake in increasing production and increasing output. One such plan is based on financing future expansion in such a way as to create stock ownership for employees. It does not reduce the holdings of the present owners, nor does it require the employees to divert their own savings into stock purchases."

Second, Blasi, Freeman and Kruse point out that there are already extensive mechanisms in place for employee ownership, not only formal ESOPs but also a variety of profit-sharing plans. Because of this, they argue, major innovations are unlikely to be needed; improvements in existing laws and practices should suffice.

The authors cite responses to a question on employee ownership asked in a 2006 General Social Survey. The survey found that 47 percent of private-sector, full-time wage and salary workers now have access to some form of sharing in the firm where they work—cash profit sharing, cash gain sharing, employee stock ownership, employee stock options or ESOPs.

Third, and most important, is the authors' claim that it is economically advantageous to give employees an ownership stake in the firm for which they work. Blasi, Freeman and Kruse provide evidence that employees with some form of worker ownership accumulate more savings than employees in non-participating firms and that firms with some form of capital sharing perform better in the competitive marketplace than those that do not.

They write that "workers with profit sharing or employee stock ownership are higher paid and have more benefits than other workers. This means that the substantial profit sharing and gain sharing and ownership stakes for the typical worker in these plans tend to come on top of, not in place of, fair fixed wages and benefits."

In addition, the authors cite studies showing sharp increases in productivity, higher employee morale, lessened turnover and fewer bankruptcies in corporations that adopt ESOPs.

These findings raise a series of questions.

If the various forms of worker capitalism or profit sharing produce such benefits, why hasn't the free market itself forced every company to adopt similar plans?

Asked about worker ownership, Robert Frank, an economist at Cornell and a specialist on issues concerning inequality, wrote in an email that he is "skeptical," and cites his analysis of employee ownership in his book, "The Darwinian Economy," in which he argues that if a worker-owned firm has all the advantages its proponents claim:

"It would enjoy a prodigious competitive advantage. Since wages account for about 70 percent of a typical firm's total cost, increasing productivity by 15 percent would reduce total cost by more than 10 percent. The firm could cut its prices by almost that amount and still remain profitable, which would enable it to peel off most of its rivals' customers."

Frank pointed out that "any firm that enjoyed these advantages should sweep the market like a prairie fire, reaping enormous profits in the process."

Freeman addressed this question in a series of email exchanges with me. He began by noting that there is management opposition to profit sharing with rank and file employees "because the people who control the firm may have to take lower profits—if I am in charge of the firm and sharing profits with you raises productivity, but it means that I take less in profits. I will not favor going to a more shared system."

In addition, Freeman argued, "magnitudes are important." The gains from employee share programs are modest, a "productivity edge of about 2 percent or so on average," which may be trumped by other marketplace factors, including "some small monopoly advantage" held by competitors.

Freeman emphasized that many liberal-left economists and policy makers are locked into the view that labor and capital are intractably adversarial. Consequently they "favor a European style big government/strong union solution to inequality" rather than solutions of a more cooperative nature such as ESOPs.

Blasi, in a more detailed response, emailed that "both Democrats and Republicans until recently really believed that inflation-adjusted wage income growth or lowering taxes alone could maintain and grow the middle class." In fact, Blasi argues, changing economic conditions dictate that "the sustaining of a middle class and mobility requires a capital ownership and a capital income policy."

In addition, Blasi writes, the "economic share policy tradition in American history has been sidelined by scholars in the modern and post-modern era. Until now, if you argued for ESOPs you were using 'small ball' ideas."

Liberal opposition to ESOPs is based in part on the view that the program amounts to a collection of tax subsidies for corporations and the wealthy. The tax breaks for ESOPs originally included a tax credit for company contributions; a deferral of taxes on shareholders who sell stock to an ESOP; deductibility of corporate dividends on ESOP-held shares; the exclusion from tax liability of 50 percent of the interest income from loans to an ESOP; and a 50 percent estate tax exclusion on the gain from the sale of shares to an ESOP.

Blasi, Freeman and Kruse acknowledge that some critics see ESOPs as pioneering "a form of special-interest tax incentives from the Treasury." Their counterargument: "We

see the ESOP as the continuation of the Founders' desire to reduce inequality and preserve democratic practices by extending property ownership to more Americans."

The Blasi-Freeman-Kruse proposal has the crucial political advantage of appealing to some on the political right because it would, in fact, make employee share programs more attractive by boosting tax subsidies—a form of cutting taxes.

Most significantly, the Blasi-Freeman-Kruse proposal stands apart from alternate policy initiatives designed to address growing inequality because it directly addresses the concentration of wealth and political power at the top.

For that reason alone, the idea of expanding employee ownership deserves serious consideration. The proposal does not resolve the question of how to give workers a sufficiently large share of capital to materially impact their economic status. Still, there are not that many viable options available to those who are committed to improving the disadvantaged position of labor versus capital. Politicians and policy makers cannot afford to disregard a proposal with demonstrable potential.

DOWN EAST MAGAZINE 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of Down East: The Magazine of Maine. From the inaugural August, 1954, edition of 5,000 copies assembled around a kitchen table in Camden, ME, Down East has grown to become one of America's most successful regional publications with a circulation that exceeds 90,000 and a devoted readership of people around the country who love the beauty and culture of the State of Maine.

Down East was founded by Duane Doolittle, a native Mainer who left a secure teaching position at Syracuse University at the age of 42 to return home in pursuit of his dream to publish a magazine dedicated to, as he wrote in his first message to readers, "honestly reflecting the beauty, the spirit, the unique and special qualities that make this corner of the world like no other place under the sun." For six decades, that statement of purpose has been fulfilled by talented photographers and engaging writers, today under the leadership of publisher Bob Fernald.

The name of the magazine was taken from the historic practice of sailing downwind to head east along the coast of Maine, and Down East continues to celebrate the heritage of Maine. At the same time, the magazine has expanded its scope to cover with expertise and insight contemporary trends in the arts, food, fashion, business, and politics. In addition to its award-winning print publication, Down East has a strong digital presence with a global readership of more than 900,000 and a popular interactive kiosk at the Portland Jetport that offers the best in Maine-made products.

Down East goes beyond recording life in Maine to enhancing it. From charities and land conservation to the arts

and festivals, the company is a generous supporter of efforts that strengthen our communities.

Capturing the essence of Maine in print is no easy task. Duane Doolittle put it this way: "To attempt to crack the mystery of what those things are that make a Downeaster different from a Texan or a Hoosier would be as unavailing as pondering the imponderables. All we can honestly say is that we are tuned to this particular parcel of earth and we like its music."

That mystery may never be cracked, but for 60 years Down East: The Magazine of Maine has made the attempt entertaining and enlightening. I congratulate the leadership and staff of Down East on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued success for years to come.

RECOGNIZING MARY "MICKEY" THOMAN

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I appreciate having this opportunity to share with the Senate some of the accomplishments and achievements of one of my constituents, Mary "Mickey" Thoman. Mickey will soon—and most deservedly—be inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. It will be another honor for her, a recognition that is fully and richly deserved.

Mickey is well known for her knowledge, experience, and dedication to the agriculture industry of Wyoming, a sector of our economy that is so important it is listed on our State seal. No one knows how much we depend on our farmers and ranchers more than Mickey, and that is why she has been such a strong and effective force in the agriculture community of Wyoming for so many years.

The record shows that Mickey has been tending to her family's ranching business and keeping everything running as it should for quite some time. In fact, her ranch can now boast of its status as a fifth-generation family ranch. I have no doubt she draws her strength and her energy from the work she does and her heartfelt connection to her ranch and her family. At the wise, experienced, and youthful age of 84, Mickey continues to prove the wisdom of the old adage that the best way to lead is by example.

Mickey's is a truly remarkable story. It begins with her marriage to her late husband Bill and their decision to begin ranching together in the Green River Valley after they were married in 1948. It is now more than six decades later. Through the years Mickey has seen some tough times and faced some difficult challenges, but she has always been able to handle each obstacle that tried to block her way because of her great love of her life as a rancher.

Mickey is well known throughout the ranching community because of her ties to the industry and to those who

farm and ranch for a living. That is why, in an effort to help the next generation of farmers and ranchers, she served as a 4-H leader for many years and helped to found the Green River Valley CattleWomen and Sweetwater County Cowbelles. Today, her ranch raises Hereford cattle, Rambouillet sheep, and thoroughbred quarter horses.

Over the years Mickey has passed on her love of ranching and her commitment to the Wyoming values that made her such a success to her children, her grandchildren, and her great-grandchildren. As they continue to put the lessons Mickey has taught them into practice they will always remember that Mickey was the one who taught them how to do so many things on the ranch.

When Mickey is inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame she will be in good company. She will be among those who pursued their commitment to serving their community by working to support the growth and strength of our agriculture industry and our state economy. Mickey will fit right in because she has been an outstanding leader in that regard, serving with agriculture organizations and groups on both the State and the national level. They were fortunate she was willing to serve and to bring her knowledge of the industry to their work so that she might help them to make a difference. Over the years the contribution she made of her time and her talents helped to advance the interests of the agriculture community as she served with the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Guardians of the Grasslands, the Wyoming Farm Bureau, the American Quarter Horse Association, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the American Sheep Industry Association, Wyoming CattleWomen, and the Wyoming Woolgrowers Association. Clearly, Mickey has never been one to sit idle when there was work to be done.

Mickey's upcoming induction into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame won't be the first time she has been honored for her commitment to ranching, farming, and our Wyoming way of life. She has also been recognized with the Green River Valley Ranch Woman of the Year award in 2012, the Farm Family Today Award from the Sweetwater County Fair in 2013, a Partnership Appreciation Award from the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative in 2012, and, with her husband Bill, the Sweetwater County Ranch of Couple of the Year Award in 1988 and the Upper Green River Valley Cattlemen's Lifetime Honorary Member Award in 1997.

Mickey Thoman has shown she has what it takes to not only survive but to thrive in what can be a truly demanding business. Through it all, she has been a role model for others to

learn from and an example not only of the best of Wyoming's traditions and values but proof of their power and strength. In a short while, I will be proud to join with Senator BARRASSO as Mickey Thoman is officially inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. It is another honor she has truly earned with her hard work, her leadership, her friendship with so many members of Wyoming's agricultural community, and her active interest and involvement in every aspect of the industry she has been a part of since she and her husband first began to work their ranch more than 60 years ago.

RECOGNIZING FRANK MOORE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, at the 102nd Wyoming State Fair, I, along with Senator ENZI, will have the honor of introducing Frank Moore as he is inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame for 2014. Frank has spent his lifetime working for positive changes in agriculture, and he has undoubtedly earned this honor through his impact both in Wyoming and nationwide.

Frank Moore's ancestors came to the Wyoming Territory in 1876 and started a ranching legacy. A century later in 1978, Frank and his wife Elaine began raising their own cattle and sheep at the Spearhead Ranch north of Douglas, WY. They also started a successful outfitting business which further diversified their ranching operation.

Frank has been iconic in his efforts to promote and build the sheep industry. He is currently serving as chairman of the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative, an organization he helped establish in 2001. The founders of the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative knew that strategic vertical integration of the sheep industry was the only way to save it, and they led the charge in making it happen. Brad Boner, another founder of the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative and Wyoming rancher, observed: "Without Frank's outstanding leadership and strong passion for Wyoming's sheep industry, I am not sure we would have been successful in our efforts to form the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative."

For almost three decades Frank has dedicated a great deal of time and energy by volunteering and serving on boards and committees at both the State and national levels. In addition to serving on the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative board since its inception, Frank has been the president of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, served on the board of directors of the Kansas City Federal Reserve Board, and he served in the Wyoming House of Representatives from 1993 to 1996. He personally worked to establish the Scrapie Eradication Program, National Wool Act, Guard Dog Program,

and many other initiatives that have influenced the sheep industry nationally.

Peter Orwick of the American Sheep Industry has said the industry is in a better place because of Frank's leadership and willingness to make hard decisions. The undying passion and determination of citizens like Frank and his wife Elaine keep the agriculture industry in both Wyoming and America thriving.

My wife Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations to Frank and thanking him for his dedication to the Wyoming way of life. I will be honored to share this special day with Frank and his family as he is inducted into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

MUDDYING THE WATERS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column written by Mr. Dennis Sun, Publisher of the Wyoming Livestock Roundup, entitled "Muddying the Waters." The article was published on June 21 of this year.

Through this recently proposed Clean Water Act jurisdictional rule, Federal agencies are attempting to expand the definition of "waters of the United States" to include ditches and other dry areas where water flows only for a short duration after rainfall. Federal regulations have never defined ditches and other upland drainage features as waters of the United States. But this proposed rule does, and it will have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers and small businesses that need to put a shovel in the ground to make a living.

Dennis knows what the true impact of this rule will be to rural communities. He is a fourth-generation rancher from Central, WY. Mr. Sun stated in his column that "according to the EPA, the proposed definition of waters of the U.S. would increase predictability and consistency for CWA programs, and as a lot of folks see it—that's right—we know we would go out of business instead of just maybe."

Dennis goes on to say that "our government has run amuck, and we shouldn't like it. . . ." He is right. This proposed rule by the administration is circumventing Congress by effectively writing navigable out of the Clean Water Act, thus allowing the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers to seize all wet areas of the States. Just as troubling as ignoring congressional intent, the proposed rule disregards the fundamental tenet embodied in two landmark cases decided by the U.S. Supreme Court that there are limits to Federal jurisdiction.

This unprecedented exercise of power will allow Environmental Protection Agency to trump States' rights and wipe out the authority of State and local governments to make local land

and water use decisions. This is particularly troubling when we have seen no evidence that the States are misusing or otherwise failing to meet their responsibilities.

The uncertainty this rule creates only delays economic investment and job creation. It defies logic to think this proposed rule will benefit anybody but bureaucrats in Washington who are far removed from the communities between the coasts.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to stand with ranchers like Dennis Sun. Stand with those who understand the land best and not with extremists outside and within this administration who do not know how to run a farm, a ranch, or a small business.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wyoming Livestock Roundup, June 21, 2014]

MUDDYING THE WATERS (By Dennis Sun)

As we all realized on April 21, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers posted their proposed definition for "waters of the U.S." protected under the Clean Water Act (CWA) in the Federal Register, and that triggered a 90-day public comment period.

EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy said during a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee hearing that current exemptions for the CWA permitting for normal farming, ranching and agricultural practices are kept intact in the proposal.

She added, "If a farmer was not legally required to have a permit before, this rule does not change that status. The proposal does not add or expand the scope of waters protected under the CWA."

Well, after those words, the fight was on by those in the farming and ranching industry, along with local governments and the nation's business community. According to the EPA, the proposed definition of waters of the U.S. would increase predictability and consistency for CWA programs, and as a lot of folks see it—that's right—we know we would go out of business instead of just "maybe."

At the same time, 231 U.S. Representatives sent a letter to the EPA and Corp of Engineers asking them to back off this proposed rule to expand federal control under the CWA. They said the proposed rule would redefine waters of the U.S. under the CWA based on a narrow opinion by Justice Anthony Kennedy in a 2006 Supreme Court decision that said an isolated water, like a stock pond or a ditch, doesn't have to have a surface water connection to a downstream navigable water to be considered a "waters of the United States."

Justice Antonin Scalia wrote the plurality opinion on the case, and his opinion differed from Kennedy's by saying that waters of the U.S. include only those relatively permanent, standing or continuously flowing bodies of water like streams, rivers and lakes. Justice Scalia specifically noted that waters of the U.S. do not include channels that only hold water periodically and are only wetlands with a continuous surface connection to bodies of water that are waters of the U.S.

The EPA and Corps chose to base the final rule on the Kennedy opinion. That was a concern that the Congressmen raised in their letter, which read, "Contrary to your agen-

cies' claims this would directly contract prior U.S. Supreme Court decisions which imposed limits on the extent of federal CWA authority. Based on legally and scientifically unsound view of the significant nexus concept espoused by Justice Kennedy, the rule would place features such as ditches, ephemeral drainages, ponds, natural and manmade, seeps, prairie potholes, flood plains and other occasionally or seasonally wet areas under federal control."

There lies the fight. Congressman Chris Collins (R-N.Y.) said, "Enough is enough with regard to federal overreach on U.S. farms and ranches. When the bureaucrats at the EPA decide to call a divot in the ground that fills with rain a navigable waterway under the CWA, we know that our federal government has run amuck."

Well, our government has run amuck, and we shouldn't like it—that is all the reason to get your comments in before the Oct. 20 deadline. This deadline extension gives us a valuable opportunity so take advantage of it. If you're wondering just how to submit your comments, read more in this week's Roundup.

MEDICARE'S 49TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, this week Medicare is turning 49 years old. Since July 1965, Medicare has provided critical access to health care benefits for older Americans and people with disabilities. Florida alone is home to over 3.5 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Medicare has become a landmark program based on its popularity among beneficiaries and the comprehensive benefits offered. In 1959, almost 4 out of 10 Americans over age 65 were living below the poverty line, as compared with about 1 in 10 seniors living in poverty in 2000. Prior to Medicare, seniors paid almost half of the cost of their health; in 1997, seniors paid only 18 percent of their health care costs. Medicare pulled millions of Americans out of poverty by not only providing them with important health benefits, but also by enabling seniors to use their hard-earned retirement savings for needs other than their health care.

As chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, I understand that Medicare is essential to the Nation, particularly as the baby boom generation enters retirement. Those served by Medicare often have modest incomes and complex health conditions that depend on these lifesaving benefits. As a committee, we have looked at Medicare's prescription drug benefit, researched ways to eradicate fraud and waste in the program, and ensured that seniors have access to quality, affordable care. In fact, just yesterday, the committee convened a hearing about how to improve Medicare beneficiaries' access to skilled nursing care.

The Affordable Care Act has helped to reduce costs, increase benefits, and improve health care delivery for Medicare beneficiaries. Earlier this year, Derrick in Tampa wrote to me about how much the ACA has meant to his family in providing care for his mother. His mother was the victim of gun

violence and will need extensive medical care for the rest of her life. So Derrick wrote that when Congress passed the ACA, "I was excited for my mother and the many others" who will benefit from the improvements in providing health care to America's seniors. For example, thanks to a provision I fought for in the ACA, Floridians have saved more than \$756 million on their prescription drugs.

While we can still make improvements, the Medicare trustees report, released earlier this week, reported that the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund solvency has been extended by 4 additional years from last year's estimate and 13 years longer than it was prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Today, Medicare is more solvent than it was in 1965.

It is our job, in Congress, to ensure that Medicare is available for all Americans when they need it and, as was the case for Derrick's mother, when they are impacted by "circumstances not of their own doing." Though the new projections are encouraging, we must continue to work to preserve Medicare for generations to come.

VIETNAM WAR COMMEMORATIVE PARTNER PROGRAM

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, it is a privilege to be a part of the national commemoration that will honor the service of our Vietnam veterans and their families.

During this conflict, nearly 350,000 Pennsylvanians served their Nation. Of that number, 3,149 paid the ultimate sacrifice, giving their lives for the United States of America.

I deeply appreciate the Commonwealth's participation in The Vietnam War Commemorative Partner Program that thanks our Vietnam veterans for their service. Although no commemoration can fully honor the profound sacrifice of those who served in Vietnam, I strongly believe we should use the war's 50th anniversary as an opportunity to further honor those who saw our Nation through one of its most troubling conflicts and ensure that their legacy is not forgotten.

A grateful nation thanks the veterans of this war, some never to return to the families they left behind. We should all hope to live our lives in a manner that befits their service and sacrifice.

WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I am pleased the President signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, WIOA, into law last week to improve job training in the United States. WIOA is the result of a commitment in both parties and both Chambers to

modernize our workforce development system to ensure American competitiveness. The last time a Workforce Investment Act reauthorization was signed into law was in 1998, far too long ago, and the significant skills gap we face as a nation is evidence that our fragmented system simply is not working.

Despite the billions of taxpayer dollars we invest annually on Federal job training programs, there are 4.5 million unfilled jobs and a staggering 10 million unemployed Americans. We need to bridge this gap, and WIOA helps get us there by reducing bureaucracy and providing American workers with a more flexible and effective workforce training system. Over the past year, I have heard from businesses, elected State and local leaders, and families back home about the critical need for reforms to our job training system, and I am glad to have had the chance to work on this bill and be a part of this process in the Senate.

This legislation incorporates many reforms contained in the SKILLS Act, which I introduced in the Senate earlier this year, including the elimination of 15 programs identified as duplicative or ineffective and countless Federal mandates on States and local boards. In addition, WIOA establishes common performance metrics and requires independent evaluations every 4 years of all workforce programs to ensure effectiveness and accountability to taxpayers. By reducing bureaucracy and enhancing flexibility, WIOA eliminates delays that hinder job seekers from immediately accessing job training services and reentering the workforce.

I thank Senators ALEXANDER, HARKIN, ISAKSON, and MURRAY and Representative FOXX for their leadership on this issue and am pleased to see this important legislation was signed into law without delay.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOCCER

• Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I would like to honor the city of Portland for hosting its first Major League Soccer All Star game on August 6. Major League Soccer, MLS, has rightly chosen Providence Park and the Portland Timbers as host for their annual All Star event, which this year pits the MLS All Stars against European giants, Bayern Munich.

Soccer City, USA—as Portland fans have dubbed it—rightly deserves to host such a high-profile match. Portland is home to the most passionate fan base in the league for both the Timbers and the inaugural champions of the National Women's Soccer League, the Portland Thorns. Timbers games drew more than 20,000 fans per

game last season, and the Thorns averaged over 13,000 for home games. And, of course, I have to mention the awesome banners displayed by Portland fans at Providence Park, which are second to none.

This year, the Timbers' head coach, Caleb Porter, along with players Diego Valeri and Will Johnson, will represent our hometown team for the MLS All Stars. Congratulations to them for making all Oregonians proud. Special thanks should also go to team owner Merritt Paulson, whose hard work getting a team to Portland paid off when he was awarded this great event.

I commend the Portland Timbers, the Portland Thorns, the Timbers Army, and the Rose City Riveters for their stellar community outreach and charity work in Oregon. Whether it is partnering with the Make-A-Wish Foundation, building soccer fields for youth, or collecting school supplies for local schools, the Portland Timbers show they are a first-class organization through their outstanding civic engagement.

I send my congratulations to the MLS players who have made the All Star team and who will represent the league against an international opponent. It is exciting to host Bayern Munich, a team who fields some of the recent World Cup championship players from Germany. I wish both teams good luck in the match, but as the Timbers Army says: "There's no pity in the Rose City!" Go MLS All Stars.●

REMEMBERING IRMA DETIEGE

• Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the illustrious life of Mrs. Irma Gene Hall DeTiege, who passed on July 1, 2014, after more than five decades of service in the Louisiana community.

Mrs. DeTiege was born in 1931 in Riverton, LA, which had a total population of 40, including livestock. From these humble beginnings, she learned lessons of humility and hard work that were embodied throughout her entire life. After moving to Monroe, LA and meeting the love of her life, Frank G. DeTiege, a graduate of Southern University who taught Industrial Arts at Carroll High School, Mrs. DeTiege rode the bus to Grambling College every morning. There she received a bachelor's of science degree in elementary education, which she would later use to become a teacher at Lincoln Elementary School. During her tenure, she created enduring changes in a wide breadth of programs that impacted and improved the lives of almost every individual who attended the school.

In addition to her efforts as a teacher, Mrs. DeTiege worked tirelessly as a newspaper editor, publisher, and columnist for the Monroe News Leader and the Monroe News Weekly before

she and Mr. DeTiege founded the Monroe Dispatch in 1975. Mrs. DeTiege had a vision of providing the citizens of Monroe with access to accurate reporting at a time when important information in this community was too often overlooked. Throughout her career, she remained dedicated to ensuring that those in crisis and most in need always had an advocate in the community. In this and in all of her tasks, Irma fought for a community where people are taken care of, no matter their situation in life. She also worked continuously to provide for the prosperity of Louisiana citizens for generations to come. This level of devotion to her craft, the people of Monroe, and the State of Louisiana is indicative of her storied career of service.

Irma was a wonderful friend to me and my family. She was also an inspiration to all those who were impacted by her tireless efforts. It is with my heartfelt and greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with her son Frank and other family members in recognizing the life and many accomplishments of this incredible leader and her impact on so many people throughout Louisiana.●

RECOGNIZING THE DELAWARE 87ERS

● Mr. COONS. Madam President, I wish to recognize the National Basketball Association's Developmental League team, the Delaware 87ers and their impact on my community.

In April 2013, Delaware sports fans rejoiced when the Philadelphia 76ers acquired an NBA Development League team, the Utah Flash, and chose to relocate the franchise to Delaware. The Delaware 87ers are named in recognition of Delaware's place in United States history as the first state to ratify the United States Constitution on December 7, 1787, as well as in a nod to the franchise's parent team, the Philadelphia 76ers.

The Sevens promised and delivered a fast-paced, high-scoring NBA brand of action with the fan-friendliness and affordability for which the NBA Development League is known.

During their inaugural season, the Sevens' success grew, drawing a steady and passionate fan base to the Bob Carpenter Center as they squared off against D-League teams from around the country. Rivalries were built with the Canton Charge, Erie BayHawks, Fort Wayne Mad Ants and the Maine Red Claws.

The passion of the players and coaches, their connection to the community, affordable ticket prices and family-friendly amenities drew thousands of fans to Newark. Head coach Rod Baker and his team, led by fan favorites Thanasis Antetokounmpo, Kendall Marshall, Lorenzo Brown and Vander Blue, finished their first season dis-

playing flashes of brilliance and leaving fans with high hopes for greatness to come.

Even more important than their on-court accomplishments was the team's off-court impact on the community. Prior to their inaugural season, the Sevens unveiled their SEVENS STRONG community initiative, which included revitalizing seven basketball courts in seven days, as well as each of their employees pledging 87 hours of community service throughout the year. Basketball courts that received makeovers included Adams Court, Fraim Boys & Girls Club, Kosciuszko Park, Helen Chambers Park, Tatnall Park, Woodlawn Park and Judy Johnson Park.

Throughout the 2013-14 season, the Sevens attracted more than 38,000 fans and averaged over 2,100 fans for the last eight contests. The attendance increase can undoubtedly be traced back to their commitment to the community and their tireless grassroots presence in Newark, Wilmington, Christiana, Hockessin, Newport, Elsmere and Elkton. Players and the front office staff participated in countless community-based activities including visiting Christiana Care and Al DuPont/Nemours Hospital for Children monthly, partnering with Stubbs Elementary School for a Green Week Challenge, volunteering at the Delaware Food Bank, hosting four non-profit promotions at games: Lyme Disease Awareness Night, B+ Foundation Night, Christiana Care NICU Night and USO Night, participating in more than a dozen community events, and donating over 8,000 tickets to Delaware-based community organizations and charities. The team truly embraced the meaning of community and civic engagement.

We congratulate the Delaware 87ers on a successful season, both on and off the court, and wish them continued success in their second season. We look forward to supporting them as they work to inspire their fans and better our community.●

RECOGNIZING MARIA MATOS AND THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMUNITY CENTER

● Mr. COONS. Madam President, on behalf of Senator TOM CARPER and myself, I wish to recognize two special occasions in Wilmington, DE happening on September 5, 2014: the 45th anniversary of the Latin American Community Center, LACC, serving the Hispanic community of Delaware as well as to honor the service, dedication and passion of a name synonymous with the service to Delaware's vibrant Hispanic community: Maria Matos.

The LACC's continuum of care promotes education, life skills, and an enhanced quality of life while celebrating diverse Hispanic cultures. The LACC

was founded in 1969 in the Hilltop section of Wilmington serving and supporting the community and people that surround it.

Over the last 45 years, the LACC has focused on lifelong learning that concentrates on the educational needs of client families, from quality pre-school programs to adult education; and life empowerment, focusing on the immediate life needs families and individuals may face, from short term case management to a job placement or English language skills.

Since 1994, Maria Matos has been the executive director and driving force behind the LACC. Her impact has been felt not just in the Hispanic community, but throughout Wilmington and New Castle County. She has contributed her leadership skills to such boards as the Medical Center of Delaware, Grand Opera House, Delaware Community Foundation, and Advisory Council for the Fund for Women, as well as at the grassroots level supporting the Hilltop Working Group, an alliance of residents and legislators who work to promote the community's well-being.

In conclusion, we would like to congratulate Ms. Matos on her years of service to the LACC as well as the LACC on its 45 years of service to the community, and wish each of them luck in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JAMES LIVINGSTON

● Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I would like to take a moment today to honor Beaufort, SC resident, Maj. Gen. James E. Livingston, a 33-year U.S. Marine Corps veteran and Medal of Honor recipient, for his tireless service to this country. He is truly an American patriot worthy of our recognition.

Born in Towns, GA, General Livingston knew from a young age that he wanted to serve his country. While enrolled at the Military College of Georgia, he was a member of the nationally recognized Corps of Cadets. After graduating from Auburn University in 1962 with a degree in civil engineering, General Livingston rose through the ranks of the Marine Corps. From Vietnam to the Philippines and domestically, wherein he was the first commander of the Marine Reserve Forces, General Livingston distinguished himself with exceptional service all over the world. Throughout his long and storied career, General Livingston has made his mark as a man who leads by example.

General Livingston, serving as the operations officer for 3D Battalion, 7th Marines, oversaw Operation Frequent Wind, the evacuation of Saigon. Despite the urgency and chaos of the situation, General Livingston led with poise and professionalism: characteristics that would define his career. Due in large parts to General Livingston's

leadership during Operation Frequent Wind, more than 7,000 American civilians and Vietnamese people in a desperate situation were airlifted out of Saigon and to safety.

In 1968, while serving as the commanding officer, Company E, 2d Battalion, 4th Marines, General Livingston led his men on a determined assault on the village of Dai Do, where another Marine company had been isolated the night before when enemy forces seized the village. Despite being twice wounded by grenade fragments, General Livingston refused medical treatment and continued to lead his men across 500 meters of open rice fields. Having reestablished contact with the surrounded Marine Company, General Livingston then learned of a third Marine Company leading an attack on nearby Dinh To village. Marshalling his resources, General Livingston consolidated the two companies and led a support effort to halt the aggressive enemy counter attack from Dinh To. After being wounded a third time and rendered immobile, he remained in the combat zone and supervised the evacuation of his men. Only after his fellow marines were safe did General Livingston allow himself to be evacuated. For his gallantry, bravery, and selflessness, General Livingston was awarded the Medal of Honor from President Richard Nixon in 1970.

In addition to the Medal of Honor, General Livingston also holds the Navy Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Superior Service Medal, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart. It is because of men like James Livingston that Americans sleep easy at night, knowing they are safe from those who wish to inflict harm upon them.

It is an honor that this Saturday, August 2, General Livingston will be the keynote speaker at my Vietnam Era Veterans Honor Ceremony in Columbia, SC where I will honor more than 1,500 veterans. General Livingston and his fellow veterans deserve to be recognized for their gallant efforts, and it will be my honor to stand with him on this special occasion.

I invite my colleagues to join me in thanking Maj. Gen. James E. Livingston for a life and career dedicated to the protection of this Nation, her ideals, and her citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE C. WRIGHT

● Mr. COONS. Madam President, on behalf of Senator TOM CARPER and myself, I wish to honor the exemplary service of the executive director of the Delaware League of Local Governments, George C. Wright and recognize his recent retirement. For over five decades, he has been a tremendous and courageous leader serving in many positions throughout our great State. His hard work, perseverance, and dedication will truly be missed.

Since the 1960s, George has played an active and integral role within Delaware. For six terms, he served as councilman in the town of Smyrna before serving as its mayor for 14 years. Since then, George has been a crucial member and leader of the Delaware League of Local Governments. As he steps down from his position as executive director, we join the many Delawareans he has worked with in thanking him for his diligent efforts to improve and assist local governments through legislative advocacy.

Born in Chesapeake City, MD and educated in the public school system there, George studied at several distinguished universities including Maryland State College in Princess Anne and the University of Delaware. After his graduation, George began his career during the turbulent 1960s as Head Start director in Smyrna, a town that was once denounced by former Attorney General David Buckson as having the worst race relations in the State. George later went on to serve on the town's council and as the chief of staffing at the Dover Air Force Base. In 1981 he was able to overcome many racial barriers in order to become the town of Smyrna and state of Delaware's first African-American mayor.

Most recently, as the executive director of the Delaware League of Local Governments, George has successfully worked with 57 municipalities in Delaware to help forge a common voice across the State. George's work has been nothing short of inspirational and we are sincerely grateful for all that he has done on behalf of the towns, cities and counties in Delaware.

We wholeheartedly thank George for all of the work he has done for local governments of Delaware. His model leadership and dedication has truly touched every corner of our great State. We offer our sincerest congratulations on a job well done and wish him many happy, healthy, and successful years to come.●

EXCEPTIONAL CITIZENS' WEEK

● Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I wish to recognize and congratulate the leadership and volunteers of New Hampshire's Exceptional Citizens', EC, Week at Camp Fatima as the program marks its 60th year of providing continuous service to children and adult campers with special needs.

Held every year at Camp Fatima on the picturesque Upper Suncook Lake in Gilmanton Iron Works, EC Week is a non-sectarian outdoor camp program sponsored by the Catholic Diocese of Manchester. Attendance, which is free for campers, is funded by generous contributions from individuals and businesses. During EC Week, campers have the opportunity to participate in a variety of traditional camping activities, giving them a chance to enjoy the

great outdoors and have some good old-fashioned summer fun.

Borne of the idea that "it would be great to allow these children the same camping experience as other kids," Bill Haller, president of The United Life and father of a child with Down syndrome; Dr. Tom Walker, a pediatrician at St. Paul's School; and the Rev. Richard O. Boner, associate pastor at St. John's Parish in Concord, who founded Camp Fatima for Boys, began work on this concept, starting EC Week in 1954.

As they set out to create an entertaining and rewarding camp experience, the program founders teamed up with student nurses from Sacred Heart Hospital in Manchester, a group of Sisters of Mercy, a group of Sisters of St. Francis, and seminarians from St. John's Seminary, in preparation for the camp's launch. The first year 25 boys and girls attended the camp.

Since that first year, EC Week has grown immensely and now includes 170 campers and more than 300 volunteers from around the country. It is a unique and special experience that is treasured by so many, and has served as a model for the creation of similar camps around the country.

As we celebrate the 60th anniversary of EC Week next month, I want to commend the Diocese of Manchester and the EC Week staff and volunteers. Their hard work and dedication has brightened the lives of thousands of campers and allowed them to have exciting experiences they otherwise may never get to enjoy. I have no doubt this outstanding program will continue to benefit and delight campers for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. HAUGHT

● Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I wish to recognize a dear friend, a proud American and a passionate West Virginia leader, Jim Haught, who is celebrating his 90th birthday on August 6, 2014. I am incredibly grateful for Jim, for his loyal friendship and his unwavering support over the years. I am proud to celebrate his vast achievements and his many years of dedicated service to his community, to West Virginia, and to our Nation.

A native West Virginian, Jim was born in the small town of Weston and was raised in New Martinsville. He was the proud son of Ben and Orpha Haught. With 11 siblings, there is no doubt that Jim learned early on about the meaning of life's most important concepts, including leadership, sacrifice, and commitment. True to Jim's character, he also had an eagerness and a passion for policy and government affairs from a very young age.

Throughout his 90 years, and still today, Jim has always answered the call of service—whether it was for our great Nation or for the beautiful people

of West Virginia. After graduating from Pine Grove High School, he joined the Navy and served proudly and honorably for 3 years.

After returning home from the Navy, he left his hometown of New Martinsville to focus on his education at Salem College and then at George Washington University in Washington, DC, where he was classmates with Margaret Truman, the daughter of President Harry S. Truman. Jim then went on to study law at West Virginia University and while there, founded the university's Young Democratic Club in 1948. It was also at West Virginia University that Jim first met my uncle, A. James Manchin. The two became lifelong best friends.

Jim's commitment to his family and to the community continued after leaving West Virginia University. In 1952, Jim met his beautiful wife Melba in Parkersburg and soon thereafter the loving couple had their four boys, Greg, Cameron, Benji, and Danny. To this day, his commitment to his family has undoubtedly always been his No. 1 priority in life.

Steadfast to his smalltown values, Jim has never been afraid to stand for the principles he was taught at an early age, never forgetting his West Virginia roots. He has always strived to make a positive difference across our great State, and in 1958, Jim decided to run for public office to represent Wood County in the West Virginia House of Delegates. He served for 2 years, until Jim embarked on a new journey in 1960.

As a staunch Democratic supporter, Jim and A. James together played an extraordinarily significant role in John F. Kennedy's Presidential campaign in West Virginia. The duo worked tirelessly setting up county organizations in all of our State's 55 counties. They worked day and night laying the groundwork, coordinating statewide efforts, and gathering the support that directly resulted in Kennedy's Presidential victory. It was Jim's perseverance and energy that helped make JFK's Presidency a reality.

Jim and A. James' hard work and commitment to the campaign did not go unnoticed. When President Kennedy arrived in the White House, he personally called Jim and offered him a position as the Director of Federal Housing, while A. James became the State Director of the Farmers Home Administration. Honored, Jim accepted the position and moved to St. Albans in Kanawha County, where he remained active in his community while working for the President.

It is not surprising to anyone who has had the pleasure of knowing him, but Jim's success and his tremendous accomplishments have been recognized on many levels.

Today, Jim continues to serve the people of West Virginia through the

Hansford Senior Center, a community center he established in St. Albans to help care for aging seniors in the area.

It has been an honor and privilege to know such an exceptional West Virginian. Jim's imprint will always be marked by his countless contributions to the State of West Virginia. I join all West Virginians in wishing Jim a happy birthday and in celebrating his 90 years of success, and I look forward to celebrating many more birthdays with my dear friend for years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO GERRY COHEN

● Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I wish to honor the service of a great North Carolinian, Gerry Cohen, who will retire in August as special counsel to the North Carolina General Assembly. For nearly 40 years, Gerry Cohen has served the general assembly with incredible knowledge, distinction and commitment.

Gerry was first hired as a general assembly staff attorney in 1977 and later became the director of the bill drafting division before taking on his final role as special counsel.

I had the pleasure to work with Gerry firsthand during my time as a State senator from 1999 to 2009. I found Gerry's extensive knowledge, legendary memory and professionalism invaluable and truly unmatched.

Gerry will retire leaving a lasting mark on the institution he served over a long and illustrious career. His professionalism and grasp of the issues have endeared him to Republicans and Democrats alike and earns him the title of "statesmen." He will be truly missed and impossible to replace.

Gerry earned a degree in political science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and later attended the UNC School of Law. As a second-year law student, he served on the Chapel Hill Town Council before beginning his work for the North Carolina General Assembly. Gerry also served on the board of the Raleigh Transit Authority between 2009 and 2013.

North Carolina General Assembly members, both past and present, will sorely miss an institutional giant with an incredible grasp of the issues facing our State. Gerry and his wife intend to travel and enjoy time with family and friends in the next phase of their lives and will fortunately not have to travel far to enjoy our State's picturesque mountains or beautiful coastline.

I wish Gerry and his family well and thank him for his incredible service on behalf of North Carolina.●

REMEMBERING ADMIRAL CHARLES R. LARSON

● Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I wish to honor the extraordinary life and service of ADM Charles R. Larson.

Admiral Larson passed away on July 26, 2014, in his Annapolis, MD home. He leaves behind his beloved wife of 52 years, Sally, three loving daughters, and seven grandchildren.

Throughout his 40 years of service, Admiral Larson exemplified the ideals of a devoted public servant. After he graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1958, he served tours of duty aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Shangri-la* as an aviator and he served as a submariner on board the nuclear submarines USS *Nathan Hale*, USS *Nathaniel Green*, and USS *Bergal*. After serving as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and naval aide to the President of the United States, he returned to sea duty aboard the USS *Sculpin*. In 1990 Admiral Larson was promoted to the rank of four-star admiral. One year later, he assumed duties as commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Command.

Admiral Larson's career was marked with many notable accomplishments. His naval service as both an aviator and a submariner was unique and admired. In 1979, at the age of 43, he became the second-youngest admiral in the history of the U.S. Navy. Admiral Larson's service is also unique in that he served as both the 51st and 55th superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy. Larson's second appointment as superintendent, while unusual, was something that the Navy desperately needed. Prior to his second tour of duty as superintendent, the Naval Academy was rocked by a cheating scandal. Admiral Larson was brought in to restore honor and integrity to his alma mater. The task was not an easy one, but he accomplished his mission by pursuing two goals that he outlined when he took the job: "No. 1: to develop character. No. 2: to prove the worth of the service academies to the people of the United States". By the time his second tour as superintendent was over, Admiral Larson had succeeded in restoring the Naval Academy's reputation as one of America's premier educational and military institutions.

In closing, when I think of ADM Larson, I am reminded of a quote from another famous Admiral, ADM Leighton Smith: "The United States Navy is the envy of every other navy in the world. They don't want to be like us—they want to be us."

I believe this quote is true because of the outstanding devotion and competence of those who serve in our Navy. Ships and weapons systems are of little value if the service men and women operating them are not the very best. Admiral Larson understood this, and his service helped the Navy produce other exceptional leaders who have bravely defended and immeasurably enriched our Nation. Few could ask for a more honorable legacy.

I believe that Admiral Larson's legacy is one of duty, honor, and a sincere

devotion to serving and improving the Navy he loved. I ask that all Members of the Senate join me in remembering this extraordinary man and his admirable years of service to our Nation.●

MESKWAKI TRIBAL POWWOW CENTENNIAL

● Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, from August 7 through August 10 the Meskwaki will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of their tribal powwow, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate them on this occasion. This is a unique event held annually on the only Indian settlement in the State of Iowa. During this celebration the tribe members celebrate and perform dances that have been handed down for generations. It is a time of reaffirmation and hope and a time of friendship.

The Annual Meskwaki Powwow originated from the traditional religious and social beliefs of the Meskwaki Tribe. This annual event is derived from the "Green Corn Dance" which originally took place during the harvesting of the crops. From 1902 to 1912, the tribe held the "Field Days" which would last for the week, with dancing, games, and horse racing. And then in 1912, the tribe made the decision to change the name from "Field Days" to "Powwow". This historic celebration continues to be held at the original location.

I would like to congratulate the Meskwaki on this joyous occasion and hope they will continue to celebrate their powwow for many more years to come.●

MAGIC VALLEY VETERANS AND HOSPICE VISIONS

● Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I wish to pay special tribute to the outstanding service of veterans living in the Magic Valley of Idaho and thank Heidi Walker and all the staff with Hospice Visions for the work they do on behalf of veterans in the Magic Valley.

Hospice Visions has chosen to honor 12 veterans this year in a veterans recognition ceremony hosted by Genesis Healthcare at their Twin Falls Center. Veterans from the River Ridge, Twin Falls and Bennett Hills facilities are among those being recognized. This year's honorees are: Dennis Asmussen, who served in the Navy in Vietnam; Bill Benedict, who served in the Army during World War II; Jon Hindes, who served in the Army in Korea and Vietnam; Levi Hussey, who served in the Marines in World War II; Benjamin Le baron, who served in the Navy during World War II; Jay Richards, who served in the Army during the Cold War; Byron J. Rowland, who served in the Navy during World War II; Rex Shirts, who served in the Navy during World

War II; Vernon Skeen, who served in the Army during World War II; Gary Winder, who served in the Army in Vietnam; Vern Winnill, who served in the Air Force in World War II; and Marion Wood, who served in the Army in World War II. These veterans are being honored for their service to our Nation. Joining in paying tribute to these extraordinary Americans is a honor.

Occasions such as this remind us of the many veterans who are such important parts of our communities. Our freedoms are preserved because of their selfless service. They not only gave all for our country, but also they continue to uplift our communities and other generations of returning veterans and their families. Thank you also to the families of those who serve our country. You make sacrifices every day in supporting your loved ones who served in the Armed Forces.

The ceremony also provides an opportunity to recognize the remarkable work of Heidi Walker and the staff and administrators of Hospice Visions for their dedication to assisting our Nation's heroes. I have the honor of presenting Heidi Walker and Hospice Visions with a Spirit of Idaho Award for going above and beyond in serving the Magic Valley's aging, ill, and home-bound veterans. Your commitment to the men and women who have served and your work to ensure they receive recognition for their service are commendable. I understand Hospice Visions is a participant in the We Honor Veterans Program, a partnership between the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization and the Department of Veterans Affairs to better serve veteran patients in hospice-like facilities. Heidi and Hospice Visions have given quality care to our Nation's veterans and have been a great support to their families.

Thank you to the veterans of the Magic Valley for your service and to Heidi Walker and all those at Hospice Visions for your exemplary dedication to veterans and their families. We are blessed to have you as part of the community.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD STRUCKHOFF

● Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to Richard Struckhoff, the county clerk of Greene County, MO. He has been a quiet, tireless and efficient servant to the citizens of my home county for a record 27 years. He was appointed when Ronald Reagan was President and John Ashcroft was Governor. Then Governor Ashcroft wisely chose Struckhoff for the position he still holds today. Richard was on the staff of another member of this body, U.S. Senator John Danforth, serving in the Senate district office in Springfield, MO.

I met Richard when I was the Greene County clerk and he was a news reporter for KWTO Radio in Springfield. Richard, with his trademark beard, was then as he is today—easy to work with, soft-spoken, insightful and a keen student of local politics. Struckhoff was part of a pack of journalists who visited my office every day looking for nuggets of public interest and features about elections and county news. He won awards for his public affairs broadcasts at KWTO. Later he went to work for Senator Danforth, and in 1987 when the Greene County clerk resigned, he was appointed. Richard says Danforth was a role model with his principled leadership, openness to many viewpoints, and a devotion to his religious faith, all of which had an impact on Struckhoff's decision to seek elective office.

During his 27 years as clerk, he has seen a host of changes, but none more dramatic than the implementation of the Help America Vote Act after the 2000 presidential election. As the chief election official in Greene County, Struckhoff guided the effort to switch from more than 20 years of punch-card voting to computerized scanner machines and a statewide voter registration system. Struckhoff's small cadre of staff has overseen elections, voter registration and education, tax law, licenses, and county archives. He is seen as a role model by his colleagues, pursuing public service in place of partisan politics. Other community leaders have praised his hard work, collaboration, and good humor. That in itself is a remarkable record.

Struckhoff has been married to Micki for more than 40 years, and they have three children and a host of grandchildren. Richard spends his free time between elections on the road, seeing grandkids, singing in the band, the "Geezers," or playing music at church. In more recent months, Richard and Micki have begun traveling to shooting competitions in various locations, and they have both become good shots.

Richard is also a man of faith—deeply involved at Immaculate Conception Catholic Church in the music program. He was born in St. Louis in 1952, came to Springfield in the late 1970s and graduated Missouri State University in 1988. We have been blessed by his leadership ever since.

Family, faith, music and guns: is there any doubt why we like to be around Richard Struckhoff? He is a funny guy with a charming smile and a quick wit. He is a true public servant and my friend. I know he won't be looking for things to do in retirement. His plate is full with grandkids to mold, songs to sing and guns to shoot. We have Richard Struckhoff to thank for more than 27 years of fair elections in Greene County. I hope retirement brings many rewards to Richard and his family.●

BOULDER STATION HOTEL AND CASINO

• Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to recognize and congratulate Boulder Station Hotel and Casino in Las Vegas on 20 years of business and excellence. Boulder Station's dedication to providing quality service and bettering its community is commendable, and I am proud to recognize it here today.

Since its grand opening on August, 23, 1994, Boulder Station has been an integral part of the Las Vegas community. Boulder Station not only contributes to the Nevada economy by bringing tourists to our great State, but it also serves as a large employer of residents of Las Vegas, currently employing 1,115 Nevadans, some of whom have worked for the property since its opening day. The Boulder Station team members strive to make the entire staff feel like a family. Their level of corporate care and devotion is demonstrated through their exemplary guest service and generosity to local philanthropic causes. They believe it is both a privilege and responsibility to help build and maintain a happy and healthy community, and by giving back they strive to assist others who may simply need a helping hand.

Boulder Station has worked to help improve education in Southern Nevada as well. For 13 years, the property has partnered with Laura Dearing Elementary, an at-risk elementary school, as part of the Smart Start Program. The partnership program has five components: the school receives an annual award; a student incentive program is set up to improve an area of need; the company sponsors a recognition program for teachers and staff; team members from the Boulder Station volunteer their time to help with school events and support teachers in the classrooms; and the casino donates surplus computers and computer equipment to the partner schools. Boulder Station's commitment to bettering the community's local educational system is admirable, and I am proud Nevada is home to a business that has taken such an active role in helping our youth.

The gaming industry plays an integral role in Nevada's economy. Casinos have also generated over 100,000 jobs for Nevadans and continue to be one of the largest employers in the State. Plain and simple, the tourism and hospitality industry is the lifeblood for businesses and job creation in Nevada.

I ask my colleagues and all of my fellow Nevadans to join me in recognizing Boulder Station Hotel and Casino on 20 years of business and dedication to the Las Vegas community.●

LANDAFF, NEW HAMPSHIRE 250TH ANNIVERSARY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I wish to honor the town of Landaff, New

Hampshire, which is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding next month. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this special milestone.

Landaff, a town in Grafton County, lies fully within the Connecticut River watershed, with the Ammonoosuc River to the northwest and the Wild Ammonoosuc River to the south. The southern half of the town is part of the magnificent White Mountain National Forest.

The town of Landaff has a rich history. It is named after the Bishop of Llandaff, chaplain to King George III. After the town's first 60 settlers failed to meet the requirements of the King's original grant, the territory was re-granted to Dartmouth College in 1770.

The college contributed to the town's development by building roads, a school and a saw mill. In 1773, however, the original owners desired a return of their land and petitioned the Governor to revoke the Dartmouth grant. The issue of the ownership of Landaff was drawn out in the courts for the next 17 years. When the American Revolution concluded, changes in the American legal system prompted the college to give the town back to the people.

Today, Landaff's population remains around 360, with the patriotism and commitment of its residents reflected in part by their longstanding record of service in defense of our Nation.

One distinguished Landaff resident, Harry Chandler, was born in Landaff in 1864 and moved to Los Angeles, CA. Mr. Chandler eventually became the editor of the Los Angeles Times, but he never forgot the little town that raised him. He was said to have offered a job at the newspaper to anyone from Landaff who showed up at his door.

Resident sage of Landaff, Moor Noyes, once made this observation about the history of the town: "Things ain't now as they use to was been and people don't do as they use to did then." Truer words have never been spoken.

Landaff has contributed much to the culture and spirit of the State of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warmest regards to the people of Landaff as they celebrate the town's 250th anniversary.●

NEW HAMPSHIRE DAY TO END CHILDHOOD HOMELESSNESS

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the New Hampshire Day to End Childhood Homelessness. On September 4, 2014, Families in Transition, a Manchester-based nonprofit organization that has long committed itself to ending the cycle of homelessness, will be hosting this important event.

Founded in 1991, Families in Transition was born from the belief that having a home is a basic human right. The

organization has since been recognized, both statewide and nationally, for its effectiveness in ending homelessness through quality, affordable housing and comprehensive services. Families in Transition focuses on addressing homelessness by facilitating familial cohesion through specialized childcare, family therapy, and positive social activities. Family and youth services at Families in Transition are a vital part of efforts to help homeless children in New Hampshire.

The New Hampshire Day to End Childhood Homelessness event will bring critical awareness and support to these children and the work of Families in Transition.

On behalf of New Hampshire I thank Families in Transition, its staff, volunteers, and supporters for their determination to serve Granite Staters in need.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD E. WRIGHT

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to honor Chief Richard E. Wright for his lifelong commitment to the New Hampshire fire service. Chief Wright retired in June after committing 70 years of his life to the safety of Granite State residents. Through seven decades, he served as a soldier, a firefighter, the fire chief for the town of Loudon, and as the chief coordinator for the Capital Area Mutual Aid Compact.

Chief Wright's service to the fire department began when he was only 11 years old. His paper route included the Central Fire Station and the fire chief's home. Soon, he became a fixture at the station, and his helpfulness earned him the unofficial title of "Errand Boy Number One."

Upon graduating from Concord High School in 1950, he worked for the Rumford Press. Then he served his country, enlisting in the U.S. Army in 1953. After a 2-year tour of duty in Germany, he returned to New Hampshire as a sergeant.

Although Chief Wright had left the Army, his life of service had only just begun. He joined the Concord Fire Department call force in 1957 and then became a full-time firefighter in 1963. Soon Chief Wright was using his skills to manage the Concord department's budget and handle administrative tasks.

Through his instinct for business and management, Chief Wright helped to create the Capital Area Mutual Aid Fire Compact in 1965. To this day, the Mutual Aid Compact enables Concord and surrounding localities to share resources to fund their fire departments efficiently, saving taxpayer dollars.

In 1970 he left full-time fire service to run his family business, Wright Communications, although he continued to serve as a volunteer firefighter in Concord for several years. Then in 1973 he

was appointed chief coordinator of the Mutual Aid Compact and became full-time coordinator in 1989. In addition to this position, he worked with the Loudon Fire Department, serving as their fire chief for 12 years.

Chief Wright retired from his role as Mutual Aid Compact coordinator on June 14, 2014. Throughout his career, he has responded to fires and calls from across central New Hampshire 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. He has coordinated resources in order to address major emergencies and keep Granite State residents safe.

Chief Wright's service to New Hampshire is truly remarkable. I congratulate him on his retirement and thank him for his lifetime of dedication to our great State.●

HELENA, MONTANA SESQUICENTENNIAL

● Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I wish to recognize Helena, MT, on the occasion of its 150th birthday. Our capital city, which I am privileged to call home, continues to contribute to the State of Montana and our Nation.

Four prospectors came to Montana territory looking for gold in the 1860s, and they struck it rich when they discovered gold in the creek that now runs under Helena's main street. They named the area Last Chance Gulch. When news of the site spread, thousands of other migrants flooded the area, hoping to find success. To care for the growing mining population, shops, hotels, and saloons sprang up, and a small city began to grow.

That settlement was officially named Helena on October 30, 1864.

Unlike other mining towns, Helena prospered after the gold rush ended. Since it was near major roads and surrounded by fertile farmland, Helena continued to thrive throughout the 20th century.

Helena has been an integral part of our State since before Montana became part of the United States—the city was named the capital of Montana territory in 1875, 14 years before Montana joined the Union.

The very first special forces unit of our Nation's military was based at Fort Harrison, just outside of Helena.

Today, Helena continues to flourish. Thousands of visitors come each year to hike scenic paths, tackle nationally-rated mountain bike trails, ski the slopes in Great Divide Ski area, enjoy the view of the Sleeping Giant, and drink great local beers.

As Montana's capital, Helena is the center of the State government, and public servants continue to tackle today's tough issues and work to create a better Montana and country for all of us.

I want to congratulate Helena for its contributions to our State and our Nation. We look forward to the next 150 years being as exciting as the last.●

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POINT OF ORDER—S. 2648

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, pursuant to section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, a 306 point of order having been sustained on S. 2648, the bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. All amendments thereto fell and the cloture motion thereon has been rendered moot.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN FRANCIS TEFFT, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

NOMINATION OF LAURA JUNOR TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider and vote on Calendar Nos. 968 and 868; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON TEFFT NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Francis Tefft, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Russian Federation?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON JUNOR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Laura Junor, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 980, 981, 982, 983, with the exception of BG Eric C. Bush, 984, 985, with the exception of COL Marta Carcana, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Clarence Ervin

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles L. Gable

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stephen L. Danner

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Patricia M. Anslow
Brigadier General Elizabeth D. Austin
Brigadier General Walter E. Fountain
Brigadier General Richard J. Gallant
Brigadier General Scott A. Gronewald
Brigadier General Jeffrey H. Holmes
Brigadier General Walter T. Lord
Brigadier General Johnny R. Miller
Brigadier General Glen E. Moore
Brigadier General Lester Simpson
Brigadier General Rex A. Spittler
Brigadier General Roy S. Webb
Brigadier General David E. Wilmot
Brigadier General David C. Wood

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Mark W. Palzer

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Neal G. Loidolt

To be brigadier general

Col. Thomas P. Bump
Col. Jeffrey E. Ireland
Col. Isabelo Rivera
Col. Wallace N. Turner

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert J. Ulse

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy J. Sheriff

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy S. Paul

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Glenn A. Goddard

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Gregrey C. Bacon
Colonel Daryl D. Jaschen
Colonel David S. Werner

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert J. Howell, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Kerry M. Metz

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Gene F. Price
Capt. Linnea J. Sommerweddington

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Dawn E. Cutler

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1887 AIR FORCE nominations (69) beginning JONATHAN ACKLEY, and ending AARON ALLEN WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1888 AIR FORCE nominations (37) beginning RICHARD EDWARD ALFORD, and ending

DYLAN B. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1889 AIR FORCE nominations (18) beginning WILLIAM J. ANNEXSTAD, and ending DAVID J. WESTERN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1924 AIR FORCE nomination of Robert P. McCoy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 22, 2014.

PN1925 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL E. COGHLAN, and ending AJAY K. OJHA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 22, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

PN1765 ARMY nomination of Burton C. Glover, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 10, 2014.

PN1767 ARMY nomination of Paul A. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 10, 2014.

PN1890 ARMY nominations (51) beginning ALEKSANDR BARON, and ending RYAN D. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1891 ARMY nominations (273) beginning CARLO J. ALPHONSO, and ending JORDAN E. YOKLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1892 ARMY nomination of Desiree S. Dirge, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1926 ARMY nomination of Nealanjon P. Das, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 22, 2014.

PN1928 ARMY nominations (3) beginning YONG K. CHO, and ending THOMAS A. STARKOSKI, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 22, 2014.

IN THE NAVY

PN1893 NAVY nominations (858) beginning JOHN I. ACTKINSON, and ending ROBERT E. ZUBECK, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1894 NAVY nominations (133) beginning CHRISTOPHER W. ACOR, and ending RICHARD P. ZABAWA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1895 NAVY nominations (48) beginning MATE W. AERANDIR, and ending JACQUELINEMAR W. WRONA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1896 NAVY nominations (38) beginning CHRISTIAN G. ACORD, and ending BRIAN P. WORDEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1897 NAVY nominations (50) beginning AARON N. AARON, and ending CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1898 NAVY nominations (18) beginning BRIAN F. BRESHEARS, and ending DAVID A. ZIEMBA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1899 NAVY nominations (10) beginning DANIEL J. BRADSHAW, and ending ROSS

W. PETERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1900 NAVY nominations (12) beginning ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON, and ending TIFFANI B. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1901 NAVY nominations (17) beginning JAMES C. BAILEY, and ending AMANDA J. WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1902 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIC S. KINZBRUNNER, and ending ERIC M. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1903 NAVY nominations (47) beginning JERMAINE A. BAILEY, and ending JEREMIAH J. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1904 NAVY nominations (31) beginning JEMAR R. BALLESTEROS, and ending ANNE L. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1905 NAVY nomination of Christopher A. Cegielski, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1906 NAVY nominations (42) beginning KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI, and ending JOSHUA D. WEISS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1907 NAVY nominations (30) beginning FERDINAND D. ABRIL, and ending ALLEN E. WILLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1908 NAVY nominations (25) beginning MICHAEL D. AMEDICK, and ending DENNIS M. WHEELER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1909 NAVY nominations (50) beginning KERRY E. BAKER, and ending MICHAEL D. WINN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1910 NAVY nominations (34) beginning KENNETH R. BASFORD, and ending JOHN P. ZALAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1911 NAVY nominations (15) beginning BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR., and ending SYLVAIN W. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1912 NAVY nominations (39) beginning KEVIN S. BAILEY, and ending THEODOR A. ZAINAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1913 NAVY nominations (22) beginning DAVID L. BELL, JR., and ending NATHAN J. WONDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1914 NAVY nominations (111) beginning RUBEN D. ACOSTA, and ending DAVID M. YOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 17, 2014.

PN1929 NAVY nomination of Adam J. Rains, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 22, 2014.

JASON CRISP FOREST SERVICE BUILDING

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4360, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4360) to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the "Jason Crisp Forest Service Building".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

OFFICER JASON CRISP

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor U.S. Forest Service Officer Jason Crisp.

On March 12, 2014, Officer Crisp and his K-9 partner Maros lost their lives during a manhunt for an individual suspected of murdering his parents earlier that day.

Officer Crisp lived in Marion, NC, located in the western part of the State. After graduating from the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in 2005, he became an officer for the Forest Service. He had previously served as a deputy sheriff in the McDowell County Sheriff's Office.

Officer Crisp's tragic death is a reminder of the countless men and women in law enforcement who put their safety at risk to protect our communities every day.

In honor of Officer Crisp's bravery, and his service to North Carolina and to the Forest Service, I am pleased the Senate will approve H.R. 4360, a bill to designate a Ranger Station within the Grandfather Ranger District in North Carolina, the "Jason Crisp Forest Service Building."

The new Jason Crisp Building will serve as a lasting tribute to the ultimate sacrifice Officer Crisp made in service to our country.

Officer Crisp leaves behind his wife, Amanda, his two sons Garret and Logan, as well as his parents, a sister, and two brothers. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4360) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMBATING AUTISM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4631, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4631) to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PRYOR. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4631) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVING TRAUMA CARE ACT OF 2014

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3548, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3548) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3548) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. GRAY III 30TH STREET STATION

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4838 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4838) to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as "30th Street Station," as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PRYOR. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4838) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RELATING TO THE APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR NUCLEAR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 494, S.J. Res. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment.

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

S.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL.

(a) Congress does favor the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, signed on May 6, 2014, in this joint resolution referred to as the "Agreement".

(b) Notwithstanding section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the Agreement becomes effective in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution and other applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 2. THIRTY-YEAR LIMIT ON CIVIL NUCLEAR ENGAGEMENT.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be used to implement any aspect of an agreement for civil nuclear cooperation pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) after the date that is 30 years after the date of entry into force of such agreement unless—

(1) the President, within the final five years of the agreement, has certified to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that the party to such agreement has continued to fulfill the terms and conditions of the agreement and that the agreement continues to be in the interest of the United States; and

(2) Congress enacts a joint resolution permitting the continuation of the agreement for an additional period of not more than 30 years.

(b) The restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any agreement that had entered into force as of August 1, 2014;

(2) any agreement with the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) or the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); or

(3) any amendment to an agreement described in paragraph (1) or (2).

SEC. 3. APPLICABLE LAW.

Each proposed nuclear export pursuant to an agreement shall be subject to United States laws and regulations in effect at the time of each such export.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION ASSESSMENT STATEMENTS.

(a) The Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement required to be submitted by the Secretary of State to the President pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) shall also be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and shall be accompanied by a classified annex, prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, identifying and explaining all classified information related to the agreement to which such Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement applies, and shall, in addition to any other requirements pursuant to law, include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the consistency of the text of the proposed agreement for cooperation with all the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and this Act, with specific attention to whether the proposed agreement is consistent with each criterion set forth in subsection a. of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(2) An assessment of the adequacy of safeguards and other control mechanisms and the peaceful use assurances contained in the agreement for cooperation to ensure that any assistance furnished thereunder will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose.

(3) A historical review and assessment of past proliferation activity of the cooperating party, or suspect activity identified by any element of the intelligence community in its review of raw or processed intelligence information, including all activities that are potentially inconsistent with a peaceful nuclear program and any potential delivery mechanisms of concern.

(4) A list of all the treaties and agreements related to non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to which the cooperating party is also a party.

(5) An assessment of the cooperating party's current national laws that govern the non-proliferation of materials or equipment related to weapons of mass destruction, including any chemical, biological, or nuclear material, plutonium, uranium-233, high enriched uranium, or irradiated source material or special fissionable material.

(6) An explanation for the negotiated duration of the agreement, including an explanation of the renewal and termination procedures.

(7) A comparison of the agreement to other existing civil nuclear cooperation agreements between the United States and other states in the region.

(8) An assessment of the strategic, security, stability, and regional considerations throughout the negotiation of this agreement.

(9) An assessment of the physical and environmental security of the waste-cycle, ensuring the agreement addresses international concerns, including international and local response.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term “cooperating party” shall mean an entity with which the United States proposes to enter into an agreement for cooperation under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and shall include—

(A) the government of such cooperating party;

(B) any person authorized by or who acts with the knowledge of the government of such cooperating party; or

(C) any person who acts within the territory of the cooperating party.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. PRYOR. I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36), as amended, was passed.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF EXIT PERMIT ISSUANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 495, S. Res. 502.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 502) concerning the suspension of exit permit issuance by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo for adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an amendment to the preamble.

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

S. RES. 502

Whereas according to UNICEF, over 4,000,000 orphans are estimated to be living in the Democratic Republic of Congo;

Whereas cyclical and violent conflict has plagued the Democratic Republic of Congo since the mid-1990s;

Whereas the United States has made significant financial investments in the Democratic Republic of Congo, providing an estimated \$274,000,000 bilateral aid to the Democratic Republic of Congo in fiscal year 2013 and an additional \$165,000,000 in emergency humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the policy of the United States Government toward the Democratic Republic of Congo is “focused on helping the country become a nation that . . . provides for the basic needs of its citizens”;

Whereas the United Nations, the Hague Conference on Private International Law, and other international organizations have recognized that a child should grow up in a family environment;

Whereas adoption, both domestic and international, is an important child protection tool and an integral part of child welfare best practices around the world, along with family reunification and prevention of abandonment;

Whereas, on September 27, 2013, the Congolese Ministry of Interior and Security, General Directorate of Migration, informed the United States Embassy in Kinshasa that effective September 25, 2013, they had suspended issuance of exit permits to adopted Congolese children seeking to depart the country with their adoptive parents;

Whereas there are United States families with finalized adoptions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the necessary legal paperwork and visas ready to travel home with these children but are currently unable to do so; and

Whereas, on December 19, 2013, the Congolese Minister of Justice, Minister of Interior and Security, and the General Directorate of Migration confirmed to members of the United States Department of State that the current suspension on the issuance of exit permits continues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, *That the Senate—*

[(1) affirms that all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent family;

[(2) recognizes the importance of ensuring that international adoptions of all children are conducted in an ethical and transparent manner;

[(3) expresses concern over the impact on children and families caused by the current suspension of exit permit issuance within the Democratic Republic of Congo;

[(4) respectfully requests that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo—

[(A) resume processing adoption cases and issuing exit permits via the Ministry of Gender and Family's Interministerial Adoption Committee and Directorate of General Migration;

[(B) prioritize the processing of intercountry adoptions which were initiated before the suspension; and

[(C) expedite the processing of those adoptions which involve medically fragile children; and

[(5) encourages continued dialogue and cooperation between the United States Department of State and the Democratic Republic of the Congo's Ministry of Foreign Affairs to improve the intercountry adoption process and ensure the welfare of all children adopted from the Democratic Republic of Congo.]

That the Senate—

(1) affirms that all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent family;

(2) recognizes the importance of ensuring that international adoptions of all children are conducted in an ethical and transparent manner;

(3) expresses concern over the impact on children and families caused by the current suspension of exit permit issuance within the Democratic Republic of Congo;

(4) respectfully requests that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo—

(A) resume processing adoption cases and issuing exit permits via the Ministry of Gender and Family's Interministerial Adoption Committee and General Directorate of Migration;

(B) prioritize the processing of intercountry adoptions which were initiated before the suspension; and

(C) expedite the processing of those adoptions which involve medically fragile children; and

(5) encourages continued dialogue and cooperation between the United States Department of State and the Democratic Republic of the Congo's Ministry of Foreign Affairs to improve the intercountry adoption process and ensure the welfare of all children adopted from the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 502), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 496, S. Res. 513.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 513) honoring the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

WARSAW UPRISING 70TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising of 1944.

I am proud to stand here today to remember the heroism of the men and women who took part in the Warsaw Uprising. On August 1, 1944, the Polish Home Army was ordered to mobilize against the German forces. The Red Army had retreated to the outskirts of Warsaw and the Polish people believed the German forces would choose to withdraw. They choose this moment to stand up and try to liberate Warsaw before the Soviet forces could take control of the city.

The Polish Home Army consisted of 40,000 brave soldiers, including 4,000 women. They lacked weapons and supplies but proved to be a challenging force against the German Army. In response, Heinrich Himmler ordered all of the people of Warsaw killed and the city razed to the ground to stand as an example to the people of Europe.

The Polish Resistance fought bravely to liberate and protect their capital and their nation. But the Nazis were determined to crush the resistance. After 63 days of fighting, the German Army overcame the courageous Polish resistance. As a result, 85 percent of the city of Warsaw had been destroyed by the end of World War II.

The actions of the Polish people during the Warsaw Uprising serve as an inspiration to all people fighting for their right to freedom and dignity. To this day, their legacy stands as a testament to the Polish character. It is for these reasons that I am honored to mark the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising, which serves as a symbol of heroism and the strength of the human spirit.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 513) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, July 29, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MALAYSIA AIRLINES FLIGHT 17

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 497, S. Res. 520.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 520) condemning the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 and expressing condolences to the families of the victims.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I further ask that the resolution be agreed to; the Murphy amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3779) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To make a technical correction)

In the fourth whereas clause of the preamble, insert "more than" before "10 additional aircraft".

The resolution (S. Res. 520) was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 520

Whereas, on July 17, 2014, Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 tragically crashed in eastern Ukraine, killing all 298 passengers and crew, including 80 children;

Whereas President Barack Obama has offered President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko all possible assistance to determine the cause of the crash, including the services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Transportation Safety Board;

Whereas intelligence analysis shows that the plane was shot down by an anti-aircraft missile fired from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists;

Whereas separatists have shot down 10 additional aircraft and took credit for shooting down another aircraft at approximately the same time as Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 crashed in eastern Ukraine;

Whereas separatists blocked international experts from accessing the crash site in the first 72 hours, preventing the proper care of the victims' bodies and allowing evidence from the crash to be removed and mishandled;

Whereas weapons and fighters have continued to flow across the border from the Russian Federation to eastern Ukraine, and there is evidence that the Government of the Russian Federation has been providing training to separatists fighters, including training on air defense systems;

Whereas this tragic incident has demonstrated that European and other foreign citizens are at risk from dangerous instability in Ukraine;

Whereas, on July 21, 2014, the United Nations Security Council condemned in the strongest terms the downing of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 and demanded that those responsible be held to account and that all states fully cooperate with efforts to establish accountability;

Whereas British Prime Minister David Cameron asserted, "Russia cannot expect to continue enjoying access to European markets, European capital and European knowledge and technical expertise while she fuels conflict in one of Europe's neighbors."; and

Whereas the United States Government has continued to implement sanctions against Russian and Ukrainian individuals responsible for destabilizing Ukraine and failing to end the violence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the shooting down of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 in Eastern Ukraine that resulted in the deaths of all 298 passengers and crew;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the families of the victims and the people of the Netherlands, Malaysia, Australia, Indonesia, Great Britain, Germany, Belgium, the Philippines, Canada, and New Zealand;

(3) supports the ongoing international investigation into the attack on Malaysian Airlines Flight 17, including unobstructed access to the crash site;

(4) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately stop the flow of weapons and fighters across the border with

Ukraine, allow an Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) monitoring mission on the border, and fully cooperate with the international investigation currently underway; and

(5) urges the European Union to join the United States Government in holding the Government of the Russian Federation accountable for its destabilizing actions in Ukraine through the use of increased sanctions.

AFRICAN LEADERS SUMMIT

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. Res. 522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 522) expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the U.S.-Africa Leaders Summit to be held in Washington, D.C., from August 4 through 6, 2014.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

U.S.-AFRICA SUMMIT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as chairman of the subcommittee responsible for funding and oversight of our Nation's foreign assistance budget, I have witnessed firsthand the significant gains achieved by many African countries over the last 20 years.

This progress has been driven by the ingenuity and hard work of the African people, and has been supported by U.S. assistance provided by the American people and others. I am pleased that so many African leaders will be coming to Washington next week for the U.S.-Africa Summit to discuss how we can continue to grow partnerships between the U.S. and their countries.

However, I am disappointed by the lack of attention to human rights and the rule of law in connection with the summit. There is no doubt that for peace and equitable economic development to flourish on the African continent, investment is needed to spur economic growth and security cooperation is needed to foster stability. But without a commitment to fundamental human rights and the rule of law, these efforts cannot be sustained.

That is why I support the administration's exclusion of three of Africa's worst human rights abusers, Omar al-Bashir, Robert Mugabe, and Isaias Afwerki, who have no place in these discussions. But it is also why I am disappointed there will be leaders present who have been credibly implicated in gross violations of human rights and significant corruption, including President Teodoro Obiang Nguema Mbasogo of Equatorial Guinea. President Obiang has used events like these as propaganda to shed his image as a brutally corrupt dictator. He should not be sit-

ting down to an invitation-only dinner at the White House while his political opponents languish in jail.

While I support the intent of this summit, and the continued growth of our relationship with African leaders who are dedicated to improving the lives of their people, I cannot support the hospitality provided to those who use their offices to silence their critics and treat their countries' natural resources as their own personal bank account.

I hope the White House and State Department will insist that the rule of law and fundamental freedoms including the freedoms of expression, association, and religion remain a common theme during discussions on economic and security cooperation. These are not just American values, they are universal human rights.

In the long run, our commitment to our own principle will ensure that the assistance we provide yields sustainable results for the good of the people of Africa and the United States.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, July 29, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REAUTHORIZING THE MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 503, S. 231.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 231) to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Multinational Species Conservation Funds

Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2(c)(2) of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (39 U.S.C. 416 note) is amended by striking "2 years" and inserting "6 years".

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 532, S. Res. 533, S. Res. 534, and S. Res. 535.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles, where applicable, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2772 AND S. 2773

Mr. PRYOR. I understand there are two bills at the desk and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2772) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2773) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRYOR. I now ask for a second reading and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader and the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 110-298, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board: Mike Hettich of Kentucky.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader and the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 110-298, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the

State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board: Michael Harris of Nevada.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 107-12, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Review Board: Berl Perdue of Kentucky.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 1,
2014

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Friday, August 1, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, there will be no votes tomorrow. The next rollcall vote will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 8.

GRIDLOCK IN CONGRESS

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, before we close the Senate before the August recess, I just want to speak for 1 minute.

We all heard the exchange earlier between the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator ENZI, and Senator CARPER also participated, about appointing ambassadors. I think it is a sad day for America when our gridlock, the gridlock that the Congress has created, makes it to where we cannot appoint our ambassadors to go overseas to represent our great Nation and to be our representatives there in these countries, many of which are struggling, and many of which have a lot of tensions either with us, the United States, or their neighbors or other countries in the world.

I think our country is suffering because of the gridlock and I must say that the fault rests with all of us. We are elected to be leaders, and we are not showing leadership by not working through these difficult issues and allowing the basics of government, including our ambassadors to be appointed.

I must say there is a simple solution to all of this, and it is not something that is found in a new political science textbook, it is not something that some talking head on a TV show has

proposed. There is some ancient wisdom that we all should follow, and that is the Golden Rule. We should do unto others as we would have others do unto us. If we would follow that, if all of us would take that to heart and apply that to our business here in the U.S. Senate and the business of the Nation, it would be revolutionary in how we conduct our business.

That is the only way to fix it. You have to approach this job as a public servant and to do what is right for the country, not for your party or not for some individual agenda. I hope when we are all home during the August recess we will hear some of that from our constituents and we will bring that back in September and we will rededicate ourselves to getting the business of the Nation done.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, August 1, 2014, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICERS AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE AND RECIPIENTS OF THE HOUSE EMPLOYEE EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member ROBERT BRADY and I rise today to congratulate and recognize the outstanding employees of the Officers (Clerk of the House, Sergeant at Arms, and Chief Administrative Officer) and the Inspector General of the U.S. House of Representatives who have reached the milestone of 25 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as the recipients of the House Employee Excellence Award.

The House's most important asset is its dedicated and exceptional employees, whose work, which is often behind the scenes, is vital in keeping the operations and services of the House running smoothly and efficiently. The employees we recognize today are acknowledged and commended for their hard work, dedication, professionalism, support of House Members and their staffs and constituents, and for their contributions day-in and day-out to the overall operations of the House. These employees have a wide range of responsibilities and skills that support the legislative process, ensure the security of the institution, maintain our technology and service infrastructure, and contribute to a more effective and efficiently operating House support structure. They have accomplished many great things in a wide range of activities, and the House of Representatives and its Members, staff, and the American public is better served because of them.

We recognize and honor the individuals named below for 25 years of dedicated service to the House. Collectively, this group has provided 325 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives:

David E. Bailey, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Cephas L. Carter, Office of the Clerk;

Antoinette P. Freeman, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Anthony T. Howard, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Carlos Leon-Campos, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Michael P. Mallon, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

William B. Plaster, Office of the Clerk;

Vincent H. Plowden, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Wallace A. Simpson, Office of the Sergeant at Arms;

Susan E. Sneden, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Jerome B. Williams, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Waverly Y. Williams, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Diane E. Wilson, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

We also recognize and congratulate four House employees for receiving the Employee Excellence Award. This is a merit-based award, given to one employee from each House Officer organization, and the Office of Inspector General. Selected employees exhibited outstanding overall job performance and displayed a willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty for their organization throughout the last year. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this prestigious award.

Russell H. Gore, Office of the Clerk;

Joyce L. Hamlett, Office of the Sergeant at Arms;

Christopher Jordan, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer;

Susan E. Simpson, Office of Inspector General.

On behalf of the entire House community, I extend our congratulations and once again recognize and thank these employees for their professionalism and commitment to the U.S. House of Representatives as a whole, and in particular to their respective House Officers and the Inspector General. Their long hours and hard work are invaluable, and their years of unwavering service, dedication, and commitment to the House set an example for their colleagues and other employees who will follow in their footsteps. I celebrate our honorees, and I am proud to stand before you and the nation on their behalf to recognize the importance of their public service.

CONGRATULATING DANSBY SWANSON, 2014 COLLEGE WORLD SERIES' MOST OUTSTANDING PLAYER

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Marietta native, Marietta High School Alumnus, and Vanderbilt second baseman, Dansby Swanson, on his accomplishments in the 2014 NCAA College World Series.

Swanson was awarded the College World Series' Most Outstanding Player Award and was an incredible asset in helping Vanderbilt clinch its first College World Series Championship.

Throughout the 2014 season, Swanson became one of the key players on Vanderbilt's

tremendously talented roster and was key in Vandy's 3–2 victory over the University of Virginia in the final to cap off a landmark 50 win season.

Just a sophomore, Swanson batted .323 with five runs scored and two RBI in Omaha—the most impressive performance of any player in the tournament.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I applaud Dansby for his achievement and look forward to his future successes. I extend my enthusiastic congratulations to him on achieving the highest level of recognition possible in the NCAA College World Series.

CONGRATULATING ETHICON ON 50-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ethicon, a member of the Johnson & Johnson family, in San Angelo, Texas on their 50th anniversary. Throughout the years, Ethicon has been an essential part of the community and has grown side-by-side with San Angelo.

Ethicon opened its doors in West Texas in 1964. During this time, Ethicon was a surgical suture manufacturing site that was critical to the Vietnam War effort. Over the past five decades, the company has expanded and modernized their production to meet the needs of today's world.

Ethicon has been a global leader in providing medical supplies for critical and life-saving procedures. Their standard of excellence is not only evident in the lives they have saved, but the families they have impacted across this nation.

The Ethicon family gathered last week to celebrate this tremendous 50-year milestone together. The smiles on the faces of their 450 employees, their families, and friends said it all. They have provided opportunities and inspiration for their people. This company is so much more than a job or a shift to its employees or this community; it is a source of pride. And I am proud to have Ethicon located in the 11th District and honored to be part of their joyous occasion.

Again, I congratulate Ethicon on reaching such a distinguished marker in their company history. I wish them many more in the great town of San Angelo, Texas.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN HONOR OF JOHN PISTO

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of a remarkable American who has spent the last half century helping to turn food into public art. John Pisto is one of the original celebrity chefs. He is part of the cutting edge group of restaurant professionals who have brought the creativity, artisanship, art, and excitement of America's best professional kitchens to the attention of the general public. And in doing so he has helped make his hometown of Monterey, California, one of the world's finest culinary treasures.

Chef Pisto was born in Syracuse New York, on October 16, 1941. His Italian immigrant parents, Santo and Santa Pisto, soon moved to Monterey, CA where Santo worked as a tailor for the Naval Postgraduate School. After graduating from Monterey High School, Pisto began work as a line cook at a fish house on Fisherman's Wharf, adjacent to Monterey harbor. Within a couple years he had learned, saved, and bought the place. The fish house began to acquire a large local following and soon celebrities such as Clint Eastwood and Doug McClure began flocking to what was one of the few wharf restaurants that actually served fresh fish harvested from the Monterey Bay.

After years of working as a top line chef, Pisto found his calling in developing new restaurants. Pisto first established Domenico's on the Wharf in the late 80's, then followed up with the Abalonetti Seafood Trattoria, followed by Paradiso Trattoria, and finally the Whaling Station. Located in the heart of Monterey's famous Cannery Row, Pisto's Whaling Station has earned an international reputation for some of the world's best steaks and freshest seafood. Each of these creations have both boosted the Monterey Peninsula's dynamic tourism industry and added to Monterey's hometown charm for its own residents.

However, Pisto is best known as the host of "Monterey's Cookin' Pisto Style". His unique style of cooking brings simplicity to recipes thought difficult to prepare, always with a touch of humor and informality. Pisto will often take viewers on adventures to culinary exploits around the world, then return to kitchen to prepare a recipe related to the excursion. The show has been filmed in China, Tunisia, Italy, France, Thailand, Portugal, Spain, Costa Rica, and Croatia, as well as dozens of U.S. locales. Celebrity guests have also been brought onto to the show, such as the legendary Julia Child, renown chef Charlie Trotter, musicians Michael Bolton, Johnny Rivers, Sammy Hagar, racing legend Mario Andretti, and the past Secretary of Defense and personal friend, Leon Panetta.

As Pisto slows down his schedule after years of dynamic work, it is appropriate to reflect on how much he has enriched our lives. And while he may let his business involvement cool down to a low simmer, I know that Pisto will continue to enrich the community that has benefited so much from his efforts over the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in offering John Pisto, his wife Cheryl, son Dana, and daughters Kim and Gia our gratitude and best wishes. Buon appetito!

CELEBRATING DR. LOWELL DILLER**HON. JARED HUFFMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Dr. Lowell Diller on the occasion of his retirement from Green Diamond Resource Co. Dr. Diller's commitment and pioneering approach to scientific research and monitoring of fisheries and wildlife has been of tremendous benefit to California's North Coast and the United States.

Dr. Diller earned bachelors and masters degrees in zoology from Oregon State University before serving in the U.S. Army from 1970 to 1971, with a tour in Vietnam. He then attended the University of Idaho, where he earned a Ph.D. in zoology with a focus on herpetology.

In 1990, Dr. Diller was hired by Simpson Timber Co., now Green Diamond Resource Co. Dr. Diller developed a Habitat Conservation Plan for northern spotted owls for the company, the first for the species. The company now has the largest demographic data set within the range of the northern spotted owl. Dr. Diller was integral in developing Green Diamond's Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan which covers the company's 457,000 acres in California.

Dr. Diller brought a passion for teaching to Humboldt State University's Department of Wildlife Management, where he is an adjunct professor since 2001. He has contributed to at least 37 peer-reviewed publications and major reports. Dr. Diller is a member of the California Board of Forestry Research and Science Committee and a member of the Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Team.

Dr. Diller's career in research and conservation will leave its mark for generations to come. Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Dr. Lowell Verne Diller for his long and impressive record of service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ELI SETENCICH**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Eli Setencich, who passed away on July 12, 2014, at the age of 90. Eli was a veteran of America's greatest generation who will be greatly missed by residents throughout Central Valley.

Eli was born on April 10, 1924, in Sacramento, California and later moved to Sanger, California to live with relatives upon his mother's passing. In 1941, he graduated from Sanger High School and joined the Army Air

Corps. During World War II, Eli flew 142 combat missions. He flew the A-36 Apache and P-47 Thunderbolt. Eli always showed great courage and superior flying ability during his combat missions. His service, heroism, and extraordinary achievements were recognized with two Distinguished Flying Cross awards.

In 1944, upon receiving his first Distinguished Flying Cross for the combat mission he completed in Italy, Eli was promoted from First Lieutenant to Captain. In 1945, Eli received his second Distinguished Flying Cross after flying a combat mission in Germany. He exhibited great leadership and determination.

When the war ended, Eli continued his service at the 144th Fighter Wing of the California Air National Guard. Later, he attended College of the Sequoias and began his legacy in journalism. After working in the radio and television industry for a short time, he started his remarkable career at The Fresno Bee. Eli worked at The Bee for 41 years. He started out writing a weekly column, and later in his career, he was writing three columns a week. In 2002, Eli retired, and the contributions he made to the paper and the field of journalism were highly commended. Eli was a very insightful journalist, and his writing was both witty and humorous. His way with words could go unmatched.

Eli was a mentor and friend to countless individuals. His humble demeanor and ability to poke fun at himself was always refreshing. Eli will be greatly missed by his wife, Yvonne, daughter, Amy, and two grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to honor the life of Eli Setencich, an American hero and distinguished journalist. His presence will undoubtedly be missed, but the impact he made on our community will never be forgotten.

HONORING PAUL AND EMMA ESKER**HON. ANDY BARR**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Paul and Emma Esker for their many contributions to healthcare, education and the arts in Madison County, Kentucky. The leadership of both these citizens has been evident and invaluable to Richmond and throughout Madison County.

In particular, I would like to recognize the Eskers' dedication to the Pattie A. Clay Regional Medical Center and its Infirmary Association, and to Baptist Health Richmond. Mr. Esker served as a member of the Pattie A. Clay Foundation Board of Directors from 2005 to 2012, and has worked at the hospital as a Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist since 1973.

Mrs. Esker served as the St. Mark Catholic Church representative to the Pattie A. Clay Infirmary Association and as a member of its Board of Directors from 2001 to 2012. In 2013, she joined the board of Baptist Health Foundation Richmond. She also served the

community as president of the St. Mark Catholic School Board and as a director of the Richmond Area Arts Council. She is a retired Radiology Technician who was employed at Baptist Health Richmond.

The retirement of Mr. and Mrs. Esker on August 1, 2014 marks the end of decades of quiet, selfless commitment to Madison County and beyond. Their service is a role model and inspiration to many, and has made a real difference to generations.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF MADISON, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the Borough of Madison, County of Morris, New Jersey.

The first residents of the borough of Madison were Lenape Indians with small villages located near rivers and streams. In 1715, when the first European settler, Barnabas Carter, reached what would become Madison, the Lenape had already left the area. The Presbyterian Church of South Hanover acquired a piece of land from Carter and built a meeting-house on it. This place, known as "Bottle Hill," became a center for Presbyterianism.

When the Revolutionary War began, the 20 families who resided in Bottle Hill joined the Morris County militia. The group was led by Reverend Azariah Horton, a Presbyterian minister. Bottle Hill provided a direct route to and from Morristown. The town served as a camp for the largest Continental Army in the Revolutionary War during the winter of 1777. Officers took up quarters in Bottle Hill, and General George Washington was offered hospitality in homes that are still located on Ridgedale Avenue today.

Once a part of South Hanover, Bottle Hill was divided between Morris and Hanover Townships until 1806 when the village joined with Florham Park, Chatham Township, and Chatham Borough to create one Chatham Township. Bottle Hill was the name originally given to Madison, and there are two beliefs surrounding this moniker. One idea is that the name is derived from the bottle-like shape of the town's original land, which was formed by two hills. The other, more likely idea, comes from a tavern that was once located on top of a hill at the meeting of Park and Ridgedale avenues that advertised by hanging a bottle-shaped sign outside. The nickname is also used for Madison's annual "Bottle Hill Day" street fair. In 1834, to pay tribute to James Madison, the fourth President of the United States and father of the U.S. Constitution, Bottle Hill's name was changed to Madison. In 1889, Madison seceded from Chatham Township to create the Borough of Madison.

In the mid-1800s, Madison was nicknamed "The Rose City" during a time when Madison was a popular destination for wealthy families from New York City seeking fresh-air and an

area on which to build their country homes. So as to ornament their estates, these families wanted fresh flowers every day. Thus, they used individual greenhouses to grow roses for themselves and, later in 1856, for the commercial market. The growth of Madison's rose production was made possible by the Morris and Essex Railroad service that began in 1937. Roses and rose shows in Madison became internationally known, and working-class immigrants from Germany, Italy, and Ireland were attracted to Madison because of jobs in the rose industry and on the estates there. The descendants of these ancestors that still reside in Madison make it the diverse municipality that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating with the residents and the officials that represent the wonderful Borough of Madison on the occasion of their one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,621,751,199,943.72. We've added \$6,994,874,151,030.64 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE DESIGNATION OF A PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL ENVOY TO THE BALKANS

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution to recommend the designation of a Presidential Special Envoy to the Balkans.

In November of 1995 the United States government spearheaded a series of peace talks in Dayton, Ohio ending more than three years of warfare and genocide plaguing the Croats of the Balkans. Ultimately, from those talks stemmed the Dayton Peace Accords, establishing the new nation-state of Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, as time has lapsed for the Dayton Peace Accords the U.S. has made no attempt to revisit the many faults in the original agreements. The time has come to lend our services in aid of the Republic of Croatia and effect positive, and lasting diplomatic change.

While the U.S. has demanded that the Bosnian people initiate these revisions themselves, we have witnessed a nation-state with great political and economic potential fall back

into violent patterns. As the Representative of the 44th district of California, an area steeped in Croatian culture, I have heard firsthand the concerns arising from growing political instability in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian region. This region is integral to the future success of our interdependent international community. We have an obligation to support the democratic and free market progress that has been hard won over the last two decades.

Therefore, I call upon this 113th Congress to designate a special presidential envoy to evaluate the successes and shortcomings of the Dayton Peace Accords, and to provide tangible policy recommendations to the Republic of Croatia. It is my greatest hope that the United States can be a catalyst for change and success in the new Bosnia-Herzegovina region.

SUPPORT FOR THE WORK OF ECODISTRICTS

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to express my support for the work of EcoDistricts, a national organization founded in my district in Portland, Oregon, and which fosters innovation, community action, and sustainability at the neighborhood level.

I have spent my career working to build livable communities in my hometown of Portland and around the country. These are communities where people are safe, economically secure and healthy. The EcoDistrict model has achieved great success in achieving this goal by starting small and engaging neighbors, local businesses, and government in the process of improving communities and creating spaces where employers want to locate and families want to live.

We have seen the success of Portland's EcoDistricts, which are diverse and range from downtown near Portland State University, to the Lents neighborhood in the Southeast part of the city. This is an area that has struggled for decades with crime, air quality, transportation access, and equity issues. The engagement fostered by these districts helped approve a project to stripe bike lanes on the major arterial to Lents, a farmers market now runs every Sunday through the summer that features local immigrant communities, and volunteers are helping kids create gardens at three neighborhood schools.

The EcoDistrict model and process does more than just set goals and implement projects. It helps neighbors identify shared values and work together to make their shared spaces fit those values. I am thrilled that this model has since been expanded to other cities around the country, and look forward to continued success stories.

Thank you to the EcoDistrict team, and to the leaders involved in this initiative, for continuing this important on-the-ground work to make communities across the nation more livable.

CELEBRATING THE RUSSIAN
RIVER HEALTH CENTER 40TH AN-
NIVERSARY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Russian River Health Center on the occasion of the organization's 40th Anniversary Celebration and National Health Centers Week on August 15, 2014.

For four decades, the Russian River Health Center has been recognized as an invaluable asset within the community and has continued to serve the growing and diverse needs of the people of West Sonoma County. The Center's HIV program has become a model and a leader in the integration of HIV care in a primary care setting and continues to provide care to people affected by the disease and reduce the spread of it in our community. In 2002, West County Health Centers became a Federally Qualified Health Center ensuring ongoing funding to care for low-income and uninsured patients.

Russian River Health Center has had an incredible impact on the community it serves and will continue to provide vital health care for many years to come. Please join me in expressing hearty congratulations to the Russian River Health Center on the occasion of their fortieth anniversary.

HONORING ALLEN JACOB WEBB

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Allen Jacob Webb. Allen is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 43, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Allen has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Allen has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Allen has earned the rank of Runner in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Allen has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Allen restored a grave box at Mt. Mora cemetery, the oldest operating cemetery in Saint Joseph, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Allen Jacob Webb for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING CARLTON SMITH, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF HEAVY EQUIPMENT RESOURCES OF FLORIDA, INC. (HERO FL), UPON RECEIVING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S 2014 REGIONAL AND STATE OF FLORIDA SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jacksonville's very own Carlton Smith, Executive Vice President of Heavy Equipment Resources of Florida, Inc. (HERO FL), upon receiving the Small Business Administration's 2014 Regional and State of Florida Small Business Exporter of the Year Award. It is an honor to represent Carlton and his thriving export company, located in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida. Small businesses, like HERO FL, are the backbone of this country and are job creators that are revitalizing our nation's economy.

HERO FL began in 2008, when Carlton, his father Leslie, and uncle George, decided to take advantage of the opportunities that the expansion of JAXPORT had to offer. Expanding on their already successful commercial landscaping business, Carlton saw an opportunity to branch out internationally, exporting machinery and other materials to construction and mining industries across the globe. And so, HERO FL was born.

HERO FL began specializing in worldwide exports of components, spare parts, and heavy machinery to mining and earthmoving industries. The company's ability to deliver hard-to-find parts quickly and efficiently to remote mining locations throughout the world has deservedly garnered a lot of attention.

In addition to the prestigious Small Business Administration award, HERO FL was recently honored with the President's "E" Award for its efforts to expand national exports. Created under President John F. Kennedy, the "E" Award recognizes people, firms or organizations that make major contributions in U.S. exports. Today, the "E" Award is the highest recognition any U.S. entity can receive for noteworthy export promotion efforts.

Due to HERO FL's success, today, 100 percent of its revenue stems from export sales and from 2010 to 2013, HERO FL's sales grew an astounding 344 percent. This is a true American success story and should serve as inspiration for all small business owners. I am proud that the First Coast can claim Carlton Smith and his prosperous company as its own.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and Members of the House of Representatives join me in this very special congressional salute to Carlton Smith and everyone at HERO FL.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
MAJOR JOSHUA S. KIRK, U.S.
MARINE CORPS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Major Joshua S. Kirk, United States Marine Corps, who recently passed away after over 10 years of service to our nation.

In 1999, Major Kirk, a native of my home state of Ohio, joined the United States Marine Corps and was commissioned in August 2000. He earned a law degree from the University of Virginia in 2004 and over the course of the next 10 years, held several positions around the world in service to his country as a Marine Corps Judge Advocate.

His assignments included Civil Law Officer and Trial Counsel at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar; Legal Assistance Officer in Charge, Senior Defense Counsel, and Chief Prosecutor at Marine Corps Base Hawaii; and Prosecutor in the Office of Military Commissions in Washington, DC. In 2006–2007, Major Kirk deployed to Iraq with the Third Marine Aircraft Wing in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom as the Deputy Staff Judge Advocate. He has earned a variety of awards for his outstanding service to our country. His personal awards include the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal (two awards), Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (two awards).

I recognize Major Kirk's honorable commitment to our country and the sacrifices he made on its behalf. He is survived by his wife of 10 years, Lieutenant Commander Erin Quay, United States Navy, Judge Advocate General Corps, and his son, Aedan Kirk. It is an honor to stand in recognition of this dedicated military family.

CANCEL AUGUST RECESS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am disappointed that Congress plans to adjourn this August without addressing critical issues important to the American people.

I appreciate that district work periods allow Members to visit and work on behalf of their constituents. I am fortunate to commute from my home in Montross to Washington, DC on a daily basis, so I am in my district listening to the concerns of my constituents every day.

However, too much unfinished business remains, and too many important issues must still be addressed with a limited amount of time on the calendar. Congress has not completed its work, and our constituents expect us to stay and finish the job.

I am prepared to stay in Washington until we complete the people's work. As I have asked year after year, let's clear our schedule, halt the outdated tradition of adjourning for the month of August, and stay in Washington to

complete the work our constituents sent us here to do.

**HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
COLONEL GARY P. GOLDSTONE
OF THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE**

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of California's 29th district, I am proud to honor one of our most distinguished constituents and hometown heroes, Colonel Gary P. Goldstone of the United States Air Force. On August 6, 2014, Colonel Goldstone is retiring, after an incredible 26 years and 19 days of active duty service.

Colonel Goldstone has served our great country with dedication and honor beginning his military career as a candidate in the United States Air Force Officer Training School. He was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in 1989. In the time since then, Colonel Goldstone's career epitomizes leadership and selfless service. He has served his country extraordinarily well as a Commander at the Squadron, Group, Wing, and Installation levels of command. During those challenging command tours he deployed into austere conditions in foreign lands to command flying operations in combat and humanitarian missions. Further, Colonel Goldstone has flown all over the world as a command pilot in a variety of aircraft in service to the United States.

Colonel Goldstone attended California State University, Northridge, and graduated in 1987. He went on to earn his commission and the coveted Air Force pilot wings of silver at Laughlin Air Force Base Texas in the Smooth and Easy Class of 1990-07. He has nearly 4,000 flying hours (including over 630 hours of combat time) in the following aircraft: T-37, T-38, C-130E/H, EC-130H, EC-130J, KC-135R/T, C-17A, and C-21A. Colonel Goldstone's career has taken him to foreign lands and harsh living conditions and to the dynamic environment of the Chairman's Joint Staff in the Pentagon, the Headquarters Air Force Staff in the Pentagon, and the Headquarters Air Mobility Command Staff. Additionally, Colonel Goldstone has held key positions on every staff and concludes his career as Chief of the Strategic Planning Integration Division in the Directorate of Strategic Planning. He also serves as Chief of Staff at the Headquarters Air Force Total Force Task Force and the Total Force Continuum.

As testament to his exceptional service, Colonel Goldstone's military decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, Air Medal with five oak leaf clusters, Aerial Achievement Medal and the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Colonel Goldstone's wife of 25 years, Mary Goldstone, has also supported the Air Force mission, actively volunteering and holding a variety of positions primarily with spouse and family support organizations. Notably, she was

instrumental in reactivating the 16th Airlift Squadron spouses group while at Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina. Through her tireless commitment she expanded the group from approximately 30 spouses to 120 spouses by the time the Goldstones departed in June 2004. During this time she helped sponsor numerous morale-building socials, fundraisers, and welcome/farewells. These activities were vital toward promoting unity of effort and support for families, especially when active-duty members were deployed conducting combat operations.

During Colonel Goldstone's tour as the Scott Air Force Base Illinois Installation Commander, Mary shined as "The First Lady of Scott Air Force Base" by continuing her steadfast work primarily with families and spouses through groups such as Phoenix Spouses, Heartlink, and Newcomer's Orientations for spouses. She also worked closely with the Airman and Family Readiness Center to restart and revitalize various key programs.

Colonel and Mrs. Goldstone have two children, Garrett and Danielle. It is with great pride and honor that I extend my heartfelt appreciation to Colonel Gary Goldstone and his family for all of their sacrifice and service, and wish them well in all future endeavors.

Colonel Goldstone has set a truly inspiring example of dedication to the defense of freedom, service before self, and what it means to be an Officer and Gentleman.

**RECOGNIZING THOMAS McNABB ON
COMPLETION OF 30 YEARS AS
THE NATIONAL SECRETARY OF
THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS
OF AMERICA**

HON. DANIEL B. MAFFEI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thomas McNabb on his completion of 30 years as the National Secretary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America (AOH).

Thomas McNabb was born and raised in Auburn, New York, where he joined the Auburn Hibernian Division in 1955. Known as "Mr. Hibernian" around town, Tom has served his division in every capacity. He started many local Irish-American traditions such as the Friends of Ireland Annual St. Patrick's Day Luncheon; he was also the founder of Auburn's Irish Festival.

Thomas McNabb also served on the AOH New York State Board as Secretary, Treasurer, Organizer, State Director, and Vice President. Tom rose through the ranks to become the youngest AOH state President in 1975.

Tom's unwavering commitment to the AOH was recognized nationally when he was elected National Vice President in 1976 and then later became the second youngest National President in 1978.

Thomas McNabb was elected to his current position of AOH National Secretary in 1984.

During his years in National Hibernian leadership, Tom met with numerous elected offi-

cials and prominent figures to promote and support Irish causes. Notable meetings included President Jimmy Carter, Members of Congress, as well as Catholic Bishops, Cardinals and Archbishops.

In addition to Tom's great work in the United States, he has traveled to Ireland numerous times in support of the nation's causes. Tom was instrumental in the funding, building, and dedication of the Great Hunger Memorial in County Clare in 1995. This monument was the first memorial in Ireland to honor those who suffered and were lost during The Potato Famine, now renamed The Great Hunger.

On top of his distinguished and devoted work for the AOH, Tom had worked as the Safety Inspector for the City of Auburn and served as an Auburn City Council member from 1995 to 2011.

Throughout his life, Thomas McNabb has fully embodied the AOH Motto—"Friendship, Unity, and Christian Charity".

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Thomas McNabb on his completion of 30 years as the National Secretary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America (AOH). May he continue to be a leading force for good in an ever-changing world.

**IN HONOR OF NATIONAL NIGHT
OUT**

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House the powerful effect that National Night Out has on our communities' continued unity and success. Next month, we will celebrate the event's 30th anniversary.

The annual event was started in 1984 by the National Town Watch Association in order to incite local cultural and philanthropic interests in the name of crime prevention and promoting deeper community relations. On Tuesday, August 7, 1984, 2.5 million Americans participated across 400 communities in 23 states.

Presently, through the efforts of thousands of hard-working Americans with those missions in mind, National Night Out comprises 37.8 million people across 16,124 communities in all 50 states, U.S. Territories, Canadian cities, and military bases around the world.

My district contains the City of Salinas, an agricultural hub, providing fresh produce throughout the United States. The City of Salinas struggles with crime and, as often follows, social splintering among residents—partially due to gang-related violence. But time and time again, my constituents and organizations in the community come together to support each other and to remind the community that peace is the answer. This year the City of Salinas' National Night Out has approximately 30 organizations taking part in the Community Safety Fair and Peace March. Some of the organizations include: A Time for Grieving and Healing, Second Chance, County of Monterey, Clinica De Salud del Valle de Salinas, Monterey County Rape Crisis Center, Natividad

Medical Center, Partners for Peace, Peacock Acres, United Farm Workers Foundation, United Way, and Sun Street Centers that are dedicated to creating unity and peace in the community.

Mr. Speaker, National Night Out will spread the message of unity and positive energy to communities throughout the United States, including Salinas, the way Salinas has shared Salinas-grown fresh produce throughout the country. I commend all of the participants taking part in National Night Out on their contribution to the worthy goal of eliminating crime and encouraging deeper community relations.

RECOGNIZING THE 2014 MINNESOTA POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Eric Kilian of the Hutchinson, Minnesota Police Department, a brave law enforcement officer from the 7th Congressional District who was recently awarded the 2014 Police Officer of the Year award by the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association—the largest organization of professional law enforcement officers in the State.

Sgt. Kilian has served as a law enforcement officer for over 22 years and was recently recognized for his heroic actions during an occurrence that took place last October in Hutchinson. When responding to a report of a suspicious person, Sgt. Kilian was faced with a dangerous suspect likely under the influence of methamphetamines. The suspect engaged the officer in a physical altercation and attempted to disarm him and take command of his service weapon. Running out of options and thinking quickly, Sgt. Kilian discharged his weapon in the suspect's chest. The injured perpetrator attempted to escape but collapsed nearby. Sgt. Kilian then proceeded to administer first aid until paramedics arrived. The suspect ultimately survived after being transported for medical treatment. Based on Sgt. Kilian's actions, a dangerous situation was resolved, and a life was saved. Sgt. Kilian's professional response to the incident demonstrates his excellence as a law enforcement officer, and I would like to recognize his brave actions before this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, as a long-time friend, supporter and ally of the Minnesota law enforcement community, I am proud to recognize the sacrifices our officers make in the line of duty each and every day. I, along with all my colleagues, owe a great deal of gratitude to the Americans who make this a safer country every single day. It is a great honor to represent these heroic men and women, and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Officer Kilian on receiving this recognition.

HUMAN RIGHTS VETTING: NIGERIA AND BEYOND

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has significantly accelerated its acts of mass murder and abduction in Nigeria, requiring a more robust and effective response from the Government of Nigeria and friends like the United States. According to a recent report by the Internal Displaced Monitoring Centre and the Norwegian Refugee Council, there are 3.3 million Nigerian Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)—more than every other country in the world except Syria and Colombia. The UN High Commission for Refugees estimates that there are now more than 10,000 Nigerian refugees in Niger and Cameroon. According to the International Rescue Committee (IRC), due to credible fears of abduction as many as one thousand refugees a week—80% women and girls—are fleeing to the nearby country of Niger from Nigeria's Borno State alone.

Former U.S. Ambassador to Nigeria Robin Renee Sanders testified before my subcommittee on June 11th that the fight against Boko Haram will be a long war, but that Nigerian military and security forces are insufficiently trained and ill-equipped to meet the challenge of savage, relentless violence. Earlier this month, she told a Capitol Hill forum on Boko Haram that in the vacuum created by delays in training Nigerian forces, vigilante groups have been formed and that now are themselves committing human rights abuses.

According to the current State Department human rights report, Boko Haram is responsible for the most heinous human rights violations in Nigeria, but that same report tells us elements in the Nigerian armed forces and security apparatus have committed serious human rights abuses with little or no accountability.

Even in the face of serious threats to Nigerian and regional security, the U.S. Government, which has a longstanding alliance with the Federal Republic of Nigeria, has experienced obstacles in providing the security assistance necessary to help our ally address this dire emergency. Laws our Congress created to prevent our alliance with rogue military and security forces are being blamed for making our assistance more difficult to provide. But is the law the problem, or rather is it how the law is being applied? Or is the U.S. not attempting to train sufficient numbers of human rights-vetted Nigerian forces? What is the targeted number of trained Nigerians? For this year—and the future—how many trainers have committed to this task?

I believe the Leahy laws are necessary components of a prudent human rights policy, and today's hearing is in large part intended to find out whether there are legitimate obstacles to their implementation.

At the outset, I would like to make clear that I have long supported human rights vetting to allow for training of those who pass muster. One example of many: as chair of the then-Subcommittee on International Operations and

Human Rights, I chaired a hearing on Indonesia on May 7, 1998 featuring Pius Lustrilang, who was tortured by members of the Indonesian military amid deep concerns that those involved may have been trained under our International Military Education and Training Program or IMET program. In like manner, I and others were concerned that U.S.-trained Indonesian troops may have been complicit in slaughtering people in East Timor.

On a fact-finding mission to Jakarta, I sought—but never received—the names of specific individuals, trained by the U.S. including members of the elite Kopassus unit, who slaughtered dissidents as the Suharto government fell.

Similar training concerns were expressed by me and others concerning the Joint Combined Exchange Training or JCET program and the Rwandan Patriotic Army during the period of time when the RPA was engaged in the killing of refugees in Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Moreover, in 1999, Congress passed my legislation (part of P.L. 106-113) that suspended all U.S. federal law enforcement support and exchanges with the British police force in Northern Ireland, the Royal Ulster Constabulary, until new human rights training programs were implemented there and until programs were established to “vet out” any RUC officers who engaged in human rights abuses from benefiting from American training and preparation.

The “vetting” legislation worked. Exchanges and training at FBI facilities for RUC officers were suspended for more than two years until President Bush certified that the British established a system to vet and block anyone who committed or condoned human rights violations from the program.

According to the current Quadrennial Defense Review, we are in a time of increased danger from terrorist forces in foreign nations while shrinking budgets force our military and security forces to become smaller and leaner.

The QDR states that: “The Department of Defense will rebalance our counterterrorism efforts toward greater emphasis on building partnership capacity, especially in fragile states.” One manifestation of that developing policy is the president's proposal to allocate \$5 billion to a new Counterterrorism Partnership Fund (CTPF).

I have visited Nigeria twice in the past nine months alone and have chaired several hearings on security in Nigeria in the past two Congresses alone. Just last month, I met with U.S. and Nigerian Government officials to find out why our security assistance has been so difficult to provide when the need is so increasingly great. Is it the process, or has the Administration not sought to seriously expand training?

You will notice that the Department of State did not testify at the hearing that I convened on human rights vetting earlier this month. That is partly because Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Tom Malinowski was unavailable when we invited him to testify. But it may also be partly due to the abundance of caution surrounding the discussion of difficulties experienced in implementing the Leahy laws.

When I was in Abuja last month, I asked our Embassy to provide me with their recommendations for making the Leahy vetting more effective so that we can provide the much-needed aid to the Nigerian government and end the increasing slaughter and kidnapping of innocents, such as the Chibok school girls. Despite initial assurances of cooperation, I have yet to receive the information. I understand that not everything that can be said publicly should be said. Nevertheless, these laws were created in the light of day, and so should our efforts to implement them be clear and transparent to all concerned.

We refer to Leahy laws because there are actually two: one for the Department of State and one for the Department of Defense. Together, they cover material assistance, including equipment and training. These laws require investigation of allegations of human rights violations by military and security forces, including police. These investigations, performed mostly by the Department of State, require details on not only individuals, but also military units. Failure to obtain such information as name and date and place of birth can place an investigation in limbo. National government officials may consider such information an invasion of their sovereignty, but to avoid aiding and abetting rogue elements, we must know if a perpetrator of abuse is a man from Jos or a man with the same name from Kano, for example.

If individuals or elements of a larger force are guilty of human rights violations, entire battalions or regiments can be tainted unless the guilty are identified and separated out from those forces that are innocent of such crimes. The Leahy laws allow for the re-creation of "clean" units. On the surface, it would seem that such a policy is clear and possible to implement. Unfortunately, it seems not to be so simple in practice.

Despite the fact that Sarah Sewall, Undersecretary of State for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights told the Foreign Affairs Committee on May 21st that at least half the Nigerian military and security forces are clear of allegations of human rights violations, we continue to be told that Leahy vetting is at least slowing the provision of security assistance. According to congressional testimony by Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Robert Jackson, there are an estimated 187 Nigerian military units and 173 police units that have been cleared, but very few Nigerian units have been trained or are in training today. Why?

Our Government provides approximately \$15 billion in security assistance worldwide each year, involving 158 countries. Yet there are only 13 headquarters staff people handling Leahy vetting, in addition to embassy personnel. Is this a sign that these laws are not being taken seriously enough by our own government?

In the current fiscal year, the Department of State is receiving \$2.75 million to conduct Leahy vetting, which represents only two-one-hundredths of a percent of all military aid. Is insufficient funding for such vetting the major problem?

Of the 158 countries we provide with security assistance each year, 46 had some aid withheld in 2011. The typical percentage of

global Leahy vettings that don't meet requirements is at most 1–2 percent with just under 10% suspended. In Fiscal Year 2012, according to Congressional Research Service expert Lauren Ploch, "the State Department vetted 1,377 members of the Nigerian security forces—of that figure, almost 85% were cleared to receive assistance, with 15% rejected or suspended."

In Colombia, the government rejected the requirements of the Leahy laws before changing their minds and accepting the process. Now there reportedly are more high-ranking Colombian military officers behind bars than in any country other than Argentina, and Colombia is cited as a Leahy law success. In Nigeria, there have been no disciplinary actions against Nigerian military for scorched earth assaults on populations, and few high-ranking Nigerian military officers have been held accountable for human rights violations.

We are here today to examine the questions these facts raise, and our witnesses have been asked to walk us through the process, to tell us what works and what doesn't work and to suggest ways to make this process more effective.

In more than three decades of promoting human rights adherence in Congress, I have seen far too much brutality and indiscipline among military and security forces that are charged with establishing the peace and protecting their people. The Leahy laws are intended to prevent our Government from supporting such behavior, but if these laws are not implemented properly, they cannot achieve the goals for which they were created. No law is perfect, and we must never stop trying to perfect the laws we create—especially when they are meant to be both practical and aspirational.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE YMCA OF GREATER HOUSTON AND CHILDHOOD SWIM SAFETY

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the three children who die every day in our country as a result of drowning and to recognize organizations, like the YMCA, that are working to give America's children the necessary skills to prevent these tragic accidents from happening.

Drowning is the leading cause of death nationally for children aged one to four and is the second leading cause of death for children aged five to nine. For children between five and nine, the drowning rate for African American and American Indian children is three times the rate of white American children. At ages 11 and 12, the disparity between black and white children grows even worse. Regardless of race or ethnicity, lower income populations disproportionately bear the burden of drowning.

For my hometown and state, the numbers are very sobering. In the Houston metropolitan area, 22 children drowned last year. For the State of Texas, 82 children were victims of

drowning in 2013, and 66 percent of all child-aged drowning victims in our state in 2012 were male.

The YMCA is one example of an organization that is changing statistics for children across the country. The YMCA is bringing swimming safety and drowning prevention programs to underserved communities throughout the U.S., including communities in Houston and Harris County. YMCAs partner with schools to bring kids to the Y for lessons and offer swimming lessons year around. I learned to swim at the M.D. Anderson YMCA in our congressional district.

I am proud that the YMCA of Greater Houston is one of 15 YMCAs across the country piloting a program to improve childhood swimming and drowning prevention. This commendable program is providing drowning prevention and water safety skills to underserved communities who would otherwise not have access to these lifesaving skills.

The YMCA of Greater Houston is one of 103 Y's providing additional scholarships to children in their communities that may not otherwise have access to swim lessons as part of a nationwide data collection project on effectiveness of skill instruction in all communities.

I would like to congratulate the YMCA of Greater Houston on serving the people of Houston and Harris County for over 100 years and on its great efforts to save the lives of all our children, and I invite Members of this chamber to join them in educating parents and providing children the skills they need to swim safely and avoid harm.

REMEMBERING THE GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues of the ongoing genocide in Darfur, which began in 2003 and continues unabated. During that time more than 300,000 Darfuris have been murdered, and countless numbers of women and children as young as 6 years of age have been brutally raped. Millions have been left homeless. The International Criminal Court has issued an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar Bashir for crimes against humanity and, in July 2010, issued a warrant for his arrest on charges of genocide.

The government of Sudan, however, has yet to turn him over, and since the issuance of the warrants, the country has seen increased violence. Furthermore, the government's forceful expulsion of humanitarian aid agencies from the country has further jeopardized conditions for many more thousands of displaced and marginalized civilians. Days, weeks, months, years pass, and the people of Darfur are not closer to security, a just peace, or adequate humanitarian relief. The international community must do much more to help the people of Darfur.

RECOGNIZING JUAN ESPARZA
LOERA**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Juan Esparza Loera as he receives the "Service Above Self" award presented by the Fresno Latino Rotary. Juan's dedication and commitment to reporting quality news to the community is something to be honored.

Juan was born in Chihuahua, Mexico, and immigrated with his parents to the United States when he was only three and a half years old. He moved to the San Joaquin Valley in 1969 and has lived there ever since. Upon his graduation from Delano High School, Juan continued his education at Bakersfield Junior College and then went on to California State University, Fresno, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism.

Juan's career in journalism began in Bakersfield as the high school sports editor for the Bakersfield Californian. His career would then take him to Modesto, where he worked for the Modesto Bee. During his time at the Modesto Bee, Juan held multiple positions ranging from general assignment reporter to business editor. His hard work in Bakersfield and Modesto created opportunities for him in Fresno. In May 1990, Juan was hired as the Editor and Publisher for Vida en el Valle. Twenty-four years later, Juan still holds the position.

Over the years, Vida en el Valle has been recognized for national awards. In 1998, Vida en el Valle was awarded the General Excellence Award by the California Newspaper Publishers Association. It was the first time a bilingual newspaper had ever won the award. Since then, Vida en el Valle has earned more than 20 additional awards from the California Newspaper Publishers Association. In 2003, Juan was recognized by Hispanic Media 100 as one of the most influential Latino journalists in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize Mr. Juan Esparza Loera. The contributions he has made to our San Joaquin Valley deserve to be commended.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS
RELATING TO H.R. 4263**HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters between the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure relating to H.R. 4263, the Social Media Working Group Act of 2014.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION IN-
FRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REP-
RESENTATIVES,*Washington, DC, July 7, 2014.*

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 4263, the Social Media Working Group Act of 2014, as reported by the Committee on Homeland Security on June 19, 2014. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 7, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4263, the "Social Media Working Group Act of 2014."

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a valid jurisdictional interest in emergency disaster response, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 4263. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation, should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the Floor. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

16TH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL
FIRE AND RESCUE AND EMS
AWARDS**HON. VERN BUCHANAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize fire and rescue and EMS personnel who have provided distinguished service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

As first responders, fire departments and emergency medical service teams are summoned on short notice to serve their respective communities. Oftentimes, they arrive at scenes of great adversity and trauma, to which they reliably bring strength and composure. These brave men and women spend hundreds of hours in training so that they are prepared when they get "the call."

Two years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Fire and Rescue and EMS Awards to honor officers, departments, and units for outstanding achievement.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District, it is my privilege to congratulate the following winners, who were selected this year by an independent committee comprised of a cross section of current and retired fire and rescue personnel living in the district.

Dr. Steven R. Newman, a Fellow of the American College of Emergency Physicians and Medical Director for Sarasota County Emergency Medical Services, was chosen to receive the Career Service Award.

Manatee County EMS Lt. Mark Jones, Charge Paramedic Angie Hadlock, and Paramedic Renee Bergschneider; East Manatee Fire Rescue Battalion Chief Stacy Bailey, Lt. Sean Battick, Lt. Chad Gamble, and Firefighters Stephen Beecher, Steven Rickman, Doug Sprigg, and Andrew Stark; and Bayflight 2 Flight Nurse Kelly Long, Paramedic Mike Bull, and Pilot Joe Mattina were chosen to receive the Unit Citation award.

Firefighter/Paramedic Larry Gibbs of the Sarasota County Fire Department was chosen to receive the Dedication and Professionalism award.

IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF HARIS
SULEMAN**HON. ANDRÉ CARSON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a profound sense of sadness, as I grieve with so many of my fellow Hoosiers over the loss of a young man who cared deeply for his community. Today, we remember Haris Suleman, a 17-year-old student who passed away last week in a plane crash.

For the past month, Haris had been piloting a single-engine aircraft around the world with the hope of setting a world record and raising money to help build schools in his family's native country of Pakistan. He was a determined young man, who took interest in being a pilot after years of flying with his father, Babar. Sadly, his father, who accompanied him on this trip, is still missing.

Haris was going to be a high school senior this fall and he dreamed of becoming an engineer like his father. Although he was only with us for a short time, Haris made a positive and lasting impact in his community, and his passing is a great loss for so many. May his determination to reach his goals and his commitment to help others serve as an example for all of us to follow.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our thoughts and prayers to Haris Suleman's family.

REMEMBERING FORMER REP.
CALDWELL BUTLER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor my former colleague, Rep. Caldwell Butler of Roanoke, who passed away on July 29, 2014 at the age of 89.

I will always remember Caldwell as a true Virginia gentleman. Representing Virginia's Sixth District from 1972 until 1983, I had the pleasure of serving with him during my first term in Congress. I appreciated Caldwell's golden character and the lasting impact he had on this body. He was a good, decent and honorable man—qualities that we should all aspire to emulate; qualities that are especially important for those in public service.

Rep. Butler had a great sense of humor and sharp wit. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, he demonstrated these qualities each and every day. He served his country and his district with distinction.

Prior to serving in Congress, Caldwell joined the Navy during World War II and later attended the University of Richmond and the University of Virginia School of Law. In 1962, he was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates, where he served until his election to Congress.

Caldwell and his wife, June, were always a team. Sadly, June passed away just last month. Together, they raised four sons—Manley, Henry, James and Marshall—and have seven grandchildren and two step-grandchildren.

I submit the following article from The Roanoke Times on Caldwell's life and accomplishments. I respectfully ask that my colleagues join me in extending our deepest condolences to his family and in honoring his great service to our country.

[From the Roanoke Times, July 29, 2014]

CALDWELL BUTLER, FORMER ROANOKE CONGRESSMAN WHO CAST KEY VOTE DURING WATERGATE, DIES

Caldwell Butler, a former congressman from Roanoke who was thrust into the national spotlight when he became one of the few Republicans to favor Richard Nixon's impeachment during the Watergate scandal, has died. He was 89.

Richard Cullen, a close family friend and former Virginia attorney general, confirmed Butler's death this morning. Cullen said he expects funeral services to be held Friday at St. John's Church in Roanoke. Butler's wife, June, died last month.

Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R-Roanoke County, who holds the 6th District seat today, remembered Butler in comments before the Judiciary Committee today. Longtime Rep. John Conyers, D-Mich., also recalled serving with Butler. Watch the comments here.

Butler was first elected to Congress representing Virginia's 6th District in 1972, running as a member of "the Nixon team" in a district where Nixon amassed 72 percent of the vote. But less than two years later, in a dramatic reversal, Butler voted for Nixon's impeachment.

As a freshman member of the House Judiciary Committee, Butler was thrown by circumstance into the Watergate scandal,

which grew out of Nixon's cover-up of a break-in at the Democratic headquarters in 1972. Through the spring and summer of 1974, as the committee investigated the actions of the president and his advisers, Butler's role became more important.

Butler had supported Nixon's legislative efforts. And some said he owed his own congressional career to the GOP landslide sparked by Nixon.

Butler was viewed as one of the half-dozen crucial swing votes on the Judiciary Committee, though. During most of the committee hearings, he had not joined the president's attackers. But neither had he joined the defenders.

Butler and the other pivotal committee members were considered bellwethers of support for impeachment. When Butler announced, in July 1974, that he backed two impeachment charges, the president's defense withered.

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGE OF AUTISM

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the global incidence of autism is steadily increasing. About 1 in 68 children has been identified with autism spectrum disorder, or ASD, according to estimates from the Center for Disease Control's Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network. ASD is reported to occur in all racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups, but is almost 5 times more common among boys (1 in 42) than among girls (1 in 189).

Studies in Asia, Europe, and North America have identified individuals with ASD with an average of about 1% of the population. The prevalence of autism in Africa is unknown, but there is no reason to believe that it is any different than other parts of the world. A new study recently found that each case of autism costs \$2.4 million over a lifetime, including the expense of special education and lost productivity for their parents. Meanwhile, 85 percent of autistic adults are jobless or underemployed.

It is, therefore imperative that people with ASD are empowered to be self-sufficient so that they can not only earn money to meet their own needs, but also so they can utilize the talents they possess to contribute to society at large. A hearing that I held last week examined some innovative strategies to achieve this goal.

SAP, a global software company, is working to rectify this problem. SAP partnered with Thorik Sonne, CEO and Founder of Specialisterne, to develop its highly successful "Autism at Work" program. Mr. Sonne, whose 17-year-old son Lars is autistic, realized that, while those with autism might lack the social skills recruiters are looking for, they possess many attributes high on their radar as well: intelligence and memory, the ability to see patterns and attention to detail on repetitive tasks. He reasoned that it would be phenomenal if we could use skills like we see among people with autism in software testing, data analysis, and quality control. He said that

there is no reason why we should leave these people unemployed when they have so much talent and there are so many vacant jobs in the high-tech sector. SAP and Mr. Sonne provided further details of their extraordinary program at last week's hearing.

In her testimony, Theresa Hussman of Autism Society of America said, "In school, at work and in the community, people with autism are often faced with segregation, low expectations, impoverished conditions and denial of opportunity that a society committed to civil rights should find unacceptable. Today, if you are an adult living with autism, you will likely be unemployed or vastly under-employed, living well below the poverty level, and denied access to affordable housing and so much more."

Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, Ron Suskind testified in part about success with an "affinity" approach, and he says, "for every visible deficit, there is an equal and opposing strength. This population is just like the rest of us, only less so and more so. The question increasingly is not 'if these 'more so' qualities exist, but 'where'?"

Autism used to be described as a disorder characterized by delays or abnormal functioning before the age of three years in social interaction, communication or restricted, repetitive and stereotyped patterns of behavior, interests and activities. More recently, behavioral scientists describe a range of such behavior now referred to as autism spectrum disorder, which includes a more high-functioning version known as Asperger syndrome.

It is medically possible to diagnose someone with ASD as early as 18 months or even younger, and a reliable diagnosis can be made by the age of two. However, symptoms might not present themselves until later in life. Those with some form of autism may never be diagnosed at all.

This has led to a debate over famous, productive people, often considered geniuses, who appear to have symptoms of autism, especially Asperger syndrome. In the April 30, 2003 issue of New Scientist magazine, writer Hazel Muir revealed the debate over whether geniuses Albert Einstein and Isaac Newton had Asperger syndrome.

Simon Baron Cohen, an autism expert based at Cambridge University, and Oxford University mathematician Ian James speculated that Newton, the noted English physicist and mathematician, exhibited Asperger traits such as hardly speaking, forgetting to eat and giving scheduled lectures even to an empty room. Einstein, the German physicist, was said to have obsessively repeated sentences until he was seven years old and was a notoriously confusing lecturer. Both were highly productive scientists, perhaps because of the kind of focus ASD produces rather than in spite of it.

In a February 2, 2005, report on CNBC, anchor Sue Herara presented an interview with 2002 Nobel laureate Vernon L. Smith in which he spoke of the way in which his autism has allowed him to excel. "I can switch out and go into a concentrated mode and the world is completely shut out," Smith is quoted as saying. "If I'm writing something, nothing else exists."

During the interview, Smith, who won the Nobel Prize for inventing the field of experimental economics, admitted that he is sometimes “not there” in social situations. He said that teaching had forced him to be more social, but it was only because he was talking about issues on which he was already focused.

I raise the issue of intelligence and functionality because we too often see people with ASD as victims who must be cared for when the focus their condition produces may allow them to be highly successful in certain endeavors. When we begin to look at people with ASD in this light, we can better see how they can be enabled to contribute to society. It just requires understanding of their potential as well as their limitations.

Many fields involving mathematics and science would allow for the intense focus exhibited by many people with ASD to be quite useful. Think also of fields of analysis—intelligence, actuary science, and other positions requiring what we commonly call “numbers crunching.” The ability to analyze data and see patterns most people would not recognize would be invaluable in analytical jobs.

As Nobel laureate Vernon Smith said, his disconnection from social relationships enables him to think outside the box, as it were, without concern for violating social norms. Smith found his condition to be an advantage in enabling greater creativity. In our increasingly technical world, people with ASD actually are becoming more valuable, if we can help them overcome social disconnection and allow them to find fields in which what we have

thought to be their disability is actually their advantage.

We hope today's hearing can be instructive in at least initiating a change in perspective on what people with ASD can do to help themselves and to make a contribution to society as a whole. We must not continue to waste the talents of people who could make their lives and ours much better.

Finally, I'd like to thank the amazing group of individuals who testified last week who made a historic difference in the lives of those on spectrum.

As Michael Rosanoff put it in his testimony “our mission at Autism Speaks is to change the future for all who struggle with autism spectrum disorders.” Each of you on the expert witness panel did just that.

SENATE—Friday, August 1, 2014

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM Kaine, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of our forebears, whose almighty hand leads forth in beauty all the starry band, thank You for the opportunity to live in a nation which seeks "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." May each day we strive to contribute to the strength of this land so that the dream of our Framers will become a continuous reality. Use our Senators as they seek to make America a beacon of freedom for our world.

Lord, so often we pray for our lawmakers but neglect to intercede for those who support them, providing wind beneath their wings. Bless all who labor for liberty. Give us traveling mercies during the August recess.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM Kaine, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. Kaine thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CHAPLAIN BARRY BLACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, may I say, while our good chaplain is still in the Chamber, he has such a way with words. I am so impressed with the prayer this morning, where he recognized the way to get things done—as little as it is. If we could do more, we would get more, with this good staff. So I really appreciate the prayer and the Chaplain.

I extend my appreciation for the hard work of this staff. Everyone in this room works hard, whether they are police officers or enrolling clerks. They do everything. I am really grateful for what they do to help us all look better. I wish we did more so we would look better, but that is the way it is.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 471.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, if any, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m. this afternoon. Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2772
AND S. 2773

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2772) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2773) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to these bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am satisfied and pleased that we have a number of Senators on the floor wishing to speak. I am going to say just a few brief words, and then we are going to go into a quorum call until the Republican leader comes. He has some things to do here. So we will wait for him.

Mr. President, we find ourselves at the end of this work period having done not a lot. There is a lot of blame to go around, and we could spend all day blaming each other, but the fact is we need to do better.

I am grateful, though; yesterday we were able to pass the veterans conference report. It wasn't what we passed out of the Senate, but it was OK. It will help. I admire very much the people who were able to get that done.

BERNIE SANDERS worked extremely hard, and I am not sure he could have completed that without the work of the senior Senator from Arizona.

The bill was dead, the conference was really dead, a week ago. But the senior Senator from Arizona weighed in, and with his influence with Democrats and Republicans, it was made possible to move forward and was brought back on track.

I am surprised my friend from Arizona is here. I acknowledge the work that he did. Others worked on it, of course, but without his McCain-like advocacy last Friday and Thursday night, it wouldn't have happened.

Mr. President, I am not only grateful for the conference report we got on the veterans matter but also the highway bill. Now, I think we need a long-term highway bill, and I think we will get one in the near future. The work done by Senator BOXER and others to have a long-term bill because they wanted us to finish something this year didn't come to fruition. We passed it here. But we worked together and have a bill that will allow construction to continue.

In the House, I regret they weren't able to overcome Republican resistance to funding a response to the humanitarian crisis at the border. Again, we could stand here for the next couple hours and affix blame as to whose fault it is. The fact is I don't think it is going to get done.

I watched the House closely. I have heard commentators. It is surprising but I am told that even Charles Krauthammer today said: This is a little unusual. They weren't able to complete their work yesterday and the day before. So what they have done is demanded that President Obama do

things on his own, for which they have sued him. That is a little inconsistent. One of the Republican senior House Members was on "Morning Joe" this morning. He said the same thing. But the House appears to be heading from bad to worse as the House Republican majority hunts for votes on border policy.

So let's be clear about what is happening today on the other side of the Capitol.

House Republicans will vote to deport children who have been living in the United States their entire lives, all in a pathetic attempt to appease the tea party. The worse the bill gets the more votes they are getting over there. That is the harsh, wrong-headed idea. If the House does pass a bill, I can't imagine it could be cleared on either side over here.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 220, H.J. Res. 76; that a Reid-McConnell-Mikulski substitute amendment at the desk providing emergency appropriations for the Iron Dome defense system in Israel be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the Reid-McConnell-Mikulski title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say to my friend, the majority leader, this is a good example of our being able to put aside partisan considerations and work together to help our good friend Israel.

I particularly want to salute Senator GRAHAM and Senator MCCAIN, who have been absolutely relentless in their efforts to make sure we send this important signal to Israel at a very tough time for them. They are being, in my view, criticized by everyone for pursuing a policy that I am absolutely certain we would pursue if somebody across our border were launching missiles at our civilian population.

I think it is important for us to send a signal that the United States stands behind one of its best friends—if not its best friend—in the world.

I think the Prime Minister of Israel pretty well summed it up when he said: There is no moral equivalency here. Hamas launches missiles on civilians, and Israel warns civilians when it attempts to attack. And Hamas uses its

own civilians to protect its missiles. There is no moral equivalency whatsoever.

So as much of the world levels its criticism at Israel, I think it is important for the United States to say: What nonsense to suggest that the Israelis are doing anything that almost any country in the world would have done had its citizens been threatened by a neighbor as Israel has experienced.

So, obviously, I do not object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to thank both leaders for their efforts in bringing about this much-needed—not only the funding but the signal that the Congress will send and the President will sign that we are supporting them.

We all know the latest news is, tragically, that a proposed cease-fire has broken down. Apparently an Israeli soldier has been captured. And all of us know the ramifications of that in the future, the value the Israeli Government and people rightfully put on each one of their citizens who serve.

I thank again our majority leader and the Republican leader for coming together on this most important signal. This isn't just about money. It is a signal from the American people and the American taxpayers that we are with the Israelis, because if they do not have Iron Dome, they can't defend themselves. It is that simple. The Iron Dome is the ability to keep innocent civilians and neighborhoods and families from being destroyed by these barrages of literally thousands of incoming rockets.

Again, I thank my friend. There has been no one more relentless in this effort than the Senator from South Carolina. I yield for him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the time is blurred now. Yesterday, or early this morning, a very bad occurrence happened to the people of Israel. During a cease-fire which they agreed to, an Israeli unit apparently was attacked by a Hamas suicide bomber. After that attack there was a charge against the unit in question, and apparently a soldier has been kidnapped and taken to the tunnels.

It is so appropriate that today, of all days, the Senate speaks in one voice.

I cannot thank Senator REID enough for making this happen. Senator MCCONNELL has worked to make sure it got cleared on our side, and it finally has.

They are running out of Iron Dome missiles to protect themselves. To whom do they turn? To us.

Mr. President, \$225 million is a lot of money, but it is a rounding error in the budget.

It is not only the missiles that matter; it is the message that goes with

the missiles: We are with you. Here are the missiles. Use them to defend yourself. We will stand with you on the battlefield. We will stand with you in the court of public opinion, and we are going to push back against the United Nations, which is becoming more and more anti-Israeli. As dysfunctional as the Congress has been, this is one of our finer moments.

We are about to leave here soon with a lot of work undone, but let it be said that we did have the foresight and the ability and, quite frankly, the moral decency to end on a positive note.

You can say a lot about this Congress—and much criticism is deserved—but here is what you cannot say: We left Israel in the lurch. In a bipartisan manner we were there when they needed us the most.

To our friends in Israel: Stay as long as you need to stay. Do whatever you need to do.

To our friends in Palestine: We grieve when children are killed. There is no more innocent person on the planet than a child.

To the Palestinian people: Reject Hamas and seek peace. We are not your enemy. We stand to help you, but you have to reject a terrorist organization that has the coldest and darkest of hearts, that would kill every Israeli child and put your children at risk. Reject this hateful ideology while you still can.

To our friends in Israel: There is more to come when it comes to standing by your side.

I thank both leaders of the Senate for rising to the occasion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the words of my three friends.

Mr. President, there are times when partisanship does not exist. I hope everyone will note that last night when we couldn't get this cleared—I, we—there was no finger-pointing. I understand the person objected. He is a fine man. He is a man of principle. But I have faith in this institution and our sticking by our friend. So I am happy to be here today to be a part of this conclusion.

The situation in Israel is grave. We think this Iron Dome protects Israel. It protects a lot of Israel. But Israel does not have enough Iron Domes—plural—to protect them. They need more. But this will certainly be a step in the right direction.

Three thousand rockets have been fired in the last 2½, 3 weeks—3,000. But for this technology that was perfected by the Israelis, they would be in dire straits. There would be a war in the Middle East that we cannot imagine.

Let's be realistic. Are we going to benefit from what they have done? Of course we are. They are sharing this technology with us as we speak.

There was a cease-fire that lasted about 2½ hours. It is terribly unfortunate what is going on over there, but,

as David Brooks said on “NewsHour”—this conservative columnist said he had never known of a conflict in history where one side says: Kill more of us. It is hard to comprehend. When the Israelis notify someone “there is going to be action taken in this building you are in; would you leave,” the leadership in Gaza tells them to stay there, and unfortunately a lot of them do. This is something that is hard for me to comprehend, that something like this goes on.

That little country, that tiny little country is the only democracy in that whole area. That is it.

Netanyahu—if I were in Israel, I may have voted for someone else, but the Israeli people determine who leads that country. I don’t know of a bond of friendship that we have or ever had in world history better than this one, and so I will stand by Israel. I will stand by Israel for a lot of personal reasons but certainly for political reasons, and I have no hesitation in declaring to the world that is how I feel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hearing no objection to the unanimous consent request, without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3780) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the first word, and insert: the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROCUREMENT
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, \$225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats: *Provided*, That such funds shall be transferred immediately only through an exchange of letters to address emergent operations in support of Operation Protective Edge, notwithstanding section 3.1.3.2.1 of the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to previously appropriated funds for the procurement of Iron Dome: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014”.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The amendment (No. 3781) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.”.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved and the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum, please.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MATT OLSEN

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center Matt Olsen. Matt has announced his intention to leave his position later this year after serving as Director of NCTC for over 3 years. Matt is one of the best and brightest public servants with whom I have had the pleasure to work. I wish to take a couple of minutes to thank him for a job well done.

As vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I have had the opportunity to work very closely with Matt, as he served in a number of key positions in the intelligence community. Regardless of his position, Matt has served with integrity and has provided sound, honest counsel, which has benefited not only me but numerous other Members of this body.

At NCTC Matt has overseen several key initiatives that have enhanced NCTC’s ability to discover and prevent terrorist attacks, such as the Pursuit Group that was put in place after the failed attack on Northwest flight 253. Matt has been a strong advocate for NCTC’s mission, striving to make sure NCTC has the right people and the right data to get the job done. He has done his part and has kept the Center acutely focused on terrorist threats to the homeland.

I am certainly glad I supported his nomination and can attest that Matt is a man of his word. Before joining NCTC, Matt served as the National Security Agency’s general counsel and as an Associate Deputy Attorney General at the Department of Justice. Matt worked on several national security issues at DOJ but quickly became an expert on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and its implementation. Matt has an excellent perspective of the role of surveillance and keeping this country safe, and I hope he will participate in the public debate on this issue even after his departure from government service.

I would like to say a special thanks to his wife Fern and his three children:

Elizabeth, Nate, and Will. Matt has missed many nights and weekends with his family as the Director of NCTC and throughout his public service career. I am sure these sacrifices have been difficult at times, but our Nation is better for it. I know Matt has spent every day of his tenure as Director focusing on how best to neutralize the increasing threat posed by Al Qaeda and its affiliates.

Matt’s family should be very proud of his outstanding achievements and his dedicated efforts to protect our national security. I understand Matt plans to return to teaching and spend some well-deserved free time with his family. His presence will be missed at NCTC as well as on the Hill. To Matt and his family, thanks again and best wishes for whatever the future holds.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I intend to speak on a couple matters in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAEL

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, a couple things.

This is a very dark day for our friends in Israel. Apparently, earlier this morning, about an hour and a half after the agreed-upon cease-fire, an Israeli column of soldiers who were trying to decommission a terrorist tunnel, consistent with the terms of the cease-fire, were attacked by a suicide bomber that resulted in some Israeli casualties. That column also was hit by antitank missiles, and a group of Palestinian Hamas fighters engaged the column, resulting in the capture of one Israeli soldier.

For lack of a better way of explaining this, there was a cease-fire. Israel was acting consistent with the terms of the cease-fire, and this was a planned military operation to take advantage of the cease-fire. In the law of war this would be a great breach. At the end of the day Israel is a victim of a group of people called Hamas that lie, cheat, have everything in their being that most of us should condemn.

So what has the Senate done? This could be a very good day for the U.S.-Israeli relationship. To my Democratic and Republican colleagues in the Senate, you have risen to the occasion. I thank the majority leader Senator REID and the minority leader Senator MCCONNELL for bringing up Iron Dome

funding. I thank all of my colleagues for allowing the funding to go forward. Senator COBURN was trying to find an offset. He is being consistent in trying to bring our fiscal house in order. He is a very principled man, but he understood the urgency of the matter in Israel and withdrew his objection last night.

To our friends in Israel, the Senate has acted in a unanimous fashion, bipartisan in nature, to appropriate \$225 million to resupply the missiles that you need to defend yourself under the Iron Dome Program. With the missiles comes a message. The message is we are with you. Take as long as you need. Go where you need to go to deal with this terrorist threat called Hamas.

To the Palestinian people, we are not your enemy. We hope one day you will reject Hamas and try to find a peaceful solution to your problems with your Israeli neighbors, and we stand ready to help in that regard.

The Palestinian Authority and Israel have a good working relationship when it comes to the West Bank. Hamas has been in charge of Gaza for several years now, and this cycle of violence repeats itself. You will have a cease-fire. You will have a lull in the violence. One year later you will fight Hamas again. They have fired over 15,000 rockets into Israel. In 2005 Israel withdrew from Gaza, giving land for peace. The land was given, the peace has been unattainable.

So the real root of the problem is Hamas. There is no moral equivalency here. Hamas is trying to kill every Israeli possible. They are firing missiles by the thousands indiscriminately into Israel. They could care less where they land. Thank God for the Iron Dome. The most heinous of all is they have put their own people in harm's way as human shields. As Israel tries to tell people to withdraw from an area because it is coming under attack, Hamas says: Ignore the leaflets. You go to that area.

There is a video where a hospital was occupied by Hamas fighters. Israel gave 2 days' notice to evacuate the hospital. When the hospital was destroyed militarily because it became a command center for Hamas, secondary explosions went on for quite a while. It was also an ammo dump.

So Hamas uses mosques, hospitals, apartment complexes. We found two instances of Hamas rockets being stored in U.N. schools. They are violating every known tenet of the law of war. They are using their own people as human shields in an unprecedented strategic manner.

As to the United Nations, you are about to run afoul of the Congress. The Human Rights Commission issued a resolution that had one sentence condemning the attacks on Israeli civilians. It never mentioned the word "Hamas." It basically accused Israel of being a war criminal.

It passed 27 to 1. We were the lone vote objecting to the resolution, which was so out of sync with reality, and several major nations abstained.

The United Nations is becoming more anti-Israeli as I speak. Anti-Semitism is spreading throughout the world, but let it be said that the Senate in a bipartisan fashion will have no part of this. The United Nations is a force that could be used for the good or it could be a force to make problems worse.

I consider myself, as a Republican, an internationalist. I believe in helping people. I believe in leading the world, not having the world run us over. Ronald Reagan is a great role model from my point of view. He said: America makes history. That is our destiny. We shape history; we are not overrun by it. That does not mean we have to become the world's policeman or act as the Lone Ranger. It does mean we have to stay involved in the world. That is my point of view. But it is very hard to maintain that point of view when the United Nations, I believe, is being hijacked in such a fashion.

To the United Nations leadership: You are about to run afoul of the Congress, who wants to be part of the body that wants to shape the world for the better. By your constant condemning of Israel in a disproportionate manner to what is going on, on the ground in Gaza, beware of where you are taking this. To the Human Rights Commission: You have become a joke in the eyes of Congress.

The second thing I hope we can do is pass a resolution that was authored by myself and Senator MENENDEZ this morning. It is cleared on the Republican side. I think we are about there on the Democratic side.

So what have we done? Tactically, the Senate has acted in a fashion to resupply missiles to the Iron Dome Program that is literally under siege. Strategically, we have a partnership agreement pending before the Senate that reaffirms our relationship for years to come as a signal to Israel: Strategically, we will be your partner as far as the eye can see.

So that is pending before the Senate, and I hope we can clear it today. Today, of all days, would be a great time for us to make decisions that reinforce the military capability of the Israelis to defend themselves, recommit ourselves to a strategic partnership.

And the third thing we could do is lend our moral voices as a nation by condemning the attack of Hamas against the Israeli defense forces and the capturing of a soldier.

This resolution thoroughly points out the cease-fire breach by Hamas, the preplanned attack on the Israeli column during the cease-fire, the capturing of a soldier. We are condemning this activity as a breach of inter-

national law, and we are urging that Hamas return the IDF soldier.

This resolution would give the moral voice of our Nation and the Senate to the cause Israel faces. So if we could, in a dysfunctional Congress—and we deserve a lot of criticism, both parties are to blame—but if we could end the day speaking as one on something that is very important, the survival of our friends in Israel—not being anti-Palestinian but being pro-Israel and pro-peace and being anti-Hamas—I just wish and hope and pray the Palestinian people will reject Hamas and turn in a new direction because in that direction you will find peace and you will find America as a partner.

So let it be said the Senate, in the most turbulent political times, found its way when it came to supporting our friends in Israel by appropriating money to help their military which is under siege, by passing a strategic partnership agreement that reaffirms the relationship, and by lending our voice to what happened today in condemning, in no uncertain terms, the vicious attack and the breach of the cease-fire by Hamas.

If we could do those three things today, it would be the right message, it would send the right message at the right time, and it would solidify this relationship that is so important because the enemies of Israel are our enemies also. Radical Islam has the same desire to kill us and destroy our way of life as they do Israel. At the end of the day we have to understand our fates are tied together.

CRISIS ON THE BORDER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the second issue I would like to talk about is my colleagues in the House are trying to find their way to pass legislation regarding the crisis on the border. They tried yesterday. They failed. They are back at it again.

I thank Speaker BOEHNER, from the Republican point of view, for not leaving town until we have a solution in a Republican-controlled House. It has been hard to find. It is an emotional issue. It is a difficult issue on many levels. The human suffering of the children—everybody is moved by that, as we should be. But we cannot incentivize these three countries in question to keep sending their children here, putting their children at risk, and overrunning our systems. That is not the way to deal with our neighbor.

So the House hopefully will pass legislation reforming the 2008 law that needs to be reformed to make children from Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, that region subject to the same laws as if you came from Mexico, and they are putting money aside to deal with the deportation problem and the humanitarian crisis.

If they can pass a solution to this problem, I am urging the majority

leader of the Senate to bring us back in because we should not be gone for 5 weeks with something this important left unresolved. You may not agree with the House, but let's take up their proposal, amend it, vote on it, vote it up or vote it down, take the prior Democratic proposal, allow amendments to be had on both sides of the aisle, and see if we can find common ground on dealing with the border.

The President at one time embraced changes in the 2008 law. That has to be done or we will never solve the problem.

I do not mind spending money in a humanitarian fashion as long as we are spending money to solve the problem, not perpetuate it. So if the House can find its way in offering a solution to the border crisis, I am urging my Democratic colleagues who control this body to act. Let's not be gone for 5 weeks. Bring us all back. See if we can find a solution among ourselves in the Senate, talk to our colleagues in the House and solve the problem.

It is within our power to do so. I know we can get there. I know there are at least five or six Democrats who understand throwing money at the problem without changing the 2008 law gets you nowhere. There are plenty of people on our side who understand a humanitarian crisis does exist. Let's marry these forces and see if we can come up with a bipartisan compromise in the Senate.

The only way you can do that is to be allowed to offer amendments and debate. I cannot think of a problem more dramatic facing the Nation right now in terms of a crisis than what is happening on our border: 50,000 unaccompanied children, the spike in people coming from Central America after President Obama unilaterally gave amnesty to children already here. No matter how well intentioned, it has created the belief in that part of the world that if you make it to America you can stay.

We want you to understand there is a legal way to get to America. Just do not show up on the doorstep and ask to be taken in. That is not a way for our Nation to have to deal with people wanting to come to this Nation. So I hope we will not be gone for 5 weeks with this problem unaddressed.

If the House can get its act together and pass a solution to the problem, it would be incumbent, in my view, upon the Senate to reconvene, deal with the House proposal, come up with one of our own, and engage the House to solve this problem. Five weeks is a very long time to be away from a problem this important.

As to the August break, contrary to what a lot of people may believe, we do not all go on vacation. We try to take some time for ourselves and our families. But it is a chance to go visit other parts of the world, to get informed on

problems that can come here in terms of affecting our national security. Situations over there are going to come here if we do not deal with them responsibly. It is a chance to do things in your State. So people are very busy during August. They try to capture some time for themselves. But at the end of the day, 5 weeks is way too long to be absent from Washington as the crisis on the border gets worse. If the House can find a solution to this problem, I am urging the Democratic-controlled Senate to bring us back, take up their solution, vote it up, vote it down, bring back the Senate bill, allow it to be amended so we can find consensus. Consensus is there if we want to find it.

I appreciate the Presiding Officer's voice on national security. The Presiding Officer has been a stalwart friend of Israel in trying to find a way forward regarding the problems the Ukrainian people face. I hope we can find a solution to our border crisis. But a final thought as to Israel: Today could be a very good day for the U.S.-Israel relationship. It started in the Senate. I hope my House colleagues will pass the Iron Dome legislation that we passed by unanimous consent today. The House needs to get this done so the President can sign this into law.

To my colleagues in the House: Please take up Iron Dome. Let's get this right.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2673

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we all know that our ally Israel is in a fight for survival because a terrorist group, so named by the United States and Europe, is at war with Israel right now. We remember how it all started, with the kidnapping of three Israeli boys and the torture and the deaths, and Hamas praised that. Tragically, there was a revenge killing, and the Israeli Government arrested the Israelis responsible for that and they are going to face justice, while Hamas praises—praises—what happened.

Today I spoke to the Ambassador, and this is what I heard him say—and I haven't fact-checked this, but as I understand it there was a cease-fire in place, all sides agreed everything was clear. Israel was going to be allowed to clear out the tunnels which are being

used to open to Hamas the country of Israel, where they go under the ground and they have one objective—to kill Israelis, to torture them, to kidnap them. No country—no country—could ever live with that, no country—not our country.

Imagine if we had 100 rockets a day coming from Mexico or Canada or from the sea, either side. We would never sit back for that. We would never sit back if under our great cities we had terrorists building tunnels so they could sneak in suicide bombers to kill our people.

Here we had a cease-fire, and I know the Secretary of State worked hard. Yet and still what happened, even though it was known that Israel was permitted to continue clearing out these tunnels, a suicide bomber blew himself up, killed Israeli soldiers and someone else grabbed and kidnapped—we think—we think—an Israeli soldier. We don't know all the facts on it. This must be condemned.

We have a bill, Senator BLUNT and I, and it has 81 cosponsors on it. It is the Israeli American strategic partnership act, and it will send a strong signal today that we stand with Israel. We want peace. We want justice. We want a good life for the Israelis and the Palestinian people. But you cannot do it when you have a terrorist organization running, in essence, the Gaza Strip.

In this bill Senator BLUNT and I have worked on, there is a visa waiver section, and I want to go over that because I fear we may have objections to this. I am hoping not, I still hope we won't, but in this visa waiver section it does three things: First, it expresses the sense of the Senate that Israel should be designated as a program country under the Visa Waiver Program.

Second, it urges United States engagement with Israel to help it meet the requirements of the waiver program; i.e., when Israelis come over they pay attention to the time on their visas and they go back to their country when the time is up.

Third, it authorizes but doesn't require the administration to waive a nonimmigrant visa waiver requirement only if Israel meets all the other program requirements.

Here is what is important. There are 38 countries in the Visa Waiver Program. These countries represent some of America's closest allies. In fact, 20 of the current Visa Waiver Program countries are NATO allies. So I want to say clearly to my friend Senator SESSIONS and anyone within the sound of my voice that the provision I hope he will not object to today, the provision gives Israel, the strongest ally of the United States in the Middle East, a chance to join the program. As a member of the Visa Waiver Program, Israeli citizens, many of whom have families in America, would be allowed to visit the

United States for up to 90 days without first obtaining a visa. This deepens the ties between our nations.

I want to read some of the countries that have these privileges: Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, Slovakia, Estonia, the Czech Republic. I was proud to support them, but I am also proud to say that Israel deserves to be on that list. Why shouldn't they have the same opportunity?

When we first wrote our visa waiver provision, there were objections that we didn't have enough flexibility. We changed it and now we have 81 sponsors on this legislation. I would ask, how many pieces of legislation have 81 cosponsors? You couldn't even get it for a Mother's Day resolution. I mean this is strong. And of all the times for us to object to this United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, it should not be today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 492, S. 2673; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reserving my right to object, I appreciate Senator BOXER's leadership on this issue. She is a great advocate and a strong supporter of Israel, as I am, and have been consistently since I have been in the Senate.

I would note for the Senator that the expansion of this program has been problematic for some time. I have been involved with the Visa Waiver Program for quite a number of years. So my concern is not based on Israel, it is based on trying to maintain consistency and effectiveness of the program.

It is not a program that I think is operating effectively. Congress has declared that no more waivers be granted until after this biometric exit system has been completed. I believe our House colleagues are considering a bill that is very similar to what Senator BOXER and others are supporting but it does not include this provision.

Based on that, I am not able to support this amendment and would object.

Mr. President, if the Senator would allow me, I would say let's pass a bill without that provision in it. Let's get that done today, and I will commit to further research and digging into this to see if there is any legitimate way based on law and consistency and the integrity of the visa waiver system that I could support it. It might be. Israel is an educated country. We have a lot of people who travel back and forth between our countries. It is just so far the State Department has not approved it. The House does not have it in their bill, and I and the Members of the Judiciary Committee who have

dealt with these issues for quite a number of years—I have resisted the expansion of this program contrary to the law and State Department policy. Regretfully I have objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I won't be long, but I am so disappointed. I know my friend wants to be helpful, but I have to say that the visa waiver section—I am not being stubborn about this—all it does is it says that Israel should have the same privileges as Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Czech Republic.

Of all the days to say no to this bill, with what is going on over there. It hurts my heart. It breaks my heart, because this bill authorizes \$200 million in the value of U.S. weapons sales in Israel to a total of \$1.8 billion. It is a stockpile that is intended to be used by U.S. forces, but in event of emergency, Israel can tap that. And, my God, this is an emergency. It is so critical. In fact, just last week the United States provided Israel with ammunition from the stockpile after Israel requested help to replace its depleted supplies.

We shouldn't be waiting another hour to pass this, and here we are as the clock ticks down and we go off on our break and as my friend knows, this bill doesn't cost one slim dime—not one slim dime—not one penny. It is such a signal to Israel that we stand with her.

It also has an energy section where we help Israel develop her natural gas supplies to become energy independent. It is so sad for me today.

Last night Senator CORKER had an objection. He cleared it. He and I had a real go-to on it. I know we had a bit of a misunderstanding. He backed off. I am so appreciative. Then Senator COBURN had a problem, and he backed off and he said, "No, I kind of like this section." Then Senator LEE had a problem and Senator COBURN talked to Senator LEE and Senator LEE was fine.

We have 81 people on this bill, and 1 Senator this afternoon is holding it hostage because he doesn't like the program. Well, we can all work together on the program, but why single out Israel because you don't like the program? Let this go.

We can have a colloquy. We can work together, Senator SESSIONS. We can make sure there is no abuse here. We changed this so we would be sure there is no abuse.

I am very saddened at this, and all I can say is that Senator BLUNT and I are coming back with this bill over and over and over again, and one way or the other we will get it done.

I say to my friends in Israel: Take heart. Eighty-one of our Senators are with you on this bill, and only a handful haven't even gone on, and only one—only one—objected. So take heart, because we are with you and we will get this done.

Mr. President, that is the end of my remarks, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if it would be more convenient for you to come to the desk, I am happy to sit in the Chair.

Since the Presiding Officer can't answer my question, I will note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOXER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Madam President, is the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a cloture motion that I ask be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Charles E. Schumer, John D. Rockefeller IV, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke

cloture on the motion to proceed occur on Monday, September 8, when the Senate resumes legislative session following confirmation of the Pryor nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I wish to express my bitter disappointment in the Senate for refusing to move forward with the President's request for emergency funding to deal with the humanitarian crisis we are facing on our southern border with Texas.

Ordinary working people do not close up shop with urgent work still undone, and neither should we. There is plenty of blame to go around; as I speak, there is a strong chance the House will leave town without taking action on this crisis either. The administration has asked for money, but has yet to speak clearly on what changes it needs in the law governing how we handle child migrants at the border.

As we all know, over the past several months, our Nation has experienced an unprecedented surge in migration from three countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. People from these countries are fleeing desperate, violent conditions and a large number of them are families, and unaccompanied children—some as young as 4 years old.

The President and Department of Homeland Secretary, DHS, Johnson responded with an all-hands-on-deck effort. The Federal Emergency Management Administration, FEMA, is coordinating the response to the problem. The Department of Defense is providing emergency beds for unaccompanied minors. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has greatly expanded its ability to detain and remove families. We have surged Border Patrol agents, immigration judges, and other personnel to the border to help process people.

These measures have been working. For example, the amount of time people are detained before they are removed has decreased from over a month to as little as 4 days in recent weeks. Migrant children who were languishing in crowded border patrol stations are being screened and relocated more quickly. But these emergency measures are expensive, and none of the Federal agencies involved have the money they need to sustain the aggres-

sive steps they are taking to deal with this situation. In fact, many agencies have indicated that they will run out of money in a matter of weeks without action—some even in a few days.

So last week, Senator MIKULSKI introduced a bill that would provide \$2.7 billion in order to address the situation and ensure that the agencies charged with securing our borders do not run out of money this summer. More importantly, it would also address some of the underlying root causes of the problem we face.

But here we are, the day before Congress leaves town, and what have we done to address this crisis? The answer is nothing.

The consequences of our inaction will be severe. Let me give you some examples of what will happen if Congress continues to do nothing.

Families apprehended at the border will be released. Why? Because Immigration and Customs Enforcement does not have the money to add the 3,000 detention beds it needs to house families until they can be returned to their countries;

Undocumented migrants scheduled to be deported will stay here. Why? Because ICE won't have the money for transportation.

People currently being detained will have to be released. Why? Because ICE will have to reduce its detention population.

Undocumented immigrants waiting for their immigration court cases to be heard will have to wait longer. Why? Because we are not adding the 40 immigration court judges that the administration requested.

We also will not be able to hire the 82 immigration prosecutors and 100 repatriation personnel that DHS was planning to hire in August. Why? Because we will not be able to afford them.

Health and Human Services will have to cut back on the number of children it can house. This means that children will have to stay at Border Patrol stations longer and agents will be forced to care for children instead of patrolling the border. Why? Because Health and Human Services will not have the money it needs.

I am frankly stunned that we here in Congress do not have a sense of urgency to pass this bill and make sure that this does not happen. I guess my colleagues believe that we can just move money around in order to patch the holes in these agencies' budgets. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Because of Congress' inaction, the administration will be forced to ask for an emergency reprogramming to get the agencies through August. But this reprogramming will also have severe consequences—consequences that I do not think many of our colleagues seem to understand.

Our border security will be reduced. Why? Because CBP will have to cut

back on aerial support for Border Patrol agents on the border. When I was in Texas and Arizona last year, I heard frontline agents say again and again that aerial support was the single most important force multiplier that they had available to help them secure the border.

People and commerce trying to get into this country will be forced to longer delays and intrusive screenings at our ports of entry. Why? Because CBP will have to take money that was going to be used to fund sophisticated scanning equipment to pay for caring for unaccompanied children at the border.

The Coast Guard will have to stop doing maintenance on many of our Coast Guard vessels. Why? Because the Coast Guard's funds will be shifted.

FEMA will have less money for disaster response just as folks in coastal states, like Delaware, are gearing up for the height of hurricane season. Why? Because DHS will have to raid its Disaster Relief Fund in order to make ends meet.

This is no way to respond to a crisis—a crisis—that we have been talking and talking and talking about here in the Senate for months!

Finally—and in my mind, most incredibly—we will leave here without doing anything to address the underlying factors that explain why this surge is happening in the first place. The President and Senator MIKULSKI included \$300 million in the supplemental package to address what I believe to be the root causes of this surge: the lack of economic opportunities, jobs, and hope in Central America, combined with increasing violence and insecurity in the region. Make no mistake about it, these funds are an emergency.

I am not suggesting that any of this will be a quick or easy fix. It will require a sustained investment—and focus—on the region by the U.S. and also by a number of others. But if we turn our backs on these countries now, I am convinced that we will be back here again 10 years from now dealing with another expensive humanitarian crisis on our border.

But today, we are left empty-handed, and all by our own doing. Again, we have been seeing this humanitarian crisis play out for months now. We have heard the heartbreaking stories of the Central American children and families arriving at our borders.

I believe that we have a moral imperative here to address this crisis with a humane response and one that honors our obligations under U.S. and international law—and is consistent with the admonition that we should love our neighbors as we love ourselves while taking care of the least of these in society.

We have not even come close to meeting the moral imperative and I am deeply disappointed.

Over the next few weeks and into September, I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to think about “the least of these” that we have left behind today and to work harder to come together and find a compromise to this challenge. I also urge the administration to speak more clearly about what it needs, and to work with us to find a path to get it done.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate on July 31, 2014.

I missed rollcall votes in relation to the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to S. 2648, the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to H.R. 3230, adoption of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 3230, the motion to recede from the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021, and the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Jill Pryor, of Georgia, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Had I been present, I would have voted against the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to S. 2648. I would have voted in favor of the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to H.R. 3230, adoption of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 3230, the motion to recede from the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021, and the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Jill Pryor, of Georgia, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM V. HUFFMAN

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing William “Bill” Huffman, the director of Government Relations for Farmers’ Rice Cooperative, who is retiring after a distinguished career that has spanned more than five decades.

Bill Huffman’s roots to rice date back to his childhood. He was raised on his family’s rice farm in Gridley, located in the heart of California’s rice country the Sacramento Valley. Bill later attended Humboldt State University and graduated with a degree in radio/television before going to work for a Sacramento radio station as a farm broadcaster.

Following his career in broadcasting, Bill worked in the government, agricultural, and financial sectors and then joined Farmers’ Rice Cooperative, California’s largest rice marketing firm, representing more than 700 rice growers.

During his 30-year career with Farmers’ Rice, Bill promoted one of the Golden State’s most important crops

with pride and skill, advocating for important public policy issues on behalf of California’s rice industry. Each week, growers could depend upon his summary of important local, State, and Federal news impacting the rice industry in “Bill Huffman’s News of the Week” blog. In addition to tirelessly representing Northern California’s rice growers, Bill also helped lead disaster relief efforts to donate rice overseas following the tragic 2004 tsunami in Southeast Asia. In recognition of all of his outstanding accomplishments, Bill was awarded the California Rice Industry Award by the California Cooperative Rice Research Foundation in 2009.

I had the pleasure getting to know Bill well during his time with Farmers’ Rice Cooperative. We worked together to promote California’s high-quality rice, protect important conservation programs, and encourage sustainable rice farming. Bill has been a strong voice for our rice growers, and I wish my friend the best as he enjoys a well-deserved retirement with his wife Sheila, their four children, and three grandchildren.

Thank you.●

REMEMBERING JOHN VASCONCELLOS

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of John Vasconcellos, a giant in California politics and government who died on May 24 at the age of 82. John made the personal political and took politics personally. He was a compassionate and caring human being who brought all of his humanity to the job of governance.

John Bernard Vasconcellos, Jr., was born in San Jose, CA in 1932. After graduating with high honors from Bellarmine College Preparatory and Santa Clara University, John spent 2 years in the Army before returning to Santa Clara for law school, where he again graduated at the top of his class.

John became interested in politics while serving on Governor Pat Brown’s reelection campaign staff during Brown’s epic 1962 race against Richard Nixon.

In 1966, John was elected to the California State Assembly, beginning a record 38 years of uninterrupted service in the Legislature.

In the assembly, John was known for his visionary idealism, brilliant intellect, and tough pragmatism. His mastery of budget issues led to his chairmanship of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, where he championed State investment in education. His deep interest in psychology led to the establishment of the California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility.

When term limits forced John to leave the assembly in 1996, he was

elected to the State senate. As chair of the senate committees on education and aging, he championed new investments in K-12, higher education and long-term care while winning bipartisan praise for his careful fiscal stewardship.

In 2004, term limits ended John’s legislative career, but he did not retire. Joining with a group of friends and supporters, he established the Vasconcellos Legacy Project, VLP, an organization “dedicated to the proposition that positive political change is possible, especially because we human beings are innately inclined toward the good.” Through research and advocacy, the VLP has sought to overcome political polarization and cynicism to create a new “Politics of Trust.”

Throughout his long and distinguished life in politics, John Vasconcellos demanded expected the best from himself, his colleagues, and our democracy. He was one of a kind, and he will be truly missed. I extend my deepest condolences to his loving extended family and many friends and admirers.●

REMEMBERING THEODORE VAN KIRK

• Mr. CASEY. Madam President, Theodore “Dutch” Van Kirk died on July 28, 2014, at the age of 93. A native of Northumberland, PA, he served his country with distinction during a difficult time for our Nation and the world. I ask that the following story from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, July 30, 2014]

OBITUARY: THEODORE “DUTCH” VANKIRK/ WWII AIRMAN WHOSE CREW DROPPED ATOMIC BOMB ON JAPAN, FEB. 27, 1921-JULY 28, 2014

(By Joe Smydo)

At first, Theodore “Dutch” VanKirk and the other airmen aboard the Enola Gay feared the atomic bomb they had dropped on Japan was a dud.

But after what seemed like an interminable wait, “there was a bright flash in the air,” Mr. VanKirk recounted in a 2012 book. The B-29 rocked from the shock waves, a white mushroom cloud shot into the sky, and the devastation became clear even from the crew’s vantage point thousands of feet in the air.

“The ground was covered with thick black smoke and dust and dirt,” he said. “It looked like a pot of boiling black oil covering practically the entire city of Hiroshima.”

Mr. VanKirk, 93, a Northumberland, Pa., native and the last surviving member of the crew that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945, a secret mission credited with bringing World War II to an end, died Monday in suburban Atlanta. He had experienced vascular difficulties.

Thomas VanKirk of Mt. Lebanon said his father was handpicked by the Enola Gay’s pilot, Paul Tibbets, to serve as navigator on

the bombing run. The two had met and served together in England years earlier.

After the war, Mr. VanKirk received bachelor's and master's degrees in chemical engineering from Bucknell University and was posted all over the country during a 35-year career with DuPont.

"Most importantly, he was an outstanding father," Thomas VanKirk, Highmark's chief legal officer, said.

The decision to use the atomic bomb on Japan—another B-29, the Bockscar, bombed Nagasaki three days after Hiroshima—remains controversial because of the lives lost.

However, Donald Goldstein, a military historian, former Air Force officer and retired University of Pittsburgh professor, said the bombings hastened the war's end and spared many other lives that would have been lost during an invasion of Japan.

He said the prevailing sentiment among U.S. military personnel at the time was, "Thank God for the bomb." Mr. Goldstein said bringing the war to a rapid close also helped to forestall Soviet geopolitical ambitions in Japan.

Thomas VanKirk said he initially learned about his father's exploits through newspaper clippings he found during a childhood exploration of his grandmother's attic. In 1995, father and son stood together during the unveiling of an Enola Gay exhibit at the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum.

"He had no regrets about dropping the bomb. He believed it was necessary," said Youngstown, N.Y., historian Suzanne Simon Dietz, whose book about Mr. VanKirk, "My True Course," relies on his letters and memoirs.

In 2005, Mr. VanKirk told the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, "I just had a job to do." But others considered him a hero and his death a reminder of the passing of the WWII generation.

"A son of Pennsylvania, Theodore 'Dutch' VanKirk helped to save the world from tyranny and then returned home to live the quiet life of a citizen," Gov. Tom Corbett said in a statement. Mr. Corbett said he and his wife, Susan, "send our heartfelt sympathies to his family and the thanks of a grateful state for his service to the cause of freedom."

Mr. VanKirk was born Feb. 27, 1921. He graduated from Northumberland High School, briefly attended Susquehanna University and joined the Army Air Forces cadet program in fall 1941—before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, his son said, because he knew the war was coming and wanted to choose his method of service.

Posted to Europe, he served aboard a B-17 bomber, the Red Gremlin, with Mr. Tibbets and bombardier Thomas Ferebee, who also would be part of the Enola Gay crew for the Hiroshima bombing. After nearly 60 bombing runs over Europe and a special mission ferrying Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. VanKirk returned to the United States and married his high school sweetheart, Mary Jane Young, who died in 1975.

In 1944, at Mr. Tibbets' request, he joined a special group, stationed in Utah, that was preparing for use of the atomic bomb. Mr. VanKirk told his story many times over the years and, Thomas VanKirk said, was still fit enough early this summer to go on a family beach vacation.

Also surviving are another son, Larry VanKirk of Charlotte, N.C.; two daughters, Vicki Triplett of Atlanta and Joanne Gotelli of Sacramento, Calif; seven grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:41 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 935. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3230. An act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. REID).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 935. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2772. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

S. 2773. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, for border security, law enforcement, humanitarian assistance, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 594. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act relating to Federal research on muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2774. A bill to require all recreational vessels to have and to post passenger capac-

ity limits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt aircraft management services from the ticket tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2776. A bill to establish a Carbon Capture and Sequestration Deployment Acceleration Fund to promote the establishment of not fewer than 10 commercial-scale carbon capture and sequestration units in the United States during the next 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 536. A resolution designating September 2014 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 537. A resolution reaffirming support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 654

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 2100

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions.

S. 2194

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Vermont

(Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2194, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2483

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2593, a bill to amend the FLAME Act of 2009 to provide for additional wildfire suppression activities, to provide for the conduct of certain forest treatment projects, and for other purposes.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2649

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2649, a bill to provide certain legal relief from politically motivated charges by the Government of Egypt.

S. 2685

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2685, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2692

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2692, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 2766

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2766, a bill to combat terrorism and promote reform in the Palestinian Au-

thority and the United Nations, and for other purposes.

S. 2768

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2768, a bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to expand the use of categorical exclusions for hazardous fuel reduction projects.

S. RES. 525

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 525, a resolution designating July 30, 2014, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day".

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution supporting Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 536—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS "NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH"

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 536

Whereas ovarian cancer is the deadliest of all gynecologic cancers;

Whereas ovarian cancer is the 5th leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States;

Whereas, in 2014, approximately 21,980 new cases of ovarian cancer will be diagnosed, and 14,270 women will die of ovarian cancer in the United States;

Whereas the mortality rate for ovarian cancer has not significantly decreased since the "War on Cancer" was declared more than 40 years ago;

Whereas 25 percent of women will die within 1 year of diagnosis with ovarian cancer and over 50 percent will die within 5 years;

Whereas while there is the mammogram to detect breast cancer and the Pap smear to detect cervical cancer, there is no reliable early detection test for ovarian cancer;

Whereas the lack of an early detection test means that approximately 80 percent of cases of ovarian cancer are detected at an advanced stage;

Whereas all women are at risk for ovarian cancer, and approximately 15 percent of women diagnosed with ovarian cancer have a family history of ovarian cancer, which places them at even higher risk;

Whereas scientists and physicians have uncovered changes in the BRCA genes that some women inherit from their parents, which may make them 30 times more likely to develop ovarian cancer;

Whereas the family history of a woman has been found to play an important role in accurately assessing that woman's risk of developing ovarian cancer and medical experts believe that family history should be taken into consideration during a woman's annual well woman visit;

Whereas many experts in health prevention now recommends genetic testing for young women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer;

Whereas women who know they are at high risk of breast and ovarian cancer may undertake prophylactic measures to help reduce the risk of developing these diseases;

Whereas the Society of Gynecologic Oncology now recommends that all women diagnosed with ovarian cancer receive counseling and genetic testing;

Whereas many people are unaware that the symptoms of ovarian cancer often include bloating, pelvic or abdominal pain, difficulty eating or feeling full quickly, urinary symptoms, and several other symptoms that are easily confused with other diseases;

Whereas awareness of the symptoms of ovarian cancer by women and health care providers can lead to a quicker diagnosis;

Whereas, in June 2007, the first national consensus statement on ovarian cancer symptoms was developed to provide consistency in describing symptoms to make it easier for women to learn and remember the symptoms; and

Whereas each year during the month of September, the Ovarian Cancer National Alliance and partner members hold a number of events to increase public awareness of ovarian cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2014 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month"; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 537—RE-AFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO DEFEND ITS CITIZENS AND ENSURE THE SURVIVAL OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 537

Whereas, on July 17, 2014, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution supporting Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel, condemning the actions of Hamas, and calling for the President of the Palestinian Authority to dissolve the unity government arrangement with Hamas;

Whereas, on July 29, 2014, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution condemning Hamas's terrorist actions and use of civilians as human shields and condemning the United Nations Human Right Council's resolution of July 23, 2014;

Whereas, since June 2014, Hamas has fired over 2,500 rockets at Israel;

Whereas Hamas has used a system of tunnels to smuggle weapons and launch attacks on Israel;

Whereas 5,000,000 innocent Israeli civilians are currently living under the threat of indiscriminant rocket attacks from Gaza;

Whereas, since ground operations in Gaza began, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) have discovered more than 30 tunnels to only provide access to Israeli territory to attack and kidnap Israelis;

Whereas Israel has accepted and implemented numerous ceasefire agreements that Hamas has rejected;

Whereas, on July 26, 2014, Hamas continued to fire rockets into Israel during a 24-hour truce that Hamas had itself proposed;

Whereas Israel embraced the Egyptian-proposed ceasefire agreement, which Hamas resoundingly rejected on July 27, 2014;

Whereas, on August 1, 2014, 90 minutes into a humanitarian ceasefire, Hamas violated a ceasefire to use one of these tunnels to conduct a suicide attack, killing two Israeli soldiers and kidnapping 2nd Lt. Hadar Goldin, an IDF soldier;

Whereas Israel has a right to defend itself from Hamas's constant barrage of rockets and to destroy the matrix of tunnels Hamas uses to smuggle weapons and Hamas fighters into Israel to carry out terrorist attacks;

Whereas the Government of Israel has taken significant steps to protect civilians in Gaza, including dropping leaflets in Gaza neighborhoods in advance of Israeli military attacks, calling Palestinians on the phone urging them to evacuate certain areas before the military strikes targets, and issuing warnings to civilians in advance of firing on buildings;

Whereas Hamas uses civilians in Gaza as human shields by placing missile launchers next to schools, hospitals, mosques, and private homes;

Whereas Hamas' interior ministry has called on residents of Gaza to ignore IDF warnings to get out of harm's way; and

Whereas any effort to broker a ceasefire agreement that does not eliminate those threats cannot be sustained in the long run and will leave Israel vulnerable to future attacks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel;

(2) condemns Hamas' repeated violation of humanitarian cease fires and its use of suicide bombings;

(3) demands Hamas return the IDF soldier kidnapped on August 1, 2014;

(4) calls on the United Nations Secretary General to immediately condemn all terrorist attacks by Hamas on Israel;

(5) reiterates its call on Hamas to stop using residents of Gaza as human shields;

(6) urges the international community to condemn the unprovoked rocket fire at Israel;

(7) calls on the Palestinian people to reject Hamas and its hateful ideology and to seek peace; and

(8) recognizes that the Government of Israel must be allowed to take actions necessary to remove the present and future threats posed by Hamas' rockets and tunnels and supports the Government of Israel's efforts to deal with the threats posed by Hamas rockets and tunnels.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3780. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. NELSON) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76, making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.

SA 3781. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76, *supra*.

SA 3782. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3780. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. NELSON) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76, making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats; as follows:

Strike all after the first word, and insert: the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats: *Provided*, That such funds shall be transferred immediately only through an exchange of letters to address emergent operations in support of Operation Protective Edge, notwithstanding section 3.1.3.2.1 of the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to previously appropriated funds for the procurement of Iron Dome: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

SA 3781. Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, and Ms. MIKULSKI) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 76, making an emer-

gency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats."

SA 3782. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 650, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

TITLE XVIII—UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

SEC. 1801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014".

SEC. 1802. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The people and the Governments of the United States and of Israel share a deep and unbreakable bond, forged by over 60 years of shared interests and shared values.

(2) Today, the people and Governments of the United States and of Israel are facing a dynamic and rapidly changing security environment in the Middle East and North Africa, necessitating deeper cooperation on a range of defense, security, and intelligence matters.

(3) From Gaza, Hamas continues to deny Israel's right to exist and persists in firing rockets indiscriminately at population centers in Israel.

(4) Hezbollah—with support from Iran—continues to stockpile rockets and may be seeking to exploit the tragic and volatile security situation within Syria.

(5) The Government of Iran continues to pose a grave threat to the region and the world at large with its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons.

(6) Given these challenges, it is imperative that the United States continues to deepen cooperation with allies like Israel in pursuit of shared policy objectives.

SEC. 1803. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the unwavering support of the people and the Government of the United States for the security of Israel as a Jewish state;

(2) to reaffirm the principles and objectives enshrined in the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-150) and ensure its implementation to the fullest extent;

(3) to reaffirm the importance of the 2007 United States-Israel Memorandum of Understanding on United States assistance to Israel and the semi-annual Strategic Dialogue between the United States and Israel;

(4) to pursue every opportunity to deepen cooperation with Israel on a range of critical issues including defense, homeland security, energy, and cybersecurity;

(5) to continue to provide Israel with robust security assistance, including for the procurement of the Iron Dome Missile Defense System; and

(6) to support the Government of Israel in its ongoing efforts to reach a negotiated political settlement with the Palestinian people that results in two states living side-by-side in peace and security.

SEC. 1804. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ISRAEL AS A MAJOR STRATEGIC PARTNER.

It is the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States.

SEC. 1805. EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Section 12001(d) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287; 118 Stat. 1011) is amended by striking “more than 10 years after” and inserting “more than 11 years after”.

(b) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 514(b)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “and 2014” and inserting “, 2014, and 2015”.

SEC. 1806. ELIGIBILITY OF ISRAEL FOR THE STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION TO CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROL LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that Israel—

- (1) has adopted high standards in the field of export controls;

- (2) has declared its unilateral adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group; and

- (3) is a party to—

(A) the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, signed at Geneva October 10, 1980;

(B) the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925; and

(C) the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on October 26, 1979.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION.—The President, consistent with the commitments of the United States under international arrangements, shall take steps so that Israel may be included in the list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception under section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the requirement for a license for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of an item subject to controls under the Export Administration Regulations.

SEC. 1807. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON ENERGY, WATER, HOMELAND SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized, subject to existing law—

- (1) to undertake activities in cooperation with Israel; and

- (2) to provide assistance promoting cooperation in the fields of energy, water, agriculture, and alternative fuel technologies.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President is authorized, subject to existing requirements of law and any applicable agreements or understandings between the United States and Israel—

- (1) to share and exchange with Israel research, technology, intelligence, information, equipment, and personnel, including

through sales, leases, or exchanges in kind, that the President determines will advance the national security interests of the United States and are consistent with the Strategic Dialogue and pertinent provisions of law; and

- (2) to enhance scientific cooperation between Israel and the United States.

(c) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized, subject to existing law, to enter into cooperative research pilot programs with Israel to enhance Israel's capabilities in—

- (1) border, maritime, and aviation security;
- (2) explosives detection; and
- (3) emergency services.

SEC. 1808. REPORT ON INCREASED UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report, in a classified format or including a classified annex, as appropriate, on the feasibility and advisability of expanding United States-Israeli cooperation on cyber issues, including sharing and advancing technologies related to the prevention of cybercrimes.

SEC. 1809. VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should designate the State of Israel as a program country under the Visa Waiver Program when the Government of Israel—

- (1) is in compliance with all the requirements of the program specified in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), except for the low non-immigrant visa refusal rate requirement under subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section; and

- (2) has met the conditions for a waiver of such requirement set forth in subsection (c).

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take steps to engage with representatives of the Government of Israel on—

- (1) the extent to which Israel satisfies the requirements specified in section 217 of such Act for inclusion in the Visa Waiver Program;

- (2) additional steps that may be required in order for Israel to qualify for consideration for inclusion in such program.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to waive the low non-immigrant visa refusal rate requirements under paragraphs (2)(A) and (3)(B) of section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)) for the State of Israel if—

- (1) the Government of Israel has complied with all other requirements of the Visa Waiver Program, including extending the reciprocal privileges described in section 217(a)(2)(A) of such Act to citizens and nationals of the United States without regard to the race, religion, national origin, or ethnicity of any such citizen or national;

- (2) the percentage of nationals of Israel who were refused a nonimmigrant visitor visa during the previous fiscal year is not more than 10 percent of the total number of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of Israel which were granted or refused during that fiscal year.

(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to exempt the

State of Israel from all requirements to which other program countries are subject under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act except for requirements relating to low nonimmigrant visa refusal rates under paragraphs (2)(A) and (3)(B) of section 217(c) of such Act.

SEC. 1810. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 4 OF THE UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2012.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, to the extent practicable and in an appropriate manner, provide an update to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on current and future efforts undertaken by the President to fulfill the objectives of section 4 of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act (22 U.S.C. 8603).

SEC. 1811. IMPROVED REPORTING ON ENHANCING ISRAEL'S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE AND SECURITY POSTURE.

(a) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT REEVALUATIONS.—Section 201(c) of the Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2776 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BIENNIAL UPDATES.—Two years after the date on which each quadrennial report is transmitted to Congress, the President shall—

“(A) reevaluate the assessment required under subsection (a); and

“(B) inform and consult with the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the reevaluation conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A).”.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.—Section 36(h) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(h)) is amended—

- (1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

- (2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DETERMINATION FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.—A determination under paragraph (1) relating to the sale or export of major defense equipment shall include—

“(A) a detailed explanation of Israel's capacity to address the improved capabilities provided by such sale or export;

“(B) a detailed evaluation of—

“(i) how such sale or export alters the strategic and tactical balance in the region, including relative capabilities; and

“(ii) Israel's capacity to respond to the improved regional capabilities provided by such sale or export;

“(C) an identification of any specific new capacity, capabilities, or training that Israel may require to address the regional or country-specific capabilities provided by such sale or export; and

“(D) a description of any additional United States security assurances to Israel made, or requested to be made, in connection with, or as a result of, such sale or export.”.

SEC. 1812. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”;

- (2) in paragraph (4)—

- (A) by striking “possible many” and inserting “possible—

“(A) many”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “and

“(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation and the development of natural resources by Israel are in the strategic interest of the United States;

“(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

“(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

“(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States, to the extent consistent with the National Science Foundation’s mission, should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;

“(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in—

“(A) energy innovation technology and engineering;

“(B) water science;

“(C) technology transfer; and

“(D) analysis of emerging geopolitical implications, crises and threats from foreign natural resource and energy acquisitions, and the development of domestic resources as a response;

“(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel with respect to expanding the use of alternative fuels;

“(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for regular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sector of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

“(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

“(B) discussing and sharing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure and other energy security matters;

“(C) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

“(D) issues relating to the energy-water nexus, including improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, water treatment in gas and oil production processes, and other water treatment refiners;

“(E) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

“(F) emergency response and coastal protection and restoration;

“(G) academic outreach and engagement;

“(H) private sector and business development engagement;

“(I) regulatory consultations;

“(J) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

“(K) any other areas determined appropriate by the United States and Israel;

“(15) the United States—

“(A) acknowledges the achievements and importance of the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation; and

“(B) supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the foundations specified in subparagraph (A); and

“(16) the United States and Israel have a shared interest in addressing immediate, near-term, and long-term energy, energy poverty, energy independence, and environmental challenges facing the United States and Israel, respectively.”.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 917(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable energy or energy efficiency” and inserting “covered energy”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) natural gas energy, including conventional and unconventional natural gas technologies and other associated technologies, and natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation; and

“(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refiners.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “energy efficiency or renewable” and inserting “covered”.

(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS; REGIONAL ENERGY COOPERATION.—

(1) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d);

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e);

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of Federal share of the costs of implementing cooperative agreements entered into pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—If the Secretary enters into agreements authorized by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that describes—

“(A) actions taken to implement such agreements; and

“(B) any projects undertaken pursuant to such agreements.

“(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Energy Center in the United States leveraging the experience, knowledge, and expertise of institutions of higher education and entities in the private sector, among others, in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of emerging geopolitical implications, crises and threats from foreign natural resource and energy acquisitions, and the development of domestic resources as a response.”; and

(D) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by striking “the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

(2) CONSTRUCTIVE REGIONAL ENERGY COOPERATION.—The Secretary of State shall continue the ongoing diplomacy efforts of the Secretary of State in—

(A) engaging and supporting the energy security of Israel; and

(B) promoting constructive regional energy cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

TREASURY RELIANCE ON STATE EXAMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further action on H.R. 4386 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4386) to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and there be no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4386) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5195, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5195) to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 5195) was passed.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 507 to 511, all post office naming bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills.

SPECIALIST CHRISTOPHER SCOTT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 606) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JAMES "JIM" KOHNEN POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1671) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VINCENT R. SOMBROTTO POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2291) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SERGEANT BRETT E. GORNEWICZ MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 3472) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SPECIALIST RYAN P. JAYNE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3765) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 536) designating September 2014 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 536) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Friday, August 1, through Monday, September 8, the majority leader and Senators ROCKEFELLER, REED, LEVIN, COONS, and CARDIN be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, following the vote on confirmation of the Pryor nomination, on September 8, 2014, the Senate proceed to executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 910, 911, 908, and 909; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of that time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, August 5, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be no rollcall votes on Tuesday. The next rollcall vote will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, September 8. And when I say Tuesday, that is this Tuesday coming up a few days from now.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2014, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:39 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, August 5, 2014, at 11 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, August 1, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 1, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, in the midst of great and urgent debate, we ask again that You give all Members peace and patience, with wisdom and courage to do what is best for our Nation.

Perplexing and competing questions and answers challenge us all to remember that our Nation is a people descended from immigrants, most in history, and many in faith. May all Americans, and those Members who represent them here, rise to the challenge of these days and prove to be the best of ourselves.

As always, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 694, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 9:08 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to the conference report H.R. 3230.

That the Senate agreed without amendment H. Con. Res. 111.

That the Senate recedes in its amendment to the bill H.R. 5021.

Appointments:

State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board. Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Review Board. State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 700 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 700

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 5, 2014, providing for consideration or disposition of measures relating to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of September 5, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to measures addressing the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met to report a rule that would provide for same-day authority for any resolution reported from the Committee on Rules related to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the southern border, border security, and related immigration law through September 5, 2014. Additionally, the rule provides suspension authority through September 5, 2014, on the same topics.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is very straightforward. It allows the House the maximum flexibility to deal with the crisis on the southern border during the district work period by providing both same-day and suspension authority through September 5.

Any legislation considered during this time period would still need to go through the regular process, by either a rule for consideration by the Rules Committee or under the standard suspension process. This resolution just allows for expedited consideration of those matters while preserving as much of the district work period as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this martial law rule.

The martial law authority created under this rule would last through September 5. In other words, the House Republicans can call us back on a whim, just to consider any kind of bill they call a border or immigration bill. So much for their 3-day rule. I wonder how much notice they have to give Speaker CRUZ before they call us back?

Let's just take a moment to remember how we got here.

The Republican leadership put together a partisan, inadequate, and unacceptable emergency supplemental

bill that allegedly dealt with the humanitarian crisis at the southern border. That bill was mean-spirited and cruel, but it wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough to satisfy the far-right wing of the Republican Conference. So the leadership tried to add another mean-spirited, cruel bill to block any further help for young immigrants under the DACA program, a program that has helped thousands of young people who have grown up in America come out of the shadows so they can go to school or hold a job without fear of being deported. But that wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough for their base, so they pulled the whole package from the floor yesterday.

So last night, we had yet another meeting in the Rules Committee, and that is when they came up with this rule, but not a solution. That is right, Mr. Speaker. They still don't know what they are going to do. But I have an idea. They are going to make their cruel, mean-spirited immigration bill even worse, and that may not be enough to placate the far right who simply don't like immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. The far-right wing of the Republican base will never, ever be satisfied. And the martial-law authority created under this rule would last through September 5, so if the Republicans can somehow come up with even more mean-spirited bills, if they can figure out a way to act even more cruelly, they can bring us back again and again and again to vote.

Now, in case any Americans are still watching, they could be forgiven for being a little confused about what happened this week. On Wednesday, House Republicans voted to waste millions of taxpayer dollars to sue the President for what they claim is excessive executive action. But on Thursday, this is what Speaker BOEHNER said about the border crisis:

There are numerous steps the President can and should be taking right now, without the need for congressional action, to secure our borders.

So which is it, Mr. Speaker? Is President Obama doing too much or not enough? I have got whiplash. It would be easier to take the Republicans seriously if they would just settle on one set of partisan talking points.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the crisis at our border.

There are nearly 50 million refugees around the world, 50 million people fleeing violence, brutality, oppression, famine, disease—50 million. But when 50,000 minors, one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number, arrive at our border, my Republican friends have a collective hissy fit.

Is this really the face of America that we want the rest of the world to see? The United States of America, a nation of immigrants, do we really

want the rest of the world to see us like this, petty and mean and small? I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, my friend and I are going to have a disagreement about the nature of the bill that I think will, in rather short order, be before us. Let's go back and look at a little bit of history here.

The administration was warned in 2012 and 2013 that we were going to have a crisis on our hands if we didn't do something, that we were going to get a flow of unaccompanied minors. They did absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States submitted a budget to us which cut money for enforcement and detention at the border, which cut money for support of people that were here while they were being processed, and that cut money for aid to the countries where most of these folks are coming from. That is real foresight.

So we have been confronted with a crisis, and a crisis that, in our view, the President contributed to by unilaterally changing whole sections of the immigration law and leaving the impression, probably unwittingly, I would say, but leaving the impression to many people that, if we get to the United States, we are going to be able to stay.

There is no question criminal elements have picked that impression up, broadcast it. Thousands of people have sent them tens of thousands—millions, really—of dollars and put children on a perilous journey of over 1,000 miles to this country.

Now we are trying to act on that, and we think, number one, if we don't do that, the societies from which they are coming are going to be disrupted. And we have been told very clearly by the leaders of those countries: We would like our children back.

Number two, if we don't stop this process, we are going to continue to enrich cartels to an extraordinary degree. Frankly, as one border agent told me, he said, from a cartel standpoint, this is actually easier than drugs, because with drugs we try to interdict you every step along the way, and if you get to the border to cross, we continue to try and interdict you. In this case, we actually, once they bring an illegal unaccompanied minor here, complete the transaction. So it is encouraging the flow, and that is dangerous for the young people involved.

We all know that in the course of that journey there is a risk that sex trafficking will take place. There is a risk that people will be lured or forced into drug dealing. There is a terrific physical risk. We know a lot of those folks are abused in the course of this process or sexually assaulted, so we

need to stop this flow. We need to do it in a humane and appropriate way.

The President, by the way, has suggested that this is due to the 2008 law which we all passed, in good faith, to deal with sex trafficking. I personally don't think that is the case, but if that is true, then we ought to make some tweak to that law. We don't need to repeal it, but we need to make sure that we do something so that we don't have an enormous backlog here and we can actually handle the flow appropriately.

We have waited in vain for the President to tell us what that tweak is. I mean, it was his Secretary of Homeland Security that actually raised this issue and said we need to be able—he said this in testimony in front of the United States Senate—we need to be able to treat people coming from the three Central American countries essentially the same way we treat Canadian and Mexican minors that arrive at our border. That was the position, but we have not seen any more requests.

So if you look at our bill, frankly, number one, it is going to take care of that problem with a tweak. Number 2, we are going to provide additional moneys to handle this process through the end of the fiscal year and the end of the calendar year. Number 3, then we can work, because there will probably be additional resources needed next year, under the caps in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement and redirect that flow of money from less urgent to more urgent problems.

So we think it is a responsible way to proceed. I think, essentially, that is what we are going to try and put before the House. Regardless, once we pass something, then the Senate can pass something.

I am sad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the other body was unable to do anything yesterday and it has adjourned and gone home. Frankly, we were unable to get things done yesterday in a way that I think I certainly would have liked, but we stayed here, and we are going to continue to work through the problem, present a product. Hopefully, the Senate will come back and do the same, and then we can proceed legislatively and provide the resources and legislative corrections that are needed to deal with the situation.

I am pleased that we are in session. I am pleased that we are working toward a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in today's paper, there is an op-ed. It is written by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the new majority leader. And in

that op-ed he said: "I have always believed that you must win the argument before you can win the vote. In Congress, committees act as idea factories for policies from both sides, and as majority leader, I will commit to the committee process and regular order."

Apparently, he didn't start yesterday doing that. And we don't start today doing that. This legislation has not been considered by committee, subcommittee, and none of us have seen it at this point in time.

I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma say that the legislation is going to do this, that, and the other.

We haven't seen it. It is 10:15. We haven't seen it. No regular order. No exercising of responsibility. We saw irresponsibility rampant yesterday in the House of Representatives. We saw a few months ago, shutting down government if you don't do it my way.

I will tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, none of the leaders of the Republican Party have reached across to say, how can we do this in a bipartisan way. And so, because of their unwillingness to do that, Mr. Speaker, the Senate is gone. What we do today will be useless, a show, a form without substance, a pretense, a political message to their base of how hard they can be because they are moving in exactly the opposite direction of trying to create bipartisanship.

So I urge my colleagues, stand up for doing the right thing and giving the resources necessary to meet the challenge that America has and America ought to be meeting today and yesterday and the day before.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to disagree with my good friend, the minority whip, on a point.

I don't think the Senate left yesterday because of anything the House did. It failed to act, and it left. It went home because it couldn't pass a bill. That is something we are not going to allow to happen here. We are going to pass legislation. We are going to get our part of the job done.

The Senate, then, will be free to come back and pass something, and we can go into a conference and do exactly what my friend suggests, work out a compromise. So hopefully that is where we will end up in this process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, there are two real crises before us, and the Republican response was the misbegotten legislation, withdrawn yesterday, as it should have been, but the other wasn't even on the table in any form.

There were 236 new fires started in the Western United States last night. There are 31 large fires that are uncontained. And the Forest Service and the

BLM are running out of money. In the Senate bill—which, granted, it didn't pass—but in the President's proposal was emergency firefighting money. But somehow, the Republicans here don't think those fires are an emergency and they don't care about the loss of resources, the potential loss of life, and the loss of property that is going to result.

When those agencies run out of money, they can't stop fighting the fires, but they have will have to cut back on programs of preparedness and things that would mitigate the disaster of future fires, deal with forest health, fuel reduction, and all those things. But they couldn't care less. They are taking no action. They didn't even put forward a lame proposal on that, unlike their very lame proposal on the border.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman may be surprised to find that, actually, we are not too far apart on the issue.

Now, currently, we have over \$700 million still on hand to deal with wildfires. The gentleman and I actually cosponsored legislation that our friend from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) has offered so that we can actually deal with this and change the structure of how we fund wildfire fighting. I suspect that issue will come back again. As a matter of fact, I was willing to work during the budget process with some of my friends on the other side of the Rules Committee to actually write the change into the budget. We had the votes on our side, working with our friends, to do that. For some reason, the Democratic amendment was withdrawn. I don't know why, and I cast no aspersions. But that is an area where we would like to work with you. I don't think it is particularly appropriate to be done in this bill.

This bill is about dealing with the crisis on the southern border. It shouldn't be a Christmas tree or a grab bag. If we need additional resources, we should come back to do that. Again, we have sufficient resources on hand. Congress will be back in session in September, back in session after the elections. So I think we are going to have multiple opportunities to deal with this.

I look forward to working with my friends on this particular issue when those opportunities occur.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we would like to work on that. As I said, no option has been given to us for that. Secondly, you are not following regular order on the legislation. What is needed now are resources. And the reason

the Senate didn't act is because no Member of your party would support action.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a fortunate man. I am a fortunate man because half a century ago, my father, at 17 years old, arrived at this country with my mother. And this country gave them refuge. Later, the rest of our family came. This country has been tremendously generous, as we were brutalized by a leftwing dictatorship, the Castro dictatorship.

And to think, Mr. Speaker, that a fellow Cuban American sits in the other House, dictating to this House that we should strip away rights, strip away rights from children, is unacceptable. It is un-American.

I am a fortunate man. And we are a rich and plentiful country, a country of laws.

We have an opportunity to do the right thing, to pass the bipartisan, comprehensive bill that the other House passed. It has now been 1 year and 1 month since that happened. The time has come. Let us pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to disagree with my friend on the root of this issue. I don't think whether or not we passed immigration reform has anything to do with the border crisis. I really don't. Frankly, what is occurring there would be illegal had we passed what the Senate passed. So it just simply doesn't address the problem.

What the problem here is, by our own actions in this country, we have sent a message that if you get here, you can stay, whether you are legally entitled to or not. And it is going to take so long to process you, you will essentially never be sent back.

And we have allowed criminal cartels to distort our position and to make tens of millions of dollars off of this. That needs to be stopped. That needs to be reversed. It is not helpful to anybody.

Now, again, we may differ on the ideas. Although, I would point out for the record once more, the administration did ask: Please do something about the 2008 law. They asked that a month ago. And then they have sort of gotten quiet since then. We don't hear anything else about that.

They have asked for resources. We have looked at what they need. We said we will be willing to do that. We are going to take them from existing monies. We are not going to spend new money. This is an urgent priority. We think you are right. We are going to redirect that. And by the way, if you are going to need additional resources next year, we will work with you again

there. We are going to do it under the Ryan-Murray budget cap. We are not going to go outside the process. And we are using that.

I think my friend from Maryland, the minority whip, is correct. We are using exceptional procedures—but they are procedures within the traditions of this House—to react to a crisis situation, and we are trying to stay here to get our work done and hopefully challenge the Senate to come back and do the same thing. So we are working the process and the crisis as best we can. With that, we will continue to work.

And I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I spoke on the connection between comprehensive immigration reform and the crisis that we have at our border. And I said then—and I will say it again—that it is the height of hypocrisy to be talking about trying to do something about our border security when we can't even bring comprehensive immigration reform to this floor that would have provided the funding for increased border security. You can't have it both ways.

But the Republican leadership said earlier this week and yesterday that, in fact, maybe the President should use his executive authority to deal with the issue at the border. But on Tuesday, they provided funding—some \$2 million—to sue the President for excessive use of executive authority. Which is it? You can't have it both ways. But it seems like some of our colleagues want to do that.

And then finally, a colleague from the Valley just said this morning: The problem we have is that some of our people just don't want to govern. That is correct. They don't. Once again, we are seeing politics trump good public policy for the people of our country.

What we ought to be doing is returning back to regular order. What we ought to be doing is putting together a bipartisan effort to solve our border problems and to bring about comprehensive immigration reform for all the people of this country. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I am here as a Member of this body who was sent here to work—quite frankly, which is the main reason why most immigrants come to this country—to work, to contribute to our economy, and to do the jobs that most of us are unwilling to do.

But the point that I want to make at this moment is that what the Republican proposal tried to do yesterday—and it failed—and what they are trying

to do today is to strip away the rights of a child to live. The Republicans want to indiscriminately return children to their death.

And I challenge any American to look into yourself and realize and find out that many of these children will be returned with or without a change of the law today. They will be returned. But the ones that deserve to live should be able to stay. And the law was passed unanimously in 2008 to give that opportunity to those children, to these children, the children that are breathing today, the children who came to the most giving, loving, caring land ever created on Earth. And that is now about to change if they are successful.

Mr. COLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker.

I think we need to step back from the emotion a moment and look at the realities of the situation. Number one, anybody that seeks refugee status in the United States can go to any of the embassies in the country and request it. You don't have to travel 1,000 miles. You can go request it, and we will look to see whether or not you qualify.

Number two, the President of the United States has said that the vast majority of these children will be returned. That is not us. That is the President. He has said that. We are trying to do it and work with him in an expeditious way because we think sooner is better.

Number three, we are not returning them to criminals. We are returning them to the custody of their governments, their own officials, who are probably better situated to make these decisions than we are 1,000-plus miles away.

So let's be real. Nobody is stripping any rights away from anyone. We actually have a situation—a 2008 law—where a loophole has been exploited by criminals. That is what is happening. And we are trying to stop the loophole and keep people from embarking on a dangerous journey and discourage people from giving thousands of dollars of their hard-earned money to criminal cartels to participate in that. That is the effort that is underway here.

Nobody would have fewer rights than the people that are currently here from Mexico or Canada. We would still have the ability to adjudicate issues. The process would be a lot faster and, we think in that sense, more humane and more efficient and more expeditious.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle don't have the intuitive gift to know that every child or the majority of every child that is there doesn't have a

right to refuge and doesn't have a right to asylum.

That is why we have been so tenacious about protecting a law that provides due process, adjudication, and representation for these children, so that they have a fair opportunity to get refuge and to get asylum as the law prescribes.

The previous bill that failed dismantled that. TED CRUZ did not give it his seal of the approval, so it didn't get out of the Republican Caucus. Now, before us, we have a rule that is fraudulent, we have a forthcoming law that will be fraudulent, and it will be worse than the previous one.

Now, we are going to codify getting rid of DREAMers and DACA into this law. What is the purpose? To turn out a base? Is this a political strategy? Is this a political expediency on the shoulders of children, on the shoulders of the American values, and on the shoulders of our history?

How shameful, how cynical—vote “no” on the rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to make the point to my friend. Nobody is trying to strip away the rights from anyone. The 2008 law has been abused. Those people have found a loophole in it, and they have clogged the legal system. We have offered not a repeal, but a relatively minor fix.

The President of the United States and his administration have also said this law is at fault. As a matter of fact, they are actually the ones who put that suggestion out there. The President of the United States is the person who said the vast majority of these people need to go home and will eventually go home. So if he has a better way to do this, we would love to see the proposal.

What he sent us was a funding proposal with no fix at all. It is a proposal aimed at better managing the flow of people, but not reversing that. It is a proposal, frankly, that goes well beyond this fiscal year, well beyond this calendar year, and allows him basically to operate outside the budget agreement limits—the caps—that we have all agreed to. We don't think that is appropriate. We think you reprioritize money toward the more urgent issue.

We agree with the President. This is an urgent issue. We are willing to find the savings in other parts of the budget. We are not willing to break the budget, and we are not willing to break the budget caps that both sides agreed to. That is really, I think, the essence of the difference. We are trying to offer a solution. It may not be the final solution.

I hope the Senate will offer their solution. We can go to conference, and we can work with the President, but so far, the only ideas that have been put forward to actually fix the problem, I

think, have largely come from our side of the aisle.

I am sure that won't last indefinitely. I think my friends will do the same thing, but certainly, they dominate the Senate. The Senate can do the same thing. Sooner or later, they will get it done.

We will continue to work on this, but for right now, again, nobody's aim is to strip anybody's rights away, but we are going to try to confront an urgent crisis, and we are going to try and do it in an expeditious way, in a responsible way, and in a limited way.

We can come back here and look at the larger issues in September and after the election. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. The gentleman said that they have offered a solution. Is H.R. 15 contained in this rule or is any legislation to deal with our border contained in this rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Can the Chair at least inform us whether or not there is anything of substance in this rule other than a martial law rule that allows them to call us back at any point from now until September 5?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As stated, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a sign: "Not our kids, not our problems," held angrily by a mob, shaken with "go home," to a group of little children who have made a perilous journey to this country. That really epitomizes what the Republican approach to this problem is.

They care about these children so much that their proposal is to tell them to get out of here just as quick as they can, before they can present their claims that they were trafficked, or that they suffer a return to violence, murder, and rape at home.

The second thing they do, instead of unclogging our broken immigration system, is to say we need more semi-automatic weapons and military uniforms on our borders to greet these little children.

Finally, they say to another group of students, those who have told us "I

have a dream," our DREAMers, that they want to turn that dream into a nightmare and send them away also.

I think that is the wrong approach. It is time for them to get off Cruz Control and join us for comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree with my good friend from Texas more. I think everybody on both sides of the aisle cares about these children. Now, we care about them enough to restore the cuts that the President made in the aids to the country of origin.

We care about them enough to restore the cuts that he made in his budget to our own border security. Yes, our border security does need to be armed, not to deal with children, but to deal with the criminals that brought them here and abused them in the process. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, there is nothing to be gained by continuing this flow. Even if some of you would like every particular person that got here to stay—and, again, I quote the President, the "vast majority" will not be allowed to, will be sent back—stopping the flow is what we ought to be focusing on and stopping people from giving thousands of dollars to criminal cartels to bring these children to the borders and abuse them in the process. The quicker that stops, the better off we are.

We are willing to work with the countries of origin, I think, on both sides of the aisle. We had the President up here saying, pretty emphatically, that they needed some assistance in dealing with that. We think that is appropriate. We try to do that in legislation, and frankly, we have done it in the foreign operations bill, where we are more generous to the countries of origin than the administration has suggested we should be in its own budget.

Mr. Speaker, we are interested in dealing with the problem, but we are also interested in helping countries keep their children in their country, which they tell us they want to do.

We are also interested in making sure those children are never subjected to this journey, which I think all would agree is difficult and dangerous, and we are also extraordinarily interested in making sure that the criminal cartels who are making profit off this are discouraged from doing this, that they can't go and tell their potential customers: Give us the money and put your kid at risk, but if we actually get them there, there is a good chance they will stay.

That false promise, that dangerous promise offered by criminals victimizing innocent people is frankly what we ought to be focused on and what we are trying to focus on.

Again, we will continue to work toward that end. I hope, Mr. Speaker,

that we have a good product. I think that we will. The House will consider it, and then we hope the Senate actually comes back from its district work period and deals with it as well, and we will go from there.

That is the reason for the rule. That is the reason, so we can act during this multiweek district work period, should the opportunity actually occur to do that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise again in opposition to this rule and against the martial law bill which has not been given to us to read, and I believe that that is the wrong thing to do to solve this problem.

Instead of working with Democrats to come up with a viable and bipartisan solution to deal with the vulnerable Central American children who are fleeing from violence and death, my Republican colleagues are apparently drafting a bill that is even worse than the one they proposed yesterday, on Thursday.

This new bill presumably continues the failed policy of enforcement only and will send thousands of these children back to certain death. If the funding levels remain the same as yesterday, the bill will not provide adequate funding to care for them while they are here.

We should instead be spending our time debating and voting on the bipartisan Senate comprehensive immigration bill that the Speaker has refused to bring up for over a year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the martial law.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield. Therefore, the request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear to the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill.

At this point, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which we have been promised consideration on for so long, to address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma would need to yield for the purpose of that request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to yield to the unanimous consent request so we can deal with this immigration problem in a comprehensive manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield, and I do want to reiterate my previous announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only. I am not yielding for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent and would ask my friend to allow the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to be considered. It is a bill that I proudly cosponsor, and it would more than adequately address this humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, to the floor. It was passed by the Senate over 1 year ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigra-

tion reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 today, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform measure to deal with the immigration problems we have and to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border that is taking place today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I, as chair emeritus of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and may become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

□ 1045

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address these humanitarian issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to bring real solutions to the problems at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crises at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which is a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill first brought to us by President Bush, a bill to prop-

erly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be charged for the time accordingly.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to the floor, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to simply allow a vote on H.R. 15, a bill that has the bipartisan votes to pass today that we can have on the President's desk today to properly address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, looking at the underlying bill, I have to wonder what my colleagues are afraid of. Are they afraid of these kids, children who are fleeing brutal violence in their home countries to come to our country to seek asylum? Are we so afraid of them that we would shortcut due process and send them right back into this violence?

Mr. Speaker, are they afraid of the border, that they would send the National Guard when we are already spending \$18 billion a year; more than on all Federal law enforcement combined; at a time when El Paso, Texas, the largest Texas city on the Mexican border, is also the safest city in this country; at a time when we are 70 percent lower in apprehensions at our southern border; and at a time when these apprehensions of children have fallen by almost 60 percent?

Mr. Speaker, I ask us not to be motivated by fear or anxiety, but instead the best traditions of this country: courage, compassion, and strength to do the right thing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that the antislavery law has some loophole that is being exploited. That is not the truth. It is not what the Evangelical Immigration Table says. Here is what they write:

By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that the law is working. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

That is not some open borders crowd. That is the National Association of Evangelicals. That is the Southern Baptists. That is the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities.

I would note, also, that over a year ago we saw the Senate come together to pass bipartisan immigration reform. Republicans in this House have blocked a vote. We should vote on it today and get it to the President.

EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE,

July 22, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, In a matter of months, more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in the United States. Millions of Americans have been moved by the plight of these children who are currently awaiting processing, with many asking how they can help.

Children are vulnerable even in the best of circumstances and warrant special protection beyond that offered to adults. This vulnerability is compounded among children who flee situations of criminal gangs, sexual violence, trauma and extreme poverty, without their parents to accompany them.

Evangelicals are guided by Jesus' admonitions to welcome and protect children (Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:37, Luke 18:15-17). As our nation responds to this humanitarian crisis, we are thankful for laws that protect children and provide for their needs. While our systems are currently stretched, our laws uphold basic child protection principles.

Accordingly, we are concerned about potential weakening of protections afforded by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) which was enacted in 2008 and reauthorized in 2013. The TVPRA ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice. It also appropriately assigns responsibility for the care of unaccompanied children to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ensures that children are placed with their families when possible. By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that since the passage and implementation of TVPRA 23% more children were assisted. The TVPRA is working according to

its design. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, we urge you to provide the necessary resources and policy guidance to address the current crisis, and then hold the Administration accountable for fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. Robust funding is needed for the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in HHS which has extensive experience with vulnerable immigrants, including UACs, refugees, and victims of trafficking. To respond to this crisis, ORR is considering reprogramming funding from other refugee programs. Funds must not simply be transferred from one vulnerable population to another. More funding is needed. There should also be increased funding for immigration courts and judges to more quickly screen the children and counsel for children going through legal proceedings so they know their rights and can understand the process. More robust investment in effectively addressing root causes of migration in Central America and Mexico is also imperative.

As we pray for these children and also our nation, we are reminded of Matthew 19:13-14 in which Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them." Churches and faith-based organizations have long partnered with the federal government in serving immigrant children and families in the United States. Many churches and faith-based organizations are ready and committed to provide the same type of assistance and pastoral care in the case of these unaccompanied children.

We offer our prayers and service as you make important decisions about our nation's response to migrant children. We hope that any response you make will strengthen our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman, President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Community Development Association; Russell D. Moore, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; William Robinson, Interim President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision U.S.; Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that if the 2008 law is not the reason, then my good friend's remarks need to be directed to the administration because they have told us it is the reason. The President has cited this as the reason. But if it is because we have sent a signal down there by unilaterally changing something, there is some explanation for a tenfold increase in the flow of individuals across our border.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 102 years ago, I assume a very frightened 14-year-old boy made his way on a boat called the RMS Caronia from Cork, Ireland, with his mother on his way to the United States, a very frightened 14-year-old boy who left behind his community, his friends and neighbors, and made his way to the United States. He later served in World War I and became a New York City police officer but didn't live long enough to see his grandson become a Member of the House of Representatives. But that 14-year-old boy contributed mightily to the United States of America in so many ways. He was a scared boy being brought to America in much the same way that children along our border today are coming to seek a better way.

Don't turn our backs on these young children, these boys and girls, many of whom are suffering. Show the compassion and beauty of the United States. Welcome the best, the brightest, and the bravest.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the arrival of tens of thousands of children from Central America seeking refuge in our country has tugged at the conscience of the American people. It has demonstrated both our best and our worst instincts. The best are all of the people who are so generous in offering food and clothing and shelter to these kids who have come from so far. But we have also seen some bad instincts, like the armed militiamen in ski masks who have shown up at our southern border, whose leader has said that the way you keep people from coming to this country is that you point a gun at them and threaten to shoot them in the head. That is not America.

The question that we must answer now is: What does it mean to be a refugee in the 21st century? Just as we offered that status to Cubans fleeing Castro, to those from the Soviet Union, to the Vietnamese, just as our adversaries have changed, they are not always state actors—they are al Qaeda; they are ISIS—I would argue that so, too, have our refugees changed, and we must recognize that.

This bill is not good for our country, and it doesn't reflect who we are as a people.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what my grandmother coming from Jamaica, West Indies, with two babies thought about this great country called America. I wondered as I went to the border and I looked into the eyes of a little 7-year-old who had just gotten off a bus by himself from someplace in Central America, or the toddler in a diaper who came here because there was true and actual violence, the beheading of their neighbors, the cutting of the throats of their young boys, the fear of the cartels, and to think of the words “no room at the inn.”

□ 1100

Our Republicans are confused. They are prosecuting the children, not prosecuting the drug dealers, the criminals, and others. Why? Because they are taking away basic due process rights for humble children who have come just for opportunity. Not only that, they don't even want to give resources to all the cities in America who are helping, the Good Samaritans. And then they want legislation that literally undermines due process for these children.

I will tell you this is a bad bill. Do not pass it. Pass comprehensive immigration reform. Pass it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in fervid opposition to this Martial Law Resolution and ask that you consider doing comprehensive immigration reform—a vote you would not even need to whip.

Yet we insist on wasting valuable House Floor time while we could be doing comprehensive immigration reform, comprehensive tax reform, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, or the Voting Rights Act.

As the GOP Majority reaches further to the anti-immigrant right to scrounge up the votes for what was already an inadequate and heartless proposal, we Democrats have a better idea: comprehensive immigration reform.

The bipartisan immigration legislation that passed the Senate over a year ago offers comprehensive answers to the problems with our immigration system—but for more than a year House Republicans have refused to give the American people a vote.

The humanitarian crisis at the border is a powerful reminder of the importance of an immigration system that honors our values as a nation. The time is now. While House Republicans search for the compassion to help desperate children, Democrats are demanding a vote on the comprehensive immigration reform our nation needs.

The United States is a country made up of immigrants, and it is part of what makes us so strong and vibrant. And while immigration reform remains an unsolved challenge for our nation, House Democrats are leading the way towards comprehensive reform.

Indeed, the decision made by President Obama two years ago to defer deportation action against young people who were brought here by undocumented parents but have been raised here in our country was an important step in the right direction.

This decision has helped ensure that over half-a-million hard-working, eager, and tal-

ented individuals who came here not of their own choice, and who are contributing to our economy and our defense, can remain here and continue to be part of building a strong future for America.

Now we are faced, Mr. Speaker, with the surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border. They do not pose a threat to our national security; nevertheless the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act must be passed before Congress leaves town for its district work-recess.

Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by an army of children dispatched to do us harm. In fact the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and I witnessed one month ago the deplorable conditions with your own eyes—babies as young as three years old.

We are confronted with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem.

In the short term, we need to allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States.

Yet this Congress has failed to provide any resources needed to fund the courts and judges needed to send these children through the legal system; therefore, we should fund the number of immigration judges needed. Without them, the result is a current average delay of 578 days to hear over 366,000 pending cases.

Because this situation is untenable for everyone—law enforcement, taxpayers, and individuals petitioning for relief, the first thing that we can and should do to reduce the backlog is pass the emergency supplemental and provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation I recently introduced, H.R. 4990, the Justice For All Children Act.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, on this very important issue, and would hope for a spill-over effect into the realm of comprehensive immigration reform.

I remain committed to advocating for common sense enforcement measures as part of a broader immigration reform package that will further secure our borders, ensure agricultural interests have an ample labor supply, universities and businesses are not short workers, and proper workplace compliance is achieved, but also uphold our values as a Nation of immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, No Room at the inn! The Republicans are confused. Let us as Americans give relief to these innocent children. I ask my colleagues to reject this resolution and call for a vote on comprehensive immigration reform and the full funding of the emergency supplemental by hiring 70 new immigration judges, provide more resources for the border, to protect vulnerable children, and help communities that are helping these children.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the question may not be: Who are the children at the border, and why they are here? The question may be: Who are we as a Nation, and why are we here as a Congress?

Our reputation has been never to turn people away, our reputation should never be to turn children away to what could be a certain death or a very difficult situation.

This is not a crisis. This is a situation that we have had before and we have known how to deal with. This is a moment for our country to show who we are. The world is looking. These are children. It is not their fault that they are here. There are many conditions that have brought them here. But how we act will be our fault if we don't act properly. How we act will be our legacy.

This is not who we are as a country—I repeat. We are much better than that. We have to understand that these are children, these are our children. Just because a border separates us, this doesn't stop them from being our children.

Let's turn down and reject all of this nonsense that we are doing, and let's try to help them and help them in the proper way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. King reminds us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

In these times of challenge and controversy, I stand with those children at the border and I stand for due process. I don't stand for a fast-track adjudication that mimics due process and makes a mockery of justice.

I stand with the DREAMers. They have been given hope by our President. I will not vote for a bill that will destroy hope for those DREAMers. We must keep their hope alive.

I stand for due process, I stand with the DREAMers, and I stand for hope. I stand with the President.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma how many speakers he has?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a unanimous consent request, because the interest on this issue and the passion on this issue on our side is so great that we don't have enough time.

So I would ask unanimous consent to extend the debate by 1 hour, equally divided. Like I said, we have a lot of speakers, and there is no pending business after this debate ends. At the very least, I think we can extend the debate.

We were not allowed any amendments when the previous incarnation of this border bill was brought before the House. I think the least we can do, in the spirit of collegiality, is to expand debate, and I would like to make that unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will try again.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the United States when Republicans in this Congress see a problem and then choose not to work with Democrats to solve the problem. That is exactly what has happened here today: their draconian way or the high-way.

Let's be clear about what the problem is: unaccompanied minor children, frightened, some fleeing violence, needing due process, and deserving due process.

This is as much about who these children are as it is about who we are. As a mother and a legislator, I know that we should be compelled to act as a matter of humanity, but also as a matter of law.

We know we have problems on the border that are in need of solutions. Republicans have rejected one solution—comprehensive immigration reform—to address the problem. They have rejected another solution—the request of the President for a supplemental appropriation that includes resources for judges, representation, and services for minor children, and assistance to the countries of origin.

Now today, in the eleventh hour, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrate once again their lack of humanity and failure to solve yet another problem for the American people.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Sadly, the Republican leadership is continuing to play politics with the lives of innocent children at our border by failing to bring forward a bipartisan supplemental spending bill that can pass the House and be signed into law.

It is unbelievable that the failure to pass their own bill yesterday was not because of its completely inadequate funding level or the fact that it would undercut critical humanitarian protections in current law, but because it was not mean enough or punitive enough for their own Members to vote on.

Working together, as Leader PELOSI offered Speaker BOEHNER but was refused, we could have come to a reasonable compromise.

Instead, Republicans have resorted to martial law, not because it is in the best interest of our country or these children, but so they can have the time to write a bill that will appease the extremists in their party.

Let's reject this rule and come together in the best tradition of this House to pass a clean supplemental bill that will address the humanitarian crisis at our border in a way that meets our government's urgent needs and upholds our most basic American values.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I have been deeply saddened and distressed to see the images and hear the stories of so many unaccompanied minors at our border.

But from Massachusetts, I have also read other stories. I have read the stories of the over 150 overdoses from heroin that we experienced in Taunton, with over ten deaths.

I recently met with the DEA officials in Massachusetts, who indicated that the heroin drug trade alone with Mexico is over \$40 billion a year; that the cartels have moved up into owning trafficking corridors throughout Mexico; that despite many of my other colleagues who are calling for the destruction of aid and reduction of aid to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, the United States bilateral aid is less than \$200 million a year. Gang violence in Los Angeles alone costs over \$1 billion a year.

If we are truly going to address this problem, we have to get to its core. We have to take a good, hard look at what is driving an economic instability that is pushing young kids to figure that they have a better life by getting on a bus by themselves to our border.

This is what our country is supposed to be all about: a better future for young children trying to make a life for themselves. I hope that we come to that conclusion.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee, my friend from Oklahoma, for yielding.

I am not sure what it is that is happening here on this floor right now because the bill that is before us that everyone is rising to object to is the bill that allows us to bring up the same day, just as soon as we find a solution that can bring this House together, bring a bill immediately to the floor to

solve a crisis. I just want to make that clear. The bill that is before us today is the only piece of legislation in this town that allows us to move immediately to solve a crisis. I am not talking about a crisis that is imagined by Republicans or imagined by Democrats.

I have in my hand here a letter from Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Speaker. In an open letter to families all across the world he says:

So, let me be clear: there is no path to deferred action or citizenship, or one being contemplated by Congress, for a child who crosses our border illegally today.

I have heard the hearts of my friends on the other side of the aisle, I have heard the hearts. But we are a Nation of laws, as well as hearts, and you know that the law of the land does not allow for that, as the Secretary of Homeland Security said. Yet, down here on the floor today, if I was watching this from my home in Guatemala or Honduras or El Salvador, I would be led to believe there is.

We are better than that, and we have to be better than that because this is, in fact, a crisis. It is not an imagined crisis. It is a real crisis.

Folks thought this House was going to go home yesterday, they thought this House was going to go home yesterday, just like the Senate did, without providing a response. That is not the House I ran to be a part of.

We are still here, we are still here working, and, by golly, I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor. I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor before the sun goes down today, and I am so proud, I am so proud that we are here to do that. But I tell you this, we cannot do it if this bill does not pass. This rule today gives us a pathway to success. In its absence, that pathway will be delayed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to a bill that the Republicans are working on. We haven't seen such a bill. Does this rule give us any indication of what bill they are talking about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I will answer my friend's question that was just asked as he was speaking.

What is happening on the floor is Republicans are trying to weaken human

trafficking laws. That is what is happening.

Over the last few days, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have jumped through linguistic and logical hoops to say that the most humane way to deal with these children is to deport them quickly without due process to discourage other children from making the dangerous journey.

There is no question that the journey is dangerous. Children are killed, robbed, raped, and maimed along the way, but the children know the risks. They are not ignorant to those risks.

Why? Because back in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, children are being raped, killed, and robbed every day. It is a fact. Read the news.

Deporting children without process to these conditions or locking them into their home countries and preventing them from fleeing to find safety is not humane. It would be, as the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops said, like sending them back into a burning building. We can do better than this.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this rule, exactly what bill is it that we are going to vote for or against as relates to the rule? Because depending on the substance of the bill, it is going to determine whether I vote for or against the rule. If they are not prepared to tell us exactly what the bill is going to be in it, how could we possibly make a judgment as to whether we support the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, as the Chair has said repeatedly, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution. That is a matter for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. May I further inquire, we are not asking you to opine anything, Mr. Speaker. We are asking you to tell us exactly what we will be debating. If we don't know what we are going to be debating—I am not asking the Speaker to tell us what is in the bill. I am asking the Speaker to find out from the majority exactly what this rule is going to be allowed for them to bring up so that I would know whether to stay here or not to stay here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the gentleman, the Chair would say that that matter is for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. Debate on what, Mr. Speaker? Just tell me what will we be debating on? That is my question. You tell me what the Members will be debating on, and I am satisfied. I don't want you to opine. I want you to tell me what is going to be in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been patient with the gen-

tleman from New York. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, a man once said:

I believe in the idea of amnesty for those who have put down roots and who have lived here, even though sometime back they may have entered illegally.

Mr. Speaker, those words were from the great bastion of Republican thinking: President Ronald Reagan.

□ 1115

Oh, how his party has changed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if Ronald Reagan were in office today, he would probably have a primary challenge for being too "liberal" thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the House today is bringing up their only immigration-related bill, and it has just one message: deport, deport, deport. Deport children seeking refuge from extreme violence. Deport a mother away from her children. Deport a young person who has pledged allegiance only to one flag, and that is our flag.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like the bill the Republicans will want to bring is a security only, no to DREAMers supplemental. It does not address our broken immigration system. Have we lost the core message of our country? What happened to, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free"? What happened to that America?

I am sure Ronald Reagan knows, but his party does not.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the legislation being put forward by the House Republicans, which is an insincere attempt to address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

This bill is misguided, unreasonable, and wrong. It does very little to address the actual root of this problem and cuts important funding from the Department of Defense, FEMA, and the State Department's Economic Support Fund.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to return to the drawing board, so we can help these children and fix this issue.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The proposed legislation is ill-conceived, and does not solve the main problem.

I am opposed to this legislation and ask my colleagues to propose a solution that really helps these children.

Thank you.

La legislación propuesta está mal planteada, y no resolverá el problema principal.

Estoy opuesto a esta legislación y pido que mis colegas propongan una solución que realmente ayudara a estos niños.

Gracias.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that he will need to provide the Clerk a translation for the RECORD.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the Republican leadership pulled this legislation from the floor, I assumed that they had come to their senses and realized that they couldn't treat children so poorly. Much to my shock, however, your old bill was not punitive enough for these children, so you went back and made it worse.

Mr. Speaker, when did we lose our way? Let me be crystal clear. The change that has been added to the supplemental will make the lives of the children worse.

How we respond to a crisis of children in need of safe haven speaks to the character of our Nation, to who we are. How could we go around the world and provide resources and bring democracy, yet treat our neighbors this way?

We should not gut children's protections, just to appease the most radical elements of a particular political party. That is not the American way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the course of the debate is about to end. There is representation that there is an underlying bill to this martial law. The Democrats have already made a commitment to stay and finish the job.

My inquiry is, the underlying bill's principles are based upon protecting children and fully funding the President's mark on the emergency supplemental to deal with this crisis and emergency.

Those are simple parliamentary inquiries as the underlying premise of the bill—two points: protecting the children and providing the full resources for helping the children. That

is not giving us the contents of the bill. It is the premise of the bill for Members to be able to intelligently come to floor to assess the need to vote for the martial law.

I, again, state the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can possibly frame a parliamentary inquiry to find out exactly what is in the underlying bill that we are asked to pass or vote against this rule.

In any event, I know one thing. We as Americans, especially those of us in the Congress, have a particular responsibility to pass on a legacy to those that follow us in terms of what this country really stands for.

Besides the Star-Spangled Banner and the Stars and Stripes, we also have the Statue of Liberty close to my hometown. People come from all over the world because it is symbolic of what this great country believes in.

Not that many years ago, a group of Jewish people attempted to flee Germany because they feared that Hitler would be looking for them in order to arrest, kill, and to eliminate them as a people. We refused that ship that came into our harbor, called the *St. Louis*. We denied them the opportunity to come to this country, and they returned to Germany.

I don't know what is on our conscience, but we should take a look at our history and what we are leaving as a legacy.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that the legal experts in the country have urged that we not change the antislavery law.

We do recognize the need for resources to make that law work. I can't help but notice that the Republican majority is denying the resources to actually adjudicate these cases in the bill that was before us yesterday. I think it is ironic to say it doesn't work and then say we won't give you the resources to allow you to enforce the law. It is hypocrisy at its worst.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman from Oklahoma whether he has any additional speakers or if he would like to give us some of his time?

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close whenever my friend is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible martial law rule. We have no idea what the hell we are going to be voting on.

This is just a rule that allows them to bring up anything at any time between now and September 5. I want to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will bring up H.R. 15, which is the bipartisan Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about poor kids, most of them fleeing terrible violence. I am ashamed at the insensitivity and the lack of compassion from the other side. America is a better country. Let's not lose our humanity in this process.

If the United States of America stands for anything, it stands out loud and foursquare for human rights. We are better than the angry mobs yelling at children. The anger and the nastiness and the insensitivity is not the face of America we want to show the rest of the world. We are better. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act like it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have had a very passionate and—in many cases, compassionate—debate. I want to recognize that quality in many of the speakers, my friends on the other side. I have no doubt about their passion. Frankly, I have no doubt about their compassion. I know they want to do the right thing.

I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill actually is, as my friend from Massachusetts suggested, a mechanism to keep us in session and working on the problem, so that we have the ability between now and September 5 to actually act and act quickly. I think that is a very important thing.

It is important, too, to think back about the nature of the problem that we are dealing with. In the last 3 years, the number of unaccompanied juveniles arriving at our borders has gone from about 6,000 to—the estimates I hear this year will be somewhere like 90,000 and may well reach 150,000 within the next year or two.

The administration, according to news reports and testimony, was actually warned about this in 2012 and 2013. Frankly, they didn't prepare for it. I am quite certain they didn't anticipate it.

They actually submitted a budget this year that called for cuts in many of the areas that we are clearly going to need to deal with this huge—and unanticipated, I guess, on their part—influx of unaccompanied juveniles.

Worth noting for the record, we actually restored a lot of those cuts in the

foreign operations bill that has now cleared the full Appropriations Committee. I am glad we did.

The administration then, when confronted with this crisis which it did not anticipate, told us this was due to the 2008 sex trafficking law. Frankly, I am somewhat skeptical about that because this influx didn't happen in 2009, 2010, or 2011. It only began to be remotely visible in 2012. That coincides, by the way, with some of the President's unilateral abrogation of immigration law.

I think that is probably more likely to be the cause, but regardless, the administration has pointed to the 2008 law. The President has done that. The Secretary of Homeland Security has done that.

So far, they have offered no formal solution, although in testimony before the Senate, the Secretary of Homeland Security said he would like the law changed, so that people arriving at our borders are treated the same way as Canadian and Mexican juveniles. That was his request, not a repeal of the law, but that was—at least in testimony—his suggestion.

The President has said that, regardless, the great majority of these children will eventually be returned home. He sent us a request recently to deal with the crisis in terms of the financial resources that he needs.

He did not send us a fix, he did not send us a proffered legislative solution, just simply a mechanism for money that would go around or go outside of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that we had agreed upon.

What has been our response? I would be the first to acknowledge this is a difficult problem to deal with. That is why the administration, I presume, has not offered us a solution.

That is why the Senate, which tried to pass one yesterday, gave up and went home. It is not an easy problem. Indeed, yesterday, we weren't able to bring legislation to the floor that would actually address the problem.

The difference between this body and the other body is this body decided to stay here and continue to work on it and try to come up with a legislative response. That response, undoubtedly, will include a fix, a tweak, an amendment to the 2008 law.

If my friends have a better solution, then I would hope the administration or the Senate or somebody offers that. So far, it has been as if we blame the problem on the 2008 law, but we are told you can't change the 2008 law.

That position is both intellectually and politically, I think, indefensible. If this is the problem, tell us how to fix the problem. If you won't tell us, we will suggest one, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

We have also decided to look at the financial issue, and there is no question additional resources are needed to handle this influx, secure the border,

add additional judges, and add additional courtroom facilities to handle an enormous backlog.

So we say, well, we are not going to give you a 13-month blank check, but we will redirect resources from within the existing budget toward what we agree is a more urgent problem, and we will help you get through this fiscal year and this calendar year, and then let's sit down and talk about what is necessary for fiscal year 2015 and try to do that within the Ryan-Murray budget agreement. I think that is what we are going to do.

So we are willing to work with the administration in these areas.

□ 1130

I would also suggest, at the end of the day, the worst thing we could do would be to go home and not do anything. My friends have suggested—and I think appropriately so—that you can't tell the President he is overreaching in one area and then is pulling back in another without providing legislative authority and legislative guidance. I think they are absolutely correct in that position. I have made that point myself both privately and publicly, but that is what we are going to try and accomplish. Hopefully, we can accomplish it today. If we do that today or this weekend, we will have done our part of the job. The Senate then, by the way, could reconvene and do its part of the job. Then we could go to conference, in working with the administration, and come up with something, but it does begin with somebody at least doing his job. That is what this House and that is what this majority is absolutely determined to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that can be said on a resolution that is only 10 lines long. This resolution is important so that we can consider possible legislation in a timely fashion related to the border crisis. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 700 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report

the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, sec-

tion 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Daines	Hensarling
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Amodei	Denham	Holding
Bachmann	Dent	Hudson
Bachus	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	Duffy	Hultgren
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Bentivolio	Ellmers	Issa
Billirakis	Farenthold	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Black	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Jolly
Boustany	Fleming	Jones
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jordan
Bridenstine	Forbes	Joyce
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	King (IA)
Broun (GA)	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Bucshon	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Burgess	Garrett	Kline
Byrne	Gerlach	Labrador
Calvert	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Camp	Gibson	Lamborn
Capito	Gingrey (GA)	Lance
Carter	Gohmert	Lankford
Cassidy	Goodlatte	Latham
Chabot	Gosar	Latta
Chaffetz	Granger	LoBiondo
Clawson (FL)	Graves (GA)	Long
Coble	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Coffman	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Collins (GA)	Grimm	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	Marino
Conaway	Hall	Massie
Cook	Hanna	McAllister
Cotton	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Cramer	Harris	McCauley
Crawford	Hartzler	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
Culberson	Heck (NV)	McKeon

McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland

NAYS—184

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Campbell
Cantor
Clay
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fattah
Garamendi
Gowdy

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kirkpatrick
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Moran
Murphy (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

□ 1154

Messrs. VELA, SCHNEIDER, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 474 (On Ordering the Previous Question related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 190, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham

Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler

Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart

NOES—190

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bilirakis
Campbell
Cantor
Clay
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fattah
Garamendi
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kirkpatrick
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Moran
Nadler
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Ruiz
Rush
Schock
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1202

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 475 (On Agreeing to the Resolution related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 474 & 475, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3548. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the "Jason Crisp Forest Service Building".

H.R. 4631. An act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as "30th Street Station", as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1735

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 12:13 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.J. Res. 76.

With best wishes, I am.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 4:17 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4386.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5195.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 606.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1671.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2291.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3472.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3765.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following

enrolled bills were signed by the Speaker on Friday, August 1, 2014:

H.R. 3230, to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments; the Senate amendments be considered as read; the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question; and the Chair may postpone the question of adoption of the motion as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up H.J. Res. 76, with the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

The text of the Senate amendments are as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the first word, and insert: the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$225,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, which shall be for the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel for the procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats: Provided, That such funds shall be transferred immediately only through an exchange of letters to address emergent operations in support of Operation Protective Edge, notwithstanding section 3.1.3.2.1 of the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome Procurement Agreement: Provided further, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to previously appropriated

funds for the procurement of Iron Dome: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 76.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-571) on the resolution (H. Res. 710) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, THE SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 710 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 710

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 696:

(a) the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted;

(b) all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived; and

(c) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except (1) one additional hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 5230, and on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, the House shall consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of House Resolution 700 is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing missile defense of Israel."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The rule provides for expedited consideration of H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are facing an unprecedented crisis on America's southern border. Nearly 60,000 unaccompanied alien children have entered the United States illegally this fiscal year, most of whom have come through the Texas-Mexico border, and today, our country faces a threat to our sovereignty and to our rule of law.

The time to act is now. It would be irresponsible for this body to go home for a month without doing our part to help work and solve this problem. I am glad that Members of the House recognize their duty to finish the job. I believe the House has put specific, concrete proposals to act in the best interest of the United States.

Let's take a look at what this crisis on our border is doing. First, the President's catch-and-release program is a big part of the problem. Under this program, nearly 90 percent of unaccompanied alien children have been placed with their families in the United States, many of whom are here illegally themselves.

Second, there is the President's DACA program. DACA is a major reason for the influx of illegal immigrants to the United States. The Director on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services recently testified to the Judiciary Committee that 700,000 undocumented immigrants have taken advantage of DACA.

Third, there is the 2008 trafficking law, which has allowed so many to effectively skip out on the judicial process and live in our country illegally. Catch and release under the President's proposal is wrong and bad for our country, and only encourages many, many more to continue the trek here.

□ 1745

Combined, these policies, plus signals from the administration, encouraged more illegal immigration and have led to the border crisis that we face today. To stop this crisis, our border must be secured and the tide of illegal immigration should be stemmed. I believe that this rule provides for legislation to accomplish that goal.

H.R. 5230 would provide \$659 million for border security, the enforcement of existing laws, illegal immigration prevention, and humanitarian assistance. Additionally, \$70 million would be provided for National Guard border efforts. This proposal is paid for, which

means that it does not result in any new or additional Federal spending this fiscal year.

However, the House will not simply throw money at the problem. This package also makes specific, concrete policy changes to address the underlying problems that are fueling this crisis. Specifically, it prevents the administration from spending taxpayer dollars to adjudicate any new applications under DACA or any other similar policy. The package also amends the 2008 trafficking law so that all unaccompanied alien children are treated the same as, under the law today, Mexicans and Canadians, and this is for the purpose of removals.

It also provides additional temporary judges to help guarantee that these children get their day in court within 14 days from their initial screening. It also strengthens laws against criminals and those with serious drug-related convictions and those who have them from applying for asylum. It allows for customs and border protection activities on Federal land. Similarly, it authorizes the deployment of the National Guard to our southern border.

Finally, it prohibits the housing of unauthorized immigrants on military bases if housing them would displace members of the Armed Forces or any Active Duty or it interferes with military activity.

These steps come after a series of conversations with members of the majority. We have an obligation to get this bill done. As a Texan, I have pushed and pushed and pushed for us to make sure that we had a bill that could be supported by our Members. It is Texas and those living on the border that are seeing tremendous conditions that are placing our States and local people at a disadvantage.

Thus, I want to thank the Members for continuing to work together on a bill to get 218 votes. I applaud those who spent the time, including today, dedicating themselves to putting the package together. I thank the staff. And as always, I expect and want this body to support this good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You would think after 4 years that the majority would know how to run the House, but this week makes us wonder. All we have accomplished this week is to sue the President and deregulate pesticides into the environment. And in a real embarrassment, canceling a vote because Tea Party Members refused to support a border bill that was tailor-made for them. Actually, I understand it was in their interest to pass it yesterday.

Now, my colleague, of whom I am inordinately fond, said that the time to

act is now. But the time really to act was yesterday when the Senate was in town, because there is no way now what we are doing today could ever become legislation because the Senate would have to pass something, and then it would go to the President who said already he would veto it. So we stay an extra day here to make a point.

Instead of going home to our constituents, we are under siege in a choke hold by some Members of the House. This much is true: it costs the taxpayers \$24 million a week to run the House of Representatives, and I am afraid the American people aren't getting their money's worth.

President Truman, it is worth noting, campaigned for President using a quote "do-nothing Congress," which had passed nearly 1,000 bills. And under Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed just around 120. Mr. Truman was mad because they had not done a health care bill. Fortunately, we got that done 4 years ago.

But this recalcitrant Congress is why President Obama had to act on his own. Nothing is working here, but he was responsible for keeping the country moving. I think we need to describe for the RECORD and for the public exactly what has been done today.

This morning, the majority adopted a martial law rule until September 5, which is most unusual. Martial law usually lasts 1, 2, maybe 3 days at the outside. But we have 5 weeks, which means the Speaker can call us back at any time. We would hope that he would not do that without telling us what we are going to do. But today, we do not even know what is in this bill. We don't understand this legislation because the 40 pages of it we have not had time to look at. So here we are. We do think it is pretty toxic.

But not only was the bill drafted by Republicans only, in a basement room, there are absolutely no Democrat fingerprints or ideas or amendments or thoughts or suggestions or hopes or anything else in this bill. There have been no hearings, no markups, no amendments, nothing of which we are entitled to as Members of the House and sent here by 750,000 Americans.

This bill, we know, does give \$35 million to reimburse the National Guard for activities related to "border security and the current influx of illegal immigrants." Now it turns out that only Texas has spent any money on that, and one wonders if that piqued Senator CRUZ's interest in this bill and what we are doing over here because it looks like that is where the money will be going.

The bill tragically cuts all funding for the DREAM Act, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. We were told there were something like 700,000 children who were involved in that, who came forward on a promise by this government that they would

have an opportunity to go to school and they would not be deported. Now the country has their names, their addresses, and they would be easy to deport because this bill puts an end to the DREAM Act.

I related today in the Rules Committee a story about four undocumented young men in high school in the United States that decided to enter into a contest to build an underwater robot, the trouble that they had simply getting the equipment to do it and the teachers who helped them do it. And they really felt that they had been out-matched and outgunned when they were going to compete as high school students against engineering students at MIT, a premier engineering school in the United States. What happened, those four young men won. They beat MIT. Now, they were part of the DREAM Act. We hope they will not be deported because, more than anything I can think of, the United States needs that kind of thinkers and innovators in what they had to do.

So the Cato Institute agrees. They wrote on July 29, 3 days ago, that DACA, the DREAM Act, was not a primary cause of the surge, and I insert this report from CATO, entitled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children," into the RECORD. I will also submit some statistical findings from Professor Tim Wong, from the University of California, San Diego, into the RECORD, entitled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Influx of Unaccompanied Minors" into the RECORD.

[From the CATO Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN
UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN
(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, "The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies." Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It

is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S.

government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE INFLUX OF UNACCOMPANIED MINORS

Statistical analysis from a political science professor, Tom Wong, from the University of California, San Diego shows that violence is causing the surge of unaccompanied children crossing the border.

Central American countries that are experiencing high levels of violence (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador) have seen thousands of children flee, other countries with lower levels of violence (Nicaragua, Belize) are not facing same outflow. This takes into consideration poverty levels as well, given that Nicaragua is the poorest country in the Central American region.

Professor Wong analyzed data from the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the CBP apprehension rate of unaccompanied children and found a direct correlation between the homicide rate in Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala and the entry of UACs.

The United States is not the only country in the region experiencing an increase in protection claims from people from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

According to UNHCR, the United Nations Refugee Agency, other countries in the region have experienced a sharp increase in the number of asylum applications filed by Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans since 2008. From 2008 to 2013, the number of such applications filed in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize increased by 712%.

The initial increase in unaccompanied minor entries occurred well before the implementation of the DACA program in June 2012.

If DACA was the cause for the increase in unaccompanied minors, we would see more entries from countries around the world—instead the children are only coming from three countries: Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala. All of these countries have high rates of violence.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What is really happening here is the most extreme, anti-immigrant voices in the Republican Party using the crisis as a political cover to repeal a commonsense policy like the DREAM Act, and the Speaker has caved once again to those voices. Representative STEVE KING described the underlying legislation as something that he could have ordered off the menu.

Furthermore, the rules are of course closed, setting the record anew for the most closed rules in any Congress. This bill does stop short of catapulting those children into Mexico and then leaving them to walk to their home countries, but it certainly doesn't do very much since the discussion in the House of Representatives for several years now has been what to do about immigration. It really is a sorry path that we have reached the condition we are in right now, a one-House bill, a Senate that is gone, and a President who won't sign it.

If we learned anything this week, we learned from Speaker BOEHNER's comments on his blog that the President should do more, not less, contrary to the reason why they sued him, and we do hope that the President will do that and bring a more humane solution to this, as almost all religions in the United States have asked us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say one of the things I learned this week was that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) presented not only her thoughts and ideas at our conference when we met about how we can make our borders stronger, but she was present the entire time at the Rules Committee, had a chance to forthrightly participate. We had hours and hours of discussion about not only the legislation and what we were doing, but we actually shared ideas among Members on a bipartisan basis today, and I felt like it was a pretty good exchange.

I am delighted, at this time, to yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, young children are being sent off alone or put in the hands of criminal cartels to cross vast, inhospitable spaces in the hopes of eventually reaching our border. This is a humanitarian crisis. Today we seek to address the plight of these children in a responsible fashion.

There has been much discussion in the House this week about constitutional role. The President has acknowledged his constitutional role in immigration policy. In 2011, speaking to a meeting of La Raza, he said:

I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting, I promise you, not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That is not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.

If the President's actions had remained consistent with these words, we would not be facing the crisis we are today. Unfortunately, though, the President did take it upon himself to unilaterally rewrite immigration law, and he did so in a way that aggravated the situation. And he knew the potential consequences. In 2010, the President said:

There are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are here illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the law on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws . . . but I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there would be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration.

Despite his clear foresight on this issue, the President still unilaterally suspended deportation to select illegal aliens. His predicted surge quickly became a reality. Now young border crossers are setting off on harrowing, costly journeys under the belief that, upon arrival, they will receive a "permiso," permission to stay in our great country.

The motivation for illegally crossing the border is understandable. I join my colleagues who have recognized the uniquely generous and welcoming nature of this great country. As a mother and grandmother, I am moved by the plight of these young children. As a granddaughter of immigrants, I am grateful that this country has welcomed generations of tired and poor and given them the chance to breathe free. And as a lawmaker, I recognize that the foundation of American generosity and freedom is the rule of law.

Today, through a constitutionally prescribed process, we have the opportunity to pass a bill that will give the President the tools to address this crisis.

Today, we can provide resources to secure the border and ensure that those who have already undertaken this journey can be speedily reunited with their families.

Today, we can send a clear, compassionate message that undertaking this border crossing journey is a mistake.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation so that we can begin to solve this problem.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and an expert on immigration.

□ 1800

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some have been asking whether this bill repeals DACA and puts the DREAMers back in deportation, and the answer is yes. Page 1, lines 5 through 17 point out that no funds can be used for a new application.

The DACA applications were a granted deferred action for 2 years. They must make a new application—and there is no guarantee that application will be approved—at the end of 2 years. That is beginning now. So this will require that the DREAMers be removed from deferred action and become subject to deportation.

Further, the bill is meant to treat all children the way we treat Mexican children, but it does more than that. Right now, the Border Patrol is required to determine on a case-by-case basis whether a child has the capacity—whether they are old enough—to independently withdraw an application. That is stricken in this bill.

The law says now that a Mexican child who raises no persecution or trafficking concerns may be permitted to withdraw an application and voluntarily return home if the child is able to make the decision. This bill changes the law to say that a child may be permitted to withdraw an application, but, in the event, the child shall be returned. It doesn't matter whether the child has the ability to make a decision. No matter what, that kid is going home. So that is new.

Current law says that even Mexican children can request to see an immigration judge, but this bill says that is not the case. It makes the CBP person performing the screening the judge, juror, and, in some cases, the executioner.

It is worth pointing out that this is not just about kids from Honduras or Mexico. We will be returning the Thai child sex slave back to her traffickers; the Christian child from Syria who has found asylum here in the United States, that child immediately returned; the Chinese teen fleeing forced abortion from China, that child immediately returned.

This is an outrageously unconscionable bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON), the dean of the Texas delegation.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS. I hope we will yield back some of that time.

First, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the leadership you have exhibited, not just in the Rules Committee, but on this issue in general. You have been a longtime advocate of substantive immigration reform in a conservative way. You have been active this week in the Conference and in the Texas delegation as we attempt to move this legislation. And, of course, you have been very active this afternoon in the Rules Committee.

I want to also compliment the leadership of the majority as we have tried to craft a compassionate conservative path forward. I happen to be an advocate of comprehensive immigration reform. I have a draft bill that I have been waiting until the right time to introduce, and, hopefully, get bipartisan support. I am not one of these "just say no" Republicans.

Having said that, we have a crisis on our southern border because of some actions the President has taken in the past and some inactions that he is not taking now. We have got this terrible situation where thousands and thousands of young children—some unaccompanied, by themselves, others with adults—who have been flooding the southern border, allegedly some of them paying thousands of dollars to individuals who are allegedly related to the drug cartels. It is an unsustainable situation, Mr. Speaker. It can't go on.

The bill that is going to be before the body later this evening targets funding to add additional judges to review these children on a case-by-case basis. It reverses current law so that children from noncontiguous countries are treated the same as the children from Canada and Mexico who perhaps attempt to come into the country without proper documentation. I don't think it is an inhumane thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually the right thing to do.

The bill before us is going to have funds to reimburse the States that have decided to deploy their National Guardsmen to the border. One of those States is my State of Texas. This bill would target funding to reimburse the State of Texas for the cost of deploying the National Guard. I think that is a good thing.

The bill before us is going to be completely offset, taking money that has already been appropriated but not expended. The offsets are not fake, they are not; in the 10th year we will theoretically save some money that would have otherwise been spent. These offsets are for funds that have been appropriated and have been obligated but not used. Some of those funds are in the foreign aid accounts of the countries that are sending us some of their citizens, and I think that is appropriate.

We can have a debate at the appropriate time on a more comprehensive package. That is obviously something that at some point I hope this body addresses. I am going to be an active, positive participant in that, Mr. Speaker.

But for today, to solve the current situation on the border, this is a targeted package. It will be better than current law if it is enacted. It will improve the situation, I think, within the next 2 months. If it were to be enacted in its totality, you would basically not have the problem of the unaccompanied minor children or minors with adults that are flooding our borders. It is a conservative approach. I will tell my friends on the minority side, I happen to be proud of that. I believe that the body is going to pass this. I am going to vote for both bills, the appropriation supplemental and then the DACA bill that Congresswoman BLACKBURN has expressed leadership on and done such a good job on, and of which I am a cosponsor.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me some time. I strongly support the rule, and I will vote for the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my friend, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free." Those words appear on the Statue of Liberty that stands tall in New York Harbor.

Today, we are here in this Chamber doing violence to a model that has served this country well. We have a humanitarian crisis in this country: tens of thousands of unaccompanied children have fled violence in Central America and migrated to our southern border.

Our response has not been consistent with the notion that America is a country of individuals from all over the world, and a compassionate one.

Lady Liberty is crying right now because of the callous response of House Republicans. Some of the children who have come here may not have a valid legal basis to remain, but some will. If a child has a credible fear of persecution; if a child was abused, abandoned, or neglected by a parent; if a child was victimized by a highly violent criminal act and suffered emotional or physical damage, under current law they have a valid legal basis to remain. House Republicans are threatening to take that away, inconsistent with our values.

That is why I urge a "no" vote on the rule and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, Judge Gohmert, a former State district judge, now Member of Congress.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SESSIONS.

This was a different experience the last few days. I remember the fiscal cliff problem when we were told: Here is your remedy, take it and like it. And they didn't have enough votes so it ended up getting pulled, and people were sent home.

But this time was different. We had people who said: Do you know what? Wait a minute, why don't we stay here and work something out? Kind of a refreshing change.

There were numerous Members last night that sat down in a room and worked for quite some time—for hours actually—and came to a conclusion. We had a verbal agreement, and there was a misunderstanding on one provision. Anyway, there were so many great changes, great compromises, people from different, diverse positions took part.

But let me just say, the importance of getting something done now before we get even one day further into August is this. I have spent many days and many nights on the border. When you look at the pitiful, beautiful little faces of people that have come 1,000 or more miles because there was a shiny object being dangled here in the United States, saying: Come on, you may get amnesty, come on, come on now; and adults paid gang members, paid drug cartels, to bring these people through—

some got pulled off into sexual trafficking we are told, many were raped, if they were young women, along the way, some given birth control pills so, gee, if they are raped they are not getting pregnant—and all because the law has been violated in an unconstitutional action by the President, who said: I don't like the law that was passed by the House and by the Senate and then the prior President signed into law, so I am passing a new law through my lips. And it created this allure.

I wish the Senate had stuck around to work with us, as many of us stayed last night to work. We could be so far down the road.

I am greatly encouraged by many of the things that are here, by the great compromises.

I want to thank KEVIN MCCARTHY, STEVE SCALISE, PATRICK MCHENRY, Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, the Judiciary staff, but especially Chairman SESSIONS. Thanks for your accorded assistance today.

We could get to a finished product even with the Senate if it wasn't HARRY REID's way or the highway.

Who suffers? Come some night with me and sit out at the border 1, 2, 3 in the morning, dodge tarantulas, scorpions, rattlesnakes, and you may get to see a beautiful face that has gone through hell instead of being accorded the decency of a better way to immigrate into America.

We can do a better job, and we haven't done our job.

I am going to be a "no" because the provision was not pulled out that gives the Attorney General the power to appoint the 40 judges that are going to deal with the issues on the border. I have been assured we are going to work on that in the future to fix it better. I just can't give a guy in contempt the ability to appoint the 40 judges to deal with this issue. But I am so grateful for the process that we are now starting to use.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, there is one really good idea in this bill, and that is the \$40 million that is going to be used to help repatriate kids with their families. This is what ideally should happen. Children want to be with their parents in their own country. I thank KAY GRANGER for her leadership on this.

Regrettably, the rest of the bill is a mess. Just think about it: \$70 million to the National Guard. Why are we seriously thinking that we have to have combat-ready troops at the border to greet 9- and 10- and 11-year-old kids, who, if they made the journey successfully, are famished, exhausted, and terrified?

□ 1815

Also, \$405 million to the Department of Homeland Security—they have got a

big budget, and there is not any evidence that this will make a dime's worth of difference.

What this really does is raise the question: Where did this bill come from? Yesterday, we were all on our way home. Some Members were at the airport. There was no bill yesterday, but then people figured out if the House didn't even act on a bill, we wouldn't be able to blame the do-nothing Senate—but, Mr. Speaker, wait.

The do-nothing Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on June 27, 2013. The do-nothing Senate passed that bill in a bipartisan manner, 68-32. The get-the-job-done House hasn't even taken that bill up, even though it has been here for over 13 months.

This bill has a House designation on it, but bills usually get considered by committees. We had no committee hearing, no consultation with any Democrats, no consultation with the President—basically, no consultation with other Republican Members of the House.

We should kill this bill. We should put our best folks together, like GRANGER, BARTON, GUTIERREZ, and LOFGREN, and do the right thing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 15 seconds for a clarification of his remarks, if he would take me up on that time.

I would like to advise the gentleman that I do not believe it is a correct statement to say combat-ready troops. The National Guard that is in Texas is not all combat ready. If I could get the gentleman to correct that, I yield him 15 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. I know we are all proud of our Guard. Our Guard in Vermont lost more lives per capita in Afghanistan and Iraq, and many of our Guard members, as you know, played that role. So I do think of our Guardsmen and -women across the country as prepared to do whatever they are asked to do, including combat.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the RECORD note that there is no specification for these men and women of the National Guard to be combat ready. In fact, I do not believe that that would be a true statement.

That is not a part of what we have specified in this plan, nor do I believe that it would be a requirement. So I have asked the gentleman, and he chose to answer the way he did, but I would like to state on the RECORD that there are no requirements, there is no precondition for that. In fact, I do not believe that that is a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), one of our newest Members.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the newest Members, and I have to tell you it is amusing to find the paradox on the other side of the aisle that, yesterday, we were being criticized for not considering a bill. Today, we are being criticized for considering a bill.

I sat in my office, just like many others today, and watched the President of the United States attempt to admonish the House for working. I want to make something very clear to the American people tonight. The President's plan for the crisis on the border was rejected not just by this body, but by the Senate.

There is not a majority in the Senate or in the House willing to consider and approve the President's plan for the crisis on the border. That plan is dead on arrival, with a majority in the Senate controlled by his own party and a majority in this House, and so the Senate brought up its bill, and it was rejected.

The Senate, controlled by the President's party, left town. This House, this body, this Congress, this caucus, is working.

I am new to this body, and I find it fascinating that the media and the pundits and the consultants can take a set of facts and suggest that, because we are working together, somehow we are dysfunctional.

That is an absurdity. We are working. What is dysfunctional is the other side of this Capitol. What is dysfunctional is the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. This body is working.

We are sitting here complaining on both sides of the aisle—some in my own caucus—about what is not in this bill, but the fact is what is in this bill is the right solution. This is a good bill, and I would say to the folks on my side of the aisle, I know a lot of folks have concerns about this.

For conservatives, this is the bill we have been asking for, for years. This is a responsible, commonsense approach that says if you come here illegally, you will be returned into the responsible and caring hands of your government, and frankly, let's put in the hands of everybody a packet that says how to immigrate here legally.

We are a loving and caring Nation, and we are better for that, but we are also a Nation of laws. This bill says enforce the law. It is accountability. That is all it is.

Where the President has proposed nearly \$4 billion, this body has proposed less than \$700 million, fully offset by cuts to other Federal programs. This is a conservative bill. It pays for itself. It is about enforcement. It is about accountability.

Lastly, I will say this as a new Member of this body. I admit my naivete. I am a Pollyanna. I actually believe this body can work. I believe what is good and right about this body. I believe we can work.

Let me tell you why we ended up here today and we didn't get a bill done yesterday is because we have Rs and Ds next to our names. If we drop the Rs and Ds, we had enough votes last night to pass this bill. We know it on both sides of the aisle.

This is a commonsense bill that addresses the priorities of the American people, and if we were here yesterday not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of Congress that know what is right for the future of this country, we could have passed this bill yesterday.

So instead of complaining yesterday that we didn't pass a bill and complaining today that we are here working on a Friday night to pass a bill, we can keep it honest, drop the partisanship, and pass what the American people expect, which is responsibility and accountability and commonsense solutions. That is why we are here tonight.

I think we need to pass this bill. I think every Member of Congress should pass this bill. This is a good bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, the influx of unaccompanied children across the southern border is a serious humanitarian situation that requires immediate action. We desperately need Members of Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to develop an effective and humane course of action to address this problem, and I am disappointed that we are playing politics with this crisis instead of developing solutions.

The rule we are considering today would allow us to consider two bills. The supplemental appropriations bill is an irresponsible funding measure that fails to address the true needs of this crisis while also making irresponsible cuts of over \$400 million to FEMA's disaster relief fund, impacting the Federal response to disasters.

The other bill needlessly punishes innocent children, known as DREAMers, and would do nothing to address the humanitarian situation caused by violence in Central America. This deportation-only and enforcement-only approach to changing our Nation's immigration law is misguided and will do absolutely nothing to prevent our broken system from spinning further into dysfunction.

In my district, there are businesses, farmers, faith leaders, law enforcement leaders, and families who have been asking Congress for years to find solutions to our broken immigration system.

I helped introduce a comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to help these constituents who deserve a functional immigration system that they can rely on; instead, House Re-

publicans have decided to make today's divisive bill a priority. They want to make sure that absolutely nothing is done to improve overall our immigration system.

After more than a year of refusing to act on comprehensive legislation, this is unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, someplace I read in the Bible, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven"—or it could have read the beloved community or the beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, at this hour, we have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do the right thing, the humane thing. Today, hundreds and thousands of our children—innocent little children—need our help. They need our support. They are running away from violence, from rape, from hunger. They are searching for a better life.

The time has arrived, Mr. Speaker. We can wait no longer. We have reached a tipping point, and now, we have a choice, a choice to do what is right, what is just, what is fair. Where are our hearts? Where are our souls? We cannot simply turn our backs on these little children and do nothing.

In the final analysis, we are one people, one family, one House. It doesn't matter whether you are Black, White, Asian American, Native American, or Latino. There is no such thing as an illegal human being.

History will not be kind to us if we fail to do what is right, what is just. We must pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform, and we must pass it now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, who are these young people across America that these Republicans would deny a dream, whose lives they are so eager to disrupt tonight?

Maria Rocha is one of them. She came here as a 3-year-old. I have rallied with this young, articulate woman in San Antonio for reform on several occasions. The first time Maria even knew she was an immigrant was when she was unable to apply for college financial assistance, so she worked three jobs. And because of the President's DACA executive order, she was able to graduate from UTSA. Now, she is teaching kindergarten.

Another is Sheridan Aguirre. He was brought here as a 1-year-old. He told me:

I was encouraged to go to college, but my legal status made it difficult for me to plan. Two years ago, I graduated as valedictorian of my high school and entered UT, where I have a 3.77 grade point average. Because of the President's executive order, I work, I own a car, I pay my rent, I can travel, I am sustainable, and I can live without fear. I need DACA so that I can go to graduate school and fulfill my career goals. Repealing DACA would be a huge step backwards for our country's history.

Republicans would deny the right to learn, the right to work—and they would deny the dream. They would deny the hope for these young people and thousands of others across this country, who pledge allegiance to America, and have so much to contribute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. You may call this amnesty. I call it a hope for our country. You can call it conservative. I call it wasteful. It wastes talent that this Nation needs.

We need to reject this mean-spirited legislation that would deny rights to these young people who are already contributing to our country and can give it so much more. We can't afford this wasteful bill. I urge its rejection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would notify the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further speakers, and I have been advised that perhaps she has no further speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, that is true. We have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than a year since the Senate passed bipartisan immigration reform, the House leadership has refused to allow a vote on this essential legislation, even though we know it has the votes to pass.

□ 1830

Indeed, over the last 13 months, the majority has not taken one step—not one—to fix our broken immigration system. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill, already passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," defeat the previous question, and vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also appreciate the gentlewoman, her team, and all of our staffs who have worked overtime, including our Appropriations staff and our staff from Energy and Commerce who helped us with this, as well as the Judiciary staff.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have a fundamental disagreement with the President on the question of the border, and that is why we are here today.

You have heard Republican speakers talking about how we believe that the rule of law is important. We believe that America is a great and awesome country and that we are very compassionate, but we take in millions of people each year through a legal process. America is a land of immigrants, but the rule of law is important also. We have problems with our borders. We have had problems with our borders for years, but in particular, after 9/11, the threats that are against this country have placed enormous pressure not only on our law enforcement but on air, land, sea, rail. We feel that the Federal Government should do a better job of not encouraging people to come to this country, bypassing the laws and laying down enforcement and making it easier for our country to be invaded. That is what is happening right now.

Some 70,000 people have come to our border, and Republicans are standing up and are talking about this in a proper way. We believe that the people who have come here should be allowed to go back home. We should help them, and we should facilitate that. We believe that the rule of law—the processes that we have got to follow to do that—must be followed.

Yesterday, there was an amendment before the Rules Committee asking for almost \$180 million to help pay for these children who, as the guests of the Democratic Party and the President, will stay in this country. We are going to have to end up paying about—\$180 million was the request, for 60 days for our local school districts.

There are enormous questions that abound about what will happen, who will pay, how this is supposed to happen when, in fact, America at this time has 25 million people unemployed and underemployed. It is a tremendous deficit that we face. Our social systems and networks are burdened already, and we have many people whom, ourselves, we cannot help—but what do we do? We take on more people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we listen to the American people and that we listen to what we are trying to do here, and that is to face up to what we were sent here to do, which is to make tough choices and tough decisions. I believe what we are doing is correct. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 710 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R.15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what

they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 183, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Broun (GA)	Cotton
Amash	Buchanan	Cramer
Amodei	Bucshon	Crawford
Bachmann	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bachus	Byrne	Culberson
Barletta	Calvert	Daines
Barr	Capito	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Carter	Denham
Benishek	Cassidy	Dent
Bentivolio	Chabot	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Duffy
Black	Coble	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Cole	Ellmers
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Cook	Fleischmann

Fleming	Lance	Rohrabacher
Flores	Lankford	Rokita
Forbes	Latham	Rooney
Fortenberry	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Fox	LoBiondo	Roskam
Franks (AZ)	Long	Ross
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rothfus
Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Garrett	Lummis	Runyan
Gerlach	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Gibbs	Marino	Salmon
Gibson	Massie	Sanford
Gingrey (GA)	McAllister	Scalise
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert
Goodlatte	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Gosar	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Gowdy	McHenry	Sessions
Granger	McKeon	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Shuster
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Simpson
Griffin (AR)	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Griffith (VA)	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Grimm	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Guthrie	Messer	Smith (TX)
Hall	Mica	Southerland
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Stewart
Harper	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Harris	Mullin	Stockman
Hartzler	Mulvaney	Stutzman
Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)	Terry
Heck (NV)	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Noem	Thornberry
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Tiberi
Holding	Nunes	Tipton
Hudson	Olson	Turner
Huelskamp	Palazzo	Upton
Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Valadao
Hultgren	Pearce	Wagner
Hunter	Perry	Walberg
Hurt	Petri	Walden
Issa	Pittenger	Walorski
Jenkins	Pitts	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Wenstrup
Jolly	Posey	Westmoreland
Jones	Price (GA)	Whitfield
Jordan	Reed	Williams
Joyce	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Wittman
King (IA)	Ribble	Wolf
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Womack
Kingston	Rigell	Woodall
Kinzinger (IL)	Roby	Yoder
Kline	Roe (TN)	Yoho
Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Young (IN)
Lamborn	Rogers (MI)	

NAYS—183

Barber	Crowley	Horsford
Barrow (GA)	Cuellar	Hoyer
Bass	Cummings	Huffman
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Israel
Becerra	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Bera (CA)	DeGette	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	DelBene	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Keating
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Bustos	Edwards	Kind
Butterfield	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Engel	Kuster
Capuano	Enyart	Langevin
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Esty	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Farr	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Foster	Levin
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lewis
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Chu	Gallego	Loeb
Cicilline	Garcia	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Lowe
Clay	Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham
Cleaver	Hahn	(NM)
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray
Cohen	Heck (WA)	(NM)
Connolly	Higgins	Lynch
Conyers	Himes	Maffei
Cooper	Hinojosa	Maloney,
Costa	Holt	Carolyn
Courtney	Honda	Maloney, Sean

Matheson	Peters (CA)	Sinema
Matsui	Peters (MI)	Sires
McCarthy (NY)	Peterson	Slaughter
McCollum	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
McGovern	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
McIntyre	Polis	Takano
McNerney	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Meeks	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Meng	Rahall	Tierney
Michaud	Rangel	Titus
Miller, George	Richmond	Tonko
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Moran	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vargas
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Vela
Neal	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Negrete McLeod	Schiff	Visclosky
Nolan	Schneider	Walz
O'Rourke	Schrader	Wasserman
Owens	Schwartz	Schultz
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Waters
Pascrell	Scott, David	Welch
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Pelosi	Shea-Porter	
Perlmutter	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Nunnelee
Camp	Garamendi	Ruiz
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cantor	Green, Gene	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa	T.
DesJarlais	Kennedy	Schock
Doggett	McDermott	Speier
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Waxman

□ 1858

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 191, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Byrne	Denham
Amash	Calvert	Dent
Amodei	Capito	DeSantis
Bachmann	Carter	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Cassidy	Duffy
Barletta	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Coble	Ellmers
Benishek	Coffman	Farenthold
Bentivolio	Cole	Fincher
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Black	Conaway	Fleming
Blackburn	Cook	Flores
Boustany	Cotton	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crawford	Fox
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bucshon	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Burgess	Daines	Gardner
	Davis, Rodney	Garrett

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Chaffetz
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Fattah
Garamendi
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
McDermott
Miller, Gary

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1907

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. **MCDERMOTT**. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 476, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall vote 477, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **HULTGREN**). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5230 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-571 are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

DIVISION A—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$71,000,000, to remain avail-

able until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to apprehend, transport, and provide temporary shelter associated with the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including related activities to secure the border, disrupt transnational crime, and the necessary acquisition, construction, improvement, repair, and management of facilities: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", \$334,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, including for enforcement of immigration and customs law, including detention and removal operations, of which \$262,000,000 shall be for Custody Operations and \$72,000,000 shall be for Transportation and Removal operations: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an obligation and quarterly expenditure plan for these funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide to such Committees quarterly updates on the expenditure of these funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided by this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming or transfer of funds that proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose than for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request for approval shall be submitted to such Committees.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Congress quarterly reports that include: (1) the number of apprehensions at the border delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; and the number of determinations of valid claims of a credible fear of persecution delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor; (3) the number of unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor granted asylum by an immigration judge, delineated by year of apprehension; (4) the number of alien adults accompanied by an alien minor in detention facilities, alternatives to detention, and other non-detention forms of supervision; and (5) the number of removals delineated by unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor.

SEC. 103. Of the unobligated balance available for “Department of Homeland Security—Federal Emergency Management Agency—Disaster Relief Fund”, \$405,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on a budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, grants awarded under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) using funds provided under the heading “Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs” in division F of Public Law 113-76, division D of Public Law 113-6, or division D of Public Law 112-74 may be used by State and local law enforcement and public safety agencies within local units of government along the Southwest Border of the United States for costs incurred during the award period of performance for personnel, overtime, travel, costs related to combating illegal immigration and drug smuggling, and costs related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor who have entered the United States.

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision in this or any other Act, amounts transferred to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 202 of this Act shall be provided by the Secretary of Homeland Security under the heading “Federal Emergency Management Agency—State and Local Programs” to States along the Southwest Border of the United States as reimbursement for necessary costs of National Guard personnel activated under the operational control of the Governors of such States and deployed for the purpose of border security.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY MILITARY PERSONNEL

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, \$47,419,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “National Guard Personnel, Air Force”, \$2,258,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$15,807,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$4,516,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for necessary expenses related to the Southwest Border of the United States.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE (RESCISSION)

SEC. 201. Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated in title II of division C of Public Law 113-76 for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, \$70,000,000 is hereby rescinded to reflect excess cash balances in Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, of the amounts made available by this Act for “National Guard Personnel, Army”, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Department of Homeland Security such funds as may be necessary, not to exceed \$35,000,000, to reimburse the States for the cost of any units or personnel of the National Guard, to perform operations and missions under State Active Duty status, deployed in support of a southern border mission.

TITLE III DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for “Administrative Review and Appeals” for necessary expenses to respond to the significant rise in unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor at the Southwest Border of the United States, \$22,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, of which \$12,900,000 shall be for additional temporary immigration judges and related expenses, and \$9,100,000 shall be for technology for judges to expedite the adjudication of immigration cases.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE (RESCISSION)

SEC. 301. Of the unobligated balances available for “Department of Justice—Legal Activities—Assets Forfeiture Fund”, \$22,000,000 is hereby permanently rescinded.

TITLE IV GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION

SEC. 401. (a) REPATRIATION AND REINTEGRATION.—Of the funds appropriated in titles III and IV of division K of Public Law 113-76, and in prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, for assistance for the countries in Central America, up to \$40,000,000 shall be made available for such countries for repatriation and reintegration activities: *Provided*, That funds made available pursuant to this section may be obligated notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e) of section 7045 of division K of Public Law 113-76.

(b) REPORT.—Prior to the initial obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section, but not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2015, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the obligation of funds made available pursuant to this section by country and the steps taken by the government of each country to—

- (1) improve border security;
- (2) enforce laws and policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States;
- (3) enact laws and implement new policies to stem the flow of illegal entries into the United States, including increasing penalties for human smuggling;
- (4) conduct public outreach campaigns to explain the dangers of the journey to the

Southwest Border of the United States, emphasize the lack of immigration benefits available; and emphasize that illegal aliens will be removed to their country; and

(5) cooperate with United States Federal agencies to facilitate and expedite the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the Southwest Border of the United States.

(c) SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State shall suspend assistance provided pursuant to this section to the government of a country if such government is not making significant progress on each item described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b): *Provided*, That assistance may only be resumed if the Secretary reports to the appropriate congressional committees that subsequent to the suspension of assistance such government is making significant progress on each of the items enumerated in such subsection.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 402. Of the unexpended balances available to the President for bilateral economic assistance under the heading “Economic Support Fund” from prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, \$197,000,000 is rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Refugee and Entrant Assistance”, \$197,000,000, to be merged with and available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the funds made available under this heading in division H of Public Law 113-76 “for carrying out such sections 414, 501, 462, and 235”: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$47,000,000 shall be for the Social Services and Targeted Assistance programs.

This division may be cited as the “Secure the Southwest Border Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2014”.

DIVISION B—SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the “Secure the Southwest Border Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

Sec. 101. Repatriation of unaccompanied alien children.

Sec. 102. Last in, first out.

Sec. 103. Emergency immigration judge resources.

Sec. 104. Protecting children from human traffickers, sex offenders, and other criminals.

Sec. 105. Inclusion of additional grounds for per se ineligibility for asylum.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

Sec. 201. National Guard support for border operations.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

Sec. 301. Prohibition on actions that impede border security on certain Federal land.

Sec. 302. Sense of Congress on placement of unauthorized aliens at military installations.

Sec. 303. Limitation on placement of unauthorized aliens at military installations.

TITLE I—PROTECTING CHILDREN

SEC. 101. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the paragraph heading to read as follows: “RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN”;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting “and” at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking clause (iii);

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(‘8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) may—” and inserting “(‘8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.)—”;

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting before “permit such child to withdraw” the following: “may”; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by inserting before “return such child” the following: “shall”; and

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the subparagraph heading to read as follows: “AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “The Secretary of State shall negotiate agreements between the United States and countries contiguous to the United States” and inserting “The Secretary of State may negotiate agreements between the United States and any foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2),” and inserting “who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)”; and

(B) in clause (i), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, which shall include a hearing before an immigration judge not later than 14 days after being screened under paragraph (4) and the unaccompanied alien child shall be detained until such hearing”.

SEC. 102. LAST IN, FIRST OUT.

In any removal proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a) with respect to an unaccompanied alien child (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2))), priority shall be accorded to the alien who has most recently arrived in the United States.

SEC. 103. EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION JUDGE RESOURCES.

Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate up to 40 immigration judges, including through the hiring of retired immigration judges, administrative law judges, or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges. Such designations shall remain in effect solely for the duration of the humanitarian crisis at the southern border (as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General).

SEC. 104. PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM HUMAN TRAFFICKERS, SEX OFFENDERS, AND OTHER CRIMINALS.

Section 235(c)(3) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “, including a mandatory biometric criminal history check” before the period at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following—

“(D) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT WITH SEX OFFENDERS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not place an unaccompanied alien child in the custody of an individual who has been convicted of—

“(I) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)); or

“(II) a crime involving a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK.—A biometric criminal history check under subparagraph (A) shall be based on a set of fingerprints or other biometric identifiers and conducted through—

“(I) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

“(II) criminal history repositories of all States that the individual lists as current or former residences.”.

SEC. 105. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS FOR PER SE INELIGIBILITY FOR ASYLUM.

Section 208(b)(2)(A)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158(b)(2)(A)(iii)) is amended by inserting after “a serious nonpolitical crime” the following: “(including any drug-related offense punishable by a term of imprisonment greater than 1 year)”.

TITLE II—USE OF NATIONAL GUARD TO IMPROVE BORDER SECURITY

SEC. 201. NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORT FOR BORDER OPERATIONS.

(a) DEPLOYMENT AUTHORITY AND FUNDING.—Amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense in this Act shall be expended for any units or personnel of the National Guard deployed to perform operations and missions under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on the southern border of the United States.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF OPERATIONS AND MISSIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—National Guard units and personnel deployed under subsection (a) may be assigned such operations as may be necessary to provide assistance for operations on the southern border, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossings by unaccompanied alien children.

(2) NATURE OF DUTY.—The duty of National Guard personnel performing operations and missions on the southern border shall be full-time duty under title 32, United States Code.

(c) MATERIEL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall deploy such materiel and equipment and logistical support as may be necessary to ensure success of the operations and missions conducted by the National Guard under this section.

(d) EXCLUSION FROM NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL STRENGTH LIMITATIONS.—National Guard personnel deployed under subsection (a) shall not be included in—

(1) the calculation to determine compliance with limits on end strength for National Guard personnel; or

(2) limits on the number of National Guard personnel that may be placed on active duty for operational support under section 115 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) HIGH TRAFFIC AREAS DEFINED.—In this section:

(1) The term “high traffic areas” means sectors along the northern and southern borders of the United States that are within the responsibility of the Border Patrol that have the most illicit cross-border activity, informed through situational awareness.

(2) The term “unaccompanied alien child” means a child who—

(A) has no lawful immigration status in the United States;

(B) has not attained 18 years of age; and

(C) with respect to whom—

(i) there is no parent or legal guardian in the United States; or

(ii) no parent or legal guardian in the United States is available to provide care and physical custody.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL LANDS PROTECTION

SEC. 301. PROHIBITION ON ACTIONS THAT IMPEDE BORDER SECURITY ON CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) PROHIBITION ON SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture shall not impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on Federal land located within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, to execute search and rescue operations, and to prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States. These authorities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection on such Federal land apply whether or not a state of emergency exists.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall have immediate access to Federal land within 100 miles of the United States border with Mexico that is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of conducting the following activities on such land that prevent all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband through such international land border of the United States:

(1) Construction and maintenance of roads.

(2) Construction and maintenance of barriers.

(3) Use of vehicles to patrol, apprehend, or rescue.

(4) Installation, maintenance, and operation of communications and surveillance equipment and sensors.

(5) Deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure.

(C) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any termination date relating to the waiver referred to in this subsection), the waiver by the Secretary of Homeland Security on April 1, 2008, under section 102(c)(1) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1103 note; Public Law 104-208) of the laws described in paragraph (2) with respect to certain sections of the international border between the United States and Mexico shall be considered to apply to all Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture within 100 miles of such international land border of the United States for the activities of U.S. Customs and Border Protection described in subsection (b).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAWS WAIVED.—The laws referred to in paragraph (1) are limited to the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), Public Law 86-523 (16 U.S.C. 469 et seq.), the Act of June 8, 1906 (commonly known as the “Antiquities Act of 1906”; 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a et seq.), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”), the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), the General Authorities Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-383) (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 et seq.), sections 401(7), 403, and 404 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-625, 92 Stat. 3467), and the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 101-628).

(d) PROTECTION OF LEGAL USES.—This section shall not be construed to provide—

(1) authority to restrict legal uses, such as grazing, hunting, mining, or public-use recreational and backcountry airstrips on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture; or

(2) any additional authority to restrict legal access to such land.

(e) EFFECT ON STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.—This Act shall—

(1) have no force or effect on State or private lands; and

(2) not provide authority on or access to State or private lands.

(f) TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.—Nothing in this section supersedes, replaces, negates, or diminishes treaties or other agreements between the United States and Indian tribes.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLACEMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should not allow the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation unless—

(A) the Secretary submits written notice to the congressional defense committees and each Member of Congress representing any jurisdiction in which an affected military installation is situated; and

(B) the Secretary publishes notice in the Federal Register;

(2) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not displace active members of the Armed Forces;

(3) the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military institution should not interfere with any mission of the Department of Defense;

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens unless all other facilities of the Department of Health and Human Services are unavailable;

(5) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should not use a military installation for the placement of unauthorized aliens for more than 120 days;

(6) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all unauthorized alien children are vaccinated upon arrival at a military installation as set forth in the guidelines of the Office of Refugee Resettlement;

(7) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should ensure that all individuals under the supervision of the Secretary with access to unauthorized alien children at a military installation are properly cleared according to the procedures set forth in the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

(8) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should fully comply with the provisions of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) with respect to background checks and should retain full legal responsibility for such compliance; and

(9) in accordance with section 1535 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Economy Act”), the Secretary of Health and Human Services should reimburse the Secretary of Defense for all expenses incurred by the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “Member of Congress” has the meaning given that term in section 1591(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “military installation” has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, but does not include an installation located outside of the United States.

(4) The term “placement” means the placement of an unauthorized alien in either a detention facility or an alternative to such a facility.

(5) The term “unauthorized alien” means an alien unlawfully present in the United States, but does not include a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLACEMENT OF UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not allow the placement of unauthorized aliens at a military installation in the United States if the use of the military institution to house or care for unauthorized aliens would—

(1) displace members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty or in a reserve or Guard status; or

(2) interfere with activities of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, at the installation.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “military installation” has the meaning given such term in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “unauthorized alien” means an alien unlawfully present in the United States, but does not include a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for an additional hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5230, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue the debate on H.R. 5230, with further amendments added by the rule the House just adopted. The need to pass this bill before Congress leaves for the August break is just as critical today as it was yesterday.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides funding to meet immediate border security and humanitarian needs in response to the recent surge of illegal immigrants crossing our southern border.

In terms of funding, this bill is essentially the same as the legislation the House considered yesterday. It emphasizes securing our borders, providing humanitarian assistance for unaccompanied children in U.S. custody, and preventing further influxes of illegal immigration, both by funding vital programs and by implementing important policy provisions. This is also a fiscally responsible bill. All funding is offset, so it won't add a penny to our deficit.

However, the bill differs from the version yesterday by adding an additional \$35 million for the National Guard to allow States, including Texas, to be reimbursed for National Guard activities related to border security and the current influx of illegal immigrants. This brings the new total of the bill to \$694 million, and, again, it is fully offset.

In addition, the bill includes new tweaks to various policy provisions which will help to further tighten our borders and provide solutions that help solve our immigration challenges for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis on our hands, and we can't simply get up and walk away. It is our moral responsibility to protect our homeland and to properly care for and process the thousands of unaccompanied children who put their lives in the hands of criminals to cross our borders. We simply can't turn our backs on this. We must pass this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

DIVISION A -- SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS			
TITLE I			
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY			
U.S. Customs and Border Protection			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	393,549	---	-393,549
Salaries and Expenses.....	---	71,000	+71,000
Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, Maintenance, and Procurement (emergency).....	39,411	---	-39,411
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	432,960	71,000	-361,960
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement			
Salaries and Expenses (emergency).....	1,103,995	---	-1,103,995
Salaries and Expenses.....	---	334,000	+334,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS -- THIS TITLE			
FEMA Disaster Relief Fund (Sec. 103) (rescission).....	---	-405,000	-405,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title I.....	1,536,955	---	-1,536,955
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE II			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE -- MILITARY			
Military Personnel			
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	---	47,419	+47,419
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	---	2,258	+2,258
Total, Military Personnel.....	---	49,677	+49,677
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	---	15,807	+15,807
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	---	4,516	+4,516
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	---	20,323	+20,323
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (Sec. 201) (rescission).....	---	-70,000	-70,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title II.....	---	---	---
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE III			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Administration			
Administrative Review and Appeals (emergency).....	62,900	---	-62,900
Administrative Review and Appeals.....	---	22,000	+22,000

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014 (DIVISION A of H.R. 5230)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

Legal Activities			
Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities (emergency).....	1,100	---	-1,100
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
DOJ Assets Forfeiture Fund (Sec. 301) (rescission)....	---	-22,000	-22,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title III.....	64,000	---	-64,000
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE IV			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs			
Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency).....	5,000	---	-5,000
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President			
Economic Support Fund (emergency).....	295,000	---	-295,000
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS TITLE			
Repatriation and reintegration (Sec. 401) (non-add)...	---	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Economic Support Fund (Sec. 402) (rescission).....	---	-197,000	-197,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title IV.....	300,000	-197,000	-497,000
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE V			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Administration for Children and Families			
Refugee and Entrant Assistance (emergency).....	1,830,000	---	-1,830,000
Refugee and Entrant Assistance.....	---	197,000	+197,000
	=====	=====	=====
Total, title V.....	1,830,000	197,000	-1,633,000
	=====	=====	=====
GENERAL PROVISION -- THIS ACT			
Transfer authority (emergency).....	(250,000)	---	(-250,000)
	=====	=====	=====
GRAND TOTAL.....	3,730,955	---	-3,730,955
Appropriations.....	---	(694,000)	(+694,000)
Emergencies.....	(3,730,955)	---	(-3,730,955)
Rescissions.....	---	(-694,000)	(-694,000)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today to oppose this outrageous bill and the ridiculous process that produced it.

Just yesterday, this House attempted to consider a bill that went too far on policy and not far enough on funding levels, but apparently even that wasn't bad enough for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's bill vanished into thin air, and in its place, we now have this haphazard mess. This bill is the result of some sort of auction with members of the majority.

The bill also paves the way for another piece of legislation to be approved tonight—a brand-new bill on the so-called DACA—deferred action on undocumented children program—related to young people who were brought here as minors by 2007 and only know the United States of America as their home. This new bill has not been approved by any committee and contains language that would throw thousands of young people into legal limbo.

This new supplemental funding bill would add an additional \$35 million to reimburse States for deploying the National Guard to the border, which is pointless. In other words, U.S. taxpayers will pick up the tab for Governor Perry's campaign stunt.

The bill also would change the initial screening process used by Customs and Border Patrol. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops opposes the change, noting:

It would make crippling changes to current U.S.-trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them.

I insert the letter into the RECORD.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF
CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,
Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to reaffirm the opposition of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to H.R. 5230 and express our opposition to H.R. 5232.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special im-

migrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

Our opposition to H.R. 5232 stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. It is our view that this program has helped protect a vulnerable group of children who for all extensive purposes are Americans. It would subject them once again to removal to countries they do not know. We urge its defeat.

How our nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5232, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
*Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle, WA,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, this House majority needs to make up its collective mind. Do they want to provide emergency funding to enable our Federal agencies to respond to the humanitarian crisis on the border? Or do they wish to rewrite current law on immigration, political asylum, and due process? We can't do both in an hour of floor consideration.

The House should have already taken up bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform the Senate passed more than 1 year ago, with the support of Democrats and Republicans, the labor and business communities, evangelicals, law enforcement, and many others.

We would have been proud to work together with our Republicans on the other side of the aisle to give thoughtful consideration to this immigration process. The Senate did it. We had an opportunity to do it, and instead, we are rushing through tonight to put a bill on the floor that has changed many times as it has proceeded through the process.

That bill, the comprehensive immigration bill, would have helped prevent the crisis on the border today. If we had passed this 1 year ago, we wouldn't be in the desperate situation we are in now. Now, we are at a point where it requires emergency supplemental funding that we should provide cleanly and quickly without the baggage of extraneous policy that caused so much political division.

This package crossed the line from being a supplemental spending bill and became a controversial revision of immigration policy with limited funding thrown in as an afterthought. That is a shame. That is really sad because we know that the Departments of Homeland Security, Justice, Health and Human Services, and State need this money to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, just last year, this body allowed a small vocal minority to push a government shutdown over controversial policy ideas. This process today causes me to wonder whether

many have learned the perils of such recklessness.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this package and start over. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we are here with this crisis because the President announced a policy that no one would be deported unless they were a criminal. That word spread through our Central American countries, and families said: hey, the gates are open; while this President is in office, if you go there and you get in, then you won't be deported.

The administration knew this 2 years ago. The word came out that we were being flooded, increasingly so, from Central American countries. So we are here trying to fix the problem that is an emergency caused by this administration, and the administration's control of the other body, rather than help us solve the problem, left town at noon today without doing anything. So we are trying to clean up their mess and the administration's mess, and this bill will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. GRANGER), the chair of the Speaker's task force on border security and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mrs. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the hard work you have put into this difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight because this Congress has a responsibility to immediately stop the humanitarian crisis on our southern border. The President has failed to lead. The Senate failed to lead. This Chamber has to lead.

Since October, 58,000 unaccompanied minors have made the treacherous 1,000-mile journey from Central America, across Mexico, and through our southern border. Tens of thousands more unaccompanied minors are expected to come if we don't act. Doing nothing is not an option. I repeat, doing nothing is not an option.

The members of the working group I chaired made recommendations for an immediate short-term response. I want to recognize the hard work and commitment of the working group members who made targeted policy recommendations on how to end this crisis.

Our conclusions included in the bill are to tweak the 2008 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act to make sure that all unaccompanied minors are treated the same as Mexicans, prioritize last in-first out, expedite the hearing process within 7 days after the children are detained, and hire additional temporary judges to support the accelerated process.

To fully support Customs and Border Protection's mission, we include a provision to allow Border Patrol unfettered access to Federal lands. Finally,

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental includes a sense of Congress that children should not be detained at military bases.

The Congressional Budget Office has given its assessment of the policy changes in this legislation. They have said that because the legislation allows for the children to self-deport, it will lead to immediate savings.

I want to commend Chairman ROGERS on this smart, targeted bill that helps address the crisis immediately, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the supplemental.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, if you read what reporters are already saying, they are saying that this isn't a serious bill that will ever become law—that opportunity was lost yesterday when the original bill was pulled. They are saying this bill does nothing because it isn't going anywhere once it leaves the House.

The perception of the press and the American people is that this is all political theater. Why don't we prove them wrong? Why don't we cancel our travel plans and commit to staying here until we can agree on an actual solution to this border issue that we can put into a bill that might actually have a shot of becoming law?

Any single one of us who is married knows the importance of compromise. Imagine what happens if you walk in your house every day and you tell your spouse: I really don't care what you think today, I am not interested in your opinion, we are going to do it my way.

Well, that marriage wouldn't last very long. Anyone who is in a marriage knows the importance of compromise and knows what happens when a relationship is one-sided.

We can get together on this. We did it for the VA; we can, and we should do it for this. An opportunity to sit down around the same table and negotiate our way through in a very serious and in a very real way—without the rhetoric, just simple reason, simple common sense—that makes a difference every day for the people on our border. That is what I would ask, and that is what I think the American people are asking.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the newly elected majority whip of the U.S. House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his leadership, and the gentlewoman from Texas for her leadership in putting this working group together to bring a bill to address this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis at our border. The President has refused and

failed to do his job to address the crisis. The Senate in fact today failed to do their job and left town without passing anything to address this crisis, but the House is here working.

The people's House is here working, and we are not going to stop working until we get our job done and pass legislation that actually addresses this crisis, and that is what this bill does, Mr. Speaker.

We have got a bill that actually allows the Governors along the border to call up the National Guard to help secure the border. The President ought to do this job. The President has all the tools to secure the border, but he won't. He has failed to do one of his basic functions in securing the American border.

Shouldn't the Governors along that border be able to call up the National Guard to help secure it if the President won't? Not only do we do that, Mr. Speaker, but we put the funds in place to ensure that it gets done.

Some other things we do is end this catch-and-release program that has been a magnet for thousands of people to come across the border and be released throughout the country—some never to be seen again. We can stop this, and we do in our bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation that actually sends a strong message that we are going to take this issue seriously, and we are going to actually solve this crisis. If the Senate wants to be serious about doing their job and if the President wants to be serious about doing his job, they ought to come back here and pass something of their own, but they won't, but that is no reason to fail to lead. That is why the House is leading.

We are going to pass this bill, and we are going to propose a solution to this crisis. I encourage the Senate to come back and do their job, and I encourage the President to start doing his.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard repeatedly that this bill simply treats all children the way that Mexican children are treated. It is true that the bill would subject all children to the ineffective border screening that Mexican children now undergo, but it actually makes that screening much worse.

Under the antislavery law, Mexican children are permitted to withdraw their applications for admission and return to Mexico only if the Border Patrol screener determines that the child has the capacity to understand what is going on and can independently agree to withdraw the application for admission.

This bill strikes that language. Under this bill, it does not matter

whether the child can comprehend that she has been given the option to voluntarily return to her home country because, in this bill, it does not matter what she thinks.

This bill now says that while a child may be permitted to withdraw her application for admission, no matter what, she shall be returned—no matter what, once Border Patrol decides, that is the end of the discussion, and that kid is going home.

Now, this is not just about our southern border and children from Central America. This new procedure would apply to any unaccompanied minor child who appears at our border seeking asylum.

□ 1930

It could mean that the pregnant Chinese teenager fleeing forced abortion in China simply gets turned away. It could mean that Syrian Christian children fleeing horrific violence and persecution in Syria simply get turned away. It would turn aside a child from Thailand being trafficked for sex.

I don't know that this was necessarily the intention of this bill—I would certainly hope not—but that is the way the bill is written. That is the effect it would have, and I think it is simply unconscionable.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5230.

There is a crisis at our southern border, and it is a disaster of President Obama's own making. The Obama administration's lax immigration enforcement policies have given confidence to parents who are in the U.S. illegally that they can stay, and now they are finding ways to bring their children who are still in Central America and beyond to the United States unlawfully. Although President Obama has many tools at his disposal to stop this surge at the border, he refuses to use them and instead proposes to make the situation worse by taking more unilateral actions to stop the enforcement of our immigration laws.

It is ultimately up to President Obama to end this crisis by reversing his policies that created it. However, since he refuses to do so, we have to act to the extent we can to provide narrow and targeted funding to meet the immediate needs of our law enforcement agencies at the southern border. We have to enable them to do their job to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws.

And we need to tweak the 2008 law regarding the removal of unaccompanied

alien minors. We need to treat apprehended minors from Central America in the same expedited but humane fashion that we treat apprehended minors from Mexico and Canada. In fact, the administration has called for such a change.

On July 14, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson said that the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 needed to be amended. He said:

In terms of changing the law, we are asking for the ability to treat unaccompanied kids from a Central American country in the same way as from a contiguous country.

That is what this bill does, based on language written by Representative CARTER, and it makes the important clarification that all minors from any country who do not have a credible fear of persecution and have not been trafficked shall be expeditiously returned home.

Because of the President's inaction, we are taking the responsible step today of passing these narrow fixes that will help the American people avoid billions of dollars in additional costs due to the President not trying to solve this problem but asking for more money to continue to resettle tens of thousands of people into the interior of our country.

While the bill is not perfect, it does give law enforcement many tools they have requested. For example, while I was in the Rio Grande Valley earlier this month, Border Patrol agents cited administration-created restrictions that bar them access to Federal lands as a significant stumbling block to securing the border. One of the more important provisions of this bill gives Border Patrol agents access to Federal lands so that they can stop drug traffickers, human smugglers, and unlawful immigrants from exploiting these gaps along the border.

Since the President isn't taking the serious action needed to address the crisis at the border, the House is doing so today. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have taken two bad bills that failed to meet the challenge of the humanitarian crisis on the border and made them worse. They are worse for children. They are worse for women. And they are worse for those who were brought here as children, grew up here, and know no other home than America. These bills do not reflect America's values and our highest ideals.

The bills that were put forward yesterday had no chance of seeing action in the Senate. Neither do these. In fact,

Representative JOHN FLEMING is reported to have said that the supplemental bill is "political cover" and that "not a single Republican in the House believes it'll be signed into law."

I believe that statement to be absolutely accurate.

Chairwoman GRANGER, my friend with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee, said, just a few minutes ago, doing nothing is not an option. And I very politely suggest to her what we are doing tonight is nothing.

What we do tonight will not pass, will not solve a problem, will not change policy, and it will not give the needed resources that are necessary. Republicans have once again embraced their "my way or the highway" attitude, the same attitude that led to last year's shutdown, instead of reaching across the aisle and working with Democrats on bipartisan legislation that can address this crisis and be enacted.

We are debating a bill that is not only bad in substance, but that was brought to the floor in near secrecy in violation of the Republican majority's own 3-day rule. How ironic. How ironic that Majority Leader MCCARTHY said in an op-ed in the Washington Post today:

I will commit to the committee process and regular order.

This is neither the committee process nor regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the House action tonight does not reflect those words from this morning's op-ed.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to have a responsible, bipartisan measure to provide the needed funds to address the border crisis, but we also must see this as a reminder of why we must pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Speaker BOEHNER, himself, said the House would act, saying last May:

The House remains committed to fixing our broken immigration system.

This is not a fix. But tonight, we must address the crisis before us. Our Republican friends should work with Democrats on a solution that can pass the House—this probably can—pass the Senate—this cannot—and be signed by the President. Nobody here, as Congressman FLEMING indicated, believes that will be the case.

Tonight will be a loss for rational humanitarian action and a victory for partisan, negative policy. How sad. How wrong. How disappointing to the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to say at least the House is putting a bill on the floor and passing it, which solves the problem. If we had the Senate here to work with

us, we might be able to get a bill the President could sign. But the Senate is gone. They have left. So I would hope that the leader of the Senate would recognize that his body is getting severely criticized for leaving town without offering a solution to this crisis on our border.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), who chairs the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security and as a native Texan, I am uniquely familiar with our southern border. I am also uniquely familiar with the national security crisis and law enforcement nightmare erupting on that border, primarily in my State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, as I have often said, and said yesterday, lawlessness breeds lawlessness. The crisis unfolding on our border is in very large part a result of the President's political decision to not enforce the immigration laws of this Nation. The House intends to correct that tonight.

In many ways this bill is similar to the legislation the House considered yesterday, but it has some important improvements. Once again, the funding in this package is fully offset and provides the resources needed to address the immediate crisis. This bill also includes the necessary policy changes to bring parity to the adjudication and repatriation of these children. Many of these provisions are borrowed from a bill I drafted along with ROBERT ADERHOLT and JACK KINGSTON, H.R. 5143, the Protection of Children Act.

This bill expands the tools available to our Border Patrol agents and allows them to better and more quickly screen the influx of migrant children. It ensures a timely trial so that no child will have to wait in limbo for months or years to find out whether or not they will be able to stay in the United States. It includes crucial language to prevent these children from being placed with criminals, sex offenders, or human traffickers. And finally, this bill provides additional resources for our border Governors as they work to assist Federal officials and keep our citizens safe.

I urge my colleagues to join me and others in supporting this strong bill. Lawlessness has bred this lawlessness. We must stop it and secure our border.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to remind the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee that the reason the Senate could not bring a bill to the floor was because not one Republican will allow the procedural vote of cloture to bring it to the floor. Therefore, we are having a very important debate, but this bill, as you know, is going nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called appropriations bill. I say "so-called" because it really is mainly about ill-advised and mean-spirited policy changes. Rather than providing the necessary funds to deal with the humanitarian crisis at the border, this bill mainly reduces protections for young people facing violence that we can hardly imagine.

For awhile, it looked like we might do better than this. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee, I was pleased to take part in a recent delegation to Central America ably led by Chairwoman KAY GRANGER. But as successive versions of the Republican bill have surfaced over the past 2 weeks, in a quest for votes only among Republicans, they reflected less and less of what we learned on that trip. That was true when I said it yesterday, and it is even more true of the bill before us now.

By the way, to respond to a claim we have heard tonight: Not a person we talked to any time, anywhere blamed the surge in unaccompanied minors on the President's decision to prioritize the deportation of dangerous criminals. That is just not a credible proposition.

The bill under consideration provides less than \$1 billion to the Departments of Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, Justice, and State, far below what is required to deal with this crisis. And what of the money that is in the bill? Most of it reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the issue before us. This isn't a border security crisis; it is a humanitarian crisis. We don't need to deploy the National Guard or surge our border capacity, because we are not failing to catch individuals as they cross. In fact, these young people are turning themselves in!

This new, worse bill brought before us mere hours ago would entice Texas, and potentially other border States, with Federal dollars, to use the National Guard to militarize the southern border. At the same time, it underfunds the additional judges that I thought we agreed were needed. We all know that we need to deal with the claims put forward by these young people who present themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's pass an appropriations bill that reflects our country's values and actually addresses the problems we face. Let's also face up to our responsibility to pass comprehensive immigration reform, as the Senate did a year ago. This bill moves us in exactly the wrong direction. I urge its rejection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON),

the distinguished chairman of the Military Construction-VA Appropriations Subcommittee.

□ 1945

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard several of my Democratic colleagues tonight say this bill does not reflect American values. I am disappointed to hear them say that because it really reflects a fundamental difference between our two parties, as we on our side as Republicans believe in the most important American value and that is enforcement. The first design on the first coin minted in the Republic of Mexico after the Revolution said: Liberty in the Law. We all understand as lawmakers, as Americans, that there can be no liberty without law enforcement.

The bill before us tonight is very simple, this is not complicated. This is a law enforcement issue. This is a law enforcement bill. Without respect for the law there can be no liberty, without respect for the law there can be no peace and quiet, there can be no prosperity.

My good friend HENRY CUELLAR, who represents the city of Laredo, whom I served with in the Texas legislature, understands better than most that, because Laredo is the largest inland port in the United States, his constituents need law and order in order to be prosperous, to be able to trade with Mexico, our most important trading partner. That relationship with Mexico is essential to the Texas economy, to the United States economy, and for that relationship to thrive there must be law and order, there must be respect for the law, and there must be peace and quiet on the streets of Laredo so children can play in the streets, so people don't have to worry about whether or not they can send their kids down to the corner store, whether or not they can thrive in the future. It is a tragedy what has happened in Nuevo Laredo. One of the most beautiful cities on the border is now essentially a ghost town because there is no respect for the law.

The bill before us tonight that the Republican majority has put together reflects our core value as Americans to respect the law, to enforce the law, with a kind heart and commonsense. We believe in the good judgment of our law enforcement officers and our National Guardsmen to use their good hearts and their commonsense as Americans to distinguish between the widow and her child who is escaping a terrible situation at home. We are trusting the good hearts and good sense of our immigration officers to know the difference between a tattooed criminal and a drug dealer and a smuggler, and the child who has come here innocently, brought up in the trust the President of the United States has made inviting them all up here. It is a

tragedy for them, it is a tragedy for our border communities, it is a tragedy for the country to let these folks come into the country.

This is a law enforcement issue, it is a law enforcement bill. I encourage folks to vote "yes."

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States of America because I have respect for the law. The comprehensive immigration bill has been sitting out there for over a year. If we could work in a bipartisan way, if we could show that we have respect for the law, we would have had a serious debate and really passed a law. This bill is going nowhere. As you know, the Republicans in the Senate wouldn't even bring a bill to the floor.

That is why I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The corrosive effects of shutdown do-nothing politics is on full display here tonight in the House of Representatives. Stripping the rights and protections of children is never a good solution in any legislation, whether it is the children huddled at the border alone and afraid or now including the young DREAMers of America who believe in this country. They have now become the targets of this legislation. They are the ones who are being told, it is because of you that we must change the law and treat human beings so harshly.

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to those frightened children and our DREAMers of America and those working for a fair solution on their behalf, this is what I would say:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Is there any doubt what Republicans' intentions are for the migrant children at the border?

Is there any doubt what Republicans' intentions are for young DREAMers and their families?

Is there any doubt why immigration reform remains shackled?

Is there any doubt what we must do with our vote, our voice, to defend the rights and dreams of our children?

¿Queda duda de las intenciones republicanas hacia los niños migrantes en la frontera?

¿Queda duda de las intenciones republicanas hacia los muchachos soñadores y sus familias?

¿Queda duda de porqué la reforma migratoria queda encadenada?

¿Queda duda de lo que tenemos que hacer con nuestro voto, nuestra voz, para defender los derechos y los sueños de nuestros hijos?

Tonight, with this bill, we see what happens when, for more than 390 days, our Republican colleagues refused to allow a vote on the Senate's bipartisan

solution to a broken immigration system. But for the shutdown do-nothing politics in this House, we could have tackled the humanitarian issues we face down on the border a year ago, but we haven't been able to get a vote to do this the right way.

It is time to have that vote to fix the broken immigration system, not blame children and punish them by changing the law to strip them of their rights and of their protections.

We can do better. This bill will not become law, and we will have a chance to do better for those children, for those DREAMers, and, quite honestly, for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will provide a translation of his statement for the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this border crisis is one of the President's making.

We are here on a Friday night in August because the President has not done his job. His failure to enforce the law and failure to secure the border have encouraged tens of thousands of children to make a dangerous journey to the United States. On the way, they are exposed to traffickers, health risks, and other dangers. That is not fair to these children. This is just the latest example of the President's lack of regard for the rule of law and how it has very real consequences.

This legislation before the House addresses the crisis with solutions that prioritize resources to expedite the processing of cases, provide temporary housing and humanitarian assistance, return children to their countries of origin, and deploy the National Guard.

Importantly, it will prevent future humanitarian crises by amending current law to allow children to be promptly returned to their native home.

This legislation is not a blank check for the President. It is a carefully crafted response to the chaos that the President has allowed to develop on the border and in these children's lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Foreign Operations Subcommittees of Appropriations.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member,

Mrs. LOWEY, for yielding and for her tremendous leadership.

Let me just start by saying that, yes, as an appropriator, I am very troubled by the shameful, first of all, inadequate funding levels and the dangerous policy riders in this bill.

Let's be honest: the bill before us in no way is a genuine effort to address the humanitarian crisis on our borders. We should be trying to help these children by making sure that they are safe and receiving due process, rather than militarizing our southern border.

Instead, this bill strips protections for children and accelerates deportations of children back to nations with some of the highest rates of deadly violence on the planet.

According to a report by the United Nation's High Commissioner for Refugees, nearly 60 percent of affected children would qualify for international protections and stated that they were fleeing violence.

This bill is shameful and does not reflect our country's proud legacy as a Nation of immigrants. We should be debating real proposals like comprehensive immigration reform that could really improve the lives of people and the American economy. We could pass it today. Instead, we are here playing politics with the lives of children.

This bill flies in the face of our values and does nothing, once again, to address due process for these children. This was a terrible bill yesterday; it is worse tonight. It will not become law, thank goodness. Hopefully, all of us will vote "no" and come back and begin to look at how we really address the needs of these children. They need our help desperately.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, how did a \$35 million earmark for 2012 and maybe 2016 Republican Presidential candidate Texas Governor Rick Perry get into this bill and why? If Texas Governor Rick Perry chooses to send the Texas National Guard to the Texas border on his own, not as a national decision or response, that is his right, but he should pay for it. It is wrong to tax New Hampshire taxpayers and taxpayers around the country to pay for a \$35 million earmark for a Texas Governor who acted on his own and now should pay for his decision.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The time is late, the cause is great. We must, we must have clarity in how we understand what is before us.

Today, we had an opportunity to work together to address humanitarian emergency at the border. Instead, it is a day of missed opportunity. The Republican leadership has rejected our hand of friendship to compromise on this supplemental. Instead of bringing legislation forward that could solve this problem really and truly, it has resisted the appeals of humanitarian and religious leaders across all faiths.

The Evangelical Immigration Table calls on us to ensure that our response strengthens our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

This legislation that we have before us does not do that. It is wrong. But don't take my word for it. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops urges Members to oppose H.R. 5230 and work together to craft legislation that is more befitting the United States of America and the American people's history of compassion and generosity to vulnerable children and refugees.

The Archbishop of Miami, Thomas Wenski, speaking on their behalf, has said of this legislation, the two pieces of legislation before us:

This is a sad day for our country. A Chamber of Congress is poised to send vulnerable children back to danger and possible death. It violates our commitment to human rights and due process of the law, and lessens us as a Nation.

In their letter, the bishops further state their opposition to H.R. 5232 and say that it "stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program," otherwise known as DACA.

In conclusion, the bishops write:

How our Nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Others, such as the American Bar Association, write:

Due to their age, lack of education, language, and cultural barriers, and the complexity of U.S. immigration law, these vulnerable children face insurmountable obstacles to proving their claims before an immigration judge on their own.

It is the children who are most likely to be eligible for some relief under the law who may be least able to articulate their experiences under this proposed procedure.

They have been through a lot of trauma, and we want to add to that. Yet, this has not been enough to stem the path that the House Republicans are going down. To further poison the pie they offer their caucus the chance to even be less compassionate in their vote to end DACA and to deport the DREAMers.

It is not enough for Republicans to send desperate children back to the violence of their home countries. They must also vote to deport the best young immigrants and brightest in our schools, vote to send victims of domestic violence back to their abusers, vote

to hand witnesses back to drug lords, vote to remove the parents of American children.

These pieces of legislation dishonor America. They are a rejection of our values. But don't take it from me, take it from the bishops, the Evangelical Table, and others. They run counter to the respect for the spark of divinity that we believe exists in every person, the respect for the dignity and worth of every person that we share, but these pieces of legislation ignore.

□ 2000

House Republicans have truly lost their way. I certainly hope that you will consider rereading the parable of the Good Samaritan who helped a stranger. He did not ignore or harm a stranger he saw on the road. Perhaps that may be a path back for you. I pray that it is so.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the record letters from the bishops, the Evangelical Immigration Table, and the ABA who oppose these pieces of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,

Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to reaffirm the opposition of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to H.R. 5230 and express our opposition to H.R. 5232.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special immigrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

Our opposition to H.R. 5232 stems from its elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. It is our view that this program has helped protect a vulnerable group of children who for all extensive purposes are Americans. It would subject them once again to removal to countries they do not know. We urge its defeat.

How our nation responds to this humanitarian challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5232, which we feel fail to live up to that test.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle, WA,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,

Washington, DC, July 30, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

(USCCB) to express the bishops' opposition to H.R. 5230, a measure making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 and making a number of changes to U.S. immigration and human trafficking law. We strongly urge Members to vote AGAINST H.R. 5230 when it is brought before the full House of Representatives and that the House, instead, work with the Senate to craft legislation that is more befitting the United States' and the American people's history of compassion for and generosity to vulnerable children and refugees.

Our opposition to H.R. 5230 stems from four troubling aspects of the measure. First, it would make crippling changes to current U.S. trafficking victim protection law that we fear would send these vulnerable children, and others in the future who have fled trauma, exploitation, and violence, back into harm's way, likely resulting in continued degradation, injury, and death for many of them. Second, it would not provide adequate funding for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to enable it to care for vulnerable unaccompanied children in U.S. custody. Third, its level of funding for ORR is so low that it would severely hamper the agency's ability to fulfill its responsibility to care for refugees, asylum seekers, special immigrants, trafficking victims, and torture victims. And fourth, the measure contains no provisions to address the root causes that have compelled so many children to make the arduous journey from their homes in Central America to the United States and elsewhere in the region.

RETURN OF VULNERABLE CHILDREN TO THEIR HARM OR DEATH

In a recent message, His Holiness Pope Francis called on nations to exercise compassion for and care of the growing number of children fleeing violence in Central America who are seeking shelter and protection in the United States and elsewhere in the region. In his message, the Holy Father said of these children and their plight: "Such a humanitarian emergency demands as its first measure the urgent protection and proper taking in of the children." We believe that H.R. 5230 fails that test.

We fear that the deprivations of basic due process contained in Title I of Division B of H.R. 5230 would result in the United States sending children who have relief available to them in the United States back to the conditions that they fled, and that this would result in many children being harmed and some being killed upon their return.

As we have stated in congressional testimony and in previous letters to Congress, this vulnerable group of children is fleeing violence from organized criminal networks. Many are likely to be eligible for a variety of forms of immigration relief, including asylum, trafficking visas ("T Visas"), visas for victims of crime ("U Visas"), Special Immigrant Juvenile visas ("SIJS Visas"), and withholding of removal. As we have stated, sending these vulnerable children back into the hands of their persecutors and exploiters without a meaningful immigration hearing would severely decrease their opportunity for legal protection and possibly lead to their bodily harm or even death. We oppose the changes to the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 and the Immigration and Nationality Act contained in Title I of Division B of H.R. 5230 and believe that these provisions alone strongly warrant a vote against H.R. 5230.

INADEQUACY OF FUNDING TO CARE FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN

As you know, the Administration requested \$1.8 billion in supplemental fiscal year 2014 funds to adequately and appropriately care for unaccompanied alien children in the United States. We are disappointed that Title V of Division A of H.R. 5230 would provide only \$197 million for this purpose, a fraction of the funds requested by the Administration.

We believe that the Administration's request of \$1.8 billion would have better ensured that these vulnerable children are placed in the least restrictive and most child-friendly setting in an expeditious manner. Among other things, such an amount would have permitted a portion of the funds to be used for post-release services, including home studies and case monitoring for children placed with families. These services would ensure that children are placed in a safe environment and that they are provided information about their immigration proceedings. The amount also would have provided for mental health counseling for children, who are traumatized from their long journey.

In contrast, H.R. 5230 provides \$262 million to Interior and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody operations, which would help fund an expansion of detention for children and families arriving at the border. We oppose this funding. Unaccompanied children and families with children should be placed in a least restrictive setting, not be detained in prison-like settings. We urge that some portion of these funds be used for community-based alternatives to detention for families. REFUGEES, ASYLUM SEEKERS, SPECIAL IMMIGRANTS, AND TORTURE AND TRAFFICKING VICTIMS

As you may know, ORR recently announced its intention to reprogram \$94 million of funding that was appropriated in fiscal year 2014 for refugee services and to use that funding, instead, to care for unaccompanied alien children. We commend the drafters of H.R. 5230 for their decision to partially reimburse ORR for its planned reprogramming refugee services funding. However, we are disappointed that the measure would designate only \$47 million of the supplemental appropriations bill for this purpose, leaving the ORR account short of the funds it will need to carry out vital refugee resettlement activities for refugees and other vulnerable populations under ORR care.

We believe that any supplemental appropriations bill passed by Congress should provide a full reimbursement to ORR for any funds that are reprogrammed so that the agency can fulfill its mandate to resettle these groups, which includes refugees, asylees, Cuban and Haitian Entrants, Special Immigrants from Iraq and Afghanistan (who are now endangered after helping the United States with its mission in those countries), torture victims, and trafficking victims.

Because ORR ordinarily distributes much of its funds in the last quarter of one fiscal year to provide refugee services during the first quarter of the following fiscal year, ORR program money lost to reprogramming in fiscal year 2014 could result in critical loss of services to refugees and other vulnerable populations in fiscal year 2015. The reprogrammed fiscal year 2014 money comes from a number of line items, including Refugee Social Services and Targeted Assistance Grants. These items provide critical programming to help refugees learn English and

find jobs so that they can support themselves and their families. They also fund programs for the elderly, intensive case management for torture survivors and victims of trauma, home child care, and school impact grants to help both the children and their schools. Besides harming refugees and ORR's other vulnerable populations, the inadequate level of funding provided in H.R. 5230 could also contribute to depleted local refugee programs and the loss of local infrastructure that provides critical ORR support for refugees, children, and the above mentioned vulnerable populations, and for the communities that welcome them.

FAILURE TO ADDRESS ROOT CAUSES

We are disappointed that H.R. 5230 contains no funding to address push factors in Central America that are compelling children to leave their homes and make the arduous journey in search of protection in the United States and elsewhere in the region. We believe that funding to address the root causes in the countries of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador is essential if we are to assist those governments in protecting their citizens and in providing hope for young people. We support funding for re-integration programs for these children and urge that funding be adequate to ensure that follow-up services are provided, including employment training and education. Moreover, we believe that funding should be provided to invest in at-risk youth in danger of gang recruitment, including mentoring services, skills training, and social support services. Catholic Relief Services, which is present in these countries, operates programs serving at-risk youth that have helped to prevent children from migrating to the United States. Funding also should be provided for improving youth employment in the region. The United States will need to make a long-lasting commitment to the region in order to make it safe for these children to live and flourish.

If the humanitarian and refugee crisis posed by children fleeing violence in Central America were happening anywhere else in the world, the United States would appropriately implore nations in that region to protect them from harm. We have done so in the case of Syrians, Iraqis, and Afghans fleeing persecution in the Near East; Somalis, Congolese, and Sudanese in Africa; and Burmese, Hmong, and Vietnamese in Southeast Asia. In these and many other cases, we have urged the countries to which refugees and vulnerable migrants have fled to open their hearts and protect these vulnerable souls. We should do no less when the United States is itself faced with this humanitarian challenge.

How our nation responds to this challenge is a moral test of our national character. We ask that you oppose H.R. 5230, which we feel fails to live up to that test. Instead, we urge you to support the appropriation of supplemental fiscal year 2014 funding to address the increased number of unaccompanied children fleeing violence in Central America, without provisions that would undermine current legal and humanitarian protections for them and others.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
*Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.*

EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE,

July 22, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, In a matter of months, more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in the United States.

Millions of Americans have been moved by the plight of these children who are currently awaiting processing, with many asking how they can help.

Children are vulnerable even in the best of circumstances and warrant special protection beyond that offered to adults. This vulnerability is compounded among children who flee situations of criminal gangs, sexual violence, trauma and extreme poverty, without their parents to accompany them.

Evangelicals are guided by Jesus' admonitions to welcome and protect children (Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:37, Luke 18:15-17). As our nation responds to this humanitarian crisis, we are thankful for laws that protect children and provide for their needs. While our systems are currently stretched, our laws uphold basic child protection principles.

Accordingly, we are concerned about potential weakening of protections afforded by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) which was enacted in 2008 and reauthorized in 2013. The TVPRA ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice. It also appropriately assigns responsibility for the care of unaccompanied children to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ensures that children are placed with their families when possible. By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that since the passage and implementation of TVPRA 23 percent more children were assisted. The TVPRA is working according to its design. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, we urge you to provide the necessary resources and policy guidance to address the current crisis, and then hold the Administration accountable for fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. Robust funding is needed for the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in HHS which has extensive experience with vulnerable immigrants, including UACs, refugees, and victims of trafficking. To respond to this crisis, ORR is considering reprogramming funding from other refugee programs. Funds must not simply be transferred from one vulnerable population to another. More funding is needed. There should also be increased funding for immigration courts and judges to more quickly screen the children and counsel for children going through legal proceedings so they know their rights and can understand the process. More robust investment in effectively addressing root causes of migration in Central America and Mexico is also imperative.

As we pray for these children and also our nation, we are reminded of Matthew 19:13-14 in which Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them." Churches and faith-based organizations have long partnered with the federal government in serving immigrant children and families in the United States. Many churches and faith-based organizations are ready and committed to provide the same type of assistance and pastoral care in the case of these unaccompanied children.

We offer our prayers and service as you make important decisions about our nation's response to migrant children. We hope that any response you make will strengthen our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan

Bauman, President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Community Development Association; Russell D. Moore, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; William Robinson, Interim President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision U.S.; Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its nearly 400,000 members nationwide, I write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5230, the Secure the Southwest Border Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2014. Additional resources are surely needed to address the challenges created by the increased number of unaccompanied children entering the country. However, the funding provided in H.R. 5230 is grossly inadequate to meet many critical needs and the bill contains misguided provisions that would significantly diminish the legal protections provided to these children under current law.

H.R. 5230 would subject these children to an expedited screening process and require them to present their case before an immigration judge in just seven days. It further requires immigration judges to issue an order within 72 hours of the conclusion of each proceeding. These requirements place unfair and unrealistic burdens on both the children and the judges. Although the bill provides some additional funding for the immigration courts, it is not sufficient to avoid severely increasing the strains on this already overburdened and chronically under-resourced adjudication system. These provisions elevate speedy procedure over due process—an anathema to our system of justice and they are unnecessary.

In addition, H.R. 5230 provides no additional funding for legal representation. Due to their age, lack of education, language and cultural barriers, and the complexity of U.S. immigration law, these vulnerable children face insurmountable obstacles to proving their claims for protection before an immigration judge on their own. Many of these children also have suffered traumatic experiences before or during their journey to the United States; it is the children who are most likely to be eligible for some relief under the law, such as victims or trafficking or persecution, who may be least able to articulate their experiences under this proposed procedure. This creates the likelihood that those children with a valid claim to asylum or other legal protection are the ones most likely to be returned to their home countries to face serious harm or even death.

There is no question that the rapid increase in unaccompanied children entering our country presents many difficult challenges that require our nation to respond. However, in the rush to address the current crisis, the United States cannot abandon the principles of fairness and due process. H.R. 5230 fails in this regard and we strongly urge you to vote against it.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his dedication and hard work in finding a solution to a problem that none of us created here in this Chamber.

I rise today in strong support of this supplemental appropriations bill for the crisis that is going on at our border. I am very proud of our Conference this week, seeking input and solutions from Members, taking the time to make sure that this legislation deals with the problem, and crafting this legislation to make sure that there are no loopholes and that we deal with the specifics and actually put a bill on the floor that should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has ignored the law and unilaterally established immigration policy without the consent or counsel of Congress. Unfortunately, the humanitarian crisis on our Nation's southern border is the result of a lack of leadership.

To solve this problem, the legislation that we are debating provides critical funding for the National Guard in those States that are seeing an influx. It also authorizes additional judges to hear the increasing caseload that they are seeing grow and grow, more and more everyday. It also makes important reforms to current law to ensure equal and timely due process for all of those unaccompanied minors.

Mr. Speaker, common sense doesn't often prevail here in Washington, but I can tell you that commonsense Hoosiers in my district understand that, first of all, our border needs to be secure, so that our immigration system can then be reformed.

We are a Nation of immigrants. We all have a history in our families of those who have made the effort to come to this great country, and legal immigrants are looking for those opportunities that they have dreamed of.

I thank Chairman ROGERS for his work, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I sat here quietly listening to the argument from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I find it absolutely amazing that they say because the President would not sign this bill and because the Senate would not pass this bill—they are right, the Senate wouldn't pass it. There are hundreds of bills on HARRY REID's desk that he will not bring to the floor for a vote, and certainly the President would not encourage that to be done.

But we are doing our job here in the House. We have put a lot of time and effort in this. We looked at this law and realized what had to be done. I

come from a law-and-order background, and we don't have law and order. We have distrust, we have gangs coming across, we have drugs coming across the southern border, and my colleagues on the other side don't want to do anything about it.

Something that I find quite interesting about the other side, under the leadership of the former Speaker and under the leadership of their former leader, in 2009 and 2010, they had the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they knew this problem existed. They didn't have the strength to go after it back then, but now we are trying to make a political issue out of it now.

What we need to do is pass this legislation, make sure that these children get back to their families, and we need to line up and protect this border from people coming across.

Yes, it is true. I did the research on it. You might want to try it. You might want to try it, Madam Leader. Do the research on it. Do the research. I did it. That is one thing that you don't do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MARINO. It works both ways, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MARINO. With that, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation because, apparently, I hit the right nerve.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, ADAM SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and also to the bill that will follow. We have a humanitarian crisis on our border in this country, and neither this bill and certainly not the next bill on DACA does anything to address it.

These children are fleeing unimaginable violence and fleeing a life that they simply can no longer bear. It is not a problem of border security. These children are turning themselves in. They are simply fleeing the violence in their home countries, and they are not just coming to the United States. Belize, Costa Rica, and other countries have seen an uptick from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras because of the unimaginable violence there.

Instead of dealing with this, we have a bill that is hopelessly inadequate in terms of funding. We will not provide enough judges and enough people to give these children the due process they deserve, and even worse than that, we are stripping them of any rights and any protections by sending them back as quickly as possible without the due process that this House voted for in 2008, was signed by President Bush, that gave these children the due process they deserve.

Then we are going one step further to undermine the ability of children who were brought into this country through no fault of their own, the DREAMers that we have long supported, and we are telling them that now they will not be allowed to stay in this country. This is a humanitarian crisis, not a border security issue.

I urge us to vote down both of these pieces of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it has been discussed throughout this debate this afternoon and this evening that we do face an unprecedented humanitarian emergency with literally thousands of unaccompanied alien children that are crossing our southwest border monthly, a number that has more than doubled since the last year.

It has been said by some that it is due to President Obama's mixed messages and the administration's unwillingness to enforce the law, but regardless of what the reason is, we have a crisis that is growing.

The bill that is before us this evening represents a simple, measured approach to the crisis at the border. It is not comprehensive immigration reform; rather, its focus is on fixing the issues within the context of the law, issues that have fueled the influx of these children.

It also streamlines the process to ensure that those who are not eligible for asylum are quickly and safely repatriated to their families while, at the same time, adding protection to make sure that children who have been trafficked or genuinely in need of asylum get that protection they need.

Like many of my colleagues, I appreciate the leadership's willingness to listen and address these matters in the bill that is before us. I think we have all come together and done a great job to craft this legislation. I believe this version now provides the necessary and appropriate language needed to move forward and to address the crisis that we are seeing.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank all the people that worked so hard to put this language together, and it makes me feel good to see the team that has done so. But I also think there is a misunderstanding as to what happened with how we got to this OTM language, the Wilberforce

language, that is current law that we are seeking to amend here.

There was a bill that was introduced in December of 2007 which was called Wilberforce. It had two provisions. One of them was that if you violated Federal law, you were exempt from the provisions that would have been beneficial to an unaccompanied alien child, and the other one was if you were a threat to national security.

Those provisions were taken out of it. A new bill was introduced on December 9, 2008. The next day was the last day of this session. We all put up our last votes, left the Capitol, and headed for the airport. There was a unanimous consent request that called the bill up.

They asked unanimous consent to discharge it from committee, called the bill up, passed it by voice in the House, sent it over to the Senate, where they took the lateral. They passed it by voice to the President of the United States. No Republican voted for this bill.

This is a bill that is the foundational excuse for the President, and this is what we are trying to fix here tonight.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, as we close this debate, I would like to address my remarks to our distinguished chairman with whom I have worked for quite a while, and just once again, I would like to say this bill deserves a “no” vote.

I look forward to working with you in a bipartisan way to pass a real comprehensive immigration reform bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill. It solves a crisis on our border. It does so in a financially safe and responsible way. It strengthens the border. It humanely treats those who are in our custody now and arranges for them to be humanely returned to their home families, where the Presidents of the three countries told us, We want these children back; and so this bill will do that.

I urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as a nation, Americans have always valued children and families.

If we pass this inadequate, irresponsible bill tonight, we will be breaking from that tradition and turning our backs on America’s enduring commitment to fairness and justice.

Two weeks ago, I visited the border with a bipartisan group of House and Senate colleagues.

There we saw small children as young as seven years old crowded into tiny cells, and forced to sleep on cold concrete floors and benches.

What I saw shocked me as a mother and disappointed me as an American.

I left that day determined to do everything I could to ensure that these children, many of whom fled horrific violence, are treated with care and compassion.

That’s why I’ll be voting “no” on the bill before us.

Joining me and others who oppose this destructive legislation are faith leaders, anti-trafficking groups, and women’s organizations.

This diverse coalition is united in the belief that children escaping violence and persecution deserve to be protected and treated with basic human dignity.

The influx of refugees from Central America has put a strain on our border and immigration agencies. These agencies need greater resources to handle the heart-wrenching situation at our border in a way that is consistent with our American values. When things get tough, and when our resolve is tested, we must not abandon the ideals that make America so special.

Instead, we must live up to our ideals, and back our lofty rhetoric with meaningful action. Passing a clean supplemental spending bill that addresses the causes and consequences of the humanitarian crisis at our border would be meaningful and effective action, because the Senate would pass that bill and the President would sign it.

The tired, scared, helpless kids I saw in that overcrowded Border Patrol station are counting on us. Instead of playing political games and falsely claiming our borders are at risk, we need to act like Americans and stand up for these vulnerable children.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this irresponsible and shameful Republican supplemental.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Amash	Carter	Duffy
Amodei	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Bachmann	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Bachus	Chaffetz	Ellmers
Barletta	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold
Barr	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Coffman	Fleischmann
Benishek	Cole	Fleming
Bentivoglio	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fortenberry
Black	Cook	Foxx
Blackburn	Cotton	Franks (AZ)
Boustany	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Gardner
Bridenstine	Crawshaw	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Cuellar	Gerlach
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gibbs
Buchanan	Daines	Gibson
Buchson	Davis, Rodney	Gingrey (GA)
Burgess	Denham	Gohmert
Byrne	Dent	Goodlatte
Calvert	DeSantis	Gosar

Gowdy	McAllister	Rothfus
Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Royce
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Runyan
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Ryan (WI)
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Salmon
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Sanford
Grimm	McKinley	Scalise
Guthrie	McMorris	Schweikert
Hall	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
Hanna	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Harper	Meehan	Sessions
Harris	Messer	Shimkus
Hartzler	Mica	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)
Hensarling	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Hudson	Neugebauer	Southerland
Huelskamp	Noem	Stewart
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Stivers
Hultgren	Nunes	Stockman
Hunter	Olson	Stutzman
Hurt	Palazzo	Terry
Issa	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins	Pearce	Thornberry
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Tiberi
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Tipton
Jolly	Pittenger	Turner
Jordan	Pitts	Upton
Joyce	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo	Wagner
King (IA)	Posey	Walberg
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Walden
Kingston	Reed	Walorski
Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Kline	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Labrador	Ribble	Wenstrup
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland
Lamborn	Rigell	Whitfield
Lance	Roby	Williams
Lankford	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Latham	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Womack
Long	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Lucas	Rokita	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rooney	Yoho
Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Marchant	Roskam	Young (IN)
Marino	Ross	

NAYS—189

Barber	Delaney	Keating
Barrow (GA)	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Bass	DeBene	Kennedy
Beatty	Deutch	Kildee
Becerra	Dingell	Kilmer
Bera (CA)	Doggett	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (NY)	Duckworth	Kuster
Bonamici	Edwards	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Braley (IA)	Enyart	Larson (CT)
Broun (GA)	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Brown (FL)	Esty	Levin
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lewis
Bustos	Fincher	Lipinski
Butterfield	Foster	Loeb sack
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Capuano	Fudge	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Lowe y
Carney	Gallego	Lujan Grisham
Carson (IN)	Garcia	(NM)
Cartwright	Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez	Lynch
Chu	Hahn	Maffei
Cicilline	Hastings (FL)	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Clay	Himes	Massie
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Matheson
Clyburn	Holt	Matsui
Cohen	Honda	McCarthy (NY)
Connolly	Horsford	McCollum
Conyers	Hoyer	McGovern
Cooper	Huffman	McIntyre
Costa	Israel	McNerney
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Meeks
Crowley	Jeffries	Meng
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Michaud
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Miller, George
DeFazio	Jones	Moore
DeGette	Kaptur	Moran

Murphy (FL)	Rangel	Takano
Nadler	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Negrete McLeod	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Owens	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Pallone	Schiff	Vargas
Pascarell	Schneider	Veasey
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Vela
Payne	Schwartz	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Walz
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Wasserman
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Waters
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Waxman
Pocan	Sinema	Welch
Polis	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Quigley	Smith (WA)	
Rahall	Swalwell (CA)	

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer	Fattah	Nunnelee
Camp	Garamendi	Ruiz
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cantor	Green, Gene	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa	T.
DesJarlais	McDermott	Schock
Ellison	Miller, Gary	Speier

□ 2037

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 478 I was caught in traffic and couldn't reach the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 478 (On Passage of H.R. 5230), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 710, I call up the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-571 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5272

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS; RESTRICTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR ALIENS NOT IN LAWFUL STATUS.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014—

(1) to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien re-

questing consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as authorized by Executive memorandum dated June 15, 2012 and effective on August 15, 2012 (or by any other succeeding Executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program);

(2) to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States; or

(3) to authorize any alien to work in the United States if such alien—

(A) was not lawfully admitted into the United States in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

(B) is not in lawful status in the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5272.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 prohibits Federal funding or resources from being used to adjudicate any application for the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program; and it prohibits the President from issuing employment authorization documents to unlawful immigrants in the United States.

This bill differs from the bill the House was set to consider yesterday in that it prohibits funds from being used for adjudication. The prior version of this bill was a simple prohibition on the President's actions.

□ 2045

According to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Director Leon Rodriguez, the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program has already allowed over 714,000 unlawful immigrants, who claimed to have arrived as minors, to remain in the United States and seek employment. DACA is a major reason for the unprecedented influx of minors and family units along our southern borders.

This deferred action program was announced by the President and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

It is a usurpation of the plenary authority over immigration law that article I, section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution confers on the legislative branch.

And the President knows that it is a usurpation of congressional authority.

In fact, in March of 2011, he stated: “With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore these congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.”

Despite this admission, just over a year later, the President implemented the DACA program. And today it stands as a beacon for any unlawful immigrant to simply cross into the United States illegally because word has gotten out that they will be given permission to stay. I heard this again and again from unlawful immigrants in Border Patrol custody when I visited the Rio Grande Valley earlier this month.

So let's be clear: the President's administrative policies abandoning immigration enforcement and his promises about future administrative legalizations continue to encourage unlawful immigrant parents to smuggle their children into the United States. These policies and promises put money directly into the pockets of human smuggling and drug cartels and put children at risk of perilous, illicit journeys to the United States. And they undermine the fundamental constitutional principles that Congress creates the laws and the President is bound to enforce them.

H.R. 5272 sends the vitally important message that minors tempted to come here in the future will no longer be rewarded by a President who chooses to use his pen and cell phone to legislate. They will have absolutely no opportunity to receive DACA benefits.

I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for introducing the bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I strongly oppose H.R. 5272. This, in all honesty and candor, is one of the most mean-spirited and anti-immigrant pieces of legislation I have seen in all of my years in the Congress.

Now, the main reason, of course, is that it would unfairly harm current and future DREAM Act kids. The majority have been clear about their intent with this bill: No DREAMers.

This legislation is designed to prevent young people who have lived here most of their lives and are members of our communities from benefiting from deferred action. It would foreclose the administration from focusing resources

on identifying and removing individuals such as criminals and gang members from our communities. And even worse, the legislation would mean that the hundreds of thousands of young people who have already benefited from deferred action, who are contributing to our economy, participating in our communities, and obtaining an education could be deported in less than 2 years. And that is why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the AFL-CIO, and the American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, have already registered their strong opposition to the bill.

I am confident that there are many more who would oppose this legislation because it seeks to roll back protections supported by civil rights organizations, religious organizations, college and university presidents, labor unions, and national educational organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for purposes of a colloquy. And I will begin by yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

There is a section within the bill, which we just passed, that provides that the Attorney General—who is currently under contempt of Congress—will appoint the 40 new immigration judges established in the bill. A number of us have a problem with that. And I know that concerns you, Chairman GOODLATTE.

I believe that you, as Judiciary chairman, have agreed to work on a solution to deal with that issue going forward and to attempt to craft a solution that would be acceptable to a majority of the committee. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GOODLATTE. That is correct.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. And I can assure you that I will work with Chairman GOODLATTE in an effort to remedy that problem.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank you both so much for your commitment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. How did we get here? In the dark of night, Republicans are voting to deport DREAMers, take away the DACA program, and make every undocumented immigrant deportable.

In November of 2012, the Republicans were shellshocked, and they spoke of turning over a new leaf with young voters, with Asian voters, with women, and Latinos.

A year ago, I was working with Congressman SAM JOHNSON and Judge CAR-

TER of Texas. I did town hall meetings and public appearances with Judge CARTER and with Congressman VALADAO. I worked with MIKE COFFMAN of Denver and stood up with AARON SCHOCK and ADAM KINZINGER in my own State of Illinois.

But now STEVE KING, MICHELE BACHMANN, and TED CRUZ are literally writing the immigration script for the Republican Party, a script filled with ugly and mean policies that demonize children and marginalize immigrants and destroy families.

In January, you were saying that all of the DREAMers should get green cards and citizenship. We always understood you wanted to deport their parents.

But now, late on a Friday night, you are going after the DREAMers, who have known no other country but this one, who risked their identities and their families to come forward and sign up with the Department of Homeland Security and pass FBI background checks so they could get right with the law.

The United States said, come forward and get right with the law. And now Republicans are saying they should go back in the shadows, back to a life of fear, where opportunities are few, and their futures are uncertain.

The voters had a referendum on the program back in 2012, and the winner was President Obama, the DREAMers, and the American people. But now you want to take all of that away. Thank God the Senate is gone. The President has called this “veto bait,” and this will never become law.

Is there no one in your conference who can stand up and talk sensibly when others in your party want to demonize children at the border and deport the DREAMers who live in our neighborhoods across America? You are so frozen in fear of your own voters, so frozen in fear of your own colleagues, and the Nation needs you to be courageous.

Only cowards scapegoat children. And only those who are ashamed of themselves do it in the night, on a Friday. You are apparently not strong enough to stand up and craft real solution to America’s problems.

But here is the truth revealed about the Republican Party in the last few weeks, and why all of the talk this year about immigration reform was just talk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. In the end, the Republican position on immigration can be summed up as “deport ‘em all.” When push comes to shove, your party is standing by the simplistic desire to deport ‘em all.

Most of you know that the approach of deport ‘em all is nonsense, and you

know it is suicide as a political strategy. But you continue to say, deport ‘em all. Shame on those who will not stand up for the children at the border, and shame on all those who will not stand in the neighborhoods of our communities for the children who live with us.

Say “no” to this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that this bill does not deport anyone. This bill simply freezes a program that violates the United States Constitution.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for his excellent work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, the U.S. House of Representatives has passed, with my support, a strong border security bill. And I rise in support of this second reform bill that would, if enacted, immediately and effectively address the humanitarian and national security crisis that has developed along the southern border of the United States.

This crisis, which will result in an estimated 90,000 unaccompanied children entering the United States illegally through the end of this fiscal year, representing a 1,381 percent increase since 2009, was entirely caused by the Obama administration’s failure to secure the border, its unwillingness to enforce existing laws, and its disastrous 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which invited this surge in illegal immigration.

The action taken by the House tonight is a serious, bold, and thoughtful legislative response to President Obama’s failure to secure the border and ensure that the laws are faithfully executed.

But there is a second and very important reason besides a policy reason why every Member of this House should support this legislation, and that is to vindicate the separation of powers.

There was a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1983 that dealt with an immigration issue, *INS v. Chadha*. And in that case, the Supreme Court talked about the procedure that the Constitution outlines to change the law, how legislation is enacted in accordance with constitutional command. And the court held that there was a single, finely wrought, and exhaustively considered procedure for enacting legislation. And unilateral executive memoranda from the White House is not the way to change the law.

So if you are interested in vindicating the separation of powers, if you believe that the way to change the law—even if you believe in the DREAM Act, even if you believe in the President’s policy of deferred action—the way that we do that is through constitutional procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BARR. So there is not just a policy issue at stake here, not just a humanitarian and national security issue at stake—the Constitution is at stake.

So I appreciate the House leadership for heeding the call that I and many of my colleagues made to stay in session and finish the work of the American people before the start of the August district work period.

I strongly urge the Senate and President Obama to do their jobs, stop trying to score political points, listen to the American people, pass this bill, and join the House in solving this very important problem.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. How much time remains on either side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 25½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the brand-new majority whip of the United States Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for bringing this bill to the floor and for his leadership on Mrs. BLACKBURN's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back and look at DACA in 2012, when it was issued as an executive order, it was an example of President Obama's executive overreach.

Some want to make this a partisan issue, yet, Mr. Speaker, more than a dozen times, the United States Supreme Court has issued 9-0 rulings that President Obama has overreached his executive authority. That is not a 5-4 decision. That is 9-0. Ruth Bader Ginsburg recognized more than a dozen times this President has overreached his executive authority.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, why is this DACA ruling so dangerous? This has been the magnet that has led to the flood of people coming across our border. This crisis at the border is partially responsible to the DACA ruling. We have got to stop having this kind of message go out that has led not only to a flood of people coming across our border, but has led to and can be responsible for the human trafficking that is going on. There are so many devastating things that this has done. We have got to stop this overreach.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a distinguished member of the judiciary committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I hope the Speaker says that word from Texas

very loud because I listened earlier today to all of the relief in the appropriations bill given to Texans down at the border, \$594 million.

Let me tell you that there are people in Texas who are ready to serve and help the unaccompanied children. There are people in Texas who recognize that we are the good Samaritans. Don't label us with wanting \$594 million, and don't label us with standing against the DACA children, the DREAMers, who have come to this country and been here for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, these children ran into the arms of the Border Patrol. There is no criminal or legal crisis at the border, but the DACA bill that is here on the floor of the House is a disgrace to the words of the Star-Spangled Banner. We are the home of the free and the brave. We are free enough to be able to welcome those in need.

This body knows that DACA has nothing to do with the unaccompanied children, and it is a disgrace that we would undermine the hardworking students like Juan Jesus in my office this summer, that we would undermine it with a disgraceful bill—a disgraceful bill. It is disgraceful. Pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, a bill brought to the floor at the eleventh hour by the House Republican leadership to placate its extreme right-wing Tea Party faction and one of the most hypocritical, irresponsible, and mean-spirited legislative proposals brought to the House floor this year.

H.R. 5272 seeks to prohibit the Administration from exercising its administrative discretion to focus resources on identifying and apprehending those aliens who are present in country illegally who pose the most serious danger to our national security and the safety of our citizens.

This cynical bill is hypocritical because the vast majority of its proponents have been claiming for years now that the reason they refuse to compromise on budget issues, support for sequestration, and voted to shut down the government is because of their belief in the importance of setting spending priorities.

Yet, H.R. 5272 would deny ICE the ability to use its limited resources in the most efficient manner to achieve its highest priorities which is to apprehend, detain, and remove aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety.

This bill is irresponsible because it seeks to prevent trained, experienced, and professional agents and prosecutors from exercising their discretion and acting on the basis of what everyone knows to be true: that there is a vast difference between a terrorist bent on harming America and a DREAM Act kid studying hard in school so he or she can graduate, join the Armed Services and willingly risk his or her life to defend the country, or go to work to support his or her family.

This inefficient use of resources wastes taxpayer dollars and does nothing to keep America safe.

This bill is mean-spirited because it would have ICE target its limited resources on inno-

cent, law abiding, young people who were brought to this country as children and would have them deported to a foreign land even though America is the country they may know as home and the only one to which they may have ever pledged allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled many times to Iraq and Afghanistan and always the highlight of my visit was meeting the young men and women who were willingly risking their lives to defend the country they love more than life.

More than 5,000 of the soldiers who fought for us in Afghanistan and Iraq were not yet American citizens but DREAMers who dreamed that one day they might become citizens of the nation they gladly risked their lives to defend.

Instead of honoring their service, this heartless bill before us crushes their dream by forcing ICE agents and prosecutors to pretend that there is no difference between one of these veterans who came to this country as an undocumented immigrant and an alien engaged in or suspected of espionage or terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 also wastes the money of hard-working taxpayers and does nothing to make America safer, and eliminates a fair and just policy legal under the President's executive authority which allows for relief for young children who have been in America for a certain number of years, follow certain requirements and may be deferred from deportation to serve in the U.S. military, go to school and contribute to America.

And, just as bad, it is inconsistent with American values of justice and fair play.

We must address our broken immigration system through comprehensive reform rather than extinguish Ms. Liberty's lamp of freedom or close her Golden Door.

We are better than that and I urge all Members to join me in rejecting this terrible legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, for yielding. There are a lot of people in this Congress that I appreciate a great deal tonight, but I have listened to the anger and the fury over on the other side, and I have never seen the Sergeant at Arms have to come and clear the floor like we have seen here tonight.

I am wondering what is this about? I would take this back to the State of the Union Address when I watched the President of the United States here on the rostrum speak, and he said, essentially, the summary of what he has delivered to America a number of times: Congress, I am going to tell you what to do, and if you don't do it, I am going to use either my cell phone or my ink pen, and I am going to do it. Here it goes again, Mr. Speaker.

What I saw was this, our Founding Fathers set up this balance in our Constitution between the three branches of government, articles I, II, and III, the

legislative, the executive, and the judicial branch of government.

They drew as fine a line as they could between the three, but they always knew that there would be a gray area, and they anticipated that each branch of government would jealously protect the constitutional authority that is vested within it within the Constitution, the supreme law of the land.

When the President said, I am going to usurp your legislative authority, I am going to take over article I, and I am going to legislate if you don't do what I tell you, what happened? The people that are applauding now applauded then, and they said, Mr. President, take the power that is in the Constitution, take it from me, take article I, too, take your pen, take your cell phone. You run this country as if you were a king, rather than only the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is about here. This is about the DACA language that the President has introduced 2-plus years ago, and I said then when we had Hill hearings before the Judiciary Committee and Janet Napolitano—I said that we will take you to court on this, this will be litigated.

It will be litigated because the President does not have legislative authority. He is only the President of the United States. If the President wants to somehow grant amnesty to one person, he has some prosecutorial discretion to do that, but they argued in the Morton Memos, and they argued in the DACA memos—seven times in the Morton Memos—on an individual basis only, on an individual basis only, prosecutorial discretion on an individual basis only.

They put it in there seven times because they knew they were wrong, and they knew it was going to be litigated. You don't do 700,000 people on an individual basis only. You don't suspend the law. If the President wants the law changed, he knows to come to Congress, ask us—and ask us, and when you take an oath to uphold the Constitution, you had better believe that it means what it says.

Why would you just throw your authority over the side and say, Mr. President, take this from us? That is not what you pledged to your constituents. That is not the oath that you take.

So what this says is that the DACA language says this: Mr. President, stop violating the Constitution from this point forward. As the chairman said, it does not deport anybody. It just restores constitutional article I authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, this just restores the constitutional authority of the United States Congress, and it says: President Obama, don't continue to violate this Constitution. President Obama, when you waved your ink pen at us a week and a half ago and you said you were going to legalize 5 to 6 million people, it is unconstitutional.

He knows it. He has many times given the lecture that he knows it. He gave his word, and he needs to keep it. I want to remind him, it won't go cheap if you try this, Mr. President. I urge the adoption of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the House are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Congressman CONYERS.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 5272, an extreme and highly partisan bill that would prevent the continuation or expansion of President Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, known as DACA.

Simply put, this misguided bill limits President Obama's prosecutorial discretion and seeks to dismantle the DACA program. I am very concerned that the majority has brought this anti-Hispanic amended bill to the floor in order to prevent President Obama from building upon the successes of the DACA program and to appease the most extreme wing of the Republican Conference.

The underlying bill punishes hard-working DREAMers and immigrants who are eager to contribute to America's prosperity and have waited long enough for comprehensive immigration reform.

Since its inception in 2012, the DACA program has protected DREAMers who meet certain requirements from deportation, allowing hundreds of thousands of young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children to remain and work in the United States.

In my view, closing the door on undocumented youth is un-American. We in the Congress of the United States have a moral responsibility to protect the welfare and rights of vulnerable children and youth, including children and youth who are undocumented or are fleeing from violence and despair in their countries of origin.

Mr. Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, extreme and highly partisan legislation that does nothing to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and I listen to the other side talk about this issue, I wonder if they even understand what is happening at the border.

In 2011, there were only 6,500 children coming to the border. In 2012, the President acted through DACA, and we started seeing an increase of these children coming to the border. Today, in 2014, we will have 90,000 children rushing to the border, and next year, it is estimated that we will have 142,000 children coming to the border.

Almost 2 months ago, Gilberto Ramos, a 15-year-old boy from Guatemala, was found lying in brush, dead from the heat. Many of these children that are coming to the border don't make it across the river. There are reports of discoveries of small, lifeless bodies washed up along the riverbanks. Many of these children are abused, they are victimized, and they are raped.

We must understand that the President is responsible because of his failure to fully comply with the law. We have heard a lot from the other side that the President acted because we did not act. Well, that is not true.

The reality is that the President and his party had majorities in both Houses of Congress for 2 years, and you failed to act, so don't point your finger at us. In November of 2012—in November of 2012—we passed in this House a STEM Jobs Act, which was the beginning of a step-by-step approach to actually deal with the immigration process. What did you do? You didn't vote for it, and the Senate refused to take it up.

In September of 2011, we passed here in the House the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, and the Senate again refused to act, which would have been the beginning of a step-by-step approach for us to deal with the immigration process. You have refused to do small things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LABRADOR. Stop the hypocrisy. If you truly care about these kids, stop encouraging them to come to the United States illegally. They are crossing the border. Most of them are being harmed, many of them are being abused, and a few of them are dying.

It is time for us to stop this nonsense and to have the President of the United States actually follow the law and work with the Congress, so we can actually do immigration reform.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and Mrs. BLACKBURN who is responsible for this wonderful bill this evening, which I wholeheartedly support. This is why: last

weekend, I think the Nation was stunned when our President said that he would unilaterally use his power—raw power—to effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals here in the United States illegally.

He said that he would do that with his power, and what happened this week is that this body came together and we decided to answer the President's unconstitutional call.

So with this DACA bill, effectively, we will put forward the strongest possible legislative response that this body could put forward. We say in this bill that the President has no power, no authority administratively to grant permits which would effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we will put a handcuff on one of the President's hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Now, in the United States Senate, the majority leader, HARRY REID, has left town. He has left town. Not only did he fail to complete an immigration bill, but he knows full well that President Obama may illegally grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States without doing anything.

What HARRY REID has the opportunity to do is to come back and join us. We will be here any time, any day, anywhere, anyhow. We will join him here in August, September, whenever, and he needs to put the other handcuff on this lawless President's hands, so we constrain this President from granting amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the American people want us to do. We do that tonight with this bill. We invite HARRY REID to bring the Senate back and put the handcuff on the President's other hand, so that we can have sovereignty again on our southern border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 2115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is: Is it not a fact that we are here because the Republicans opposed this legislation in the Senate and there were not sufficient votes to move the bill and that is why we are here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who comes from the State of Texas, and like many in this House, I have been down on the Texas-Mexico border. I was there last weekend. You have to be there to know what is going on. I went up and down the Rio Grande River with law enforcement officers from the State of Texas. We see the people on the Mexican side—and I think the Mexican Government is complicit—just waiting for us to pass, and then they start coming across.

And the other side talks about it just being one group of people—children. Well, that is just not true, because the people who are being apprehended are not just children. A lot of them are teenagers. A lot of them are older. The chief of Border Patrol of the McAllen sector said there are 144 nations that came across the border this year represented. Just a week ago before I got there, there were three Ukrainians.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is everybody coming to America through south Texas? Because they believe wherever they start out, whether it is kids in Honduras looking for a better life, or terrorists, or Ukrainians, or someone else, they believe that this President, this administration, said: You get to America, we are going to let you stay.

We have all kinds of different legal reasons. Some of it is called DACA, and there are other reasons. But the bottom line is you are going to get to stay in America, and Americans will take care of your needs. That is what they believe. And the reason they believe that is because the rule of law is not being enforced in America.

Third World countries protect their borders better than the United States.

And who is benefiting from all of this? Well, it is not the kids. As pointed out, many of them are dying or getting hurt. It is not America. It is not legal immigrants. Who is benefiting? It is the drug cartels, the criminal gangs, the MS-13 gang. They are making money off the fact that the rule of law in this country is not being enforced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. The rule of law is not enforced when it comes to the sovereignty and security of the Nation. And that is all we are asking. Let's have some rules and follow them so people all over the world who want to come to America, let them know there is a right way to come. And the wrong way is they shouldn't believe that you get here, you are going to get to stay because the administration is not going to enforce the law. That is why we have the chaos. That is why we have

the 50,000 to 60,000 people crossing in south Texas.

So all we are trying to do with this little piece of legislation is get back to let's enforce the rule of law. Let's not grant amnesty and let's not treat people from different countries differently. Let's treat them all the same way. That is why I support this legislation, because it will send the message that even in America the rule of law will be enforced.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I know you said that is just the way it is, and I agree, but I just want to make an added point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. So 50,000 coming across the border, that is 50,000 unaccompanied minors coming to the border, and they are a small percentage of the total number of people. Eighty-five percent of the people coming to the border right now—and all categories are up. Children are up most, but all categories are up, and 85 percent are not unaccompanied minors.

So the gentleman makes a very valid point about the crisis at our border and the cause of that crisis. The President caused it. The President can solve it. The President should act now, and we need to send a strong message that America is not open to people who violate our laws.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry as to the bill that is on the floor, is this not the bill dealing with deferred action for juveniles or young people who have been in this country for 5 years, graduated from high school, going to college or working, and in actuality is not dealing with the unaccompanied children? But more importantly, is it not true that this bill is destined for a veto, will not be passed in the Senate, and in essence, we are here passing a bill that has no future?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we are ready to close on this side.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I also only have one speaker remaining and am prepared to close.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, to close.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some Members have asked whether this bill terminates deferred action for DREAMers with DACA. This question was put to Chairman GOODLATTE at the Rules Committee today, and he answered, as I saw on TV, that the text speaks for itself. He is right. The text does speak for itself. And on lines 5 through 7 on page 1, the text clearly terminates DACA by prohibiting DREAMers from applying to renew their deferred action, which they must do after a 2-year time period.

It also prevents future deferred action to ensure that we continue to deport the parents of the DREAMers and parents of U.S. citizen children, sending those children, by the way, into foster care, or prevent DREAMers who have not yet filed for deferred action from doing so.

So basically, this bill will have the effect of removing DACA from the DREAMers and making them deportable.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion about the role that DACA has had, and I will put into the RECORD a report from the Cato Institute, titled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children." If you do statistic analysis, you can see that it is impossible that DACA has been the cause of these children coming from the three war-torn countries, as the report reports.

[From the Cato Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN
UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN
(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, "The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies." Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It

is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S.

government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

Ms. LOFGREN. Now, we know that this bill would eliminate DACA for DREAMers and make them deportable, but few in this body may know that the bill also returns to our bitter 2-year fight about reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. It took this House 2 years to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act at the beginning of this Congress, and when we did it, we did it over the strong opposition of the majority of House Republicans.

Today's bill undermines the basic premise of that act, that victims of domestic violence should be empowered to leave their abusers. It does that by denying the ability of battered immigrant spouses who have left their abusers and successfully self-petitioned for a VAWA visa the ability to work for the months it may take for a visa number to become available. This one change will prevent countless battered immigrant spouses from ever leaving their abusers and will drive others right back into the hands of their abusers.

Now, we have heard a lot of discussion about the law, but I think it is important to recall that the ability to make prosecutorial decisions is well-grounded in the law. In fact, in 1999, I recall well the letter sent by then-Chairman Henry Hyde, signed by 28 bipartisan Members of Congress, to the Clinton administration asking for the use of prosecutorial discretion. And most recently, the Supreme Court in the Arizona case recognized the broad authority of the administration to make decisions about whom to prosecute. The Arizona case reaffirmed the legality of the deferred action program.

So all this discussion to the contrary is really nothing more than legal nonsense.

What does this bill do?

It deports the DREAMers. It reinvigorates the Republican war on women by forcing women with VAWA visas back to their abusers. This is bad policy. It is an outrageous bill. It is being done in the worst possible process, and I wish so much that the Republicans had reached out, taken the offer of our leaders to sit down and work together to come up with a solution that really works for our country instead of deporting the DREAMers who are so much the hope and future of our great American Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that DACA is more than just abuse of prosecutorial discretion. It also creates

benefits that are not provided for under the law.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise in support of my amendment to prevent the extension of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that was indeed unlawfully put in place by an executive memo on August 15, 2012. What this amendment does is to return us to the original language of H.R. 5160. Plus, it strengthens that original language by looking beyond July 30. What it will do is to tie the President's hands as to future executive actions that he might take to expand amnesty for illegal entrants into this country. It would freeze DACA.

Now, I want to read the bill because it is not a lengthy bill. Beginning on line 1, section 1, Limitation on deferred action for childhood arrivals; restrictions on employment authorization for aliens not in lawful status.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014:

One, to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as authorized by the executive memo dated June 15, 2012, and effective on August 15, 2012, or by any other succeeding executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program.

Number two, to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States.

Number three, to authorize any alien to work in the U.S. if such alien, A, was not lawfully admitted into the U.S. in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and, B, is not in lawful status in the U.S. on the date of the enactment of this act.

That is it. That is it. That is what is in this piece of legislation.

What it does, in effect, is to give Central American children a false hope. It says that they are going to be able to obtain amnesty, as those before them have done in this program. And the reason we are so concerned about this and the reason my colleagues have come and have talked about their concern, what is happening is you have the traffickers, you have the smugglers, you have the coyotes who are preying on these innocent people. And they believe if these children can make it here, they will get amnesty. It is a false hope. Certainly we know and we care about these families. We know these countries want to get their children back and reunite them with their families in their home countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing is that the administration would like to expand DACA. Indeed, we have

heard that the President has instructed Secretary Johnson and General Holder to come up with a list of executive actions to address immigration.

□ 2130

The increase and the statistics that Mr. LABRADOR gave us on the percentages of increase cannot be denied.

We see what is happening on this border. Mr. POE talked about what he has seen happening with those families. And true to form, just as Governor Perry warned us in 2012 that this was going to happen, indeed, it is. We are seeing this unprecedented increase going back to 2009, looking at where we are with today, with the children, with the teens, with the adults that are streaming across this border and are disrupting life along the southern border for American families.

I want to make one other point. Chairman GOODLATTE mentioned this earlier. We have talked a little bit about the Constitution tonight, and, indeed, we all know that when you look at the Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 4, that is where those enumerated powers are given to Congress. They are given to Congress "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272. In this legislation, Republicans are turning their backs on children, toddlers, and infants who are trying to escape violence and abuse. The reality is that there is a humanitarian crisis on our doorstep.

Militarizing these borders and expelling children are not long-term solutions. If you read in the news about a country taking these actions, you would assume it was a third-world dictatorship—not the U.S. Instead, we should be rising to the occasion—not cowering from it.

Republicans say that they are just closing a loophole. But, they are really slamming the door shut. Subjecting 5-year-olds to sham legal hearings without counsel is un-American. What's next for the Republicans, sending these kids to Guantanamo Bay?

The reality is that this is a cowardly approach. Time and time again Republicans say "Deport them!" But we know that this does not work—and we do know this is not right.

We like to call ourselves "the land of brave." But the real "brave ones" are those children who travel thousands of miles to reach a better place. We must reject this unjust and dehumanizing Republican bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this mean-spirited bill that will slam the door in the faces of young DREAM Act students who know America as their only home, their only country.

Rarely have I seen fear and hatred turned into an actual piece of legislation and debated on the floor of the People's House.

This GOP bill proposes to deport DREAM Act students like Jose Godinez-Samperio from Tampa, Florida, who was only 9 when his parents brought him to the United States.

He has done everything right. Jose graduated as Valedictorian from Armwood High School in Hillsborough County.

Jose graduated from the State of Florida's Honors College, New College, and then graduated from law school with honors from Florida State University College of Law.

He passed the bar exam, and this year the Republican-dominated Florida Legislature said Jose should receive his license to practice law. They passed a law to do so. In fact, Republicans and Democrats gave him a standing ovation.

There are hundreds of thousands of students like Jose across America tonight who have been living in limbo, waiting for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. They were given a lifeline by the President through the DREAM Act and America has invested in them.

Now, the Republican Congress is moving us farther away from immigration reform, farther away from justice, farther away from smart policy to utilize the talents of young men and women who love America, and farther away from the values America holds dear.

Vote "no" on this malicious piece of legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just an assault on Dreamers who grew up in our communities and except on paper, are Americans in every way.

It's not just an attack on their parents who raised them and taught them their values and love of this great country.

What it is, is an affront to everyone who believes in the American Dream and our American values. It is an affront to those who uphold and subscribe to the basic notion that America is a fair, compassionate, and welcoming nation.

It is unconscionable that this bill will condemn Dreamers and their parents to second-class status.

It is unconscionable that this bill will cruelly foreclose any possibility that Dreamers and their parents could adjust their status, regardless of how hard they work or how much they contribute to their communities and our country.

If deported, their loss will be America's loss as we will lose the benefits of their talents and their ability to strengthen our economy and enrich our nation.

If we end DACA, our country could lose young people like Paola, a medical student from Los Angeles, to cure the sick. We would lose Andree, a brilliant young woman who is also from LA, who is studying at Harvard and dreams of one day curing cancer.

President Clinton once observed that "we cannot build our own future without helping others to build theirs."

That sentiment—the basic awareness that we're all in this together—is at the center of the American Dream, a Dream which is threatened by the bill before us.

Let's stand up for Dreamers, for their families and for our nation's future by defeating this mean-spirited and destructive legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 76.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 192, answered “present” 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Amash	Garrett	McCaul
Bachmann	Gerlach	McClintock
Bachus	Gibson	McHenry
Barletta	Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre
Barr	Gohmert	McKeon
Barrow (GA)	Goodlatte	McKinley
Barton	Gosar	McMorris
Benishek	Gowdy	Rodgers
Bentivolio	Granger	Meadows
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Messer
Black	Griffin (AR)	Mica
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)
Boustany	Grimm	Miller (MI)
Brady (TX)	Guthrie	Mullin
Bridenstine	Hall	Mulvaney
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Harper	Neugebauer
Broun (GA)	Harris	Noem
Buchanan	Hartzler	Nugent
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Burgess	Hensarling	Palazzo
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Calvert	Holding	Pearce
Capito	Hudson	Perry
Carter	Huelskamp	Peterson
Cassidy	Huizenga (MI)	Petri
Chabot	Hultgren	Pittenger
Chaffetz	Hunter	Pitts
Clawson (FL)	Hurt	Poe (TX)
Coble	Issa	Pompeo
Cole	Jenkins	Posey
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Conaway	Jolly	Reed
Cook	Jones	Renacci
Cotton	Jordan	Ribble
Cramer	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Roby
Culberson	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Daines	Kingston	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Duffy	Lamborn	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rooney
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Roskam
Ellmers	Latham	Ross
Farenthold	Latta	Rothfus
Fincher	LoBiondo	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Long	Runyan
Fleischmann	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Flores	Lummis	Sanford
Forbes	Marchant	Scalise
Fortenberry	Marino	Schweikert
Foxx	Massie	Scott, Austin
Franks (AZ)	McAllister	Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman

Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

□ 2155

Mr. PETERS of California changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 479 (On Passage of H.R. 5272), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

NOES—192

Amodei
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Engel
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia

Gardner
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nader
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 8, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—395

Aderholt	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Chaffetz	Edwards
Bachmann	Chu	Ellmers
Bachus	Cicilline	Engel
Barber	Clark (MA)	Enyart
Barletta	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Esty
Barrow (GA)	Clay	Farenthold
Barton	Cleaver	Farr
Bass	Clyburn	Fincher
Beatty	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Becerra	Coffman	Fleischmann
Benishek	Cohen	Fleming
Bentivolio	Cole	Flores
Bera (CA)	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Poster
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Foxx
Bishop (UT)	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Black	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bonamici	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Boustany	Costa	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Cotton	Gabbard
Brady (TX)	Courtney	Gallego
Braley (IA)	Cramer	Garcia
Bridenstine	Crawford	Gardner
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Crowley	Gerlach
Broun (GA)	Cuellar	Gibson
Brown (FL)	Culberson	Gohmert
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Goodlatte
Buchanan	Daines	Gosar
Bucshon	Davis, Danny	Gowdy
Burgess	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Bustos	DeFazio	Graves (GA)
Butterfield	DeGette	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Delaney	Green, Al
Calvert	DeLauro	Griffin (AR)
Capito	DelBene	Griffith (VA)
Capps	Denham	Grijalva
Capuano	Dent	Grimm
Cárdenas	DeSantis	Guthrie
Carney	Deutch	Gutiérrez
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hahn
Carter	Dingell	Hall
Cartwright	Doyle	Hanna
Cassidy	Duckworth	Harper
Castor (FL)	Duffy	Harris
Castro (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Davis (CA)
DesJarlais
Fattah
Garamendi

Gibbs
Grayson
Green, Gene
Hanabusa
Kennedy
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Nunes

Nunnelee
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schock
Speier
Whitfield

Hastings (FL) McClintock
Hastings (WA) McCollum
Heck (NV) McGovern
Heck (WA) McHenry
Hensarling McIntyre
Herrera Beutler McKeon
Higgins McKinley
Himes McMorris
Hinojosa Rodgers
Holding McNeerney
Holt Meadows
Honda Meehan
Horsford Meeks
Hoyer Meng
Hudson Messer
Huelskamp Mica
Huffman Michaud
Huizenga (MI) Miller (FL)
Hultgren Miller (MI)
Hunter Miller, George
Hurt Moore
Israel Mullin
Issa Mulvaney
Jackson Lee Murphy (FL)
Jeffries Nadler
Jenkins Napolitano
Johnson (GA) Neal
Johnson (OH) Negrete McLeod
Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer
Johnson, Sam Noem
Jolly Nolan
Jordan Nugent
Joyce Olson
Kaptur Owens
Keating Palazzo
Kelly (IL) Pallone
Kelly (PA) Pascrell
Kildee Pastor (AZ)
Kilmer Paulsen
Kind Payne
King (IA) Pearce
King (NY) Pelosi
Kingston Perlmutter
Kinzinger (IL) Perry
Kirkpatrick Peters (CA)
Kline Peters (MI)
Kuster Peterson
Labrador Petri
LaMalfa Pingree (ME)
Lamborn Pittenger
Lance Pitts
Langevin Pocan
Lankford Poe (TX)
Larsen (WA) Polis
Larson (CT) Pompeo
Latham Posey
Latta Price (GA)
Lee (CA) Price (NC)
Levin Quigley
Lewis Rahall
Lipinski Rangel
LoBiondo Reed
Loeb sack Reichert
Long Renacci
Lowenthal Ribble
Lowey Rice (SC)
Lucas Richmond
Luetkemeyer Rigell
Lujan Grisham Roby
(NM) Roe (TN)
Luján, Ben Ray Rogers (AL)
(NM) Rogers (KY)
Lummis Rogers (MI)
Lynch Rohrabacher
Maffei Rokita
Maloney, Carolyn Rooney
Maloney, Sean Roskam
Marino Ross
Matheson Rothfus
Matsui Roybal-Allard
McAllister Royce
McCarthy (CA) Runyan
McCarthy (NY) Ruppersberger
McCauley Ryan (OH)

NAYS—8

Amash Lofgren O'Rourke
Ellison Massie Sanford
Jones Moran

NOT VOTING—29

Blackburn Campbell DesJarlais
Blumenauer Cantor Doggett
Camp Davis (CA) Fattah

Ryan (WI) Garamendi Marchant Rush
Salmon Gibbs McDermott Sánchez, Linda
Sanchez, Loretta Gingrey (GA) Miller, Gary T.
Sarbanes Grayson Murphy (PA) Schock
Scalise Green, Gene Nunes Speier
Schakowsky Hanabusa Nunnelee Tiberi
Schiff Kennedy Ruiz Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2203

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 480, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE ON THE CURRENT SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 683) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 683

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a political and religious insurrection stemming from an Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in the Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas ISIL is a transnational Sunni insurgency whose ideological and organizational roots lie in both al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syria-based Jabhat al Nursa and has a stated mission of establishing an Islamic state and a caliphate across the Levant through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unresponsive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yazidis, Sabea-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000 with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syrians, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating—

(1) "no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy";

(2) "no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution"; and

(3) "[This Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandeans Sabaeans";

Whereas over 500,000 people have been displaced by the current situation in Iraq and reports have surfaced of targeted harassment, persecution, and killings of Iraqi religious minorities by ISIL with little to no protection from the Iraqi Government and other security forces;

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that for the first time in 1,600 years there was no Mass in the city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, 1,100,000 people of diverse religious backgrounds remain internally displaced and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has not upheld its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States has provided over \$73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, "Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace". Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its commitments to promoting and protecting religious freedom around the world and providing relief to minority groups facing persecution;

(2) calls on the United States Department of State to work with the Kurdistan Regional Government, the Iraqi central government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other key stakeholders to help secure safe havens for those claiming amnesty in Iraq; and

(3) respectfully requests the addition of a Special Representative for Religious Minorities to be included in Prime Minister al-Maliki's newly reconstructed government.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) deplores and condemns the religious bigotry, vandalism and destruction of property, and violent attacks on and intimidation of innocent Iraqi civilians by armed extremists;

(2) calls on the United States Department of State to work with the Kurdistan Regional Government, the Iraqi central government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other key stakeholders to help secure safe havens for those claiming amnesty in Iraq;

(3) calls on the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to work with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on a sustained basis to document human rights abuses against Iraqi civilians and develop an immediate plan to facilitate safe humanitarian access to potable water, health care, fuel, electricity, and basic security for the most vulnerable civilian populations;

(4) calls upon the Government of Iraq to take immediate steps to protect the safety and constitutional rights of all Iraqi citizens;

(5) respectfully requests the addition of a Special Representative for Religious Minorities to be included in the newly reconstructed government of Iraq; and

(6) reaffirms its commitments to promoting and protecting religious freedom around the world and providing relief to minority groups facing persecution.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY
MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a political and religious insurrection stemming from an Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in the Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas ISIL is a transnational Sunni insurgency whose ideological and organizational roots lie in both al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syria-based Jabhat al Nursa and has a stated mission of establishing an Islamic state and a caliphate across the Levant through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yazidis, Sabeen-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000 with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating—

(1) “no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy”;

(2) “no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution”; and

(3) “[This Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandeans Sabeans”;

Whereas over 500,000 people have been displaced by the current situation in Iraq and reports have surfaced of targeted harassment, persecution, and killings of Iraqi religious minorities by ISIL with little to no protection from the Iraqi Government and other security forces;

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that for the first time in 1,600 years there was no Mass in the city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, 1,100,000 people of diverse religious backgrounds remain internally displaced and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has not upheld its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports as of January 2014 a total population of concern in Iraq numbering 1,522,855 people, including refugees and internally displaced persons, many of whom face grave deprivation and imminent threats to life, health, and safety;

Whereas the United States has provided over \$73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, “Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace”: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELCOMING AFRICAN LEADERS TO FIRST UNITED STATES-AFRICA LEADERS' SUMMIT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 699) welcoming African leaders to the first United States-Africa Leaders' Summit and African trade ministers to the 13th Forum of the African

Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 699

Whereas the United States Congress enacted the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000, with broad bipartisan support and with a view to expanding growth and opportunity in Africa;

Whereas in the original AGOA legislation, Congress encouraged the establishment of more regular high-level dialogues, including regular meetings by the President with his African counterparts;

Whereas the people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity, and are both committed to strengthening economic relations;

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to support the reduction of poverty in the continent of Africa;

Whereas greater opportunities for mutually beneficial trade and investments promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability;

Whereas good governance, including respecting constitutional term limits, human rights, and ensuring that civil society organizations are able to function freely contribute to enduring economic and social development in Africa;

Whereas the countries in Africa are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas Africa has today 6 of the 10 fastest growing economies in the world, over 1,000,000,000 people, 60 percent of the world's uncultivated agricultural land, and expanding democracies;

Whereas Africa is rich through the youth of its population, enjoying a demographic advantage over all other regions of the world, and is likely to replace China as the biggest contributor to the global workforce by 2050;

Whereas it is in the economic interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging African markets, boost United States-Africa trade and investment, support greater capacity building for Africa, and invest in Africa's youth and leadership development;

Whereas exports from sub-Saharan Africa to the United States under AGOA have increased over three-fold from \$7,600,000,000 in 2001 to \$24,800,000,000 in 2013;

Whereas United States exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased from \$6,900,000,000 to \$23,900,000,000 and United States investment in sub-Saharan Africa has increased six-fold;

Whereas per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled to \$1,624 annually since Congress first passed AGOA, yet nearly half the population in sub-Saharan Africa lives in poverty;

Whereas timely renewal of AGOA, which expires September 30, 2015, is critical to the maintenance and promotion of investment opportunities in the region;

Whereas regional integration should be strengthened to improve the full utilization of AGOA preferences, and elimination of barriers to trade and investment in Africa, such

as high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, among others, will strengthen and improve regional and global integration;

Whereas it remains the goal of United States policy to support the diversification of sub-Saharan exports in terms of products and countries that utilize AGOA;

Whereas the members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) adopted several important Decisions and Declarations in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2013, including the Agreement on Trade Facilitation and specific results on agriculture and development, with the protocol of amendment for the Agreement on Trade Facilitation to be adopted on July 31, 2014;

Whereas full implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will help to address supply-side constraints in Africa, promote regional integration on the continent, and facilitate integration into global supply chains;

Whereas the House of Representatives introduced on June 27, 2013, and passed on May 8, 2014, the Electrify Africa Act, to make it a national policy of the United States to promote the electrification of Sub-Saharan Africa to more than double the number of people with access to power in order to improve health and education outcomes and stimulate economic opportunity; and

Whereas, on June 30, 2013, in Cape Town, South Africa, President Barack Obama announced the Power Africa Initiative, to significantly increase the number of people with access to power in Sub-Saharan Africa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) welcomes African leaders to the first United States–Africa Leaders' Summit in Washington, DC;

(2) welcomes African trade ministers to the 13th African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) Forum;

(3) recognizes the significant progress and hope that modern Africa represents today in global affairs and economic advancement with its booming demographics, increasing modernization, dynamic youth, and vast resources;

(4) acknowledges the vast opportunities to boost cultural, trade, and economic relations and partnerships between the United States and Africa;

(5) recognizes the importance of renewing the AGOA program well before its expiration in September 2015;

(6) supports studying potential changes to the program to improve its effectiveness and utilization and exploring how Africa can address barriers to become more attractive to trade and investment within Africa as well as globally;

(7) encourages the prompt and full implementation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Trade Facilitation Agreement as one important way to address supply-side barriers and encourage greater trade and investment in Africa; and

(8) welcomes that the African Leaders at the African Union Summit on June 27, 2014, reaffirmed their commitments to all the decisions the Ministers took in Bali, including emphasizing that assistance and support for capacity building should be provided as envisaged in the Agreement on Trade Facilitation, and that the Agreement should be implemented in line with the decision Trade Ministers took in Bali, which provides that a protocol be adopted by July 31, 2014, and definitive entry into force by July 31, 2015.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) is studying ways to improve the effectiveness and utilization of the range of United States trade policy tools with respect to Africa, including AGOA, and exploring how Africa can address barriers to become more attractive to trade and investment within Africa as well as globally; and

(2) looks forward to continuing to work with African leaders to improve our economic and bilateral relationships.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity, and are both committed to strengthening economic relations;

Whereas it is in the national interest of the United States to support the reduction of poverty in the continent of Africa;

Whereas greater opportunities for mutually beneficial trade and investments promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability;

Whereas the countries in Africa are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas Africa has today 6 of the 10 fastest growing economies in the world, over 1 billion people, 60 percent of the world's uncultivated agricultural land, and expanding democracies;

Whereas Africa is rich through the youth of its population, enjoying a demographic advantage over all other regions of the world, and is likely to replace the People's Republic of China as the biggest contributor to the global workforce by 2050;

Whereas it is in the economic interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging African markets, boost United States–Africa trade and investment, support greater capacity building for Africa, and invest in Africa's youth and leadership development;

Whereas in 2000 the Congress passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), with broad bipartisan support and with a view to expanding growth and opportunity in Africa;

Whereas in the original AGOA legislation, Congress encouraged the establishment of more regular high-level dialogues, including

regular meetings by the President with his African counterparts;

Whereas exports from sub-Saharan Africa to the United States under AGOA have increased over three-fold from \$7.6 billion in 2001 to \$24.8 billion in 2013;

Whereas United States exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased from \$6.9 billion to \$23.9 billion and United States investment in sub-Saharan Africa has increased six-fold;

Whereas per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled to \$1,624 annually since Congress first passed AGOA, yet nearly half the population in sub-Saharan Africa lives in poverty;

Whereas regional integration should be strengthened to boost economic growth in Africa, and elimination of barriers to trade and investment in Africa, such as high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, among others, will strengthen and improve regional and global integration;

Whereas it remains the goal of United States policy to support the diversification of sub-Saharan exports in terms of products and countries that utilize AGOA;

Whereas the members of the World Trade Organization adopted several important Decisions and Declarations in Bali, Indonesia, in December 2013, including the Agreement on Trade Facilitation and specific results on agriculture and development, with the protocol of amendment for the Agreement on Trade Facilitation to be adopted on July 31, 2014;

Whereas full implementation by our trading partners of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation will help to address supply-side constraints in Africa, promote regional integration on the continent, and facilitate integration into global supply chains;

Whereas on June 30, 2013, in Cape Town, South Africa, President Barack Obama announced the Power Africa Initiative, to double the number of people with access to power in Sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas on May 8, 2014, the House of Representatives passed the Electrify Africa Act, to make it a national policy of the United States to support the electrification of sub-Saharan Africa, and to direct United States agencies to devote resources to facilitate and support the implementation of this initiative; and

Whereas the first United States–Africa Leaders' Summit and the 13th African Growth and Opportunity Act Forum will be held in Washington, DC, this summer: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST TO DELETE REMARKS IN DEBATE

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the words of the gentlewoman from Minnesota who described placing a handcuff on one hand of the President's—

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I object as the request is not timely.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Excuse me. May I finish my unanimous consent request? Thank you.

She in one moment described putting one handcuff on one hand of the President's and a second handcuff on the second hand of the President's and handcuffing the lawless President of the United States.

Those are words which are not appropriate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that they be stricken. Impugning the character and integrity of the President of the United States is a clear violation of the rules of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I do object. The request is not timely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. CICILLINE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment.

There is no requirement that a unanimous consent request be timely. The House can consent unanimously to any course of action. I am asking the House to consent unanimously to striking these particular words from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no requirement under the House rules that it be done contemporaneously, that is, of taking down the words of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has stated a unanimous consent request, and there has been an objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. And I have heard no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. There is an objection to the unanimous consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp; the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution relating to the approval and implementation of the proposed agreement for nuclear cooperation between the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the speaker:

H.R. 3230. An Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3548. An Act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the "Jason Crip Forest Service Building".

H.R. 4631. An Act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An Act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as "30th Street Station", as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station".

H.R. 5021. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 694, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, August 4, 2014.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 4, 2014, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6775. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6776. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6777. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6778. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6779. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6780. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6781. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6782. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6783. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6784. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6785. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6786. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6787. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6788. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6789. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6790. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6791. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6792. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6793. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6794. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6795. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6796. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6797. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6798. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6799. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6800. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6801. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6802. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6803. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6804. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6805. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6806. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6807. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6808. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6809. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 [CMS-1608-F] (RIN: 0938-AS09) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6810. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2014 (FY 2015) [CMS-1606-F] (RIN: 0938-AS08) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

tees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

6811. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities for FY 2015 [CMS-1605-F] (RIN: 0938-AS07) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-571). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5390. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to the Donbass People's Militia or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5391. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place a chair on the grounds of the United States Capitol honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the determination of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without regard to alien agricultural seasonal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5393. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for required Medicare hospice program surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 5394. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5395. A bill to establish a United States Boxing Commission to administer the Professional Boxing Safety Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5396. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 5397. A bill to modify the boundary of Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5398. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for additional qualification requirements for individuals appointed to marriage and family therapist positions in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 5399. A bill to modify the grace period prior to the repayment period for certain Federal direct loans and to exclude from Federal income taxation certain employer-provided student loan assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MCALLISTER):

H.R. 5400. A bill to provide for State enforcement of border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. JOYCE):

H. Res. 711. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all business and residential customers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H. Res. 712. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a bilateral free trade agreement with the Republic of South Africa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Sections 8, Clauses 1, 10, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 5394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause) of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States." This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to education to the states and individuals.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises

shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 5396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 5397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 5400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the "Power To...provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 32: Mr. GRIMM and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 292: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 494: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 533: Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 543: Mr. NOLAN and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 690: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARR, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 720: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 725: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 728: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 765: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 808: Ms. WATERS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 861: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1074: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1136: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1318: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1339: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1427: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1547: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1601: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1620: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1666: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1812: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1827: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1852: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1907: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2027: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2099: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 2322: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2366: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2504: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2529: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2536: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms.

LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2654: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2780: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2825: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2835: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2847: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms.

CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2856: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. McNeerney, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2869: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2870: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr.

KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2902: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2994: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3118: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3199: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 3335: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 3382: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3383: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3486: Mr. MICA and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3560: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3680: Mr. HONDA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 3689: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3722: Ms. SINEMA and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3833: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 4035: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4060: Mr. PETERS of California and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 4143: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4145: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4158: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4190: Mr. BARR and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4217: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 4219: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 4223: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4260: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4306: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4319: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr.

COBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4336: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 4382: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 4385: Mr. CALVERT and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4388: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4432: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4440: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 4503: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4510: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 4578: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 4582: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4607: Mr. COSTA and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 4623: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 4628: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4682: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4717: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4755: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4793: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 4818: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4885: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4886: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4888: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4906: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4916: Mr. ROONEY and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 4920: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 4960: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 4964: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 4966: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
 H.R. 4969: Mr. LANCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JONES, and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 4971: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 4978: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 4998: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 5015: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5051: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5071: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5083: Mr. McINTYRE.
 H.R. 5110: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HURT.
 H.R. 5114: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 5138: Mr. SANFORD.
 H.R. 5159: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 5212: Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 5216: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 5219: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 5226: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 5227: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5233: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5235: Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 5239: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 5245: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5252: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 5263: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5279: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 5285: Mr. BARR and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 5306: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 5310: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 5321: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 5325: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 5328: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 5330: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 5338: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 5352: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 5354: Mr. COSTA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5363: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 5372: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5382: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 5384: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. RIGELL.
 H.J. Res. 68: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.J. Res. 118: Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H. Res. 440: Ms. PELOSI.
 H. Res. 520: Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 536: Mr. DAINES.
 H. Res. 665: Mr. POMPEO.
 H. Res. 668: Mr. GERLACH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 683: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YODER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr.

CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 688: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 689: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 698: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 699: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 701: Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENYART, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 707: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the fortieth anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, a private, non-profit corporation established by Congress to ensure equal access to justice under law for all Americans.

Since 1974, LSC has been on the frontlines of providing civil legal aid for low-income Americans. By funding legal aid in hundreds of offices across the country, LSC has made a critical difference in the lives of countless Americans.

Whether helping homeowners prevent foreclosures, fighting for veterans and workers' rights to receive the benefits they have duly earned, or helping mothers obtain child support or protection from abuse, LSC has provided funding for legal aid attorneys to protect the safety, security, and health of our most vulnerable citizens through qualified counsel.

Alarming, more than fifty percent of eligible clients seeking assistance are turned away due to a lack of program resources.

Equal justice for all is not just an aspiration; it is a guarantee to every American regardless of race, gender, socio-economic status, and creed. We can do better, and we must do better.

On this anniversary, I salute the Legal Services Corporation, and I call on my colleagues to protect its program resources.

HONORING LT. COL. MATT URBAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Lt. Col. Matt Urban and to recognize his service to our great nation. As a veteran of World War II, I understand the great sacrifices made by the "greatest generation" and their families. Lt. Col. Urban is a true American hero and is worthy of recognition by this body.

Lt. Col. Urban is one of the most decorated soldiers of our time. He has received the Medal of Honor, Silver Star, Legion of Merit and the Purple Heart, among others. After enlisting in the Army on July 2, 1941, Lt. Col. Urban fought in six campaigns in World War II in the Mediterranean and European theaters. On September 3, 1944, after exposing himself to enemy fire while destroying two tanks with a bazooka, he was critically wound-

ed and medically evacuated from battle. The following year, a fellow soldier recommended him for the Medal of Honor for his heroic actions in battle. Unfortunately, this letter was not received by the Army, which resulted in a great delay in recognizing his valor. However, thanks to hard work by his family, friends and supporters, Lt. Col. Urban was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Jimmy Carter on July 19, 1980. He passed away on March 4, 1995.

The citation for his Medal of Honor states that Lt. Col. Urban deserves to be honored "for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life above and beyond the call of duty." On August 23, 2014, his family will gather at Arlington National Cemetery for a wreath laying ceremony and celebration of his life. I join them in honoring Lt. Col. Matt Urban for his heroism in battle and many sacrifices he made on behalf of our great nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great American.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. EDWARD "ED" MOSLEY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Edward "Ed" Mosley. His service to our community, and the contributions he made to our state and nation will always be remembered.

In 1924, Ed was born in Chicago, Illinois. He grew up during a time when skin color affected a person's opportunities, but Ed pushed past the barriers. Ever since he was a young child, obtaining a higher education was a primary focus for Ed. In 1944, he graduated from the University of Illinois and continued onto medical school at Meharry Medical College. He completed his medical internship at Harlem Hospital in New York and his residency at Tuskegee Veterans Hospital in Alabama. In addition, Ed also taught English at the Tuskegee Institute.

Ed also served in the United States military as a Captain in the Army. He exhibited great leadership, determination, and love for his country. An extended tour in Korea truly highlighted his bravery and commitment to the values that he and this country represent.

Ed established his medical office in Fresno, California. He served residents from throughout the San Joaquin Valley for 50 years. Ensuring that individuals had access to adequate healthcare was one of Ed's greatest priorities which led him to create the West Fresno Health Care Coalition, now known as the West Fresno Family Resource Center. Ed served as president of the board for 15 years. Due to Ed's dedication and commitment to the West

Family Resource Center, the organization has provided thousands of individuals and families with resources to better their lives. Ed is also responsible for the collaboration between doctors to create the Westview Convalescent Hospital in Fresno.

In addition to his contributions made in the healthcare industry, Ed was also very active throughout the community. For 13 years, he served on the State Center Community College Board. Governor George Deukmejian appointed Ed as a delegate to the Electoral College in 1972, making him the first African-American to be appointed. He also became a member of the Blue Ribbon Commission for the Master Plan for Higher Education. Finally, he served on the Fresno Mayor's commission on Bi-Racial relations.

Ed will be greatly missed by his wife of 48 years, Marian; his children, Cary, Kia, Rennie, Christopher, and Caroline; his grandchildren, Michael, Drew, Mariah, Kyle, Dominique, Rory, Maddie, Donovan, and Liam; and his two great-grandchildren, Ben and Jack.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to honor the life of Dr. Ed Mosley, a community leader and humanitarian. His presence will undoubtedly be missed, but his impact and legacy in the San Joaquin Valley will never be forgotten.

HONORING TOM HOM

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Tom Hom, a man who has made it his life's work to better the city of San Diego. As the American-born son of Chinese immigrants, Tom saw firsthand the discrimination that Asian Americans experienced in the U.S. in the early 20th century as his parents worked tirelessly to build a better life for their twelve children. Despite immense obstacles, Tom rose to success, all the while giving back to his family and his community.

In 1963, Tom Hom was elected to the San Diego City Council, becoming the city's first minority councilmember, and he went on to serve in the California State Assembly. As a councilman, and later as a businessman, Tom helped reinvigorate downtown San Diego, transforming our skid row into the vibrant Gaslamp Quarter that now draws businesses and visitors from around the country. He was instrumental in founding the San Diego Chinese Historical Museum, which documents the culture and contributions of our city's Chinese-American community, and he remains an influential figure in the San Diego business and philanthropic communities.

Tom's vision and hard work have shaped San Diego into the city it is today, and his

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

generosity and humility in the face of such success are inspiring. Tom Hom's journey from Chinatown to the California statehouse truly embodies the American Dream.

HONORING TOMMY "MR. NOTTIE"
GUNNS, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man of noble character from Shaw, MS in Bolivar County.

I believe that when you give honor and recognition to someone they should truly deserve it. I am always happy when I meet someone or hear their story about overcoming, rising from obscurity, coming from meager beginnings but leaving a legacy although unaware; which doesn't get the recognition and thanks it really deserves. This is why I want to honor Mr. Tommy Gunns, Jr. a man of "noble" character.

Childhood: Nottie was originally from Egypt, MS in Chickasaw County, MS. He was born in the year 1900 to Mr. Tommy Gunns, Sr. and Mrs. Alberta Gunns. Nottie was raised in a home with his mother, his only sister named Alma, and his stepfather, "Mr. Brick". His parents were sharecroppers and struggled; which was the backdrop for an unstable home environment that easily led to abuse. And Nottie was often times the one subjected to the abuse (verbal and physical) by his stepfather. Since his mother could not protect him and because of years of abuse, he developed the drive early in life to want "better," so he planned to run away, someday. In his plan, he always included Alma, his young sister.

The day came when he ran away and took Alma with him, never returning home. Nottie ran away and arrived in Shaw, MS in 1914. He was just a young teenager when he ran away. When Nottie arrived in Shaw, he worked as many odd jobs as he could find and raised his sister alone; vowing to never let anyone else abuse him or his little sister. In fact, he was so protective of her that he never eased up until he had approved of the man she married. He had to be assured the man was not abusive and was a good provider for Alma.

A Young Man and Family Man: As a young man working in Shaw he was able to acquire many skills and a reputation as a fast learner, hard worker, and a person of good moral character, which equated to a nonsense type of reputation. He was still determined to have a better life and wanted to be respected and treated like a man so he carried himself like a man. Nottie eventually earned that reputation and people began calling him Mr. Nottie or Mr. Gunns. Some of the jobs he worked included driving trucks to haul logs, a loader at the Shaw lumber yard, and sharecropping as a small farmer. While working at the Shaw lumber yard, he learned the skill of carpentry; and became known as a master carpenter around Shaw. Everyone wanted him to do their work.

Mr. Gunns eventually met and married, Nancy Hunt of Shaw, MS. The couple had ten

children, 2 died shortly after child birth. Mr. Gunns wanted a big loving family that was full of happy times but serious about life. He directed his journey and based goals in life on his childhood, all that he never had, he was determined to experience before dying. His and Nancy's children are Berna "BB" Gunns-Williams, Nathaniel, "Baby Sister" Gunns-Clark, Tommy "Win" Gunns, Jr. (although he is the 3rd), Christine Gunns-Gardner, Torries Gunns, Maurine "Morgan" Gunns-Gray, Shirley Ann "Shelly" Gunns-Juette, and Lonnie Lee Gunns.

As a husband, father, and community member, Mr. Gunns saw the need to become more involved. You see he wanted to be a role model for his children; he wanted to make sure they had a good upbringing and education, so he felt he needed to get involved in the community and help make it happen. Mr. Gunns served as a volunteer fireman for the city. He wasn't trying to be a hero or win a popularity campaign; he just wanted a better life for his children. Mr. Gunns number one priority was education for all colored children.

Since he was very vocal about education he was asked to become a member of the Board of Trustees for the Shaw Colored School.

The Shaw Colored School only educated children to the 8th grade. Beyond 8th grade the colored children had to travel to Greenville or surrounding towns for a high school education. Mr. Gunns helped changed that. He convinced the Board of Trustees to agree to vote on establishing a curriculum for 9th through 12th grades for Shaw students to be able to get their high school education. So, under his tutelage the first high school graduating class from the Shaw Colored High School was in 1949.

How did he do it? Mr. Gunns had an unyielding faith. That was the same faith that brought him as a young teenage runaway with his little sister, Alma, safely to Shaw, MS during the early 1900s. His faith in God provided him with jobs to take care of himself and his sister as a young boy, alone in the Mississippi Delta. His ability to pick up on things and learn fast paid off because he became that master carpenter. His daughter, Maurine said he could build a house from the ground up. He was a devoted member and deacon of the Strangers Home M.B. Church in Shaw, where he was laid to rest for eternity. And those trying times were no match for his common sense, the old folks called it "mother wit" for survival. It was the foundation of his approach on how to survive in life:

Financial Policy—never spend all your money. Save some for a rainy day.

Child Rearing—everybody has a role and place. Only adults are in charge and children are to stay in their place and do as they are told. He called it his no nonsense approach to raising children. He would often paraphrase Proverbs 13:24, by saying "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Preparation—your future depends on your education. "All my children are going to college. I had enough children to work and chip in to help pay for everyone's college," he would say.

The End: The first of Mr. Gunns children to go to college was Berna at the age of 16. This was made possible by two reasons: (1) every-

one in the family picked and chopped cotton, and (2) his financial policy of saving money. The children all knew their earnings went to their parents to help provide for the family and save for college. Berna went to Tuskegee Institute in 1950 in Tuskegee, AL. Berna graduated before he died. He was able to see the first of his children to get a college education. His daughter, Berna remembers her father and mother faces as they watched her graduate with all her sisters and brothers watching as well. They knew they had to do it too. Berna went on to become a self-employed, self-made millionaire. She started her own company "Scrubbles Janitorial Service" in her home and grew it to become a multi-million dollar company in Washington, DC. She was able to live that better life because of her fathers' determination to clear the path.

Mr. Gunns didn't live to see another one of his children to go to college, he died in 1954 but he had already planted the seeds for success. Everyone in the family knew their place and role. Mrs. Gunns, his wife and eldest daughter, Berna carried on his mantra for every child of his going to college. Mrs. Gunns continued to work as the cafeteria manager and cook for the Shaw Colored School.

Tommy, his eldest son, became the father figure for his siblings. Since his father had taught him the carpentry trade, Tommy was able to get his father's job at the Shaw Lumber Yard. It was a year later in 1958 that he got the job because graduating from high school was priority in 1957. The family never missed a check; he knew the money was going to help pay for his siblings to finish high school and attend college. Tommy eventually went to college in 1959 by getting a job with Mississippi Vocational College (now called Mississippi Valley State University—MVSU) driving the school bus picking up students in Bolivar and Sunflower County. That was one of the ways he was able to pay his way through college, as well as it served as his transportation to and from the College. The other way was when Dean Isaac offered him a work study job to help build other buildings on campus (i.e., the auditorium, and campus maintenance) because he had seen his work as a student. As a requirement for graduation, Tommy had to build something to show he had mastered his trade. But the requirement was reconsidered when he drove his instructor to Shaw and showed him the house he built along with the blueprint he had drawn. When asked how, Tommy told him "My Dad is a master carpenter and he taught me this stuff a long time ago." That house was for his best friend, Roy Magee and the family still lives there. In fact, Tommy still has the blueprints he drew. Tommy was a part of the team that built the first house on campus for the first president of Mississippi Valley State University, Dr. James H. White. The house now serves as the National Alumni House on the campus of the University. Tommy did not graduate until 1964 because of split session with his degree in Industrial Arts. He became the Industrial Art instructor for the Shaw School District, working for 30 years until his retirement.

All of Mr. Gunns children went to college and became very successful in their own rights with good jobs, homes, cars, money to

send their children to college, and blessed to see retirement, etc. But Berna and Tommy stood out as the oldest daughter and son after their father's death. As for Mr. Gunns master carpentry skills, his son, Tommy and grandson, Undra Gunns (son of Torries and Dorothy Washington-Gunns) acquired that skill. So, he lives on in many ways and in many accomplishments without even trying to do so, he left a legacy.

One more mention on how did he do it? Mr. Gunns received only a 2nd grade education. He never learned to read or write. But, his stepfather, "Mr. Brick" taught him how to count. And passed that on to his children by teaching them how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide. That's all he could do in terms of academics. It was his faith in God, his common sense, determination, and ability to count money and perform mathematical operations in his head, and serve on the school board, which sparked change in education in Shaw. All those things got him through life and he was destined to accomplish the things he did. "If you don't walk in purpose, you won't walk in destiny." Find your purpose in life and walk it out (Quote by: Farrah Gray). Now, that's how he did it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the legacy of Tommy "Mr. Nottie" Gunns, Jr. from the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position on rollcall votes cast between July 9, 2014 and July 17, 2014.

On rollcall vote No. 371, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. MCALLISTER I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 372, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. HAHN I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 373, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. GOSAR I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 374, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. WENSTRUP I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 375, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. SWALWELL I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 376, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. BYRNE I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 377, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 378, on consideration of H.R. 803 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 379, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 380, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. BONAMICI I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 381, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. SPEIER I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 382, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. TITUS I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 383, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. SCHIFF I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 384, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. QUIGLEY I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 385, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. CHABOT I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 386, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. TITUS I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 387, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms. DELAURO I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 388, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. KING I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 389, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. LANKFORD I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 390, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. CASSIDY I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 391, on ordering the previous question for H. Res. 661 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

On rollcall vote No. 392, on consideration of H. Res. 661 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

On rollcall vote No. 393, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. BURGESS I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 394, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. LAMALFA I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 395, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. STOCKMAN I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 396, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. STOCKMAN I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 397, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. MCKINLEY I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 398, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Ms.

BLACKBURN I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 399, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. GOSAR I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 400, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 4923 by Mr. HUDSON I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "no."

On rollcall vote No. 401, on the motion to recommit for H.R. 4923 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 402, on final passage of H.R. 4923 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

On rollcall vote No. 403, on the motion to recommit to H.R. 4718 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 404, on final passage of H.R. 4718 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

On rollcall vote No. 405, on consideration of H.R. 4195 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 406, on consideration of H.R. 5029 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 407, on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 669 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 408, on passage of H. Res. 669 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 409, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 5016 by Ms. JACKSON LEE I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 410, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 5016 by Ms. MOORE I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 412, on consideration of an amendment offered to H.R. 5016 by Ms. WATERS I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 413, on consideration of the motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 5021 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 414, on passage of H.R. 5021 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 428, on ordering the previous question to H. Res. 670 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

On rollcall vote No. 429, on passage of H. Res. 670 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 430, on the motion to instruct for H.R. 3230 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 431, on the motion to recommit for H.R. 4719 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "yea."

On rollcall vote No. 432, on passage of H.R. 4719 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "nay."

I would also like to take this opportunity to clarify my vote on final passage of H.R. 4923 and H.R. 5021.

On H.R. 4923 I would have voted for the bill despite concerns about the increase in funding for fossil fuel research at the expense of decreases in funding for renewable energy technologies. Furthermore, I was concerned by a

policy rider that would prevent the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers from moving forward with rulemaking to clarify the definition of Waters of the U.S. under the Clean Water Act.

On H.R. 5021 I voted yes because it is critically important that we keep our Highway Trust Fund solvent and transportation projects moving forward. However, I am frustrated that we have not yet been able to achieve a longer-term fix for the Highway Trust Fund. In crafting a new highway reauthorization I urge my colleagues to work on a bipartisan basis to ensure a reliable, dedicated funding source for our highway projects.

THE GROWING CRISIS OF AFRICA'S ORPHANS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a hearing that I convened recently in my subcommittee addressed a very important humanitarian crisis: the more than fifty million children orphaned on the continent of Africa.

Indeed, to put this in perspective, as one of our witnesses, Shimwaayi Muntemba, pointed out, with such a number, the orphans of Africa, if grouped together in a single country, would be the fourth largest country in all of Africa—after Nigeria, Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The factors contributing to this crisis are varied, starting with war and civil unrest, which have displaced millions—wars that have led to the deaths of parents and other adult relatives, leaving children to fend for themselves. Or sometimes children are separated from their parents in a mad flight for sanctuary, never learning if their mothers and fathers are alive or dead. They may never know if they are orphaned in reality, or if both parents turn out to have survived and are alive in a refugee camp somewhere else. Such parents, too, agonize over what ever happened to their children.

Other children are indirect victims of HIV/AIDS, which has wreaked such devastating havoc on the continent, or other diseases. They could have lost one or both parents to this or some other dread disease. Often being forced into the role of the primary caretaker of younger siblings, their childhood innocence is ended by the burdens of adult responsibility.

As with many of the humanitarian crises that confront the continent, there is a big picture aspect to this one, one which we as Congress certainly need to address. There are important strategic implications of so many children and adolescents left without fathers or mothers. We have all heard of the scourge of child soldiers, how orphaned children are recruited and brutalized, themselves turning into remorseless killers. Terrorist groups such as the Lord's Resistance Army, under the rapacious warlord Joseph Kony, actively recruit child soldiers.

And if humanitarian reasons are not enough to compel Congress to rally behind the efforts to address the issue of Africa's orphans by USAID and countless charitable organizations, many of them faith-based, then strategic concerns and the effect this has on stability

throughout the region, should be reason to sit up and take notice of this tragedy.

But behind every statistic about orphaned children, behind the pie charts and graphs, there is also a portrait in miniature: a lonely child who is left without a mother or a father, perhaps dealing each night with the pangs of hunger, or just seeking a place where one can lay one's head down in safety until the morning comes. That child awakes to forage and fend for another day. Behind every statistic, there is a young boy or girl who has to deal with the sense of abandonment, or with the trauma of having seen parents killed before his or her eyes. There is a little soul, a young person, whose inherent dignity has been scarred in a world itself wounded, where there is so much pain, suffering and darkness.

These children are in need of love and compassion, of simple needs being met. Those who do find loving homes and families are truly the lucky ones.

One remedy for this crisis is inter-country adoption, which sometimes brings children from Africa to our shores to provide them with loving homes. This is, of course, only a partial remedy, because for every child who is given a loving home, there are many more for whom there is never will be such a refuge. At best, they may end up in an institutional orphanage, which is a topic fraught with controversy. While the best ones, again often faith based, help address the developmental and educational needs of children, the worst may abet trafficking. In some cases, such institutions do not even shelter orphans per se, but rather children who are placed there by parents who think that their children will get better education and nutrition than what they themselves can provide. Clearly, such institutions can never provide the type of love that a father and a mother, along with any siblings, can give.

An issue that was addressed in the hearing was the role of inter-country adoption in helping address, at least in part, the crisis of orphans. Some of the testimony was critical of the role of our State Department's Office of Children's Issues in the Bureau of Consular Affairs. Such testimony needs to be heard, for we can, and we must, do better.

We also heard about an adoption issue that has received a lot of attention on Capitol Hill and was the topic of a resolution authored by my good friend and colleague COLLIN PETERSON of Minnesota, which I am happy to say was passed by the House, after being marked up by my subcommittee and then the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Last year, the Democratic Republic of the Congo suspended the issuance of exit permits for Congolese children adopted by foreign parents—impacting hundreds of U.S. families. The suspension means that Congolese children adopted by American parents cannot leave the country to go to their new homes—even though the parents have been officially declared the legal guardians under Congolese law.

What's more, despite the exit permit suspension, Congolese courts have continued processing new adoptions, leading to a backlog of adopted children who are unable to leave the country.

More than 900 American families are caught up in varying stages of this adoption limbo—breaking hearts.

This is a deplorable situation for these children, and for their distraught families. Indeed, we will hear about this from one such family that has been impacted, as well as an advocate for families that have been impacted.

Finally, I also want to say a word to those parents who have endured not only burdens that are financial, but ones that are primarily emotional, separated from the children that they have voluntarily welcomed into their lives. Your hardship and pain is deeply noted by my colleagues and I, as well as our staff members, many of whom have worked not only on passing Congressman PETERSON's resolution, but also have pushed our State Department and the Government of the DRC to resolve this issue.

Please continue to persevere, and do not give up hope! We remain in your corner.

PROTECTING THE VULNERABLE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Cummings Foundation, the Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project, Child Justice, and the Courageous Kids Network should be commended for their work combatting child abuse and ensuring justice for abuse victims.

Earlier this year they recognized Members of Congress who work on child abuse issues, but I think these groups are the ones who should really be recognized.

Child abuse is a horrific crime.

And it's made even worse when justice is not served.

Only a monster would harm a child.

It is an inexcusable injustice when a child is ordered by our own legal system back into an unsafe situation.

As a former judge and prosecutor and as co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus with my good friend JIM COSTA of California, I know how important groups like these are in advocating for victims and helping them through court proceedings.

Not only do these organizations serve children and their protective parents, who many times are also victims of abuse, but work to fix the family court system, when justice is not served.

They counsel protective parents and help children who have been wrongly placed with an abusive parent.

These groups work with the parent and courts to bring the child back into a safe situation, some providing pro bono legal assistance.

They work to educate the public on these issues and fight for a justice system that works, striving to bring real change to our society by ending domestic violence and child abuse.

Those that work with children and their families through some of the hardest situations are true heroes.

Our country was founded on the principles of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

The Cummings Foundation, the Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project, Child Justice, and the Courageous Kids Network want to make sure that victims are able to live that American ideal.

Our country cannot tolerate abuse.

Justice demands that we fight back.

Because justice is what we do.

A society will be judged by how it treats the most vulnerable.

I hope that because of the work these groups are doing, our society will be judged well.

And that's just the way it is.

THE FTO REFORM ACT OF 2014

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the United States Foreign Terrorist Organization List is widely recognized as a powerful tool in the fight against terrorist networks around the world. Designating a terrorist group as an "FTO" makes it clear that organizations that engage in terrorist activity should not be welcome in any civilized society, while the wide-ranging effects of designation can hamper a network's financing and operations. Often, when the United States adds an organization to the FTO List, they are leading the global community in taking on extremist groups willing to murder innocent civilians, and therefore, the value of a credible, potent, and reliable designation process is immense.

The Secretary of State's role in managing the FTO List in accordance with Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality act is complemented by consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury. Each of these cabinet level officials plays a role in enforcing an FTO designation, and their assistance in considering potential additions to the list is absolutely vital. However, since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)—which also has responsibility for many of the enforcement tools of FTO Designations—the role of the Secretary of Homeland Security in the FTO process has not been codified in statute.

As an example, DHS is the only Cabinet-level Department whose first three missions are the prevention of terrorism and enhancement of security; securing and managing borders; and enforcing and administering immigration laws. Each of these is a major component of the FTO List, which is designed to mitigate the terrorist threat and prevent members of designated organizations from entering the United States. Further, DHS already plays a significant role in assisting the Department of State in making FTO designations by providing information gathered by component agencies and DHS' Office of Intelligence and Analysis. The Immigration and Nationality Act should codify the reality of the responsibility DHS has to assist in these designations.

Additionally, DHS personnel have a large presence in foreign countries, and DHS em-

ployees interact with individuals attempting to enter the United States thousands of times each day. DHS personnel contribute to screening FTO members who attempt to enter the United States.

Homeland Security Investigations (HSI), an office within U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE), is the second-largest federal investigative agency in the country. The National Security Investigation Division of HSI "enhances national security through criminal investigations; prevents acts of terrorism by targeting people, money and materials that support terrorist and criminal activities; and identifies and eliminates vulnerabilities in the nation's border, economic, transportation and infrastructure security." This mission is intimately linked to the FTO list.

Many recent FTO designations have been issued for groups that have already attacked U.S. interests, U.S. citizens, or the U.S. Homeland. At the same time, many of these organizations engaged in terrorist activity and have been viewed as terrorist networks long before their inclusion in the FTO list. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan, Boko Haram, the Haqqani Network, and al Shabaab are some such examples. Yet the FTO list was intended to proactively respond to the threat of terrorism, and should be utilized as a weapon in the fight against all terrorist entities, not merely a declaration of the obvious and measure of last resort.

With this in mind, it is important to balance the diplomatic concerns of the State Department with the law enforcement concerns of the Departments of Justice and Treasury, and the security concerns of the Department of Homeland Security. Terrorist groups, and their members, should be identified as terrorists and barred from the United States according to the threat they pose. Adding the Secretary of Homeland Security to the formal designation processes in statute will help achieve that goal.

The FTO Reform Act of 2014 will strengthen the FTO process and ensure all relevant considerations are taken into account when considering potential FTO designations. Lastly, the bill enhances Congressional oversight and creates greater visibility into the impacts of these designations and how they are used.

RECOGNIZING PHILLIP V. SANCHEZ

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Phillip V. Sanchez as he celebrates his 85th birthday. His many years of dedication to civil service deserve both acknowledgment and appreciation. Sanchez was a pioneer for the Mexican American community; he was the first Latino to serve in a Presidential administration as the Director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, an impressive feat.

Sanchez was born on July 28, 1929. He is the son of Mexican migrant workers, who settled in the small town of Pinedale in Califor-

nia's San Joaquin River Valley. A student at the nearby Clovis High School, he founded and edited the school newspaper. Graduating salutatorian in 1946, his accomplishments garnered the superlative "Most Likely to Succeed," an obvious indicator of his future successes. Sanchez went on to earn both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in political science at Fresno State, where he chartered the school's chapter of the Sigma Chi Fraternity and wrote for the school's paper, The Daily Collegian. After graduating from Fresno State, he took the position of Fresno County Chief Administrative Officer, his first government position.

It was in 1971 that Sanchez was appointed as director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity under the Nixon administration, making him the first Latino to serve in a Presidential administration and thereby cementing himself in history. He served admirably in this position until 1973, when President Nixon appointed him as the U.S. Ambassador to Honduras. Sanchez also served as Ambassador to Colombia under President Ford's administration.

Phillip V. Sanchez serves as a prime example of an exemplary citizen. Although not currently active in politics, he continues to contribute to his community, recently reading to children at the Mexican Consulate in honor of Children's Day. His accomplishments have inspired numerous individuals, and his name now graces the halls of the Ambassador Phillip V. Sanchez Public Charter School.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Phillip V. Sanchez on his 85th birthday. He serves as shining example of outstanding public service, and I thank him for both his dedication to the Mexican American community and to this nation.

RECOGNIZING ORGANIZATIONS LIKE YMCAS THAT PROVIDE CHILDREN WITH SAFE SWIMMING SKILLS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the three children who die every day as a result of drowning—and to recognize organizations, like YMCAs across the country, that are working to give children and youth the skills to prevent these tragic accidents from happening.

Drowning is the leading cause of death nationally for children aged 1–4, and is the second leading cause of death for children aged 5–9. For children between 5 and 9, the drowning rate for African American and American Indian children is roughly 3 times that of white children, and African American children aged 11 and 12 are 10 times more likely to drown in pools than their white counterparts. Regardless of race, lower income populations disproportionately bear the burden of drowning in their communities.

During 2013, 7 children drowned in the Dallas metropolitan area. In Texas, 82 children

were victims of drowning. During 2012, 66% of child drowning victims in Texas were male.

Both in Texas and across the country, there is an opportunity and a need to save these children's lives—to reach out to communities that historically have not had access to swimming and drowning prevention programs. Many low-income children live in housing complexes with unguarded swimming pools, and in hot summer months, these pools may be the only way to cool down, as many of the housing units lack air conditioning.

The YMCA is one example of an organization that is changing statistics for children across the country. The YMCA is bringing swimming safety and drowning prevention programs to these community sites. YMCAs also partner with schools to bring kids to the Y for lessons and offer swimming lessons year-round. I am thrilled that the YMCA of Metropolitan Dallas is one of the 15 YMCAs across the country piloting a program to reduce youth incidences of drowning. The YMCA makes an effort to go into underserved communities to teach drowning prevention and water safety to children who otherwise would not have access to these life-saving skills. Moreover, the YMCA of Metropolitan Dallas is one of 103 Ys providing additional scholarships to children in their community that may not otherwise have access to swim lessons as part of a nationwide data collection project on effectiveness of skill instruction in all communities.

I would like to congratulate the YMCA of Metropolitan Dallas on its innovative efforts to save the lives of all our children, and to join them in educating parents and providing children the skills they need to swim safely and avoid harm.

**SECRET PROGRAM TO SUPPLY
ARMS TO REBELS IN SYRIA**

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed with the recent reporting of a new, covert, secret U.S. program—not secret to the intelligence communities throughout the world, but secret to the American people—to supply military weapons and equipment to arm the rebels in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, we've spent the last thirteen years sending arms into the Middle East, and now the region is blowing up.

I commend President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry for their commitment to finding diplomatic solutions in preventing these wars and challenges—especially for their recent efforts to achieve an immediate ceasefire and settlement between Israelis and Palestinians.

However, I am deeply disturbed by these repeated undercover missions to fan the flames of foreign wars by inserting more military weapons and equipment into the conflicts. These efforts run contrary to our work of diplomacy and toward lasting peace—and what's more, are time and time again executed without seeking the Constitutionally-granted authority of the Congress of the United States.

I firmly believe that if the question were brought before the Congress, many of these programs would never be sanctioned.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, these are arms that all too often end up in the hands of our worst enemies. And this apparent determination on the part of the Administration to send weapons into so many regional conflicts only serves to escalate the violence, prolong the fighting, and stir feelings of ill will toward America.

Mr. Speaker, I've said this before—we have no friends in these fights.

We must get over the tired and fallacious notion that the enemies of our enemies are our friends.

I urge the Administration to remember that it is the Congress—not the President—that has authority over matters of war and peace.

I strongly urge my colleagues to remember our constitutional obligation to consider the future untold costs of these so-called wars of choice and nation-building abroad.

Those monies and resources are urgently needed here at home—in reducing the deficit, rebuilding America—creating good-paying jobs restoring our roads and bridges—and reinvesting in our people and our future by renewing our support for education, basic research in science, medicine, technology, and clean energy.

**MEMBER ONLINE ALL-STAR
COMPETITION**

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have my office participate in the Democratic Whip Office's fifth annual "Member Online All-Star Competition." I applaud my colleagues for a friendly and spirited three week competition, and I congratulate the All-stars who led House Democrats in collectively acquiring over 213,000 new followers on social media.

I am always delighted to find new ways to engage my constituents and all Americans. To that end, my staff did an outstanding job making many new connections. I especially commend Ladan Ahmadi in my office for her tremendous effort to take us to the final round with our Vine video.

I thank the Democratic Whip for building on and fostering comity in the People's House. I know that we are all better off for it, and our work on the behalf of the American people is enhanced by it.

**THE TROUBLING CASE OF MERIAM
IBRAHIM**

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for weeks this spring, the world watched as Meriam Ibrahim Ishag, a pregnant Christian woman in Sudan, faced flogging and the death

penalty because her government would not accept that she had lived her life as a Christian and married a Christian man. Meriam has demonstrated both courage and grace under pressure—giving birth in jail in May while chained and caring for her two children, including her newborn, not only under restraints, but also without the normal amenities that any pregnant woman and nursing mother should expect.

The harsh application of Sharia law on non-Muslims was the trigger for a two-decade civil war in Sudan and the eventual secession of the South. Sudan is one of 20 countries in the world who have laws against apostasy—defined as the abandonment by an individual of their original religion. In Sudan, apostasy is effectively considered leaving the Muslim faith, particularly the interpretation of Islam followed by authorities. In Sudan, to leave the Muslim faith is an automatic death sentence. If you are considered an apostate, you cannot legally marry someone of another faith, and for this, Meriam also was charged with adultery and sentenced to flogging.

However, this story is not just about harshly applied religious and legal principles in violation of national and international law. Daniel Wani, Meriam's husband, is a Christian who is a dual American and South Sudanese citizen. He has lived in the United States for more than a decade. He married Meriam in late 2011, and they had a son a year later. Somehow, the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum could not find a way to help this American to get his family out of Sudan before a crisis developed, even after she was arrested and released last year in charges involving apostasy.

A hearing that I recently convened was intended to examine the facts as we know them to determine how strictly applied rules almost led to the officially sanctioned beating and execution of a young woman who has lived as a Christian all her life, but who has now been told that she has no right to choose her religious belief.

This hearing was originally supposed to take place in June, but at the urging of both the U.S. Government and Sudanese officials, we postponed it to allow for quiet diplomacy to take place. However, prior to the hearing, Meriam's legal entanglements seem to be increasing rather than diminishing.

A Sudanese court initially ruled that the mere fact that her father was Muslim means that she should have been raised as a Muslim. She was given three days to convert to Islam, but she told authorities she would not abandon her Christian faith. Her refusal to leave the faith she had practiced her entire life led to her being in mortal fear for her life.

Fortunately, a Sudanese appeals court believed that she considered herself Christian and overturned her conviction on apostasy and adultery charges. However, members of her family have appealed the overturning of her conviction. Meanwhile, the Government of Sudan rearrested Meriam for using South Sudanese documents in an attempt to leave the country, and while she was released on bail. Fortunately, she was able to leave Sudan last week.

We cannot be absolutely certain of the exact chain of events that led to the situation that Meriam was in prior to her release. The

Department of State understandably declined to testify last week because of the sensitive nature of the then ongoing efforts to end the matter satisfactorily. Daniel and Meriam were still in Sudan at that point. Daniel was free to leave with his children, but he chose, of course, to stay with his wife, until she too could leave with her family.

Since Meriam's conviction in May, a bipartisan, bicameral Congressional coalition worked to undo the harsh penalties for her under the apostasy and adultery laws and secure her family's repatriation to the United States. Contact was made with Daniel, as well as the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum and the Sudan embassy in Washington. Eventually, the headquarters offices of both the State Department and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services got involved.

Yet one wonders why this matter had to come to a crisis stage before a means could be found to avoid what now seems to have been an inevitable outcome in this case. Daniel told congressional staff that he sought help from the U.S. Embassy in Khartoum but was told that he should seek an attorney since the situation was mostly focused on his wife, who was not an American. This was the advice he received even when he was arrested and had his passport seized. An American citizen should expect more from his government's representatives in a foreign country when that country's government has taken action against them.

Under the principles of natural law, which are the basis of our governing documents and those of countries around the world, there are certain inalienable rights endowed by Our Creator. The decision on how to worship Our Creator is one of them.

Elements in Sudan's Islamic clergy and in the government interpret the Koran to give them license to tell people how they will live out their faith whether they consider themselves Muslim or not. In Meriam's case, her father has been absent from her life since she was a small child. Her Christian mother raised her as a Christian.

Sadly, Meriam is not the only Sudanese who chose differently on the matter of faith only to be faced with a death sentence for that choice. Sudanese civil activist Mahmud Muhamud Taha was arrested and charged with apostasy in 1984 for his efforts to end Sharia law in Sudan. He was subsequently executed.

In some countries, Christian converts have been forced to renounce their faith and conform to the version of Islam favored by the government of the day. Some of these countries have constitutions that ostensibly guarantee religious freedom even as they may also have laws that actually contradict those rights. Except for Malaysia, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, the other 15 countries including Sudan, have signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guaranteeing freedoms for their citizens.

Article 18 of that document enshrines "the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." Speaking of the rights of the individual, that article also forbids "coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. Article 18

also guarantees "the freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching."

The current report by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, or USCIRF, cites Sudan as a "country of particular concern" due to its government engaging in "systematic, ongoing and egregious violations of freedom of religion or belief." According to USCIRF, Sudan is the world's most violent abuser of the right to freedom of religion or belief.

USCIRF's Zudhi Jasser recommended in his testimony that not only should the U.S. Government take appropriate actions against Sudan as detailed in the International Religious Freedom Act, but that our government should also make religious freedom and human rights a centerpiece of U.S.-Sudan bilateral relations.

The troubling case of Meriam Ibrahim Ishag should warn of future incidents in which those who do not believe in Islam as defined by a government are persecuted or placed in fear of death or torture.

THE RETIREMENT OF CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT WENDELL L. PEACOCK

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Chief Master Sergeant Wendell L. Peacock of the 94th Airlift Wing at Dobbins Air Reserve Base on the occasion of his retirement.

Chief Peacock enlisted in the Air Force in 1981 and served eight years of active duty before joining the Air Force Reserve. He has held various assignments in the security forces career field. In 2007, he moved to Dobbins Air Reserve Base as a Security Forces Manager. Chief Peacock became the Command Chief Master Sergeant for the 94th Airlift Wing at Dobbins in May 2011.

In this position, Chief Peacock has been the principal advisor to the commander and staff. He has been responsible for influencing mission readiness, utilization, morale, and quality of life for more than 1,600 enlisted Airmen. He has also coordinated with staff agencies and assists with the implementation of wing policies.

I had the privilege of working alongside Chief Peacock as a chaplain in the 94th Air Wing and had a close relationship with him. He exemplifies the very best traits that can be found among the ranks of our Armed Forces. I stand with many Airmen at Dobbins who will miss the Chief and wish him all the best in his retirement.

HONORING CELANESE CORPORATION AND HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my fellow colleagues to join me in thanking and congratulating Celanese Corporation as they celebrate their 10 year partnership with the South Collin County Habitat for Humanity.

Over the past decade, Celanese and Habitat have changed countless lives and have improved the future for families in our communities. In fact, since 2005, Celanese has donated over \$400,000 and over 7,500 volunteer hours towards building 10 Habitat for Humanity Homes. This year, almost 300 volunteers devoted 2,500 hours to complete a home for a family over 14 weekends. They must be proud of these accomplishments, I sure am.

When the strength of corporations and the hearts of volunteers come together the results are limitless. The noble work done by these two groups is to be commended and emulated by all.

A strong relationship between outstanding companies and selfless volunteer organizations is one of the fundamental building blocks of a safe and prosperous community. I thank all of those involved for their hard work, dedication, and promise of a brighter future for North Texans.

I look at the extraordinary accomplishments over the past 10 years, and can't help but look forward to the next 10 years. I'm confident that your hard-work, generosity, and compassion will continue to guide you and lead you to continued success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Celanese for their dedication to enhancing the lives of Collin County families. It is an honor and a privilege to represent the Celanese Corporation and its numerous employees in the United States Congress. God bless you. I salute you.

CONGRATULATING JOHN HANCOCK COLLEGE PREP HIGH SCHOOL ON THEIR AWARD AT THE 2014 MATE INTERNATIONAL REMOTELY OPERATED VEHICLE COMPETITION

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Hancock College Prep High School and their Underwater Robotics team on their award in the 2014 MATE International Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) Competition. I appreciate all of the hard work and dedication the team members have put in to build their ROV and would like to congratulate them on this tremendous accomplishment.

The Marine Advanced Technology Education (MATE) Center created the ROV competition in partnership with the Marine Technology Society ROV Committee to encourage

students to excel in mathematics and science and to pursue careers in these fields. The MATE competition brings together K-12, community college, and university students from all over the world to design and build ROVs based on scenarios from the ocean workplace. In addition to engineering their ROVs, students were required to create technical reports and presentations to be delivered to competition judges.

In June, John Hancock College Prep High School traveled to Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary in Alpena, MI after advancing from the Midwest regional. In competition with 29 other teams, they were awarded the "Biggest Bang for Buck Award" in the Ranger category for spending the least amount of money on a vehicle that performed exceptionally. Their underwater ROV, the "Aquatic Eagle", was designed to be a low-cost option for shipwreck and science investigations, as well as for conservation efforts. It was equipped with a camera, four motors, two hooks, and flotation devices. This is the first year that John Hancock College Prep High School has competed in the MATE contest.

The team included Hancock seniors Irving Alamilla, Jesus Caballero, Vincent Calderon, and Marisol Ramirez as well as juniors Carlos Barrios, Ivan Lopez, and Jennifer Mondragon. Ms. Jennifer McConnell Stites, a science teacher at John Hancock College Prep, was a mentor to the team.

John Hancock College Prep High School is a high school focused on college preparation, community service, and leadership. The school opened in 1999 and is located in the Third Congressional District on the Southwest Side of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating John Hancock College Prep High School on their remarkable achievement and I wish them the best in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF RONALD W.
WALKER

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ronald W. Walker of Piperton, Tennessee. Today, Mr. Walker retires from the Federal Aviation Administration as a Supervisory Air Traffic Control Specialist after 32 years, 7 months, and 2 days of faithful service to the people of the United States of America and the Memphis Air Route Traffic Control Center.

I thank Mr. Walker for his service, and I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

IN APPRECIATION OF EARL F.
BROWN, JR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina today is giving loving recognition and appreciation for Earl F. Brown, Jr.

His achievements are recognized with the article of July 24, 2014, by Jason Old for WIS television, and the obituary of July 30, 2014, in The State newspaper.

(WIS)—Earl F. Brown, a longtime community servant, has died at the age of 82. Brown was most recently Congressman Joe Wilson's deputy district director. He worked in the Second Congressional District Midlands office for 11 years. "This is a time to recognize an appreciated Patriot of our State," said Wilson. "From his Army service, his Columbia Rotary Club dedication, to rising to being Director of the Human Affairs Commission to the Congressional Office, Earl was driven by his love of people." Brown served as chairman of the Richland County Airport Commission among other public service positions with several groups including the Riverbanks Park Commission, Central Midlands Regional Council, SC Human Affairs Commission and others. He was also an active member of numerous organizations including the Columbia Rotary Club, Columbia Urban League, NAACP, National Teachers Association, and United Way of the Midlands. "His ready smile and can do attitude will be sorely missed by those who knew and served with him," said Jim Hamilton, former airport manager of Jim Hamilton—L.B. Owens Airport. Brown is a graduate of Savannah State College, Benedict College and University of South Carolina's Criminal Justice Masters Program. He served in the U.S. Army and also worked as a public school teacher. His daughter Kim says her father was active in the community well into his retirement and wants people to know Brown believed it's never too late to get involved. "His loss is personal to the Wilson Family where four generations have affectionately identified him as 'Uncle Earl', a tradition that started with the births of our four grandchildren at Lexington Medical Center as Earl was always the first visitor bringing flowers," said Wilson. "Our sympathy to his daughter Kim, son Felton, and his beloved church family at Brookland Baptist Church," said Wilson. Brown's funeral will be Thursday, July 31 at 12 noon at Brookland Baptist Church. He will be buried at the National Cemetery at Fort Jackson.

Obituary of July 30, 2014, in the State newspaper.

(The State) Earl Felton Brown, Jr. COLUMBIA.—Funeral services for Mr. Earl Felton Brown, Jr. will be held Thursday at 12:00 noon, at the Brookland Baptist Church, with burial and military honors in the Ft. Jackson National Cemetery. A family visitation will be held this evening beginning at 6:30 p.m., at the Leevy's Funeral Home, Taylor Street Chapel. Born in Jacksonville, Florida, Mr. Brown graduated from Savannah State College and Benedict College. He completed additional studies at Duke University and the University of South Carolina School of Law, Court Administration Program. Throughout his distinguished career, he worked at W. A. Perry Middle School, Cheney State University, Vorhees College, the S.C. State Human Affairs Commission, and retired as the Deputy District Director of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. He served his country in the United States Army, was a dedicated member of Brookland Baptist Church and Kappa Alpha Psi, Fraternity, Inc. Surviving are his former wife of 25 years, Rudyne Davis Brown; children, Felton Earl Brown, II and Kim Lanette (Marshall) Brown-Jackson; grandchild, TaiLa Sacarian Brown; great-grand-

child, Juelz Domini Brown; his brother, Ernest Arnell (Beverly) Brown, sister, Doretha (Lester) Turner, other loving relatives and friends. In lieu of flowers donations may be made to the Brookland Foundation, 1066, Sunset Blvd., West Columbia, 29169.

At the services S.C. Attorney General Alan Wilson presented a eulogy on behalf of the appreciative Wilson family.

THE 2014 MEDICARE TRUSTEES REPORT

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Medicare Trustees' report projected that the Medicare Hospital Trust Fund would remain solvent until 2030, four years beyond last year's projection and 13 years longer than was projected in 2009.

In the 50 months since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, health care costs have risen at a slower rate than any comparable period in the last 50 years.

And per capita spending is projected to continue to grow slower than the overall economy during the coming years.

This is in part due to the reforms implemented in the Affordable Care Act.

We have made progress in reducing hospital readmissions, improving patient safety and transitioning to new payment models that reward quality and reduce costs.

Thanks to these important steps, the quality of care for Medicare beneficiaries has improved, along with the long-term solvency of Medicare.

For the second year in a row Medicare Part B premiums will not grow, meaning that seniors will be able to keep more of their annual Social Security COLA.

The ACA has also saved America's seniors over \$11.5 billion in prescription drug costs by improving drug benefits and closing the "donut hole."

I am proud to have played a significant role in the authorship of ACA and hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together and look for ways to further improve ACA and Medicare.

Now is the time to build on these successes and ensure all Americans have access to quality affordable care and that our health care system remains on a path to fiscal solvency.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL
JOSEPH E. MARTZ

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Lieutenant General Joseph E. Martz of the U.S. Army. With his retirement approaching, he will soon close out an incredible thirty-six years of service to his nation and begin the next chapter of his life.

LTG Martz currently serves as the Military Deputy for Budget to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller) and is responsible for the accountability and execution of the current fiscal year Army budget. He shoulders the responsibility of requesting and resourcing the appropriate funds to defend the nation. His profound knowledge is of immense value to the Army and our national security.

A native of New Kensington, Pennsylvania, LTG Martz enlisted in 1974 and later graduated from both the United States Military Academy and the U.S. Army Ranger School. His career of service took him from Germany to Korea to Kuwait. Whether commanding prestigious units or serving in key staff positions, he kept the needs of the mission first and always took care of his soldiers.

LTG Martz knows that a great warrior is also a great scholar. After earning a Master's in Education from the University of South Carolina, he served as a tactical officer and as the Executive Officer to the Commandant of Cadets at the United States Military Academy. While at the academy he influenced and groomed the future officers of the Army.

LTG Martz's great work has not gone unnoticed. He is a unique officer who excelled in his assignments and earned the Pace Award—a prestigious award that recognizes a single staff officer for his or her extraordinary achievements.

His devotion to country is matched only by his commitment to family. He is married to his lovely wife Barb and is the proud father of two sons—Josh and Tim, both of whom are graduates from the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Penn State.

Retirement is to be celebrated and enjoyed. It is not the end of a career, but rather the beginning of a new adventure. I commend LTG Martz for his selfless service to his nation and to the United States Army. His leadership has positively impacted soldiers and families across the world. I wish him and his family only the best in the years ahead.

HONORING REVEREND THADDEUS J. WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams, a native of Yazoo City, Mississippi.

Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams is married to the former Teresa L. Buckner and the father to four children: Sam, Dante, Philip, and Alexandria. He is a Licensed and Ordained Minister of the Gospel and currently serves as Minister of Membership Assimilation at Greater Fairview Baptist Church.

Reverend Williams is currently enrolled in Mississippi Baptist Seminary and Bible College pursuing a Master in Christian Education. He earned a B.S. degree in Business Administration from Mississippi Valley State University in 1987 and a Master of Public Administration from the University of Mississippi in 1991. He

is a graduate of the Mississippi Certified Public Manager Program, the John C. Stennis Institute of Government, Leadership Yazoo City's Inaugural Class in 1992, and the 2008 Inaugural Class of FOCUS—DMH's Succession Planning/Accelerated Leadership Development Program.

Reverend Williams organized and has facilitated T and T (Thad and Teresa) Food/Outreach Ministry since 2000 where they have received both national and local recognition for their service to the community including the 2014 "WJTV Jefferson Award" and the 2013 Southern Christian Services "Hands of Providence Award."

Reverend Williams has served as Chaplain for the Mississippi Valley State University National Alumni Association, employed with the State of Mississippi since 1992 and currently with Mississippi Department of Mental Health's Central Office where he was voted by his peers as the 2012 Employee of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BETTY LOU LAVAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Betty Lou Laval, who passed away on June 27, 2014, at the age of 79. Betty Lou's optimism and appreciation for life will be missed greatly by all who had the pleasure of knowing her.

Betty Lou spent most of her life in Fresno, California. She met her future husband, Claude Laval III, in kindergarten at Heaton Elementary School. For a short time, she left Fresno and attended the University of Southern California on a full scholarship. Betty Lou was a very active member of the Delta Gamma Sorority and recently attended their 50th reunion. She adored her alma mater and was one of the university's greatest supporters.

Betty Lou and Claude were married for 57 years. They raised two daughters: Melinda and Luann. Family was most important to Betty Lou. Her children and grandchildren—Nicholas, Chase, and Ellery—took priority over everything else in her life. Betty Lou will be greatly missed by Claude, her daughters, grandchildren, and many nieces, nephews, and relatives.

Staying involved in the community was always very important to Betty Lou. She was an active member of the Junior League of Fresno and served on the Board of Trustees for Children's Hospital Central California. She was also a dedicated member of La Feliz Guild for over 40 years.

One of Betty Lou's greatest passions was music, and she was a very talented musician. Betty Lou could play any string instrument and especially loved the banjo and ukulele. In addition to her appreciation for music, Betty Lou also enjoyed traveling with Claude. They visited many different countries together, making friends from all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the life of Betty Lou Laval. Betty Lou will be remembered as someone who always brought joy to others, and her commitment and dedication to the community she loved dearly will never be forgotten.

TONY GELDENS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Tony Geldens is known locally in Kingwood, Texas for being a community and political activist and strong patriot. There is much more of a heroic story to tell.

It gives me great honor to tell you about Tony Geldens' courageous account of resistance under Nazi Germany's control of the Netherlands. Throughout World War Two, Tony courageously fought Hitler's Nazis as a member of the Dutch Underground. He helped to feed, hide, and protect Dutch Jews.

Born in the 1920s, Tony grew up in Hertogenbosch, Netherlands where his dad owned a brick factory. Like most of the world in the 1930s, the Netherlands suffered from a Depression.

Tony grew up belonging to the Boy Scouts, like most Dutch teenagers, camping with fellow Scouts, riding bicycles along canals and by old brick buildings. Tony remembers a close circle of friends consisting of both Christians and Jews. After school, like most young boys, they all enjoyed hanging out together.

However, on May 10, 1940, most of Tony's world suddenly changed. Sixteen year old Tony was camping in the woods, close to his dad's factory, when without warning the German Army invaded the Netherlands. His dad came and retrieved Tony from his camping site, and the family quickly evacuated to their home ahead of the invading forces. The Dutch resistance held out for three days before surrendering; marking the beginning of the Nazi Germany's occupation of the Netherlands.

The Nazi occupiers soon imposed anti-Jewish measures on all Dutch Jews. As was throughout Nazi Germany, Dutch Jews were required to wear a yellow Star of David at all times. Strict curfews were enforced, Jews could not own businesses, and students were forced to transfer to segregated Jewish schools.

In January 1941, Hitler required all Jews to register themselves as Jews. A total of nearly 160,000 Jews in the Netherlands registered. They were issued ID cards stamped with the letter "J" for Jew.

Unlike many, Tony remained in the Netherlands during World War Two, even after having the opportunity to leave. Remaining because he felt compelled to stay and fight against the injustices occurring in his country. After Germany invaded, he withdrew from high school due to the war, and then much later attended Architecture school in Tilburg, Netherlands. It was there he met his wife, Anna.

As time went on, the harshness of the Nazi occupation grew. Notice was sent to all Dutch

Jews that they would be shipped to work in Germany—forced labor.

Tony was outraged towards the Nazi's treatment of Jews, he and fellow Scouts decided to join the Dutch Resistance effort. Although, the Nazis had immediately disbanded the Boy Scouts, Tony and his friends would always remember the Scout promise, to do their best to do their duty to God and Country; and to other people.

Under Nazi control, resistance was forbidden and often quite dangerous. All resistance happened illegally and occupiers were ruthless.

Captured members of The Dutch Underground were usually shot, imprisoned, or sent to concentration camps.

Nonetheless, Tony and his loyal band of Scouts were not deterred from joining the resistance movement.

Without an organized leader, Tony began a covert four year fight against the Nazis, saving Jews from starvation, torture, imprisonment, and death.

Like a war time Robin Hood, Tony fed hundreds of Jews by holding up German food stamp offices to obtaining food ration books. Drawing from his hobby building radios, he also operated a radio transmitter which transmitted to England information about downed British pilots and Nazi movements.

He would also help downed allied pilots by hiding them among different homes of Dutch citizens until they were able to reach safety in France.

As a result of his actions, he was arrested and imprisoned numerous times. When imprisoned, the Nazis beat and tortured him for information concerning the Dutch resistance cells, or Dutch Jews.

Several times they administered "truth serum"—it never worked! Sometimes they let him go and sometimes he escaped—just to be rearrested again. The last few days before the war ended were the hardest for Tony. One day, Tony came home and discovered an empty house. He ran next door to his priest to find answers. After investigating, the priest informed Tony that the Nazis were holding his family and they would give him three days to turn himself in.

After the third day, Nazis shot his mother first, then his sisters and then his father.

Wanted posters with Tony's picture began to be circulated on trees around Hertogenbosch. In order to save his family, Tony resolved to turn himself in to the authorities. He said his goodbyes to his priest, friends and family. He hid at a bombed out rail road station; sleeping between the railroad ties. On his way to turn himself in, he saw the Canadian Red Cross working the area.

According to Tony the hardest moment throughout everything, was to see liberators but knew he had to turn himself into the Nazis.

Halfway during his trial, shooting broke out between the Canadian soldiers and the Nazi police.

Once again, Tony was able to escape. However, while Tony was at his trial, German Nazis had evacuated his family along with hundreds of Dutch Resistance citizens thirty miles away.

With the intentions of murdering the resistance fighters, the Nazis put them in five dif-

ferent buildings and subsequently blew up the buildings, including city hall. Miraculously, his family was at the end of the line going into the building and unbeknownst to the Nazi's they hadn't entered before it was demolished. Unlike so many others, they survived.

Soon after, the Netherlands was liberated. At this point however, they thought Tony was dead. Imagine the Geldens reunion when they learned they all had survived.

During World War II, the Nazis deported 107,000 Dutch Jews to concentration camps. Only 5,200 survived. The Dutch Underground helped hide 25,000 to 30,000 Jews. Two-thirds of Dutch Jews in hiding survived the war. Less than 25 percent of Dutch Jews survived the Holocaust.

Tony and thousands like him put his life on the line for freedom. He saw the concentration camps and the victims of the Nazis. He saw friends murdered.

He saw incredible numbers of new graves throughout Holland. But like so many of his generation, he never discusses the details. He does not see himself as a hero; oftentimes the greatest acts of heroism and courage are the ones that go most unnoticed.

After the liberation of the Netherlands, Tony became a successful architect. He stayed and helped rebuild his hometown and his country. Eventually, in 1967 he found his way to Texas, and became a United States citizen in 2000. He and his wife, Anna, raised five children in their home in Kingwood. He now loves this adopted country; and he loves Texas. Tony is a true patriot. He fought the good fight up until his death, July 29th, 2014. He was 90 years old.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize and honor my friend, Tony Geldens, for his part in saving Dutch Jews in World War Two. He was a person of great courage, dignity and compassion and his actions were truly heroic.

The city of Kingwood lost a tremendous man. Tony's selfless service truly made the world a better place. He leaves behind an amazing story, wonderful legacy and a grateful local and national community. I am proud to say I knew Mr. Gelden. He was one of Texas's best.

And that's just the way it is.

H.R. 4315, THE 21ST CENTURY ENDANGERED SPECIES TRANSPARENCY ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 4315, a package of bills that would weaken the process by which the Administration makes Endangered Species Act (ESA) determinations.

While H.R. 4315 is nothing more than a partisan talking point, it does raise an important debate about the need to reform our regulations to make them more performance-based. Instead of establishing specific rules that tell stakeholders how to achieve specific outcomes, our regulations should instead identify exactly what we want and allow for multiple

paths and discretion for achieving set outcomes. By holding local governments, states, and the private sector accountable, while allowing for flexibility, we can reduce unnecessary bureaucracy and make our regulations more efficient and effective without undercutting public and environmental protections.

The ESA has a clear intention of protecting threatened wildlife species and from 1973 to 2013, it has prevented extinction for 99% of species under its protection. H.R. 4315 does not improve the process, and only moves us away from achieving further wildlife protection and recovery goals.

While framed as a way to roll back red tape, this bill instead creates additional layers of bureaucracy through burdensome and unnecessary reporting requirements on the details of all ESA lawsuit expenditures made by the Department of Interior, the Forest Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Bonneville, Western Area, Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations. Given that our federal agencies are already resource-constrained, these requirements will only distract from the charge to protect threatened and endangered species.

The bill also downgrades the quality of science used in the ESA determination process, by defining all data provided by a State, Tribal or county government as the "best available" data without any review of whether or not it actually is the best data.

This legislation does not further the important goals of species recovery efforts. Congress should work to reform regulation in a way that helps agencies, Tribes, local government and private industry increase performance measures, not create additional bureaucracies and waste limited public resources. I oppose this legislation, yet another in a long series of bills passed by this Congress to undermine important environmental protections. I was disappointed to see it pass.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF VINCE AND PAT FOGLIA

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once said, "Commitment is what transforms a promise into a reality."

It's with these words in mind that I rise today to recognize Vince and Pat Foglia for their extraordinary spirit of generosity and commitment to people with disabilities in their community as manifested by their years of service and support of the work done by the Pioneer Center for Human Services in McHenry, Illinois.

On June 20, 2014, I was honored to salute them when they received the inaugural "Make Change" Award presented by the Center.

For years, Pioneer Center has lived out its mission of "empowering individuals to achieve their full potential." It engages people of all abilities throughout the community through innovative, effective, and compassionate services. This includes employing and finding meaningful job opportunities for exceptional

people to achieve individual and organizational excellence.

When Pioneer Center was in search of client work opportunities, it approached Vince and Pat, and in typical fashion their response went beyond expectations.

As chairman of the board of Sage Products, a global leader in the innovation and manufacture of disposable health care products, Vince understands the meaning of work to people with disabilities. He immediately agreed to partner with Pioneer Center and provide work for the clients.

Vince further "transformed a promise into a reality" by hiring Pioneer clients as employees of Sage. Vince and Pat take pride in knowing their employees personally—a reflection of their heartfelt compassion for helping others.

Vince and Pat also funded the client computer lab at Pioneer Center that included specialized equipment for people with disabilities.

But their benevolence isn't limited to providing opportunities and monetary support. In keeping with their passion and commitment to give back, Vince and Pat have made it a point to stay engaged with Pioneer Center seeking opportunities where they can meet whatever challenges confront Pioneer Center so that they can continue to make a difference in others' lives.

Vince and Pat, how fitting it is for you to be honored with the "Make Change" Award, for your acts of compassion and dedication to helping others have surely made an impactful change for those whose lives and circumstances you touch.

It is with great privilege and heartfelt appreciation that I take this opportunity to recognize you both for your work and charitable spirit.

Your commitment has indeed transformed the promise of hope into the reality of a better future for so many people. For that I wholeheartedly thank you and congratulate you on your well-deserved award.

HONORING LATONYA DENISE
COTTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a determined young lady, LaTonya Denise Cotton. Ms. Cotton has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to make a positive difference in her community.

LaTonya Denise Cotton, a resident of Anguilla, Mississippi, was born on January 29, 1976 to Diane Cotton and Tom Davis in Hollandale Mississippi. She is a graduate of Anguilla High School.

LaTonya is the author of a historical novel called "A Small Payton Place in a Town Called Anguilla". She has plans to make a movie based on the novel. LaTonya has served as a volunteer through the AmeriCorps program as a career trainer in Sharkey County.

LaTonya has been a devout member of Union Chapel Baptist Church in Anguilla, MS for thirty one years. She is the proud parent of

two girls, Dominique and Sumonia Cotton. She enjoys time with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. LaTonya Denise Cotton for her dedication to serving her community.

TRIBUTE TO GARY JOB CORPS
CENTER

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gary Job Corps Center for 50 years of providing successful service to the people of San Marcos, Texas.

Located on a campus of 1,000 acres at the former Gary Army Air Field, Gary Job Corps is the largest of 125 Job Corps campuses nationwide, enrolling a growing number of nearly 2,000 young men and women. The increasing number of enrollment at Gary Job Corps represents the fulfillment of President Johnson's 1964 promise he made while visiting the former Southwest Texas State University. President Johnson's promise was to develop a Job Corps camp to train young men and women in the skills that would allow them to contribute to their community and become leaders.

For 50 years, Gary Job Corps has continuously helped young men and women achieve their academic and professional dreams. In addition to providing vocational training for careers in health occupations, business, computers, cooking, driver's education, and numerous other industries, their alumni have continued their education to the student bodies of Texas State University, Alamo Community College, and other institutions of higher education.

Gary Job Corps has helped countless young Texans achieve their life goals, has helped bring economic growth, educational achievement, and the promise of a better future to Central Texas. I am happy to have this opportunity to congratulate Gary Job Corps on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, and I wish all of its staff and students many more years of success.

INTRODUCTION OF H. RES. 699

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H. Res. 699, Welcoming African leaders to the first United States-Africa Leaders' Summit and African trade ministers to the 13th Forum of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA).

At the start of the new millennium, the United States Congress enacted the African Growth and Opportunity Act—AGOA—with broad, bipartisan support and with a view to expanding growth and opportunity in Africa like never before. In this legislation, Congress called for the establishment of high-level dia-

logues, including regular meetings by the President with his African counterparts. Now, fourteen years later, that vision is coming true.

Next week, the largest delegation of African heads-of-state in United States history will make its way to the White House. This will truly be a great day for America and a great day for our friends and partners from across the African continent, and I take immense pleasure in welcoming this historic delegation to our nation's capital.

Africa has six of the ten fastest growing economies in the world, over one billion people, sixty percent of the world's uncultivated agricultural land, and is likely to replace China as the biggest contributor to the global workforce by 2050. The people of Africa share the hopes and aspirations of all Americans for peace and prosperity across both our lands, and they are committed to strengthening economic relations through mutually beneficial trade and investment opportunities which promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, stability, and the rule of law.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is one of those opportunities, and I would like to use this chance to emphasize the importance of renewing AGOA well before its expiration in September 2015. Since the passage of AGOA, U.S. exports to sub-Saharan Africa have increased from \$6.9 billion to \$23.9 billion, per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled, and U.S. investment in sub-Saharan Africa has increased six-fold.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, which already has broad, bipartisan support, recognizes the significant progress and hope that modern Africa represents today in global affairs and economic advancement with its booming demographics, increasing modernization, dynamic youth, and vast resources; and it acknowledges the many paths available for boosting cultural, trade, and economic relations and partnerships between the United States and Africa.

It is in the economic and national security interests of the United States to engage and compete in emerging African markets, to foster U.S.-Africa trade and investment, to support greater capacity building for Africa, and to invest in Africa's youth and emerging leaders. It is also in our national interest to advocate good governance, a respect for human rights and constitutional term limits, and support for civil society organizations which contribute to enduring economic and social development.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution demonstrates that the United States Congress stands beside Africa in promoting peace and prosperity on both sides of the Atlantic. I look forward to your timely support of H. Res. 699 on the eve of the United States-Africa Leaders' Summit, as we prepare to welcome our African friends and partners to this nation's great capital for a truly historic occasion. Thank you very much.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STARTUP
ACT OF 2014**HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with Mr. VALADAO of California, introduced the bipartisan Startup Act of 2014. The Startup Act provides immigrant entrepreneurs and foreign graduates of U.S. universities with the opportunity to appeal and extend their visa by two years on the condition that they secure financing from a U.S. investor and demonstrate the ability to create jobs and bolster the U.S. economy.

If they are able to demonstrate success, by securing additional funding, generating revenue and creating jobs, they would be eligible for legal permanent residency, enabling them to continue to create more American jobs, expand and improve their business, and reinvigorate the United States as the land of opportunity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

Our history as a nation has been defined by immigrant innovators, pioneers, and entrepreneurs. Many of the world's best and brightest minds come to this country seeking the freedom and resources necessary to turn their ideas into successful businesses. Transformative U.S. companies including Google, Yahoo, Pfizer, Intel and eBay all began as startups founded by immigrants.

Today, foreign born entrepreneurs come to the United States, graduate from our universities and start businesses on our soil, only to find that our country's archaic, complex visa restrictions make it difficult for them to stay in this country and continue to develop their business, contribute to our economy, and create American jobs.

This places us at a competitive disadvantage at a time when our foreign competitors are catching up. For example, in 2009 foreign innovators were awarded more patents than U.S. inventors for the first time; whereas a decade ago the U.S. held 57 percent of all patents worldwide.

With two Fortune 500 companies headquartered in Phoenix, Arizona, it's easy to see the benefits of immigrant innovators in my home state. Freeport-McMoRan is a leading natural resource company which employs thousands of Arizonans. Avnet Inc. is another innovative Phoenix based company and one of the largest distributors of electronic components, computer products, and embedded technology.

We also have a multitude of smaller startups founded by foreign entrepreneurs. Sumiko Glenn emigrated from Japan and after graduating from Texas Tech University, founded her own tax consulting firm, Glenn Consulting LLC, in Mesa, Arizona. Gelie Akhenblit left Moldova with her family to come to Arizona, where her later studies in Communication at Arizona State University led her to launch NetworkingPhoenix.com as a way to fill the advertising needs of our state through social media. In the state of Arizona, immigrants make up 13.4 percent of population; own 19.6 percent of businesses, and start 31.5 percent of new businesses.

If we are going to protect America's position as the global leader in innovation, we must ensure that tomorrow's entrepreneurs have every opportunity to build and develop their ideas on American soil. The Startup Act of 2014 will create high-wage jobs here in the United States, spur private investment and economic growth, and help ensure that America remains globally competitive. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF VIRGINIA
LEE ROSE**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Virginia Lee Rose. Virginia was truly a pillar in the Madera community. Her time and energy spent to better the lives of individuals throughout the region will always be remembered.

Virginia was born on September 27, 1934, in Rayville, Louisiana. She attended Merritt College in Oakland, California where she received an Associate's Degree. After graduating, Virginia worked as a Probation Aide with the Alameda County Probation Department.

In 1953, Virginia moved to Madera, California. She and her husband, John, built a very nice life together and raised two beautiful daughters, Margaret and Jacklyn.

Virginia's philanthropic efforts and hard work were crucial to the development of numerous public, private, and nonprofit organizations in Madera County. Some of these organizations include the Madera County Chamber of Commerce Crime Prevention Commission, the Madera County Cultural Diversity Committee, and the Interagency Child and Youth Services Council. Virginia volunteered with over 15 organizations throughout the community, demonstrating her dedication to improve the lives of residents in Madera.

Virginia's good work and efforts never went unnoticed. She was honored with numerous awards from the community, including: the Martin Luther King Humanitarian Award, the Victim Services Volunteer of the Year award, and the Golden Apple Award from the Mariposa/Madera Chapter of the Association of California School Administrations. Additionally, Madera Community Hospital recognized Virginia for dedicating 15 years of service to the hospital.

Virginia will be greatly missed by John, Margaret, Jacklyn, her granddaughters, Shanel, LeeAnn, and Amanda, and many relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to honor the life of Virginia Lee Rose, an individual who dedicated her life to improving the lives of others. Her presence will undoubtedly be missed, but her impact and influence in the community she loved dearly will never be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. OSCAR
JESUS CANTU**HON. FILEMON VELA**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Oscar Jesus Cantu, a championship boxer from Kingsville, Texas.

Oscar is a lifelong resident of Kingsville, Texas and has been boxing since the age of eight at Kingsville Boxing Club. In 2009, Oscar graduated from H.M. King High School with honors and continued his education at Texas A&M University—Kingsville.

In 2012, Oscar was an alternate on the U.S. Olympic boxing team. He holds the World Boxing Council's USNBC Title won in Kingsville, Texas on March 22, 2014 and is currently ranked within the top one hundred boxers in the super-flyweight class by the International Boxing Organization.

Oscar actively gives back to his Kingsville community and manages an organization named "I Am Second," which encourages students to avoid destructive behaviors and find hope, peace, and fulfillment. Additionally, he serves as a role model to children by volunteering as a boxing coach at the Kingsville Boxing Club.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor Mr. Oscar Jesus Cantu and his contributions to the sport of boxing. Further, I appreciate you joining me in recognizing his contributions to Kingsville, Texas.

HONORING MRS. MARY LEE
TAYLOR**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former educator and longtime community activist from Tallahatchie County, MS, Mrs. Mary Lee Taylor.

Mrs. Taylor is 101 years old. She was born January 17, 1913 in Paynes, MS. Her years have been long and her mind is full of many stories her eyes have seen. I am talking about trying times, historical eras, blue skies, and personal achievements.

Mrs. Taylor is a 1936 graduate of the Tallahatchie County Training School. She went on to continue her education at Rust College in Holly Springs, MS and at the Mississippi Vocational College (now referred to as Mississippi Valley State University) in Itta Bena, MS. There she received her Bachelor of Science Degree.

Her age has not had an effect on her memory which brings smiles to her face. One of her personal achievements is that Mrs. Taylor is the only person in her family who received an education, according to her son, Mervyn Leon Taylor.

Mrs. Taylor taught 1st grade and adult education classes. Another achievement of Mrs. Taylor is that she was one of the original pioneers who led the effort to bring the Head

Start program to Charleston and across Tallahatchie County. Her list of fighting for the citizens of Tallahatchie County and surrounding communities goes on to include road improvements in the Black community, and bringing electricity and telephone service to the Black communities.

Her son, Mervyn, said his mother wasn't just active locally but also overseas. She traveled to poverty stricken areas on mission trips. Mrs. Taylor was also an active member in her church, St. Paul Christian Methodist Episcopal (C.M.E.) Church. She served as president of the local missionary, president of the Northern District Episcopal faith domination, and missionary president of the northern and southern Mississippi C.M.E. conferences.

Mrs. Taylor is the widow of the late Mr. Jimmy M. Taylor. She now lives in the Blue Cane Community, right outside of Charleston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Mary Lee Taylor a pioneer in her community who has helped to pave the way for others, like you and me, to come along.

"ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE" ENERGY APPROACH

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of an "all-of-the-above" energy approach for our nation's future. By taking this fair and reasonable approach to domestic energy exploration and production, we can properly care for the energy needs of families and businesses in New York, and across the country, while promoting American jobs, boosting national security and taking care of the environment.

Last year, 13 percent of electricity in the United States was produced from renewable sources, ranking us second in the world. This development has improved environmental quality while providing power to our nation's homes and businesses. Since I care about our fellow Americans health, this is the right thing to do. Additionally, the growing use of alternative and renewable fuels lower imports of foreign energy, improves our national security by reducing foreign energy consumption, and creates jobs for families across the country. In addition, clean natural gas development is bringing with it job growth and revitalizing manufacturing in towns and cities across America.

We can create jobs, provide quality energy to American businesses and families, care for the environment and support national security if we, as a nation, focus on an "all-of-the-above" energy approach.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF GENERAL WILLIAM SHELTON TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONSTITUENTS OF COLORADO'S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize General William L. Shelton, Commander of Air Force Space Command, on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Air Force.

Over the course of his 38-year career in the United States Air Force, General Shelton has served with great distinction and made countless sacrifices for our country. We commend his service; the sacrifices of his family in support of his service, including his wife Linda and their two children Sara and Joel; and must express our great appreciation for his leadership and devotion to our Nation's security.

A graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, General Shelton's selection as the Commander of Air Force Space Command in January 2011 culminates a distinguished career that began in 1976 at the Space and Missile Test Center at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California. In a career dedicated to the space enterprise, he commanded units at Falcon/Schriever, F.E. Warren, Offutt, Vandenberg, and Peterson Air Force Bases. He also provided valuable leadership and counsel to the Secretary of the Air Force, Chief of Staff of the Air Force and Joint Staff community during multiple Headquarters U.S. Air Force assignments. His positive leadership directly influenced countless men and women in our Armed Forces, and the enduring effects of his service to our country will be felt for years to come.

General Shelton has been a vigilant advocate for national security space programs. As the Commander of Air Force Space Command, he was responsible for organizing, training and equipping more than 40,000 military and civilian personnel to assure space and cyberspace capabilities for the Combatant Commands and for the Nation. While space and cyberspace capabilities clearly contribute to making our military unmatched in combat operations, they also have become essential in humanitarian and disaster relief efforts and are now vital assets for the global community and world economy. Through his leadership, we enjoy unprecedented success in the areas of space launch and acquisition which have led to greater mission assurance and cost savings across the Department of Defense. Further, his vision on future space capabilities will position us to make the changes necessary to provide resilient, capable and affordable space capabilities for the joint force and the Nation well into the future.

General Shelton established an unmatched and sustained level of success during a time of increasing challenges. He has worked closely with the House Armed Services Committee, and it has been my great pleasure to work with him in that important capacity. His frank and informed discussions on our space

systems, particularly the Global Positioning Satellite system, have helped leaders and citizens around the world appreciate the value and need to protect our Nation's foundational space capabilities. As a member of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, I am grateful for General Shelton's wise counsel and firm resolve to always do what is best for the Nation and for the Airmen he has led.

With nearly four decades of exemplary service to our Nation, General William L. Shelton deserves our most heartfelt gratitude and praise. Thank you, General Shelton—and best wishes to you and your family.

GRAYCE UYEHARA

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to remember a stalwart leader in the Japanese American community, Grayce Uyebara, who passed away recently on June 22nd.

Grayce was a leading force in organizing and drawing attention to the Redress campaign—with her well-known Action Alerts and grassroots mobilization efforts—during her tenure as the executive director of Japanese American Citizens League's Legislative Education Committee.

Her commitment to the Japanese American community, as well as this country more broadly, was a stunning display of courage and dedication in seeking justice for injustices throughout.

Her legacy will be one not only of justice and fairness, but of true leadership and perseverance.

HONORING TAKAYUKI KUBOTA

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Takayuki Kubota. For seventy-five years Mr. Kubota has been involved in the study and practice of the martial arts and is one of the most widely known and respected Karate masters in the United States.

Born on September 20, 1934 on the Japanese Island of Kyushu, Mr. Kubota's commitment and study of the martial arts began when he was four years old under the guidance and direction of his father. His dedication and daily training led to studying diverse styles of martial arts, which include incorporating the study of meditation and history, as well as the non-combative facets of the arts.

This dedication and passion inspired Mr. Kubota to start the International Karate Association with affiliated schools throughout the globe. Through his association, he teaches his own unique style of karate, known as Gosoko Ryu Karate, and is recognized around the world for its effectiveness.

Over the years, Mr. Kubota has had thousands of students from around the world come to learn and practice his karate style. These students are attracted to his versatility in his ways of teaching. In addition, he has trained a multitude of federal, state, law enforcement personnel, largely on a volunteer basis.

It is with sincere appreciation that I recognize Takayuki Kubota for the value he has contributed to his community through his dedication and teachings of the martial arts.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA'S INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES (IFAS) COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICES

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the University of Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) Cooperative Extension Services. IFAS is a highly successful federal-state-county partnership that has helped support Florida's farmers and agricultural industry for more than 100 years.

IFAS Extension was born from two important laws, the Morrill Act of 1862, which created Land-Grant universities throughout the country including the University of Florida, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which established the Cooperative Extension Service as a partnership between the Department of Agriculture and Land-Grant universities, jointly administered with state extension agents, and local county officials. In its early history, IFAS Extension was focused on increasing agricultural production and improving the lives of rural residents by tapping the latest information from the world class research being done at the University of Florida and Florida A&M University and converting it into practical knowledge that Floridians could use to improve agricultural techniques and home economics. These core extension services have helped serve millions of Floridians, and today IFAS operates 1,249 buildings, 3,622,462 gross square feet and 27,279 acres with locations in all 67 counties. Thanks to these efforts, the value-added contribution of IFAS Extension add more than \$100 billion to the state economy.

In addition to the core agricultural support programs, IFAS also contributes greatly to the development of Florida's youth through the 4-H program. The 4-H youth development programs began in 1909 with "corn clubs" for young men, which showed Florida's youth how to prepare and plant their fields with hybrid corn seed. Cash prizes were awarded to those who produced the most corn, with additional prizes for youth whose crops out-produced their parents. Two years later, in 1911, tomato clubs were established for young women to plant, harvest and can tomatoes. When the IFAS Extension Service was established in 1915, it took over administration of the clubs, and in 1924, the various clubs were officially

recognized as 4-H Clubs. As a former 4-H participant, I can attest to the incredible leadership and educational opportunities that 4-H provides to Florida's youth.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the University of Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) Cooperative Extension Services. Agriculture is a vital component of Florida's history and economic success, and I join Floridians in appreciation of the first-class work and effort that IFAS provides to support our state.

A TRIBUTE TO THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEST MIDLAND FAMILY CENTER

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the West Midland Family Center in commemoration of the organization's 40th anniversary.

The West Midland Family Center (WMFC) first opened its doors in 1974. Originally an abandoned school, in 1931, WMFC founder Phyllis Breedlove and several other dedicated community members began the transformation of what was to become a thriving community center. Founders had a vision for the community of Midland and its families where local citizens both young and old could come to learn, socialize, and participate in recreational activities.

It is this vision that has helped the West Midland Family Center continued to grow and expand throughout the years. By the generosity of multiple donors and foundations, the WMFC has added a 20,500 square foot building for classrooms, an outdoor pool, a playground, baseball diamonds, and a soccer field. These facilities have enriched the lives of thousands of children, adults, and families throughout the area. After the completion of its most recent expansion project, the WMFC now offers licensed childcare, family support, and afterschool programs. It is because of the guidance and support of countless volunteers and generous individuals that the Center continues to fulfill its mission today.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, it is with great honor that I commemorate this 40th anniversary of the West Midland Family Center and congratulate the organization for its many years of success within Midland County. I offer my deepest appreciation to the organization for all it has done and wish it continued success in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. LINDA ESCOBAR

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Linda Escobar for her many contributions to Tejano and Conjunto music.

Linda Escobar is a native of Alice, Texas. She and her father, noted conjunto pioneer Eligio Escobar, created an act that toured nationwide with a group of musicians that included Lucha Villa, Jose Alfredo Jimenez, Cantinflas, Los Relampagos and Freddie Fender.

While still a child in the late 1960s, Ms. Escobar composed and recorded the gold record "Frijolitos Pintos." After the death of her father in 1994, Ms. Escobar collaborated with Japanese accordionist Kenji "El Gato" Katsube, to create an electric mix of Asian/Tex-Mex music. Ms. Escobar was awarded Female Vocalist of the Year at the South Texas Conjunto Association Music Awards in both 2001 and 2003.

To pay tribute to her father and other veterans, Ms. Escobar founded "El Veterano Conjunto Festival," now in its 16th year of existence, which raises funds for the Eligio Escobar Scholarship Fund for talented young conjunto musicians.

In recognition of her distinguished musical career, she was inducted into the Tejano ROOTS Music Hall of Fame as well as the Texas Conjunto Music Hall of Fame. Additionally, she has received numerous other awards and accolades, including a key to the City of Alice.

Known as the First Lady of Conjunto Music, Ms. Escobar has been instrumental in promoting Conjunto Tejano and Tex-Mex music throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor Ms. Linda Escobar and her contributions to the Conjunto, Tejano and Tex-Mex genres. Further, I appreciate you joining me in recognizing her contributions to South Texas' cultural heritage.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL JOHN A. LEGGIERI FOR EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND TO OUR NATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Colonel John A. Leggieri for his exemplary dedication to duty and his service to the United States Army and to the United States of America. Colonel Leggieri will retire from the Army in December after serving almost half of his 30-year career in Congressional Liaison.

A native of Claverack, New York, Colonel John Leggieri was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant through Sienna College's ROTC program. Initially branched into Air Defense Artillery, John led Soldiers in demanding situations—first with the 2nd Infantry Division in Korea and then with the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He then transitioned to the Quartermaster Corps, where he led Soldiers for the next decade as a logistician in New York, Nebraska, Virginia, and Arkansas.

In 1999, John began the next phase of his career in Congressional Liaison. He initially

served as an Army Congressional Fellow for a year, working in a Member's office on Capitol Hill. For the next 14 years he served in positions of increasing responsibility in the critical, fast-paced arena of Congressional Liaison. He worked as Legislative Liaison Officer for the Chief of the Army Reserve and then as Congressional Budget Liaison Officer for the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller), working closely with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. There are few who know more about the Congressional budget process and none respected more. After his initial work with Congress, John was selected as a National Security Fellow and studied for a year at Harvard University's prestigious John F. Kennedy School of Government in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Colonel's next role with Congress was as Chief of Congressional Plans and Strategy for the Army's Chief of Legislative Liaison, where he directed the development of long-range Army wide legislative goals and objectives to help clearly communicate the Army's multi-billion dollar annual budget requests. Finally, Colonel Leggieri served as the Chief of Congressional Budget Liaison, where for the last three years he ensured the Army's budget positions were extremely well represented and articulated to the Congressional Appropriations Committees. John's tenure as the Chief of Congressional Budget Liaison coincided with a particularly challenging fiscal period for the Department of the Defense. Under his leadership, the Army's Congressional Budget Liaison Office navigated dramatically declining defense budgets as operations in Iraq and Afghanistan drew down and sequestration was implemented. In spite of these challenges, John was instrumental in ensuring that Congress was informed of the importance of key programs for the future of the Army.

In his many years in the liaison role, John helped showcase the Army's great accomplishments by leading countless high profile Congressional delegations to locations around the world, including Afghanistan, Bosnia, Egypt, Iraq, Kosovo, and innumerable other places where dedicated Americans serve our nation. These fact finding missions have been instrumental in improving the United States' foreign and defense policy.

Colonel Leggieri's leadership throughout his career positively impacted his Soldiers, peers, and superiors. His integrity, his exceptional work, and his sense of service are leaving our world improved and they have always served as an example for those he has commanded. To quote Charles Dickens, Colonel Leggieri is, "as good a friend, as good a master, and as good a man, as the good old city knew."

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in commending Colonel John Leggieri for over three decades of service to his country. We wish John, his wife Rebecca, herself a retired Army Lieutenant Colonel and now Professional Staff Member on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and their two children, Olivia and Gabriel, all the best.

HONORING CHIEF MASTER
SERGEANT RICHARD R. ONSGARD

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Chief Master Sergeant Richard R. Onsgard, Command Chief Sergeant for the 146th Airlift Wing for the Channel Islands Air National Guard Station, on the special occasion of his retirement from a distinguished and exemplary career.

Chief Onsgard has had a remarkable and admirable career enlisting in the Air National Guard in 1972, serving the Los Angeles Fire Department for 24 years and rising to the rank of Engineer, and being selected in 1996 as First Sergeant of the 115th Airlift Squadron. Answering his country's call of duty, Chief Onsgard was activated for Operation Noble Eagle and assigned to a Marine Expeditionary Force. In addition to serving on active duty for both Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, Chief Onsgard has supported missions for the National Guard Bureau in many areas including logistics and planning.

As the senior ranking enlisted member of the 146th Airlift Wing, Chief Onsgard has served as the Command Chief and the principal advisor to the wing commander on areas pertaining to the welfare, health, morale, progress, and efficient utilization of all the enlisted members assigned to the wing. In addition to his honorable service, Chief Onsgard has served as the representative to the wing commander and the enlisted force on committees, councils, boards, and has represented the enlisted force at military and civilian functions.

His work has earned him many accolades and awards that mirror his personal vigor and professional work ethic. These honors include the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal, the Air Force Achievement Medal, and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, which are but a few of the decorations that showcase his long career path of achievements.

Chief Onsgard's lifetime career of servant leadership and his many accomplishments are indicative of his unwavering commitment and dedication to his country and community. As this chapter in his career comes to an end, I want to express my sincere appreciation for Chief Onsgard's years of honorable and selfless service that greatly contributed to the success of the United States Air National Guard's mission.

For these reasons, I commend Chief Master Sergeant Richard Onsgard and wish him the best in all of his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF FORMER CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN TO ADVANCING OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tremendous contributions of our former colleague, Edith Starrett Green, who served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1955–1974, representing Oregon's 3rd District. During her tenure in the House, Mrs. Green was one of the nation's leading advocates for expanding access to higher education for all Americans and ensuring equal pay and opportunities for women and minorities.

Among her many accomplishments, Mrs. Green authored two landmark pieces of legislation that continue to shape the field of post-secondary education, including the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which authorized the use of Federal funds to expand and improve classrooms, libraries, and laboratories on college and university campuses. She also sponsored the Higher Education Act of 1965, which for the first time authorized Federal financial assistance for undergraduate students. President Lyndon Johnson referred to the Higher Education Facilities Act as "the greatest step forward in the field since the passage of the Land-Grant Act of 1862." Her commitment and success earned Mrs. Green the monikers "the Mother of Higher Education" and "Mrs. Education."

Mrs. Green, a native of South Dakota, also was concerned with the issues of equal opportunity and equal pay for women and minorities and advanced pioneering legislation addressing both issues. She was appointed to President John F. Kennedy's Commission on the Status of Women and chaired its Civil and Political Rights Committee in the early 1960s. She was the author of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which she helped push across the finish line eight years after first introducing it. She followed that by winning support for her amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1965 to expand the scope of the bill to include training opportunities for urban youth.

Mrs. Green was known as a shrewd legislator, once called a "bare-knuckle fighter" by one Congressional observer, and those skills helped her advance this and other issues close to her heart. She spent much of her public life working to eliminate the social and legal obstacles preventing women from achieving equality in post-secondary education.

Perhaps most notably, Mrs. Green was one of several members to introduce legislation prohibiting federally-funded colleges and universities from discriminating against women after the idea was born out of seven days of hearings she held on the topic in her role as Chairman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Higher Education. "If you can make every young girl know that there's no ceiling of expectations, that there is not height

to which that young girl cannot go, she'll aspire to that," Mrs. Green said in a 1978 interview. Ultimately, she collaborated with fellow Representative Patsy Mink, of Hawaii, and Senator Birch Bayh, of Indiana, on the groundbreaking Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, which opened new academic and athletic opportunities for women and has had a transformative effect on future generations of girls and women across America. Upon her retirement in December 1974, former New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan remarked that "she presided over the enactment of the most important education legislation in the history of the Republic, and I hope someone would say so." Mrs. Green returned to Oregon, where she taught college government classes and passed away in April 1987.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before and surely deserves repeating: The passionate and persistent efforts of Congresswoman Edith Green have forever transformed our modern classrooms, athletic fields, and employment settings for the better, and she deserves our sincere respect and gratitude. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the tremendous record of accomplishment compiled by our former colleague, Edith Starrett Green, and in thanking her family for their sacrifice and support of her career, which continues to help advance opportunities for so many others.

RECOGNIZING THE PAXTON LADY CATS AS CLASS 1A BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONS AND HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF COACH RANDY INFINGER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the First Congressional District of Florida's Paxton School girls basketball team for winning the Class 1A Basketball State Championship and to honor the life of Coach Randy Infinger.

The Paxton Lady Cats ended a spectacular season with a record of 26–3 to clinch this year's state championship. The final game was played against Chipley High School on February 20, 2014, in Lakeland, Florida, with the Lady Cats claiming victory with a score of 39–34. Many of the exceptional plays leading up to the victory occurred in the final quarter of this tightly contested championship game. Senior Emily Murray scored a game-high 20 points on the strength of four 3-pointers, including a game-winning 3 pointer with just 38 seconds left on the clock. With their victory, the Lady Cats secured Paxton's fifth girls basketball state championship, moving them into fifth place on the all-time Florida girls basketball championship list. Their latest state championship marks another proud moment in the sports history of Northwest Florida high school basketball.

Sadly, on February 23, 2014, four days after their extraordinary victory, the Paxton Lady

Cats and the entire Paxton community were struck by tragedy when long-time Paxton Assistant Coach Randy Infinger passed away. Throughout his dedicated 25-year career at Paxton School, Mr. Infinger coached several teams and touched the hearts of countless students and teachers. His contributions to Northwest Florida and Paxton School were truly exceptional, and his legacy will not be forgotten.

On behalf of the United States Congress and the citizens of Northwest Florida, I would like to honor and remember Coach Randy Infinger and congratulate players Katie Sebastian (#3), Quinn Williams (#4), Cortni McKee (#5), Faith Elmore (#11), Emily Murray (#12), Sidney Beck (#14), Genesis Long (#15), Lenora Dixon (#21), Allison Carnley (#22), Annie Myles (#23), Bethany Neale (#24), Cassidy Brazile (#25), and Kristen Corbett (#45); Head Coach, Steve Williams; Assistant Coach, Kim Corbett; Bookkeeper, Laurie Gilbert; Statistician, Connor Williams; Principal, Beth Tucker; Assistant Principal, Mitch Jackson; and Athletic Director, Steve Williams for their extraordinary victory. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to Paxton School and its talented athletes and coaches for their continued academic and athletic success, as well as our prayers and most sincere condolences to the family of Mr. Infinger and the entire Paxton community for their tremendous loss.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF
CARL COAN, MS, MPH

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Carl Coan on the end of his tenure as president and CEO of Los Angeles' Eisner Pediatric & Family Medical Center (EPFMC).

In his role as president and CEO since 1990, Mr. Coan has played a major role in expanding the medical center on every front. Annual patient visits have increased from 17,000 to 114,000. Annual operating revenue has gone from \$1.7 million to \$24 million. Three capital campaigns have raised a combined \$17.8 million. The EPFMC has expanded to nine locations, and has been designated as a Federally Qualified Health Center. Meanwhile, its number of services has ballooned to encompass such new areas as family health, round-the-clock hospital care, early child development, behavioral health, speech and occupational therapy, pharmacy, and case management. It has also come to feature such innovative care models as centering pregnancy prenatal care, a foster grandparent program, and an adolescent medicine clinic.

Mr. Coan has also facilitated a partnership between the University of Southern California's Keck School of Medicine of USC and the California Hospital Medical Center to establish and oversee the USC-Eisner Family Medicine Center at California Hospital, which serves as the main training site for the California Hospital Medical Center's Family Medicine Residency program.

Outside of EPFMC, Mr. Coan is a prominent leader in the local health community. He is the founder and past president of the Health Care L.A. IPA and the Southside Coalition of Community Health Centers, a current board member of the California Primary Care Association, and a former board member for the Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County and L.A. Care Health Plan.

Mr. Coan also meets regularly with government officials to speak about issues important to the EPFMC and other community health centers. I have personally met with him many times, and he has participated in my annual community health center roundtables alongside other health care providers from my district. I can attest that he is an excellent advocate for the vital role that community clinics and health centers play in our health care system. It is fitting that he received the California Primary Care Association's 2013 Clinical Legacy Award for his hard work in increasing awareness of the importance of these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, as Carl Coan leaves his position at the helm of EPFMC, I want to recognize his long and distinguished career of providing excellent and wide-ranging medical care to the people of Los Angeles. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the fine work he has done to make Los Angeles a healthier and happier place to live, and to wish him the very best as he moves on to new challenges.

DAN BERNSTEIN

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dan Bernstein, a columnist for The Press-Enterprise in the Inland Empire who recently retired.

Dan began his career thirty-eight years ago in 1976, and has covered business, government, and politics for our community. His column has informed, enlightened, and entertained his readers for decades.

His wife, who he calls his "unofficial editor-in-chief," pushed him to write a column in his voice, with his point of view. This established a connection and a bond with his readers that lasted for years, and I'm sure many in Riverside County would agree with me that his retirement from The Press-Enterprise creates a void—as his voice informatively and candidly filled the homes of the Inland Empire.

We will surely miss Mr. Bernstein and I congratulate his long-standing career.

I wish him the best of luck in retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to President Obama's visit to my district, I regrettably missed votes on July 28, 2014, July 29, 2014,

and July 30, 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 455, "yes" on rollcall 456, "yes" on rollcall 457, "no" on rollcall 458, "no" on rollcall 459, "yes" on rollcall 460, "yes" on rollcall 461, "yes" on rollcall 462, "no" on rollcall 463, "yes" on rollcall 464, "no" on rollcall 465, "no" on rollcall 466, "yes" on rollcall 467.

HONORING NICHOLAS COCOVES

HON. PATRICK MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nicholas Cocoves, who has recently achieved distinction as an Eagle Scout. To become an Eagle Scout, one must design and complete a service project that will benefit their surrounding community. For Nicholas's project, he honored American veterans by installing a bench, flagpole, and plaque in front of the Historic Cray House in downtown Stuart, Florida. Not only will the site serve as a beautiful welcome feature for visitors, it will enhance our community by serving as a constant symbol of reverence and gratitude for those who sacrificed their lives for our country.

The site will be dedicated to veterans who are Purple Heart recipients and revelation of the site will take place on August 6, the day before National Purple Heart Day. Creating the veterans site was also a part of Nicholas's project to make Martin County a Purple Heart county and Stuart a Purple Heart city.

I commend Nicholas for his dedication and commitment to obtaining this prestigious rank and I applaud him for his leadership and community service.

COMMENDING PINELLAS COUNTY JOB CORPS

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, Job Corps is the largest career technical training and education program for low-income students ages 16 through 24. There are five centers in Florida—Pinellas County, Jacksonville, Miami, Gainesville, and Homestead.

In Florida, approximately 27,000 students are trained annually. The contributions of Job Corps to these young men and women, the future of this community, cannot be overstated.

That is the essence of this country—men and women who did not believe there was a ceiling on their capacity to achieve greatness; men and women who reached higher, and wanted to do better.

Students who work to graduate from Job Corps are emulating and realizing those distinctly American values.

We have fallen on hard times—a lot of Americans are out of work, and people in all walks of life are feeling the impacts of an economy still on the rebound.

It is men and women like the graduates of Job Corps who will help bring this country

back to greatness and economic prosperity. We are a nation of doers, and we are at our best when we are creating things and ideas.

Hard work is a virtue that no one can take from anyone else. Each day, you decide what to give; you decide how hard you will work, how hard you will try.

"Pull yourself up by your bootstraps" is a phrase often used with respect to doing a job. It is not often so simple. To pull yourself up, you must be armed with the skills to do so; armed with the skills to succeed.

By coming here, to the Job Corps, each and every one of those young men and women chose to get those skills. That in and of itself is commendable—they made the choice to work to better themselves. That choice sets Job Corps graduates apart, and they are all extraordinary.

Today, I want to express its appreciation to the Pinellas County Center for their outstanding service in improving the lives of youth.

STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION— CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND SAFETY ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time to further address the epidemic of sexual assaults at our nation's college and university campuses. During some of the most formative years of their lives, students across the country should not have to live in fear of being stalked or abused. That is why a bipartisan group have come together to introduce the Campus Accountability and Safety Act that will address ambiguities in the law, strengthen protections and enforcement, and improve reporting by universities.

The changes included in the recent Violence Against Women Act reauthorization from the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act are starting to go into effect but more must be done. Rape is a horrific crime that exacts a physical and psychological toll on survivors. Women trying to get an education should not have to worry that they might also be victimized by predators on their campuses. This new legislation establishes new campus resources such as Confidential Advisors who will serve as a confidential resource and help coordinate support services; ensures specialized training and minimum standards for on-campus personnel who oversee sexual assault cases; creates new annual standardized, anonymous surveys that will be published online to help high school students and their parents make informed choices when comparing universities; requires a uniform process for campus disciplinary proceedings; no longer allows athletic departments or other subgroups to handle sexual violence complaints separately; and establishes penalties if schools do not comply with the legislation.

I applaud the work of our colleagues in the Senate on their comprehensive and bipartisan bill, and thank my colleagues, Reps. PATRICK MEEHAN, TED POE, CHERI BUSTOS, GWEN

MOORE, SUZANNE BONAMICI, SUSAN BROOKS, RENEE ELLMERS, LYNN JENKINS, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, KRISTI NOEM, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, TOM REED, ROBERT SCOTT, LOIS FRANKEL, DAVID JOYCE, ANN KUSTER, and GARY PETERS, for teaming up on this legislation. I am hopeful that the House will take up this effort in tandem with the Senate so that we can put a bill on the President's desk.

RICHARD TEGLEY

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I'm deeply saddened to have learned that Richard Tegley, a force in our community, passed away earlier this month.

Richard lived a remarkable life—first bravely serving his country in the Air Force for 22 years, then on to an illustrious career as a real estate broker in the Inland Empire, where he quickly became a leader in the community. For decades, Richard was an advocate for the people of Moreno Valley and Riverside, whom he cared so deeply for.

He was a trusted friend who helped ensure that I would be able to stand here in the House today. I always knew that I could turn to him to get a perspective on the issues facing our community, and I will miss his dedication and passion for others.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WORLD WAR II MERRILL'S MARAUDERS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the World War II Merrill's Marauders unit for their accomplishments in the China-Burma-India Theater of Operations. The 70th anniversary of the disbandment of this courageous and noble unit is on August 10, 2014.

In 1943, almost 3,000 U.S. Army volunteers from the jungles of Panama and Trinidad, Guadalcanal, New Guinea, New Georgia and the United States, landed in Bombay, India on October 31, 1943. On January 1, 1944, the unit was officially designated as the 5307th Composite Unit Provisional, code-named "Galahad," and later nicknamed Merrill's Marauders by the press after their commander, Gen. Frank D. Merrill. They were the first American ground troops to fight the Japanese in Asia.

Merrill's Marauders trained with Britain's Major General Orde Wingate's Chindits before beginning their history-making march in the China-Burma-India Theater, the "forgotten" WWII Theater. With only what they could carry on their backs or pack on mules, Merrill's Marauders walked farther, almost 1,000 miles, than any other WWII fighting force.

Trudging behind enemy lines up the foothills of the Himalayas and into the jungles of north-eastern Burma, Merrill's Marauders succeeded in

capturing the only all-weather airstrip at Myitkyina on May 17, 1944. This feat obliterated Japan's control of the sky and enabled the Allies to begin flying supplies into Burma so the Ledo and Burma roads could be connected to open up a crucial pathway into China. Although vastly outnumbered, Merrill's Marauders then went on to defeat the Japanese 18th Imperial Division in five major battles and thirty minor engagements.

The volunteers of this short-lived mission were considered "expendable" since a plan existed to get them into, but not out of, Burma. The unit was expected to have a casualty rate of more than 85 percent. Jungle diseases ravaged their numbers so only about 300 of the approximately 1,300 remaining Merrill's Marauders were still fit for combat when they reached their objective. They later went on to join replacements who continued to fight in Burma as the 475th Infantry, which became part of the Mars Task Force.

For their accomplishments in the China-Burma-India Theater of Operations, the Merrill's Marauders unit was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation. They also have the extremely rare distinction of every member of the unit receiving the Bronze Star Medal. There were also six Distinguished Service Crosses, four Legions of Merit and forty-four Silver Star Medals awarded. Twenty-five Merrill's Marauders have been inducted into the Army Ranger Hall of Fame.

The legacy of the Merrill's Marauders continues to be honored today by members of the 75th Ranger Regiment, headquartered at Fort Benning, Georgia, who wear the Marauder patch as their crest. Camp Frank D. Merrill, where the mountain phase of today's vigorous Army Ranger training takes place in north Georgia, is named in honor of the unit's commanding general.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to the Merrill's Marauders for their steadfast courage and commitment to serving our country during World War II. The Merrill's Marauders made significant contributions in safeguarding our liberties as Americans seventy years ago and we honor their outstanding valor and patriotic service that helped make America the great nation it is today.

CELEBRATING FLORENCE-FIRESTONE/WALNUT PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Florence-Firestone/Walnut Park Chamber of Commerce (FFWPCC) on its seventy-fifth anniversary. Ever since its incorporation in 1939, the Chamber has provided a forum for local merchants, business and property owners, professionals, residents, lenders, and teachers to work together in making the Florence-Firestone community a better place to do business. Since 2006, the Chamber has served the Walnut Park business community as well.

The Chamber was severely shaken by the 1992 Los Angeles riots, but it was kept afloat by Community Development Commission (CDC) funding secured by Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, who was then the Supervisor for Los Angeles County's Second District. This CDC funding has continued under current Second District Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas. The Chamber has also benefited from funding under a partnership with the County's First District and its Supervisor, Gloria Molina.

At present, the Chamber gets funding from the Community Development Block Grant program. With this funding, the Chamber supports business development through technical assistance, workshops, seminars, and individual consultations.

The Chamber also uses its community newsletter to spread word about business assistance programs, and to advocate on behalf of the businesses in the Florence-Firestone and Walnut Park Region. Florence-Firestone and Walnut Park are two of the local communities that have faced the most challenges during the recent recession, with unemployment rates exceeding 20 percent. The FFWPCC has aggressively confronted these challenges by seeking and identifying opportunities to enable the creation of new employment opportunities.

To this day, the FFWPCC serves its members by promoting their businesses' products and services and by protecting their interests at all levels of government. This was particularly evident in the Chamber's recent collaboration with Los Angeles County Supervisors and business and property owners to beautify the streetscapes in the business corridor linking the Florence-Firestone area to Walnut Park. The streetscape improvements have made the shopping community much more inviting, and have helped community members and visitors take pride in their walkable and sustainable community.

After this streetscape project was finished last year, the Chamber continued to tackle new challenges. It is now working on another beautification project in Walnut Park, with the help of Los Angeles County Supervisors. The Chamber has also brought new business opportunities to Walnut Park by organizing an annual Summer Fest in the community. Last year's event attracted over 50,000 people, and this year's attendance is expected to be even higher.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of its seventy-five years of faithful and diligent support of local businesses, I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing the Florence-Firestone/Walnut Park Chamber of Commerce for making Florence-Firestone and Walnut Park better places to work and live, and in wishing the Chamber many more years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LAKE DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL FIGHTING FALCONS 50TH SEASON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lake Dallas High School who will

be celebrating their 50th football season this year. The Fighting Falcons have played 494 games in their illustrious time with a winning record of 260-226-8. They have appeared in the playoffs 18 times throughout their victorious history.

I am proud to say that in 2002, Lake Dallas introduced a new football facility in Corinth that now holds 6,000 spectators. In 2008, Lake Dallas and Sherman scored 115 points in one game to tie a state record.

Impressively, the Fighting Falcons have also had notable college and NFL players. These include Dusty Dvoracek, James Franklin, Justin Hill, Graysen Schantz, Chase Baine, Daryl Williams, Dontonio Jordan, and Dalyn Williams.

On behalf of the 26th Congressional District, I offer my sincere congratulations to the Lake Dallas High School Fighting Falcons on their 50 years of teamwork, success and greatness. I wish them a bright future.

RECOGNIZING MILLER'S HEALTH SYSTEMS 50 YEARS IN BUSINESS

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate a local small business for 50 years of great service to Hoosiers all over Indiana. Miller's Health Systems is known throughout the state of Indiana for providing excellent services in: assisted living, rehabilitation, and nursing home care.

The business started by Wallace and Connie Miller in 1964 as Miller's Merry Manor nursing home on the outskirts of Warsaw. After the company was taken over by their son V. Richard Miller, the company has expanded to over 30 Miller's Merry Manors and 10 senior living facilities. With the multitude of facilities Miller's Health Systems has today, they have grown to over 3,000 employees. Their mission statement speaks to the importance of the Miller's Health Systems employees enjoying the work they do and helping them grow. The company has helped this happen by having Miller's Merry Manor 100 percent employee-owned. The Miller's commitment to service and their core principles of passion, integrity, stewardship, growth, and adaptation have helped Miller's Health Systems withstand the test of time.

As the Representative for the many employees and facilities for Miller's Health Systems it is with great honor I recognize the 50th anniversary of this great business. With the leadership of the Miller family and the passion of their employees, I have no doubt there will be many more celebrations to come. On behalf of Indiana's Second District, I am proud to recognize the last 50 years of Miller's Health Systems and wish them many more.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 2014, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall No. 468 due to a personal health matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of rollcall No. 468, H. Res. 676, to provide for the authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE KEVIN BURNHAM OF THE SPRINGFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, the Springfield, Massachusetts, Police Department said farewell to their longest serving officer when Kevin Burnham retired after 43 years and 2 months on the job. A highly respected professional, a popular colleague, and a dear friend to everyone on the force, Kevin relinquished his senior officer badge last week to Ruben Boerro following a time-honored tradition. For the first time since July of 1971, Detective Burnham would not be patrolling the streets of the city he loves.

Ask anyone in the department who their favorite co-worker was, and the reply would likely be Kevin Burnham. They admired his dedication, strength and courage. They enjoyed his sense of humor and the laughter that seemed to follow him everywhere. And his loyalty was unquestioned. At the end of the day, Kevin looked upon the Springfield Police Department as a band of brothers and sisters. To him, the force was a family working together to make our city a better place to live, work and raise our children.

From his early days as a rookie, it was obvious that Kevin was born to be a cop. He had the streets smarts necessary to be effective in law enforcement, but he also had compassion. Those two qualities were the reasons his career was so successful. Whether it was becoming one of the first detectives to work on the narcotics bureau, his service in both the uniform division and the crime prevention bureau, or the responsibility that came with the job of evidence officer, Kevin performed each task exceptionally. He was honest and trustworthy, and his fellow officers knew he had their back.

Being a police officer always comes with risks. And two years ago, one of his closest friends, Officer Kevin Ambrose, was killed in the line of duty. To Kevin Burnham, it was the lowest of low points. But with his trademark integrity and character, he led the funeral procession for his fallen friend along with nearly one thousand law enforcement officials from across the country. He helped turn a sad day

into a touching tribute to a lost comrade. That's the kind of person he is.

Kevin and Barbara Burnham have been great friends of mine for many years. They are good people and great fun. As Kevin begins his long overdue retirement, I want to wish him nothing but the very best. And on behalf of the United States of America, it gives me personal satisfaction to congratulate him on an extraordinary career serving and protecting the citizens of Springfield. Well done Detective Burnham.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARGARET EDGE CHALFANT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Margaret Edge Chalfant for a noteworthy career dedicated to the advancement of the arts. After almost a decade as Executive Director of the Greater Denton Arts Council (GDAC), Ms. Chalfant is retiring from her distinguished service at the helm of the non-profit organization.

Margaret Chalfant's successful leadership at the GDAC began in 2005; in that same year, she was selected to attend the Women's Leadership Summit in Washington, DC. During her GDAC tenure, she has expanded and enhanced its permanent collection, upgraded and updated the physical facilities, and highlighted the importance of the arts through education outreach to students from the elementary level through college. She instituted an After School Arts program for Denton ISD schools, hosted An Artistic Discovery—the 26th Congressional district's annual high school art contest, and collaborated with the University of North Texas and Texas Woman's University to initiate the Getting Started with the Arts program. Throughout her career she has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the arts, as well as engaging in multiple civic activities to benefit the Denton community and the North Texas region.

The sterling reputation of the Greater Denton Arts Council is a reflection of the outstanding administration of Ms. Chalfant, and her professional legacy will continue to benefit the citizens of Denton for years to come. I join her colleagues and the community in commending the Greater Denton Arts Council's Executive Director, Margaret Edge Chalfant, for her outstanding record and extend best wishes upon her retirement. It is my privilege to represent the City of Denton in the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE CHOCTAWHATCHEE CHEER-LEADERS AS 1A SMALL CO-ED DIVISION STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate the First Congressional

District of Florida's Choctawhatchee Senior High School Indians for winning the 1A Small Co-ed Division State title at the Florida High School Athletic Association Cheerleading State Championship on January 31, 2014 for the third year in a row.

Located in Fort Walton Beach, Florida, Choctawhatchee High School boasts an exceptional cheer squad, led by coaches Shaunice Clay and Hailey Looney. During the preliminaries, the squad ranked 1st out of a total of fourteen squads before claiming victory over Harmony High School and Gulf Breeze High School.

I commend the following young men and women of the squad for both challenging themselves and inspiring their fellow students and youth throughout our community: Jenna Angelos, Jean Bernier, Megan Bradley, Loren Burkett, Olivia Carr, Kacey Childers, Dani Connelly, Alexia Faustinella, Shayla Fish, Tiffany Fought, Zach Given, Anna Greene, Rielly Griggs, Holly King, Kerri Kriech, Amy LeMenager, Rachel Loughney, CJ McDonald, Emily McGaughy, Johnny Mundy, Temple Nichols, Ashley Oliver, Sydney Pattison, Allison Plantz, Storme Rynearson, Emory Shelton, Olivia Sims, Tristin Stevens, Mark Thomas Walker, Shane Wright, and Rachelle Wyatt. Choctawhatchee Senior High School's victory at the Florida High School Athletic Association Cheerleading State Championship is a true testament to the commitment and dedication of all the members of the squad, and it is a great reflection on Fort Walton Beach and the greater Northwest Florida community.

On behalf of the United States Congress, my wife Vicki and I congratulate the Indians for their extraordinary victory and wish them all the best for their continued success.

ON ADDRESSING THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS ON OUR BORDER

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support Comprehensive Immigration Reform, which would secure our borders, create a pathway to citizenship, and provides for electronic employment verification. I believe more than ever after having seen the humanitarian consequences of the crisis firsthand, we must act now. Having a broken system that is in dire need of reform only exacerbates the issue.

However, I oppose H.R. 5230, Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, and H.R. 5272, To prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes. These bills do not adequately address the problems in our immigration system or deal with the current influx of unaccompanied minors. These bills will also end protections that have provided relief to millions of people currently living in the U.S.

H.R. 5230 emasculates current anti-trafficking law, meant to protect minors from certain countries and allow them to apply for asylum in this country. The bill provides a fraction

of the \$3.7 billion requested by President Obama to address the humanitarian crisis at our border. The bill would likely produce simulated hearings with fast-track adjudication that mimics due process for unaccompanied minors.

H.R. 5272 eviscerates the vital Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which has provided much needed relief for millions of undocumented immigrants who arrived in this country as minors. DACA allows the Department of Homeland Security prosecutorial discretion towards some undocumented immigrants who immigrated to our nation as children not of their own volition.

Mr. Speaker, the humanitarian crisis caused by an influx of unaccompanied minors from mostly Central American countries with staggering crime rates has tested our nation's laws and values. We are a nation of laws but we are also a nation of values. We must treat all individuals, especially minors, in a way that is consistent with our values.

IS ANYBODY LISTENING?

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's USA Today, columnist Kirsten Powers raised an important question,

QUOTE: "Iraq's Christians are begging the world for help. Is anybody listening?" UNQUOTE.

Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh consecutive legislative day that I have come to House floor to ask that same question:

Is anybody listening?

Less than two weeks ago, on July 19, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, more commonly referred to as ISIS, ordered Christians to convert to Islam, pay taxes levied upon non-Muslims, or be killed.

In the region around Mosul—what we know as Nineveh in the Bible—there is not a single Christian left.

Think about that. There is not one Christian left in the ancient heart of Iraqi Christianity. A 2,000-year presence wiped away before our eyes in just a matter of weeks.

Yet President Obama has said nothing.

And Secretary of State Kerry has said nothing.

ISIS has driven people from their homes, taken their cars as they attempted to leave and stripped them of all their money and possessions.

We have heard accounts of ISIS terrorists cutting the fingers of people to steal their wedding rings.

Yet President Obama has said nothing.

And Secretary of State Kerry has said nothing.

Gruesome videos produced by ISIS are appearing on Internet showing beheadings and public displays of dismembered Christians. I couldn't even watch the video to the end; it was that grotesque.

Yet President Obama has said nothing.

And Secretary of State Kerry has said nothing.

The U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power—who made a name for herself denouncing the U.S. and other governments' failure to act in the face of genocide—also has been silent on these genocidal acts.

What Power famously labeled "A Problem from Hell" is now taking place in Iraq on her watch.

Yet she says nothing in her post at the UN in New York.

Perhaps this lack of action should not be surprising given that her boss, President Obama, has said nothing.

President Obama has had multiple opportunities to use his "bully pulpit" to raise global attention to this genocide.

But we have heard NOT ONE WORD on the situation of the Christians being driven out of Iraq.

Let me lay out what has happened in Iraq just in the last six weeks:

All of Christians in Mosul have fled to the north, to Alqosh, Dohuk and other Assyrian villages.

In nearby Qaraqosh, 50,000 Assyrian Christian residents have fled from fighting between ISIS and Kurds.

All Christian institutions in Mosul—all 45 churches monasteries and cemeteries—have been looted, destroyed, occupied, converted to mosques or shuttered.

All non-Sunni Muslim groups in Mosul—Shabaks, Yazidis and Turkmen—have been targeted by ISIS. Most have fled.

Water and electricity have been cut off by ISIS. The water shortage in the areas surrounding Mosul is now a full-blown crisis.

Mosul is now governed under Sharia law.

Congress is about to adjourn until after Labor Day. If the events of the last two months are any indication, one can only imagine the horrors that await over the next five weeks.

Absent urgent action what more will be on this list?

We cannot continue to sit back and watch these atrocities unfold.

President Obama, Secretary Kerry, Ambassador Power—before you take your summer vacations, you have a moral obligation to speak up.

Martin Luther King said QUOTE: "In the end, we will remember not the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends." UNQUOTE

President Obama, in your lifetime, books will be written on the end of Christianity in the Middle East.

History will acknowledge you and your administration's lack of will to do something—anything.

You have the power and the pulpit to do something before it is too late.

If you continue to do nothing, your silence will remain heavy on your conscious long after you leave office.

Mr. President, there are a number steps you can take right now that would make a difference—steps that don't require new funds or additional congressional action:

ONE. You can sign the bipartisan legislation approved by the House and Senate to create a special envoy to promote religious freedom in the Middle East that has been sitting on your desk this week. It is just waiting for your signature.

You can name someone to fill this post who can immediately deploy to the region to work with the Kurdish and Iraqi governments.

TWO. You can appoint someone in your administration to be the lead person coordinating all of the U.S. government resources necessary to stop this genocide.

THREE. You can publicly thank the Kurdish authorities for protecting the Christians and other religious minorities who have fled ISIS and found refuge in the Kurdish region;

FOUR. You can work with trusted NGO's—like Catholic Relief, Save the Children, UNICEF and others—who are already on the ground trying to help, but need U.S. assistance and leadership to help more people.

You can make sure they have the food, water, housing and medical resources to help the victims of this genocide; and

FIVE: You can direct the Secretary of State and USAID administrator to reprogram existing funds to provide these resources to trusted NGO's on the ground.

Mr. President, those are five simple steps you can do now and over the next five weeks that would make a difference.

All it takes is your interest and your leadership.

This April marked the 20th anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda.

One need only look at President Clinton's continued regret for his failure to act to stop the Rwandan genocide to see how President Obama and his administration will feel years from now for their failure to act.

Last year, Clinton said "If we'd gone in sooner, I believe we could have saved at least a third of the lives that were lost . . . it had an enduring impact on me."

They would do well to recall the words of Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel, who said: QUOTE: "We must take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented."

Mr. Speaker, I close with the words of German Lutheran pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who stood up to the tyranny and horror of Nazism, and said, QUOTE: "Silence in the face of evil is itself evil. Not to speak is to speak. Not to act is to act."

It's time to act, while there are still people left to save.

Listen to the words of Psalm 82:3-4:

Defend the weak and the fatherless; Uphold the cause of the poor and oppressed. Rescue the weak and the needy; Deliver them from the hand of the wicked."

Also, in the Old Testament in Ecclesiastes 4:1 it says,

"Again I looked and saw all the oppression that was taking place under the sun: I saw the tears of the oppressed—and they have no comforter; power was on the side of their oppressors—and they have no comforter."

Mr. President, I call on you to be on the side of the oppressed Christians.

SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN
SUPPORT FOR THE CHRISTIAN
COMMUNITY IN IRAQ

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last month, 55 of my colleagues and I sent a priority letter to President Obama urging him to actively prioritize security and humanitarian support for the Christian community in Iraq. We specifically warned him of the dangers and brutality of the terrorist group ISIS in Iraq who are now rampaging across Iraq and terrorizing the vulnerable Christian population.

In the letter, we specifically pointed out to Mr. Obama that QUOTE, "Parts of Syria and Iraq that have previously fallen under the rule of ISIS have witnessed summary execution, beheadings and even crucifixions." And that QUOTE, "Absent immediate action, we will most certainly witness the annihilation of an ancient faith community from the lands they've inhabited for centuries." UNQUOTE

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, President Obama—who once likened ISIS to a junior varsity basketball team—simply ignored us again, as he has done so many times before. And now ISIS, this "junior varsity basketball team", is beheading their way across Iraq and has declared that there would be QUOTE "nothing for [the Christians] but the sword" if they do not convert." Last week, ISIS torched a 1,800-year-old church in Mosul and ruthlessly destroyed the historic tomb of Jonah. Images of ISIS beheadings, crucifixions, rapes, torture and mass execution are all over the Internet and social media. Just this morning, I met with a group of NGOs based in Iraq who told me ISIS beheaded six Christians—then proceeded to play soccer with their decapitated heads.

This past Sunday, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no Mass in Mosul. The head of Iraq's largest Christian community said, "For the first time in the history of Iraq, Mosul is now empty of Christians."

Mr. Speaker, ISIS has systematically and insidiously targeted Iraq's ancient Christians, and they are now nearly extinct. It can rightly be called targeted religious cleansing, and it is a crime against humanity."

And yet, we hear not a word from the President of the United States when a Christian genocide is taking place at this very moment. And we have not heard one syllable about what his administration is doing or planning to do to relieve or protect persecuted Christians in Iraq.

So, on the floor of this house, I repeat the words we wrote in a letter to President Obama a month ago, QUOTE, "we urge you and your administration to urgently and actively engage with the Iraqi central government and the Kurdistan Regional Government to prioritize additional security support for these particularly vulnerable populations and provide emergency humanitarian assistance to those affected communities. Absent immediate action, we will most certainly witness the annihilation of an ancient faith community from the lands they've inhabited for centuries." UNQUOTE

Mr. Speaker, if President Obama continues to ignore this Christian Genocide in Iraq, his-

tory will record that it was Barack Obama who idly stood around and let it happen.

RECOGNIZING MR. FLOYD
BENNINGHOFF'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mr. Floyd Benninghoff, who reached the milestone of his 100th birthday on June 12th, 2014.

Mr. Benninghoff was born in Hamlet, IN as 1 of 9 brothers and sisters and spent most of his life as a Hoosier. He is the father to Ronald Benninghoff and Lynn Kline, a grandfather to 5 grandchildren and a great grandfather to 14. During World War II he served his country as an airplane technician, then spent the next several years as a delivery driver for the Jewel Tea Company before retiring from Sears. He is well known by his family and friends for his love of music and his guitar playing abilities.

I am honored to wish Mr. Floyd Benninghoff a very happy 100th birthday and to recognize his admirable life. On behalf of Indiana's Second District, I am proud to recognize Mr. Benninghoff's birthday and life and wish him good health and many more birthdays.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING
ACHIEVEMENT OF ESCAMBIA
HIGH SCHOOL NAVY JUNIOR RE-
SERVE OFFICERS TRAINING
CORPS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Escambia High School Navy Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (NJROTC) for placing first in this year's Navy League NJROTC drill team competition. This outstanding achievement is evidence of the hard work and dedication of the Escambia High NJROTC program.

After a year of three to four hour long practices after school, a combined 15,000 hours of community service required to satisfy NJROTC standards, and months of local and regional competitions, the "Gator Elite," as they're known, beat out more than 600 other NJROTC programs to achieve the highest honor and bring this prestigious recognition back to Northwest Florida.

In addition to the normal academic coursework, the members of Escambia High's NJROTC program were required to comply with rigorous procedures to maintain discipline through uniform inspections and strict grooming standards, while also mastering the core components of drill team exercises, through marching practice and adroit handling of rifles in showmanship fashion. The "Gator Elite" achieved these tasks with the highest degree of excellence, as evidenced by their first place performance at the NJROTC national championships.

On behalf of the United States Congress, it is my privilege to congratulate the Escambia High NJROTC "Gator Elite"—Corey Abercrombie, Joshua Aguilar, Alexander Apin, Nigel Archer-Shee, Alexis Cannon, Michael Cox, Faith Doby, Audrey Ferrand, Emerald Francis, Julia Freeman, Ruben Gardner Jr., Christopher Gibson, Cassandra Harrison, Katelin Hayes, Daniel Helms, Thalezondra Hill-Dowdy, Matthew Holmes, Brenda Jernigan, JoseRafael Kaibigan, Angelique Le, Jared Lyon, Jason Mitchell, Andrew Nicolle, Austin Odell, Jeremiah Renfro, Destiny Seladones, Jimmie Simmons, Alfonso Sosa, Antonio Stone, Brian Thompson, Kenny Tu, Alphonso Williams, Erik Williams, Nicholas Willig, Alex Wilson and Brieonna Wilson and their instructors, LCDR Eddie Thompson (USN, Ret.), SCPO Ruben Gardner (USN, Ret.), and SGTMAJ Andre Francis (USMC, Ret.). My wife Vicki joins me in wishing them all the best for continued success.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIE WILSON,
CHAIRMAN OF OMAR MEDICAL
SUPPLY COMPANY

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 31, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 27th, 2014, Dr. Willie Wilson celebrated the 27th anniversary of Singation, his nationally syndicated gospel television show at the Apostolic Pentecostal Church of Morgan Park, where Apostle William A. Ellis is Pastor and spiritual leader.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Dr. Wilson, not only for the longevity of this production, but also for his business success and for his humanitarian work with faith-based organizations.

Dr. Willie Wilson is no ordinary man. He is basically a man of great religious faith. Self educated, self made, high school dropout, multi millionaire business man, a great philanthropist who contributes somewhere in the area of a million dollars annually to small churches and provides financial support to many other charities.

In addition to running his businesses (Omar Medical Supply Company), he serves as Chairman and Chief Fundraiser for the Chicago Baptist Institute, a college level educational and training institute for clergy and lay individuals who want to learn how to more effectively practice Christian principles and practice in their everyday lives.

Dr. Wilson is well known for his hobby and passion for singing gospel music. On practically every Sunday afternoon, he, along with his gospel singing group and orchestra can be found at a small church singing gospel music, after which he always leaves a sizeable donation for the church.

A man among men, a giver from his heart, and a leader of leaders.

I commend and congratulate Dr. Willie Wilson as he and his friends celebrate 27 years of Singation.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF
JOHNPOL JONES

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Johnpaul Jones for his distinguished architecture, his commitment to honoring our natural world and cultures, and his accomplishments as a recipient of the 2013 National Humanities Medal.

A Bainbridge Island resident of 43 years, Johnpaul Jones has enriched our community and historical awareness through his holistic approach to space design. Locally, he has earned the title of "Island Treasure" for his help in designing the Japanese American Exclusion Memorial and the Waypoint Park on Bainbridge Island. In designing the gorilla exhibit and the elephant house at Seattle's Woodland Park Zoo, Mr. Jones' unique approach pioneered a movement to design more natural habitats for zoo animals.

Mr. Jones' design philosophy is deeply rooted in his Cherokee-Choctaw ancestors. Johnpaul Jones' projects have demonstrated an ingrained respect for the natural world and native landscapes and for enhancing awareness of the indigenous people, cultures, and the communities in which they inhabit. This philosophy is apparent in his celebrated design of the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, DC.

Mr. Jones has received multiple honors and awards for his work including the American Institute of Architects Seattle Medal, the Executive Excellence Award from the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, and the Distinguished Service Award from the University of Oregon, his alma mater.

Most recently, President Barack Obama honored Johnpaul Jones with a National Humanities Medal. The National Humanities Medal, introduced in 1997, honors individuals and groups whose work has enhanced our nation's understanding of the humanities and expanded our citizens' involvement with history, literature, languages, philosophy, and other humanities subjects. Johnpaul Jones, the first architect to be honored with this award, was one of ten who received the 2013 National Humanities Medal for his work in broadening our nation's cultural understanding and awareness through his architecture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by again applauding Johnpaul Jones for his environmentally conscious and culturally reverent architecture and for his commitment to our community. From our nation's capital to the beautiful city of Bainbridge Island, Johnpaul's work preserves our nation's stories for generations to come. I am honored to recognize Johnpaul Jones today in the United States Congress.

HONORING FRANKLIN COUNTY
HIGH SCHOOL'S NATIONAL DEFENSE
CADET CORPS

HON. SCOTT DESJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the hard work and dedication of students in Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District who participate in Franklin County High School's National Defense Cadet Corps in Winchester.

Once again, these students were Senior National Finalists in the 34th Annual National Energy Education Development Project's Youth Awards.

They were presented the award in Washington, DC, on June 23, 2014. The cadets were recognized for their excellence in environmental education. This year's projects included studying the feasibility of Compressed Natural Gas as an alternate energy source. The Elk River Public Utility District contributed by providing benefits and a demonstration including test driving of their CNG vehicles. The students increased their knowledge on solar power production by visiting the Duck River Electric Municipal Cooperative solar farm.

One of their most unique recycling efforts not only saved 22 trees but promoted literacy among elementary school children. The cadets sponsored a community wide book drive called "Ride for Reading." This is a national effort to deliver free books to Title I schools. The Cadet Corps delivered 1,472 books to Cowan Elementary School by bicycle. Every elementary student received five free books. The cadets once again recycled cooking oil that was turned into biodiesel by Winchester Utilities for city equipment. The cadets were recognized on the field during a University of Tennessee home football game and awarded a \$1,000 grant for their recycling efforts as part of the Good Sports Always Recycle program.

These are just some of the projects these energetic students undertook to make an impact on their community and promote environmental education this school year. It is always a pleasure to see our young people are civically engaged. Each student's individual drive has led them to great accomplishments. I want to thank them for their dedication and wish them the best as they continue in their educational pursuits. I am proud to represent these fine young people and their friends and families in the United States Congress.

CONGRATULATING FOUR-TIME
STATE CHAMPIONS RILEY
RAMBO AND TAYLOR LYCKMAN

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Riley Rambo and Taylor Lyckman from Menard, Texas on their historic 1A Mixed Doubles Tennis State Champion-

ship, on April 30th—a noteworthy accomplishment in and of itself.

While any state championship is impressive, this duo made U-I-L history by being the first mixed doubles team to win the title four years running.

Over the course of their high school careers, they have exemplified hard work, perseverance, and tenacity; and have become hometown heroes because of it. They are role models inspiring the younger generations of Menard.

Riley and Taylor are not your normal doubles team. They are not just teammates or friends; they are cousins. They are family. They have grown up together, competed together, and won together. I can only imagine the overwhelming excitement and pride their entire family feels from this accomplishment. I encourage them to savor their historic feat and wish them all the best in their bright futures.

Again, I congratulate Mr. Rambo and Ms. Lyckman on their historic fourth Mixed Doubles Tennis State Championship title.

HONORING RALPH FERTIG

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of Ralph Fertig from Santa Barbara County, who passed away suddenly on July 18, 2014.

Ralph was a devoted community leader and advocate for sustainable transportation in the Santa Barbara community. He was also the perennial renaissance man, having graduated from Penn State in 1961 with a degree in art and architecture before studying painting and ceramics at Cranbrook Academy of Art, earning a master's in mathematics from the University of Michigan, studying photography with Ansel Adams, and finally earning a second master's degree in photography from the Chicago Institute of Design in 1970.

Ralph came to the Santa Barbara community in the early 1980s to work on graphics and marketing for a computer communications company. It was during those early days in Santa Barbara that Ralph rediscovered his love of bicycling and began commuting by bike to work every day.

It wasn't long before Ralph became known in Santa Barbara as an effective civil advocate for the bike community. In 1991, he joined a group of local cyclists to form a group eventually known as the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition to advocate for the improvement of road and trail conditions. He also began publishing a monthly newsletter that, for the next 20 years, would be the voice of the bicycle community and a powerful force on behalf of pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Ralph made it his mission to attend every local transportation planning meeting to bear witness to the need for more space on the roads for bicycles, and he did this with perseverance, intellectual honesty, and respect. Ralph served as a member of the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition for more than 20 years, attending many bicycling conferences all over

North America. In 1998, Ralph single-handedly brought the Pro Bike/Pro Walk conference to Santa Barbara, attracting 540 participants from around the country. He was involved with crafting the City of Santa Barbara's Bicycle Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, and a regional Bikeway Signage Program.

Ralph was keenly aware of how transportation projects impact environmental quality and social equity. In 2010 the Coalition for Sustainable Transportation, or COAST, recognized Ralph with its biggest honor, the Barry Siegel Award, for his contributions to Santa Barbara County in the field of sustainable transportation.

I offer my most heartfelt condolences to Ralph's friends and family, and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this exemplary American and Santa Barbara County resident.

HONORING ROSS ERWIN HANNA

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it brings me sadness and honor to pay final tribute to Ross Erwin Hanna. Ross passed peacefully on Tuesday, June 10, 2014 after 91 years of life well lived.

Ross was born in San Francisco, CA, on October 20, 1922 as the youngest of six children to Tom and Wanda Hanna. Ross grew up in the Alhambra Valley with his four brothers and sister. Ross spent his childhood roaming the hills around his home and enjoyed spending summers in the Sierras. Ross's love of the outdoors was a legacy from his grandfather, naturalist John Muir.

Soon after graduating from Alhambra High School in Martinez, Pearl Harbor was bombed and Ross enlisted in the California Coast Guard where he served in numerous landings in the South Pacific. WWII sent him to the Pacific for four years, but built friendships that continued to grow for seven decades.

After the war, he went to Stockton, CA to attend the College of the Pacific (now University of the Pacific) where he graduated with a degree in business, and was a fraternity man at Alpha Kappa Phi Fraternity. Music was a major part of Ross's life and he led the Ross Hanna Orchestra during college. There Ross met a young Gladys Ann Stoeven who would later become his bride. Ross and Gladys married in San Mateo, CA in June of 1948.

Over the next 66 years the two of them had much to celebrate. A year to the day after they were married, they welcomed their first son, Hal. They moved to Dixon soon after his birth and two years later welcomed son Michael. Four years after their two boys, they welcomed a sweet daughter, Lynne. Ross and Gladys enjoyed raising their children in Dixon.

Ross imparted his love for nature to all of his children and grandchildren. Pack trips in the mountains, fishing in streams and lakes, hiking and enjoying nature are all a part of their memories. Ross left this life to join his parents Tom and Wanda Hanna, brothers Strent, John, Dick and Bob, his sister Jean and numerous family and friends who have

gone before him. Ross is survived by his loving wife Gladys of 66 years; son Hal and wife Kathleen, son Michael Muir and daughter Lynne Hanna-Lincoln; grandchildren Tim Hanna and wife Jamie, Liz Fuller and husband James, Allison Theubet and husband Jerry and Mei-Lin Hanna. Ross lived to see eight great-grandchildren join his family; Kilian, Stephen, Natalie, Timmy, Gabby and Kolbe Theubet and Ross and Matthew Fuller. Ross will be missed by immeasurable friends and family members, but his love and music will play in their hearts forever.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MAYOR GEORGE VUKOVICH

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of former Mayor George Vukovich of Youngstown, Ohio who passed away on Monday, July 28, 2014 at the tender age of 87 with his wife of 64 years, Helen, by his side. He was a dedicated and compassionate public servant, serving for over 20 years as the Seventh Ward Councilman, Clerk of Youngstown Municipal Court, and Mayor of Youngstown.

When I first started my political career I was lucky enough to have spent time with George. He always had great stories to tell of the good old days. But more importantly he always gave good advice and counsel. I will always remember how much he talked about and treasured his family, especially his grandkids. I really enjoyed our time together.

Mayor Vukovich served as mayor from 1979–1983 and oversaw the city during one of its darkest hours. Although Youngstown was suffering from massive job loss due to the decline of the steel industry, Mayor Vukovich was able to hold the city together during one of its most trying seasons. He was a proud veteran of the United States Army who loved his community. Mayor Vukovich was also active in the Youngstown Democratic Party, a member of the Catholic War Veterans, the Croatia Fraternal Union (Lodge 185, Campbell), and St. Angela Merici Parish (Sacred Heart of Jesus). He treasured spending time with his family, as well as hosting visits from loved ones, especially his grandchildren who were his greatest joy. He and his wife spent many winters in Florida during retirement where they enjoyed boating and long walks on the beach.

Mayor Vukovich is survived by his beloved wife Helen; his daughters, Carol and Sonia; grandchildren, Carrie, Michael, Carly, and Katie; brothers Peter and Henry, an abundance of loved ones and friends. George has been preceded in death by his loving parents, sisters Ann and Helen, as well as his brothers Jack, John, and Thomas. I am proud to honor the life of Mayor George Vukovich. The city of Youngstown is forever indebted to honorable years of his service. Youngstown is a much better place to call home because of his valiant work. My deepest condolences go out to his family and close friends. George will be

deeply missed but his courageous spirit will forever live on through the hearts and lives he has touched.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,618,599,653,160.19. We've added \$6,991,722,604,247.11 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FIRST RARE PEDIATRIC DISEASE PRIORITY REVIEW VOUCHER SOLD

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, across this nation tens of thousands of children live with rare pediatric diseases, such as childhood cancers, that threatens their bright futures. As the chairman of the Childhood Cancer Caucus, I have personally met with dozens of children and their families who are desperate for treatments.

Since the 1980s, only one new treatment has been developed for children with cancer. Sadly, for many other rare pediatric diseases, no Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved treatment exists at all. That is why I introduced the Creating Hope Act in 2011, to create an incentive for drug companies to develop new treatments for children with rare pediatric diseases, such as pediatric cancers.

Without any cost to the taxpayer, the Creating Hope Act established a priority review voucher (PRV) for rare pediatric diseases as Sec. 908 of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act. As an incentive for developing a new rare pediatric disease treatment, a company can be awarded a PRV by the FDA. The voucher entitles a company to a priority six month review of another new drug application that would otherwise be reviewed under the FDA's standard ten month review period. Companies can also choose to sell or transfer the voucher to another drug sponsor.

On Valentine's Day this year the first rare pediatric disease PRV was awarded to BioMarin for Vimizim to treat Morquio A Syndrome. There are fewer than 800 kids in the United States with Morquio A Syndrome. Vimizim will help children living with this terrible disease to live a longer and healthier life. That's what every kid should have.

And just this week, BioMarin sold its voucher to Regeneron Pharmaceuticals and Sanofi for \$67.5 million. This will allow BioMarin to reinvest their new earnings in even more products to treat rare and ultra-rare diseases. And

it will allow Regeneron Pharmaceuticals and Sanofi to speed up FDA review of Alirocumab, an experimental drug designed to lower low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in patients who have previously tried other treatments. This is a win-win for the companies, but best of all this will benefit patients.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this news demonstrates the value of this important program. As Dr. Ned Braunstein, Regeneron's Vice President for Regulatory Affairs, said after his company announced that it was buying BioMarin's voucher, the "decision to acquire and leverage the voucher is clear evidence that this program is a valuable incentive for biopharmaceutical companies."

Many people deserve credit for helping to make the Creating Hope Act a reality. Congressman FRED UPTON, the Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, the Vice Chair of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, and former Congresswoman Sue Myrick, were all tremendous champions of this law. So too were many countless advocates, but most of all Nancy Goodman. A mother and an advocate, Nancy is the founder and executive director of Kids V Cancer, which is fighting to change the landscape of pediatric research.

More children deserve life-saving treatments which is why I hope to work with my colleagues to make the rare pediatric disease Priority Review Voucher program permanent. As a father I can think of nothing more important than investing in our children's futures.

TRIBUTE TO MOTHER LOUISE JONES

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mother Louise Jones was born in Brewster, Florida on September 24, 1931. She later moved to Chicago, Illinois in 1943, with her Uncle John and Aunt Jessie Walker, who lived in the South Chicago Community.

Mother Louise attended James N. Thorpe Elementary School and Bowen High School. She joined the Pilgrim Baptist Church of South Chicago in 1946 and has remained active in the church affairs ever since. She served under Rev. Wainwright, she also served under G.G. Osborne and Rev. Hilliard Hudson as his pulpit nurse for 27 years.

Mother Louise's work and life were both immersed in the church. She held a number of governmental positions with the City of Chicago, County of Cook, and worked at both Oak Forest and South Shore Hospitals where she worked for 18 years until retirement in 2010.

Mother Louise loved politics and cooking and was actively involved with both. She was filled with vision, a warm spirit and hope. She was a helper and a giver, always giving and always helping.

Mother Louise was obviously one of the best social workers around, without even trying. She would sense a problem or need and always react to help.

We know that when time came, the good Lord just opened up the doors of heaven and said, "Well done my good and faithful servant, Louise come on in."

We express condolences to the family and friends, especially our friend and her daughter Dr. Sharon A. Latiker and immediate family and all of the host of loved ones that she is leaving behind.

May her soul rest in peace.

HONORING SHERIFF RODNEY L. COFFEY OF MENIFEE COUNTY, KENTUCKY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sheriff Rodney L. Coffey of Menifee County, Kentucky for his years of dedication and service to the citizens of Frenchburg, Menifee County, the Commonwealth of Kentucky and our great nation.

Sheriff Coffey has devoted over 20 years to the law enforcement profession. He holds a Bachelor's Degree in Police Administration, graduated from the Department of Criminal Justice Training Police Academy, the National FBI Academy Class 229 and served eight years in the Navy Reserves.

He served on the Morehead State University Police Department for eight years prior to running for Sheriff. Elected Sheriff in 1998, Coffey served as one of the youngest sheriffs in the history of Kentucky. He was named Kentucky Sheriffs' Association Sheriff of the Year in 2003, served on the Board of Directors for the Kentucky Sheriffs' Association from 2007–2013 and was elected President of that same organization in 2014.

Soon after the devastating and fatal tornado that touched down in Menifee County two years ago, Sheriff Coffey invited me to see firsthand the relief and response efforts taking place. At a time of turmoil and tragedy, Sheriff Coffey provided a calming and helpful presence in the community. I remember him leading me into the Red Cross trailer where his wife and family were volunteering. His selfless devotion to maintaining the safety of the residents of Menifee County is truly heroic, and I am honored to represent him in Congress.

I commend Sheriff Rodney Coffey for his honorable service, his leadership in the community and his patriotic devotion to this nation. I am proud to call him a friend.

COMMENDING THE HONORABLE DAVID R. OBEY

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Wisconsin Institute for Public Policy and Service, at the University of Wisconsin—Marathon, on the opening of their newest facility named after one of our state's

most dedicated public servants, former Congressman Dave Obey.

The David R. Obey Civic Resource Center will provide opportunities to educate and encourage young people to become active participants in a healthy democratic society.

Many lessons can be learned from Dave Obey's leadership and service in this House.

While, Dave Obey remains a fierce champion of progressive causes, the Obey Center will embody his bipartisan approach and will encourage our citizens to explore the facts and ideas on both sides of any debate.

Dave's impact is still felt within the Wisconsin delegation today as we continue his tradition of working together, regardless of party, to serve the citizens of our state.

I applaud the opening of the Obey Center—a place that will ensure future generations of Wisconsinites become the leaders we need.

HONORING MR. PAT BOWLEN

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Pat Bowlen. Mr. Bowlen is a natural leader with unquestionable integrity, an incredible work ethic, and a voracious appetite for success. As the Denver Broncos owner over 30 years, he led the team to back-to-back Super Bowl Championships and 6 AFC Division Championships.

In 1984, Mr. Bowlen took over as the Denver Broncos CEO during a time when the team was having financial difficulties. Since then, his distinguished leadership and strategic vision has turned the franchise into one of the most successful teams in the NFL today.

His outstanding business acumen is respected by players, coaches, and the fans themselves. In 2000, according to an ESPN fan poll, Mr. Bowlen was voted in as the NFL owner fans would most like to play for.

Mr. Bowlen is also very proactive in the Denver community. In 2007, he was inducted into the Colorado Sports Hall of Fame, and in 2013 received the Mizel Institute Community Enrichment Award, only given to those who have exemplary philanthropic involvement in their communities.

During his personal time, Mr. Bowlen has participated in grueling fitness activities such as the Ironman Triathlon, which is just another testament to his incredible self discipline and work ethic.

Due to Mr. Bowlen's courageous fight against Alzheimer's disease, he will step down this month from his position as CEO of one of the greatest NFL franchises in history, but his dignified legacy will live on. Mr. Bowlen, thank you for being such a positive influence and inspiration for the city of Denver, the Colorado community, and people all across the United States.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION
"EXPRESSING THE SENSE THAT
THE UNITED STATES POSTAL
SERVICE SHALL TAKE ALL AP-
PROPRIATE MEASURES TO EN-
SURE THE CONTINUATION OF
DOOR DELIVERY FOR ALL"

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution of the House "expressing the sense that the United States Postal Service shall take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all."

Many do not realize that the Post Office is already in the process of phasing out door delivery service, the heart of its customer experience.

And that if some in Congress had their way it would be eliminated entirely!

In my home state of California, residents in newly planned communities are already witnessing the end of traditional mail delivery.

Instead, residents are being forced to resort to so-called cluster boxes—centralized curbside locations many of which are in insecure locations and poorly maintained.

Just last month local residents from a community meeting in my district adopted an official neighborhood resolution calling on Congress to address this pressing issue.

I have heard stories from dozens of my constituents about cluster boxes being stolen or damaged and having to wait months to raise enough money to replace them.

Americans have benefited from door delivery service ever since the time of the Civil War.

But now some in Congress, in a short-sighted attempt to cut costs, are pushing through a radical overhaul of the Post Office without even considering the consequences.

Studies have shown that in today's digital age it is people with disabilities and the elderly that rely most on postal mail more, especially for prescription medicine.

Yes it is these very groups that would most be hurt by the sudden forced adoption of centralized cluster boxes.

And businesses all across the country, especially startups will be forced to close up shop since there will be no way to guarantee the security of their delivery.

All this just for short term cost cutting—which will do nothing to address the long term solvency of the Post Office.

And we already know that nobody wants these changes. In 2013, USPS offered voluntary cluster box conversions to businesses and only .8 percent signed up.

What business could survive by constantly looking for ways to reduce customer satisfaction?

Or by finding ways to devalue the very service, door delivery, it is known for?

But that is what the proponents of such radical postal reform efforts have in mind.

Furthermore, such changes will end the equal mail delivery system we have now for everyone.

Forced adoption of cluster boxes and a "delivery tax", whereby only the wealthy will have access to door delivery, will create a two-tiered system breaking the fundamental unity that has always been central to the Post Office's mission.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this effort to help preserve door delivery for all.

SUPPORTING THE INCREASED DIA-
LOGUE BETWEEN GREEK AND
TURKISH CYPRIOTS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding the 40th anniversary of the division of Cyprus, and to encourage a final settlement that makes possible a reunited island and a shared, peaceful and prosperous future for all Cypriots.

Over time, members of this House have delivered, and will deliver, statements denouncing Cyprus' status quo, while placing all responsibility of it with Turkey and its actions in 1974. It is scarcely noted that in 1963, as a result of ethnic tension, Turkish Cypriots were compelled to leave the joint institutions of the Republic of Cyprus. This hostile environment for the Turkish Cypriots continued and in 1974, the Cypriot National Guard, supported by Greece's military junta, launched a coup to secure enosis—or unification—with Greece. Following the coup, animosity towards Turkish Cypriots increased and the Cyprus that was once unified, became an environment where the Turkish Cypriots no longer felt safe nor welcome in their home country. Turkey defends it was within its rights to protect the population as a guarantor power under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee.

Each year, we hear from one side that a final settlement can be achieved once Turkey withdraws its forces from the island. The Turkish government has previously stated time and again its desire for a final settlement that protects the rights and freedoms of both communities, and will allow Turkish troops to return home. Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan called again this week for a political settlement based on mutual consensus and the political equality of both communities. Turkish Cypriots demonstrated their desire for the reunification of the island through their support—a decade ago—of the Annan Plan, which contained drastic compromises for both communities, yet was rejected by the Greek Cypriot community. The continuing isolation of Turkish Cypriots from the international community in the ten years since while Greek Cypriots, as the Republic of Cyprus, utilize EU membership and the global flows of commerce, is an imbalance that must be redressed.

The only solution to this imbalance, and the status quo in total, is a comprehensive agreement where the rights and equality of both communities are recognized, respected, and maintained. Both parties will have to give, if common ground is to be secured. I call upon both sides to continue their efforts on this

front, and express my hopes that the Administration do everything within its power to support such a process.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE KEVIN
BURNHAM OF THE SPRINGFIELD
POLICE DEPARTMENT ON HIS
RETIREMENT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on July 25th, the Springfield, Massachusetts, Police Department said farewell to their longest serving officer when Kevin Burnham retired after 43 years and two months on the job. A highly respected professional, a popular colleague, and a dear friend to everyone on the force, Kevin relinquished his Senior Officer badge last week to Ruben Borrero following a time-honored tradition. For the first time since 1971, Detective Burnham would not be patrolling the streets of the city he loves.

Ask anyone in the Department who their favorite co-worker was, and the reply would likely be Kevin Burnham. They admired his dedication, strength and courage. They enjoyed his sense of humor and the laughter that seemed to follow him everywhere. And his loyalty was unquestioned. At the end of the day, Kevin looked upon the Springfield Police Department as a band of brothers and sisters. To him, the force was a family working together to make our city a better place to live, work and raise our children.

From his early days as a rookie, it was obvious that Kevin was born to be a cop. He had the street smarts necessary to be effective in law enforcement, but he also had compassion.

Those two qualities were the reasons his career was so successful. Whether it was becoming one of the first detectives to work on the Narcotics Bureau, his service in both the Uniform Division and the Crime Prevention Bureau, or the responsibility that came with the job of Evidence Officer, Kevin performed each task exceptionally. He was honest and trustworthy and his fellow officers knew he had their back.

Being a Police Officer always comes with risks. And two years ago, one of his closest friends, Officer Kevin Ambrose, was killed in the line of duty. To Kevin Burnham, it was the lowest of low points. But with his trademark integrity and character, he led the funeral procession for his fallen friend along with nearly one thousand law enforcement officers from across the country. He helped turn a sad day into a touching tribute to a lost comrade. That's the kind of person he is.

Kevin and Barbara Burnham have been great friends of mine for many years. They are good people and great fun. As Kevin begins his well-deserved retirement, I want to wish him nothing but the very best. And on behalf of the United States of America, it gives me personal satisfaction to congratulate him on an extraordinary career serving and protecting the citizens of Springfield. Well done Detective Burnham!

PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN'S
POLICIES**HON. MATT SALMON**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, as everyone in this Chamber knows, Russia has been conducting itself in a manner that is irresponsible and demands accountability. Over the past several months we have witnessed President Vladimir Putin's ruthless actions in Crimea and now Eastern Ukraine that has prompted a series of economic sanctions that are being escalated as he continues to display a doctrine of muscular nationalism amid the growing concerns in Europe and the U. S.

This past week, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague announced a historic ruling that the Russian Federation had violated the Energy Charter Treaty when it expropriated the assets of the Yukos Oil Company after fabricating tax charges and put its founder and chairman, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, in prison. Mr. Khodorkovsky's former holding company, GML, rightly brought the case to the Hague and received a ruling in their favor that exceeded \$50 billion.

I have been following this case for the past ten years because I am personally acquainted with Mr. Khodorkovsky and was greatly concerned when the Russian government confiscated his company and then had him arrested. At the time, a top aide to President Putin, Igor Sechin, maneuvered the government takeover of Yukos and eventually created Rosneft, a company he now heads, without any compensation to the Yukos Oil Company investors and shareholders.

I am pleased that Mr. Khodorkovsky was eventually released from prison and that the Hague's Arbitration Court, after seven years of litigation, has finally brought justice to a case where one of the world's largest countries seized the assets of its largest company, thus violating all the principles associated with the rule of law.

But as the extensive news accounts reveal, it is unlikely that the Russian Federation under the guidance of Mr. Putin will honor the court's decision that awarded the GML shareholders about half of the original \$114 billion claim. Undoubtedly, Russia will exhaust all means to contest the ruling and avoid payment, but ultimately justice will prevail even if it results in the seizure of assets outside Russia.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that President Vladimir Putin's authoritarianism and nationalistic policies are moving our bilateral relationship back to the Cold War days. The Russian leader has to recognize that in today's world he has to be held accountable for actions that are reprehensible, whether they are geopolitical in attempting to impose his will on other countries or internal when it involves the core tenets of democracy: rule of law, a free press and a viable opposition. Indeed he is taking Russia in the wrong direction.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE US
MEDICAL SOCCER TEAM**HON. TODD C. YOUNG**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Soccer Caucus, I rise today to recognize the US Medical Soccer Team. The Congressional Soccer Caucus mission is to encourage legislation, activities and events that promote soccer and issues affecting the greater soccer community, toward encouraging healthy and active lifestyles among America's youth.

The US Medical Soccer Team is an organization comprised of practicing physicians from around the country who share a passion for soccer, medical education and community service. They represent the United States in the World Medical Football Championships, which is an annual World Cup-style soccer tournament comprised of similar physician teams from around the world. On July 6th, the US Medical Soccer Team will kick off their fifth year of participation in this tremendous event, taking place this year in Natal, Brazil.

The US Medical Soccer Team formed in 2010 by connecting physically active physicians who love the game of soccer. While their time on the soccer field has been an incredible experience, the growing focus of the organization has been community service. As active physicians, the US Medical Soccer Team is passionate about reaching out to underserved youth around the United States through their outreach program "Healthy, Fit and Smart". This program, focused on fitness, nutrition and education, is a fun and interactive way for the team to convey the importance of an active and healthy lifestyle while educating about careers in science and healthcare. The soccer brought the team together, but the outreach has enriched their lives and fostered strong connections to numerous community centers and organizations around the country.

In the summer of 2015, the US Medical Soccer Team is honored to host the World Medical Football Championships in Long Beach, California. This event will bring over 400 physicians from around the world to the United States for a week of athletic competition, medical education, and community outreach. The US Medical Soccer Team is confident this event and the organization's expanding efforts, both on and off the field, will be a source of pride for our nation.

I urge all Americans to recognize the US Medical Soccer Team and wish them luck on the field as they head to Brazil to compete this summer in the Physicians' World Cup and support them off the field in their continued outreach efforts with underserved youth advocating for fitness, nutrition and education. As physically active doctors, they "walk the talk" and encourage other colleagues and their patients to do the same.

IN TRIBUTE TO DEANA MARTIN

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to shine a spotlight on an American star for vastly different reasons to which she is accustomed. Deana Martin, an accomplished singer, actor, author and performer in her own right, as well as the daughter of the legendary Dean Martin, will be performing for the people of Enfield at the request of the Lady of Mt. Carmel Society and the local Chief of Police, Mr. Carl Sferrazza.

On August 2nd, Ms. Martin, as a special guest of the community, will be visiting seniors at the Enfield Senior Center to talk about her experiences watching and performing with her father. She will also stop by the Felician Sisters, Our Lady of the Angels Convent to bring her performance to those who would not otherwise have the opportunity to see it.

In addition to performing her music, Ms. Martin will also be speaking on her best-selling book, "Memories Are Made Of This" in which she tells her father's story through her own eyes. The book's name is a reference to her father's work that captures the essence of their relationship.

Thanks to Ms. Martin's participation, this annual tradition of a proud Connecticut town will be a unique experience filled with music and storytelling from a legendary American family. I thank Ms. Martin for her wonderful musical work, and her service to this local community.

CELEBRATING JAMES BALDWIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration that today I rise to join all of the people in the village of Harlem and my Congressional District to celebrate the works of Mr. James Baldwin on his 90th birthday this upcoming August 2, 2014. James Baldwin was a legendary writer who broke new literary ground by exploring racial and social issues in his works.

Mr. Baldwin was born to Emma Jones, a single mother, on August 2, 1924 in Harlem, New York. While he never met his biological father, Mr. Baldwin did have a father figure growing up: Baptist Minister David Baldwin. The preacher's religious influence had a lasting impression on James and his writings. He would go on to spend three years as a youth minister. The language of the church shaped the cadences and tones of his work, becoming unmistakable hallmarks of his literary style.

After striking out on his own and moving away from home, Mr. Baldwin published short stories in national periodicals under the tutelage of his mentor, Beauford Delaney, a renowned Harlem Renaissance painter. Growing disillusion with chauvinism against African-Americans and the gay community, Baldwin left our country and settled in France at the

age of 24. He found that the distance gave him enough space to reflect on his experience as a black man in white America. Please allow me to quote Mr. Baldwin's later thoughts on this dramatic change in his life: "Once I found myself on the other side of the ocean, I saw where I came from very clearly . . . I am the grandson of a slave, and I am writer. I must deal with both." Through his writing, Baldwin did deal with this reality.

In 1953, Baldwin published his first novel, a semi-autobiography called *Go Tell It on the Mountain*, which explores the repression, moral hypocrisy, religious inspiration, and community ties that characterize the Black American experience. While he spent much of his life abroad, Baldwin always remained a quintessentially American writer. In the early 1960s, he returned home and became a leading voice and activist in the Civil Rights Movement. The works that Baldwin published during this tumultuous time in American history, explored the deep-rooted racial tension with eloquence and unparalleled honesty. His two collections of essays, *Notes of a Native Son* (1955) and *Nobody Knows My Name* (1961), as well as two novels, *Giovanni's Room* (1956) and *Another Country* (1962), were immediate bestsellers. James Baldwin created beautiful literary works with unprecedented depth and power; his writing will remain an essential part of the American literary canon.

In honor of his birthday, as well as to pay tribute to Mr. Baldwin's tireless effort to addressing our nation's issues with race and spirituality, the New Heritage Theatre Group, Columbia University School of the Arts, National Black Theater, Street Corner Recourse and Harlem Renaissance High School recognize August 2nd as James Baldwin Day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me as we pay tribute to such a legend. I pledge to continue his fight for justice for all and encourage everyone to do the same.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE JOB
CORPS PROGRAM ON THEIR 50TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this year the Job Corps program celebrates its 50th anniversary. It does much good by helping young people earn a high school diploma, develop a career, and obtain a good job.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the individuals at the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Texas. Gary Job Corps opened its doors in 1965 and has provided a wide range of career technical training opportunities to students in San Marcos ever since.

Gary Job Corps has a long, distinguished history in our community that began in a deactivated air field. The former Gary Air Field was transformed from an air base to a career technical training facility. Barracks and buildings were converted to dormitories, classrooms, training shops, and offices.

Today, Gary is the largest Job Corps Center in the United States with more than 1,600 students. Gary Job Corps has more than 20 career technical training opportunities that range from health occupations and business technology to computer related professions. Other opportunities include construction, manufacturing, human services, and correctional and security officer training. Additionally, Gary Job Corps offers the largest GED program in the state of Texas. Students can obtain their high school diploma via the Internet and acquire an accredited Texas high school diploma.

There is overwhelming support for the Center among local civic and community groups. Teachers, mentors, friends and advisors selflessly invest themselves on a daily basis in the futures of Gary's students.

But it is the students themselves who make the greatest investment and they are to be commended for their dedication to success. The tireless efforts of the bright, young men and women of Gary Job Corps have enabled them to enter a competitive marketplace equipped with the skills and education necessary to succeed; and succeed they do.

The motto on the entrance to Gary Job Corps says, "Not your last chance, your best chance." I commend Gary Job Corps for providing these students an opportunity to discover their learning potential and providing them with the ability to succeed. I also commend these students for recognizing that this "best chance" required hard work and dedication on their part, and for rising to meet this challenge.

Congratulations to Gary Job Corps and the Job Corps Program on 50 years of "best chances." May you continue to prepare America's young people with the skills needed to succeed in a career and in life.

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION
FOR 85 YEARS OF SERVICE BY
THE TUCSON METRO CHAMBER
MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Military Affairs Committee of the Tucson Metro Chamber for 85 years of outstanding service to the communities of Southern Arizona. No other state is as friendly to the military as Arizona and the Tucson Metro Chamber is at the forefront in support of our military installations, service members, military families and veterans.

With the military generating nearly two billion dollars in economic activity in Tucson, the Military Affairs Committee plays a critical role, acting as a conduit for Southern Arizona businesses to access, partner and work with Tucson's strong defense industry. The Committee also engages in a number of community projects, such as Toys for Tots and Operation Zulu, a program that raises funds in the business community to send holiday gifts to local deployed service members.

The Military Affairs Committee has helped advocate for Davis-Monthan since 1929, when

it was the nation's first municipal aviation field. Today with the MAC's help, Tucson and its surrounding military installations look to the future, ready to support our men and women in uniform for another 85 years, through to the end of the 21st Century.

I am proud to recognize the Military Affairs Committee on the occasion of its 85th year of community support and all that it has done for the men and women stationed in Southern Arizona, their families, and our city that we know and love.

ON THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE FIRST AMERICAN FINANCIAL
CORPORATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the First American Financial Corporation, and to use this occasion to honor the pioneering role that First American has played in developing the title insurance industry in the United States.

First American was founded in my home district of Orange County, CA in 1889, not long after the then-rural County was itself founded. First American grew from a small, local company into an international provider of title insurance, settlement services and risk solutions for real estate transactions. The company now provides a job to over 11,000 hardworking Americans.

Though it is a multinational corporation, First American has never lost sight of its roots as a closely held family business. Founder C.E. Parker instilled into the company a spirit of entrepreneurship and a commitment to service—core values that still steer First American today. Mr. Parker's grandson and Chairman Emeritus Don Kennedy joined the family business in 1948 after attending law school and serving in the U.S. Navy during the Second World War. Under his leadership, First American expanded into surrounding counties, and acquired a trust company, a home warranty provider, and a real estate tax service firm into its portfolio of services. In 1964 he took the company public. Eighteen years later, First American was serving every region of the country. Don Kennedy's son, Parker Kennedy, like his father and great-grandfather before him, is now the company's Chairman of the Board, and is leading the company as it continues to grow.

The Kennedy family has navigated uncertain times over the past century due to the rise of homeownership, technological developments in the field, and shifting regulation both in the U.S. and abroad. Yet by maintaining their commitment to the founding principles of their family business, the Kennedy family grew their small company in southern California into a multinational Fortune 500 company.

First American revolutionized the way title insurance is used across the globe as it pioneered the industry in a number of countries. First American was the first title insurance provider in Mexico, Korea, and Hong Kong, and it has the leading market share in Australia,

Canada, and England. The company innovated the world's first international title insurance policy, and has worked with government officials in developing nations to create legislation that protects landowner rights and secures a stronger local economy.

Title insurance is a foundational component of the real estate industry, and by making sure a homebuyer gets what he bargained for, the First American Financial Corporation paved the way for homeowners across this nation to live out the American Dream. It is a company that all Americans—indeed, all people—can choose to be their financial partner.

I congratulate First American Financial Corporation on 125 years of service, and for supporting the homeowners and business communities in the U.S. and abroad.

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Resolution to the Rule.

Yesterday's decision to pull the border bill was an embarrassment for Republican leadership and they are now trying to save face by circumventing democracy. The use of 'martial law' authority was designed to stifle debate and rush legislation to keep the American people out of the loop.

Had we passed bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform, we would not be in this situation today. Thousands of children would not be in limbo. Instead many of these children would be legally reunited with their families—without—the need to take the dangerous journey to get to the U.S.

My Republican colleagues like to blame the President for the number of children making the perilous journey. They need to look at their own inaction from the past year. Instead of passing comprehensive immigration reform which would greatly benefit our country, they continue to hold our country hostage through obstruction. Shame on them for sitting on their hands, then blaming others for a crisis they helped create.

H.J. RES. 76

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 76, legislation that would make supplemental appropriations to provide continued support to the Iron Dome system currently in operation in Israel.

As my colleagues know, the Iron Dome system, built jointly with the U.S. and Israel, has been used multiple times over the last several years, and many times in recent weeks alone, to defeat rocket attacks staged by Hamas out of Gaza. As those attacks represent the most

imminent danger to Israeli population centers, our continued support for that system is extremely important.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES.
76—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the supplemental appropriations bill to provide additional funding for the Iron Dome for Israel.

Hamas should not have been shooting rockets into Israel, and Israel certainly has a right to defend itself.

However, it is heartbreaking to me to read and hear about all the little children in Gaza who have been killed or injured. And it is very sad to see pictures and news reports of frightened little children laying in the hospital with serious injuries.

As I did on the floor a few days ago, I once again plead with officials in Israel, Gaza, the U.N. and the U.S. to work together to get small children away from the bombs and out of harm's way.

Even if the fighting for some unfortunate reason has to continue, I hope we can at least save some of the little children.

IN SUPPORT OF SENATE
AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 76

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because I stand with Israel I rise in strong support of this bill to provide \$225 million to the State of Israel to support the Iron Dome system. These funds are in addition to what the House has already approved in the FY 2015 Defense Appropriations Bill.

For the past four weeks, Israel and the Israeli people have been subjected to a relentless attack by the terrorist organization Hamas.

Hamas has fired thousands of rockets from Gaza into Israel, deliberately attempting to kill as many Israelis and damage as much Israeli property as it possibly can.

These indiscriminate attacks would likely have killed large numbers of Israelis and destroyed untold amounts of property except for one thing—the Iron Dome.

The Iron Dome has proven to be a remarkably effective defensive weapon, destroying rockets headed for targets in populated areas, saving lives and protecting property from Hamas's terror from the skies.

It is crucial that the Israelis continue to be able to employ and improve the Iron Dome to repel these terrorist rocket attacks.

The funds we approve today will enable Israel to continue to defend itself and its people from these wanton terrorist attacks.

The clearest way this House can demonstrate that it stands with Israel is by overwhelmingly approving this bill.

Let's show the people of Israel that we stand with them and let's show Hamas, and anyone else who would threaten Israel's right to exist, that we will not stand by and give their ruthless mission even the slightest possibility of success.

FY15 IRON DOME SUPPLEMENTAL

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this emergency supplemental furthering our commitment and support to our steadfast ally through critically-needed funding for the Iron Dome missile defense system.

Israel is currently embroiled in a devastating war on terrorism. For weeks, Hamas, an internationally-recognized terrorist organization, has indiscriminately fired thousands of rockets into Israel and has built miles of tunnels to launch vicious land attacks.

Just yesterday, in a dastardly breach of the humanitarian ceasefire, Hamas operatives reportedly surfaced from a tunnel, killed two Israeli soldiers, and abducted a third, Hadar Goldin. I join the Administration in demanding his immediate and unconditional release.

We are all heartbroken by the devastating loss of human life on both sides. But the fact remains, Hamas is responsible for this war, cowardly booby-traps in UN-health clinics, hiding rockets in UN-run schools, instructing Gazans to ignore Israeli warnings to relocate to protect its weapons instead, and repeatedly violating internationally-backed ceasefires.

Innocent Israelis and Palestinians have already suffered an enormous toll. Yet Hamas remains committed to wreaking fear and havoc on as many civilians as possible.

That is why this measure is vital. Iron Dome has already protected millions of Israelis who must have our full backing.

The additional \$225 million will accelerate production of Iron Dome to counter short-range rockets.

I urge immediate passage.

THEN THEY CAME FOR ME

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this is just my first term, but during my time here I have seen some truly low moments.

But this is the saddest day so far.

We just voted to send children back to unspeakable violence, and now we are considering deporting young people brought to this country through no fault of their own.

It reminded me of the words of Pastor Martin Niemöller. Words that I have hanging in my office:

First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out—

Because I was not a Socialist.

Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not speak out—

Because I was not a Trade Unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out—

Because I was not a Jew.

Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me.

I ask you Mr. Speaker—who will speak for the unaccompanied children, for the Dreamers, if not us?

H.R. 5230 AND H.R. 5272

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted in favor of H.R. 5230 because it strengthens our security on the southern border and relieves this humanitarian crisis. This legislation fixes the 2008 law to ensure that a speedy process returns these children safely and swiftly to their homes. It also provides the resources necessary for states and the National Guard to end the immediate problems on the border.

Additionally, I voted in favor of H.R. 5272 because the Constitution demanded it. This administration cannot simply pick and choose

which laws they would like to enforce and which they would like to ignore. My position is clear that I believe we have a broken immigration system and I support reforms that secure our borders, fix our legal immigration system, and address those here unlawfully. However, these reforms should be done through Congress, not executive orders that stretch the authority granted by the Constitution. Additionally, the President's Executive Order attempts to treat a symptom, but not the root of the problem, and it has undoubtedly contributed to the current humanitarian crisis along our southern border. We need to pass laws to fix our immigration system if we want to solve this problem once and for all.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5230 AND
H.R. 5272

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 1, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272, sham legislation that fails to address the humanitarian crisis on our country's southern border.

I strongly object to the language contained in H.R. 5230 that would amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Re-authorization Act of

2008 (TVPPRA). When Congress unanimously passed and President Bush signed the TVPPRA, the purpose was to address the flow of child trafficking out of Central America, a process which requires a more extensive review and care for these children. I believe that changes to this law, especially those adopted in haste, would not be in the best interests of our nation or the children who suffer from trafficking. The commercial exploitation of children, especially sexual abuse, is among the most heinous crimes known to humanity and we should not engage in changing policy hastily or without a great deal of deliberation.

I also object to H.R. 5272 which would prohibit the expansion of the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, and prevent those that otherwise would be eligible for deferred action. This program was designed to protect children who came to this country as minors through no choice of their own. DACA does not confer lawful immigration status, does not alter an individual's existing immigration status, and does not provide a path to citizenship. This legislation is unrelated to the current crisis, and is nothing more than a handout to radical Republicans who have no compassion.

We do this country a disservice with both H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272. The time has come to pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, August 4, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 4, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Peter Folan, Holy Trinity Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of the unexpected, God who makes the weak strong, who makes the poor rich, who makes the dead alive again, dash our expectations as we begin this week of labor on behalf of the citizens of this country.

Help us seek You, not in the familiar, but in the strange; help us reach out to You, not in the comfortable, but in the challenging; help us realize Your justice, not in the usual patterns that can shackle us, but in the new way You show us, the way that always frees us.

Bless today the Members and the staff of this body. May they be women and men who demand not to be served, but to serve.

Bless, too, their work. May it ease the burden of the downtrodden, lighten the load of the oppressed, and give rest to the weary.

We ask this in Your holy Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 694, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Monday, August 4, 2014, through Friday, September 5, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Monday, August 4, 2014, through Friday, September 5, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, when the House adjourns

today, it shall adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday, August 7, 2014, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 112, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 31, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 4028. To amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to include the desecration of cemeteries among the many forms of violations of the right to religious freedom.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on August 1, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 5021. To provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3230. To improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until noon on Thursday, August 7, 2014, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 112, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, August 7, 2014, at noon, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 112, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

6812. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Foreign Commercial Satellite Services (DFARS Case 2014-D010) (RIN: 0750-AI32) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6813. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert E. Milstead, Jr., United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6814. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Michael M. Gilday, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6815. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on the payment of a Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus to members of precommissioning programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6816. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to previously closed positions in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6817. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Bruce W. Clingan, United States Navy, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6818. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Terry G. Robling, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6819. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael T. Flynn, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6820. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 29 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6821. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report regarding the Department's enforcement activities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1691f; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6822. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Virgin Australia International Airlines (Virgin Australia) of Bowen Hills, Australia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6823. A letter from the Director, Office for Special Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program — Rehabilitation Specialty Areas [Docket No.: ED-2014-OSERS-0068] re-

ceived July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6824. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Haynesville, Louisiana) [MB Docket No. 14-37] [RM-11711] (File No.: BMPH-20130913ACG) received August 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6825. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Generator Relay Loadability and Revised Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standards [Docket Nos.: RM13-19-000 and RM14-3-000; Order No. 799] received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6826. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Format and Dimensions of Maps and Drawings Required by the Commission's Hydropower Program [Docket No.: RM14-20-000; Order No. 798] received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6827. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twenty-fourth quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6828. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of El Salvador (Transmittal No. 10-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6829. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-31, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6830. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6831. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-061, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6832. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-031, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6833. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-083, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6834. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-075, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6835. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-071, pursuant to the reporting requirements of

Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6836. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6837. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report (APR) for Fiscal Years 2013-2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6838. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Fiscal Year 2013 Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6839. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Texas Regulatory Program [SATS No.: TX-066-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2014-0001; S1D1SSS08011000SX066A00067F144S180110; S2D2SSS08011000SX066A00033F14XS501520] received August 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6840. A letter from the Director, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of the detailed boundaries for the Virgin Wild and Scenic River in Utah; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6841. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Deep Water Complex in the South Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 1312311999-4319-01] (RIN: 0648-XD351) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6842. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Island Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD337) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6843. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Tribal Crime Data Collection Activities, 2012-2013"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6844. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debt Collection (RIN: 1400-AD60) received July 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6845. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Annual Events in the Captain of the Port Zone Buffalo [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0081] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6846. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special

Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Marine Events and Fireworks Displays within the Fifth Coast Guard District [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0095] (RIN: 1625-AA00, AA08) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6847. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Patapsco River; Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0201] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6848. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Venice, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0848] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6849. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Lake Michigan; Winnetka, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0259] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6850. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quarterly Listings; Safety Zone, Security Zones, Special Local Regulations, Drawbridge Operation Regulations and Regulated Navigation Areas [USCG-2014-0567] received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6851. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Suncoast Offshore Grand Prix; Gulf of Mexico, Sarasota, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0789] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6852. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Columbus Road Bridge Installation, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0556] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6853. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Water; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0410] (RIN: 1625-AC13) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6854. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Marine Week Seattle Seahawks Demonstration, Lake Washington; Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0574] (RIN: 1525-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6855. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area and Safety Zone: Tappan Zee Bridge Construction Project, Hudson

River; South Nyack and Tarrytown, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA00, 1625-AA11) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6856. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Belt Parkway Bridge Construction, Gerritsen Inlet; Brooklyn, NY — Correction [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0471] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6857. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2014 Fireworks Displays in Northern New England [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0491] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6858. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Life-saving Equipment: Production Testing and Harmonization with International Standards [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0048] (RIN: 1625-AB46) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6859. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (NFS): Contractor Whistleblower Protections (RIN: 2700-AE08) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

6860. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities — Mental Disorders and Definition of Psychosis for Certain VA Purposes (RIN: 2900-AO96) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6861. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Money Market Funds and the Wash Sale Rules (Rev. Proc. 2014-45) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6862. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-19) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6863. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Closing of the Jamieson Line, New York Border Crossing [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0037] [CBP Dec. 14-08] received July 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

6864. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Administrative Simplification: Change to the Compliance Date for the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10-CM and ICD-10-PCS) Medical Data Code Sets [CMS-0043-F] (RIN: 0938-AS31) received July 31, 2014, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PETRI:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr.

ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COOK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Ms. BASS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 713. A resolution recognizing the friendship between the United Kingdom and the United States and expressing the support of the House of Representatives for a united, secure, and prosperous United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

299. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution No. 212 requesting that the Congress support legislation that would award the Congressional Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

300. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution No. 248 supporting a long-term extension of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002; to the Committee on Financial Services.

301. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 396 condemning Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets in Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

302. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution No. 356 marking the fortieth anniversary of the unlawful Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maryland, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 ratification of the 17th amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 70 calling for a convention for the purpose of adding an amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

305. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 70 calling for a convention for the purpose of

adding an amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

306. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 318 urging the Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to the United States Vietnam Veterans who served in the water defined by the combat zone, and in the airspace over the combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

307. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 96 requesting the Rhode Island Commerce Commission pursue certification as a Federal Promise Zone and Manufacturing Hub; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

308. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 412 requesting the

state's Congressional Delegation to initiate and pursue all efforts to have Rhode Island declared a "Promise Zone"; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

309. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 107 supporting the Rhode Island Commerce Corporation's Phase II Grant proposal to the United States Economic Development Administration; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

310. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 388 urging the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Crisis Act of 2013; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Science, Space, and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1696: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 4748: Mr. BECERRA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

95. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Governor of Vermont, relative to a letter regarding the success of the State Trade and Export Promotion (STEP) grant program; which was referred to the Committee on Small Business.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this infor-

mation, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, August 5, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SENATE—Tuesday, August 5, 2014

(Legislative day of Friday, August 1, 2014)

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by Rev. Adam Briddell, Associate Pastor of Asbury United Methodist Church, Washington, DC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God, we give You thanks for the abundance of Your blessings and the promise You have made to Your people—a promise to never fail or forsake us. So You have sent Your Spirit, a spirit of truth, courage, grace, and love; a spirit that calls us together in fellowship because we are so much stronger when we are united and not divided.

May Your Spirit be at work in the hearts of the men and women of this great Chamber. May all find the courage to choose Your righteousness over self-righteousness. Let Your truth inspire us to great acts of grace and love. This day and every day may we be found faithful to who You are and who You are calling us to be.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEVIN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I previously filed budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for budget years 2014 and 2015 pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. Today, I am adjusting those levels.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act allows the Chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. On August 1, 2014, the Senate passed one bill that is eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act: H.J. Res 76, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014, which includes \$225 million in budget authority and \$150 million in outlays in 2014 and \$75 million in outlays in 2015 that is designated as emergency funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Consequently, I am revising the budgetary aggregates for 2014 by a total of \$225 million in budget authority and \$150 million in outlays. For 2015 I am revising the budgetary aggregates by \$75 million in outlays. I am also revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Appropriations Committee by \$225 million in revised security budget authority and \$150 million in outlays in 2014 and by \$75 million in outlays in 2015.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the changes to the allocation to the Committee on Ap-

propriations and the budgetary aggregates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	2014	2015
Current Spending Aggregates:*		
Budget Authority	2,842,558	3,015,208
Outlays	2,819,514	3,035,686
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	225	0
Outlays	150	75
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,842,783	3,015,208
Outlays	2,819,664	3,035,761

* 2014 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for the farm bill and unemployment insurance. 2015 current spending aggregates reflect previous adjustments made for disaster, overseas contingency operations, and terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

(Pursuant to sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

In millions of dollars	Current allocation/limit	Adjustments*	Adjusted allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2014:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority	605,882	225	606,107
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	504,843	0	504,843
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,201,186	150	1,201,336
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority	1,110,725	225	1,110,950

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(Pursuant to sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

In millions of dollars	Current allocation/limit	Adjustments*	Adjusted allocation/limit
Fiscal Year 2015:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority	579,851	0	579,851
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	508,872	0	508,872
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	1,191,903	75	1,191,978
Memorandum: Total Discretionary Budget Authority	1,088,723	0	1,088,723

* Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2014 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

	\$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
H.J. Res. 76, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014: *						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.000	0.225	
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.150	
Total:						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.000	0.225	
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.150	
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category:						
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.000	0.225	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.150	

* This table reflects the Congressional Budget Office estimate of H.J. Res. 76, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 as passed by the Senate on August 1, 2014.

DETAIL ON ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 2015 ALLOCATIONS TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 302 AND 314(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

	\$s in billions	Program integrity	Disaster relief	Emergency	Overseas contingency operations	Total
H.J. Res 76, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014: *						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.075
Total:						
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.075
Breakdown of Above Adjustments by Category:						
Revised Security Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
General Purpose Discretionary Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.075

* This table reflects the Congressional Budget Office estimate of H.J. Res. 76, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 as passed by the Senate on August 1, 2014.

CYPRUS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this summer marks the 40th year since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the division of the island into Greek and Turkish zones. That division has led to great hardships on both sides of the divide and been a source of some instability in a part of the world—the eastern Mediterranean—that already is far too unstable. It is profoundly in the interests of the United States, our friends and allies in the region, and the Cypriot people, both Greek and Turkish, to resolve this dispute and achieve the goal of a unified Cyprus.

The division of Cyprus has had profoundly negative consequences for its people and the region. Cyprus has been a source of ongoing tension between two important NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. The division has stunted Cyprus economically and politically. Tragically, the line has divided families for four decades. None of this is in the interests of Greece, Turkey, the United States, our allies, or the world. That is why the United States supports the creation of a bizonal, bicomunal federation as envisioned by numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions.

It is unfortunate that, four decades after the island's division, we have yet to achieve that goal. It is long overdue that Cyprus be unified. And there are reasons today to believe that goal is closer. In February, U.N.-sponsored talks between Greek and Turkish leaders restarted after a 2-year halt. They agreed to a roadmap for further negotiations and, importantly, committed to build a positive atmosphere surrounding the talks, including important confidence-building measures de-

signed to help ease 40 years of mistrust. Little over a week ago negotiators met and committed to progress on outstanding issues in advance of their next meeting on September 2.

It is vitally important that negotiators continue to build momentum toward peace and unity on the island because so much is at stake. The discovery of large natural gas reserves off the island's coast promises a newly prosperous future for Cyprus and its people, but it will be far more difficult, if not impossible, to fully capitalize on that opportunity in the absence of peace and unity.

The United States should continue to work closely with all sides in pursuit of the peaceful reunification of Cyprus that is so long overdue.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT PERCIASEPE

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I want to take a moment today to honor Robert “Bob” Perciasepe, the Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency EPA. Bob is a true public servant and dear friend who will be departing government service shortly. He has spent the past several decades protecting our environment and his work in this regard has been exemplary. The air we and our children and grandchildren breathe and the water we drink are cleaner because of Bob Perciasepe.

Bob graduated in 1974 from Cornell University with a bachelor of science degree in natural resources and then received his master's degree in planning and public administration from

the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. After Bob graduated from Syracuse, he began his career in public service with the Baltimore City Planning Department in 1976, eventually becoming the city's assistant director for planning in 1986. Later, he served as the Maryland secretary of the environment. It was during his service in my home State of Maryland that I first had the opportunity to know and work with Bob, particularly as he worked on an issue near and dear to me—protecting the Chesapeake Bay.

Following Bob's service in Maryland, he served President Bill Clinton in two different capacities at the EPA, first as the Assistant Administrator for Water and then as the Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation. In these positions, he continued his tireless work to improve the air we breathe and protect our drinking and recreational waters.

Bob was instrumental in working with us in Congress to pass the 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act—a law that provided critical protection standards for drinking water. When he led the Office of Air and Radiation, he signed the first official finding that mercury pollution from our Nation's power plants should be controlled.

Bob left government service but he didn't stop working to protect human health and the environment. He went to work for the National Audubon Society, where he continued to champion conservation and environmental progress. When Barack Obama became President in 2009, Bob returned to Federal service as the EPA's Deputy Administrator and served as Acting Administrator between the tenures of Lisa Jackson and Gina McCarthy.

Bob's dedication to public service and his practical approach to problem-solving were evident from my first interactions with him. His fun-loving nature, intellectual capacity, and devotion to duty make him an exemplary public servant. We all breathe easier—literally—because of Bob Perciasepe, so I wanted to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for his service and congratulate him on his countless contributions to protecting our Nation's environment during his long tenure at EPA. I have no doubt that Bob will maintain his untiring commitment to the betterment of the environment in his next venture, and I wish him all the best.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 4, 2014, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats, and further that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned joint resolution.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 4, 2014, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the

Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3548. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the "Jason Crisp Forest Service Building".

H.R. 4631. An act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as "30th Street Station", as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station".

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bills were subsequently signed on August 4, 2014 by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 4, 2014, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOLF) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 606. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

H.R. 1671. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office".

H.R. 2291. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office".

H.R. 3472. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3765. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building".

H.R. 4386. An act to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5195. An act to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bills and joint resolution were signed on August 4, 2014, during the recess of the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5230. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5272. An act to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 5230. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5272. An act to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MIKULSKI, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015" (Rept. No. 113-241).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2040. A bill to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-242).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for advance appropriations for certain discretionary accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and

controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2687

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2687, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2692

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2692, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 2771

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2771, a bill to establish a WaterSense program, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 112, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Monday, August 4, 2014, through Friday, September 5, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Monday, August 4, 2014, through Friday, September 5, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any re-

assembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 5230 AND H.R. 5272

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. COONS. I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO REPORT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Tuesday, August 26, 2014, from 10 a.m. to 12 noon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S.-AFRICA SUMMIT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, before I conclude I simply wanted to thank the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and our chair, Senator BOB MENENDEZ, for hosting—along with the House Foreign Affairs Committee—yesterday a very successful reception in the Russell Office Building where 50 African heads of state and heads of government were received. It was a successful event and an important kickoff to a 3-day U.S.A.-Africa summit currently being led by the President and Secretary of Commerce.

ORDERS THROUGH MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn and convene for a pro forma session only, with no business conducted, on Friday, August 8, at 9:15 a.m.; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, it adjourn under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 112 until Monday, September 8, 2014 at 2 p.m.; that on Monday, September 8, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; further, that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session, resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 848, and immediately proceed to vote on confirmation of the Pryor nomination, as provided under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, on Monday, September 8, 2014, at 5:30 p.m., there will be at least three rollcall votes on confirmation of the Pryor nomination to be U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit; confirmation of the Aaron nomination to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board;

and a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on campaign finance reform. There will be voice votes on the Cohen and Chen nominations for the Social Security Advisory Board.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COONS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senator SESSIONS for up to 40 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you, Mr. President. The facts are plain, colleagues. The immigration policies of President Obama are having a devastating effect on the classical American goal of a fair and lawful system of immigration, one that serves our national interest. He has directed the Federal immigration officers not to enforce plain law. He meets privately with pro-amnesty, open borders, and special interest business groups and promises to take even more actions in the future to erase plain law. Unfortunately, our fine law enforcement officers are excluded from the discussion. I have asked that they be involved for years now, and the President has flatly refused.

The President's actions evidence no policy or guiding principle that is sustainable. Now the heretofore largely covert actions by the President are open and blatant, and he has announced them. He has told the world that with the stroke of his pen he will, by Presidential directive, by Executive order, provide legal status to 5 to 6 million people unlawfully in the country today—all this contrary to long established law. But there is more. He has said he will issue, in effect, legal identification cards and work authorization.

Surely we know the President cannot make law. Congress makes law. As Chief Executive, the President executes, carries out, and enforces law. This we learned in grade school. This constitutional construct is not a small matter; it is the mechanism by which this Nation conducts its governmental business. Through this method, the people control their government.

Allowing any President to nullify law is a threat to the future of our Republic and to the ultimate power of the people to control it. That is why I have urged the President to reconsider this point and to adhere to his plain statements, where he has expressly stated he did not have the power to do what

he now—in a complete reversal—states he will do.

On November 25, 2013, less than a year ago, he stated: “If, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing them through Congress, I would do so. But we’re also a nation of laws.”

On March 28, 2011, President Obama said:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that’s just not the case. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Again, on September 28, 2011, he said:

I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there’s been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It’s just not true. But we live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it.

That is true. Every schoolchild knows that. But what is happening today? The President is saying something quite different.

It is important for Congress to stand and resist the complete erosion of its powers—and even more significantly, the powers of the American people—and see that our laws are carried out effectively.

I know this is a somewhat postmodern time where many believe words have no meaning except as they advance one’s agenda of the day, but such approaches are wholly inconsistent with the founding concepts of America. We were founded on the belief that words do have meaning, that sound principles must be adhered to, and that truth is real and must be sought.

While we debate many issues, and good people can disagree, surely we can all agree that at this moment we are in the Senate Chamber and that there is daylight outside. Those are not matters for debate or else we are, indeed, through the “looking glass.” Likewise, it is surely not a matter of debate—among Democrat or Republican—that the President cannot make or nullify law. He cannot do that. Thus, we must in unity call on President Obama not to go through with his stated desire which would eviscerate long and clearly established American immigration law. What law might the next President ignore, bend, or nullify?

It is said that he has ordered his lawyers and officials to tell him how he may carry out such actions before the end of the summer. Apparently he did not ask them whether he had such power; he just ordered them to develop

a plan to do that which the law does not allow.

Mr. President, frustration and pique can result in hasty and unwise decisions. Please do not do this.

To the officials and lawyers who have received this directive from the President, you must always remember that your first duty is to the Constitution and the Nation and its laws. There will be times when you have the duty to say no.

Lawyers at the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security are going to be asked how they can carry out the President’s plan that he previously said he had no authority to do. They are also challenged. Their duty is to say no. And sometimes you have to resign your office.

Just imagine, this past Sunday—2 days ago—White House adviser Dan Pfeiffer repeated the Obama administration’s warning of an impending Executive action on immigration. Mr. Pfeiffer said this action would come at “the end of the summer.” According to repeated and multiple news reports, these Executive actions could provide administrative legal papers and work permits for up to 5 to 6 million immigrants in clear contravention of Federal law. If these actions are taken, we will have effectively opened the borders of America. We are nearly there already.

Consider that millions of people come every year to America on visas. Currently, if you overstay a visa, there is no legal consequence today. No one is going to come and get you. No one even clocks if you come in or if you leave. If you get a student visa and drop out of school, or if you come to work on a visa and it expires, or if you just come on a tourist visa and never leave, nobody checks, nobody asks these individuals to leave.

The Congressional Budget Office said, in analyzing the Gang of 8 bill that came through the Senate, that as much as 40 percent of the illegality in America today is a result of visa overstays. They also projected that was going to increase in the years to come.

If you get past the Border Patrol at the border and somehow get to the interior of this country, you are also allowed to stay under President Obama’s policies, which are not to deport anybody unless they have been arrested for a serious crime, maybe even limited to a serious felony.

As the President’s former ICE Director John Sandweg explained, “If you are a run-of-the-mill immigrant here illegally, your odds of getting deported are close to zero.” In order to be deported from the interior, you basically have to commit a serious criminal offense. Otherwise, you are mostly free to enter illegally, work illegally, and even collect benefits like the additional child tax credit. The Treasury Department inspector general said that

loophole should be eliminated, and we could do so, but Congress and the majority in this Senate have refused to allow us to do so.

Chris Crane, the head of the ICE officers association—that is Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers who do all the work on the interior of the country and help in other areas too—testified before Congress:

Most Americans would be surprised to know that immigration agents are regularly prohibited from enforcing the two most fundamental sections of the United States immigration law. According to ICE policy, in most cases immigration agents can no longer arrest persons solely for entering the United States illegally. Additionally, in most cases immigration agents cannot arrest people solely because they have entered the United States with a visa and then overstayed that visa and failed to return to their country. Essentially, only individuals charged or convicted of very serious criminal offenses by other law enforcement agencies may be arrested or charged by ICE agents and officers for illegal entry or overstay.

This is a very serious matter. This has not been the policy of America; it is the policy President Obama has directed through his top administrative officials down to the very officers on the street.

Furthermore, if you show up at the border and simply turn yourself in, you are often released into the interior of the country.

A recent newspaper in New Jersey interviewed a 27-year-old illegal immigrant from Honduras. The newspaper wrote that he had “arrived in Freehold Borough 15 days ago from Honduras.” The article says he “left behind his parents and 10 brothers and sisters,” but “he is hoping his family will join him at some point in the future.”

Once illegal immigrants have been released into the interior, they frequently do not show up for court hearings. The National Review reports that “in one day at a Los Angeles immigration court last week, Judge Ashley Tabaddor heard the cases of nearly 40 illegal immigrant minors, but none of the children appeared in court, according to the Los Angeles Times.” None of them came to appear in court.

The article goes on to say:

In each case, the illegal immigrant was thought to have settled elsewhere, and the judge reportedly decided not to deport the children in absentia. Instead, the judge—who declined to speak with National Review Online, citing Justice Department policy—reportedly issued change-of-venue orders in each case.

That basically means nothing. If you fail to show up in court for a DUI or for a speeding ticket or for a reckless driving ticket, a warrant is issued for your arrest. That is what happens in America throughout this Nation, and that is what should happen. But when a person who enters the country unlawfully is released and asked to show up at a hearing at some date in the future, and then doesn't show up, the judge appar-

ently transfers it to some other district on the assumption the individual has moved to some other place. How do they know where they are? And nobody will go out and look for them. There is nobody looking for these individuals. They are not even able to put a warrant in the National Crime Information Center because they probably don't even have their true name or any ability to identify them. It is a complete capitulation to lawlessness.

But there are more ways, unfortunately, to get into the country illicitly. Our asylum system is plagued by fraud. The House Judiciary Committee reported this:

Asylum approval rates overall have increased dramatically in recent years. Approval rates by asylum officers have increased from 28 percent in 2007 to 46 percent in 2013 and approval rates by immigration judges in affirmative cases have increased from 51 percent in 2007 to 74 percent in 2013. Combining both of these approval rates, the vast majority of aliens who affirmatively seek asylum are now successful in their claims.

The report goes on:

This does not even take into account appeals to the Board of Immigration Appeals or federal courts. At the same time, an internal Department of Homeland Security report shows that at least 70 percent of asylum cases contain proven or possible fraud.

Our system as it is being run today is not lawful, it is not principled, it does not have integrity, and it has no ability to carry out the wishes of the American people—which has always been to have a system that is effective and lawful and serves the national interests.

And remember, all of these entries are in addition to the huge flow of annual permanent immigration into the United States as well as work authorization. That is all in addition to the lawful flow that we have. Between 2000 and today, the U.S. Government issued nearly 30 million lawful visas for individuals and their relatives to either live permanently in the United States or to come to take a job. We are a generous Nation. We have a very generous immigration policy—more than any nation in the world. And the American people have the right to expect that our laws are enforced, that we don't have open borders. They have never believed in that, and no official, to my knowledge, will stand up publicly and advocate for that, although many of the policies being promoted would result in just that.

Now consider what will happen to our system if the President goes through with his plan to provide work authorizations for another 5 million people living illegally in the United States. What immigration law will be left, colleagues? The government is not enforcing visa overstays, illegal entries, illegal work, or asylum fraud. And now the President is just going to start printing millions of work permits for people

illegally in the country—after Congress has loudly declared “no.”

Congress has refused to pass his plan. What is the President's excuse for wanting to do this unlawful act? He says Congress won't act. But Congress acts when it refuses to do something the President decides. That is an act of Congress, and Congress has declined to provide amnesty in the method the President asked for and has been advocating for. Therefore, he is not given any power to ignore current law that he wishes to change and Congress didn't change.

This is very serious. I say to my colleagues—Republicans, Democrats—this is more than a dispute over who should enter and what kind of amnesty we should have, if any; it is a challenge to the integrity of our constitutional order and a challenge to this Senate.

If the President persists in his plan, any one ICE officers come into contact with will simply assert protections and eligibility under this new Executive action. Now, get this. So we are going to give amnesty to 5 million or 6 million people. Well, if there are 11 million, 12 million people here today, what happens to the other 5 million to 6 million? If any ICE officer comes into contact with them, those individuals will assert they are entitled to protections and eligibility under the new Executive action. New illegal immigrants will flood across, as they did after the President's Executive amnesty for people under the age of 30 because they will believe—correctly, it appears to me—that if they can get into the country unlawfully, they will never be deported. They will wait until the President—this President or the next President or some other President—gives them work privileges in the United States to take jobs that Americans need to be doing at a time of extraordinarily high unemployment, at a time when we have the lowest workplace participation rate since the 1970s. Illegal immigrants won't even have to wait for Congress to pass amnesty if this goes through.

So I ask: What immigration law will be left? The President has simply decided—on his own, without Congress or legal authority—that the immigration laws protecting the jobs and wages of U.S. workers won't exist anymore. The President has taken it upon himself to decide who can enter the United States and who can work in the United States—by the millions—regardless of what laws have been passed. The President often talks of justice, but one of the gravest injustices that has been done is to deny the American people the protections of their laws. The laws on the books in America today are the laws of the people of the United States, and they protect working people from job competition at a time of high unemployment.

My message to the American people today is this. You can stop it. We can stop it, together. We will not let this lawlessness stand, and that fight begins with a vote on the House-passed bill just last Friday to block this new Executive action the President would undertake. The Senate cannot be allowed to surrender to the President's

lawlessness. It cannot. So I am calling today on every Senator to support this bill from the House and to demand that Majority Leader REID call it up, and let's have a vote. Every American needs to know where their leaders stand on this issue.

Let me share a message with my friends on the other side of the aisle. Each of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will have to decide whether they work for Majority Leader REID, whether they work for the President of the United States, or whether they work for their constituents.

I remember in 2007 when President Bush got it in his head that we had to have amnesty, without being able to present any compelling reason for us to believe the lawlessness would end in the future—and that effort failed. Three-fourths, I believe, or at least well more than half of the Republicans, opposed their President on this. Why shouldn't Democrats now stand up and oppose President Obama if he is overreaching in his policies?

So I will ask this. Will my Democratic colleagues protect the jobs of the American people? Will they protect the borders of this Nation and, in essence, the sovereignty of this Nation? Will my colleagues demand the Senate leader bring this House bill up for a vote? If my colleagues oppose these Executive actions, as some on the other side of the aisle have indicated they do, there is only one way to demonstrate it with integrity: Support the House bill and demand it receive a vote in the Senate.

There is nothing in that bill that is wrong or unprincipled or improper. There are two bills coming over from the House—a good bill that improves the technical enforcement issues that

are at the border today that are making it hard to enforce the law. They improve that in one piece, and they provide almost \$700 million in funding to help improve that situation and take care of the humanitarian need there. But they passed a second bill that simply uses a traditional congressional power to bar the President of the United States and any of his officers from spending moneys of the United States to execute some amnesty or work permit program.

Every member of the public—whether in a red State or a blue State or a purple State—ought to call their Member of Congress and Senators and ask them where they stand on this issue. Ask them if they support the House bill to block this executive amnesty that would be contrary to law, contrary to heritage, contrary to the President's own words on more than one occasion. Will your elected representatives demand that we at least have a vote in the Senate? You are a citizen of this country. You are entitled to a clear answer to the question.

We work for the people, and I believe the people are not happy with us. I believe the people rightly believe this Nation should have a principled immigration policy, one that is enforced and carried out fairly and objectively, that serves the national interest, an immigration policy where a person in another country who wants to come to the United States can read the requirements and submit an application, and if they meet those requirements and meet the limits of our law can be admitted to America, and those who do not, are not.

That is what nations all over the world have. There is not anything wrong with that. No nation, particu-

larly any developed nation, can just open its borders to every individual who would like to come here. It just cannot be done. The American people have a right to expect that. That is what they have wanted, that is what they have demanded of their Presidents and their Congresses for 40 years, and that is what the powers that be, the masters of the universe, surreptitiously and openly and otherwise have blocked, refused to give them. They are entitled to that. I believe it truly, and I believe they will get it.

This issue is not going away. We are going to confront it here in the Senate. I believe in the end the American people will be able to hold to account those who do not support a lawful system of immigration.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY,
AUGUST 8, 2014, AT 9:15 A.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate stands adjourned until Friday, August 8, 2014, at 9:15 a.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:34 a.m., adjourned until Friday, August 8, 2014, at 9:15 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

JORGE LUIS ALONSO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE RONALD A. GUZMAN, RETIRING.

JOHN ROBERT BLAKEY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE JAMES HOLDERMAN, RETIRED.

SENATE—Friday, August 8, 2014

The Senate met at 9:15 and 35 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 8, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COONS thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, and pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 112, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 8, 2014.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:16 and 7 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, September 8, 2014, at 2 p.m.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Thune:									
France	Euro		1,527.27				1,780.73		3,308.00
Italy	Euro		1,024.55				1,167.38		2,191.93
England	Pound		540.18				505.67		1,045.85
Total			3,092.00				3,453.78		6,545.78

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition & Forestry, June 30, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kuiken:									
Yemen	Rial		865.00						865.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		586.00						586.00
United States	Dollar				9,751.10				9,751.10
Adam J. Barker:									
Yemen	Rial		490.00						490.00
United States	Dollar				9,816.90				9,816.90
Thomas W. Goffus:									
Yemen	Rial		865.00						865.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		586.00						586.00
United States	Dollar				9,751.10				9,751.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham					122.52			122.52
Senator John McCain:									
Estonia	Euro		204.01						204.01
Latvia	Euro		148.07						148.07
Lithuania	Litas		242.19						242.19
Moldova	Leu		17.91						17.91
Christian Brose:									
Estonia	Euro		198.61						198.61
Latvia	Euro		161.45						161.45
Lithuania	Litas		277.88						277.88
Moldova	Leu		237.00						237.00
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Norway	Krone		5.97						5.97
Estonia	Euro		192.07						192.07
Latvia	Euro		198.07						198.07
Lithuania	Litas		270.27						270.27
Moldova	Leu		67.91						67.91
Delegation Expenses: *									
Estonia	Euro				307.48		701.88		1,009.36
Latvia	Euro				432.36		408.10		840.46
Lithuania	Litas						286.43		286.43
Moldova	Leu						178.86		178.86
Senator Roger Wicker:									
Japan	Yen		486.00						486.00

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,129.97						1,129.97
Joseph Lai:									
Japan	Yen		486.00						486.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,129.97						1,129.97
Delegation Expenses: *									
Japan	Yen						566.10		566.10
Hong Kong	Dollar						2,908.66		2,908.66
Senator Carl Levin:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		151.00						151.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		25.00						25.00
United States	Dollar				11,899.20				11,899.20
Peter K. Levine:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		146.00						146.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		25.00						25.00
United States	Dollar				12,029.20				12,029.20
William G.P. Monahan:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		146.00						146.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		25.00						25.00
United States	Dollar				11,984.20				11,984.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						21.90		21.90
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						49.59		49.59
Delegation Expenses: *									
Israel	Shekel						5,253.30		5,253.30
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Italy	Euro		488.33		63.81				552.14
Lithuania	Litas		235.05		63.81				298.86
Israel	Shekel		919.50						919.50
Ethiopia	Birr		797.93						797.93
Spain	Euro		66.76						66.76
John A. Bonsell:									
Italy	Euro		248.59		10.00		4.00		262.59
Lithuania	Litas		283.54						283.54
Israel	Shekel		1,022.00						1,022.00
Ethiopia	Birr		841.90						841.90
Spain	Euro		91.00		13.62				104.62
John Mark Powers:									
Italy	Euro		415.53						415.53
Lithuania	Litas		239.54						239.54
Israel	Shekel		893.00						893.00
Ethiopia	Birr		694.00						694.00
Spain	Euro		52.00		11.00				63.00
Lucas A. Holland:									
Italy	Euro		434.21		63.81				498.02
Lithuania	Litas		253.52		63.81				317.33
Israel	Shekel		1,174.88						1,174.88
Ethiopia	Birr		740.15						740.15
Spain	Euro		72.17		13.62				85.79
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Italy	Euro		668.98				10.00		678.98
Lithuania	Litas		284.54						284.54
Israel	Shekel		1,010.00				20.00		1,030.00
Ethiopia	Birr		835.00						835.00
Spain	Euro		105.00		13.62				105.00
Lenwood A. Landrum:									
Italy	Euro		673.76				10.00		683.76
Lithuania	Litas		284.55						284.55
Israel	Shekel		1,012.00				35.00		1,047.00
Ethiopia	Birr		835.00				20.00		855.00
Spain	Euro		112.00		13.62				112.00
Senator Deb Fischer:									
Italy	Euro		618.01						618.01
Lithuania	Litas		262.98						262.98
Israel	Shekel		1,398.98						1,398.98
Ethiopia	Birr		675.30						675.30
Spain	Euro		209.98						209.98
Peter Schirtzinger:									
Italy	Euro		573.83		9.48				583.31
Lithuania	Litas		239.00						239.00
Israel	Shekel		1,220.22						1,220.22
Ethiopia	Birr		695.00						695.00
Spain	Euro		58.00						58.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro				1,867.48		5,236.33		7,103.81
Lithuania	Litas						749.39		749.39
Moldova	Leu						265.74		265.74
Israel	Shekel						12,367.77		12,367.77
Ethiopia	Birr				3,938.39		1,365.30		5,303.69
Spain	Euro				227.09		568.51		795.60
Senator John McCain:									
Poland	Zloty		181.18						181.18
Romania	Leu		249.99						249.99
Bulgaria	Lev		182.52						182.52
United States	Dollar				6,488.80				6,488.80
Christian Brose:									
Poland	Zloty		245.00						245.00
Romania	Leu		268.66						268.66
Bulgaria	Lev		253.00						253.00
United States	Dollar				6,558.80				6,558.80
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Poland	Zloty		193.36						193.36
Romania	Leu		223.76						223.76
Bulgaria	Lev		180.98						180.98
United States	Dollar				6,488.80				6,488.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
Poland	Zloty				803.98				803.98
Romania	Leu						1,417.93		1,417.93
Bulgaria	Lev						2,404.38		2,404.38
Joseph Lai:									
United States	Dollar				15,744.40				15,744.40

August 8, 2014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 160, Pt. 10

14071

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Total			33,077.53		108,402.24		34,971.69		176,451.46

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Hoeven:									
Estonia	Euro		198.04						198.04
Latvia	Euro		148.07						148.07
Lithuania	Litas		278.83						278.83
Josh Carter:									
Estonia	Euro		198.04						198.04
Latvia	Euro		148.07						148.07
Lithuania	Litas		267.38						267.38
Charles Kolo Rathburn:									
China	Renminbi		1,382.75						1,382.75
Thailand	Baht		712.48						712.48
United States	Dollar				17,851.30				17,851.30
Allen Cutler:									
China	Renminbi		1,382.75						1,382.75
Thailand	Baht		712.48						712.48
United States	Dollar				17,918.30				17,918.30
Marian O'Rourke:									
China	Renminbi		1,382.75						1,382.75
Thailand	Baht		712.48						712.48
United States	Dollar				17,942.50				17,942.50
Christopher Ford:									
Australia	Dollar		285.00						285.00
Philippines	Peso		474.00						474.00
Japan	Yen		187.00						187.00
South Korea	Won		240.00						240.00
China	Renminbi		368.20						368.20
United States	Dollar				23,019.40				23,019.40
Brian Potts:									
Japan	Yen		187.00						187.00
South Korea	Won		700.00						700.00
China	Renminbi		368.20						368.20
United States	Dollar				16,937.40				16,937.40
Paul Grove:									
Lebanon	Pound		150.00						150.00
Egypt	Pound		267.00						267.00
Jordan	Dinar		355.40						355.40
Iraq	Dinar		86.00						86.00
Turkey	Lira		1,258.00						1,258.00
United States	Dollar				9,775.70				9,775.70
Adam Yezerski:									
Lebanon	Pound		150.00						150.00
Egypt	Pound		267.00						267.00
Jordan	Dinar		355.40						355.40
Iraq	Dinar		86.00						86.00
Turkey	Lira		1,258.00						1,258.00
United States	Dollar				9,775.70				9,775.70
Tim Rieser:									
Vietnam	Dong		1,484.00						1,484.00
China	Renminbi		987.00						987.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Australia	Dollar				550.00				550.00
China	Renminbi				321.96		1,913.69		2,235.65
Egypt	Pound				26.00		550.00		576.00
Estonia	Euro						672.91		672.91
Iraq	Dinar				7,600.00		141.24		7,741.24
Jordan	Dinar				95.25		134.49		229.74
Latvia	Euro						714.35		714.35
Lebanon	Pound				130.00		2,840.54		2,970.54
Lithuania	Litas						190.96		190.96
Moldova	Leu						44.72		44.72
Philippines	Peso				120.46				120.46
South Korea	Won				314.16				314.16
Thailand	Baht				98.85		254.09		352.94
Turkey	Lira				377.06		723.00		1,100.06
Vietnam	Dong						2,643.10		2,643.10
Total			17,037.32		122,854.04		10,823.09		150,714.45

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. TO JUNE, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mike Crapo:									
China	Renminbi		667.71						667.71
Vietnam	Dong		986.80						986.80
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,190.33						1,190.33
Senator Richard Shelby:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
Vietnam	Dong		1,228.00						1,228.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,222.53						1,222.53
Anne C. Caldwell:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
Vietnam	Dong		1,228.00						1,228.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,137.40						1,137.40
Total			9,235.99		0.00		0.00		9,235.99

SENATOR TIM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, July 7, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Megan Foster:									
Tanzania	Shilling		1,385.00						1,385.00
United States	Dollar				4,674.50				4,674.50
Total			1,385.00		4,674.50				6,059.50

SENATOR PATTY MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, July 10, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Tim Scott:									
Italy	Euro		674.00						674.00
Lithuania	Litas		253.54						253.54
Israel	Sheqel		1,017.00						1,017.00
Ethiopia	Birr		711.00						711.00
Spain	Euro		167.00						167.00
Jennifer DeCasper:									
Italy	Euro		612.98		9.48				622.46
Lithuania	Litas		257.55						257.55
Israel	Sheqel		999.00						999.00
Ethiopia	Birr		744.00						744.00
Spain	Euro		167.00						167.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro				466.88		1,309.08		1,775.96
Lithuania	Litas						187.34		187.34
Moldova	Leu						48.32		48.32
Israel	Sheqel						3,091.94		3,091.94
Ethiopia	Birr				984.60		341.32		1,325.92
Spain	Euro				56.78		142.12		198.90
Total			5,603.07		1,517.74		5,120.12		12,240.93

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
July 24, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1, TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Isaac Edwards:									
Denmark	Danish Krone		469.65						469.65
United States	Dollar				4,197.50				4,197.50
Total			469.65		4,197.50				4,667.15

SENATOR MARY LANDRIEU,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, June 27, 2014.

August 8, 2014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 160, Pt. 10

14073

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Maria Cantwell:									
Chile	Peso		951.63						951.63
Bolivia	Boliviano		398.16						398.16
Jonathan Hale:									
Chile	Peso		697.86						697.86
Bolivia	Boliviano		348.16						348.16
Jayne White:									
Singapore	Dollar		894.63						894.63
Elissa Alben:									
Singapore	Dollar		894.63						894.63
Everett Eissenstat:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,118.29						1,118.29
Shane Warren:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,115.64						1,115.64
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar				43.21				43.21
Total			6,419.00		43.21		0.00		6,462.21

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jayne White:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,615.09						1,615.09
United States	Dollar				13,165.70				13,165.70
Elissa Alben:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,571.31						1,571.31
United States	Dollar				13,165.70				13,165.70
Everett Eissenstat:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,697.22						1,697.22
United States	Dollar				13,122.30				13,122.30
Shane Warren:									
Singapore	Dollar		1,630.50						1,630.50
United States	Dollar				13,122.30				13,122.30
Delegation Expenses:*							1,497.16		1,497.16
United States	Dollar								
Total			6,514.12		52,576.00		1,497.16		60,587.28

* "Delegation Expenses include other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country."

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Latvia	Euro		142.10						142.10
Lithuania	Litas		239.44						239.44
Moldova	Leu		17.91						17.91
United States	Dollar				5,771.08				5,771.08
Senator Ron Johnson:									
Lithuania	Litas		233.59						233.59
Moldova	Leu		17.91						17.91
United States	Dollar				5,645.90				5,645.90
Lydia Westlake:									
Lithuania	Litas		252.42						252.42
Moldova	Leu		11.94						11.94
United States	Dollar				5,653.90				5,653.90
Delegation Expenses:*									
Latvia	Euro						280.15		280.15
Lithuania	Litas						286.43		286.43
Moldova	Leu						67.07		67.07
Senator John Barrasso:									
Italy	Euro		531.87						531.87
Lithuania	Litas		333.02						333.02
Israel	Shekel		1,427.02						1,427.02
Ethiopia	Birr		871.81						871.81
Spain	Euro		255.01						255.01
Delegation Expenses:*									
Italy	Euro						279.90		279.90
Lithuania	Litas						93.67		93.67
Israel	Shekel						1,545.97		1,545.97
Ethiopia	Birr						662.96		662.96
Spain	Euro						69.70		69.70
Senator Ben Cardin:									
Ukraine	Hryvnya		354.20						354.20
Vietnam	Dong		1,040.85						1,040.85
Singapore	Dollar		849.55						849.55

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				21,107.10				21,107.10
Debbie Yamada:									
Ukraine	Hryvnya		345.18						345.18
Vietnam	Dong		1,124.47						1,124.47
Singapore	Dollar		756.18						756.18
United States	Dollar				21,107.10				21,107.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnya					2,521.82			2,521.82
Vietnam	Dong					215.86			215.86
Singapore	Dollar					326.11			326.11
Senator Bob Corker:									
Moldova	Leu		296.91						296.91
Ukraine	Hryvnya		650.37						650.37
United States	Dollar				13,959.10				13,959.10
Todd Womack:									
Moldova	Leu		296.91						296.91
Ukraine	Hryvnya		696.16						696.16
United States	Dollar				14,319.10				14,319.10
Daniel Vajdich:									
Moldova	Leu		148.00						148.00
Ukraine	Leu		824.00						824.00
United States	Dollar				13,144.10				13,144.10
Ukraine	Hryvnia					1,137.12			1,137.12
Senator Bob Corker:									
Estonia	Euro		133.88						133.88
Romania	New Leu		238.75						238.75
Poland	Zloty		372.25						372.25
United States	Dollar				19,054.00				19,054.00
Caleb McCarry:									
Estonia	Euro		133.88						133.88
Romania	New Leu		165.00						165.00
Poland	Zloty		495.25						495.25
United States	Dollar				16,993.50				16,993.50
Daniel Vajdich:									
Estonia	Euro		133.88						133.88
Romania	New Leu		238.75						238.75
Poland	Zloty		372.25						372.25
United States	Dollar				17,664.80				17,664.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
Estonia	Euro					1,155.52			1,155.52
Romania	New Leu					1,864.00			1,864.00
Poland	Zloty					257.25			257.25
Senator Ron Johnson:									
Poland	Zloty		146.18						146.18
Romania	Leu		219.99						219.99
Bulgaria	Lev		189.46						189.46
United States	Dollar				6,488.80				6,488.80
Lydia Westlake:									
Poland	Zloty		205.36						205.36
Romania	Leu		250.91						250.91
Bulgaria	Lev		192.52						192.52
United States	Dollar				6,488.80				6,488.80
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Poland	Zloty		202.00						202.00
Romania	Leu		344.00						344.00
Bulgaria	Lev		239.00						239.00
United States	Dollar				6,488.00				6,488.00
Jessica Elledge:									
Poland	Zloty		410.00						410.00
Romania	Leu		355.00						355.00
Bulgaria	Lev		258.00						258.00
United States	Dollar				6,488.00				6,488.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Poland	Zloty					499.40			499.40
Romania	Leu					1,890.57			1,890.57
Bulgaria	Lev					3,205.84			3,205.84
Senator Edward Markey:									
Italy	Euro		1,735.76						1,735.76
United States	Dollar				7,463.40				7,463.40
Ana Unruh Cohen:									
Italy	Euro		1,275.78						1,275.78
United States	Dollar				2,233.40				2,233.40
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro					2,183.62			2,183.62
Senator Robert Menendez:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,568.87						1,568.87
United States	Dollar				10,880.30				10,880.30
Jodi Herman:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		333.42						333.42
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,268.73						1,268.73
United States	Dollar				11,570.30				11,570.30
Dana Stroul:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		218.00						218.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		546.09						546.09
United States	Dollar				11,570.30				11,570.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal					1,700.00			1,700.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham					2,142.27			2,142.27
Michael Gallagher:									
Turkey	Lira		1,594.60						1,594.60
Jordan	Dinar		1,359.62						1,359.62
United States	Dollar				2,867.50				2,867.50
Charlotte Oldham Moore:									
Turkey	Lira		1,157.22						1,157.22
Jordan	Dinar		1,392.60						1,392.60
United States	Dollar				2,832.50				2,832.50
Dana Stroul:									
Turkey	Lira		1,201.62						1,201.62
Jordan	Dinar		1,436.60						1,436.60
United States	Dollar				2,832.50				2,832.50

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Delegation Expenses: *									
Turkey	Lira						1,236.28		1,236.28
Jordan	Dinar						359.85		359.85
Jenifer Healy:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		1,254.00						1,254.00
Cambodia	Dollar		904.27						904.27
United States	Dollar				5,065.86				5,065.86
Trey Hicks:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		1,254.00						1,254.00
Cambodia	Dollar		897.00						897.00
United States	Dollar				4,938.75				4,938.75
Delegation Expenses: *									
Indonesia	Rupiah						506.00		506.00
Cambodia	Dollar						549.00		549.00
Chris Homan:									
Cuba	Dollar		272.93						272.93
United States	Dollar				1,195.36				1,195.36
Carolyn Leddy:									
Japan	Yen		1,075.00						1,075.00
Vietnam	Dong		869.90						869.90
Australia	Dollar		906.20						906.20
United States	Dollar				4,175.10				4,175.10
Andrew Olson:									
Japan	Yen		434.10						434.10
Vietnam	Dong		885.06						885.06
Australia	Dollar		838.50						838.50
United States	Dollar				7,555.70				7,555.70
Delegation Expenses: *									
Japan	Yen						0.00		0.00
Vietnam	Dong						383.61		383.61
Australia	Dollar						1.00		1.00
Caleb McCarry:									
Poland	Zloty		600.00						600.00
Latvia	Euro		516.00						516.00
United States	Dollar				3,277.10				3,277.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
Poland	Zloty						0.00		0.00
Latvia	Euro						988.46		988.46
Caleb McCarry:									
Haiti	Dollar		873.00						873.00
United States	Dollar				1,002.39				1,002.39
Christen Mogavero:									
Haiti	Dollar		789.00						789.00
United States	Dollar				1,002.39				1,002.39
Delegation Expenses: *									
Haiti	Dollar						663.96		663.96
Michael Schiffer:									
Vietnam	Dong		970.54						970.54
Singapore	Dollar		1,310.58						1,310.58
United States	Dollar				8,847.80				8,847.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
Vietnam	Dong						107.93		107.93
Singapore	Dollar						163.05		163.05
Caroline Vik:									
Kuwait	Dinar		745.62						745.62
United States	Dollar				4,848.10				4,848.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kuwait	Dinar						357.38		357.38
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						926.86		926.86
Morgan Vina:									
Mozambique	Metical		788.55						788.55
Zambia	Kwacha		849.50						849.50
United States	Dollar				7,445.20				7,445.20
John Zardozny:									
Mozambique	Metical		728.55						728.55
Zambia	Kwacha		849.50						849.50
United States	Dollar				7,445.20				7,445.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Zambia	Kwacha						229.71		229.71
Brandon Yoder:									
Ecuador	Dollar		804.79						804.79
United States	Dollar				1,331.87				1,331.87
Total			51,842.05		290,754.30		28,858.32		371,454.67

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Collins:									
United States	Dollar				2,931.41				2,931.41
United Kingdom	Pound		577.00						577.00
Germany	Euro		877.05						877.05
France	Euro		1,198.38						1,198.38
Jillian Fitzpatrick:									
United States	Dollar				3,212.40				3,212.40
United Kingdom	Pound		577.00						577.00
Germany	Euro		877.05						877.05

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
France	Euro		1,198.38						1,198.38
Michelle Taylor:									
United States	Dollar				2,931.40				2,931.40
United Kingdom	Pound		577.00						577.00
Germany	Euro		877.05						877.05
France	Euro		1,198.38						1,198.38
Senator Thomas R. Carper:									
United States	Dollar				2,156.29				2,156.29
Mexico	Peso		572.00						572.00
Guatemala	Quetzal		135.00						135.00
Blas Nunez-Neto:									
United States	Dollar				1,911.39				1,911.39
Mexico	Peso		678.00						678.00
Guatemala	Quetzal		175.00						175.00
Holly Idelson:									
United States	Dollar				1,869.79				1,869.79
Mexico	Peso		615.53						615.53
Guatemala	Quetzal		135.00						135.00
Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
United States	Dollar				1,188.43				1,188.43
Mexico	Peso		1,082.34						1,082.34
Liam Forsythe:									
United States	Dollar				1,318.93				1,318.93
Mexico	Peso		1,013.55						1,013.55
Senator Rob Portman:									
United States	Dollar				12,384.90				12,384.90
Ukraine	Hryvnia		235.90						235.90
Poland	Zloty		470.29						470.29
Brent Bombach:									
United States	Dollar				11,916.90				11,916.90
Ukraine	Hryvnia		231.37						231.37
Poland	Zloty		465.77						465.77
Delegation Expenses:*									
France	Euro						168.18		168.18
Mexico	Peso						651.00		651.00
Guatemala	Quetzal						734.00		734.00
Total			13,767.04		41,821.84		1,553.18		57,142.06

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs,
July 25, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
United States	Dollar				991.36				991.36
Mexico	Peso		1,087.82						1,087.82
Kirstin Dunham:									
United States	Dollar				1,349.46				1,349.46
Mexico	Peso		978.47						978.47
Brian Burton:									
United States	Dollar				1,349.46				1,349.46
Mexico	Peso		1,038.91						1,038.91
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar						126.00		126.00
Mexico	Peso						2,391.60		2,391.60
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
Vietnam	Dong		1,228.00						1,228.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,222.54						1,222.54
Kevin McDonald:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
Vietnam	Dong		1,228.00						1,228.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,137.40						1,137.40
Kristine Lucius:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
John Tracy:									
China	Yuan		787.61						787.61
Vietnam	Dong		1,228.00						1,228.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,137.40						1,137.40
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar						956.50		956.50
China	Yuan						3,475.72		3,475.72
Vietnam	Dong						7,929.30		7,929.30
Hong Kong	Dollar						5,741.07		5,741.07
Total			13,436.98		3,690.28		20,620.19		37,747.45

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 29, 2014.

August 8, 2014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 160, Pt. 10

14077

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard Burr:									
France	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Senator Johnny Isakson:									
France	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Senator John Boozman:									
France	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Senator Mike Johanns:									
France	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Lupe Wissell:									
France	Euro		2,108.00						2,108.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Polly Walker:									
France	Euro		2,108.00						2,108.00
Italy	Euro		683.50						683.50
England	Pound		659.73						659.73
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro						10,684.38		10,684.38
Italy	Euro						7,004.28		7,004.28
England	Pound						3,034.02		3,034.02
Total			21,119.38				20,722.68		41,842.06

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BERNIE SANDERS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 30, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Saxby Chambliss	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
	Euro		683.50						683.50
	Pound		659.73						659.73
Senator Tom Coburn	Euro		2,211.00						2,211.00
	Euro		683.50						683.50
	Pound		659.73						659.73
Martha Scott Poindexter	Dollar		1,932.00						1,932.00
					12,491.84				12,491.84
Tyler Stephens	Dollar		1,932.00						1,932.00
					12,491.84				12,491.84
Tressa Guenov	Dollar		332.00						332.00
			362.00						362.00
			238.00						238.00
Michael Pevzner	Dollar		332.00		10,361.00				10,361.00
			362.00						362.00
			238.00						238.00
Ryan Kaldahl	Dollar		332.00		10,361.00				10,361.00
			362.00						362.00
			238.00						238.00
Senator Martin Heinrich	Dollar		670.95		10,361.00				10,361.00
					13,737.20				13,737.20
Chad Tanner	Dollar		892.45						892.45
					13,737.20				13,737.20
Senator Saxby Chambliss	Dollar		764.00						764.00
					2,523.88				2,523.88
Tyler Stephens	Dollar		764.00						764.00
					2,411.18				2,411.18
Christian Cook	Dollar		682.00						682.00
					9,344.00				9,344.00
Ryan Tully	Dollar		682.00						682.00
					9,344.00				9,344.00
Total			18,223.86		107,164.14				125,388.00

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Aug. 1, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Erika Schlager:									
Austria	Euro		1,668.00						1,668.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hungary	Forint		1,518.00						1,518.00
United States	Dollar				3,192.30				3,192.30
Hungary	Forint		1,012.00						1,012.00
Macedonia	Denar		852.00						852.00
United States	Dollar				2,354.00				2,354.00
Shelly Han:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,401.00						1,401.00
United States	Dollar				1,866.10				1,866.10
Japan	Yen		2,038.00						2,038.00
United States	Dollar				2,484.00				2,484.00
David Killion:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,496.00						1,496.00
Austria	Euro		1,628.72						1,628.72
United States	Dollar				10,061.20				10,061.20
Japan	Yen		2,038.00						2,038.00
United States	Dollar				17,830.00				17,830.00
Orest Deychakiwsky:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,800.00						1,800.00
United States	Dollar				3,499.70				3,499.70
Kyle Parker:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,496.00						1,496.00
United States	Dollar				2,799.70				2,799.70
Alex Johnson:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		636.00						636.00
Austria	Euro		1,628.72						1,628.72
United States	Dollar				3,605.20				3,605.20
Austria	Euro		4,170.00						4,170.00
United States	Dollar				3,575.20				3,575.20
Total			23,382.44		51,267.40		0		74,649.84

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
July 10, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY AND REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR TRAVEL FROM JUNE 5 TO JUNE 7, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Senator Dean Heller:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Senator Robert Casey:									
France	Euro		754.58						754.58
Senator Jon Tester:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Senator Michael Bennet:									
France	Euro								0.00
Senator Joe Manchin:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Senator Mazie Hirono:									
France	Euro		794.00						794.00
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
France	Euro		804.00						804.00
John Dowd:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Anna Gallagher:									
France	Euro		809.00						809.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro						11,570.00		11,570.00
Total			8,015.58				11,570.00		19,585.58

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384.

SENATOR HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, July 31, 2014.
SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Republican Leader, Aug. 1, 2014.

SENATE—Monday, September 8, 2014

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Oh holy God of love, You have made us secure in Your love. Thank You that our right standing with You is based on what You have done and not on our feeble efforts. Set Your stronghold of protection firm against the foes of this land we love, as You use our lawmakers to fulfill Your purposes. Lord, in the midst of distracting problems, give our Senators a vision of what America can become. Make this a nation of justice and plenty where vice shall cease to fester. Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands so that our lives will glorify You. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING EVERYONE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is so good to see the President pro tempore and to be back in this place where we have spent a lot of years of our lives. I am glad to see everybody here ready to go so we can wrap up this double lame duck session.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 471.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m. this evening. During that period of time until 5:30 p.m. Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their designees.

At 5:30 p.m. the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote and confirmation of a nomination to fill the vacancy in the Eleventh Circuit—Jill Pryor. Following the disposition of the Pryor nomination, there will be a rollcall vote on the nomination of Henry J. Aaron to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board, followed by three voice votes in relation to Aaron, Cohen, and Chen.

Following disposition of these nominations, the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the constitutional amendment.

Therefore, Senators should expect up to three rollcall votes after 5:30 p.m.

SENATOR HOLLINGS

The President pro tempore and I served for a long time with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Fritz Hollings, who retired. Dealing with the constitutional amendment was his issue, and I can remember seeing this dignified, handsome, very articulate Senator talking about its importance. Before he left he spoke on this on many occasions. So it brings back memories—all very positive—about the good work that this man did before he left. By the way, he is still strong and vibrant, 90 years old or thereabouts, still playing tennis and as strong as we knew him when he was here.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 5230
AND H.R. 5272

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings as to both of these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The bills will be placed on the calendar.

MUST PASS LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the Senate returns from the State work period, we have a number of vitally important matters that require our attention. I only mention a few of them. There is a lot more than this. The matters coming out of the Judiciary Committee alone would fill this whole page and more, but we have been stopped from doing virtually everything for the last two Congresses, and so we are not getting much done. But I will mention a few of them.

We need to pass appropriations legislation to keep the government from shutting down as it has in the past because of the obstruction of the Republicans. We need to pass the extension of the Internet Tax Freedom Act; we need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank; we need to pass the Travel Promotion, Enhancement, and Modernization Act, which was overwhelmingly passed by the House a short time ago; and we need to reconsider the issues of college affordability and equal pay for women.

But the bill before us today is Senator UDALL's and Senator BENNET's constitutional amendment. The good Senators from New Mexico and Colorado have joined together on a very important issue and we are going to consider that. The first vote will be tonight.

We have had in this country a flood of very dark money coming into this Nation's political system which is threatening to tear apart the fabric of American democracy. During the 2012 Presidential campaign, outside groups spent about \$1 billion. That is about as much spending as took place in the previous 10 elections combined.

Last year was a Presidential election, so the money this year is focused on the Senate and House races. They will again break all records. This spike in the amount of money being pumped into elections is not surprising, as alarming as it is. Recent decisions rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Citizens United and McCutcheon cases have destroyed our campaign finance laws and have left the American people with the status quo in which radical billionaires are attempting to buy our democracy.

Meanwhile, hard-working families who don't have endless funds to dump into political campaigns are expected to sit on the sidelines and watch as two brothers try to fix every election in America to their liking. And when I say every election—they are involved in elections in the State of Virginia—not for the Senate, but they are involved in that, I am sure, too—but for

secretaries of State, and State legislative races in Vermont. All over the country they are spending money as if there is no end to it, and I guess with them there is no end to it.

Hard-working families, though, don't have those endless funds to dump into political campaigns. So they just sit on the sidelines and watch. When I say that Americans are watching the Koch brothers trying to influence November elections, I mean that literally.

Last week it was reported that Charles and David Koch and their political empire have funded 44,000 political ads for television so far during this election cycle—44,000. But that doesn't count money they hide in other organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations' ads they helped fund. But we can identify directly Charles and David Koch with 44,000 separate 30-second TV spots.

Putting that in perspective, if for 16 days there was nothing else on television except their 44,000 ads, the 30-second ads would run for 16 consecutive days, 24 hours a day. That is 16 consecutive days, around-the-clock, 30-second political ads, and that is just from them. Imagine—16 consecutive days of nonstop political ads, no 24-hour news coverage, no ESPN, no football games, no baseball games, no SportsCenter, no reality television, no anything—just the Koch brothers' paid ads and deceitful messaging all day, everyday for more than 2 weeks. This is the political environment that the Citizens United decision has hatched. It is a society inundated by the wrath of political misgivings and I guess some of the musings of the two billionaire brothers. They are multibillionaires.

While the Kochs and other special interests are using their vast resources to make their voices heard, Americans are being systematically disenfranchised from our democracy. To say that is wrong is a gross understatement. I don't know how else to say it. Our involvement with the government should not be dependent on somebody's checkbook. The American people reject the notion that money gives billionaires, corporations or special interests a greater voice in the government than our own voice, the voice of the voters. The American voter believes, as I do, that the Constitution doesn't give corporations a vote, and it doesn't give them—because of the dollars they have—extra votes.

The only people who don't see it that way are the Republicans here in Congress. They see money as speech. In fact, the Republican leader has said: "In our society spending is speech."

If spending is speech, where does that leave the rest of the American people? Should their role in democracy be diminished because they are paying a mortgage and sending kids to college? Should a family hard hit by a recession—let's say they are out of work—

does that mean they shouldn't have any say at the ballot box? Should families hard hit by the recession take a back seat in our government to a couple of billionaires? Right now the answer is yes.

How could everyday American families afford to have their voices heard if spending money is speech? Families cannot compete with billionaires. Rich families can't, poor families can't, working families can't. The only people that would have a vote are these megabillionaires who are trying to buy our country.

They are trying to buy America at every level of government. Why? Because they want to make more money. They control vast amounts of tar sands, oil, gas, coal, chemicals, and on and on. They want to make more money. What they have now is not enough.

So we are faced with a choice: We can keep the status quo or we can change the system and restore the fundamental principle of one American, one vote.

When I was in law school one of the classes I had sent us over to the Supreme Court to listen to an argument—*Baker v. Carr*. The decision was on one man, one vote; one woman, one vote. I didn't realize that when I was there listening. Frankly, I didn't really understand a lot of the talk that went on before the Supreme Court, but I came to learn later. I have been in public office now for a few years, and I can remember the first time I ran for the State legislature in Nevada. Clark County, where Las Vegas is, was really growing at the time, but they had not totally reapportioned the State. They had done a little. Clark County is only 1 of 17 counties. They had 9 incumbent assemblymen. So I ran against those 9 incumbent assemblymen. Now the assemblymen run in single districts because reapportionment has taken place because of *Baker v. Carr*. When I was elected in the legislature one person, one vote did not apply. They hadn't completed that work yet. So I do believe that we should be a society where one vote equals one person.

Corporations should not have a vote and dollar bills should not have a vote. But that is where we are now. We are faced with a choice: Keep the status quo or change it. Senators UDALL of New Mexico and BENNET of Colorado want to change this system. Their constitutional amendment is about restoring freedom of speech for everyone in America. Whether you are a billionaire, a millionaire, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class, poor, homeless—that is for whom we are fighting. It grants Congress the authority to regulate and limit the raising and spending of money for Federal political campaigns.

Senators UDALL and BENNET's amendment will rein in the massive

spending of super PACs, which has grown exponentially since the Supreme Court's misguided decision in *Citizens United*. It also provides States with the authority to institute campaign spending limits at the State level, which they should have a right to do. This is common sense. It is a solution to an issue that is plaguing our political system. Yet, instead of joining with us to expel the undue influence of special interests from our government, Senate Republicans are doing their best to keep the status quo. What they are going to do, Mr. President—we are going to have a cloture vote tonight to stop debate on this, and they say: Well, great. We will go ahead and support that because we can stall.

They want us to not be able to do anything here. Remember, their whole political mantra is this: We have a Democratic President; we have a Democratic Senate. And they have done their best for the 6 years of the Obama administration to stop everything. That is what they agreed to do—stop everything. They have two goals: not allow the President to be re-elected—they failed there miserably. During the first Congress of his Presidency, we had a lot of Democratic Senators so we were able to get a lot done during that time, but in the last two they have been experts at stalling everything. That is what they are going to do again today.

But we are going to go ahead and vote on this tonight, and we are going to vote on it again Wednesday. There will be no amendments. It is not a difficult issue. You are either for campaign spending reform or not. So my Republican colleagues can stall for time. We are going to be very patient. We are going to see if there is a single Republican who believes an election in America today should be determined by how much money you have. That is what this vote is all about.

I am going to move this legislation forward regardless of any Republican obstruction because this issue is important. Simply put, this constitutional amendment is what we need to bring back sanity to elections and restore Americans' confidence in our democracy. We must overturn the status quo created by the Supreme Court and instead put in place a system that works for all Americans, not just the richest of the rich.

It is such a shame what this Republican-driven tea party has done in Congress to try to stop everything. Virtually everything is a filibuster. I do not know how much longer the American people are going to put up with it. These are artificial numbers anyway. Should not we be a democracy? We are not because everything in this Senate requires 60 votes. That is not the way of the Founding Fathers. And, of course, a number of the Founding Fathers were from the Presiding Officer's

State. None from Nevada; we were not a State. But the Founding Fathers must be turning over in their graves. They must be looking down at this and saying: What in the world are they doing to our country?

We must overturn the status quo. This is what the entire issue boils down to: whether our democracy, as President Lincoln said, is a "government of the people, by the people and for the people." That is what Lincoln said, and we know that is what he meant—or as we have it today: a government of the rich, by the rich, and exclusively for the rich.

Is America for sale? The American people want change. They want their place in government to be protected. The constitutional amendment before the Senate protects working families. It protects Americans. It protects their voice and participation in government because our voice—not the wealth of a few—is the very essence of American democracy.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are currently in a period of morning business.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know we are going to hold our first vote relevant to S.J. Res. 19 later today, so let me speak about that for a few minutes. It is a constitutional amendment. It is something rare here, but this would restore to Congress and the States the authority to set reasonable limits on contributions and expenditures in our elections. The amendment would also allow Congress and the States to distinguish between natural persons and corporations when shaping legislation regarding the financing of elections.

Both the States and the national government have exercised this power for a long time in a responsible way until a narrow majority of Supreme Court justices ignored history, and, worse than that, they ignored the Court's own precedent. These Court

opinions have now eviscerated campaign finance laws, and they have invited corruption into our political system. If we do not respond, we will continue on a path back to the days when only the wealthy few had access to our government. If we do not respond, corruption will flourish and hard-working Americans will lose any remaining faith they have in their elected officials. So I believe it is time to restore some sanity to our campaign finance laws but also to restore the true meaning and intent of the First Amendment.

I came to the Senate in January 1975, in the wake of the Watergate scandal. Americans were voicing concerns about the integrity and honesty of their elected leaders. They were concerned about the corrupting influence of anonymous money flowing into elections. The public's confidence in our democratic institutions was at a low point, so Congress passed the 1976 amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act. As a freshman Senator—in fact, the junior most Member of the Senate—I was proud to vote for this law.

Decades later Democrats and Republicans again came together in 2002 to pass the McCain-Feingold Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. It targeted the use of soft money donations and the unlimited spending that could be done anonymously, used to finance attack ads before an election. Just as we did in the wake of Watergate, our bipartisan effort recognized the need to pass important campaign finance reforms to protect our democracy from corruption and to preserve access to our popular democracy.

But it appears today that many of our elected officials and a narrow majority of the U.S. Supreme Court no longer even acknowledge the corrosive influence of unfettered, anonymous money flowing in to fund our elections. Anonymous money—somebody can try to buy an election, and they do not even have to put their fingerprints on it. They just spend the money. They can say it is the Committee to Bring Honesty and Openness to Government even though it might be funded by a group who wants just the opposite.

Over the last decade a slim majority of the Supreme Court has issued one dreadful campaign finance decision after another. In fact, in 2010, in a 5-to-4 ruling—five Republicans on the Supreme Court—in *Citizens United*, the Court reversed a century of precedent by declaring that corporations have a First Amendment right to spend endlessly to finance and influence elections. In effect, they said corporations were people. I have said this many times before, and sometimes people chuckle, but stop and think about it. This country elected General Eisenhower as President. If you really listen to what the Supreme Court said, we

could elect General Electric to be President or General Motors to be President.

In this past year the same five Justices held that aggregate limits on campaign contributions are now somehow a violation of the First Amendment. In other words, if you are running in a local election somewhere where people would normally spend \$300 or \$400, but it is critical because that local board may decide what the tax policy of a big corporation might be in that community, they could say: OK, people running the board are going to spend \$300 or \$400 each. We will just put \$1 million in to elect a different board that will give us a \$10 million tax break.

The Court's radical reinterpretation of the First Amendment contradicts the principles of freedom, equality, and self-government upon which this Nation was founded. The consequence of the Court's opinions is that a small, tiny minority of very wealthy individuals and special interests are drowning out the voices of hard-working Americans and skewing our electoral process. What they are saying is: I have millions of dollars. I have a voice in elections. You? You are just an average hard-working man or woman, and you do not have any voice.

The expressed justification for time-honored campaign finance laws has been a genuine concern about the corrupting influence of money in politics. But despite this well-founded concern, Justice Kennedy's opinion in *Citizens United* nonsensically confined corruption to mean only quid pro quo corruption or bribery. In doing so, these five Justices discarded what our very Founders understood to be the meaning of corruption. They have also rejected the definition of corruption upon which this Court has historically relied. As recently as 2003 when the Court initially upheld the McCain-Feingold Act before striking much of it down later, the Court stated:

In speaking of 'improper influence' and opportunities for abuse' in addition to 'quid pro quo arrangements,' we [have] recognized a concern not confined to bribery of public officials, but extending to the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors.

In fact, I look at the distinguished Presiding Officer—a man who served with such great distinction as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia—and I think about the jury verdict handed down last week against another former Republican Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and it reminds us that when elected officials grant political favors in exchange for gifts and money, it certainly threatens the functioning of our democracy. What Justice Kennedy and those who joined with him fail to recognize is that more subtle forms of corruption are also corrosive and undermine public confidence.

Way back in the last century, we changed the Constitution to allow the direct election of Senators. One of the motivating factors was that in one State—at that time the legislatures appointed Senators—in one State, one major corporation in the mining industry so controlled the legislature that it picked who were going to be the Senators. We changed that because we said everybody should have a voice.

States and future Congresses should be able to recognize that corruption extends to the idea that money—particularly unregulated campaign contributions—buys access and influences the political process in disproportionate ways for a wealthy few.

This “pay to play” notion is corrosive to our democracy. The size of your bank account should not determine whether and how the government responds to your needs. The government should be there for all Americans, not just the most wealthy. Vermonters understand this. They have led the way by speaking out forcefully about the devastating impact of these Supreme Court decisions. So we ought to start listening to our constituents. We ought to vote to protect our democracy against corruption. We ought to restore democracy for all Americans.

Some have argued that money is speech so we should not allow the States or Congress to limit any spending in our elections. As Justice Stevens said in his testimony before the Rules Committee, “while money is used to finance speech, money is not speech. Speech is only one of the activities that are financed by campaign contributions and expenditures. Those financial activities should not receive the same constitutional protection as speech itself.” This is exactly right.

I have also heard the argument that this proposed amendment would silence nonprofit advocacy groups like the NAACP and the Sierra Club because it allows Congress and the States to distinguish between corporations and actual individuals. Do not believe it. Until Citizens United, prohibitions on corporate and union political spending were the norm at the Federal level and in many states. Those prohibitions never stopped nonprofit groups from engaging in vigorous issue advocacy. Nor would this amendment.

Moreover, I have received a letter of support signed by both the NAACP and the Sierra Club, among many others, that openly advocate for this proposed amendment. If this proposed amendment would have the potential effect of silencing their organizations, why would they support it?

For those who claim the threat of these Supreme Court decisions is not sufficient to warrant a constitutional amendment, let's get the facts straight. Even incremental measures to simply increase the transparency of the flood of money pouring into our

elections have been repeatedly filibustered by Republicans. In fact, many of us have tried for years to pass a law to require greater transparency and disclosure of political spending. I have tried to practice what I have preached. I have disclosed every cent ever contributed to me, including one time for one for about 40 or 50 cents. It cost us more to disclose it than what it was, but I wanted people to know exactly who had contributed to my campaign. We tried to have that kind of disclosure.

Republicans have repeatedly filibustered that legislation, known aptly as the DISCLOSE Act. The statutory approach would allow the American people to at least know who is pouring money into the electoral system. It is bad enough that they can pour in an unlimited amount of money, but we ought to at least know who is doing it and why they are doing it.

I hope we will be able to convince enough Republicans to join this effort to overcome the Republican filibuster of a modest transparency bill. But because the Supreme Court based its rulings on a flawed interpretation of the First Amendment, a statutory fix alone will not suffice. Only a constitutional amendment can overturn the Supreme Court's devastating campaign finance decisions.

Our proposal to amend the Constitution simply restores the ability of future lawmakers—Republicans and Democrats—at both the Federal and State levels to rein in the influence that billionaires and corporations now have on our elections. It is necessary to restore the First Amendment so all voices can be heard in the democratic process, whether you are a millionaire or not, and it is vital to ensure that corruption does not flourish.

I hope Senators will join with me on this vote.

I do not see anybody seeking recognition. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMNESTY IN AMERICA

Mr. SESSIONS. President Obama announced Friday that he would not follow through on his promise to utilize Executive orders by the end of the summer to provide amnesty and work authorization for 5 to 6 million illegal immigrants who cannot work lawfully in America because they unlawfully entered the country or have overstayed

their visas. That does not indicate he has in any way abandoned his plan to execute such an Executive amnesty.

Indeed, the President directly said he understands that the American people oppose what he is doing—this authorization to work and create a legal status by Executive action. The American people oppose it by more than 2 to 1. So is he going to back off and honor the wishes of the American people? No, not at all—this is the point the American people need to understand.

The President is now brazenly reaffirming in even clearer language that he will carry out his amnesty plan—but only after the election in November. This is an attempt to protect his Democratic Senate candidates. Just a few moments ago, his spokesman, Josh Earnest—Mr. Flack—said it would be wrong to inject this issue into the election.

What I say to Mr. Flack at the White House, whose salary is paid by the American people, is the American people have one chance to have their voice heard. The President is talking about unilateral, illegal action contrary to American law to legalize as many as 5 to 6 million people and we should not inject it into the election. There are Democratic Senators and other Senators who failed to object to that—should they now be protected from being criticized for allowing this to occur? Is that what we have gotten to in our democracy, that the President can make this decision and not involve the American people? They think they should stay out of this. That they should not talk about it in an election. Well, when should we talk about grave issues that are facing America if not during the election cycle?

I think it is time for the Senate, and all Senators, to be heard explicitly. Where do you stand? Do you support the legislation that the House of Representatives has passed that would effectively—as we often do around here—bar the President from spending any money to execute such an illegal, unauthorized amnesty or not? Are you for it or not?

Well, we know one thing. If it is left up to the Democratic leader in the Senate, it will not be brought up. So it will take a lot of Senators to stand up to Majority Leader REID and President Obama and bring the legislation the House has passed that would bar the expenditure of any money to carry out an unlawful amnesty.

The President cannot give work authorization—as he and his people have said he intends to do—to people unlawfully in America. The law says they are not eligible to work in America, and they are not eligible to be hired in America. The President cannot say, as he has already done for the young people through the DACA program: You are authorized to work. They are now talking about 5 to 6 million more people. One article correctly said there

were 10 times as many adults—many of them presumably have entered the country illegally only recently.

I think we have to understand what is going on, and we need to challenge our colleagues to stand up and be counted—counted with regard to the legitimate authority of Congress, which has passed laws of this country that are due to be executed and carried out faithfully by the President of the United States. He is not authorized to just not enforce the law and not utilize the ICE officers and Border Patrol officers and block them from doing their work.

The ICE officers have even sued the Administration, the head of DHS and the ICE director, because they have been blocked from following their oath to enforce the laws of the United States. No wonder this is an important issue. No wonder the American people's interest is rising on this issue, and they have every right to do so.

Well, I am going to explain why this amnesty is unlawful, how it will hurt the American worker, and how it will eviscerate any hope of ever establishing a lawful immigration system in the future if it goes forward. First, let's look at recent events. The President stated at the NATO conference a few days ago that he will give legal status to persons who are unlawfully here by utilizing Executive orders. I say to the American people and to my colleagues that he cannot do that. Those individuals are unlawfully here. He has no power to reverse the laws passed by the Congress of the United States and declare someone lawful who is unlawful. It is a thunderous, dramatic abuse of Presidential power.

He has made it clear previously that his amnesty will include work authorization, and he cannot do that either. It is plainly contrary to law. He has already provided executive amnesty and work permits to those who supposedly came here as young people, although the proof is very uncertain. ICE officers report that they are forced to take someone's word about qualifying for the amnesty. So they are certainly not very tight about verifying that. His advisers and allies openly boast about how broad this is going to be. They say you must go ahead, Mr. President, and do even more than you are saying you are going to do now under this plan. It is really all because of the opposition of the American people.

By a substantial majority, the American people oppose this action, but the President is intending to do it. According to the news reports, Members of the Senate went to the President and said: Don't do this now, Mr. President. I know you promised to do it before the end of the summer, but don't do it now because that might hurt me in my election. I might have to block votes in the Senate that will stop you from doing this, and I will get criticized for doing

it. Please don't do this now. Don't do it now. You can do it after the election, when I have secured my 6-year term. Do it then, Mr. President.

No wonder Senator McConnell referred to that as a cynical act by the President.

This was a dramatic event which occurred over weekend. This executive amnesty would include work permits for millions of people who illegally entered the United States or have overstayed their visas and they are here unlawfully. It is a violation of a sovereign, constitutional law passed by the people's representatives in the Congress. It wipes away the Immigration and Nationality Act's clear rules on who can enter the United States, who can work in the United States, and who can live in the United States. Don't we all agree that our Nation has a right to establish that? Shouldn't those rules and principles be established and followed? We are not against immigration. We have 1 million people come to our country every year legally. They apply, wait their time, and then they have the benefit of citizenship in America. We have one of the most generous immigration policies in the entire world. In addition to permanent immigration flows, we have a huge temporary guest worker program which allows people to come here and take jobs. The President wants to double the number of people who come here and take jobs, but the House has refused to do that.

These rules are the bedrock of any Nation's immigration policy and sovereignty, and in reality the President is actually and truly proposing to wipe away what amounts to the few immigration rules that are in effect. Through executive action, the President is proposing to repeal the lawful protections to which every American worker is entitled. His action would allow millions of illegal immigrants to instantly take precious jobs from struggling and unemployed American workers by the millions in every sector of the economy. These are not just agricultural and seasonal workers.

Under the President's plan, these people who are given work authorization would be entitled to take any job. They would be entitled to work at the county commission or the energy company or power company. They would be entitled to work at the manufacturing plants and drive the forklifts and heavy equipment. They would be eligible for good jobs—jobs that are good for America.

This is at a time of high unemployment and falling wages. We are now talking about another 5 million people who will be rewarded with the ability to take the best jobs in America when millions of Americans are struggling and wages are falling and we have the highest percentage of people outside of the workforce in America since the

1970s. We have a higher percentage of people who are working part-time instead of working full-time. There are people who are on welfare. Food stamps have gone up fourfold. We need to get our people working first.

Again, no one that I know of would say that the people who want to come to America and work are evil or bad people. We have a generous immigration plan. We are not saying bad things about them. We are simply saying that if you want to come to America, apply. If you don't qualify, we are sorry. We are not able to accept everybody who would like to come to America. We have rules and regulations to make sure we identify people who are likely to be successful in America and won't be on the welfare rolls and won't demand health care from the government and will be able to pay their fair share of the cost of living in America. That is what any smart Nation does.

I think what people need to know right now is that this unconstitutional action—this planned executive amnesty—has not gone away. It is only a matter of months now that it has been delayed—unless the American people stop it from happening.

The New York Times reported a few days ago on the timing of these actions. They said this:

President Obama will delay taking executive action on immigration until after the midterm elections, bowing to pressure from fellow Democrats who feared that taking action now could doom his party's chances this fall, White House officials said on Saturday.

Well, what does that mean? It was reported in a very neutral way. The New York Times, of course, favors amnesty. But how cynical is that? How cynical is it that the President is now going to take action on a different date than he promised repeatedly, because he is afraid that if he does it now, the American people will have an opportunity to register their opinion come November and members of his party will face election and they are going to be asked, Did they support and vote for this or not? He does not want that to happen.

What is wrong with the American people being able to influence their government? Is the President above that? Has he reached such a high level of popularity he doesn't have to worry about what the American people say, think, or believe, and that he can advocate and carry out policy based on political deals he has made with big business and special-interest groups and politicians. Even when the American people don't support it and Congress won't pass it, he gets to do it anyway? Is this where we are in America today?

What is particularly disturbing is our Senate Democratic colleagues apparently don't object to the President carrying out unilateral executive amnesty; they only prefer that the President implement it after the election,

after their race is over, so they don't have to explain it to the people they represent.

Politico reported one typical Senate Democrat office as saying: "Obama should use his executive authority to make fixes to the immigration system, but after the November elections." After the elections. Don't let it blow back on me. Go ahead, Mr. President, we want you to do this fix, but don't do it now, do it after the election so nobody can hold me to account.

I think the American people are getting tired of this. I think they are wising up. The politicians work for the American people; the American people don't work for the politicians.

We held a vote in the Senate on July 31. I sought to block this action by bringing up a bill similar to a bill the House passed that would bar the President from spending any money to carry out this executive amnesty. Only one Senate Democrat—Senator MANCHIN—voted in support of allowing the bill to come up for a vote. And no one, to my knowledge, on the Democratic side has challenged Senator REID and his blocking of the House-type legislation.

It is a very serious matter that we are engaged in today. It is a very serious matter. The moral underpinnings, the integrity of the immigration law—already seriously damaged by the DACA action President Obama took—will be fatally wounded if he now legalizes 5 million to 6 million people unilaterally. How could we then tell anybody in the future they have to comply with the law?

The President himself said at the NATO conference that if we do his executive amnesty, it will, as he said, encourage legal immigration. Wrong, wrong, wrong. Rewarding millions more who have entered the country illegally—rewarding their illegal acts—is not going to cause more people to follow the law; it is going to be a further weakening of the law. And in the future, how will we be able to tell people who came across the border after that, that they shouldn't be given lawful status, rewarding them for their illegal act? It is that simple.

We are going to have to confront this issue. Congress needs to stand up, affirm the rule of law, do the right thing. We are not against immigration. We are not against immigrants. We don't believe this country ought to be isolationist. But we have a right—and the American people have a right—to believe their government will create an effective, honorable system of immigration and see that it is enforced fairly and resolutely. That is the moral thing to do. It is the right thing to do. It is what the American people have been demanding for 30 or 40 years, and the politicians have steadfastly refused.

I think it is time for the people's voices to be heard. The American peo-

ple are right on this issue. They are exactly right. We are failing the future of our country, the lawful system of our country, we are failing the American people, and we are failing American workers who are having a difficult time today finding jobs and seeing their wages decline.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD NOMINEES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on three nominees to positions on the Social Security Advisory Board. Two of these nominees—Alan Cohen and Lanhee Chen—are well suited for these positions, and that being the case I totally support their nominations.

However, I plan to vote against the remaining nominee, Dr. Henry Aaron, whom the President ultimately intends to serve as chairman of the board. I wish to take a few minutes today to explain why I have reached this decision.

Over the past decade or so, Dr. Aaron has spent most of his time and efforts focusing on health care issues and advocacy. Indeed, the vast majority of his writings he offered in support of his nomination dealt with health care, not Social Security.

When the Finance Committee considered his nomination, I specifically asked Dr. Aaron if he had performed any Social Security analysis over the past decade. He could not produce anything substantive along these lines.

There is nothing wrong with focusing one's energies on health care instead of analyzing Social Security policy. However, given the specific focus of the Social Security Advisory Board, I am concerned about the extent to which Dr. Aaron has considered Social Security issues and analytical advances in the field over the past decade or more. It appears to me that Dr. Aaron's interests and skill set make him better suited for a position in the health care arena rather than advising on the current state of Social Security.

Dr. Aaron has written about Social Security more extensively in the past, but his conclusions were predominantly normative. His most recent Social Security writings too often imply that anyone disagreeing with his conclusions is dead wrong and likely has adverse motives.

In fact, this is a trend that pervades all of Dr. Aaron's writings. Far too often, in addition to reaching conclusions and making recommendations, Dr. Aaron finds it necessary to condemn potential critics, usually along partisan lines. Of course, I am not one to vote against a nominee simply because I disagree with their policy prescriptions or their analytical tech-

niques. I generally believe in giving reasonable deference to the President on nominations, particularly those involving positions designed to provide advice to the President and his administration.

The Social Security Advisory Board, however, is set up to provide bipartisan advice on Social Security issues to Congress and the Social Security Commissioner, as well as the President. Given all of the challenges facing Social Security, this type of advice is crucial. The board chair must be able to work toward gathering bipartisan consensus and avoid turning the Social Security Advisory Board into another platform for political division and partisan rhetoric. Therefore, it is necessary to consider Dr. Aaron's nomination from the perspective of bipartisanship.

As I said, a nominee for board chair must demonstrate an ability to promote and garner bipartisan consensus. Unfortunately, the evidence does not convince me that Dr. Aaron would be able to set aside his partisan views and manage the board in a bipartisan fashion that aims at consensus in both analysis and conclusions.

Throughout much of his writings, Dr. Aaron has, far more often than not, opted for partisanship over sound policy. This not only makes me question his ability to be bipartisan, it also leads me to question his judgment on policy issues.

For example, he has recently advocated that the President disregard the Constitution and ignore the statutory limit on Federal debt. He has praised the President for ignoring the law by unilaterally deciding not to enforce provisions of the Affordable Care Act, identifying the administration's failure to enforce the law written by Congress and signed by the President himself as an act that, to quote Dr. Aaron, "adroitly performs political jiu jitsu on ObamaCare opponents."

He has written that the Independent Payment Advisory Board—the IPAB—an agency with virtually unchecked power to ration Medicare spending, should be given even broader authority.

He has scolded States that have, fully within their rights, decided against expanding Medicaid as part of the Affordable Care Act rollout. Dr. Aaron used particularly vitriolic words to describe State officials who opted not to expand Medicaid, saying: "Officials in many states have adopted a stance reminiscent of massive resistance, the South's futile effort to block implementation of the Supreme Court's decision banning school segregation."

When I asked Dr. Aaron a question at his confirmation hearing about the caustic nature of some of his comments, he alluded to writings for newspapers and op-eds as avenues in which

inclusion of politically charged rhetoric is the "coin of the realm."

That may very well be the case, but that doesn't mean there is a place for it on the Social Security Advisory Board. I have serious concern about Dr. Aaron's ability to keep such rhetoric in check as he chairs the board that is by statute intended to exhibit impartiality.

Once again, our Social Security system faces a number of fiscal and structural changes and challenges. If we are going to address these challenges, we need serious discussions that will lead to serious solutions, not more partisanship.

Dr. Aaron has not convinced me that he is the one to help lead these types of discussions. For these reasons I intend to vote against this confirmation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. CRUZ pertaining to the introduction of S. 2779 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CRUZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to support an independent constitutional amendment offered by Senator UDALL of New Mexico which would restore to Congress and the States the authority to rein in the enormous sums of money that are flooding into our political process.

As they built our democracy, the Founders feared the impact of concentration of power. John Adams, a Massachusetts native and the author of our State Constitution, expressed this ideal well. He said:

Power must be opposed to power, force to force, strength to strength, interest to interest, as well as reason to reason, eloquence to eloquence, and passion to passion.

Balance, said Adams, was critical.

But in Washington power is not balanced. Instead, power is concentrated all on one side. Well-financed individuals and corporate interests are lined up to fight for their own privileges and to resist any change that would limit their special deals.

I saw this up close and personal following the 2008 financial crisis when I fought hard for stronger financial regulations, and the biggest banks in this country spent more than \$1 million a day to weaken reforms. But there are many more examples.

Big corporate interests are smart. They fight every day on Capitol Hill, every day in the agencies, every day in the courts, always with the same goals in mind—to bend the law to benefit themselves. The U.S. Supreme Court is doing all it can to help them.

Three well-respected legal scholars, including Judge Richard Posner of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, a widely respected and conservative Reagan appointee, recently examined almost 20,000 Supreme Court cases from the past 65 years. The researchers used multivariate regression analysis to determine how often each Justice voted in favor of corporate interests during that time. Judge Posner and his colleagues concluded that the five conservative Justices currently sitting on the Supreme Court are in the top 10 most procorporate Justices in more than half a century—and Justice Alito and Justice Roberts No. 1 and No. 2.

Perhaps the most egregious example of this procorporate shift is the Citizens United decision. In this new Citizens United era, the Supreme Court has unleashed a flood of secret corporate money into our political system and emboldened a powerful group of millionaires and billionaires who can toss out checks for millions of dollars to influence election outcomes.

Earlier this year the Supreme Court gave them even more room to operate. Congress had long ago put limits on how much money one rich person could contribute to a candidate, a party, or a political action committee in an election. These commonsense limits were intended to preserve the integrity of our democracy and to prevent corruption or even the appearance of corruption, but the Supreme Court struck down those limits.

As Justice Breyer noted in his dissenting opinion, the Court's decision "will allow a single individual to contribute millions of dollars to a political party or to a candidate's campaign."

The impact of this line of judicial decisions is powerful. In 2012, about 3.7 million typical Americans gave modest donations, \$200 or less, to President Obama and Mitt Romney. These donations altogether added up to about \$313 million. In that same election, 32 Americans gave monster donations to super PACs. Thirty-two people spent slightly more on the 2012 elections than 3.7 million typical Americans who sent in modest dollar donations to their preferred Presidential candidate. When 32 people can outspend 3.7 million citizens, our democracy is in real danger.

This is an extraordinary situation. The Supreme Court overturned a century of precedent, voiding campaign finance restrictions passed by Congress and making it far easier for millionaires, billionaires, and big corporations to flood our elections with massive amounts of money. The Supreme Court is helping them buy elections.

We are here to try to reverse the damage inflicted on our country by these decisions. We are here to fight back against a Supreme Court that says there is no difference between free speech and billions of dollars spent by the privileged few to swing elections and buy off legislators.

We are here to fight back against a Supreme Court that has overturned a century of established law in an effort to block Congress from solving this problem.

I support a constitutional amendment only with great reluctance. Our Constitution sets forth the fundamental structure of our government, the scope of that government's power, and the critical limits on that power. Any change to its text should be measured, should be carefully considered, and should occur only rarely. But there are times when action is required to defend our great democracy against those who would see it perverted into one more rigged game where the rich and the powerful always win.

This is the time to amend the Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support this effort. We were not sent to Congress to run this country for a handful of wealthy individuals and powerful corporations. We were sent here to do our best to make this country work for all our people.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I chair the Senate judiciary subcommittee entitled the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights. Obviously, the most serious charge of the subcommittee is to consider proposals to amend the Constitution. S.J. Res. 19, the democracy-for-all amendment, was the first amendment considered by the constitution subcommittee since 2009, when I became its chair.

The U.S. Constitution and the wisdom of its Framers has endured for generations. I have established—and so have many of my colleagues—a very high bar for suggestions to amend that Constitution. That is the way it should be. That is why Majority Leader REID, Chairman PATRICK LEAHY of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I were committed to ensuring this proposal would be thoroughly vetted and that it move through the Senate by regular order.

It is important to recall that until the early 20th century most Americans were not allowed to vote. Even after the franchise was legally expanded, a violent racist campaign prevented many African Americans from voting.

Six constitutional amendments, landmark civil rights legislation, and Supreme Court decisions helped make the promise of one person and one vote a reality. We must, in our time, in our generation, be constantly vigilant against threats to these victories which were won through the blood, sweat, tears, and even the lives of many Americans. That is why we are engaged in this debate today, because the right to vote is under siege. It is in peril. A well-funded, coordinated effort has made it harder for millions of Americans to vote and at the same time unleashed a tidal wave of special interest and corporate money into elections to drown out the voices of average Americans.

Opponents of our amendment say, oh, they are just trying to repeal the First Amendment. They have it backwards. Our efforts would protect and restore the First Amendment.

The amendment before the Senate would begin to undo the damage done by five activist, conservative Supreme Court Justices who have rewritten and distorted the First Amendment. With decisions like *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, these five Justices overturned a century of legal and constitutional precedent to give a privileged clique and corporate titans the power to drown out the voices of ordinary Americans—and that is exactly what is happening.

Big-money donors—and their names are familiar to those who follow the world of politics; the Koch brothers, Sheldon Adelson, and the corporate interests they represent—certainly deserve a seat at the policymaking table. But the size of their bank accounts does not entitle them to buy every seat at the table, control the agenda, and silence their critics. Unfortunately, this is exactly what we are seeing across the Nation being played out, even as I speak, in this current election campaign. Big-money campaign donors and special interests, emboldened by the Supreme Court, have flooded our elections, unfortunately, to a great degree with secret contributions.

Listen to these statistics: Spending by outside groups has tripled since the last midterm election. They spent \$27.6 million in 2010 compared to \$97.7 million so far this year. In 2006, before this awful decision in *Citizens United*, these groups spent \$3.5 million. And now the running total for this year: almost \$100 million from outside special interest groups and well-heeled individuals.

In 2012, super PACs spent more than \$130 million on Federal elections, and 60 percent of all super PAC contributions that year came from an elite class of 159 people. In North Carolina, that elite group had just one member, that State had just one person. Seventy-two percent of all outside spending in 2010 in North Carolina came from one man, Art Pope, a millionaire, conservative, rightwing activist.

As I stand and speak, there is a super PAC on the air attacking me in my home State. As best we can trace it, it is to one individual who so far apparently has spent \$700,000 in negative ads against me on radio and television. Perhaps more will follow. That is the nature of the world we live in.

Members of Congress who run for office, for election and reelection, abide by strict rules on disclosure, money raised, how much is being spent. But when it comes to these individuals, since *Citizens United*, all bets are off.

Although some of the biggest and most frequent spenders are on the Republican side of the aisle, the influx of secret money from super PACs and wealthy donors is happening on the right and on the left. Many have created super PACs on the other side as a defense. Unfortunately, it is a tactic or strategy that has been dictated by the Supreme Court decisions. Sadly, all of this money fight is eroding our democracy and drowning out the voices of everyday citizens.

One year ago, in the Shelby County decision, the same five Justices gutted the Voting Rights Act, civil rights legislation that had protected the constitutional rights of average Americans for 50 years. Emboldened by the Shelby County decision, more Republican-dominated State legislatures followed suit by pursuing legislation to restrict the right to vote. It is no coincidence that these laws have a disproportionate impact on minority, young, and low-income voters.

During his confirmation hearings, Chief Justice John Roberts of the Supreme Court said this of the right to vote. It was “the right preservative of all other rights.” And he pledged to be a neutral umpire, calling balls and strikes when it came to issues such as the right to vote. But because of the judicial activism of Chief Justice Roberts and his four conservative allies, the right to vote of average Americans is now at greater risk than any time since the Jim Crow era.

Two years ago I decided to take my subcommittee for hearings in the States of Ohio and Florida. In both of those States, the Republican-dominated legislatures, inspired by a group known as ALEC that is not a lobbying group but creates so-called model legislation, had dreamed up ways to restrict the opportunity to vote. How did they do this? Some of them called for the presentation of identification cards when you vote. Others said: We will limit the time that you can vote—no early voting. We will restrict the opportunities for people to vote.

My first table of witnesses consisted of a bipartisan gathering of election officials in both Florida and Ohio, States that had passed these restrictive voting laws. I asked the first panel, under oath, a basic question: Tell me about the incidents of voter fraud and voter

abuse in your State which led to these changes in the legislature. There were none.

Tell me the number of individuals who had been prosecuted for voter fraud in Ohio and Florida that led to these changes in State legislation. There were virtually none. One said he could remember maybe one case or two in the course of years.

I think it is pretty clear. These efforts to restrict the right to vote have nothing to do with the integrity of elections. There isn't a single one of us in either political party who condones voter fraud and voter abuse, period. But to restrict the right to vote of millions of Americans in the name of stopping voter fraud that doesn't exist—well, it is time to ask the more basic question: What is the real reason? The real reason is to restrict the right to vote.

It is hard to believe that Republicans in State legislatures, and even some in this Chamber—the party of Abraham Lincoln, for goodness' sake—is party to this effort to restrict the right to vote across America. For goodness' sake, I have been involved in election campaigns which I have won and those which I have not won. I always felt, if it was a fair election, so be it; let the people speak. That is what a democracy is all about. But when you start playing with the rules, when you start saying, well, we are going to try to make it tougher for people to vote—even those who are legally entitled to vote—I frankly think we have crossed a line which we should not ever cross in this country. Fire hoses, growling dogs, and insidious poll taxes have now been replaced with a well-funded campaign denying millions their right to vote and a flood of special interest money drowning out the voices of average Americans.

Is that your vision of America? Is that your vision of this country in the future, where your opportunity to vote is now restricted more and more, even without any indication of voter fraud or voter abuse, when your opportunity to be informed about the candidates and their positions is in fact overwhelmed by those who come in—such as the Koch brothers and those on the left, too—to spend millions of dollars?

I introduced a bill a few years back for public financing and campaigns. There was one valiant Republican who stood, who agreed to cosponsor my bill, and only one: Arlen Specter, a Senator from Pennsylvania, a Republican Senator. What happened to him? I can tell you what happened. The late Arlen Specter was challenged in his Republican primary by one of those on the far right in his party. He couldn't win as he looked at the polls. He switched parties and became a Democrat. I lost my only Republican on public financing when he joined us on this side of the aisle. He lost the Democratic primary, went on and finished his term

and passed away. But he was the only Republican with the courage to stand for public financing to change this mess we have.

I can tell you we are reaching a point where mere mortals—individuals who don't happen to be multimillionaires—want nothing to do with this political business. It has become the hobby of high rollers. The two candidates for the highest offices in my home State now are multimillionaires playing with their own money now, putting millions into their campaigns.

I am not envious of their wealth. I have said it publicly and I will say it again: I am only one Powerball ticket away from matching their wealth. So I am not jealous of them, but it says something about the political process, doesn't it, that someone could put in \$10 or \$12 million of their own money and the Supreme Court can say, well, they are just exercising their right to free speech. Really? I didn't see the word "cash" in the First Amendment. I didn't even see the word "money" in the First Amendment. That is what we are up against.

S.J. Res. 19, which is before us, is a constitutional amendment. It is narrowly tailored and it is a proposal to protect and restore the First Amendment. It empowers Congress and State legislatures, the elected representatives of the American people, to set reasonable, content-neutral—let me underline that—content-neutral limits on the amount of money wealthy individuals and special interest donors can give to candidates. It overturns Citizens United by authorizing Congress and State legislatures—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

It overturns Citizens United by authorizing Congress and State legislatures to prohibit corporations and unions from spending money from their treasuries to influence elections. Our amendment will ensure that elections are contests for the best ideas, a contest where mere mortals—the group I mentioned earlier—have the same chance to succeed as multimillionaires. That is why our amendment is supported by 60 diverse advocacy organizations and the majority of the American people. Politicians may not get it, but the American people do. They could see what is happening to this bidding war we now call elections. They understand the flood of television.

We have one Senatorial candidate on our side, who she has been subjected to \$15 million in independent expenditures, negative ads in her State. That has been going on for almost 1 year.

She is going to weather the storm and be reelected, incidentally. But imagine that \$15 million of special interest groups just showering her with hate and venom for month after weary month. Is that what our political process has come down to?

Opponents of our amendment argue that any limit whatsoever on election spending violates the First Amendment. Just as there is no constitutional right to buy an election, freedom of speech doesn't give anyone the right to violate or overwhelm the constitutional rights of others. Apparently five conservative Supreme Court Justices believe the wealthy and elite have a greater right to free speech because they have more money.

Our opponents also argue that corporations are people. Give me a break. Corporations are granted the advantages of perpetual life, property ownership, and limited liability to enhance their efficiency as an economic entity, according to Justice Rehnquist in one of his opinions, but he went on to say in the same opinion, "Those properties so beneficial in the economic sphere pose special dangers in the political sphere."

That was Justice Rehnquist speaking about giving powers to corporations which exceed the obvious. While some First Amendment protections have rightfully been extended beyond everyday Americans to corporations, Citizens United went way too far. Living, breathing Americans face challenges these legally created entities will never face. Corporations never get married, they don't raise kids, they don't care for sick relatives, and they cannot vote in elections or run for office. Corporations have the right to be heard, for sure, but the right to control an election with their bank account? There is something wrong with that decision.

Our amendment restores the basic longstanding principle that corporations shouldn't be able to wield their enormous economic power to sway Federal elections. Our amendment restores and protects the First Amendment for all Americans. I encourage my colleagues to vote for S.J. Res. 19, and I expect a strictly partisan vote. I am sorry if that happens, but I expect it.

When we brought up the issue of disclosure, to disclose who was giving to campaigns, we couldn't get the Republicans to give us support. Just disclose who is giving the money. Nope. Keep it secret. That was their position. Now they not only want to keep it secret; they want to make sure those who are abusing the process by sending in huge sums of money on behalf of corporations and individuals are going to be protected. They may protect the special interests, but they will do it at the expense of average Americans who are losing their faith—losing their faith in this process and in the institutions it creates.

Restore that faith. Support S.J. Res. 19. Let's amend the Constitution and make Citizens United a vestige of a wrong-headed decision by the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

I again thank my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad I got to catch a few of the tail-end remarks of my colleague from Illinois. I didn't realize what this debate was truly all about, but he made that clear.

This is all about public financing of elections, according to him, because anybody contributing any of their hard-earned money to support a candidate whom they happen to believe in or someone espousing or advocating for the principles they believe in—there is something inherently wrong with that according to the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Illinois, because to him the only answer is let's take your money and use that to finance an election perhaps to benefit a candidate who doesn't agree with anything you believe in. Is that what this is all about, public financing of elections?

He said something else I don't think I ever heard anybody have the audacity to say before. He said voter fraud doesn't exist. I am sure in Chicago they have had a few instances of voter fraud. We have unfortunately had some in Texas, some that resulted in the nomination of Lyndon Johnson to be Democratic nominee for President of the United States in box 13 in Duvall County, TX, and there have been a number of other instances investigated and found cases of voter fraud that have been found to exist.

What is the problem with issuing or requiring somebody to have a photo ID to vote? In Texas to get a voter ID, for which the Attorney General has sued the State of Texas, saying somehow it is discriminatory to require somebody to have a voter ID to prove they are who they say they are so they can then cast their vote, even though it takes a photo ID to get into the Department of Justice—you cannot go see Eric Holder or anybody at the Department of Justice unless you have a photo ID. Oh, by the way, you cannot buy tobacco products, you cannot buy alcohol, you cannot fly on an airplane without a photo ID, and if for some reason you don't have one in the State of Texas, well, you get one for free. How does that possibly burden the right to vote?

It is no surprise that 70 percent of the respondents in most of the polling I have seen—Independents, Democrats, and Republicans alike—say they think voter ID is a good idea, because what does it do? It protects the integrity of the ballots for people who are qualified to vote and doesn't permit illegal votes to dilute those votes.

We spent the last several weeks back home meeting with our constituents. I know some people like to call it recess. I know it doesn't feel like recess, at least not in the elementary school sense of the word, because most of the time this is a period during which we get to travel our States and interact with our constituents and do something we need to do more of, which is to listen to what they have to say and what their concerns are, and I did that in Texas.

My constituents did not say the most important thing we can do is pass a constitutional amendment gutting the First Amendment, the right to free speech. That didn't come up one time. What did come up were their concerns about the economy, about the access to health care, about immigration, about the challenges imposed by radical Islamic terrorists and the Russian strongman Vladimir Putin. All of those came up. Not a single time did my constituents say: We want you to go back to Washington, DC, and vote to gut the First Amendment right to free speech. At this time of high unemployment and stagnant wages, with the labor participation rate at historic lows—that is, the percentage of people actually in the workforce looking for jobs is at a historic low—and millions of Americans concerned about losing their health insurance or facing higher deductibles or premiums, with a crisis on the southwest border which has not gone away with this wave of unaccompanied minor children coming across from Central America, with terrorists on the march in the Middle East, with Russian military forces continuing a full-blown invasion of Ukraine, despite all that, the majority leader in his wisdom has decided to bring up this amendment because he thinks the most urgent order of business is to replace the current First Amendment which has stood the test of time for 10 all these many years since our country's founding and replace it with one that empowers incumbent politicians to control who has access to the resources in order to get their message out.

Now everyone is entitled to their priorities, but it is painfully clear the majority leader's priorities have everything to do with November 4, the coming midterm elections, so it is all politics all the time, no matter what. I am embarrassed, frankly, to confront my constituents when they say: What are you going to be doing when you return to Washington, DC? Are you going to be dealing with jobs or the energy sector—which is a very bright spot in our economy—or what are we going to do to make sure the millennials—the young adults—can actually find jobs so they can pay down their college loans and so they can get to work? What are you going to do to keep the promises the President made on health care; that if you like what you have you can

keep it, the premiums for a family of four are going to go down by \$2,500, and you can keep your doctor if you like your doctor—what are you going to do to make sure those promises are kept?

Instead of dealing with all of those very important issues, it is embarrassing for me to tell my constituents that, look, the majority leader is the one who controls the agenda in this Senate. He is the traffic cop, and an individual Senator—and certainly not one in the minority—doesn't have any ability to control the agenda of the U.S. Senate.

So this is all Senator REID's choice as the majority leader, and he claims this proposed constitutional amendment is all about getting so-called dark money out of the political system. In reality, if that was all this was about, we might have a good debate and a vote. But in reality what he is concerned about is opposition—political support that is going to make it more likely that Republicans regain the majority of the Senate and Democrats become a member of the minority. That is what is motivating this vote. In reality what this amendment would do would be to undermine some of our most cherished, most fundamental, and most important liberties.

If this proposed amendment ever becomes law, State and Federal lawmakers would suddenly have vast new powers to regulate or even criminalize political speech. So to state the blindingly obvious, the Founding Fathers proposed and readopted the First Amendment precisely because they saw how dangerous it was to let politicians restrict the exercise of free speech. The Founders understood that without the First Amendment we could end up with a never-ending cycle of elected officials shrinking the boundaries of permissible speech. A political system such as that would be totally incompatible with the principles and values of a free society. Yet that is exactly the type of political system we would have if this constitutional amendment being proposed ever were to take effect.

I heard the majority whip saying this isn't about political speech, this is just about the money, but that argument quickly falls apart.

For starters, my colleagues amendment would allow Congress to restrict freedom of assembly and freedom of petition as well, both of which are essential to safeguarding political speech. While the amendment might not give Congress the power to curtail freedom of the press per se, it would give Congress the power to curtail political speech by individuals and activists, which begs the question: Why should the political speech of newspapers and magazines be any different from the political speech of you and me? Why should theirs be carved out and unrestricted in terms of the financial resources that could advance those

points of view in newspapers and magazines? Yet our ability to communicate about the things we care about the most would be restricted by limiting the amount of money we could spend to advocate those points of view.

After all, when newspapers publish editorials about public policy, they are trying to persuade politicians and other elected officials to adopt a given position, and that is an important part of our system.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Newspapers are trying to persuade voters all the time to elect a given candidate because they endorse those candidates.

I remember when I ran for my first public office as a district judge in Bexar County, San Antonio, TX, one of the most important things I sought was the endorsement of the editorial board of the local newspaper. I knew that even if nobody knew anything else about me, if the newspaper editorial board thought I was a credible candidate, that might help in my election.

Neither Federal nor State lawmakers should have the power to decide what type of political speech is permissible. Free speech is free speech. The solution to speech is more speech, not less speech.

For 225 years the First Amendment has served as the guarantor of American democracy. It was designed to protect all speech, not just speech we happen to agree with or that supports our particular point of view. A recent Supreme Court decision put it this way: "There is no more basic right to our democracy than the right to participate in electing political leaders."

Unfortunately, this amendment would undermine that right, and it would roll back perhaps the most elemental freedom of our founding document by creating a system in which vital, indispensable liberty would be contingent on the ever-shifting tides of partisan politics. These efforts should not only be not supported, they should be repudiated firmly, loudly, and unapologetically, nothing less than the very bedrock of American democracy is at stake.

As I close, I wish to add that the Founders wisely put the process by which the Constitution can be amended in our Constitution. Two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate must vote for a constitutional resolution and then it goes to the States where three-quarters of the States must ratify this constitutional amendment. I can tell you that there is no doubt in my mind that this would ever happen with this amendment.

Why is the majority leader bringing this up now, less than 60 days before the midterm elections? Perhaps it is to

motivate his own political base in the hope that will mitigate some of the losses in the November 4 election. But it certainly cannot be without any hope or pipedream that it would ever become the law of the land, and for the reasons I have stated it should not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I say to my good friend the Senator from Texas that there are very important reasons for bringing up this issue now, and it is because of the elections that are going on. He makes it sound as though this is some kind of a political process. What is going on in our elections right now—and here are the nine top Senate races in the country. The blue on this chart indicates partial or nondisclosed money. This is the dark money. Nobody knows where this money is coming from. It could be billionaires or large corporations. It could be almost anyone with a secret agenda.

As an example, more than half the money in this race in Arkansas is dark money. In Georgia we can see that almost all of the money is in this category of partial or nondisclosure. In Kentucky and North Carolina almost half the money is in the category of partial or nondisclosed money, and there is a significant amount of partial or nondisclosed in the other nine States. This issue has to do with what is happening right now in our elections.

Just 6 months ago I went over to the Supreme Court and listened to the McCutcheon argument and the ruling—well, I went over there longer than 6 months ago. They made the ruling about 6 months ago. That ruling said one individual can give \$3.6 million, and that is what this is about. We are trying to get to the bottom of what is happening in our elections and how our elections are being taken away from us and how they are being influenced in terms of dark money. This is a very good time to have this debate.

I will also say to my friend from Texas, this is a bipartisan amendment. This amendment started back in 1983 with Ted Stevens, a Republican. Ernest Hollings could not be more of a bipartisan figure in the Senate, and he picked it up. From 1983 to today, we have had 11 Republicans either vote for the amendment or a similar amendment or beyond the amendment. This is not anything that should be partisan. This dark money and the impact it is having is something the American people are very worried about. I will come back to this chart in a minute.

This is a crucial period in our history. Americans will go to the polls and vote. It is our heritage, it is something to celebrate, and it is something to protect. The integrity of our elections is crucial, but our campaign fi-

nance system is under siege, drowning in cash and record amounts of money. Much of the money is from outside groups and much of it is hidden. Our elections should not be for sale to the highest bidder. Money has poisoned our political system. The American people have lost faith in us as they have watched this merry-go-round and constant money chasing from special interests and very little has been getting done.

Folks want Congress to get to work and work together so we can find real solutions to real problems and spend our time raising hopes instead of raising cash. That is why Senator BENNET and I have introduced our constitutional amendment and that is what I wish to talk about today.

Total spending on Federal elections was over \$6 billion in 2012. That is double what was spent in 2000, just 12 years before. That is a lot of money. Where does it come from? Most of it comes from a tiny fraction of the population, and there are billionaires and special interests writing checks—often in dark corners with a lot of the dark money, as I talked about at the beginning of my speech. Nobody knows who is behind that dark money, and that dark money is in our elections in a big way.

There are basically two questions: How did we get into this mess and how do we fix it? First, we need to look at the history, which is important to understand because folks can change the subject, but they cannot change the facts and the facts are very clear. Our campaign finance system is being destroyed by misguided Supreme Court decisions, one after another with narrow 5-to-4 decisions, giving a hammer to big money and chipping away at our democracy.

Normally the tradition in the Supreme Court has been that of Justices deciding on issues with a vote of 9 to 0 or 8 to 1 after trying to work things out, but these are narrow 5-to-4 decisions which are dividing the country and dividing the Court.

We can go all the way back to a Supreme Court decision back in 1976 in a case called *Buckley v. Valeo*, when the Court said money and free speech are the same thing. Four years ago in a case that involved *Citizens United*, the Court said corporations are persons and they can spend all they want.

Basically the Supreme Court put a for sale sign on elections. These elections and decisions opened the door and allowed a flood of money. They ignored political reality and drowned out the voices of ordinary Americans.

Most recently the McCutcheon decision knocked down aggregate contribution limits. What we are talking about in that case is that one person can dole out \$3.6 million directly to candidates and parties in all 50 States. Let's put that in perspective for the average American working full time and mak-

ing minimum wage. He or she would have to work 239 years to make that much money. Because of the McCutcheon decision, one person can dole out \$3.6 million directly to candidates and parties in all 50 States. It would take the average American, working full time and making minimum wage, 239 years to make that much money. Look at the imbalance and inequality there.

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said in a recent interview in the *National Law Journal*:

I think the biggest mistake this Court made is in campaign finance. . . . It should be increasingly clear how [money] is corrupting our system.

Justice Ginsburg is right. It is clear to most Americans, which is why opponents of reform either change the subject or muddy the water, which I will get into in a minute. But the point must be made that the five conservative Justices on the Supreme Court are not done. If left unchecked, the hammering will continue and the destruction will go on.

Chief Justice Roberts made a troubling statement in the McCutcheon decision. He said preventing bribery is the only basis, the only justification for Congress to pass campaign finance laws.

What does this mean? It means more bad decisions from the Court, the floodgates stay open, and the money keeps pouring in. Short of prohibiting out and out bribery, Congress is powerless to act and the American people must step aside. Billionaires will stay at the front of the line. All of this, folks, defies common sense.

Senator MCCAIN said after the ruling on McCutcheon: "There will be scandals involving corrupt political officials and unlimited, anonymous campaign contributions that will force the system to be reformed once again."

I am afraid my friend is right. There will be scandals. We are setting the stage for scandals. Just look at the millions of dollars of undisclosed money pouring into our elections.

How can there be reform? The Court has tied the hands of Congress. Until the Constitution is amended, we cannot enact real reforms—reforms such as McCain-Feingold. The Court will just strike them down. We are headed back to the pre-Watergate era.

In 2012 outside groups spent \$450 million to influence Senate and House races. In 2008, before *Citizens United*, they spent \$43 million. That is a ten-fold increase. There is an obvious trend and it is deeply troubling. Much of that money is hidden.

According to a recent report by the Brennan Center, over half the money spent in this year's top nine Senate races is not fully disclosed. So in 2 months we will know the outcome of these elections, but we won't know who paid for them.

This chart is a great indication. We have the top-most contested Senate races, and here in the red we have full disclosure of the money. So the red shows us what people know and that they know who the contributors are, but the blue, which is more than half if we average it through all of the elections, represents partial or absolute nondisclosure.

This clearly shows we have a broken system. There are only two ways to fix it. The Court can reverse itself—that is unlikely—or we can amend the Constitution, making clear in the Constitution that people have the right to regulate campaign finance. Until then, we will fall short of real reform. That is why a constitutional amendment is essential—because the time has come to give power back to the elected representatives of the people.

Opponents say this is just an election year stunt, but, again, this ignores history. Our amendment is similar to other bipartisan amendments introduced in nearly every Congress since 1983 when Ted Stevens—a Republican—was the lead sponsor. Many prominent Republicans cosponsored and voted for these amendments over the course of three decades, people such as John Danforth, Strom Thurmond, Nancy Kassebaum, Arlen Specter, JOHN MCCAIN, and THAD COCHRAN. This was always a bipartisan effort. And this was before Citizens United, before McCutcheon, when things went from bad to worse.

It is not a radical idea. In fact, it is pretty simple. It would give back power to Congress to regulate campaign finance at the Federal level and to States at the State level. That is it, period. We do not dictate specific reforms. We can debate the specifics, and we should, but Congress has a duty and a right to enact sensible campaign finance reform.

The American people support reform because they know a basic truth: No matter how hard some may try to obscure it, when the Court says money is free speech, there is a great risk that special interests can drown out the voices of everyone else because we know we don't get something for nothing. Folks writing those checks want something in return. Whether they are Democratic billionaires or Republican billionaires, they want value for their money, which usually means less compromise and which usually means less compromise and more gridlock.

Opponents of reform are in full throttle by ignoring history and torturing logic. But let's be clear. Here is the bottom line: They oppose any limits, they oppose any restrictions on how big the checks are or even saying which billionaires are writing them. It is hard to defend that. Instead, they change the subject and talk about threats to free speech, which goes something like this: If Congress can

regulate campaign finance spending, then it can also regulate free speech. I think this is a straw man argument not supported by history, logic, or the law. It isn't persuasive, and it is basically a scare tactic.

Congress has a long history of regulating campaign finance, often in the wake of scandal. Since 1867 Congress has been in the business of regulating campaign finance by banning solicitation of campaign funds from naval yard government employees. We have had the Pendleton Act, the Tillman Act, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, the Hatch Act, the Federal Campaign Election Act of 1974, and the Bipartisan Campaign Act of 2002.

First scandal and then reform—that is the unfortunate pattern. Every generation has faced that challenge for ethical government, for standing up to the power of big money, and the Congress has acted. It has not banned books, suppressed preachers, or stopped printing presses. Reform has been modest, reasonable, and responsive, sensible enough to pass both Houses of Congress and get the signature of the President. We have to answer to our constituents, unlike Supreme Court Justices.

Further, our amendment does not give Congress free rein. There is still a reasonableness requirement in the Court's interpretation of any constitutional amendment. If Congress did pass extreme laws, the Court could still overturn them as unreasonable. The First Amendment is in full effect. So in the classic example, we protect free speech, but we cannot yell "fire" in a crowded theater. "Reasonable" is not a complicated idea—except maybe here in Washington or to billionaires who demand their way or the highway.

Opponents also argue that our amendment protects incumbents. This, again, misses the point. If anything, the current system favors incumbents. Raising \$10 million, \$15 million, or \$20 million for a Senate seat is a tall order—one many qualified candidates will decline. If a person is elected, it is just the beginning of this endless campaign cycle to compete, to keep up, to raise more money. Every Member in this body can speak to the hours on the phone dialing for dollars when our time could be better spent meeting the real needs of our constituents and serving the folks who sent us here in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute to sum up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, this is not about free speech, and the American people know it. It is about the wealthiest interests trying to buy elections in secret, with no limits, period. That is it.

Let me finally say that I have had a great group of Senators working with me on this amendment over the years. One of them we are going to hear from right now—Senator BERNIE SANDERS from Vermont. All of us—Senator LEAHY, Senator DURBIN on the Judiciary Committee—have worked and refined this amendment to do everything we can to make sure that it is responsive to the American people and that it will make us responsive to the American people in terms of having a good, solid electoral system other than the one the Supreme Court is leading us down the path with.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator TOM UDALL for his extraordinary work over the years in calling attention to this disastrous Supreme Court decision called Citizens United which is doing so much to undermine the foundations of American democracy. It has been a pleasure working with him, and we will continue to fight.

My colleagues may not know it by reading the newspapers or watching TV, but this week we are going to be having a debate on what I consider to be the most important domestic issue facing the United States of America; that is, whether this great country retains its democratic foundations—one person, one vote—or whether we move into an oligarchic form of society where a small handful of billionaires is able to control not only the economic life of our Nation but the political life as well.

Whether one is a Democrat, whether one is a Republican, or whether one is—as the Presiding Officer and I are—an Independent, the overwhelming majority of the American people do not believe free speech has anything to do with billionaires being able to buy elections.

The Washington Post reported earlier this week that one family, the Koch brothers—a family worth \$80 billion—has already put on the air some 44,000 ads, and this campaign has 2 months left to it—44,000 ads. America is supposed to be about debates on issues. It is not supposed to be a process where a billionaire can come into a small State such as Maine or Vermont and plop \$50 million down or \$20 million down to elect candidates whose sole job in life is to represent the wealthy and the powerful.

Men and women have put their lives on the line and died to defend American democracy—the right for all of us to be involved in the political process, not to create a situation where a handful of superwealthy families can elect the candidates they want.

I think some people, when they hear about Citizens United, say: Well, it is kind of an esoteric issue; it is not really relevant to my life.

Those who believe that are dead wrong. If people are concerned about the collapse of the middle class; if people are concerned about the fact that more people today are living in poverty than at any time in American history; if people are concerned about the fact that we have more wealth and income inequality in America today than any other major country on Earth; if people are concerned that we are the only major country on Earth without national health care, guaranteeing health care to all people; if people are concerned about the crisis of global warming and many other issues, people have to be interested in the issue of Citizens United and how we elect Members of the House and Senate and Governors, and so forth and so on, because ultimately what this is about is whether the wealthy can determine the agenda of the House and the Senate, whether they can say to candidates: Here it is—we are going to put \$50 million into your campaign, and all you have to do is support us on A, B, C, D, and E. You have to make sure the rich get more tax breaks—despite the fact that the wealthy are doing phenomenally well. You have to make sure we cut food stamps or education or we eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency. That is why we are giving you the money we are giving you.

People do not spend hundreds of millions of dollars on campaigns for fun, for the hell of it; they are spending money because they have an agenda. And the billionaire agenda is not the agenda of the American people.

I wish to read for a moment exact language from the 1980 Libertarian Party, whose Vice Presidential campaign and major funder was one David Koch—one of the two Koch brothers. What I am going to read to my colleagues today is what I believe remains their agenda today because I see no evidence that it has changed.

When we turn on the TV and we see an ad coming from one of the Koch brothers' organizations, know what they stand for.

"We favor the abolishment of Medicare and Medicaid programs."

That doesn't mean cutting them; that means ending them.

"We favor the repeal of a fraudulent, virtually bankrupt and increasingly oppressive Social Security system."

That does not mean they are opposed to raising the minimum wage, which many of us want to do; they want to do away with Social Security entirely—not cut Social Security but do away with it.

"We support repeal of all laws which impede the ability of any person to find employment, such as minimum wage laws."

What that means in English is that while we are trying to raise the minimum wage, they want to abolish the concept of the minimum wage. So in

high-unemployment areas, an employer can pay a worker \$3 an hour or \$4 an hour.

This is also from the Koch brothers' platform: "We oppose all government welfare, relief projects, and aid to the poor programs. All of these government programs are privacy-invading, paternalistic, demeaning, and inefficient. The proper source of help for such persons is the voluntary efforts of private groups and individuals."

That means goodbye to good jobs, nutrition programs, Federal aid to education, and goodbye to unemployment insurance.

This is not a conservative agenda. This is not a small-government agenda. This is an extremist agenda designed to eliminate virtually every piece of legislation passed by Congress in the last 80 years which protects the middle class, working families, low-income people, seniors, and the system. That is their agenda.

I am not saying every Republican adheres to every aspect of this agenda, but these guys are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the political process for a reason, and that reason is to make the wealthiest people in this country even wealthier while they do away with all legislation that protects working families.

Citizens United is one of the worst decisions in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court. I hope every Member of the Senate votes this week to start the process for a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

REMEMBERING TRUETT CATHY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today the State of Georgia lost a great citizen and America lost a great patriot. Truett Cathy, 93 years old, the founder of Chick-fil-A restaurants, passed away this morning. One of the great entrepreneurs of all time, Truett Cathy started a restaurant called the Dwarf House in College Park, GA, years and years ago. He turned it into the Chick-fil-A restaurant, which now has over 1,800 restaurants in 40 States and the District of Columbia. It is a family-owned business. It is not a public corporation. It is a business that is built on the principles that Truett Cathy believed in and believed in to this day. Truett Cathy's stores are never open on Sunday. He is a devout Christian and believes Sunday is a day of rest. So he operates 6 out of the 7 days. Everybody who competes with Truett Cathy operates for 7 days. But everybody who competes with Truett Cathy finishes second in gross sales, second in quality, and second in the line.

Truett Cathy was an extra-special man whose life has been a great tribute to all the right things in life that all of us believe in.

Truett Cathy also gave back to his community probably more than any other person I know of. He founded WinShape Homes, WinShape to build boys, WinShape to take children who could not find a foster parent, put them in a home and turned their life around. He was a prolific writer of book after book after book about his belief in life. His greatest book is one I gave to each Member of the Senate about 5 years ago: "It's Better to Build Boys than Mend Men." Because he knew the citizens of our country would be better if we had good foundations from the beginning. So he tried to make sure all those who were less fortunate, who did not have the advantages he or others had, had a chance to grow up in a home with a warm and nurturing environment, a Christian environment, an environment that was dedicated to the principles of this country, and freedom and democracy.

Atlanta and Georgia will miss Truett Cathy. He is irreplaceable. It is said that nobody is irreplaceable. Truett Cathy is. But the legacy and the legend he built and his restaurants will go on as a flagship for everything that is right about free enterprise and about the United States of America.

On this day on the floor of the Senate, to his family and to his legion of friends and to all he stood for and stands for, I mourn the loss of Truett Cathy, a great American and a great citizen.

I urge everybody, when they get the chance, to read the story of his life, because it is the story of the American way of life. It is the story of principles you are committed to, vision you hope for, taking a risk to try and create a reward, and giving back to the community when you earn the money from that reward, to see to it you leave this world a better place than you found it.

For America and Georgia today, Truett Cathy has left us. He has gone to a much better place. But he has left our city, our State, and our country a better place than what he found. May God bless the life of Truett Cathy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 42 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. This evening the Senate will vote on whether it should proceed to the consideration of a constitutional amendment that would, of all things, alter the Bill of Rights. Specifically, it seeks to amend the First Amendment to permit this Congress to regulate the speech and political activity of American citizens.

As written, the First Amendment does not permit regulation of the sort the majority wishes to impose, so they have decided to rewrite it. This is incredible and a sad demonstration of the lengths to which this majority is willing to go in its quest to retain power.

It is particularly sad when you realize that in just over 2 weeks we will be celebrating the anniversary of the Senate action that made ratification of the First Amendment possible. It was on September 25, 1789, that this body passed the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. That was 225 years ago. The ratification process was completed when Virginia became the 11th State to approve the amendments on December 15, 1791.

Since then, for over two centuries, the First Amendment has guaranteed all Americans will have the right to express themselves and participate in the political process without fear of government reprisal. While other nations have struggled to build and sustain democracy, the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution have given us a stability that allowed the United States of America to grow, to prosper, and to become a beacon of freedom around the globe.

Our Founders knew that the free expression of ideas was essential to the life and health of our democracy. Many other nations have yet to learn this lesson and still punish and imprison their citizens for daring to speak out and challenge those in power.

That does not happen here because of the system our Founders gave us. It does not happen because of the First Amendment. These things should be obvious. We might even call them self-evident. One would think that even in these polarized times we would have a consensus or could have a consensus on the wisdom of the Founders on this point.

You would think that Senators on both sides of the aisle would recognize and agree that the First Amendment, which has preserved our liberty, must itself be preserved.

I am very sorry to say that if you thought that, you would be wrong. I am very sorry to say that as we stand here today in September 2014 those on the other side of the aisle now want to reverse the decision this body made that September 225 years ago. Forty-nine Members of the majority have chosen to cosponsor S.J. Res. 19, an amendment to the Bill of Rights.

I am pleased to say that not a single one of my Republican colleagues has joined them, but I am saddened that so many of those across the aisle have taken the extraordinary step of supporting it.

I think the reason is clear. They want to silence their opponents. The First Amendment does not allow them to do so, so they are going to try and change it.

The First Amendment begins with “Congress shall make no law”—for a reason. Our Founders knew a great deal about human nature. They knew that those in power would be inclined to retain it and unless constrained would use their power to punish those who would seek to challenge them or remove them from office.

The First Amendment denies us that power. It explicitly prohibits this Congress from passing laws that restrict the speech of the American people.

Now the majority wants to remove that prohibition. They want to grant themselves the power to control speech, to silence their opposition.

We will hear from the other side that there is nothing to worry about, that all they wish to do is impose reasonable regulations.

Of course, the point of the First Amendment is to prevent this Congress from making determinations about what speech is reasonable—and, therefore, permitted—and what is unreasonable and, therefore, prohibited. We don't need to speculate about what the majority will deem reasonable and what it will deem unreasonable.

As I described at a recent Rules Committee hearing on the DISCLOSE Act, prior consideration of that legislation has shown us what the majority regards as reasonable. The DISCLOSE Act is the majority's most recent version of their now biannual attempt to create a new regulatory structure to deter speech. It is precisely the kind of legislation we can expect to see more of if the majority grants itself the power to regulate speech through the amendment we are debating today.

So with past as prologue, let us recall what happened when the DISCLOSE Act was considered by the House in 2010. Not surprisingly, the restrictions and obligations it imposed were applied to groups disfavored by the majority at that time. A number of corporations were simply prohibited from speaking. Government contractors and TARP recipients were prohibited from making independent expenditures.

During floor consideration an amendment was added also to prohibit speech by companies that explore and produce oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf. The bill was on the floor soon after the Deepwater Horizon spill, so this was an easy target.

Not surprisingly, the majority thought it was perfectly reasonable to prevent any of these companies from speaking but did not think it was necessary to extend those restrictions to the unions that might represent the workforce in these companies. Republican amendments to extend the restrictions to those unions were rejected. The majority did not find them reasonable, apparently.

In some cases groups were excluded from the disclosure obligation solely because the votes were not there to in-

clude them. That is what happens once the Congress starts imposing speech restrictions—restrictions get applied to whoever doesn't have enough votes in the Congress to prevent them. Imposing speech regulations based on the whims of whatever party happens to be in the majority in the Congress at a given time is not reasonable, but it is exactly what happens once we start down this path and the majority has not deviated from it.

The Rules Committee hearing revealed the DISCLOSE Act continues to exempt groups sympathetic to the majority from the obligations it would impose on others.

It may be a natural impulse to wish those who are criticizing us would stop—everybody understands that—but the First Amendment does not allow us to make it stop. We should not have the power to silence our critics and we should never have it.

I know many Members on the other side of the aisle are upset about the ads that are attacking them and their agenda. I know they want those ads to stop. Well, we don't get to choose who gets to speak.

The proponents of this amendment and the critics of the Citizens United decision are clearly exercised by the prospects of corporate speech. It is obvious they fear how such speech might influence public policy debate in this country and their own electoral prospects. They have decided these voices should not be heard and must be suppressed.

They claim to be motivated only by a desire to promote the health of this democracy. They claim they just want all voices to be heard and want to make sure powerful corporations do not drown out the voices of others.

This claim is belied by one simple fact that there are and always have been powerful and wealthy corporations that have exerted enormous influence over our politics in this country and in our culture even. But the majority has not had a problem with them. I am speaking, of course, of media corporations. They were never limited by the electioneering restrictions imposed on other corporations. The Citizens United decision simply leveled the playing field and ended that nonsensical distinction.

That logical and constitutional result alarms the majority, though, because they fear that other corporations may not be as sympathetic to them as media corporations have been. They therefore regard it as perfectly reasonable to allow media corporations to say whatever they want, while at the same time regarding it as intolerable that other corporations be permitted to do the same.

While the amendment they propose would allow them to prohibit speech by any corporation—including the media—we can expect their allies will

continue to enjoy the right to free expression. Their opponents, however, will be targeted. Those whose views align with the majority should draw no comfort from this fact though. Majorities do change. The whole point of the First Amendment is to ensure that the people's right to speak is not dependent on the whims of whatever majority happens to be in power at a given time in the Senate.

People have a right to express themselves and that right is not limited to whatever this body might deem to be reasonable.

We have a free marketplace of ideas. We do not entrust this Congress with the power to decide what ideas will get expressed or how much they will be expressed. Again, we don't entrust this Congress with the power to decide what ideas will get expressed or how much they will be expressed.

The majority proposes this amendment because they want that power, but they should never have it, and neither should any future majority. We have already seen from the rule change they imposed unilaterally only a few months ago that this majority is willing to jettison longstanding traditions and practices for short-term political gain. This mentality has already done serious and possibly irreparable damage to this body, but apparently destruction of the Senate rules will not suffice. Now the Constitution itself must yield. The interests of the majority are paramount and everything—even our most basic principles—must be sacrificed on the altar of the majority.

Well, thankfully, the rules for ratification cannot be discarded as easily as the rules of this body. To ensure against precisely what the majority wishes to do—to alter the Constitution for their own benefit—the Founders made it very hard to amend. Two-thirds of each House of Congress must agree to an amendment. Then three-quarters of the States must ratify it. That is just not going to happen.

But the fact that they will not succeed does not mean that we should not take their threat seriously. To even begin down this path shows a remarkable contempt for our political traditions and founding documents. It reveals the desperation of the majority and at the same time it reveals the wisdom of our Founders. In seeking to amend the First Amendment to protect themselves, the majority reminds us again how lucky we are to live in a country with a Constitution that prevents such abuses.

I am profoundly grateful for the wisdom of the Founders and proud to stand here today to defend the First Amendment that they gave us.

I will oppose this amendment today, tomorrow, and forever, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the

time be charged equally to both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE TO THE FAMILIES OF JAMES FOLEY AND STEVEN SOTLOFF

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, these last few weeks have been very trying for America. In August, as the result of the cowardly and barbaric acts of the terrorist group ISIS, America lost two courageous and inspiring journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff.

Along with my colleagues Senators AYOTTE, NELSON, and RUBIO, and Chairman MENENDEZ, I am submitting a resolution to honor the lives of James Foley, who was born and raised in New Hampshire, and Steven Sotloff, a Florida native but a graduate of Kimball Union Academy in Meriden, NH.

Our resolution mourns James and Steven, two outstanding journalists who pursued their profession under the most difficult and dangerous conditions in order to tell the stories that needed to be told of the struggles that people on the ground were facing in the middle of difficult conflicts. We will never forget the bravery of James and Steven and their dedication to the ideals of freedom they so embodied.

Our resolution strongly condemns the terrorist group ISIS, a group that has committed unspeakable atrocities against humanity and attempted to justify them through a perverted interpretation of Islam. ISIS fighters have targeted Iraqi Christians, killing many and forcing others to flee their ancient homeland, they have massacred Muslims who do not subscribe to their depraved ideology, they have threatened genocide against the ancient Yazidi population of Iraq, and they have targeted other religious and ethnic minority groups. They have threatened to conduct terrorist attacks internationally, including here in the United States. And of course ISIS brutally murdered these two American journalists, Jim Foley and Steven Sotloff.

Let us be clear. We must hold ISIS accountable for their despicable acts. We must vigorously pursue those responsible and bring them to justice, and we must not let the deaths of these two Americans go unanswered. The terrorists who murdered Jim Foley are deeply mistaken if they think their barbaric acts will lessen Americans' resolve and pave the way for ISIS to continue terrorizing. We will bring an end

to those who stand against everything these men stood for.

I hope the entire Senate—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—will stand together to adopt this resolution. Let us show the world our Nation is united in its commemoration of the lives of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and in our condemnation of the barbaric group that took these Americans from us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRYOR NOMINATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in about 19 minutes the Senate will exercise one of its constitutional responsibilities of advice and consent to President Obama on the appointment of Jill A. Pryor to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit of Georgia. I urge all of my colleagues to vote favorably for Ms. Pryor, a lawyer from the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia, a great nominee and a great appointee.

As I make this recommendation, I want the Chamber to know loudly and clearly that I praise the President and his staff—particularly Kathy Ruemmler—for the job they did in coordinating with Senator CHAMBLISS and myself in seeking advice and consent to come up with a series of appointees to the district and circuit courts of Georgia.

Jill Pryor is an outstanding lawyer and an outstanding attorney. She is a graduate of William & Mary and Yale University, and was editor of the Yale Law Review.

An outstanding jurist and an outstanding person, she has practiced and specialized in business law, representing plaintiffs and defendants—not in the same case, I might add—in the areas of business torts, corporate governance, and shareholder disputes, class actions, trade secrets, fraud, intellectual property fraud, and the Georgia and Federal RICO statutes.

She is an outstanding member of the firm of Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore, and clerked for an Eleventh Circuit judge when she got out of Yale University Law School. She is an outstanding individual of impeccable credentials, impeccable integrity, and will be a great credit to the Federal bench of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

I commend her to each of my colleagues here today with my highest recommendation, and I again thank

the President of the United States and his staff for their cooperation in nominating a superior judge to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, with all the problems facing the country and the world, the majority has decided the time has come to cut back on the Bill of Rights to be amended for the first time in our history.

We hear from the other side repeatedly that they revere the Constitution. But they want to restrict the core of free speech. That is speech that allows a self-governing people to choose in elections the people who will represent them. This proposed amendment would enshrine in our Constitution the ability of elected officials to criminally punish those who would dare to criticize them more than the elected officials think is reasonable.

Today Americans are free to spend unlimited money on behalf of candidates and political issues and messages of their choice. The amendment being proposed would put those who would engage in political speech on notice that they may be prosecuted for being active citizens in our democracy. That threat of criminal prosecution would not just chill speech, it would freeze political speech. This proposed amendment would be the biggest threat to free speech that Congress would have enacted since the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798.

The First Amendment creates a marketplace of ideas. When people disagree on political speech, competing voices respond to each other and the public then decides. When speech is free, people are not shut up with the threat of jail if the government thinks they speak too much.

Since the 1970s, the Supreme Court has ruled repeatedly that because effective speech can only occur through the expenditure of money, government cannot restrict campaign expenditures by candidates or anybody else. The Court has recognized that effective campaign speech requires that individuals have the right to form groups that might actually spend money on campaign speech.

The proposed amendment is very radical. It would not overturn just 1 or 2 but it would overturn 12 Supreme Court decisions. That was the testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the country's foremost First Amendment lawyer, Floyd Abrams.

The other side may think the Senate can simply filibuster the motion to proceed and then move on to some other political vote they may want to have us take. Proposals to amend our fundamental charter of liberty, the Bill of Rights, should be treated more seriously. We should have debate on this important amendment. The majority should be made to answer for why they want to silence their critics under threat of criminal prosecution.

I look forward to supporting the vote to move to that debate, and I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

PRYOR NOMINATION

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Jill Pryor to serve as circuit judge for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit.

Ms. Pryor's educational pedigree is beyond reproach. She worked to put herself through college at William & Mary, graduating phi beta kappa. She then went on to Yale Law School where she was the senior editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal. After finishing law school she clerked for Judge Edmundson on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta, the very court for which she is today being considered.

Once she finished her clerkship, she decided to stay in Atlanta in private practice, where she has been practicing for the last 25 years. During that time she has played a pivotal role in some of the largest, most complex cases in the history of our legal system and in our great State of Georgia. But like any other well-rounded attorney, Ms. Pryor has taken time to give back outside the courtroom. She is currently on the State Bar of Georgia Board of Governors, and she is also on the Board of Governors of the Georgia Legal Services Program. She is the former chair of the appellate practice section of the State bar, and she is a past president of the Georgia Association for Women Lawyers.

The Eleventh Circuit will be well served by the addition of Ms. Pryor, and as I said in July before the Senate unanimously confirmed Judge Julie Carnes to this very same court, this is a vacancy that needs to be filled and needs to be filled quickly. Ms. Pryor certainly has the judicial as well as educational background to serve on the Eleventh Circuit. She has done extensive work inside the courtroom as well as at the appellate level, and she is well qualified to now go to the Eleventh Circuit.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this highly qualified nominee, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of Jill Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit judicial court.

Thank you very much. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JILL A. PRYOR TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we will finally vote on the confirmation of Jill Pryor of Georgia to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit. Her nomination has been pending in the Senate since February 2012—more than two and one-half years, which is longer than any other currently pending judicial nominee. She received the American Bar Association's highest rating of unanimously well qualified and has the support of both of her Republican home State Senators—Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON. Rather than vote to confirm her before the August recess, some Senate Republicans continued their senseless obstruction to keep the Senate from fulfilling its constitutional duty of advice and consent by filibustering her nomination for the sake of delay.

Despite this unyielding partisan strategy, the Senate has made great strides to fill vacancies on courts around the Nation. This year the Senate has confirmed 61 nominees to the circuit and district courts and in doing so, it has hit an historic milestone for diversity on the Federal appeals courts. More women and people of color are serving on the Federal appellate bench than ever before. Today I am happy that we will add to this laudable record with yet another well-qualified nominee.

From the outset, President Obama has understood that our Federal courts should reflect the diverse communities that it serves. He has nominated more women and more lawyers of color than any previous President in American history. Since the first day of the Obama administration, former Senate staffer Christopher Kang has worked with home State Senators to implement President Obama's goal of finding judicial nominees who not only embody the necessary integrity, intellect, and commitment to the rule of law, but who are also drawn from diverse backgrounds. I urge my fellow Senators to vote to confirm Jill Pryor of Georgia and to agree to votes on the remaining district court judges on the calendar without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jill A. Pryor, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 257 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Graham	Murray
Ayotte	Grassley	Nelson
Baldwin	Hagan	Paul
Barrasso	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF HENRY J. AARON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first nomination.

The bill clerk reported the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on confirmation.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, at an important time for the Social Security program, the Senate now votes on three nominations to the Social Security Advisory Board which the Congress established to provide critical input and perspective on the Social Security Program. All three of these nominees are very well qualified, and they are strong and independent thinkers.

The first is Dr. Henry Aaron. Dr. Aaron is one of America's foremost experts on Social Security. His many publications and contributions to the program make him an invaluable asset. I strongly urge Senators to support his confirmation on this bipartisan board.

The second is one of the Senate's own, Dr. Alan Cohen, a veteran economist of the Finance Committee staff. He will be an excellent board member.

The third is Dr. Lanhee Chen. Dr. Chen has a particularly commendable academic record.

I yield the additional time to Senator CARDIN, who has great expertise on Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I support all three of these nominations, but I want to talk a moment about Dr. Henry Aaron. I have had a chance to work over my legislative career with Dr. Aaron. I do not know of a person who is more qualified to serve on this board. He has been involved with Social Security his entire professional life dating back to 1979 when he chaired the Advisory Council on Social Security, which is a bipartisan group that works on Social Security.

He is an individual who will work across party lines in order to deal with the short-term and long-term needs of Social Security. He is currently the Bruce and Virginia MacLaury senior fellow in economic studies at Brookings, a fellow faculty member at the University of Maryland, Stanford University. He is very well qualified.

I know personally of his commitment to work with all Members of the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to support all three of these nominees.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and urge their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2014?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 258 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Hagan	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harkin	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, have we finished all of our work on the last vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last vote has concluded.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are now going to have three voice votes on nominations. There will be one more rollcall vote tonight. That is it.

NOMINATION OF HENRY J. AARON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the second nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Aaron nomination.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry J. Aaron, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ALAN L. COHEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Cohen nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Alan L. Cohen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Cohen nomination.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Alan L. Cohen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2016?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF LANHEE J. CHEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Chen nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lanhee J. Chen, of California, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Chen nomination.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lanhee J. Chen, of California, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, with respect to those nominations confirmed, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Charles E. Schumer, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Al Franken, Amy Klobuchar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 259 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Graham	Moran
Ayotte	Grassley	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hirono	Rubio
Brown	Hoeven	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Sessions
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Collins	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Coons	Levin	Vitter
Corker	Manchin	Walsh
Cornyn	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCain	Warren
Durbin	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Feinstein	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Menendez	Wyden
Flake	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

NAYS—18

Barrasso	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Shelby
Cruz	Paul	Thune
Enzi	Portman	Toomey

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Gillibrand	Murkowski
-------	------------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 79, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDI- TURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PRO- CEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 43 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

NDAA

Mr. INHOFE. There is another issue I wish to talk about, and I have talked to our leader, Chairman LEVIN, on the Armed Services Committee. There are several members of the Armed Services Committee, including the chair, on the floor.

I think we wanted a vote on what happened last year. Last year we did not pass an NDAA—keep in mind we passed an NDAA every year for 52 years. Perhaps, in my narrow view, I think it is the most significant bill we address every year.

Now we have this year's NDAA that we passed on May 22. It passed our committee 25 to 1. It had the overwhelming support of Democrats and Republicans to go ahead and have an NDAA bill. Chairman LEVIN and I have come to the floor and begged our colleagues to send down amendments if they want. We have several amendments now, a couple hundred amendments. We are looking those over. We are going to try to see what can go into a managers' amendment, and maybe we can come up with something. I am hoping we can do it before the election, to come up with a bill that will consider the amendments. If we were able to say to the Democrats and Republicans in this vote that we would restrict it to "X" number of amendments, 3, 5, 6 amendments on each side, then I believe our leader would allow this to come to the floor so we could have an NDAA vote.

I have a number; 140 amendments have already been filed. The staff has been working over the August recess to put together a managers' package that is going to consider varieties of all these 140 amendments, but we need more. What I don't want to happen is in the last minute everyone comes up and says: Wait a minute. I have amendments and I want to have them included. Now is the time to do it.

We have thousands of men and women serving today in harm's way, risking their lives for us, for our Nation, and they are dealing with the most complex and volatile global security environments I have ever seen in my life. We rely on them to do their job to keep our Nation safe and they should rely on us to do the same.

Let's remember what happened last year. Last year we didn't do it and we came up to the year-end, and it wasn't until then we decided we were not going to be able to do it in the legitimate way that we have been doing for 52 years. And so I happened to be the ranking member of the minority, and of course we have Chairman LEVIN and we had the two on the House side. The big four got together in a room, took all the amendments that had been considered, weeded through them, satisfied most of the people, and in 3 hours we designed a bill, brought it out to the floor and passed it on the 26th of December. Now we have gone beyond that. We have gone to December 31.

We have kids out there risking their lives without hazard pay, without reenlistment bonuses. It costs some \$15 million to train a fighter in the air to the standards of an F-22, and the reenlistment bonus would be about \$200,000. So the economics are there. Assuming we had gone beyond that point, it would have been an absolute disaster.

So I am pleading with all of our Members on the Republican side and on the Democratic side to do what is necessary to bring their amendments down to the floor.

The President recently submitted an OCO request for \$59 billion to fund operations in Afghanistan and around the world. The request includes a new \$4 billion counterterrorism partnership fund and \$1 billion for the European re-assurance funds. Many questions remain about these funds. I have questions about it. I haven't talked to one member of our Senate Armed Services Committee who knows the details of this request.

We are the ones who should be doing this. These are measures we can include in the NDAA, and I am going to ask and plead with our fellow Members on the Democratic and Republican side to get your amendments in and let's go ahead and let us take a number of amendments on each side so we can have the ability to do it the way it should be done.

The only alternative is to do what we did last year, and that doesn't include anyone except four people in the House and Senate.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE MARSHFIELD HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, true to their Vermont roots, the citizens of Marshfield, VT, are bringing to fruition a new vision for the Marshfield Historical Society, an organization dedicated to preserving—and sharing—the long history of this 44-square mile town in the foothills of Vermont, just outside our State capital of Montpelier.

In the late 17th century, the land that came to be known as Marshfield was home to the Abenaki. Then, just as now, its inhabitants enjoyed the Winooski River to fish and the surrounding hills to hunt. Marshfield is a community that upholds tradition and passes stories from generation to generation. The land is clearly different than it was centuries ago, but these customs can make it difficult to notice the sometimes subtle changes Marshfield has borne. Creating a public space to commemorate the town's past is the mission of the Marshfield Historical Society.

On September 12, with the support of the Vermont Historical Society, the Marshfield Historical Society will host its grand opening, a reopening of sorts. In concert with the support of the local Selectboard, the Jaquith Public Library, a generous anonymous donor, the perseverance of a dedicated core of volunteers, and, of course, the residents of Marshfield, the history of this small but vibrant town will now be accessible to the public. Local artifacts and memorabilia, cloistered for years, will be publicly accessible in the Old Schoolhouse Common. The Marshfield Historical Society is returning to the residents of Marshfield their own history.

The Marshfield Historical Society owes much to the memory of Hap Hayward, a longtime resident, who was an original inspiration for the establishment of a local historical society. The society's new site, organized content, and new exhibits will surely attract visitors and locals. Some of their most noteworthy collections include a rare copy of Militia Law of the State of Vermont from 1843, as well as an extensive collection of postcards of Marshfield buildings and landscapes. I hear such wonderful things about it from my sister, Mary Leahy, who is a Marshfield resident. These artifacts belong to the residents of Marshfield, and to all Vermonters. As a longtime supporter of the historic preservation of our communities, our downtowns and our local histories, I am eager to visit the new historical society.

I congratulate the people of Marshfield on successfully undertaking this impressive effort to protect their history for generations to come.

REMEMBERING JAMES FOLEY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I would like to honor James Foley, a proud son of New Hampshire, whose life was guided by love—love for the humanity he devoted his life to documenting, love for his family members who worked tirelessly to secure his release, and love for God who brought him strength and comfort, even in the darkest moments.

The entire Nation was saddened to hear the news about Jim. It was with a heavy heart that I joined the Foley family and a crowd of nearly 1,000 on August 24 at Our Lady of the Holy Rosary parish in Rochester, NH, to memorialize Jim and reflect upon how he chose to live his life.

As we here pause to remember Jim, we cannot allow those responsible for his death to fill us with sorrow and despair. Though the sense of loss remains, through Jim's life we may hope to rediscover a sense of optimism and goodness—the same feelings that motivated him as a journalist to search for humanity in the world's darkest and most dangerous places.

When I think of Jim, I will remember his fierce passion for his work and for the people whose stories he lived to tell. I will remember the interminable spirit of his parents, Diane and John. And I will remember how New Hampshire, and Americans across the country, came together to support the Foleys.

Jim Foley's life began in Wolfeboro, a small New Hampshire town on the shores of Lake Winnepesaukee. He graduated in 1992 from Kingswood Regional High School, where classmates remember him as light-hearted, but also caring and eager to see the world. As the oldest of Diane and John Foley's five children, James developed a strong sense of responsibility for others.

Jim was known in his family for running late because wherever he went he ran into friends and colleagues who wanted to stop and catch up with him. Jim's uncommon kindness earned him the trust and friendship of people across the United States and the world.

Jim's compassion for others and his desire to learn their stories is what motivated his life's work. According to his parents, Jim's exposure to the poverty of inner-city Milwaukee while attending Marquette University led him to realize that people are often shaped by events and circumstances out of their control, and that it was within his power to tell their stories.

He carried this mission with him throughout his life and used it as a basis for his work in conflict zones.

After graduating from Marquette, Jim started down the path that would turn him into the successful journalist he became. He first taught history for 3 years at middle school in Phoenix, AZ, a world away from his upbringing in the Lakes Region of New Hampshire.

Eager to learn how best to turn his experiences into compelling stories, he went on to complete master's degrees in writing and journalism at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and Northwestern University. Classmates of Jim's at Northwestern recall that when one of his professors assigned him to cover a neighborhood in the Lower West Side of Chicago, Jim decided to move there, a telling decision for a future frontline journalist.

Jim later gained experience in conflict reporting while covering U.S. military operations as an embedded reporter in Iraq and Afghanistan, but he worried that being removed from the local population detracted from his reporting to people back home.

When a wave of popular revolutions swept the Middle East and North Africa in the spring of 2011, Jim knew that he needed to bear witness to this incredible phenomenon from the perspective of those living through it.

Jim left for Libya, where he provided critical stories on the Libyan civil war until he was captured and imprisoned for 44 days by pro-Gadhafi forces.

Others who were detained with Jim tell stories of his unending selflessness toward his fellow prisoners—how he shared food, blankets and an endless stream of jokes to help everyone cope with a difficult and scary situation.

Furthermore, when Jim returned to the U.S. after his release, he was frequently asked to tell the story of his capture and detention. Instead of focusing on his own experience, Jim used the publicity to raise money for the family of a colleague who had been killed in the attack that led to Jim's capture. It was Jim's nature to care more about others than he did about his own personal successes or accolades.

In his reporting from Libya, Jim discovered that his passion was in helping the world relate to those in the middle of unimaginable conflict, and he would soon return to the region, this time to Syria, where Bashar al-Assad was escalating his brutal tactics of repression to maintain control of the country.

It was in the Syrian chaos that observers began to talk about rise of a group of militant Islamists calling themselves the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, the same group that would later hold Jim hostage for 637 days alongside a handful of other innocent journalists and aid workers.

Thanks to a message Jim passed to his family through a fellow prisoner who was released, we know that his close relationship with God and his family provided him with strength in captivity.

In the letter, he thanked his family and friends for their thoughts and prayers, and recounted treasured memories from time spent together. Most strikingly, he spent most of his words offering encouragement and support to those he loved. Even in the most trying circumstances, Jim Foley refused to abandon his core concern for others over himself.

We will always remember Jim for his compassion and devotion to the lives and stories of others, even in the most difficult conditions.

We are all proud to call James Foley our fellow American.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ARNOLD

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and congratulate John Arnold and recognize the 47th anniversary of Portable Practical Educational Preparation. This is a noteworthy milestone, an opportunity to recognize them for their remarkable history and the important results they continue to achieve.

The story of Portable Practical Educational Preparation begins with John Arnold and his vision of what could be done to address the problems being faced by the poor and those who came to America in search of a better life. His response was to roll up his sleeves

and get to work. He knew an education would be the key these individuals would need to create a better life for themselves and their families. Over the past 47 years the success he began in that and so many other efforts has been nothing short of extraordinary.

The work that began in Arizona proved to be just the beginning. John has since reached out to those in need across the country and around the world. When Hurricane Katrina devastated so many of our Southern States, he was there to help provide those whose lives were forever changed with a reason to hope for a better future because he cared enough to help. His other projects have reached out to people in Africa to provide them with the resources they needed to improve their lives, their communities, and their countries.

As has been said before, John Arnold leads the best way—by example. By so doing, he has provided us with a chance to see what can be done if we are sufficiently motivated and determined to take on the greatest challenge of them all—changing the world—and creative and enthusiastic enough to make it happen.

I want to offer my congratulations to John and all those who have worked with him over the years. He has made so many things happen, and we are all looking forward to seeing what he will take up in the years to come.

NEW HARMONY, INDIANA BICENTENNIAL

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the outstanding citizens of New Harmony, IN as they celebrate their town's 200th anniversary and to recognize the many contributions of New Harmony's citizens to the great State of Indiana and our Nation as a whole.

New Harmony was founded in 1814 by the Harmonie Society, led by Georg Johann Rapp. Just 5 short years after purchasing land along the Wabash River, the settlers had developed the area into a productive and prosperous community. In 1825, the community was sold to Robert Owen and his financial associate William Maclure. With the continued developments of Owen, a Welsh industrialist, and Maclure, who some consider "the father of American geology," New Harmony became a magnet for intellectual and academic innovators of the 19th century. The town had been called "the Athens of the West" because of the many scholars and scientists that called New Harmony home, such as the renowned American entomologist Thomas Say, French educator Marie Duclos Frategeot, and Dutch naturalist Gerard Troost.

Throughout its history, New Harmony has demonstrated a constant spirit of innovation, especially in the

educational and scientific fields. New Harmony was the home of the early kindergarten movement in America, as well an early example of what is now called a technical school. Robert Owen's son, David Dale Owen, led the early geological surveys of the Midwest, and another son, Robert Dale Owen, was a U.S. Representative from New Harmony, who wrote the bill to establish the Smithsonian Institution and chaired the Building Committee. Robert Dale Owen was also an abolitionist who was influential in shaping President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

New Harmony has long sustained its spirit of cultural innovation. In 1979, world-renowned architect Richard Meier designed the Athenaeum of New Harmony. Since its construction, the Athenaeum has been recognized with the prestigious Progressive Architecture Award and the American Institute of Architects' Twenty-Five Year Award.

I wish to congratulate the council members of New Harmony, Joe Straw, Don Gibbs, Linda Warrum, Karen Walker, and Andrew Wilson; the entire Bicentennial Commission and its co-chairs, Connie Weinzapfel and Raymond McConnell; as well as the citizens of New Harmony for their ongoing support and contributions to their community and the State of Indiana.

Today, New Harmony remains a bastion of the hard work, dedication, and innovation that are such an integral part of the Hoosier spirit that makes Indiana the great State it is today. On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate each and every member of the New Harmony community on the town's 200th Anniversary. I wish them continued success and growth for many more years to come.

2014 GREEN RIBBON SCHOOLS

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today, I wish to applaud the Saint Thomas Aquinas School of Indianapolis and Carmel High School of Carmel, IN for being recognized as 2014 Green Ribbon Schools by the U.S. Department of Education.

Established in 2011, the Green Ribbon School program is the Federal Government's first comprehensive green school initiative. Since its inception, the program has offered the opportunity for schools in every State to gain recognition for educational and environmental accomplishments. Recognition as a Green Ribbon institution is based on a school's ability to reduce environmental impact, improve the health of students and staff, and provide environmental education. Both of these exceptional Hoosier schools have made great strides in these areas.

In 2003, Saint Thomas Aquinas School constructed a National Wildlife Federation-certified schoolyard where

students can learn about the environmental sciences as they grow vegetables for a local food pantry. In addition, Saint Thomas Aquinas School has also greatly reduced its carbon footprint through the installation of new energy efficient windows and low-flush toilets, the implementation of an extensive recycling program, and the encouragement of walking and biking to school. As a result, Saint Thomas Aquinas has reduced its solid waste by nearly 30 percent and carbon-emissions by nearly 19 percent.

Similarly, Carmel High School has made its campus and the surrounding community environmentally friendly. Carmel has embraced energy saving technology such as energy efficient bulbs and LED lighting and has moved to a fuel efficient bus fleet. After two decades of implementing these impressive measures, Carmel High School has reduced its energy consumption by 72 percent, its greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 50 percent and its water consumption by 55 percent. The school also established Carmel Green Teen, a board that dispenses microloans for student projects that work towards pollution reduction, conservation, and energy savings.

I would like to thank Principal Cara Swinefurther of Saint Thomas Aquinas School and Principal John Williams of Carmel High School, their entire staffs, and their students for the hard work and dedication it undoubtedly took to receive this prestigious award.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate both the Carmel High School and Saint Thomas Aquinas communities, and I wish them continued success in the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RAYMOND, NEW HAMPSHIRE

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the town of Raymond, NH, which is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding this month. I am proud to recognize this historic milestone.

Located in Rockingham County along the Lamprey River in southeast New Hampshire, the geographic area that Raymond now occupies was originally a parish of Chester called Freetown by its early settlers who came from nearby Exeter. Later, in 1764, the town was incorporated by colonial Governor Benning Wentworth and was officially named Raymond.

Since its incorporation in 1764, the population in Raymond has grown to approximately 10,000 residents, whose dedication to preserving the town's unique character and historical charm is a testament to their patriotism and pride. Raymond is also a hub for commerce with a vibrant downtown.

Raymond's town common serves as a central gathering place for the commu-

nity and helps makes this town a quintessential New England treasure. Each year Raymond's residents come together for the annual Christmas parade and tree lighting, the Fourth of July parade, Veterans Day, and other special events. The town is also home to several historic sites, including the Raymond Congregational Church, which was established in 1874, the Dudley-Tucker Library, and the old Raymond Railroad Depot, which now houses the Raymond Historical Society.

The theme for Raymond's 250th anniversary celebration is "My Town, Your Town, Our Town." These words reflect the deep pride and spirit of citizenship that have defined Raymond over the course of the past 250 years—and which will continue to guide the town's future. Among the many activities planned as part of Raymond's 250th celebration is a parade that will bring together local residents, community organizations, businesses, veterans, and students. I am truly honored to be joining residents of Raymond for this special and historic event.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I am delighted to congratulate the citizens of Raymond on this important occasion in the town's history and commend them for their many contributions to our State and their spirit of community—which will endure for the next 250 years and beyond.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL SIELICKI

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the exceptional public service of my good friend Police Chief Michael Sielicki. Mike Sielicki has worked as a New Hampshire law enforcement officer for more than 26 years, retiring as the chief of police of the Kensington Police Department.

After serving in the U.S. Army with the 82nd Airborne Division from 1979 to 1983, then as a combat engineer in Germany from 1983 to 1986, Chief Sielicki returned to New Hampshire to serve in the New Hampshire criminal justice system. He first joined the Hillsborough County Department of Corrections in 1986 and then the Coos County Department of Corrections in 1987. Mike Sielicki began his law enforcement career with the Colebrook Police Department in 1987 and attended the New Hampshire Police Academy in 1989. Through his hard work and dedication, he rose through the ranks and became the chief of the Colebrook Police Department in 1993, serving in that capacity until 1999, when he accepted the chief's position in Hancock, where he worked from 1999 to 2003. In 2003, he was appointed the chief of police of the Rindge Police Department, where he served until accepting the chief's position in Kensington in 2012.

In a career that has spanned three decades, Mike has established a reputation as a knowledgeable, respected and

compassionate public safety professional and engaged community member. He established the Colebrook Police Athletic League in 1994. Chief Sielicki became a foster parent and subsequently served as the president of the New Hampshire Foster Parent Association from 1999 to 2004. He led the Law Enforcement Torch Run for NH Special Olympics from 2008 to 2011.

During my tenure as New Hampshire's attorney general, it was my privilege to work directly with Chief Sielicki on many important law enforcement initiatives. Mike earned the respect and admiration of his peers and has been a thoughtful, effective leader in efforts to improve the criminal justice system and public safety in New Hampshire. Active in the New Hampshire Association of Chiefs of Police, Chief Sielicki rose through the executive board chairs and served as its president from 2013 to 2014, a term he just completed. A courageous and respected leader, Mike often spoke out on important public policy issues, such as opposing the legalization of marijuana, and the expansion of gambling.

As Chief Sielicki celebrates his retirement, I want to commend him on a job well done and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him, his wife Kim, and their family well in all future endeavors.●

REMEMBERING COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR HOWARD A. MCRAE

● Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to memorialize a decorated veteran from the Alaska community of Haines, CSM Howard A. McRae. Born in 1929, he wanted to see more of the world, so, with his buddy Dave Berry, he made his way to Seattle. In that short distance, the two young men found themselves broke, so they joined the U.S. Army, where they received training in electronics. That was 1948.

For Howard it was a turning point. Described by a family member as "a little disheveled," the Army changed his life. He was now on his way to a 23-year military career, including 11 in the Green Berets.

Howard got his wish to see more of the world, although perhaps not as originally intended. Assignments took him to Korea, Japan, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam. He did four tours of duty in Korea and three in Vietnam.

Described as courageous and disciplined, Howard McRae received many citations and medals for his bravery, his dedication to duty, and his leadership. Among them: an Army Commendation Medal with three Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters to include a "V" for valor; a Korean Service Medal with four Bronze Service Stars; a Vietnam Service Medal with three Bronze Service Stars, a United Nations Service

Medal given by the U.N. for participation in the Korean war; and an Army Commendation Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster for meritorious service as chief instructor of the Advance Training Committee and as sergeant major and director of instruction at Fort Bragg, NC.

Exemplifying the military's own respect for Command Sergeant Major McRae, he was among the 44 Special Services soldiers chosen to stand guard over President John F. Kennedy's body as he lay in State in the White House. McRae had said that this was his proudest moment.

In his later military career, McRae was command sergeant major of the Special Forces School and the High Altitude Low Opening Military School, parachute at Fort Bragg, NC. As the highest ranking noncommissioned officer at the post, he was in charge of oversight for those who taught tactical training skills. Truly, he was a leader among leaders.

Unfortunately, and likely due to the effects of agent orange connected to his service in Vietnam, Command Sergeant Major McRae was medically retired in 1971. With wife Sarah Elizabeth, whom he met at Fort Bragg, he returned to Haines. There, he continued in service but this time through the city and borough of Haines, where he served in the borough assessor's office. In 1976 he and Sarah moved to Juneau, where he served as a budget analyst for the Alaska Department of Education.

Every inch a soldier, McRae raised his blended family of 8 children and 34 grandchildren to serve. His son Guy served in the Army, as did grandsons Steven and Joshua. Grandson Thomas joined the Marines and, given his grandfather's indomitable spirit, survived serious injuries in Afghanistan.

Sadly, we lost Command Sergeant Major McRae in 1987, but given his service through the military, his community, and State, it is only fitting that his home community of Haines has placed his name in partnership with another great Alaskan leader, Walter Soboleff, on a veteran's home. The Soboleff-McRae Veterans Village and Wellness Center will forever serve as a reminder of the exemplary service of this man gave to his country. We are eternally grateful.●

RECOGNIZING KRAFT FOODS

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, Kraft Foods has a long history in Springfield, MO, and is observing two anniversaries this year. Kraft started production of processed cheese in 1939 on the second floor of a building on West Mill Street. After 15 years, Kraft made the decision to expand and build a "modern new plant" on property on the outskirts of town off Bennett Street east of Glenstone. This plant is now home to

more than 800 employees who enjoy good-paying jobs. The 780,000-square-foot plant turns out hundreds of millions of pounds of product annually, including Kraft American Singles, Kraft Macaroni & Cheese in boxes and microwaveable cups, and Kraft natural cheeses. The dozens of different products made at Kraft Foods-Springfield are distributed throughout the South, the Midwest, and the mountain States.

The current Springfield plant was expanded again in 1976, adding 219,000 square feet of modernized production space for new lines of pasta products; shredded cheese joined the product mix, and a 100,000-square-foot warehouse was completed in 2000. Kraft-Springfield receives raw products by the train car load every day, and a fleet of trucks sends the finished products to the marketplace. In 2010, working with the city of Springfield, bonds were issued to allow Kraft to expand, which included an \$18 million pasta press, drying equipment, and a natural cheese project. Another \$20 million funded new technology for Kraft Singles, and a third project funded improvements to the EZ Mac cup line.

Critical to the success of the Kraft-Springfield operation is the offsite warehouse in the Springfield Underground. Opened more than 50 years ago when below-surface storage was untested, offsite space today boasts reduced energy costs and performance sustainability. At 36 degrees Fahrenheit, the Kraft Foods space in the underground stores cheeses, Oscar Mayer meats, and Jell-O puddings. Kraft officials believe that the facility uses about 65 percent less electricity than a comparable surface warehouse. It is another part of the emphasis Kraft places on its environmental stewardship. The Kraft facility achieved the Ozarks GreenScore Green Level in 2013—the highest level of environmental achievement—and the Ozarks GreenScore Gold Level in 2011.

Kraft employees and the company also give back to the community through product donations, employee time and fundraising to support the Ozarks Food Harvest, Boys & Girls Clubs of Springfield, United Way Day of Caring, and Park Board Dairy Days, among numerous other organizations.

I remember touring the plant during our Congressional Agriculture Tour in 2000 and later at the Underground. It was a remarkable facility then and is even more advanced now. The commitment Kraft Foods has made to Springfield is reflected in the commitment Springfield has made to Kraft. On this 60th anniversary of the plant and Kraft's 75th year in Springfield, I hope this unique public-private partnership survives for many generations to come.●

JACKIE ROBINSON WEST LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS

• Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Chicago's very own Jackie Robinson West Little League team, who are the reigning 2014 Little League World Series U.S. Champions. Jackie Robinson West is the first team from Chicago to reach the Little League World Series in more than 40 years. They have brought immense pride to our city, and I commend them on their incredible achievement.

From Chicago's South Side, the Jackie Robinson West team consists of 13 players aged 11–13 years old. The last Little League team from Chicago to make it nearly this far was in 1967, and we were long overdue for another run at the championship. These 13 players worked together for countless hours to bring their A-game to the field. During their season, they outscored their opponents by a score of 212 to 28! Their teamwork, dedication to their teammates and coaches, and perseverance to become champions is nothing short of an inspiration to myself and our entire country.

Jackie Robinson West showed us all what true dedication, tireless effort and teamwork can achieve. They represented our Nation with great pride and sportsmanship on and off the field, and I am proud of each and every one of these young men for what they have achieved and for the sense of pride and accomplishment that they have brought to our city. They are an inspiration to young men and women across Chicago and throughout the Nation.

I want to personally congratulate DJ Butler, Lawrence Noble, Jaheim Benton, Ed Howard, Cameron Bufford, Brandon Green, Darion Radcliff, Marquis Jackson, Joshua Houston, Eddie King, Prentiss Luster, Pierce Jones, Trey Hondras, their coach Darold Butler, director Bill Haley, and assistant coaches Jerry Houston and Jason Little on their historic win. I am exceedingly proud of their accomplishments and wish them best of luck in this upcoming school year.●

REMEMBERING JOSEPH CALNAN

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I honor Mayor Joseph Calnan, of Anaconda, MT. It is with pride that I recognize his dedication and service to those Montanans who most needed a helping hand.

Joseph Calnan believed in the value of hard work. He spent 30 years working for the Butte Anaconda Pacific Railroad. Each night he returned home for dinner with his wife and seven children before heading out to his second job at a local store. The only interruption in his long career was the 4 years he spent working as the mayor of Anaconda.

Mayor "Joe" Calnan took office in 1963 and immediately began fighting

for a better Anaconda. He worked to beautify Anaconda's Common, taking it from a weedy field to the lush, tree-filled park it is today. Joe fought to open land for business development at a time when one in five Americans was living below the poverty line. He knew the importance of creating jobs so hardworking folks would have a chance to provide for their families. His own children still remember him saying time and again, "We have plenty of picnic tables in Anaconda. But without jobs, there won't be food to put on those tables."

As he worked on the local level, Joe also kept an eye on national politics. On August 20 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act into law, creating the Job Corps. Job Corps allows young people from low income families to get the training they needed to enter the workforce, free of charge. Joe began his campaign to bring a Job Corps center to Anaconda immediately.

First, Joe wrote to Sergeant Shriver, Special Assistant to the President, to request the establishment of a Job Corps center at the Forest Creek Picnic Area just west of Anaconda. He received an encouraging reply, and traveled to Washington to meet with Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf and Representative Arnold Olsen to finalize his proposal. When the first three Job Corps students arrived in Anaconda in 1966, they got off the bus to find Joe waiting there for them in his personal car. Through a partnership with the Forest Service, the Job Corps program thrived at the Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

The Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center has graduated over 14,000 students since it opened its door, over 160 students are currently enrolled, and most importantly, 86 percent of enrolled students get jobs.

On August 20, Job Corps celebrated its 50th anniversary. At the Anaconda Center, the Forest Service dedicated its newly completed dining hall to Mayor Calnan in honor of his hard work to bring the Job Corps to his town. While Joe has passed away, his children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren were there to celebrate the event. Job Corps students had created the metal sign dedicating the dining hall, the same sort of hard-working young people that Joe spent so much time helping during his time as mayor. They put it best. The sign reads simply, "Joseph F. Calnan Thank You for Your Vision."●

HONORING TERESA LAWRENCE

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish today to honor Teresa Lawrence, CEO of Delta Personnel and the 2014 recipient of the Excelencia Award for Small Business Leadership by the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana.

Teresa was born in Cuba and came to the United States in 1973 to escape tyranny. She came here with her mother, brother, and grandmother. Tragically, her father was unable to join the family in leaving Cuba and was killed 4 years later.

Teresa's mother, along with her grandmother, instilled in her a strong work ethic. She began working at the age of 14 by bagging groceries, and eventually worked her way up to the position of advertising account executive. She attended college for 2 years until her mother was injured and needed her help. Teresa then took a full time job at a large architectural firm to help support the family. She said this position helped sharpen her skills and expand her vocabulary.

In 1988, Teresa married David Lawrence, whose family owned and operated a staffing agency, Delta Temporaries. That same year, the business was struggling and her father-in-law was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, so David and Teresa quit their jobs and began running the company. With no formal training in the staffing profession, they spent years trying to run the business, get out of debt, and just survive.

In 2000, Teresa became the sole owner of Delta Personnel. Just when she felt she had really turned things around, the community was devastated by Hurricane Katrina, which brought immeasurable changes not only to her business, but also to southeast Louisiana. Through a lot of hard work, Teresa and her staff were able to re-open the business in Baton Rouge before eventually being able to locate the business back home in Metairie.

Teresa is known as a great leader who places an emphasis on empowering her staff to make decisions needed to help their business grow and thrive. She participated in and graduated from the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Small Businesses program in New Orleans in March of 2012. Since joining 10,000 Small Businesses, her company has more than doubled their sales from \$2.3 million with expectations to exceed \$5 million this year. Teresa says the great reward is that she and her staff have placed more than 950 people in jobs across the Gulf Coast.

I am pleased to join with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana in honoring Teresa Lawrence.●

NORTHWEST YOUTH CORPS ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this weekend, the Northwest Youth Corps celebrated its 30th year of providing young people with opportunities to learn and lead. For three decades, Northwest Youth Corps has educated youth and young adults and instilled in them a strong sense of leadership, community, and environmental stewardship.

Northwest Youth Corps, NYC, founder Art Pope created NYC in 1984. Mr. Pope's inspiration for the NYC stemmed from the 1930s-era Civilian Conservation Corps, CCC, which provided work to the unemployed during the Great Depression. Mr. Pope was inspired by the hands-on, education-based model of the CCC and wanted to extend the vision of hard work and service to modern youth. The NYC philosophy encourages youth to pursue individual achievement, develop a solid work ethic and leadership skills, all while benefitting their communities and the environment.

Thirty years ago, NYC extended this vision to its first class of 52 students. Today, NYC serves more than 1,000 teens per year across 5 States. NYC offers a wide variety of programs for youth and teens from 12 to 19 years old. Youth enrolled in NYC summer programs learn conservation values in a hands-on learning environment. Summer programs range from teaching youth how to build trails and enhance natural habitats to 6-week camping programs where teens learn reforestation techniques. At the summer program graduation last year, I saw firsthand the sense of accomplishment and pride NYC students feel upon completing 6 weeks of conservation efforts in our State's beautiful forests.

In 1997, NYC drew from the success of its summer programs and established a full-year high school. Over the past 17 years, the Outdoor High School has grown into a fully-accredited, tuition-free, private high school with a strong focus on applied learning and environmental stewardship.

NYC's hands-on conservation education programs have enriched the lives of more than 16,000 students over the past 30 years, and have touched countless communities and ecosystems across the west. It is my pleasure to recognize Northwest Youth Corps 30th anniversary. I look forward to NYC's continued contribution to the community for many, many more years.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5230. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5272. An act to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6723. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted air strikes in Iraq, received during adjournment of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6724. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted airstrikes in Iraq, received during adjournment of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6725. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the deployment of certain U.S. forces to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6726. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the authorization of targeted airstrikes in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6727. A communication from the Deputy Assistant to the President and Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the War Powers Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6728. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fresh Blueberries From Morocco Into the Continental United States" ((RIN0579-AD81) (Docket No. APHIS-2013-0016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6729. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Approved Tests for Bovine Tuberculosis in Cervids" (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0027) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6730. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities and Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process" (RIN0596-AD18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6731. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Law Enforcement Support Activities" (RIN0596-AB61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6732. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Non-discrimination in Programs or Activities Conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture" (RIN0503-AA52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6733. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Foreign Commercial Satellite Services" ((RIN0750-A132) (DFARS Case 2014-D010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6734. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert E. Milstead, Jr., United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6735. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral and an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6736. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eight (8) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6737. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense's facility repair and recapitalization goals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6738. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services for 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6739. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6740. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program Regulations" (RIN2502-AJ24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6741. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6742. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Debris Removal: Eligibility of Force Account Labor Straight-Time Costs under the Public Assistance Program for Hurricane Sandy" (RIN1660-AA75) (44 CFR Part 206) (Docket No. FEMA-2012-0004) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6743. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6744. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6745. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6746. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6747. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6748. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6749. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Multifamily Mortgage Insurance: Capturing Excess Bond Proceeds" (RIN2502-AJ16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6751. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee" (RIN1557-AD83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6752. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Defense Priorities and Allocations System Regulations" (RIN0694-AE81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6753. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee" (RIN3064-AE13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6754. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Wassenaar Arrangement 2013 Plenary Agreements Implementation: Commerce Control List, Definitions, and Reports; and Extension of Fly-by-Wire Technology and Software Controls" (RIN0694-AG05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6755. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Update of Export Control Classification Number 0Y521 Series Supplement—Biosensor Systems and Related Software and Technology" (RIN0694-AG23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6756. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6757. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequester for fiscal year 2015, if sequester is necessary; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6758. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirement all funding so designated by the Congress in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the following account: "Department of Defense-Procurement-Procurement, Defense-Wide"; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-6760. A communication from the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the detailed boundaries for the Virgin Wild and Scenic River in Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6761. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Texas Regulatory Program" ((SATS No. TX-066-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2014-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6762. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Generator Relay Loadability and Revised Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standards" (RIN1902-AE81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6763. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve; Off-Road Vehicles" (RIN1024-AE14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 5, 2014, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 26, 2014:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2113. A bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-243).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 2117. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-244).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2640. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-245).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 1447. A bill to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-246).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1468. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-247).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1691. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents (Rept. No. 113-248).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2323. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service (Rept. No. 113-249).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 4002. A bill to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 919. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 1474. A bill to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes, to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1574. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

S. 1622. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1948. A bill to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2041. A bill to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2188. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 2299. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2442. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important land into trust for the benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2465. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2479. A bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada.

S. 2480. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2665. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-250).

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2511. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2777. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2778. A bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to \$10,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley and Steven Sotloff; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; read the first time.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of force against the organization called the Islamic State in order to defend the American people and assist the Iraqi Government in expelling the Islamic State from their territory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 434

At the request of Mr. WALSH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to authorize and implement the water rights compact among the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation and the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to prevent the doubling of the interest rate for Federal subsidized student loans for the 2013–2014 academic year by providing funds for such loans through the Federal Reserve System, to ensure that such loans are available at interest rates that are equivalent to the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 948

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program.

S. 1008

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1008, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from implementing proposed policy changes that would permit passengers to carry small, non-locking knives on aircraft.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1533

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1533, a bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1556

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1556, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 1688

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), collectively, in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1691, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents.

S. 1811

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1811, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit voice communications through mobile communication devices on commercial passenger flights.

S. 1828

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1828, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 2037

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2042

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2100

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions.

S. 2207

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2207, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require all political committees to notify the Federal Election Commission within 48 hours of receiving cumulative contributions of \$1,000 or more from any contributor during a calendar year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2207, *supra*.

S. 2231

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2231, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health assessment before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2377

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2377, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain

small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2529, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2530

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2530, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation or exportation of mussels of certain genus, and for other purposes.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2570, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2692

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Mary-

land (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2692, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 2693

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2693, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2694, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 2701

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2701, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address certain inconsistencies between the self-attested information provided by an applicant in enrolling in a health plan on an Exchange and being determined eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions or in being determined to be eligible for enrollment in a State Medicaid plan or a State child health plan under the State Children's Health Insurance Program and the data received through the Federal Data Services Hub or from other data sources.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2702, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the social security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits.

S. 2704

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2704, a bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain philanthropic enterprises which are

independently supervised, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2732

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2732, a bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S. 2737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2737, a bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2742

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to provide for public notice and input prior to the closure, consolidation, or public access limitation of field or hearing offices of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2757

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2757, a bill to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Warren Weinstein should be returned home to his family.

S. RES. 410

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 410, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

S. RES. 536

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 536, a resolution designating September 2014 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; read the first time.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of grave importance to the national security of the United States; that is, the threat from the radical Sunni terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria or simply as the Islamic State.

Now it claims to control territory in a grotesque parody of a nation state. ISIS is a study in oppression and brutality that is conducting ethnic cleansing against religious minorities in the region; that is, targeting and persecuting Christians and that is attempting to subject the local population to the strictest forms of Sharia law. ISIS has grotesquely murdered U.S. civilians and indeed journalists on the public stage. It should come as no surprise that the people of the United States are deeply concerned about this development. We are concerned about the

inability of our government to anticipate this gathering threat. We are concerned about the brutal acts of oppression against the weak and the helpless.

We are concerned about ISIS's seizure of financial and military assets that have fueled their murderous rampage. Above all, we are concerned about the threat ISIS poses, not only to our close allies in the region but also to our citizens and even here in our homeland.

There has been a lot of talk in recent days about developing a strategy to combat ISIS. I would like to propose a couple of commonsense steps that we should take immediately to combat this scourge.

First, the time has come—it is beyond time—for us to secure our borders. Representing the State of Texas, which has a border nearly 2,000 miles long, I know firsthand how unsecure the border is right now. This week of all weeks, with the anniversary of the September 11 attacks upon us, we can have no illusions that terrorists will not try to make good on their specific threats to attack America. As long as our border is not secure, we are making it far too easy for the terrorists to carry through on those promises.

Rumored ISIS activities on the southern border should unite us all in the resolve to make border security a top priority rather than an afterthought or rather than something to be held hostage for political negotiations in the Congress. Second, we should take commonsense steps to make fighting for or supporting ISIS an affirmative renunciation of American citizenship. We know there are over 100 Americans who have joined ISIS who have taken up arms alongside the jihadists, along with thousands of others from the European Union.

We also know they are trying to return to their countries of origin to carry out terrorist attacks there. We know this because on May 24 an ISIS member returned to Belgium where he attacked innocent visitors at a Jewish museum, slaughtering four people. It was reported today he had been plotting an even larger attack on Paris on Bastille Day.

In addition, on August 11 of this year, an accused ISIS sympathizer, Donald Ray Morgan, was arrested at JFK Airport trying to reenter the United States. So we know this threat is real. That is why I have today filed legislation, the Expatriate Terrorist Act of 2014, which would amend the existing statutes governing renunciation of U.S. citizenship to designate fighting for a hostile foreign government or foreign terrorist organization as an affirmative renunciation of citizenship.

By fighting for ISIS, U.S. citizens have expressed their desire to become citizens of the Islamic state. That cannot and will not peacefully coexist with remaining American citizens, the

desire to become a citizen of a terrorist organization that has expressed a desire to wage war on the American people, has demonstrated a brutal capacity to do so, murdering American civilians on the global stage and promising to bring that jihad home to America.

We should not be facilitating their efforts by allowing fighters fighting alongside ISIS to come back to America with American passports and walk freely in our cities to carry out unspeakable acts of terror. It is my hope the legislation I am introducing today will earn support on both sides of the aisle, that we will see this body come together and say: While there are many partisan issues that divide us, when it comes to protecting U.S. citizens from acts of terror, we are all as one. That is my fervent hope.

The third thing we should do is we should do everything possible to make ISIS understand there are serious ramifications for threatening to attack the United States, for murdering American citizens. While damaging ISIS's financial assets is certainly a part of this action, because of the very nature of ISIS, the response must be principally military.

All Americans are weary of the long and costly wars in the last decade. We are tired of sending our sons and daughters potentially to die in distant lands. No one wants to see an extended engagement in Iraq, but at the same time I do not believe the American people are one bit reluctant to defend our national security, to defend the lives of fellow Americans. The American people can see the grim threat represented by ISIS and the need for decisive action.

We should concentrate on a coordinated and overwhelming air campaign that has the clear military objective of destroying the capability of ISIS to carry out terror attacks on the United States. We must remain focused on this clear military objective if we hope to be successful. We cannot engage in photo op foreign policy or press release foreign policy of dropping a bomb here, shooting a missile there, and not have a strategy that is dictated by clear and direct military objectives in furtherance of U.S. national security interests.

We should be perfectly clear as well that any action we take against ISIS is in no way contingent on resolving the civil war in Syria. That conflict is a humanitarian tragedy, pitting a brutal dictator against radical Islamic terrorists. The sad reality is there are no good options for the United States in this fight. We may have had less radical options 3 years ago, but those are not currently available.

The Obama administration had proposed arming rebel forces that contained terrorist factions associated with ISIS. Previously, we were told the rebels fighting alongside ISIS were our

friends and Assad and Iran were our enemies. Now, in the face of ISIS, we are hearing Assad may be our friend, Iran may be our friend, and ISIS is now our enemy. This makes no sense. Indeed, it is a dangerous cycle reminiscent of George Orwell's "1984." Orwell wrote:

At this moment, for example, in 1984. . . . Oceania was at war with Eurasia and in alliance with Eastasia. . . . Actually . . . it was only four years since Oceania had been at war with Eastasia and in alliance with Eurasia. But . . . [o]fficially the change of partners had never happened. Oceania was at war with Eurasia; therefore Oceania had always been at war with Eurasia. The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil, and it followed that any past or future agreement with him was impossible. . . .

This administration seems to have no sense of past or future. All of those familiar with the terribly human carnage inflicted by the civil war in Syria pray for its end. But the goal of our action against ISIS should not be to end it by supporting Assad. The enemy of my enemy is not always my friend. Sometimes the goal is the destruction of the enemy who poses an imminent threat to our national security, not the enabler of yet another enemy of America.

It should also be clear that any action we take against ISIS should in no way be contingent on political reconciliation between Sunnis and Shiites in Baghdad. This administration has often become distracted by the hope to achieve this reconciliation, but the sad truth is the Sunnis and Shiites have been engaged in a sectarian civil war since 632 A.D. It is the height of hubris, it is the height of ignorance to suggest the American President can come and resolve a 1,500-year-old religious civil war and have both sides throw down their arms and embrace each other as brothers. That should not be our objective, although we of course always hope for reconciliation and peace. We should not be so naive as to make defending our national security contingent on resolving millennia-old sectarian religious civil wars. Doing so, seeking to promote a utopia, seeking to transform Iraq into Switzerland is nothing less than a fool's errand.

Likewise, it should be perfectly clear that any action we take to stop ISIS from attacking and murdering Americans is in no way contingent on consensus from the so-called international community. America is blessed to have many good friends and allies in the region and beyond who understand the threat of ISIS and are eager to do what they can to combat it. We welcome their support. But in order that this action be done right, it must be led by the United States, unfettered by other nations' rules of engagement that might impede our effective action.

Achieving some preordained number of countries in a coalition is not a strategy. For as has often been remarked: In the most effective efforts, the mission determines the coalition,

not the other way around. It is heartening to hear the voices from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, raising the alarm of the threat posed by ISIS. President Obama has signaled his intention of addressing the issue later this week.

It is well past time for him to do so. His recent statements from his admission on August 28 that "we don't have a strategy yet" to his suggestion on September 3 that "our best bet is to try to 'shrink' ISIS's sphere of influence until they are a manageable problem," those comments are not encouraging. The objective is not to make ISIS manageable. The objective is to protect the national security interests of the United States and to destroy terrorists who have declared jihad on our Nation.

Neither are the two things we already know that the President will propose in his new "game plan"—namely, that he will not be requesting authorization from Congress for military action against ISIS and that his model is the counterterrorism policies pursued by his administration the past 5 years. Neither of these is encouraging. I ask the President to reconsider both of these points.

While ISIS is obviously part of the scourge of radical Islamic terrorism that has bedeviled the West for decades, it equally obviously represents a new and particularly virulent strain. The President is reportedly considering an action that could last as long as 3 years and may require a range of actions. If this is indeed the case, then it is incumbent on him to come to Congress and lay out his strategy so that we and the American people are clear on it.

I would note that the Presiding Officer has been particularly vocal and clear defending the constitutional authority of Congress to declare war. I would note as well that it is beneficial for the effort for the President to come to Congress, because in doing so it will force the President to do what has been lacking for so long, which is lay out a specific and clear military objective: What is it we are trying to accomplish that is tethered directly to the U.S. national security interests of America?

The Constitution is clear. It is Congress and Congress only that has the constitutional authority to declare war. Any President, as Commander in Chief, has constitutional authority to respond to an imminent crisis, to respond to a clear and present danger. But in this instance, the President is not suggesting it. He is suggesting engaged military action, and it is, therefore, inconsistent with the Constitution for him to attempt to pursue that action without recognizing the constitutional authority of this body.

It is my hope that he will do so, and it is my hope we will have a substantive and meaningful debate about

the military objective we should be united in achieving, which is, namely, destroying ISIS and preventing them from committing acts of terror and murdering innocent Americans.

Given the need to consider such action against a new actor such as ISIS, it also must be admitted that the Obama administration's counterterrorism policy has not been a success. They have labeled the 2009 attack on Fort Hood in my home State of Texas as an act of "workplace violence" even though the terrorist attacker Nidal Hasan recently asked to become a citizen of the Islamic State.

They also missed connecting the dots that would have uncovered the radicalization of the Tsarnaev brothers that resulted in the attack on the Boston Marathon. It should be noted that Tamerlan Tsarnaev, the elder brother, worshipped at the same Cambridge, MA, mosque where the ISIS head of propaganda worshipped. This jihad can reach back and directly take the lives of Americans citizens at home.

The administration has failed to respond effectively to the attack on our facilities in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, in which four Americans were murdered, including the first ambassador killed in the line of duty since 1979, an event that inaugurated Libya's spiral into terrorist anarchy that continues unchecked to this day. They completely missed the gathering threat of ISIS to the point that the President himself was under the misapprehension that the group was the terrorist equivalent of the junior varsity only a few months ago.

We cannot afford to return to these destructive policies, given the acute threat posed by ISIS. It is my hope that this body will stand together as one in bipartisan unity to secure the borders and to change our laws to pass the legislation I am introducing today to make clear that any American who takes up arms with ISIS has, in doing so, constructively renounced his or her American citizenship so that the Congress, with one voice, can protect Americans at home. This requires clear, decisive, unified action, and it is my hope that all of us will come together supporting such action and that the President will submit to the authority of Congress seeking authorization to protect America against ISIS and to engage in a concentrated, directed military campaign to take them out.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have introduced today a Senate joint resolution. This is a resolution that will express the authorization for the use of

the U.S. Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. It is a resolution that has been necessitated by legal scholars.

Since the President has used his existing authorization for the use of military force in Iraq, most recently against ISIS—ISIL/ISIS; it is the same thing. The Levant is that area broadly from about Baghdad all the way to the Mediterranean. That is ISIL. ISIS, I-S-I-S, is the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Of course, we know that this organization that is calling itself an Islamic caliphate knows no jurisdictional boundaries. It has taken large swaths of territory in Syria as well as Iraq. When the President successfully employed the use of air power, both manned and unmanned, against ISIS targets as they were marching toward Erbil, the capital of Kurdistan, and then likewise as they were marching toward the Mosul dam, the President used his authority in Iraq and also his authority as Commander in Chief to protect Americans.

There are Americans in Erbil. There are Americans in Baghdad. There are Americans in other places in Iraq. The protection of the dam in Mosul was to protect those Americans downriver, because if the dam were blown, that would have flooded all downriver and it would have flooded Baghdad.

Legal scholars disagree with me that the President has the authority under the Constitution as Commander in Chief to go after ISIS in Syria. I describe ISIS as a snake. If the head of the snake is in Syria, which it is—a lot of their organization, a lot of their leadership is there—then we ought to go after the snake where the head is and decapitate the snake. In doing that, we are going to have to go into Syria.

I believe the President has the authority to do this under the Constitution anyway, but there are some who disagree. So rather than quibble about legalities, I have introduced this legislation. There is no pride of authorship. The Senate is obviously going to debate this. I believe if you are seeing the polls from today, where 90 percent of the people of this country are concerned about ISIS, and some huge number want us to go on and attack ISIS in other places than where we are attacking now, then I think it is obvious the United States is going to have to continue this attack on ISIS.

I want to compliment the President. Often, as I have talked about this issue, people have come—or members of the press—and said: Well, the President has dillydallied and so forth. I do not think he has at all. I think the President indeed has employed a very successful strategy of going after ISIS in Iraq—in fact, stopped their march on Erbil, in fact, stopped their march on the Mosul dam, and is going after them in other locations in coordination with

the Peshmerga of the Kurds, as well as the Iraqi Army.

Indeed, the President started on August 25 the surveillance flights over Syria so that we can collect the intelligence that is necessary to prepare to go after them in Syria. But the President has done something more. He has started to put together a coalition, realizing that the American people have no appetite for American boots on the ground in Syria—to put together a coalition so that maybe the Free Syrian Army, maybe other members of the Arab League, maybe some other members of NATO would participate.

But the way we drew this resolution, it talks about there would not be a recurring military presence and the employing of an American army on the ground. It leaves the flexibility that clearly there will be American boots on the ground, just as there already have been when we sent our special operations forces in there to try to rescue the two American journalists who subsequently met such a brutal and uncivil end in their beheading. So American boots have been there. We might need special operations kinds of missions in the future. We might need forward air observers actually on the ground to direct air strikes. So there is flexibility in this resolution.

I want to say if there is anybody with any doubt about the intent of ISIS, they have made it so clear, not only taking the lives of these journalists, the second one of which was from my State of Florida, but in their statements of what they intend to do, setting up an Islamic caliphate. The leader, al-Baghdadi, even calls himself the caliph or religious leader.

But they have also said they will not stop until the black flag of ISIS is hanging and flying over the White House. Their intent is pretty clear. We are going to have to deal with them, not only in Iraq as we are now, but elsewhere. It is going to be sooner or later. It is not going to be a 1-day or 2-day operation. As the President has already indicated, this is going to be a long-term kind of operation. The fact is, the United States is the one that has to lead the coalition.

To get this right out front and center of what we need to do, I have introduced, and it is printed as a part of the RECORD, this resolution to give the legal authorization from the Congress for the President to strike ISIS in Syria and to do as the President has said, to bring to a successful conclusion, to stop this horrendous uncivil, extraordinary kind of inhumane behavior that is being illustrated by these folks.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of force against the organization called the Islamic State in order to defend the American people

and assist the Iraqi Government in expelling the Islamic State from their territory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when you look at what is happening with ISIS, we have gone through all kinds of terrorist activities. We all know we are in a crisis right now. I am inclined to agree—and I don't always agree—with Secretary Hagel, but on the day when he said that “ISIS is an imminent threat to every interest we have, whether it is in Iraq or anywhere else,” this is a big deal.

As America sat back and looked and observed and saw the beheading of two Americans, a lot of people said that was an act of war. I found out recently that as of yesterday—and it will be announced in the next few days that there is a poll that has been conducted, that if we take all the problems that are out there that people have been talking about for a long period of time, including the borders and all the other issues, nothing is even close to ISIS.

I think it was very interesting that on August 28, just a few days ago, the President made the statement, “We don't have a strategy yet” to deal with ISIS in Syria. If there is not a strategy now, there has to be a strategy.

I am introducing an AUMF resolution for action against ISIS. An AUMF is Authorization for Use of Military Force. This is something that perhaps the President has anyway—we don't know that—but we have to take away the doubt that is out there. Something has to be done. I know the President is going to make a speech—I guess it is on Wednesday—and he may come out with a specific strategy. If he doesn't, he has had all the time in the world he needs to do it, and he hasn't done it. My AUMF is specific to ISIS. There are other AUMF's dealing with Al Qaeda and other things, but to me that just confuses the issue. This has now become the No. 1 issue in America, and there is no tolerance to continue doing nothing, as we have been doing. We need to make sure the President has the authority, and this requires the President, within 15 days and then with 90-day updates, to submit in writing to Congress a comprehensive strategy to defeat the global threat posed by ISIS.

Keep in mind, it seems as if this President is inclined, anytime there is a problem out there, let's drop a bomb here and let's do something over there. That is not a strategy. I stated 1 year ago, on this same day, that the President cannot continue to operate without a clear-cut strategy.

So the congressional authorization for the President is to use all necessary and appropriate force to protect Americans in defending national security in the United States against a threat posed by ISIS and any successor terrorist organization. It allows the President to use all tools available and necessary to defeat ISIS, with flexibility

to adjust efforts as the terrorist organization evolves. So this is not just limited to any boundaries. As you know, there are no boundaries with ISIS. It is not just Syria, it is not just Iraq. This is something that is spread all over. It is huge, and it is a threat unlike anything we have seen in our country before.

So I am asking my good friends—I have already talked to several friends on the Democratic side and the Republican side—to join me, and I think hopefully we will be able to do it.

It is estimated that 12,000 foreign fighters have joined ISIS, about 2,500 of which hold Western passports to give them easy access. What is going to happen is they will come back and be trained terrorists. I think that is a major issue that I want to at least have announced.

I have introduced this resolution. It is out there right now and we are going to be asking for support.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3783. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3784. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3785. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3786. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3783. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a surge of violence arising from an ISIL-led of-

fensive that began in Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas, on June 29, 2014, ISIL leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi renamed the group the Islamic State and pronounced himself Caliph of a new Islamic caliphate encompassing the areas under his control, and Mr. al-Baghdadi has a stated mission of spreading the Islamic State and caliphate across the region through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 people, with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities comprising of Christians, Yazidis, Sabeen-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000, with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating that "no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy," "no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution," and "[this Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandaean Sabaeans";

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no Mass in that city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki did not uphold its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States Government has provided over \$73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, "Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace." Now, therefore, be it

SA 3784. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: "That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its commitment to promoting and to protecting religious freedom around the world;

(2) calls on the Department of State to work with the Government of Iraq, the Kurdistan Regional Government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, and other key stakeholders to address the urgent plight of those Iraqi minority groups seeking safety and protection from persecution in Iraq;

(3) respectfully requests the Government of Iraq to prioritize the issue of protecting religious minorities and take concrete action to enact and enforce laws protecting religious freedom; and

(4) urges the President to ensure the timely processing of visas for Iraq's minority groups fleeing religious persecution, in accordance with existing United States immigration law and national security screening procedures.

SA 3785. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)."

SA 3786. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "No Exemption for Washington from Obamacare Act".

SEC. 2. HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

Section 1312(d)(3)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

"(D) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL STAFF, AND POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXCHANGE.—";

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(A) by striking "and congressional staff with" and inserting "and congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, and political appointees with"; and

(B) by striking “or congressional staff shall” and inserting “, congressional staff, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee shall”;

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by inserting after “Congress,” the following: “of a committee of Congress, or of a leadership office of Congress,”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(aa) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(bb) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code;

“(cc) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(dd) is employed in or under the Executive Office of the President in a position that is excluded from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION.—No Government contribution under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, shall be provided on behalf of an individual who is a Member of Congress, a congressional staff member, the President, the Vice President, or a political appointee for coverage under this paragraph.

“(iv) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT OR COST-SHARING.—An individual enrolling in health insurance coverage pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or reduced cost sharing under section 1402 of this Act in an amount that exceeds the total amount for which a similarly situated individual (who is not so enrolled) would be entitled to receive under such sections.

“(v) LIMITATION ON DISCRETION FOR DESIGNATION OF STAFF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Member of Congress shall not have discretion in determinations with respect to which employees employed by the office of such Member are eligible to enroll for coverage through an Exchange.”.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571, or Sallie Derr at (202) 224-6836.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amanda Figueroa, a Defense fellow serving on our office staff, and Bale Dalton, also a Defense assistant, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE DISCHARGED AND INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S.J. RES. 39

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 39; also, as part of that unanimous consent request, I ask that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2779

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told S. 2779 is due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2779) to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with regard to this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow morning, September 9, at 10 a.m.; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business for 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 postcloture; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.; finally, that the time during any period of morning business, adjournment or recess count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:27 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RONALD ALAN PEARLMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, VICE NANCY KILLEFER, TERM EXPIRED.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

DEVEN J. PAREKH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE KATHERINE M. GEHL, RESIGNED.

TODD A. FISHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE JAMES A. TORREY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CARLOS A. MONJE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE POLLY TROTTERBERG, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

COLETTE DODSON HONORABLE, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2017, VICE JOHN ROBERT NORRIS, RESIGNED.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019, VICE WILLIAM B. SANSOM, TERM EXPIRED.

RONALD ANDERSON WALTER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019, VICE BARBARA SHORT HASKEW, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SETH B. CARPENTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE MATTHEW S. RUTHERFORD.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHEILA GWALTNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

JENNIFER ANN HAVERKAMP, OF INDIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS, VICE KERRI-ANN JONES, RESIGNED.

PETER MICHAEL MCKINLEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.

NANCY BIKOFF PETTIT, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA.

PEACE CORPS

CARLOS J. TORRES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, VICE CAROLYN HESSLER RADELET, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RUSSELL C. DEYO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAFAEL BORRAS, RESIGNED.

SARAH R. SALDANA, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOHN MORTON, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL P. BOTTICELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE R. GIL KERLIKOWSKIE, RESIGNED.

DANIEL HENRY MARTI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE VICTORIA ANGELICA ESPINEL, RESIGNED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

GILBERTO DE JESUS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. STEVEN J. ANDERSEN
CAPT. PAT DEQUATTRO
CAPT. WILLIAM G. KELLY
CAPT. JOHN P. NADEAU
CAPT. JOANNA M. NUNAN
CAPT. KEITH M. SMITH
CAPT. DAVID G. THROOP

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. TOD D. WOLTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. VERALINN JAMIESON

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DENNIS D. GRUNSTAD II

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN W. NICHOLSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PAUL M. BENENATI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. CALHOUN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BRET D. DAUGHERTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL RAUL E. ESCRIBANO
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. MCATEER
COLONEL JEFFREY L. MILHORN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

HERBERT J. BROCK IV
THOMAS W. HANLEY
GREGORY S. PHIPPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

SYED AHMED
KEVIN S. AKERS
SHAWN M. ALDERMAN
MUSTAFA M. ALIKHAN
ASNA A. AMIN
ZACHARY M. ARTHURS
CRAIG H. BARSTOW
DANIEL A. BELLIN
MATTHEW A. BORGMAN
JOANNA G. BRANSTETTER
ELIZABETH L. BRENT

JAMIE D. BULKENHOOVER
MARK D. BUZZELLI
JOSEPH G. CHEATHAM
ERIC CHIN
SUNGHUN CHO
PAUL CLARK
DANIEL V. CORDARO
DAVID A.T. CORTESE
DANIEL CUADRADO
AMANDA S. CUDIA
SCOTT P. CUDIA
RACHEL A. CUENCA
NEIL B. DAVIDS
DAVID C. DEBLASIO
CHAD A. DEROSA
JAY M. DINTAMAN
BRAD M. DOLINSKY
DUANE DUKE
ELIZABETH H. DUQUE
LEE A. EVANS
BYRON J. FALER
EDWIN A. FARNELL IV
COLLIN J. FISCHER
ERIN FLAHERTY
SHANNON K. FLOODNICHOLS
ERIC C. GARGES
JEFFREY R. GIULIANI
TRISA A. GIULIANI
DAVID L. GREENBURG
CHRISTINA D. HAHN
JASMINE J. HAN
UEL D. HANSEN
SCOTT HARRINGTON
PENELOPE J. HARRIS
DOROTA J. HAWKSWORTH
MELVIN D. HELGESON
EREK K. HELSETH
PETER M. HENNING
MARC W. HERR
MARY K. HINKLE
COURTNEY A. HOLLAND
KEVIN G. HUEMAN
EDWARD A. HULTEN
CHESTER C. JEAN
CHRISTOPHER S. JOHNSON
WILLIAM J. JORDAN
CHARMAINE F. KAULA
DAVID S. KAUVAR
JOSEPH F. KELLY
KEVIN M. KELLY
AARON D. KIRKPATRICK
PETER KREISHMAN
ADRIAN T.G. KRESS
ANJALI N. KUNZ
ANTON P. LACAP
JEFFREY N. LACKEY
JEFFREY T. LACZEK
JEFFREY B. LANIER
CYNTHIA L. LAUER
ABIGAIL J. LEE
SUKHYUNG LEE
LUCAS R. LEONARD
CHRISTINA LONG
JOSEPH M. LURIA
DUSTEN MACDONALD
MICHAEL A. MAHLON
ASHLEY MARANICH
SCOTT A. MARSHALL, JR.
THERESA M. MCKAY
NEIL MCMULLIN
GEORGE J. MEYERS IV
PAUL M. MICHAUD
ETHAN A. MILES
CAELA MILLER
LUKE M. MILLER
FOUAD J. MOAWAD
RYAN T. MOORE
JASON M. NAKAMURA
SHAHIN NASSIRKHANI
EMUEJEOKE J. OKOH
JUSTIN D. ORR
DAVID OWSHALIMPUR
JAMES O. OYEKAN
MATTHEW PFLIPSEN
MATTHEW A. POSNER
JENNIFER PUGLIESE
ERIC W. RAWIE
JOHN R. REAUME
THEODORE T. REDMAN
MEAGAN M. RIZZO
JUSTIN ROBBINS
ROSEMARIE RODRIGUEZ
KATHLEEN M. SAMSEY
SHAWN C. SHAFFER
EVA SMIETANA
DAVID R. STAGLIANO
JUSTIN J. STEWART
BRENDA L. STRYJEWSKI
GERALD W. SURRETT
MICHAEL P. SZCZEPANSKI
MICHAEL F. TRAVER
JACOB L. TURNQUIST
PAUL S. URIBE
CHRISTINE M. VACCARO
MICHELLE S. VAL
TIMOTHY D. WAGNER
JAMES Y.L. WANG
ERIC D. WEBER
TIMOTHY S. WELCH
RYAN A. WITHROW
ROSS A. WITTERS
SCOTT E. YOUNG

BRADLEY ZAGOL
AMY ZINGALIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRADLEY AEBI
JAMES P. ARNOLD
TRAVIS J. AUSTIN
CHAD BANGERTER
CHUN Y. CHAN
HUI F. CHIU
MICHAEL FORAN
KEITRA T. GEORGE
JOHN K. GOERTEMLER
THOMAS R. GUNNELL
KELLY J. JOHNSON
DANIEL D. KERSTEN
SOOMO LEE
WILLIAM A. MACNAUGHTON
MICHAEL R. MANSELL
DAVID D. NELSON
LISA NORBY
KEVIN PARKER
JERROD L. SANDERS
JILL E. SANDERS
NALORN N. SENGAMPHAN
DANIEL C. SHIN
DAVID TUCKER
AZURE L. UTLEY
RUSSELL M. WEAVER
KEVYN WETZEL

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

GREGORY E. OXFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

BENJAMIN I. ABNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JOEL N. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GREGORY C. CATHCART
JAMES M. EDWARDS
YOLANDA L. A. GILLEN
STEPHEN M. LEE
CHRISTOPHER MERRIS
WILLIAM J. MUHM
MICHAEL W. SNEATH
MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS

THE JUDICIARY

JEANNE E. DAVIDSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE DONALD C. POGUE, RETIRED.

HAYWOOD STIRLING GILLIAM, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE CLAUDIA WILKEN, RETIRING.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 8, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

JILL A. PRYOR, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

ALAN L. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2016.

LANHEE J. CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2018.

HENRY J. AARON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.

HENRY J. AARON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2020.

September 8, 2014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 160, Pt. 10

14113

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by
the President to the Senate on Sep-

tember 8, 2014 withdrawing from fur-
ther Senate consideration the fol-
lowing nomination:

ANNETTE TADDEO-GOLDSTEIN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A
MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-
AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEP-
TEMBER 20, 2018, VICE JOHN P. SALAZAR, TERM EXPIRED,
WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 27, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 8, 2014

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Though we are a week away, as the House now gathers, in the wake of a great American holiday, we ask Your special blessing on American workers, those fortunate to have jobs during these difficult economic times and those desiring work. May they know and be confident of the nobility and sacredness of their labor.

Lord, the task facing the Nation's Congress is a difficult one, which will call upon each Member to consider what is best for American workers first. It is the challenge facing all Americans. Give the Members wisdom in their work, that our economy might begin to rebound, and our countrymen and -women throughout these United States be able to provide for their families to build lives we have all come to expect for our citizens.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 5, 2014 at 11:49 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 112.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to notify you that I have tendered my resignation as the Representative to Congress from the 7th District of the Commonwealth of Virginia to Governor Terry McAuliffe. That resignation is to be effective at 6:00 p.m. on August 18, 2014.

A copy of the letter to the Governor tendering my resignation is attached. I am,

Sincerely,

ERIC CANTOR.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 4, 2014.

Governor TERRY MCAULIFFE,
State Capitol,
Richmond, VA.

DEAR GOVERNOR MCAULIFFE: I write to inform you of my intention to resign from the 7th District seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, effective August 18, 2014.

It has been my high honor to represent the people of Virginia's 7th District and I am grateful and humble for the opportunity to have served them. As such, I timed my announcement to allow the Commonwealth enough time to hold a special election coincident with the general election of November

4th. This special election will ensure the citizens of the 7th District will have representation in the consequential lame duck session of Congress, scheduled to take place this November and December.

There is precedent in Virginia for special elections coincident with general elections to fill vacant Congressional seats. Upon the resignation of Justice Richard Poff in August 1972 a special election was held on the day of the 1972 general election. M. Caldwell Butler was elected to complete Mr. Poff's unexpired term in the 92nd Congress and also to serve in the 93rd Congress beginning in January 1973.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

ERIC CANTOR,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the whole number of the House is 432.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 5078, WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVER-REACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 5078.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled joint resolution and bills were signed by Speaker pro tempore WOLF on Monday, August 4, 2014:

H.J. Res. 76, making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats;

H.R. 606, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone,

New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building";

H.R. 1671, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office";

H.R. 2291, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office";

H.R. 3472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office";

H.R. 3765, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building";

H.R. 4386, to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5195, to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND THE WAR POWERS CONSULTATION ACT

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, today, I will be introducing two bills to address the most pressing national security threat since 9/11, the rapid advances made in ISIS in Iraq and Syria, as well as territorial gains made by al Qaeda-affiliated groups in Libya, Nigeria, and Somalia.

We are seeing perhaps the largest ever territorial gains by terrorist groups in the Middle East and north Africa. If we learned any lesson from 9/11, it is that wherever terrorist groups find safe haven to train and plot, the United States and our allies will inevitably be targeted.

The purpose of this authorization is to end any ambiguity about the President's authority or the Congress' support for a U.S.-led international coalition to take action against this threat.

Passage of this bill also would send a strong message to our allies that the U.S. intends to confront and defeat this threat. The Congress has a responsibility and a constitutional obligation to take an up-or-down vote on this.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, the President signaled that he would not move forward on comprehensive immigration reform, and we are deeply disappointed.

However, we should be angry—angry that this House has not had the courage to take up comprehensive immigration reform. For 1 year and 5 months, the Senate version has sat passed, and we have been unable to debate it. All during this time, we have hurt our country, our economy, and our families. The time has come to make a decision.

Now, while the President may have put this decision off, this decision will not work. It is the right thing to do. It is the American thing to do, and with God's help, it will be done before the conclusion of this year.

PRESIDENT IGNORED ISIS THREAT FOR YEARS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, a year ago last June, I presented this map by Dr. Fred Kagan of the American Enterprise Institute, warning of expanding terrorist safe havens around the world. The President ignored these signs and underestimated the strength of the bloodthirsty terrorists. This has led to mass murder of opposing Muslims and American journalists.

According to a recent article in The Washington Times, after the U.S. exited Iraq, "It took just weeks for foreign al Qaeda fighters to start pouring back into Iraq to attack the new government. It announced itself as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, now the Islamic State, known as the initials ISIS and ISIL."

The President has been negligent for the past 2½ years, as ISIS fought to seize control of the very country we liberated with our dedicated military, including two of my sons and a martyred staff member.

Radical Islamic terrorists must be fully confronted and defeated to protect American families at home and our allies abroad.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President should never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

We need peace through strength, and I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman FRANK WOLF, who is retiring, who has been a stalwart for freedom.

THE FDA CREATES ROADBLOCKS ON THE PATH TO CURES

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has embarked upon an ambitious plan to advance the cures of the 21st century and to make them a reality for today's patients and physicians.

I spent, indeed, part of August doing roundtables for the Energy and Commerce Cures initiative. One issue that came up time and again is the potential, the promise of genomic medicine to understand, diagnose, treat, and prevent illness if given the opportunity.

The era of precision medicine is at hand, and doctors need to have the tools, the tools to utilize this. One of the tools is known as laboratory developed tests in order to identify best therapies for a specific patient, but burdensome regulation by the Food and Drug Administration of laboratory developed tests would prevent clinical labs from developing tests to respond to public health needs.

I actually believe the Food and Drug Administration has no authority to regulate laboratory developed tests, and in fact, if they continue to do this, it will only create more roadblocks, more obstacles on our path to cures. As a physician, I am adamantly opposed to this.

This week, the Energy and Commerce Committee will hold a hearing on the future of laboratory developed tests. We must work together to oppose the Food and Drug Administration's proposal, so that the work of medical professionals, which is to heal our patients using all the tools at our disposal, may finally be realized.

IMMIGRATION

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President continues to claim that if Congress won't act on immigration issues, he will, but the House has acted and recently passed legislation to address the border crisis.

The President still threatens to grant amnesty by executive order, but such actions run counter to his own statements about the illegality of enacting such immigration policies on his own.

In 2011, the President stated:

I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the immigration laws on my own. That is not how our Constitution is written.

He stated as recently as last fall that, "If, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws."

The President should listen to his own words and abide by his oath of office and the Constitution.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me indicate that as our Members come back from the work recess—and I think it is important to establish that although 1 or 2 vacation days may have been taken and Members got a chance to see their families, they were working—and I am going to take the optimistic approach and say that the American people want to see us working over the next couple of days.

I believe we can collectively, with the President, address the terrorist threat of ISIS. Those of us who had a chance to be in the Middle East know how serious an impact that it has on the homeland, but I also believe that we can put on the floor of the House a comprehensive immigration bill, raise the minimum wage, provide for pay equity, and provide for the education of our children by bringing down the high interest rates for higher education.

Madam Speaker, it should be the rule of this House and the rule of the other body to work on behalf of the American people. Yes, we were working in our districts.

Now, we need to come and work on behalf of them and to ensure that the national security of our homeland is protected, to be reminded of those lives that were lost as we approach 9/11, and to raise the minimum wage, and to save lives by passing comprehensive immigration reform.

As a Member from the border State of Texas, I know we can do this.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 231) to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Multinational Species Conservation Funds

Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2(c)(2) of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (39 U.S.C. 416 note) is amended by striking “2 years” and inserting “6 years”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S. 231, the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act, was introduced by Senator ROB PORTMAN on February 7, 2013.

S. 231 would extend the Multinational Species stamp for an additional 4 years, through December 31, 2016.

□ 1415

The Multinational Species stamp was initially signed into law in 2010 in a bill introduced by then-Representative Henry Brown of South Carolina. Profits from this stamp will go to support programs designed to help to protect African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, great apes, and marine turtles. Since its introduction, the stamp has generated \$2.5 million in proceeds that have been divided equally among the conservation programs.

By supporting this legislation, the Postal Service will be better able to sell its existing stock of 75 million Save the Vanishing Species stamps in further support of these conservation efforts. And with that, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S. 231, the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Semipostal Stamp Reauthorization Act, would require the United States Postal Service to continue issuing the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp for 4 more years.

The conservation fund is a small initiative, run by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, that supports a variety of

conservation efforts that benefit several species, including great apes, rhinoceroses, tigers, and marine turtles. Because semipostal stamps cost more than typical stamps, they allow members of the public to donate to a particular cause encouraged by the stamp. Passage of this bill is a way to raise revenue for the Multinational Species Conservation Fund without increasing its appropriations.

We have no objections to the passage of S. 231, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of S. 231.

At this point, I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 231.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEIL HAVENS POST OFFICE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4939) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the “Neil Havens Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NEIL HAVENS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, shall be known and designated as the “Neil Havens Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Neil Havens Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this bill which is under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4939, introduced by Representative BUCK MCKEON of California, which would designate the postal facility located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the Neil Havens Post Office.

Charles "Neil" Havens was the longest serving postmaster of Simi Valley, California, serving more than 30 years with the United States Postal Service until his retirement in 1988. In 1958, he continued the family tradition when he was appointed postmaster by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. His grandfather had served as the first mail carrier in Simi, beginning in 1912, and multiple generations of the Havens family followed in his footsteps. Over the course of Neil's career, the mail service grew from a single route with a single carrier to over 60 routes covered by 170 employees under his direction.

In addition to his service with the post office, he was dedicated to bettering his community and his country. He was a Rotary Club president, an active community volunteer, charitable and educational organization supporter, and a Navy reservist.

Mr. Havens passed away in July of 2004 while resting at home with his wife, Pat. He left behind a strong legacy of service and excellence.

I ask that my colleagues support H.R. 4939 to designate Neil Havens' beloved Simi Post Office in his honor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4939, a bill that designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the Neil Havens Post Office.

For Charles "Neil" Havens, working for the Postal Service was a family tradition. After his grandfather became Simi's first rural letter carrier in 1912, Neil's uncle and father both followed, becoming carriers on the same route. In 1953, Neil's father, Charles, took on the job of Simi postmaster, a job Neil himself would hold for 30 years, beginning in 1958.

Neil was known for going out of his way to help his community, be it through mentoring young postal workers or his involvement in the local Masonic Lodge, the Rotary Club of Simi Valley, and the Simi Valley Historical Society. Regardless of the situation, Neil could always be found smiling and ready to lend a helping hand.

Sadly, on July 16, 2004, Neil Havens passed away peacefully at his home at the age of 74. In addition to his wife, Pat, their children and four grandchildren, Neil is survived by the many

residents of his community whom he made feel like family.

Madam Speaker, we should pass this bill to pay tribute to the life of Neil Havens and recognize the dedication with which he worked to better the lives of those around him.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today it is my pleasure to bring to the floor H.R. 4939, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the Neil Havens Post Office.

I want to thank Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for giving my legislation a fair hearing and for moving the bill through committee in an expeditious manner.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank the mayor of Simi Valley, Bob Huber, for the great leadership that he provides to the Valley, for his service and dedication over a great number of years. He is the one who pointed out to me what the Havens family has meant to the Simi Valley and suggested naming the post office in their honor. It was found out that we don't name post offices after a whole family; it has to be named after one person. Neil, having served the longest, was given that distinction.

Madam Speaker, much of this has already been said, but I think it bears repeating. I have heard that a genius is one who hears something six times and then accepts it, so this will only be three times.

Neil Havens, Charles "Neil" Havens, was the longest serving postmaster in Simi Valley history, serving more than 30 years with the U.S. Post Office department and the Postal Service. His retirement ended three-quarters of a century of mail service by the Havens family of Simi Valley.

The first rural route set up in Simi began in 1912, when Neil's grandfather served as the first carrier. The Havens family became synonymous with mail service in the area, having multiple generations delivering letters. Despite losing one Havens carrier to combat in World War I, the Havens family persevered and continued to serve their community, starting out when they just had a couple of people in the community.

Neil, following a competitive examination, continued the family tradition in 1958, after being appointed postmaster by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Over the course of his admirable career, Neil Havens saw mail service grow from Route 1, Simi, California, with a single carrier, to a team of more

than 170 employees and approximately 60 routes.

In July of 2004, Postmaster Havens passed away while resting in his favorite chair at the home he and his wife, Pat, had owned for 53 years. A Rotary Club President, Navy reservist, and supporter of charitable and educational foundations, Neil embodied the spirit of the Simi Valley. Known for his firm handshake, his trademark jawline beard and endless desire to serve, Neil Havens left an indelible legacy in his hometown.

Madam Speaker, thank you for giving my bill time on the floor. I cannot think of a better tribute to such a consummate public servant. I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will mean so much to the Havens family and the folks in Simi Valley.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank and appreciate the gentleman from California.

At a time in which our country goes like this, a story like this needs to be told over and over. I appreciate the chairman sharing that again so that we see true civil service and true giving back to the country, and I appreciate that very much.

With that, I urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 4939, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4939.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2819) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, at this point, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have introduced H.R. 2819, legislation that would name the post office at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, the Veterans Memorial Post Office.

I want to thank all of my colleagues in the Ohio delegation for their support of this legislation.

In my view, veterans are the one segment of our society that most deserves our sincere gratitude and assistance. I am eternally grateful to the brave men and women who have served our country in the past and for those who still serve her today. While this represents a small recognition of our veterans, dedicating the Marietta Post Office pays tribute to America's heroes and serves as a reminder of their great sacrifices in defense of our freedoms.

In addition to a debt of gratitude, our veterans and their families deserve the care and the benefits and the services they were promised and have earned. It is particularly important that we keep our veterans at the forefront of our minds as so many return home from combat, some returning home with wounds that just a few short years ago they might not have survived. We have a responsibility to ensure that all veterans are receiving the very best of care from the VA, as well as all the assistance necessary for a successful transition back to civilian life.

I thank you for the time, Madam Speaker, to speak on this important measure, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am also pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2819, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the Veterans Memorial Post Office Building. This legislation recognizes the service of the many men and women from Marietta, Ohio, who have so courageously dedicated their lives to protecting this country.

Every day members of our Nation's military risk their lives to defend the many freedoms Americans enjoy. We must never forget the sacrifices made by these servicemembers and their families. Madam Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor the brave veterans who have given so much to this great country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, again, what has been said is true. What has been said about veterans and the naming of this post office at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, could ring true on any day and any time, especially now as we look around the world and we know the things that are going on and the things that may occur, but also looking back on those who currently save our Nation here and abroad, it is a fitting tribute to have the Veterans Memorial Post Office Building in Marietta, Ohio, voted on by this House, supported by this House. Just as those who serve our country deserve that support, this is a visible reminder of that support.

With that, I would urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 2819.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2819.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL M. FERGUSON POST OFFICE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5089) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL M. FERGUSON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, at this point, it is my privilege to also recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) and yield him such time as he may consume to speak on his bill.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a brave soldier and to recognize his dedication to serving his fellow man. His name is Sergeant 1st Class Daniel M. Ferguson.

Sergeant Ferguson was one of the servicemembers whose lives were tragically taken on April 2, 2014, at Fort Hood, Texas. A shooter shook the entire Nation on that somber day when he turned his weapon against his own military community.

We must never forget those who were lost and must remain ever-vigilant to provide medical attention to all veterans in need.

Sergeant Ferguson was a hero to our Nation. He demonstrated sovereign loyalty and selflessness on this horrific day of the shooting. When shots rang out, Sergeant Ferguson, without hesitation, blocked a set of unlocked doors to deflect the attacker's advancement into the room where his comrades remained. He was literally shielding them from the dangers of the shooter.

Sergeant Ferguson's first instinct was to protect, and with that, he saved many uniformed soldiers. Grievously, Sergeant Ferguson succumbed to his wounds and left behind the broken hearts of loved ones. But his brave actions will live on forever.

It is heroes like Sergeant Ferguson who we need not forget but rather we must continue to honor his courage.

Today, I stand in support of H.R. 5089, a bill I introduced that will name the post office located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, in honor of Sergeant 1st Class Daniel M. Ferguson. His respected name and brave actions will never be forgotten. A veteran of Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan, Sergeant Ferguson will remain in the hearts of his family, friends, and those in the military community.

Please join me in paying respect to Sergeant 1st Class Daniel M. Ferguson for his immeasurable adherence to duty, honor, and country. His name should be voiced for the years to come.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 5089, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the Sergeant 1st Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office.

A Mulberry native, Daniel Ferguson graduated from Mulberry High School, where he lettered in five sports, including football, baseball, and track. He joined the Army in 1993 and served almost 21 years, completing tours of duty in Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

In March of 2013, after returning from his deployment, Sergeant 1st Class Ferguson was stationed as an Army transportation supervisor at Fort Hood, Texas. On April 2, 2014, Sergeant 1st Class Ferguson was working on base when a shooting rampage broke out. In a final act of courage and service to his country, Ferguson held himself against an unlocked door, using his body as a shield to block the shooter from firing into a room full of his colleagues.

Although Ferguson was tragically killed that day, his valiant actions saved the lives of many other soldiers. Ferguson is survived by his fiancée, fellow soldier Kristen Haley, and is remembered for his loyalty, fearlessness, and heroism. He was awarded the Bronze Star and Meritorious Service Medal, among others, for his honorable military service.

Madam Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the bravery and courage exhibited both at home and on the battlefield by Sergeant 1st Class Daniel Ferguson and to commemorate the great sacrifice made by him and his family.

I urge adoption of H.R. 5089, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, again, we are recognizing here someone who shows that heroism is not confined to a battlefield, it is not confined to a place; it is a state of mind, it is a state of being, and our armed services are full of those individuals who do so. Sergeant Ferguson is one who is to be remembered, as my friend from Florida stated, not just for the fact that he served but for the fact that he served honorably around the world and served honorably on that tragic day on which he put his life before others, and others were saved because of it.

For that, it is with honor that I would ask that all Members support H.R. 5089, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Ross) for bringing this forward, letting us rejoice also in one who sacrificed for our country and

also has something for us to look forward to, as well, in our own service in the measure in which he lived.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5089.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2678) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2678, which was introduced

by Representative JOE GARCIA of Florida. This bill would designate the postal facility located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building.

Larcenia Bullard was a schoolteacher and member of the Florida State senate representing the 39th District from 2002 to 2012. She also served in the Florida State House of Representatives from 1992 to 2000.

Born Larcenia Dunbar on July 21, 1947, she was a graduate of Antioch College in Ohio and moved to the Miami area from Philadelphia in the early 1980s. She earned her master's degree from Southeastern Nova University and taught first grade but had developed a desire for public service while working on political campaigns in high school and decided to run for office. She was elected to the Florida State House of Representatives in 1992. When she left the State house in 2000, she managed her husband Edward's successful campaign to succeed her. Likewise, her son, Dwight, succeeded her as a State senator following her retirement.

Larcenia Bullard is remembered as a woman of integrity with a great sense of humor, caring spirit, and a heart of gold. While she fought passionately for her convictions, she treated everyone, including her opponents, with respect and dignity. At the time of her passing, Florida State Senate President Don Gaetz said:

Every hard fight in committee or tough debate on the senate floor always ended with her warmly embracing those with whom she disagreed and assuring them of her love.

Madam Speaker, Larcenia's example is one that all Members of this body would do well to follow. She died in March of 2013 in the town of her birth, Allendale, South Carolina, while on vacation with her family.

In addition to her husband, Edward, and son, Dwight, she is survived by her son, Vincent; daughter, Edwina; and her grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the legacy of this great woman and public servant by passing H.R. 2678.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2678 and would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida, Representative GARCIA, my good friend who has sponsored this legislation.

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Nevada for their kind words.

Larcenia Bullard was a teacher, a public servant, a trailblazer for young, African American women, a mother, and a personal friend of mine. I am

honored to stand here today in recognition of her unparalleled service to the people of south Florida.

Larcenia spent 35 years living in Richmond Heights, Florida, with her son, Dwight, and husband, Edward, before passing early last year. She was a devoted first-grade teacher and an accomplished State representative in the Florida House and a legendary State senator. She is remembered for voting with her heart—no matter the politics or the party.

Her passing was crushing to the south Florida community. Although her son, Dwight, carries on her legacy through a commitment to strong leadership and challenging the status quo, Larcenia was an irreplaceable champion of the African American community, defender of education and opportunity equality, and a believer in the ability of each of us to create and instill change.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 2678, legislation that would designate the U.S. Post Office on 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building. Doing so would recognize not only Larcenia’s undying dedication to the community she served, but also the heart, vibrancy, and passion she shared with the world.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have no more speakers, and we are ready to close.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I support the passage of this bill to honor the passion, dedication, and love with which Larcenia Bullard legislated. I urge this body’s adoption of H.R. 2678, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, again, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida bringing forth an example of a fine public servant, and I would urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 2678.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2678.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SPECIALIST THEODORE MATTHEW GLENDE POST OFFICE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5019) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5019

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST THEODORE MATTHEW GLENDE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1445

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5019, which was introduced by Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York. This bill would designate the postal facility located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office.

Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende died while serving in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He was killed in Kharwar, Logar province, Afghanistan, on July 27, 2012, when his unit was in the field and came under enemy fire.

During the attack, Specialist Glende helped the medic get his wounded comrades to take shelter in a trailer when a mortar round hit the trailer and killed him. Members of his unit said that he saved the lives of five of his fellow soldiers in the attack. He was only 23 years old.

A native of Rochester, New York, Theodore graduated from McQuaid Jes-

uit High School in 2007 and enrolled at Niagara University. He soon felt called to join the U.S. Army and enlisted.

He is survived by his wife, Alexandra, whom he married just months before leaving for his first tour of duty.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to pay tribute to this true American hero. I ask for my colleagues’ support of H.R. 5019. Naming a postal facility after him is the least we can do to honor Specialist Glende’s service and sacrifice.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. HORSFORD and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for their kind words that you have already said about my constituent, Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende.

As was said before, he was born in Rochester on January 13 of 1989. His life was taken far too soon at the age of 23, while he served his country and helped to protect the lives of his brothers in arms.

Those who knew him described him as a fun-loving jokester, who above all else was dedicated to service to his country. After graduating from McQuaid Jesuit High School in 2007, he joined the ROTC at Niagara University.

He was so passionate about defending his country that when he learned he would likely be commissioned as a Reserve lieutenant, he instead enlisted in the U.S. Army to pursue his goal of becoming an Active Duty infantryman.

After enlistment, Theodore was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 503rd Infantry Regiment, 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, based out of Vicenza, Italy. He then married his wife, Alexandra, on April 12, 2012, just a few months before leaving on his first tour of duty.

On July 27, Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende and his unit were ambushed. He courageously ushered his wounded comrades to shelter and endangered his own life. His selfless and sacrificial actions saved the lives of five of his fellow soldiers. He gave his young life in service to his country, and because of his bravery, he was posthumously promoted from private first class to specialist.

Today, I rise to honor the memory of Specialist Glende. With this legislation, the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, will be permanently designated the Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office.

While nothing we can do will ever assuage the grief of Theodore’s wife, of his family and friends, this designation

is a small token of our gratitude for his valiant service and will help to keep his memory alive for future generations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have no other speakers and are ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support the passage of this bill to honor the courage exhibited by this young man in the face of danger. Because of Specialist Glende's brave actions, five American lives were saved on the battlefield. He deserves our respect for his honorable service.

I thank our colleague, Representative SLAUGHTER, for bringing this legislation. I urge the body's adoption of H.R. 5019, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I have been listening here just for the last few moments—and at this point, as the song says, “We are over halfway there”—of listening through these what many people would say are just post office namings, if you listen to the stories that are being told, these are the stories of America, these are the stories of those who serve, those who gave their life, those who served us in other ways in their communities.

For that reason, if no other, this should be mandatory to watch in the elementary schools and high schools all across this country because this is what we are talking about is the best of America.

With that, I would ask support of passage of H.R. 5019, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5019.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CORPORAL JUAN MARIEL
ALCANTARA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4443) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the “Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4443

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORPORAL JUAN MARIEL ALCANTARA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the “Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4443, introduced by Representative CHARLIE RANGEL of New York, which would designate the postal facility located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building.

Army Corporal Alcantara was killed on August 6, 2007, in Baqubah, Iraq. He died due to wounds suffered from an improvised explosive device. Juan was posthumously awarded a Bronze Star; a Purple Heart; an Army Good Conduct Medal; and, prior to his death, the Army's Commendation Medal.

Originally from the Dominican Republic, Juan moved to the United States with his family when he was 5 years old. Growing up in Washington Heights in New York, he became known as a kind and helpful person.

He mentored youth and encouraged them to set goals and aspire to their dreams. After his father passed away, Juan became even more dedicated to taking care of his family. He made the courageous decision to join the Army and serve his adopted country. He was posthumously awarded naturalized U.S. citizenship.

It is my honor to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4443 and memorialize the sacrifice and heroism of Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who represents the fabulous community of Harlem, and in support of H.R. 4443.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman from Nevada for this opportunity to support H.R. 4443, naming a post office in my district after a fallen hero who, as was reported by the chairman, came to this country as a kid on August 24, 1984, with his family from the Dominican Republic.

He didn't come to this country to become a hero; he came in search of the American Dream, as so many thousands of people have. Ultimately, after living and playing in the vicinity of this post office that we will name after him, he finished school and saw an opportunity in serving in the United States Armed Forces, as a matter of fact, joining the 2nd Infantry Division, which I was honored to serve from 1948 to 1952.

Juan lost his life, and he gained his citizenship after that through provisions that we have made in the immigration law. There are so many thousands of young people that won't have post offices named after them, and some will be forgotten by many people who have no idea where our young people have lost their lives or what even they were fighting for.

That is why it is so important for us as Americans, as we continue to fight the longest war in our history, you should remember that it is more than the post office, it is more than their life, but it is what this great country stands for as we try to protect America all over the world.

It is so important to us, as Members of Congress who have this responsibility to determine when that moment comes, that our Nation's national security is threatened and when we will be going to war, and that these thousands of lives, not just the people who for economic or other adventurous reasons join the military, but in fact, a sacrifice that all of us have to make when our great Nation is threatened.

We are still going through this period, and it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that when the President of the United States or Members of the United States Congress believe that our Nation's national security has been threatened, that we should also make certain that we have a mandatory service that goes with us, so that no matter what neighborhood, no matter what the economic status is, that when that flag goes up, all Americans, regardless of their age, should be prepared—should be prepared and anxious to make some type of sacrifice in support of our Nation's security.

Certainly for those who are young enough to serve, they should not be

confined to just those who volunteer, but everyone should be made vulnerable or at least given the opportunity to be drafted into the military to serve this great Nation.

So I appreciate the support of the House to name this post office—it will be symbolic—on Vermilyea Avenue after the name of this brave young person, a son, a brother, a father, and—most of all now—an American who gave his life for this great Nation.

I thank the gentleman from Nevada for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have no other speakers, and we are ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, we support the passage of this bill to honor the ultimate sacrifice that Corporal Juan Alcantara made for this country. He and so many other servicemen and -women risk their lives every day to protect the freedoms that we hold so dear, and it is only right that we recognize and respect their great courage.

We thank Representative CHARLIE RANGEL for bringing this important legislation to us and ask the body's full support of H.R. 4443.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is always a privilege to honor those who have sacrificed for us.

With that, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4443, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4443.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYNTHIA JENKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3957) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3957

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CYNTHIA JENKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens,

New York, shall be known and designated as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3957, which was introduced by Representative GREGORY MEEKS of New York, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building.

Essie Cynthia Jenkins served the communities of Jamaica, St. Albans, Springfield Gardens, and Rosedale, New York, for 12 years as a New York assemblywoman. She made history by being the first African American woman elected to represent southeast Queens. Ms. Jenkins served as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Affirmative Action and a delegate to both the Governor's and White House Conferences on Libraries. She was also instrumental in the State's decision to make a 250-bed Veterans' Home to St. Albans in the 1980s.

Prior to her career in public service, Ms. Jenkins was a librarian for 23 years, working in every southeast Queens branch library. In 1966, she earned a Master of Library Science degree from Pratt Institute. It was around this time when she met her husband, Joseph Jenkins. The two had a son, Joseph Jenkins, Jr., who credits his mother's strong spiritual beliefs and active membership in the Springfield Gardens United Methodist Church with his decision to become an ordained minister at the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Bay Shore, Long Island.

Ms. Jenkins, sadly, passed away on October 31, 2001, at the age of 77; however, her passion for learning lives on. Her undergraduate alma mater, the University of Louisville, named a

scholarship in her honor, known as the Essie Jenkins Torchbearer Endowment, established in 1999. Since then, many young people have had the opportunity to go to college, thanks in part to the dedication and trailblazing efforts of this remarkable woman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 3957, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 3957. I urge its quick and unanimous passage and ask all Members to join me in honoring one of southeast Queens' best and a memorable public servant, Cynthia Jenkins.

Let me, at this time, also thank my colleagues from the New York delegation who all signed onto this bill, because Cynthia was a history maker. She was the first African American woman in Queens County to be elected to the New York State Assembly. She was elected because of the work that she did prior.

For 22 years, she worked as a librarian and made sure that every single library in southeastern Queens would remain open. She, in fact, worked in every library in southeastern Queens. She fought hard on behalf of libraries and those who enjoyed their services, even preventing many branches from closing in a time of cutbacks. She wanted to make sure the children had a safe place to go to learn after school. She also had various programs within the public libraries.

As indicated, when servicemembers returned from Vietnam, it was Cynthia Jenkins who played an integral role in opening the State Veterans' Home in St. Albans at the veterans' facility. That facility still exists and continues to serve thousands of veterans to this very day.

In addition, her advocacy on behalf of civil rights was inspiring for many at a time when civil inequality was rampant. She was instrumental in trying to make sure that there was a district where an African American could run for Congress one day—the seat that I hold today.

She also was the founder of Social Concern, which took care of young people, older people, and seniors who were frail and had to stay in their homes and helped make sure they got the food and quality health care that they needed.

Indeed, Cynthia Jenkins, a member of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, a member of the community, was a long, hard fighter who did not know how to take "no" for an answer when she was trying to make sure that the community received its due.

Today, I ask all of my colleagues to honor this public servant who was dedicated to her community, dedicated to

libraries, dedicated to literacy, dedicated to the commitment of social and racial equality, and that we unanimously pass this bill memorializing the late Cynthia Jenkins, our assemblywoman.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers and are ready to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 3957, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building.

Cynthia Jenkins worked as a librarian, community activist, and civil rights advocate after moving to Queens from Louisville, Kentucky. In 1969, while working for the Queens public library system, Cynthia cofounded the Black Librarians Caucus, to address racial inequalities in the public library system, as well as an educational action program, the Social Concerns Committee of Springfield Gardens, Inc.

In 1982, Cynthia became the first African American woman elected to public office in southern Queens, winning a seat in the New York State Assembly. For the next 12 years, she worked tirelessly on behalf of her constituents, focusing particularly on educational issues.

Cynthia passed away on October 31, 2001, at the age of 77. She continues to be remembered for her dedicated public service and for always fighting for the principles she believed in.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor the life and public service of State Assemblywoman Cynthia Jenkins.

I thank Representative MEEKS for introducing this bill.

I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was stated in my remarks previously that Ms. Jenkins, sadly, passed away October 31, 2001. I think from her faith background and for her children, it was a sad day, but it was also a happy day, because every time we remember those such as we are remembering today, there was a birth and there was a death—and we are remembering the death—but in between there is a dash or a space. Those lives that we memorialize today on the House floor are in that dash or space. So, for me, the dates mean a birth and a death, but it is the nondate in the middle that makes what we are doing here today so special in the lives of these individuals.

With that, I would urge all to support H.R. 3957, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the mo-

tion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3957.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE THOMAS "MICKEY" LELAND POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 78) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 78

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GEORGE THOMAS "MICKEY" LELAND POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 78, which was introduced by Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE of Texas. H.R. 78 would designate the post office located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the George Thomas "Mickey" Leland Post Office Building.

Mickey Leland was an effective spokesman for disadvantaged people across the United States and the world. During his six terms in Congress and 6 years as a Texas State legislator, he strongly advocated for civil rights, hunger relief, and health care for the

poor. He helped establish the House Select Committee on Hunger, of which he was chairman.

Under Mickey's leadership, the Select Committee reemphasized the priority of hunger and the alleviation of poverty within the foreign assistance programs of the United States. He succeeded in expanding funding for primary health care in developing countries and fought against the injustice of apartheid in South Africa.

Additionally, his legislative initiatives included establishing the National Commission on Infant Mortality, providing better access to fresh food for at-risk women, children, and infants, and instituting the first comprehensive services for the homeless.

Mickey was a powerful advocate on other causes as well. While chairing the House Select Committee on Hunger, he was a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Subcommittees on Telecommunications and Finance, Health and the Environment, and Energy and Power. He chaired the Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services, and he served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employment.

Tragically, Mickey was killed in a plane crash, along with 15 others, following a humanitarian mission to Ethiopia. He was survived by his wife, Alison, and three children: Jarrett, Austin, and Cameron.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the legacy and example of Mickey Leland by passing H.R. 78.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the author of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it was really good to hear the initial description of Congressman Mickey Leland. He loved being called Mickey Leland. Although his full name is George Thomas, Mickey was what he went by. He was a person of the people.

Today, I stand here in support of H.R. 78, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the George Thomas "Mickey" Leland Post Office Building.

I thank the ranking member and the chair of the full committee of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee for their kindness and their diligence in helping to bring this to the floor of the House. It is appropriate to have it in this year, the 25th commemoration of Mickey's death, along with 15 other brave individuals who were flying to provide lifesaving commodities for those who were starving and dying.

This bill will acknowledge this 25th year that we have lost Mickey Leland.

It will acknowledge the charitableness of his heart. It will acknowledge he was a person who was willing to sacrifice his own life. It will also acknowledge that he was our fellow colleague in the United States Congress.

I am glad that we are doing this, and I again thank the committee because it is important to note that, over the years of this very historic, hallowed institution, Members have come and they have served. That should be our continuing challenge: to serve America and to serve the world.

Mickey was born in November 1944. He was born to George Thomas and Alice Raines in Lubbock, Texas. Soon, Mom brought the family to Houston, Texas—to our advantage and benefit. He thrived in this city, where as a youth he enjoyed a successful career as a high school sports star at historic Phillis Wheatley High School in Houston, Texas, which is still standing. In fact, as I speak on the floor today, there are advocates trying to preserve the historic old Wheatley High School where Mickey went to school.

Mickey entered Texas Southern University in 1965 and received a bachelor of science degree in pharmacy in 1970. In fact, we called Mickey “the pharmacist,” as a nickname. It introduced him to caring about people and health care.

Mickey was so good, he served after graduation as an instructor of clinical pharmacy at TSU for 1 year. While working there, he established a door-to-door outreach campaign in low-income neighborhoods to educate people about medical care options and to perform preliminary health screenings.

Can you imagine, Mickey Leland, a graduate of the Texas Southern University pharmacy school, helping those poor people who really had no access to health care?

His first effort in public service was to work with the City of Houston health officials to set up community health clinics. We could call him the father of that endeavor. Then, of course, he also was an activist trying to improve the civil rights of African Americans in the fifth ward community, and also involved himself in the Jensen Medical Referral Service.

In 1972, he was elected to the 88th session of the Texas House of Representatives. He was one of the first groups of African Americans to be elected to that body.

□ 1515

Heretofore, prior to the 1965 Voting Rights Act, there were no African Americans of number in the Texas State Legislature, including the Honorable Barbara Jordan, who was able to be elected as well during that time after the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

He was reelected for 2 years, two terms, serving until 1978, and then, during that tenure, he served on the sen-

ate-house conference committee as a member of the house appropriations committee, and then came to the United States Congress.

He will be remembered in the United States Congress as someone who helped create and support health maintenance organizations, HMOs. He did that through the State of Texas.

He then came to Congress in January of 1978, was elected in 1978 to the 18th Congressional District, and he served 10 years here. He was chosen as a freshman majority whip and an at-large majority whip, chaired the Congressional Black Caucus, advocated for ethnic diversity through affirmative action and broadcast, served as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and he and Bill Emerson established the Select Committee on Hunger.

Now, my colleagues, this is where his heart showed even larger than it did in his local community. He was an effective spokesperson for ending the suffering of hunger in the United States, and he joined with his good friend, Republican William “Bill” Emerson, who represented Missouri’s Eighth Congressional District. His wife later represented him.

Through the power of bipartisanship, Mickey Leland and Bill began a mission that still resonates today—that food is a basic right and should never be used as a weapon.

Today we still have the Mickey Leland Hunger Center, of which I serve on the board, and many are still advocating around the world, Mickey Leland Fellows who are around the world and who are fighting against hunger.

Bill died in office and, as I indicated, his wife took his place.

But Mickey married, in 1983, his wonderful wife, Alison. His beautiful sons, Jarrett David and twins Austin Mickey and Cameron George Leland, and his mother, Alice Raines, of course, are still living.

In 1983, in the midst of the civil war, the nation of Ethiopia experienced the worst famine in nearly 100 years, which led to more than 400,000 deaths. Mickey heard that cry, and so the Speaker of the House asked him to go there to Sudan in 1985.

The hunger was so overwhelming he came back and passed the African Famine and Relief and Recovery Act of 1985. He then continued to serve on the Select Committee on Hunger, led by himself and Bill Emerson, and provided \$8 million for a vitamin A program.

Mickey loved people. He loved solving their problems, and so it was maybe fate that he would die on August 7, 1989, on the side of an Ethiopian mountain with other brave individuals, such as Hugh Anderson Johnson, Jr., and Patrice Yvonne Johnson, two of his aides; Joyce Francine Williams, an aide to Ron Dellums; Robert Woods, a political aide at the American Embassy; Gladys Gilbert, a staff person

with USAID; and Thomas Warrick, the USAID representative, and many others who were on that flight with him.

I can only say that, in closing, it is an honor to introduce this legislation, and I would ask my colleagues to support this legislation, not in the honor of a colleague so much as in honor of an American who cared enough about people to be willing to sacrifice his life.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation in the 25th year of the commemoration of the death of the Honorable Mickey Leland, George Thomas Mickey Leland, the late Congressperson of the 18th Congressional District.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this point I have no other speakers and am ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune to know former Representative Mickey Leland, and I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 78, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the George Thomas “Mickey” Leland Post Office Building.

Born in Lubbock, Texas in 1944, Mickey Leland earned a degree in pharmacy from Texas Southern University in 1970. He quickly became a local civil rights leader, organizing the Black Citizen Action Team in protests against police brutality while using his medical background to found a door-to-door outreach campaign to educate low-income individuals about their medical care options.

In 1972, Mickey continued his health advocacy work in the Texas State House of Representatives, passing legislation to provide better access to affordable medications and HMOs.

In 1979, Mickey Leland was elected to Congress as the Representative for Texas’ 18th District. After serving as the freshman majority whip, Representative Leland later served twice as at-large majority whip, chaired the Congressional Black Caucus from 1985 to 1987, and was reelected five times.

As a Member of Congress, Representative Leland advocated for an increase in hiring quotas for women and minorities in the telecommunications industry, and focused much of his attention on alleviating hunger across the globe, particularly in Africa.

During the 98th Congress, Representative Leland’s efforts led to the creation of the Temporary Select Committee on Hunger, which studied the effects of domestic and international hunger and poverty.

Tragically, Representative Leland’s career was cut short on a trip to Africa during the 1989 congressional recess. While checking on the progress of establishing a refugee camp in Addis

Ababa, Representative Leland and three of his congressional aides lost their lives when their plane crashed over a mountainous region of Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to honor Mickey Leland's life and career as a tireless advocate for underserved and minority populations, both at home and abroad.

I urge passage of H.R. 78, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my colleagues and what they have shared about a former colleague. I think once served here we are always colleagues, and I think the example that he set is one that is well worth remembering.

I appreciate the gentle lady from Texas for bringing this and look forward to supporting it, and would ask that all Members support the passage of H.R. 78.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 78, Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service Located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building."

I had the pleasure of serving with Congressman Leland and even taking my first oath for public office together, along with Congressman Leland's successor, Congressman Craig Washington. Congressman Leland, my friend and mentor, made a lasting impact on Congress that has helped bring focus to aid parts of the world that suffered from extreme hunger and poverty. Congressman Leland was a transformative leader not only in our home state of Texas, but throughout the world.

Congressman Leland was elected to Congress in 1978 to represent the 18th Congressional District of Texas, filling the seat vacated by Congresswoman Barbara Jordan when she retired. He was a progressive leader that twice chaired the Congressional Black Caucus. Congressman Leland helped to form the House Select Committee on World Hunger in 1984 which generated awareness within Congress regarding national and international hunger and prompted a bipartisan effort to find solutions to end hunger in the U.S. and around the world.

Congressman Leland made a lasting impact that can be felt today through the Congressional Hunger Center. Former Democratic Congressman Tony Hall, a close friend of Congressman Leland and former chair of the House Select Committee on Hunger, joined Republican Representative Bill Emerson to form the bi-partisan Congressional Hunger Center in 1993. Soon after its formation, the Congressional Hunger Center established the Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellows Program to serve as a living legacy to Congressman Leland and his world-changing work to end hunger. The Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellows Program trains emerging leaders during a two-year period to eradicate hunger worldwide.

Congressman Leland's legacy continues to thrive in Congress. I urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE's legislation to designate the U.S. Post Office in Houston, Texas as the Mickey Leland Post Office building as a tribute to my dear friend and former colleague.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 78, which designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston Texas as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building."

I thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the House Oversight and Government Reform for taking up consideration of H.R. 78, which I introduced to honor our beloved former colleague George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland, by having a post office in the 18th Congressional District designated in his name.

My thanks to Congressman DOUG COLLINS and Congressman DANNY DAVIS for management of the floor debate on this bill.

In 1983, Mickey Leland married Alison Clark Walton, and fathered three wonderful children, Jarrett David; and twins, Austin Mickey and Cameron George Leland, who were born on January 14, 1990, following his tragic death.

On November 27, 1944, George Thomas Leland, III was born to George Thomas Leland, II and Alice Raines, in Lubbock, Texas.

Mickey Leland's mother moved the family, which included his brother William Gaston Leland, to Houston where she worked in a drugstore and later became a teacher.

Mickey Leland thrived in the city of Houston where as a youth he enjoyed a successful career as a high school sports star at the Phyllis Wheatley High School in Houston.

In 1965, Mickey graduated in the top 10% of his class from Wheatley High School and enrolled in Texas Southern University (TSU), where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Pharmacy in 1970.

Mickey Leland had heart, passion and brains and he used all three to the benefit of the poor and working poor living in the city of Houston.

Following his graduation from TSU he was hired as an Instructor of Clinical Pharmacy at TSU from 1970–1971. This was not enough for Mickey who saw so much work that needed to be done for those in need.

While working as a TSU instructor he established a "door-to-door" outreach campaign in low-income neighborhoods to educate people about their medical care options and to perform preliminary health screenings.

Benjamin Mayes once said, "The tragedy of life is often not in our failure, but rather in our complacency; not in our doing too much, but rather in our doing too little; not in our living above our ability, but rather in our living below our capacities."

Mickey Leland was not complacent—one of his first efforts in public service was to work with city of Houston health officials to set up community health clinics.

Mickey Leland, as an active member of the Black Community Action Team, ("Black Cats") worked towards other reform measures, which led to the establishment of the health system for Casa del Amigos.

In Fifth Ward, Houston, Mickey Leland helped initiate a free community health clinic

called the Jensen Medical Referral Service. Long before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, he was creating an opportunity for universal health care for poorest of the poor living in the 18th Congressional District.

In 1972, he made the full transition to public servant when he ran for and won election to the Texas House of Representatives to represent the 88th District of Houston Texas. He was reelected to successive two-year terms, serving in the Texas House until 1978.

Mickey Leland was the first African-American legislator in the Texas State legislature to serve on the Senate-House conference Committee as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

During his time as a member of the Texas House of Representatives Mickey Leland is remembered for promoting legislation that provided Texas residents access to generic prescription medication; and for his support of employment opportunities for minorities.

He also supported the creation of universal access to health care for Texas residents through establishment of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO's).

In 1978, Mickey Leland expanded his public service to include the entire 18th Congressional District when he was elected to Congress, succeeding the legendary Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

Congressman Leland served in the United States House of Representatives for nearly 10 years.

He was chosen Freshman Majority Whip in his first term, and later served twice as At-Large Majority Whip.

Martin Luther King, said, "Human progress is neither automatic nor inevitable . . . Every step toward the goal of justice requires sacrifice, suffering, and struggle; the tireless exertions and passionate concern of dedicated individuals."

During his time in Congress Mickey Leland engaged in tireless and passionate concern for others. As a member of Congress, he Chaired the Congressional Black Caucus; Advocated for ethnic diversity through affirmative action in broadcast employment both on and off camera to promote responsible and realistic television and cable programming; served as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee; chaired the Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services; served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employment; established the Select Committee on Hunger.

Mickey Leland was an effective spokesman for those suffering from hunger in the United States and he joined with Republican Congressman William "Bill" Emerson, who represented Missouri's 8th Congressional District, to create the House Select Committee on Hunger.

Through the power of bipartisanship Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson began a mission that still resonates today—that food is a basic human right—and should never be used as a weapon.

The Select Committee on Hunger led by Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson is credited gaining Congressional approval of an \$8 million annually appropriation for a developing the nation's Vitamin A program that is believed to have reduced child mortality.

The anti-hunger committee also worked to improve hunger conditions for impoverished neighborhoods in the United States.

Bill Emerson died while in office and was succeeded by his wife Jo Ann, who served the people of Missouri's 8th District for many years.

In 1983, in the midst of civil war, the nation of Ethiopia experienced the worse famine in nearly 100 years, which led to more than 400,000 deaths. A significant drought contributed to the famine, but it had more to do with the war that impeded aid and the violence that was visited upon people who were displaced as they searched for food.

He led the effort for the Africa Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985. The legislation provided \$800 million in food and humanitarian relief supplies.

He was asked by then Speaker Tip O'Neill to lead a bipartisan Congressional delegation to assess conditions and relief requirements in Ethiopia.

Mickey Leland's trip to the Sudan in the spring of 1989, made a tremendous impression on him, which made his mission against hunger a personal commitment to help the Sudanese refugees in Ethiopia.

Throughout his time in the House of Representatives his commitment to end hunger and homelessness became his mission and now it is his legacy.

Nelson Mandela observed that, "If you talk to a man in a language he understands, that goes to his head. If you talk to him in his language, that goes to his heart."

Mickey Leland knew how to speak to the hearts of people to move them to action with the goal of relieving suffering where he found it.

The international attention Congressman Leland brought to the plight of famine victims in Ethiopia by his personal commitment to bring non-governmental assistance to support government efforts saved thousands of lives.

Mickey Leland met personally with Pope John Paul II about food aid in Africa.

Pope John Paul II once said, "Have no fear of moving into the unknown. Simply step out fearlessly knowing that I am with you, therefore no harm can befall you; all is very, very well. Do this in complete faith and confidence."

While Chairing the Congressional Black Caucus he proudly presented the first awards the Caucus had ever given to non-black recipients: Rock musician Bob Geldorf and news person Ted Koppel.

Bob Geldorf was honored for his Band Aid concert and fundraising efforts for Africa Famine victims; and Ted Koppel was honored for his news stories on the African famine.

On Leland's sixth visit to Africa on August 7, 1989, his plane crashed near Gambela, Ethiopia on a mountainside on his way to visit the Fugnido refugee camp on the Sudan-Ethiopian border. The camp held more than 300,000 Sudanese escaping famine and war in their adjacent country.

The plane, carrying sixteen people, was found after a six day search in southwestern Ethiopia.

Congressman Leland was joined on that fateful flight by: Hugh Anderson Johnson Jr.; Patrice Yvonne Johnson, both his Congress-

sional aides; Joyce Francine Williams, an aide to fellow Congressman Ronald V. Dellums, who served as an expert on child nutrition; Y. Ivan Tillen, a New York businessman and friend of Congressman Leland's; Robert Woods, a political and economic officer at the American Embassy in Addis Ababa; Gladys Gilbert, a special projects officer for the mission of the U.S. Agency for International Development attached to the embassy; Thomas Worrick, the acting AID representative in Ethiopia, and Worrick's wife, Roberta.

Also seven Ethiopians were killed including Debebe Agonofer, an Ethiopian agricultural economist with the AID mission, and six other Ethiopians, including the plane's crew of three.

Mickey Leland's dedication and service were honored at services throughout the State of Texas and in Washington, DC. The U.S. Congress named the Mickey Leland Harris County Courthouse Annex located in the city of Houston in his name. TSU honored Mickey Leland and Barbara Jordan by dedicating the School of Public Affairs as the "Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs."

Mickey Leland was laid to rest in accordance to his wishes in a plain pine coffin, under an oak tree in Houston's Golden Gate Cemetery located in his former neighborhood.

Mickey Leland we stand on this floor among the shadows of yesterday and the dreams of tomorrow to honor you for what you have done in far too short a lifetime

There is much more to the life of Mickey Leland that I want to share with my colleagues who will be voting on this bill to name a Post Office in his name. His life's work to end famine, hunger, and provide access to health care to the poor are tremendous in and of themselves, but he contributed much more to the lives of people he touched.

Mickey Leland was a person who loved people and found great joy in gatherings where he could meet new people or share moments with family and friends. He had a great sense of humor and would soon have others laughing at one of his stories or an account of a personal experience.

He accomplished a great deal and still had time to encourage young people to pursue careers in public service. In 1980, Mickey Leland and his close friends J. Kent Friedman and Vic Samuels founded the Mickey Leland Kibbutzim Internship. Mickey Leland was so deeply moved by his visit to Israel in 1979 that he wanted other young people to share that experience. His admiration for the Kibbutzim Movement, and his own childhood experiences of growing up in poverty inspired him to create a program to fund urban youths' travel to the Holy Land.

The Mickey Leland Kibbutzim Internship has benefited outstanding high school students from the fifth Congressional District who demonstrated leadership skills allowing them to have travel to Israel.

To honor his legacy and commitment to youth, the Leland Fellowship Program at the University of Houston was initiated and launched.

The Leland Fellowship Program supports historically, economically disadvantaged students who may want to pursue employment opportunities as congressional staff members.

Leland Fellows are provided with a monthly stipend and round-trip airfare, as well as paid housing. Upon successful completion of the program, interns earn 3–12 upper level hours in political science.

Mickey Leland as Chair of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services championed the United States Postal Service—which remains one of the world's most efficient low cost national postal systems.

In 1987, when the Postal service considered closing a 52-year-old post office in Philadelphia he raised questions about the buildings future after the announcement to abolish 87 jobs.

Mickey Leland championed the cause of our men and women of the Postal Service by acknowledging that they were then and remain the most productive and efficient in the entire world. He chaired the committee at a time when the Postal Service was undergoing change and renovations that spoke to its age and the demand for its services by the American public.

It is the one agency that touches every home and business in the United States 6 days a week. The Post Office for roughly a hundred million Americans is the face of the Federal government.

Mickey Leland reminded us that life is made by those who take the hard road and tough challenges. Your mission to change how America viewed famine and hunger was monumental because it saved the lives of millions through domestic and international food programs that you created or inspired.

First Corinthians Chapter 12 verse 11 through 13 reads "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

George Thomas "Mickey" Leland once was a child, but he grew into a man and knew in part the wages of hunger and famine and it was enough to set his course in life to relieve the suffering of people no matter where they were or who they were. He demonstrated charity in the truest sense of the word.

I was proud to call you a friend and mentor—and I am honored to stand before our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to affirm your impact on the city of Houston, this nation and the world.

I thank my colleagues who join me in honoring former Congressman Mickey Leland by naming the Post Office located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building."

This post office will be a living memorial to a dedicated public servant. It has been over 25 years since we lost the Honorable George Thomas "Mickey" Leland.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives honor the life and legacy of Honorable George Thomas "Mickey" Leland by passing H.R. 78.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 78.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL CHRISTIAN A. GUZMAN RIVERA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORPORAL CHRISTIAN A. GUZMAN RIVERA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any references in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill which is now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and it is with great joy that I look forward to her remarks and her speaking on this important measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. COLLINS and especially Mr. ISSA, the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, as well as our ranking member, for approving this bill and for bringing it one step closer to its full consideration by the House today.

This legislation would name a post office in my congressional district in

Princeton, Florida, an area in the southern part of Miami-Dade County, after a local hero, Marine Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera, who was killed by an IED, an improvised explosive device, while serving our country in Afghanistan.

Christian was 21 years old, and was killed in the western province of Afghanistan in a place called Farah by the enemies of freedom and democracy.

Christian was born on the tropical island of Puerto Rico on December 3, 1987. Two years later he moved with his family to south Florida, where he attended our public schools and joined the Junior ROTC at Homestead Senior High School.

Previously a shy boy, Christian became a more confident young man through his leadership experience in JROTC.

Upon graduation from Homestead High in 2006, he enrolled in Miami-Dade County's Fire Rescue Academy and graduated from the firefighter program. Christian also became a certified emergency medical technician, an EMT.

But Christian, who was always dedicated to public service, also wanted to serve our country in our Armed Forces. His peers say that for Christian, becoming a Marine was not a spur of the moment decision, it was his destiny. He knew it all along.

As the proud wife of a Vietnam combat veteran who volunteered for service and was severely injured in battle, and as the stepmother of two Marine aviators, I am familiar with this military calling.

During a time when the United States was involved in wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan, Christian volunteered for Active Duty service. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps.

In May 2009, Christian was deployed to Afghanistan as a combat engineer attached to the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment.

In Afghanistan, Christian excelled. He understood his duties and his responsibilities and carried them out to the best of his abilities. He was known to be one of the most dependable combat engineer Marines in the battalion.

When his squad leader was wounded and hospitalized for a month, Christian stepped up and assumed his leadership role. Other Marines sometimes requested him specifically by name to accompany them on dangerous patrols.

First Lieutenant Enming Lou, a former Marine Corps officer, said this about Christian A. Guzman Rivera: "Senior explosive technicians thought of Christian as among the best combat engineers in the battalion."

On August 6, 2009, Christian was killed while serving during Operation Enduring Freedom in Farah Province, Afghanistan. Christian made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of liberty and democracy, the cornerstones of America's ideals.

His military awards include the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Purple Heart Medal, and the Combat Action Ribbon.

Five years have passed, and Christian was and still is deeply missed by close friends in south Florida, by fellow Marines who had the privilege of serving with him, and a close-knit family who could never replace the void left in their lives.

He is survived, loved, and remembered by his mother, Velma, a wonderful lady; by his wonderful stepdad, Felix; his brother, Jonathan; his uncle, Chris, and aunts Rebecca and Vilma; his grandmother, Carmen; and cousins and friends who have endured great pain remembering Christian's sacrifice in the name of country and honor.

Mr. Speaker, Christian's brave service exceeded all measures of selflessness and devotion to our country, and I encourage my colleagues to honor Corporal Christian Guzman's memory and support this bill.

I am proud to name the Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building after our local hero who courageously sacrificed his life in the line of duty so that we could enjoy the freedom that makes our wonderful country so special.

Christian is deserving of our continuous praise and gratitude, and I am humbled in presenting this bill to my colleagues, and I pray that our good Lord will continue to give strength to Christian's family.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any greater service that one can give than to give the gift of their life fighting for their country. Therefore, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 5030, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 Southwest 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building.

A native of Homestead, Florida, Christian Guzman Rivera graduated from Homestead Senior High's ROTC program in 2006.

□ 1530

With dreams of becoming a Marine firefighter, Christian graduated from the Miami-Dade Fire Academy, and in 2007, was assigned as a battalion engineer in Okinawa, Japan.

Tragically, on August 6, 2009, after having just received a promotion to corporal, Christian Guzman Rivera was killed while supporting combat operations in Afghanistan. Although he never got the chance to fight fires as he had hoped, Corporal Rivera was named an honorary member of the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department, and he still remains a role model to his younger siblings.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill, H.R. 5030, to recognize Corporal Christian Guzman Rivera's honor, courage, and sacrifice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated by my friend, Reverend DAVIS, and also by my dear friend from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN), at this point, you do not have to live many decades to live a full and vibrant life.

This young man proved that you can live a full life if you live each of your days to their fullest. To his credit, we will be proving this, that spirit of living a life that is full and in service to others.

With that, I would ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5030, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5030.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN SUPER COMPUTING LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2495) to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2495

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Super Computing Leadership Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5541) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

"(1) CO-DESIGN.—The term 'co-design' means the joint development of application algorithms, models, and codes with computer technology architectures and operating systems to maximize effective use of high-end computing systems.

"(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Department' means the Department of Energy.

"(3) EXASCALE.—The term 'exascale' means computing system performance at or near 10 to the 18th power floating point operations per second.

"(4) HIGH-END COMPUTING SYSTEM.—The term 'high-end computing system' means a computing system with performance that substantially exceeds that of systems that are commonly available for advanced scientific and engineering applications.

"(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

"(6) LEADERSHIP SYSTEM.—The term 'leadership system' means a high-end computing system that is among the most advanced in the world in terms of performance in solving scientific and engineering problems.

"(7) NATIONAL LABORATORY.—The term 'National Laboratory' means any one of the seventeen laboratories owned by the Department.

"(8) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Energy.

"(9) SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'software technology' includes optimal algorithms, programming environments, tools, languages, and operating systems for high-end computing systems."

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HIGH-END COMPUTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 3 of the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 5542) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "program" and inserting "coordinated program across the Department";

(B) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting "; and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) partner with universities, National Laboratories, and industry to ensure the broadest possible application of the technology developed in this program to other challenges in science, engineering, medicine, and industry.";

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "vector" and all that follows through "architectures" and inserting "computer technologies that show promise of substantial reductions in power requirements and substantial gains in parallelism of multicore processors, concurrency, memory and storage, bandwidth, and reliability"; and

(3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) EXASCALE COMPUTING PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a coordinated research program to develop exascale computing systems to advance the missions of the Department.

"(2) EXECUTION.—The Secretary shall, through competitive merit review, establish two or more National Laboratory-industry-university partnerships to conduct integrated research, development, and engineering of multiple exascale architectures, and—

"(A) conduct mission-related co-design activities in developing such exascale platforms;

"(B) develop those advancements in hardware and software technology required to fully realize the potential of an exascale production system in addressing Department target applications and solving scientific problems involving predictive modeling and simulation and large-scale data analytics and management; and

"(C) explore the use of exascale computing technologies to advance a broad range of science and engineering.

"(3) ADMINISTRATION.—In carrying out this program, the Secretary shall—

"(A) provide, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, access for researchers in United States industry, institutions of higher education, National Laboratories, and other

Federal agencies to these exascale systems, as appropriate; and

"(B) conduct outreach programs to increase the readiness for the use of such platforms by domestic industries, including manufacturers.

"(4) REPORTS.—

"(A) INTEGRATED STRATEGY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the American Super Computing Leadership Act, a report outlining an integrated strategy and program management plan, including target dates for prototypical and production exascale platforms, interim milestones to reaching these targets, functional requirements, roles and responsibilities of National Laboratories and industry, acquisition strategy, and estimated resources required, to achieve this exascale system capability. The report shall include the Secretary's plan for Departmental organization to manage and execute the Exascale Computing Program, including definition of the roles and responsibilities within the Department to ensure an integrated program across the Department. The report shall also include a plan for ensuring balance and prioritizing across ASCR subprograms in a flat or slow-growth budget environment.

"(B) STATUS REPORTS.—At the time of the budget submission of the Department for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the status of milestones and costs in achieving the objectives of the exascale computing program.

"(C) EXASCALE MERIT REPORT.—At least 18 months prior to the initiation of construction or installation of any exascale-class computing facility, the Secretary shall transmit a plan to the Congress detailing—

"(i) the proposed facility's cost projections and capabilities to significantly accelerate the development of new energy technologies;

"(ii) technical risks and challenges that must be overcome to achieve successful completion and operation of the facility; and

"(iii) an independent assessment of the scientific and technological advances expected from such a facility relative to those expected from a comparable investment in expanded research and applications at terascale-class and petascale-class computing facilities, including an evaluation of where investments should be made in the system software and algorithms to enable these advances."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2495, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2495, the American Super Computing Leadership Act, requires the Department of Energy to develop a plan to bring the United States into the next generation of supercomputing, also known as exascale computing.

The Advanced Scientific Computing Research program at the Department of Energy is the primary Federal research and development program for these computing technology breakthroughs.

High-performance computing has enabled researchers to push beyond our previously understood scientific boundaries. This capability has solved major engineering challenges, ranging from the in-depth modeling of our nuclear weapons stockpile to increasing the fuel efficiency of cars. High-performance computing keeps the United States globally competitive.

The country with the strongest computing capability will host the world's next scientific breakthroughs. Unfortunately, China currently hosts the world's fastest computer, not the United States. This bill is a step in the right direction to reverse this trend and to help keep America on the forefront of supercomputing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for their initiative on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2495, the American Super Computing Leadership Act.

This bipartisan bill would authorize an exascale computing program to promote the development of the next generation of the fastest computers in the world right here in the United States. The bill would also help ensure that we develop the software and algorithms that help us to make the best use of these computers.

Exascale is often used interchangeably with "extreme scale" to refer to the next generation of supercomputers in general. It also refers to the computing systems that would be able to carry out a million trillion operations—that is a million trillion operations per second.

That is a 1 with 18 zeros after it. Now, that is about 500 times faster than the world's fastest computers today. Developing these capabilities is vital to maintaining our leadership in a wide range of research areas.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of Energy to support research to significantly increase the computing power available to sci-

entists from the Department of Energy, industry, universities, and other Federal agencies.

I would also like to note that there is no new money being authorized here. We are simply ensuring that we are making the best use of our resources when it comes to the money that we are already investing.

The capabilities made possible by these investments would enable our best and our brightest scientists to gain new insights into societal concerns, ranging from Alzheimer's disease to climate change.

Other examples of both industrial and academic research that would benefit from advancing high-end computing capabilities include high-temperature superconductivity to significantly reduce energy losses in the transmission of electricity, aerodynamic modeling for aircraft and vehicle design, pharmaceutical development, and fusion plasma modeling.

Finally, this legislation would also require that the Department of Energy submit a management plan, as well as regular reports to Congress that detail how the Department of Energy expects to implement this program, as well as its progress to date.

With this bipartisan legislation, we will be establishing a transparent program that will allow the United States to remain a leader in high-end computing. I expect that we may well reap benefits from this effort, even beyond what I have spoken about today and beyond the advances that any of us can now imagine.

I would like to take a moment to compliment the sponsors of this legislation, Mr. HULTGREN from Illinois and Mr. SWALWELL from California, for their efforts to craft this bipartisan bill we have before us today. I also thank Ms. LOFGREN from California and, of course, Science Committee Chairman SMITH for his support.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), who is a member of the Science Committee and also a member of the Science Committee's Energy Subcommittee.

Mr. HULTGREN. I would like to thank the distinguished chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from Texas, for helping this legislation come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2495, the American Super Computing Leadership Act, is an important update to a current statute which will ensure that America stays at the forefront of supercomputing technology for the benefits it brings to our national security, the economy, and, more broadly, our research capabilities as a Nation.

While America and American companies are still leading the way for much of this current technology, it is important to point out that the National University of Defense Technology, in China, is now housing the world's fastest supercomputer.

One of the Department of Energy's primary responsibilities within the National Nuclear Security Administration is the maintenance of our current nuclear stockpile. This stockpile stewardship responsibility is carried out with increasingly complex situations, especially as our stockpile has aged.

The need for improved parallelism, capabilities, and decreased energy requirements are spelled out in this legislation to ensure the Department carries out a targeted basic research program to overcoming the most pressing needs.

This legislation also points out and defines exascale as the next checkpoint to be accomplished. Exascale computers would exceed existing computing power by nearly 10,000 percent.

I would like to point out, however, that exascale cannot be seen as the end point. It is just a step toward the larger goal of American leadership in this field. This legislation will ensure that the broader scientific community has access to these facilities on a competitive merit review process.

The scientific drivers and the national security responsibilities should be the primary focus of this research, but we must also make sure that the crosscutting benefits of this research are not left at the wayside.

This legislation would create partnerships with universities, industry, and the national labs to conduct the research, ensuring that the Nation as a whole benefits from this research more quickly and efficiently.

In having the pleasure to represent the great State of Illinois, I have been able to witness how an ecosystem of innovation can best be fostered, and part of this is by making sure that our facilities are open to the public when it makes sense and does not interfere with the core missions of our Federal agencies and the labs.

I have been able to see how Fermilab, in my district, and Argonne National Lab, which is just down the road, carry out groundbreaking scientific research, but they also have unintended cross-over benefits, such as proton beam cancer therapy, which uses accelerators developed in our labs.

User facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, have given a tremendous research capability to pharmaceutical companies, where companies doing research that used to take weeks can often spend more time with samples in the mail than on the lab bench.

The computing capabilities this legislation will help bring about will have tremendous application in the health

care and drug development fields, and the modeling simulations this will make available will allow manufacturers to build better prototypes that have been tested thousands of times virtually before they come off the line. This is why I ask all of my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on this important legislation.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of that committee's Energy Subcommittee. He is also a former member of the Science Committee, so we appreciate his participation today.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the American Super Computing Leadership Act, H.R. 2495. I want to commend Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, and our chairman for their support of this great legislation.

As part of my representation of the great people of the Third District of Tennessee, Oak Ridge is right in the heart of my district. This is the city that won the cold war. This is the city which was the birthplace of the Manhattan Project.

These are wonderful people, and in that city sits the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, I believe one of the premier national labs in a great national lab system. Oak Ridge National Laboratory has been in the forefront of the leadership on high-speed computing.

I also want to commend our lab director, Dr. Thom Mason, for leading the way in supercomputing. His great successes in upgrading our computing facilities and in working with the other Department of Energy labs has been critical for the greater good of our Nation.

□ 1545

As my colleagues have already articulated, exascale is the next level. Right now, we are at a level called petaflop. Exascale is the next level.

Ladies and gentlemen, a short time ago, the United States was number one. During my tenure in Congress, a couple of years ago, it was number one in the world in supercomputing. I want to maintain that we move forward and become number one again. We cannot let the Chinese or any other nation beat us in this fight. It is critically important.

Why is exascale and supercomputing very important? I have actually seen these roomfuls of computers. It is critically important to our economic security as a Nation.

All Members of this great House want America to be great again, and supercomputing is going to lead the way. This is an economic security issue, as every area of our economy is

dependent on this. Banking, manufacturing, health care, commerce, and communication are all critically dependent on supercomputing.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their strong support of H.R. 2495, the American Super Computing Leadership Act.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2495, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5309) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “research,” after “warnings,”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to maintain full coverage of tsunami detection assets, and to reduce false alarms;”;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(6) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “and increase” and inserting “, increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for”; and

(B) by inserting “, including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami” after “approaching”;

(7) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “, including the Indian Ocean; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following:

“(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other coastal hazards; and”.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is amended by striking “Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region” and inserting “Atlantic Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico”.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section 4 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “established” and inserting “supported or maintained”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and safeguarding port and harbor operations” after “communities”;

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting “, including graphical warning products,” after “warnings”;

(B) by inserting “, territories,” after “States”; and

(C) by inserting “and Wireless Emergency Alerts” after “Hazards Program”; and

(4) in paragraph (8), by inserting “and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables” after “observing technologies”.

(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Subsection (c) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

“(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

“(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

“(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

“(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

“(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.”.

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—Subsection (d) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers, as part of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction, to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

“(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska, the continental United States, and the Caribbean;

“(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

“(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

“(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

“(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

“(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models to predict tsunami arrival times and flooding estimates.

“(E) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, and local government officials and the public.

“(F) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 5 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

“(G) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to researchers.

“(3) FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and ability to perform back-up duties for each other.

“(4) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—The National Weather Service shall coordinate with the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

“(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve; and

“(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts.

“(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

“(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c)—

“(i) reflect industry best practices;

“(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

“(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

“(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

“(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c); and

“(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system; and

“(D) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

“(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c).”.

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

“(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

“(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

“(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

“(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

“(3) ensure that the Administration’s operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.”.

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

“(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to acquire the agency’s assistance; and

“(B) to prioritize the necessary assets.”.

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Such section 4 is further amended by striking subsections (g) through (k).

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (d) and inserting the following:

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, shall conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.

“(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

“(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response,

evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment programs in affected areas.

“(3) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and nongovernmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

“(4) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments, using inundation models that meet programmatic standards for accuracy. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

“(A) The sources, sizes, and histories of tsunami in that region.

“(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

“(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes.

“(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

“(5) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

“(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

“(B) The development of decision support tools.

“(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

“(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

“(6) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including standards for—

“(A) mapping products;

“(B) inundation models; and

“(C) effective emergency exercises.

“(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (b), the program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) may include the following:

“(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

“(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

“(3) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems.

“(4) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

“(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

“(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

“(5) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, local and State government agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

“(d) NO PREEMPTION.—

“(1) DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

“(2) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.”.

(b) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMI-READY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “The Administrator shall” and all that follows through “establish or maintain” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State and territorial governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 11(b), and the panel under section 8(a), support or maintain”;

(2) by striking “and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—” and inserting the following: “assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained pursuant to subsection (a) shall—”;

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) consider other appropriate research to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which may include use of new generation Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration supercomputer capacity to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “include” and inserting “conduct”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PILOT PROJECT.—The Administrator may, pursuant to subsection (b), develop a pilot project for near-field tsunami forecast development for the Cascadia region along the west coast of the United States using new generation Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis, upcoming and exist-

ing cable networks, and new National Centers for Environmental Protection modeling capability.”.

SEC. 7. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance and training to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “establish” and inserting “support”; and

(ii) by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”.

SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 9; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

“SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate the Ocean Exploration Advisory Working Group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to serve as the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The working group designated under subsection (a) shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the working group designated pursuant to subsection (a) may be a Federal employee.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the working group designated under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

“(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

“(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working

group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).”.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 4(d)(6), 5(b)(6), and 6(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

(2) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 4 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203) can be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act, as redesignated by section 8(a)(1) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this Act \$27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, of which—

“(1) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities under the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program under section 5; and

“(2) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for the Tsunami Research Program under section 6.”.

SEC. 11. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

(b) COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall convene a coordinating committee to assist

the Administrator in the conduct of the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)).

(2) **COMPOSITION.**—The coordinating committee shall be composed of members from each of the States at risk from tsunami, and any other such representatives as the Administrator considers appropriate to represent Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local governments.

(3) **SUBCOMMITTEES.**—The Administrator may approve the formation of subcommittees to address specific program components or regional issues.

(4) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The coordinating committee shall—

(A) provide feedback on how funds should be prioritized to carry out the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a));

(B) ensure that areas described in section 4(c) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(c)) in the United States and its territories have the opportunity to participate in the program;

(C) provide recommendations to the Administrator on how to improve and continuously advance the TsunamiReady program, particularly on ways to make communities more tsunami resilient through the use of inundation maps and models and other hazard mitigation practices; and

(D) ensure that all components of the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)) are integrated with ongoing State-based hazard warning, risk management, and resilience activities, including—

(i) integrating activities with emergency response plans, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development programs in affected areas; and

(ii) integrating information to assist in tsunami evacuation route planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5309, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5309, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2014, amends and strengthens the Tsunami Warning and Education Act of 2006. It reauthorizes an important program at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and sharpens its focus on tsunami detection, forecasts, and warnings.

The recent absence of tsunami disasters here in the U.S. does not mean we should stand by as spectators. The threat is very real. The tsunami resulting from the 2011 earthquake in Japan

caused massive destruction and is a vivid reminder of the need for enhanced early warning capabilities.

Tsunamis pose a similar threat to America's coastline. They have the ability to injure Americans, damage property, and harm the economy.

This bill updates the tsunami forecasting and warning program operated by NOAA. It modernizes and enhances the accuracy of forecasts, improves standards and guidelines for mapping and modeling tsunamis, and supports research efforts related to tsunami science.

H.R. 5309 expands outreach responsibilities of the NOAA administrator to coordinate with State and local emergency managers to improve tsunami education and awareness. This will help develop resilient communities in the face of tsunamis and other coastal hazards.

This bill strengthens scientific research on these phenomena, fosters outreach programs, and advances technological forecasts to better understand and respond to disasters when they occur.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the vice chairman of the Science Committee; our Environment Subcommittee ranking member, Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon; and the ranking member of the full committee, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, for their initiative on this bipartisan legislation.

I really want to single out the gentleman from Oregon for her efforts on this particular subject. She has engaged this subject for the last several months, has been instrumental in our getting here to the floor today, and it is her initiative that is going to benefit the country.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5309, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation with me. I also want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. SMITH and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, for their support in moving this bill forward.

I also would like to thank the hard-working staff, my personal staff, Mr. ROHRBACHER's staff, and the dedicated committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their help with this bill.

Finally, I would like to thank the State and local emergency management officials, coastal zone managers, and the many scientists and other experts who have contributed their ideas to the development of this bill.

I have met with coastal community groups and emergency planners in my

district who are working on a number of fronts to prepare their communities for earthquake and tsunami events.

So much of our ability to prepare, respond, and recover from a tsunami will depend on awareness, planning, and mobilization at the local level. From the Federal agencies all the way down to local emergency managers, we all agree that adequately preparing communities across the country for the threat of natural disasters is of vital importance to the future of this country.

The Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2014 is an important step toward making sure that our coastal communities are ready to face the dangers posed by tsunami threats.

In 2004, the Sumatra-Andaman earthquake in Southeast Asia triggered a deadly tsunami event that claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of people from Indonesia to the coast of Madagascar, prompting Congress to enact the Tsunami Warning and Education Act of 2006.

We were reminded of the significant threat that a tsunami poses to U.S. coastal communities 3 years ago when the Tohoku earthquake near Japan created a devastating tsunami event. That tsunami resulted in the tragic loss of human life and billions of dollars of economic damage, which made it one of the costliest natural disasters we have ever seen, and its damage reached as far as the west coast of the United States—California and Oregon, to be specific.

The events in Indonesia and Japan underscore the importance of this legislation and why we must prepare and protect our coastal communities from similar events.

Maritime commercial activities, vibrant tourist industries, and more than 120 million Americans are all part of the rich coastal U.S. economy, an economy that contributed close to half of the entire U.S. GDP in 2011.

The commercial fishing industry alone supports about 1 million jobs, and the international trade associated with coastal and marine fisheries contributes close to \$70 billion annually to the U.S. economy. Likewise, more than 13 million Americans work at our commercial ports. They help to move the more than \$1 trillion worth of goods and products to the shelves of our local stores.

These examples show that investing in the resiliency of coastal communities is important to the economic health of not just these regions, but to the Nation. Ensuring that these coastal communities, big and small, have the resources and knowledge necessary to protect these critical aspects from the threat of a tsunami and be prepared, should one occur, is simply good and prudent policy.

Because this body collectively provides assistance when there is a natural disaster, like Superstorm Sandy,

for example, planning and preparation to avoid or minimize damage and destruction is important for all of us, whether or not we represent a coastal district.

Oregonians are aware of the threat that a tsunami would pose to their communities, and cities up and down the coast have responded by installing warning sirens and developing evacuation routes, but as newer warning technologies develop and more is understood about the areas that will be hit the hardest, a coordinated effort is required to update preparation and response.

In Tillamook County, Oregon, for example, they recently decided that warning sirens were not the way of the future, favoring the use of warning residents through social media and by phone instead.

Seaside, a small coastal town in my district, has been identified as the most vulnerable community to tsunami on the Oregon coast. In Seaside, local leaders and organizations are proactively educating residents and visitors about tsunami evacuation routes, storage supply locations, and emergency communication systems.

At the Federal level, we can help these communities understand the risks and seriousness of the threats they face and work with them to be prepared, which is why I sponsored this bill, along with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

H.R. 5309 will update and reauthorize the Tsunami Warning and Education Act and will help to ensure that local and regional decisionmakers have the tools and information they need to develop mitigation and response plans to this ever-present threat and to communicate these plans to the public in an effective and efficient manner.

For distant tsunami events, this legislation will advance research efforts related to improving tsunami forecasting, protection, and notification which could mean extra minutes for emergency responders on the ground and translate into lives saved and tragedies avoided, and it adds ports and harbor operations as entities to be safeguarded by tsunami forecasting capabilities.

This bill will also support research needed to improve our understanding of local tsunami events. A local tsunami, one that is generated just off the coast, has a travel time of about 30 minutes or less.

That is the kind of tsunami most likely to have widespread and devastating impacts on the U.S. coast and on the Caribbean. In Oregon, we know that a catastrophic Cascadia earthquake and tsunami will occur someday. Although no one can predict the next time the Cascadia fault will rupture, we can and must prepare.

At a recent Coastal Caucus event in Florence, Oregon, State-elected offi-

cials, tribal governments, community leaders, and business owners attended a panel discussion that focused on the threat posed by tsunami and how we are updating our response plans to reflect new understandings of subduction zone tsunami events. One thing everyone on the panel agreed on: it is not a matter of if, but when.

We have already learned a lot about how to prepare for, mitigate, and respond to tsunamis. I have no doubt that the progress we have made through NOAA's efforts under the Tsunami Warning and Education Act has enhanced the safety of our communities and will save lives, and this good work must be continued.

The coastlines of the United States already play an integral role in the economic prosperity of this country, and we must strengthen their preparedness and resiliency, so they can continue to play that role going forward. In this bipartisan bill, we recognize the need for continued protection of our coastal communities from the impacts of tsunami.

In closing, I want to say that September is National Preparedness Month. It is a reminder to everyone to make disaster preparedness a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I hope we can further this discussion and continue to find ways to build America's resiliency to tsunami and other natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5309, the "Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2014".

First, I want to thank the Ranking Member of the Environment Subcommittee, Ms. BONAMICI, for her work on this legislation and her commitment to maintaining the health and vitality of the Nation's oceans and coastal communities. I would also like to thank Mr. ROHRBACHER for joining her in this bipartisan effort. And finally, I want to thank the Chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. SMITH, for helping to move this bipartisan bill to the floor today.

Over 120 million Americans call the United States coastline their home. These coastal communities—from major cities to small towns—play a vital role in sustaining the American economy, supporting commercial fishing enterprises, tourism, and maritime commerce. In fact, approximately one-third of the U.S. gross domestic product has its origins in coastal areas. That is why the bill we are considering today is so important. It would reauthorize the Tsunami Warning and Education Act of 2006, and allow the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to continue to protect Americans and our coastal economies from the threat of tsunami.

This legislation is a perfect example of a familiar saying: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Our tsunami warning program has been effective over the last eight

years, but we must remain vigilant in our preparedness and continue to invest in the research and development, and education and outreach, necessary to improve the resiliency of our coastal communities to these destructive waves. We were reminded in 2004 in Sumatra, and again in 2011 in Japan, of the devastation that can be caused by a tsunami. Since the United States has not been struck by a major tsunami since 1964, I think it is useful to put the potential threat into perspective. I know I do not have to remind anyone of the amount of damage caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy. A single tsunami event in the United States could dwarf the devastation caused by either of those disasters.

Billions and billions of dollars in economic damages and countless lives are at risk if we do not maintain, and improve, our tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities. H.R. 5309 advances NOAA's research efforts to do just that and may ultimately add minutes of critical response time to tsunami warnings. The bill also recognizes that the results of NOAA's research must be translated into outreach and education activities at the state and local level. The effective and timely communication of threats is critical in mitigating the impacts of a natural disaster. Increased warning times are only effective if people know how to respond. I am pleased that this legislation emphasizes and supports local community preparedness.

Resiliency to natural disasters is an important part of strengthening the nation's economic security. I want to ensure that our coastal communities have the resources and tools they need to minimize the loss of life and property caused by a tsunami. Reauthorizing NOAA's tsunami activities by passing H.R. 5309 is a key step in helping to do just that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5309.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

STOPPING TAX OFFENDERS AND PROSECUTING IDENTITY THEFT ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 744) to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 744

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act of 2014" or the "STOP Identity Theft Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. USE OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RESOURCES WITH REGARD TO TAX RETURN IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General should make use of all existing resources of the Department of Justice, including any appropriate task forces, to bring more perpetrators of tax return identity theft to justice.

(b) *CONSIDERATIONS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.*—In carrying out this section, the Attorney General should take into account the following:

(1) The need to concentrate efforts in those areas of the country where the crime is most frequently reported.

(2) The need to coordinate with State and local authorities for the most efficient use of their laws and resources to prosecute and prevent the crime.

(3) The need to protect vulnerable groups, such as veterans, seniors, and minors (especially foster children) from becoming victims or otherwise used in the offense.

SEC. 3. VICTIMS OF IDENTITY THEFT MAY INCLUDE ORGANIZATIONS.

Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1028—

(A) in subsection (a)(7), by inserting “(including an organization)” after “another person”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(7), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or other person” after “specific individual”; and

(2) in section 1028A(a)(1), by inserting “(including an organization)” after “another person”.

SEC. 4. IDENTITY THEFT FOR PURPOSES OF TAX FRAUD.

Section 1028(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) during and in relation to a felony under section 7206 or 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

SEC. 5. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report that contains the following information:

(1) Information readily available to the Department of Justice about trends in the incidence of tax return identity theft.

(2) Recommendations on additional statutory tools that would aid in the effective prosecution of tax return identity theft.

(3) The status on implementing the recommendations of the Department’s March 2010 Audit Report 10-21 entitled “The Department of Justice’s Efforts to Combat Identity Theft”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 744, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Identity theft is a crime that leaves its victims feeling exposed and vulnerable while simultaneously inflicting serious financial damage upon them and the financial institutions and government agencies they do business with.

Unfortunately, identity theft is an expanding problem that has recently shifted its target to include the tax refund dollars owed to many hard-working Americans.

The Federal Trade Commission routinely issues statistics listing identity theft as the number one consumer complaint, with American adults having a roughly 1 in 5 chance of being victimized. Fraud related to government benefits and documents regularly comprises the large majority of identity theft reports.

The IRS has recognized the problem and begun shifting assets in response to this expanding threat. In a typical example from earlier this year in Norfolk, Virginia, two hospital workers were sentenced following their convictions for tax-related aggravated identity theft. Their scheme included stealing the personal information of hospital patients and using that information to apply for Federal tax refunds. All told, nearly 80 fraudulent returns were filed, seeking more than \$400,000 in illegitimate refunds.

For the victims of this type of fraud, the original notice is often a rejection by the IRS of their legitimate tax returns. Not surprisingly, this initial rejection is often only the beginning of a long and continuing road to financial recovery. In addition to the delays inherent in resolving their tax return dispute and receiving their refund, the months following the discovery of the identity theft are typically spent trying to restore their credit through an endless stream of paperwork, including police reports, affidavits to credit bureaus, and complaints to various consumer protection agencies.

Unfortunately, in Virginia and nationwide, this is a problem that is only growing in magnitude, partly due to the expanding methods used by criminals to gain access to personal information. From highly sophisticated cyber criminal organizations engaged in activities designed to gain access to personal data on a grand scale to individual cases involving a lost wallet or purse, the ways in which someone with criminal intent can obtain our personal information are too numerous to list.

The legislation before us today, the STOP Identity Theft Act of 2014, is designed to strengthen the penalties associated with tax-related identity theft. Additionally, H.R. 744 expands who can be a victim of tax-related identity theft to include businesses and organizations, directs the Justice De-

partment to allocate additional resources towards enforcement in this area, and encourages cooperation with State and local authorities through the establishment of task forces and otherwise.

I commend the sponsors, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Chairman SMITH, for their dedication to this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 744, the Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act, has laudable goals of addressing the growing problem of tax return identity theft. Unfortunately, in seeking to address one problem, the bill creates another one.

Last Congress, the Crime Subcommittee held a hearing at which we learned how individuals are victimized by those who file false returns using the names and Social Security numbers of the victims.

When someone has had a false return filed in their name, they often have to engage in an arduous process of setting the record straight with the IRS and obtaining a refund they may be due.

In other instances, perpetrators sometimes benefit by falsely claiming that a deceased child of another is a dependent on their own forms. Parents of the deceased children are then subjected to the additional grief and burden of clearing things up with the IRS.

As a longstanding advocate of personal privacy and personal privacy rights, I am particularly concerned about these schemes which violate the privacy of individuals in addition to imposing financial burdens.

Clearly, we need to do more to combat this type of crime. Accordingly, I support the approach in section 2 of the bill, which encourages the Department of Justice, using task forces, to bring its resources to bear on the problem of tax return identity theft. Increased effort in investigating and prosecuting these crimes is certainly necessary, and Congress should work to provide additional resources to support our agents and prosecutors.

Unfortunately, another provision in the bill raises serious concerns by expanding mandatory minimum sentencing. The bill amends both the basic identity theft statute and the aggravated identity theft statute so that organizations, and not just individuals, may be covered as victims.

Expanding the scope of victims under the aggravated identity theft statute, thus, also expands the scope of mandatory penalties under the statute, section 1028A of title 18. The penalty for aggravated identity theft is a mandatory term of imprisonment of 2 years or, for an offense related to terrorism, 5 years. While I oppose this expansion

of the mandatory minimum sentences, I do not oppose the imposition of appropriate sentences for this offense as warranted under the circumstances of each case.

With respect to the proposed expansion of the coverage of the aggravated identity theft statute to organizations, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, offered an amendment at markup to narrowly prevent application of mandatory sentences to the expansion, but instead allow for even higher sentences for those offenses, but at the judges' discretion. As a result, judges would have the flexibility to impose even greater sentences, when warranted, but they would not be required to impose mandatory minimums. Unfortunately, the amendment was not adopted, leaving H.R. 744 with a serious flaw that violates sound sentencing policy.

Mandatory minimums have been studied extensively and have been found to distort rational sentencing systems to discriminate against minorities, to waste the taxpayers' money, and to often violate common sense. Even if everyone involved in a case—from arresting officer, prosecutor, judge, and victim—believes that the mandatory minimum would be an unjust sentence for a particular defendant in a case, it still must be imposed.

Mandatory minimum sentences, sometimes based merely on the name of the crime, unwisely remove sentencing discretion from the judge. Regardless of the role of the offender in the particular crime, the offender's record or lack thereof, or the facts and circumstances of the case, the judge has no choice but to impose the mandatory minimum set by legislators long before the crime has been committed. Such a policy is unjust and unwarranted. The expansion of mandatory minimum sentencing in this bill is, therefore, problematic.

For these reasons, I cannot support this well-intentioned but flawed bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding me time, and I also want to thank him for bringing this bill to the House floor today.

H.R. 744, the STOP Identity Theft Act, is a bicameral, bipartisan solution that curbs the rapidly increasing problem of tax return identity theft. I am the original cosponsor of this bill, with Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who has long taken the initiative on this pressing subject.

The STOP Identity Theft Act increases criminal penalties for tax return ID theft. The bill also broadens the definition of identity theft victims to include businesses and nonprofit organizations.

In recent years, tax thieves have received billions of dollars in fraudulent tax returns. These criminals have become proficient in stealing identity information and Social Security numbers to file false tax returns with the IRS, oftentimes before the legitimate taxpayer files a return themselves. It is only after a tax return is rejected that the victim learns that their identity has been stolen and their tax return wrongfully pocketed.

H.R. 744 is crucial to deter the number of individuals and families who are victimized by ID tax thieves. Identity theft costs victims both money and time to restore their identities.

The House previously adopted this bill by voice vote in the last Congress. This past February, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed a companion bill to the STOP Identity Theft Act by Senators KLOBUCHAR and SESSIONS. So I urge my colleagues again to join me in support of H.R. 744 to protect American taxpayers.

I thank the Judiciary Committee chairman again, Mr. GOODLATTE, for bringing this legislation to the House floor and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for her efforts to stop tax identity theft.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida, the Honorable DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 744, the Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act of 2014 or, simply, the STOP Identity Theft Act.

Over the past several years, we have all witnessed the crime of tax return theft explode into a nationwide epidemic. It is time for Congress to act and let would-be thieves know that there will be serious consequences if they engage in this crime.

Thank you to Congressman LAMAR SMITH for leading this effort with me over the past 3 years. I hope that we can finally get this legislation over the finish line so law enforcement has more tools in the fight against crime. Working with our Senate sponsors, Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR and Senator JEFF SESSIONS, I know that we can get this done.

Thank you to Chairman GOODLATTE and to his intrepid staffer Caroline Lynch for your support and your leadership to help bring this bill to the floor today.

We have all heard stories of tax refund thefts. An unsuspecting taxpayer goes to file their tax return only to be

told by the Internal Revenue Service that someone else has already filed their return and claimed their hard-earned tax refund.

□ 1615

Tax return identity theft wreaks emotional and financial havoc on hard-working taxpayers and costs the Federal Government billions of dollars.

According to a recent Treasury Department report, the number of stolen tax return refunds skyrocketed in just the last year—going from approximately 1.1 million stolen returns in 2011 to more than 1.8 million in 2012—a 69 percent increase. And the cost to the U.S. Treasury and the American taxpayers is staggering—nearly \$9 billion in just the last 2 years and \$21 billion in the last 5 years, Mr. Speaker.

We cannot allow billions of taxpayer dollars to be stolen from hardworking Americans and from our Treasury. This will only get worse unless we act.

We also must protect the thousands of taxpayers that fall victim to this crime, many of whom are vulnerable groups like seniors, veterans, and minors. Seniors in my south Florida community have been particularly hard-hit by this crime, and I simply couldn't stand by and let it continue.

Even though victims of tax return theft eventually are reimbursed by the U.S. Treasury, it can take many months and a lot of frustration to set things straight. Many of these victims rely on a timely tax return just to pay the bills.

These tax return identity thieves hide behind a veil of technology by stealing Social Security numbers and filing false electronic returns where the payoffs are almost instantaneous. Right now, more thieves and criminal organizations are turning to this lucrative crime because law enforcement lacks the kind of stiff criminal penalties afforded many other forms of identity theft. In this instance, technology has simply outstripped the enforcement tools currently on the books. The STOP Identity Theft Act brings together several measures to strengthen criminal penalties and increase the prosecution rate of tax return identity thieves.

First, this bill amends the identity theft statute to increase the maximum penalties for the crime of tax return identity theft. Right now, this crime is seen as low risk and high reward for would-be thieves. Toughening sentencing for tax return identity thieves will help deter this kind of crime.

The legislation also expands the definition of "identity theft victim" to include businesses and charitable organizations. Often, these organizations have their identities stolen and they are used in "phishing" schemes to extract the sensitive information from unsuspecting taxpayers used in tax return thefts. These thieves then use the

harvested information to file thousands of fraudulent tax returns.

This amendment to the identity theft statutes will ensure that thieves who misappropriate the identities of any business, be it a small business or a nonprofit organization, can be prosecuted. The STOP Identity Theft Act also calls for better coordination between the Department of Justice and State and local law enforcement to make the most efficient use of the law and resources.

My own local law enforcement agencies in south Florida have been inundated with crime reports of tax return identity theft, and they need all the help we can provide.

This legislation is not the end-all, be-all to the congressional efforts to combat tax return identity theft, but it is a strong, bipartisan beginning. It is intended to provide targeted tools to law enforcement right away so that they are better prepared before next tax season rolls around.

Finally, the legislation also calls for DOJ to report back on trends in tax return identity theft, on progress in prosecuting these crimes, and recommendations for additional legal tools to combat it.

Information and data on trends about tax return identity theft can be valuable tools to detect and prevent future fraud, and it will inform Congress of additional legislative actions that will help in the effort.

I also send a big thank you to the various organizations that have supported and helped craft this legislation, including the National Conference of CPA Practitioners, the Committee for Efficient Government, the American Coalition for Taxpayer Rights, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National Association of Counties.

Together, we all must ensure that Federal laws keep pace with emerging crimes such as tax return identity theft. It is time to make the prosecution of this crime a greater priority. The STOP Identity Theft Act is an important step towards this goal, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 744, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3109) to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaskan Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3109

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION FROM PROHIBITIONS FOR ALASKAN NATIVE ARTICLES CONTAINING MIGRATORY BIRD PARTS.

Section 2 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXEMPTION FOR AUTHENTIC ALASKAN NATIVE ARTICLES OF HANDICRAFT OR CLOTHING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, nothing in this Act prohibits possession, offering for sale, sale, offering to barter, barter, offering to purchase, purchase, delivery for shipment, shipment, causing to be shipped, delivered for transportation, transport or causing to be transported, carrying or causing to be carried, or receiving for shipment, transportation, or carriage, any authentic Alaskan Native article of handicraft or clothing on the basis that it contains a nonedible migratory bird part.

“(2) LIMITATION.—This subsection shall not apply with respect to any handicraft or clothing containing any part of a migratory bird that was taken in a wasteful manner.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ALASKAN NATIVE.—The term ‘Alaskan Native’ means any Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo who resides in Alaska.

“(B) AUTHENTIC ALASKAN NATIVE ARTICLE OF HANDICRAFT OR CLOTHING.—The term ‘authentic Alaskan Native article of handicraft or clothing’—

“(i) means any item that is—

“(I) composed wholly or in some significant respect of natural materials; and

“(II) produced, decorated, or fashioned by an Alaskan Native, in the exercise of traditional Alaskan Native handicrafts, without the use of any pantograph or other mass copying device; and

“(ii) includes any weaving, carving, stitching, sewing, lacing, beading, drawing, or painting described in clause (i), or any combination thereof.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since 1918, the United States has signed four migratory bird treaties with Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. In 1997, the Canada and Mexico treaties were revised to allow Alaska Natives to harvest for subsistence use protected migratory birds during the so-called closed season.

Unfortunately, when implementing the treaty language, Congress failed to clarify that the nonedible parts of the harvested migratory bird could be sold in commercial products. As a result, what we have today is a bizarre policy that allows Alaska Natives to hunt, kill, consume, and to also use nonedible parts in handicraft items, but prohibits them from selling those handicrafts.

However, the Fish and Wildlife Service has now decided to cite Alaska Native artists who use migratory bird feathers in a variety of items, including hats, fans, and hunting arrows. It is not illegal to simply throw away these nonedible migratory bird parts.

According to Ms. Jacqueline Pata, the vice chair of the Sealaska Corporation, there are less than 500 traditional artists and a much fewer number that use nonedible parts of migratory birds. In her testimony, she noted that this legislation parallels the existing exemption in the Marine Mammal Protection Act and that “all we are asking is to be able to begin helping ourselves in a very small way by providing a modest income to severely impoverished communities through a traditional means.”

Mr. Speaker, the Fish and Wildlife Service could have revised their regulations, they could have worked with the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-Management Council, and they could have continued to utilize their law enforcement discretion. In each case, they chose not to; instead, they decided to penalize a Native Alaskan artist who used raven and flicker feathers gathered from road-killed animals.

This is a misguided and wrong policy. This is why I introduced this important legislation on behalf of my Native Alaskan constituents.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 3109, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide an exemption to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the MBTA, for the sale of Alaskan Native handicrafts that seems consistent with exemptions provided to Alaska Natives in other important conservation laws, like the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

However, the MBTA is distinct from these other laws because it actually implements four separate treaties between the United States and Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia; and it remains unclear if amending the MBTA, as proposed by Mr. YOUNG's bill, would violate our treaty obligations to the other implementing nations.

During our legislative hearing on this bill, the committee heard testimony from the Fish and Wildlife Service that the State Department should be consulted on any proposed amendments to the MBTA. However, we have not heard from the Fish and Wildlife Service or the State Department since that time.

I support the rights of Alaskan Natives to create and sell traditional handicrafts. So while I feel it is important that we consider the impact that this bill may have on other existing treaty obligations, I will support this bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3109.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4283) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4283

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MAINTENANCE OR REPLACEMENT OF FACILITIES AND STRUCTURES AT SMITH GULCH.

Section 3(a)(24)(D) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(24)(D)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary shall also authorize or continue to authorize maintenance or replacement of facilities and structures listed in this subparagraph for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch whose location is defined above. The facilities and structures referred to in this subparagraph are—

"(i) motorized landscaping equipment, such as lawnmowers and weed trimmers;

"(ii) chainsaws;

"(iii) gasoline-powered electrical generators and associated electrical transmission facilities;

"(iv) hydroelectric generators and associated electrical transmission facilities;

"(v) gasoline-powered water pumps for fire suppression;

"(vi) transition from propane to electrical lighting;

"(vii) solar energy systems; and

"(viii) 6-volt or 12-volt battery banks for power storage."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, timely action on this bill will allow the Forest Service to implement an earlier congressional action intended to allow continued operation of certain commercial recreational services and facilities at Smith Gulch in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness in Idaho.

Although Congress amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in 2004 to direct the Forest Service to allow established uses and occupancy at Smith Gulch Lodge, the Forest Service believes it needs additional authority to allow the lodge to use power equipment, such as gas generators, mowers, and other equipment needed for routine maintenance and for improvements, such as an in-stream hydroelectric water wheel for renewable energy. H.R. 4283 would authorize limited use of such equipment for the general upkeep of the lodge.

Congressman SIMPSON should be commended for his attention to this matter, and I urge adoption of this commonsense bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the lodge at Smith Gulch is located within the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness in the State of Idaho. It is a popular destination for visitors and offers recreational opportunities for people in a spectacular natural setting.

H.R. 4283 will allow the lodge owners to carry out very specific maintenance activities necessary to keep the lodge operating. I support this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4283, which is intended to authorize the use of maintenance equipment and the replacement of some outdated and potentially hazardous energy facilities at the River of No Return Lodge in Smith Gulch on the Salmon River in Idaho.

As it currently sits, the River of No Return Lodge is a small outfitter on the Salmon River that provides a unique recreational experience operating under a Forest Service permit.

Unfortunately, the Forest Service does not believe it has clear authorization to permit the use of necessary maintenance or replacement of facilities. This proposed bill is an effort to clarify Congress' intent in legislation passed in 2004 to retain the basic characteristics of the lodge without substantially altering the existing use.

This legislation makes it clear that the owners of the lodge are authorized to use weed trimmers, chainsaws, and other maintenance equipment needed for the general upkeep of the lodge.

It also will allow the outfitter to reduce or eliminate his reliance on propane fuel and replace it with modest renewable energy sources. I believe H.R. 4283 keeps recreational opportunities available on our public lands, while maintaining the ability to keep our lands in even better shape for future generations of Americans. The Congressional Budget Office has also scored this bill at no cost to the taxpayer.

It should be noted that a few small changes were made during the markup of H.R. 4283 to address both the technical corrections and concerns raised by interested parties. The bill, as amended, has been crafted with the sentiments of both the Idaho Conservation League and The Wilderness Society in mind.

We trust that the Forest Service will faithfully grant authorization for the maintenance and replacement activities without the burden of unreasonable environmental review costs.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that has been carefully crafted with the stakeholders' views in mind, so the operator

of the River of No Return Lodge can perform the fundamental maintenance and replace outdated energy sources needed to carry out this small business with respect to the existing law.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I can only compliment the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for his work on this legislation, and it is a practical solution to a problem. Again, I agree with him.

I hope that there is an expedited process which we can fulfill our obligations to this lodge owner and, of course, the intent of the act itself and that the Congress had intended so this could continue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4283, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION ON LAND FORMERLY A PART OF ACADIA NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4527) to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. USE RESTRICTION REMOVED.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the conveyance, for school purposes, of certain land in Acadia National Park to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes", approved August 1, 1950, is amended by adding at the end the following: "Lands conveyed to the town of Tremont, Maine, under the Act known as NPS Tract 06-126, which were conveyed by the National Park Service in deed recorded at the Hancock County Registry of Deeds Book 737 Page 467, National Park Service Deed 377, shall no longer be required to be used exclusively and perpetually for school purposes and upon the discontinuance of such use of said land, or any part thereof, shall no longer be required to revert to the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman

from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, enacted in 1950, Public Law 81-629 permitted the National Park Service to convey property, formerly part of Acadia National Park, to the town of Tremont, Maine, to build a new school.

In 1951, the Secretary of the Interior completed the conveyance of approximately 8 acres with a clause that specified the land would revert back to the United States if it was not used exclusively for school purposes.

Tremont is now consolidating schools with a nearby town, and the property will no longer be used for the original intended purpose. However, Tremont would like to retain ownership and continue to use the developed property in the best interest of the community.

H.R. 4527 removes the requirement that the land be used exclusively and perpetually for school purposes, allowing Tremont to use the property to the maximum benefit of its residents.

The Natural Resources Committee has consistently sought to assist local communities in gaining control of property within their boundaries by freeing them from Federal interference. Communities around the country would benefit significantly and immediately if the example of H.R. 4527 was replicated by Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the town of Tremont, Maine, was granted a parcel of Federal land to build a school in 1950. The town, which is adjacent to Acadia National Park, no longer needs the parcel for school purposes and would like to be able to consider other uses.

H.R. 4527 will remove the restrictions on the parcel, and its passage is a priority for the town and the bill's sponsor, Mr. MICHAUD of Maine. I would like to thank and congratulate my colleague from Maine for his work on this bill on behalf of his constituents.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume

to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. As you heard, this legislation would allow the town of Tremont, Maine, to continue to use public land that has been continuously maintained for more than six decades.

In 1950, Congress transferred a parcel of land from Acadia National Park to the Town of Tremont so the town could build and maintain a school. Unfortunately, what might have been best for the Park Service and the community in 1950 might not be best for either in 2014.

Due to demographic changes, Tremont has explored the possibility of merging its elementary school with another in a neighboring town. Under the terms of the original agreement, if Tremont were to stop using the land for school purposes, the land would be transferred back to the Federal Government.

Complicating the situation is legislation passed by Congress in 1986 that established a permanent boundary for Acadia National Park. The permanent boundary did not include the tract of land containing the school. As a result, any changes in usage would require transfer to the General Services Administration.

This legislation would simply remove any restriction on the land, which would allow the community to continue utilizing the land as it sees fit. Acadia National Park supports this legislation; GSA has no objection.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Chairmen HASTINGS and BISHOP and Ranking Members DeFAZIO and GRIJALVA for their support for this remedy of this issue, and I would like to thank the committees on both sides of the aisle for supporting this issue.

I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. With that, I yield back the balance of my time also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4527.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 110-229

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4751) to make technical corrections to Public Law 110-229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge

Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4751

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BAINBRIDGE ISLAND JAPANESE AMERICAN EXCLUSION MEMORIAL.

Section 313 of the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-229) is amended as follows:

(1) In the heading of subsection (b), by striking “JAPANESE AMERICAN MEMORIAL” and inserting “JAPANESE AMERICAN EXCLUSION MEMORIAL”.

(2) In the heading of subsection (c)(5)(C), by striking “JAPANESE AMERICAN MEMORIAL” and inserting “JAPANESE AMERICAN EXCLUSION MEMORIAL”.

(3) In subsection (c)(5)(C), by striking “Japanese American Memorial” and inserting “Japanese American Exclusion Memorial”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4751 makes technical corrections to reflect a change in the name of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Memorial. The site will now be known as Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial to reflect a new name adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park and Recreation District in Kitsap County, Washington.

This legislation has no cost and is only a change in the name, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4751 changes the name of Bainbridge Island Japanese American Memorial in Washington State to the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial.

The addition of the word “exclusion” is significant, as it acknowledges the true purpose of the memorial: to recognize and honor the 276 Japanese Americans living on the island who were relocated and interned after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

When Congress adjusted the boundary of the Minidoka National Historic Site to include the site, the name Con-

gress used was the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Memorial. At the request of the Bainbridge Island community and owners of the memorial, H.R. 4751 amends the name to reflect the memorial’s official name.

I would like to thank Representative KILMER for sponsoring this bill and working to get it through the committee process. This name change is important for the Bainbridge Island community and the integrity of the memorial.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. KILMER), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My legislation would make technical corrections to a 2008 law to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial.

I would also like to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA, as well as Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO, for their efforts to move this legislation through their committee and ensure that Congress is properly recognizing this memorial.

The Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 included the site now known as the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial as a unit of a national historic site. The memorial was established to recognize the historical injustice that was committed against the Japanese American community on Bainbridge Island.

In the wake of this surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, facing fears about potential threats among people of Japanese heritage, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, forcing more than 120,000 people with Japanese ancestry to leave their homes, leave their jobs, their neighbors, their friends, and their communities. They were forced to travel great distances in order to be held indefinitely in one of ten relocation centers.

This order, now rightly denounced, first went into effect on March 30, 1942, when more than 200 residents of Bainbridge Island, Washington, were forced to leave their homes, gather at Eagledeale Ferry Dock, and then were transported to a so-called relocation center. These individuals, many of them American citizens, committed no crimes, yet were deprived of their rights simply because of who they were.

Just recently, I had the honor of visiting this memorial and meeting with local Japanese American survivors who were forced to stay at these relocation camps for years before finally moving back to their homes. They told me

their stories. Some were just little kids when it all happened, no older than my daughters are today. Some were older, teenagers and young adults.

The memorial tells their stories. The day I met with them I heard their stories, many of them were heartbreaking: the pain that they and their families experienced coming home to the family farm to find that you had to start over from scratch; in some instances, the painful reality, the constant reminder of having received a high school diploma from an internment camp; the challenges of coming back to a community.

Some of the Japanese American survivors told stories of hope, of coming home and having had a neighbor take care of the farm or of having many in the Bainbridge Island community welcome them back with open arms.

While the particular stories are different, there are some basic realities. This is a dark chapter in our Nation’s history. We have an obligation to ensure that future generations remember what took place so that these mistakes are not repeated.

Today the National Park Service manages three national historic sites related to the Japanese American incarceration. The Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, which was included in 2008, is the only site administered by the Park Service that commemorates the forcible removal of Japanese Americans.

In April of this year, the Bainbridge Island City Council and the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park and Recreation District, which jointly own the memorial, officially renamed it the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial.

In order to eliminate any confusion and ensure that the official name of the site is formally recognized, H.R. 4751 would update the law to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial. Not only will this name properly respect the unjustified and discriminatory treatment faced by this community, it will also bring greater attention to the beautiful site commemorating this difficult history.

I want to thank the many local leaders and community organizations who have worked in this for so many years. I am hopeful that we can move this effort forward for them, for our ancestors, and for future generations.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment Mr. KILMER on his legislation. I am one of the few people on this floor who lived through that period of time. The reason I remembered it, I was 10 years old. My father happened to be from California—and I myself was born and raised in California—went to the local farm bureau and caused a great disturbance because they started putting Japanese into internment camps, and he actually stood

up in that meeting and said, I don't see any Germans serving in internment camps.

It was an unjust thing. Not only were they interned, their property was seized. We have never had a black eye in our history of the United States such as we had during that period of time.

I just hope people in America realize it can happen again. We have to be very aware of what we actually have from people when they are under stress or when they are under, they think, attack by fellow Americans.

So, I compliment you on this legislation. I did have an individual—actually, three individuals—from Alaska that I know of that served on that island during that period of time. So again, I compliment you, Mr. KILMER, for your work on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I just also want to thank Representative KILMER for bringing forth this very important bill. Hopefully, this will be another step towards closure in this very—as Representative YOUNG mentioned, this tremendous injustice that occurred in this Nation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4751.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

APPROVAL OF MEMORIAL TO COMMEMORATE SLAVES AND FREE BLACK PERSONS WHO FOUGHT IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 120

Whereas section 8908(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code, provides that the location of a commemorative work in Area I, as

depicted on the map entitled “Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs”, numbered 869/86501 B, and dated June 24, 2003, shall be deemed to be authorized only if a recommendation for that location is approved by law not later than 150 calendar days after Congress is notified of the recommendation;

Whereas section 2860 of Public Law 112-239 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note) authorized the National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in Area I or Area II, as depicted on such map, to honor the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for American independence in the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Administrator of General Services has notified Congress of the Administrator's determination that such memorial should be located in Area I: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the location of a commemorative work to honor the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought in the American Revolution, authorized by section 2860 of division B of Public Law 112-239 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note), within Area I as described on the map entitled “Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs”, numbered 869/86501 B and dated June 24, 2003, is approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the joint resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012 Congress authorized a National Mall Liberty Fund to establish a memorial on Federal land to honor the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who served as soldiers and sailors or provided civilian assistance during the American Revolution.

Under the Commemorative Works Act, memorials must be recommended by the Government Service Administration for placement within what is known as Area I, which is generally the location around The National Mall in Washington. A recommendation may be issued if the Administrator finds a proposed memorial is of preeminence and of lasting significance.

On June 3, 2014, the GSA Administrator notified the Natural Resources Committee he found the proposed National Liberty Memorial to be of lasting significance. Under current law, once this notification is delivered, Con-

gress has 150 days to concur with the finding. H.J. Res. 120 provides the necessary concurrence and allows this privately funded project to move forward. Again, I know of no Federal funds that will be used in this memorial.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., and The National Mall are where we honor our Nation's heroes and commemorate our most significant achievements. An important chapter in our history which has yet to be fully recognized is the contribution and the sacrifice of the over 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought to free the Colonies in our Nation's War of Independence. These brave, selfless men must not be forgotten and are certainly deserving of our lasting recognition. That is why in 2003 after years of debate and effort, Congress authorized the National Liberty Memorial.

The National Liberty Memorial will serve as an important remembrance. I am very pleased that we are able to consider this bill today. When Congress authorizes the establishment of a memorial in Washington, D.C., it then takes years of planning to select a design and location. Fortunately, for the Liberty Memorial, a site has been selected. One of the last hurdles is approval from Congress, and with the adoption of H.J. Res. 120, that is why and what we are here to do today.

□ 1800

Getting this far would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of the bill's sponsor, Representative BUTTERFIELD from North Carolina. I would like to thank him and congratulate him for his work and look forward to soon visiting the new National Liberty Memorial.

We support this legislation and thank the majority for bringing it up for consideration. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. First, I want to thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL, for those kind words and thank you for your leadership. Thank you for yielding time today and for working very hard to bring this important resolution to the House floor. I also appreciate the work of the Natural Resources Committee chairman, DOC HASTINGS, and Ranking Member PETE DEFAZIO, and you, Mr. YOUNG, for considering this resolution expeditiously and for seeing that it was favorably reported by the committee.

Also, let me thank Senator CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut, who used to

serve in this body and now serves in the United States Senate, for introducing a companion bill in the Senate. His support is critical, and I thank him for his commitment to this important issue. I hope that the Senate will act as expeditiously and in as bipartisan a fashion as has the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 120, a bill that I introduced that will formally approve the location that was selected by the Administrator of the General Services Administration of a memorial that will recognize the thousands of slaves and free persons of color, or as historians sometimes refer to, free Negroes, who fought for independence during the American Revolution.

Federal law requires, Mr. Speaker, that the location for the memorial identified by the Administrator of GSA be formally approved by Congress within 150 days of receiving the recommendation by the GSA Administrator.

The memorial that will eventually be constructed to honor tens of thousands of slaves and free people of color who helped to secure American independence during the Revolution will be a fitting tribute to their heroic actions that helped shape the very foundation of our Nation.

For generations, historians estimated that at least 5,000 African Americans—both slave and free—fought for American independence. Revised estimates now show more than 10,000 brave men joined the fight. At least 252 of these patriots came from North Carolina, and at least 109 of those came from my congressional district, the counties of Bertie, Chowan, Craven, Edgecombe, Franklin, Granville, Halifax, Hertford, Northampton, Pasquotank, and Perquimans.

The president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution wrote of the brave souls who fought for freedom when they themselves were not free that “they deserve special recognition in order to help better educate our country.”

In 2008, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution published landmark research containing the names and communities of these African American patriots. The research is continuously updated with the discovery of new heroes. Scores of African American men and women have been accepted by heritage societies that had not been previously open to their membership.

The desire to honor these brave men and their descendants in a permanent and meaningful way had long been championed by a distinguished Member of this body who has since passed away, Congressman Donald Payne, Sr. Congressman Payne introduced authorizing language as far back as 2005.

After Congressman Payne’s death, I have worked to get this effort to the finish line, guided by his words that “this memorial is an important chapter in the reclamation of African American history.”

There are over 2 million descendants of these Revolutionary War patriots nationwide. This eventual memorial will show the Nation, and it will show the world, Mr. Speaker, that the sacrifices and heroic efforts of African Americans—both slave and free—who took up arms to secure America’s independence are not forgotten. It will permanently affirm what we know to be true: these patriots and their service to our then-infant Nation will forever be of preeminent historical and lasting significance to our country that they fought to create.

Again, I thank you for the time, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Representative BUTTERFIELD from North Carolina for helping us get this across the finish line.

We are really going to honor these brave Americans, both slaves and free blacks, who fought for American independence, and I think this is a wonderful bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 120.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5089, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5019, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4283, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DANIEL M. FERGUSON POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5089) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the “Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

YEAS—401

Aderholt	Chaffetz	Enyart
Amash	Chu	Eshoo
Amodei	Cicilline	Esty
Bachus	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold
Barber	Clay	Farr
Barletta	Cleaver	Fattah
Barr	Clyburn	Fincher
Barrow (GA)	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Coffman	Fleischmann
Bass	Cohen	Fleming
Beatty	Cole	Flores
Becerra	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Benishek	Collins (NY)	Portenberry
Bentivolio	Conaway	Foster
Bera (CA)	Connolly	Fox
Bilirakis	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Franks (AZ)
Black	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cotton	Fudge
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gabbard
Bonamici	Cramer	Galleo
Boustany	Crawford	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Garcia
Brady (TX)	Crowley	Gardner
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Garrett
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gerlach
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Daines	Gibson
Broun (GA)	Davis (CA)	Gingrey (GA)
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Gohmert
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Buchanan	DeFazio	Gosar
Bucshon	DeGette	Gowdy
Burgess	Delaney	Granger
Bustos	DeLauro	Graves (GA)
Butterfield	DelBene	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Denham	Grayson
Calvert	Dent	Green, Al
Camp	DeSantis	Green, Gene
Campbell	Deutch	Griffin (AR)
Capito	Diaz-Balart	Griffith (VA)
Capps	Doggett	Grimm
Capuano	Doyle	Guthrie
Cardenas	Duckworth	Hahn
Carney	Duffy	Hall
Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hanabusa
Carter	Duncan (TN)	Hanna
Cartwright	Edwards	Harper
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Hartzler
Castro (TX)	Ellmers	Hastings (FL)
Chabot	Engel	Hastings (WA)

Heck (NV) McDermott
 Heck (WA) McGovern
 Herrera Beutler McHenry
 Higgins McIntyre
 Himes McKeon
 Hinojosa McKinley
 Holding McMorris
 Holt Rodgers
 Honda McNerney
 Horsford Meadows
 Hoyer Meehan
 Hudson Meeks
 Huelskamp Messer
 Huffman Mica
 Huizenga (MI) Michaud
 Hultgren Miller (FL)
 Hunter Miller (MI)
 Hurt Miller, George
 Israel Moore
 Issa Mullin
 Jackson Lee Mulvaney
 Jeffries Murphy (FL)
 Jenkins Murphy (PA)
 Johnson (GA) Napolitano
 Johnson (OH) Negrete McLeod
 Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer
 Johnson, Sam Noem
 Jolly Nolan
 Jones Nugent
 Jordan Nunes
 Joyce O'Rourke
 Kaptur Olson
 Keating Owens
 Kelly (PA) Palazzo
 Kennedy Pallone
 Kildee Pascarell
 Kilmer Paulsen
 Kind Payne
 King (NY) Pearce
 Kingston Pelosi
 Kinzinger (IL) Perlmutter
 Kirkpatrick Perry
 Kline Peters (CA)
 Kuster Peterson
 Labrador Petri
 LaMalfa Pingree (ME)
 Lamborn Pittenger
 Lance Pitts
 Langevin Pocan
 Lankford Poe (TX)
 Larsen (WA) Polis
 Latham Pompeo
 Latta Posey
 Levin Price (GA)
 Lewis Price (NC)
 Lipinski Quigley
 LoBiondo Rahall
 Loeb sack Rangel
 Lofgren Reed
 Long Reichert
 Lowenthal Renacci
 Lowey Ribble
 Lucas Rice (SC)
 Luetkemeyer Richmond
 Lujan Grisham Rigell
 (NM) Roby
 Luján, Ben Ray Roe (TN)
 (NM) Rogers (AL)
 Lummis Rogers (KY)
 Lynch Rogers (MI)
 Maffei Rohrabacher
 Maloney, Carolyn Rokita
 Maloney, Sean Rooney
 Marchant Ros-Lehtinen
 Marino Roskam
 Massie Ross
 Matheson Rothfus
 Matsui Roybal-Allard
 McAllister Royce
 McCarthy (CA) Runyan
 McCarthy (NY) Ruppersberger
 McCaul Ryan (OH)
 McClintock Ryan (WI)
 McCollum Salmon

NOT VOTING—30

Bachmann Dingell
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva
 Bishop (UT) Gutiérrez
 Cassidy Harris
 Clark (MA) Hensarling
 Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL)
 Cook King (IA)
 DesJarlais Larson (CT)

Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

Peters (MI)
 Ruiz

□ 1856

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIALIST THEODORE MATTHEW GLENDE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5019) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

YEAS—399

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NY)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Carson (IN)

Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clawson (FL)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Deutch

Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McAllister
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum

Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McAllister
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Napolitano
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Petri
 Peters (CA)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce

Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Waxman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—32

Bachmann
 Barber
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Cassidy
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cook
 DesJarlais

Dingell
Garcia
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hensarling
Kelly (IL)
King (IA)

Lee (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Miller, Gary
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Nunnelee

Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tierney
Velázquez

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
McGovern
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBando
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—32

Bachmann
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Cassidy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cook
DesJarlais
Dingell
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hensarling
Kelly (IL)
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Meng
Miller, Gary
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Peters (MI)
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Tierney
Velázquez
Walberg

□ 1913

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1915

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5078, WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 644, DISAPPROVAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO NOTIFY CONGRESS BEFORE RELEASING INDIVIDUALS FROM GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–581) on the resolution (H. Res. 715) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H. Res. 644) condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PHILMORE GRAHAM POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5106) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the “Philmore Graham Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5106

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4283) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

YEAS—398

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Coston
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge

SECTION 1. PHILMORE GRAHAM POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, shall be known and designated as the “Philmore Graham Post Office Building”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Philmore Graham Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5106, introduced by Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California. H.R. 5106 would designate the post office located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the Philmore Graham Post Office Building.

Philmore Graham was a naval veteran, engineer, and founder of the Continentals of Omega Boys and Girls Club in California in 1966. Over the next several decades, the Boys and Girls Club helped boys and girls graduate from high school and college and go on to become accomplished athletes, doctors, judges, attorneys, and teachers.

Born in North Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM graduated from Tennessee State University, served our country in the Air Force, and built a career at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. He was the first and, to this day, remains the only African American to hold the position of supervisor at Mare Island's department of nuclear energy, but it was his passion for bettering the lives of young people that led him to establish the Boys and Girls Club in Vallejo, California.

Beginning with only six young men meeting in his garage, Mr. Graham grew the Continentals of Omega Boys and Girls Club to over 300 young people. Mr. Graham mentored them and encouraged them to apply themselves to their academics and get involved with sports and other extracurricular activities and instilled in them the value of hard work, self-respect, and perseverance. He truly made a difference in the lives of hundreds of young people and was beloved by all who had the privilege to know him.

Philmore Graham passed away in June of 2014. He had received numerous honors and awards for his work, including the NAACP's Outstanding Citizen of the Year, the Salute to America Lifetime Merit Award, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Humanitarian Award, and the Omega Man of the Year and Citizen of the Year.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the many accomplishments and contributions of Philmore Graham by passing H.R. 5106. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for the nice remarks with regard to Mr. Philmore Graham, for whom we are naming the post office in Vallejo.

I want to preface my remarks by saying that my district just suffered a terrible earthquake, and it was centered between Vallejo and my home county of Napa, and two of the post offices in Vallejo are seriously damaged and are probably going to be torn down as a result, but remarkably, the one on Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo is still standing.

It hasn't received any damage at all, and that is the one that we are naming after Philmore Graham, and I think it is fitting because, like Philmore Graham, that post office is strong, standing, and serving the community, a community that Philmore served for decades.

I feel particularly privileged to have known Philmore Graham. I knew him as a community leader. As was mentioned before, he was a hero. He served our country in the military. He founded the Omega Boys and Girls Club, and he was the first and only African American nuclear supervisor on Mare Island Naval Shipyard, and he had a passion for the lives of children and for the future of our community.

He founded that Boys and Girls Club in his garage. He started with a small group of kids, and he grew that group to a large population within our community. Kids under Philmore's tutelage grew up to be great people and to do great things.

The kids who came out of that Boys and Girls Club, as my friend mentioned, went on to be doctors and lawyers and business people, professional athletes—all-star professional athletes who continue to give back to our community, and the work that Philmore did of founding the Omega Boys and Girls Club in Vallejo lives on today and will always be responsible for the betterment of our community and the betterment of the young boys and girls who grow up in that community.

I ask that all of our colleagues join us in voting for this measure, to rightfully name this post office after Philmore Graham.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Having no further requests for time, I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5106.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERGEANT SHAWN T. HANNON AND MASTER SERGEANT JEFFREY J. RIECK AND VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4189) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the “Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon and Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4189

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MASTER SERGEANT SHAWN T. HANNON, MASTER SERGEANT JEFFREY J. RIECK AND VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the “Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to ask support for H.R. 4189, a bill to rename the U.S. post office located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey T. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office.

Master Sergeants Hannon and Rieck were killed in Afghanistan in April 4, 2012, while serving their country as members of the Ohio Army National Guard. The House recently passed a bill to rename a post office after a third soldier, Captain Nicholas Rozanski, who died in that same attack, and that post office will be in Dublin, Ohio.

Master Sergeant Hannon was a native of Grove City, Ohio, and served as the chief legal counsel at the Ohio Department of Veterans Services. I knew him personally as both a soldier and as one of the best advocates for the Ohio veterans community. He is survived by his wife Jamie and his son Evan.

Master Sergeant Rieck lived in Columbus and worked in the Guard's Family Readiness office, where he helped families prepare for deployment and helped loved ones deal with deployments. His son, Joel, was 15 when his father made the ultimate sacrifice.

These men dedicated their lives to helping other people and died while protecting our freedoms. This bill will help ensure that their sacrifices and service are always remembered. We also included the Veterans Memorial Post Office on this to make sure that all veterans' sacrifices and service are remembered when people enter this post office.

I want to thank Chairman Issa for advancing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4189.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join with my friend in asking everyone to support this measure to name this post office after Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon and Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck, and I align myself with all of the comments that my friend and colleague has made on behalf of these two gentlemen, these two heroes. I ask that everybody vote for this measure.

On behalf of all of us, I thank the families of these two heroes for their service and for their sacrifice to our great country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4189, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the fa-

cility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the 'Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIALIST KEITH ERIN GRACE, JR. MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4651) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, as the "Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST KEITH ERIN GRACE, JR. MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, shall be known as the "Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referenced to subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN).

Mr. STOCKMAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I attended this young man's funeral and started hearing stories about him, and one of the things that was really moving was that he lost his mother when he was 12. He went on to get bone cancer and survived bone cancer, and then last spring, he was assigned to Afghanistan, after he volunteered to join the military to make something of his life.

As we know, we have no greater respect or love for someone than to lay down your life, and that is exactly what Keith did, he laid down his life.

At his funeral, his friends were gathered there in honor of him, but in truth, the whole Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for his service. Given all the rough times he had through his life, he wanted to make something great of his life, and he did that.

Unfortunately, he gave the ultimate sacrifice, but I, for one, am very honored that we can remember him in a way that he wasn't remembered earlier in life.

I include for the RECORD a brief bio on Spc. Grace:

Spc. Keith Erin Grace Jr. was killed in action on August 11, 2013. Spc. Grace was killed near the town of Dzadran, which is in the Khost province near the Pakistan border in southern Afghanistan and a site of repeated insurgent activity.

Grace joined the Army in January 2012 and was stationed in Fort Campbell in May of last year. The 4th Brigade Combat Team, a unit of the 101st Airborne, was deployed to Iraq this spring. His military awards include one National Defense Service Medal, one Global War on Terrorism Service Medal and an Army Service Ribbon.

Grace came from difficult family circumstances and was placed for adoption at birth, friends said. His adoptive mother died when he was about 12. By that time, he had survived bone cancer that they said should have killed him.

"He shouldn't have made it, but he pulled through it and survived 100 percent," said longtime friend, Garland Davis, who said he regarded Grace as a brother, though there was no legal or blood connection.

Grace grew up in Baytown and graduated from Lee High School in 2006. He worked in a variety of jobs before deciding to join the military. Friends said he was looking for something that would give his life structure and possibly lead to a career.

"He was an extremely hard worker and was very, very funny," said friend Natalie Ingram, who met Grace about five years ago. "His positive attitude is hard to even describe, it was so strong. He took everything as it came to him. He survived cancer and went through countless family struggles. He had a very tough background, but he had a great attitude and made everyone comfortable."

"We were his family because he chose us," Davis said. "He's been through hell and back with his family, but he always has had a smile on his face. He never picked fights, never tried to create a problem. He was stuck in a bad position and he tried to better himself. He ended up falling in love with the Army, and he loved this country."

□ 1930

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join with my colleague and friend on the other side of the aisle in support of this measure. Specialist Keith Grace, Jr. was a hero. All of us thank his family for his service and his sacrifice, and I ask that everyone vote in favor of this measure to rightfully name this post office in his honor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge that all Members support H.R. 4651.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4651.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an important and timely field hearing that was put on today by the House Natural Resources Committee in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, titled, "The Northern Long-Eared Bat: The Federal Endangered Species Act and Impacts of a Listing on Pennsylvania and 37 Other States."

Today's oversight panel heard from witnesses representing a number of economic sectors on the harmful economic impacts of this wrongheaded designation proposal.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny the primary challenge facing the northern long-eared bat, which is a disease known as white-nose syndrome, and there is a consensus that we must learn more about this great threat. However, it is imperative that we get the science right and strategically address the root cause of the apparent population losses rather than restrict a large area of the economy and activities that have no bearing on slowing or reversing this disease.

The Endangered Species Act is far from perfect and has generated many unintended and harmful consequences. Unfortunately, the proposed designation for this particular species is yet another reminder of how this law must be improved and modernized.

LAWLESSNESS BREEDS LAWLESSNESS

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud cosponsor of H. Res. 644, which condemns the Obama administration for transferring five Taliban leaders from Guantanamo Bay in direct violation of the 2014 Defense Authorization Act.

Not only is this another troubling example of this President's disregard for our system of government, but it also represents a serious national security risk. At a time when we are fighting to contain ISIS and radical Islam around

the world, releasing seasoned leaders back into the fight against America and our allies hardly seems wise.

Lawlessness breeds lawlessness. The President needs to understand that our laws are not merely suggestions for him to consider when politically convenient. I hope that the bipartisan passage of this resolution later this week will help send that message.

MURDER IN THE NAME OF RELIGION AND AMERICAN TRAITORS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ISIS is continuing its murderous rampage on Christians, Jews, and Muslims in Syria and Iraq. America needs to go dismantle, disrupt, and defeat ISIS. Victory should be the goal. ISIS has arrogantly beheaded two Americans and sent the murder videos all over the world, and now they say they are coming to America to kill us.

Once a small band of bandit thugs fighting the Syrian civil war, these cutthroat terrorists have fighters from many nations, including the United States.

When Americans go and take up arms with foreign terrorist organizations like ISIS, when they go and give aid and comfort to America's enemies, their passports should be revoked. So tonight I introduced legislation that would prohibit the Benedict Arnold ISIS fighters from the United States from reentering our country. The bill is called the FTO Passport Revocation Act.

American traitors who go to war against America are not welcome back in our land. Their passports should be revoked. Further, ISIS fighters must be held accountable for their terror, and we should track them down and make the consequences of their terror unpleasant.

And that is just the way it is.

FRANCIS BELLAMY AND THE 122ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Francis Bellamy, one of the most influential individuals from Mount Morris, New York. Unknown by most Americans, Francis Bellamy is the author of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Today marks the 122nd anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance, which was first published in a magazine called The Youth Companion on September 8, 1892. The Pledge was initially written as part of a campaign to put American flags in every school in the country.

In its original form it read:

I pledge allegiance to my flag and the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

In 1923, the words, "the flag of the United States of America" were added. In 1954, Congress added the words "under God," creating the 31-word pledge that we say today.

Bellamy's words are recited millions of times every day and are ingrained in our society as an expression of national pride and patriotism.

SERIOUS CHALLENGES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Texas outlined for us today the serious challenges that we face in the Middle East. We have a challenge that is of a historic nature where a significant number of Islamic extremists are taking control of territories; and they plan to use that control as a means to terrorize large segments of the world's population, including the people of the United States of America.

If we are to defeat this, this evil force that beheads journalists, stones women to death, and persecutes people of other faiths, we must make sure that we reach out to people within the Muslim community as well. We must make sure that moderate Muslims know that we are on their side, and when they side with us that we will stick with them.

As we speak today, as I speak on this floor, a man who sided with the United States of America in order to bring justice to those Americans killed by radical Islamists on 9/11, this man, Dr. Afridi, languishes in a prison in Pakistan. If we expect other people to stand with us, we cannot forget Dr. Afridi. We must remember him, and we must save him as he saved us.

COMMUNITY POLICING, LESSONS LEARNED FROM FERGUSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleague, the coanchor, Mr. JEFFRIES from New York, to lead this Special Order hour on this, the first day back after the August congressional district work period.

We are here for a very important reason tonight, Mr. Speaker, because on August 9, in Ferguson, Missouri, a young boy, an unarmed young boy by the name of Michael Brown, had his

life tragically taken. He was taken from his friends and his family. That community was devastated and has left behind so many questions of how this could have happened.

I was honored to join with other colleagues at the invitation of the Representative from that area, Mr. CLAY, to attend Michael Brown's funeral. It was an incredibly powerful service in which a city and a Nation came together to mourn. But out of that mourning and frustration, we have an obligation to act. And so tonight, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will use this Special Order hour to discuss the challenge of profiling, of militarizing our local law enforcement agencies, and the need to build community policing approaches that work.

I am honored to work with my co-chair and to lead this Special Order hour because it is a very significant moment that will allow us to heal and to move forward as a Nation.

I would like to start by yielding time to the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, who provides so much leadership and direction to the 43 members of the CBC each and every day.

This is an issue that we have been working on far before Michael Brown lost his life. There are a pattern of issues and young people who have been profiled, and we are committed to making sure that this does not continue.

I would like to yield now to the gentlewoman from Ohio, the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Chairwoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank you for yielding.

I want to thank my colleagues, Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD, for leading today's conversation on a problem that America must acknowledge, come to terms with, and address. I want to thank them for their leadership. As a freshman member, Mr. HORSFORD has been outstanding. It is my pleasure to serve with you.

Mr. Speaker, in communities across our Nation, many believe that police officers, sworn to protect and serve, are instead disturbingly and violently attacking citizens without just cause.

We have heard stories of individuals being shot to death when there is clearly no threat to an officer's safety. We have seen peaceful protestors and journalists on the job arrested, having cans of tear gas shot at them and guns suited for military combat pointed at unarmed citizens.

Over the past few months, cell phone videos and pictures have surfaced showing a policeman kicking subdued civilians in the head, repeatedly punching a woman in the face on the side of a highway, and placing a man in an illegal choke hold when there appears to be no resistance to arrest.

Last year in Cleveland, one of the cities I represent, 13 officers fired 137

shots into one car, killing two unarmed individuals, and both occupants of the car were shot more than 20 times.

The startling images we saw of the police response to civil protest in Ferguson, Missouri, were in stark contrast to the citizens exercising their constitutional right to be heard. Police met peaceful protestors with a force intent on silencing their voices. This excessive use of force often provokes animosity instead of building the cooperation needed to combat violence.

The trust between law enforcement and citizens required to keep our community safe is being eroded by the uncertainty of motives and biases behind the actions officials take, often against those who are powerless yet pay for them to protect them. Instead of keeping the peace, these actions incite tensions where there should be opportunities for understanding.

This type of activity must stop. Community policing can only be effective when citizens and leaders, community law enforcement and elected officials work together, not against one another, to address violence and unrest. Transparency, accountability, and responsibility must be at the nexus of this relationship.

□ 1945

Because of Ferguson, our Nation and the world have seen what happens when these principles are ignored or disregarded.

I applaud the Department of Justice for initiating full civil rights investigations into this case and others that have resulted in the deaths of civilians at the hands of law enforcement. I also applaud the citizens of Ferguson for realizing that their community belongs to them and that it is up to them to decide with whom they will work to lead it.

Just because the cameras are no longer rolling in Ferguson, the recent tragedies we have witnessed there, in Staten Island, and in other American cities have shown that we cannot keep turning a blind eye to what is going on between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus remain committed to working with our colleagues on the local, State, and Federal level to improve the policies and practices of law enforcement officials across this country so that safety, trust, and confidence can be restored where it has been broken.

I want to especially congratulate my colleague, Mr. CLAY, for all of the work that he did during the Ferguson situation and will continue to do. I am as proud of him as I can be of anyone, and I certainly am going to be supportive of his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot move forward together without figuring out what must be done so that what happened in Ferguson never happens again.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlewoman, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, for your ongoing commitment and leadership on these important issues and the recognition that there is so much more work that needs to be done. And while there are local law enforcement agencies and police officers who do a good job every day and who put their life on the line, we know that there are individuals who are not necessarily living up to those standards of public safety and trust, and so we look forward to improving that.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Missouri, Representative LACY CLAY, who provided the leadership on the ground, on the scene, particularly following the days after Michael Brown's shooting. He represents the community of Ferguson in St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Nevada, as well as my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who offered their support during this tragic time in Ferguson. In particular, let me thank the Congressional Black Caucus for standing with me in our efforts to deliver justice—equal justice—under the law to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the congressman from Missouri's First Congressional District, which includes Ferguson, Missouri, a suburb with over 23,000 people in St. Louis County. The pain that has enveloped that community since the tragic police shooting of Michael Brown on August the 9th has stirred the conscience of our Nation and has forced us to confront some very difficult truths.

The hard reality that I observed with my own eyes is a deep sense of outrage and anger that is present, not just in Ferguson, but in many communities across this country. And that pain is most deeply felt by millions of Americans of color, both young and old, who know from decades of sad experience that far too often local law enforcement agencies and the justice system do not view them or treat them as equal citizens who deserve due process and equal protection under the law.

That is certainly true in Ferguson, Missouri.

According to the latest Census data, Ferguson, Missouri, is 67 percent African American. It has a police force of 58 officers. Only four of those officers are black, and many of the officers do not live in Ferguson. So, in essence, the Ferguson Police Department is an outside armed force which is not representative of the community that they are sworn to protect and does not live among the citizens who pay their salaries. And that is a prescription for tension, a complete lack of trust, and in the case of Michael Brown, an 18-year-old, unarmed black teenager, a tragic and completely unnecessary death.

Two days after he was killed, I joined with CBC Chairwoman FUDGE and House Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS to send an urgent letter to the Attorney General seeking immediate assistance from the Justice Department. And I want to personally thank President Obama and Attorney General Holder for responding to our request with great speed and strength.

In addition to the local criminal investigation into the Michael Brown shooting, which I have little confidence in, there are now two parallel Federal investigations that are being directed by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. The first investigation is examining all the circumstances, physical evidence, and multiple eyewitness accounts of the fatal police shooting on August the 9th. The second, which was announced by the Attorney General just last week, will examine the overall law enforcement practices of the Ferguson, Missouri, Police Department, including the already published extreme racial disparities in who is stopped, who is searched, who is arrested, and what happens to them if they go to jail.

Mr. Speaker, I made a promise to Michael Brown's mother that we would focus every possible Federal resource on this case in an effort to bring justice for her son's death. I have confidence in that process. But the sad truth is that there are too many communities just like Ferguson across this country where decades of discrimination, abuse, and a lack of respect by local law enforcement has resulted in a gulf of suspicion and mistrust. And as we have seen, that tinderbox can lead to an explosion of anger and violence that is difficult to control.

While I certainly condemn all lawbreaking and the destruction of property, I understand the anger that so many of my constituents feel because I feel it too. And I would urge all of you to read a compelling story published in *The Washington Post* on September 3 entitled, "How Municipalities in St. Louis County Profit From Poverty". This remarkable story, authored by Radley Balko, tells the tale of how people of color are often preyed upon at municipal ATM machines by the police and by the very justice system that is supposed to protect these people.

Again, the title of the story: "How Municipalities in St. Louis County Profit From Poverty," published on September 3 in *The Washington Post*.

That same story happens every day in majority-minority communities across this country. So, Mr. Speaker, there are many hard lessons to be learned from Ferguson, and I fear that there may be more to come.

But this much cannot be disputed: across America today, we have too many Michael Browns, we have too many unarmed young black men who interact with police and wind up dead.

The resolution of that problem will only come through a painful, honest, national discussion about race and our inability to address these tragic disparities.

My hope is that we will not only achieve justice for Michael Brown but that his tragic death will help us begin a long overdue national conversation that leads to truth, reconciliation, and equal justice under the law for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I thank you for really putting your heart and soul into serving your constituents and the outpouring of compassion that was shown following this unfortunate death of Michael Brown.

At the funeral, the one remark that really stayed with me was that Michael Brown wanted the world to know his name. I think out of this unfortunate situation, there is this opportunity now, as you indicate, Representative CLAY, for us to have a discussion, an action, to take action on a pattern of practices that are not limited to just Ferguson, Missouri. And as you just indicated, this is an issue that has happened in other places, whether it is John Crawford in Beavercreek, Ohio; Ezell Ford in Los Angeles, California; or Eric Garner in Staten Island, New York; or Dante Parker in Victorville, California; or constituents in my home State in Las Vegas, Nevada.

This is a pattern that must end. And for Michael Brown, for him to have the world know his name, the best outcome could be to change and improve the community-police relationship so that all people are treated fairly and equally under the law. That is our hope and aspiration here tonight as we bring attention to this very important issue during this Special Order hour.

I would like to now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative FREDERICA WILSON, for her to add comments to this very important topic and to bring her perspective, as well.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you, Representative HORSFORD, and to all the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who are here tonight to contribute to this conversation regarding an issue that is oh so prevalent in our communities and has been there for generations.

I just want to say to the President of the United States that I am extremely grateful for his vision in creating an initiative called My Brother's Keeper. My Brother's Keeper hopefully will address some of the issues that our young boys of color face.

I want to say that there is so much friction between police and black boys. That friction has been there for generations, almost since slavery. And it is a conversation that black parents have to have with their young boys as soon as they probably get a driver's license.

They have to talk to them about dealing with the police. And I want to say, in my hometown of Miami-Dade County, I founded a program called the 5000 Role Models of Excellence 22 years ago.

We must realize that everyone just doesn't have a parent, they just don't have a responsible parent that can have that conversation with them. So we recruit mentors across this Nation to deal with these young men and try to teach them how to deal with some of the issues that impact especially boys of color but more specifically when it comes to the police black boys. The pamphlet starts out by saying if the police stop you, freeze, don't move, unless you are told to do so. Never run from the police. Always remain calm. Think, cooperate, speak clearly, ask questions if you have to, and it goes on and on.

It is sad that we have to do this. We are not trying to break the spirits of young black boys, but we are trying to keep them alive.

This is how the pamphlet looks. And it was really orchestrated by our State attorney, our public defender, and the Miami-Dade County Association of Chiefs of Police. And they put it together and put it in all of the schools for all of the children and members of the school's police to teach these children how to respond if the police ever stop them.

□ 2000

I have a real concern with Michael Brown's case, and that concern is with the State attorney. I really have a real concern that the grand jury may not get all of the evidence that they need. My father served on the grand jury for many years. I do know that the State attorney has so much sway over the grand jury.

My heart broke even worse than it did when he was killed, when we realized that the State attorney would be the one that would send the case to the grand jury that would oversee the case. He had a history that no one wants to have.

His father was a police officer, and he was killed by a Black youth. If that is not enough to recuse yourself from the case in general, to my colleagues, I cannot understand what else could be the case.

You remember Trayvon Martin, who came from my district. He was killed. The first thing that happened was the State attorney didn't want to recuse himself, but the Governor removed him, so I am really counting on Governor Nixon tonight to remove the State attorney, to remove the prosecutor from this case because, otherwise, Michael Brown may not get a fair trial, and he deserves justice under the law.

Thank you so much for this opportunity. I will continue to pray for his family because this is not a good time

in America for young Black boys. They are watching. They are paying attention to this case. People all across the world are watching what is going to happen in Ferguson. I am afraid of what will happen if the verdict or if the police, Wilson, is not even indicted.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida. Thank you for providing the information about the resources that are available to young people to know their rights, to understand how they need to approach the situation.

I just had the privilege of participating at a "Know Your Rights" town-hall that was hosted in my congressional district by the National Bar Association, the Las Vegas chapter of the National Bar Association. We had approximately 100 attendees, many of them young people, who do need this information.

Regardless of whether there is a parent in the house or not, every young person needs to understand their rights and the best practices on how to interact with law enforcement when and if that does occur.

We want to encourage young people to know their rights. I think working with the Congressional Black Caucus, we will find opportunities to post that information, to share it with organizations in our local communities, to help connect young people and adults alike, so that we can improve on the relationship between police officers and our community.

I would like to now turn to our next Member for the Congressional Black Caucus for this hour, the gentleman from Texas—I was very delighted to join with him and other Members at the funeral, to pay our respects to the family and the community. I would like to now yield time to the gentleman from Texas, Representative AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you very much, Representative HORSFORD. I am honored to be with you tonight. Nevada's Fourth District is most capably and competently represented by your presence in Congress. I am also grateful to Mr. JEFFRIES, who represents New York's Eighth District. The two of you have done a stellar job in hosting these Special Order hours.

I am grateful to the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Barack Obama, for appointing the Honorable Eric Holder as Attorney General. I am grateful because Mr. Holder is intelligent.

He has the intellect necessary to comprehend the breadth of these issues. I am also grateful in that he is a person of courage. I am grateful because intellect without courage can be intellect wasted. His intellect is not wasted. He has had the courage to take on the challenges such as what we have with Ferguson.

The Justice Department is there. They are investigating. There is good

reason for the Justice Department to be in Ferguson. The Justice Department is in Ferguson because Ferguson is 67 percent Black, and only one African American is on the city council of seven, if you count the mayor—67 percent Black.

The police department is 83 percent White. Three Blacks out of 53 officers—good reason to be in Ferguson; school board, one member Black of seven. Of the officers that are on the police department or were on the police department, one of them is on the city council—good reason to be in Ferguson.

Five officers or former officers, either they are on the department now or not, have been alleged to be involved with some sort of civil rights violation, accused—allegation—of choking and hog-tieing a young person—another circumstance wherein a person was tased and died afterwards; another circumstance wherein a person was beaten by a peace officer and then charged with destroying public property when he bled on the officer's clothing—good reason to be in Ferguson.

A prosecutor who has decided that he will not recuse himself, notwithstanding his father's tragic circumstance—the father died at the hands of a person who happened to have been African American, who was a peace officer by the way, his father was—refuses to recuse himself, and he refuses to have a preliminary hearing with this case.

This case does not have to go to a grand jury. This case could be heard by way of a preliminary hearing after an arrest warrant has been issued.

I submit to you that there is sufficient probable cause to indict this officer or to arrest this officer, more appropriately. In any jurisdiction in the United States of America, there is probable cause to arrest.

Then you would go to a preliminary hearing, and you would have transparency. The world would hear what the witnesses have to say. There is good reason for the Justice Department to be in Ferguson.

So I am honored to be here tonight to stand with my colleagues, especially the Honorable LACY CLAY, who has been a real champion on behalf of this family. I am honored to be here because I understand that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, and injustice in Ferguson unchecked can lead to injustice in Houston.

I think that the President of the United States of America made a wise choice when he chose the Honorable Eric Holder. I pray that the natural order of things will not continue to be circumvented. Mothers and fathers should not—n-o-t—should not bury their children. We must circumvent this kind of behavior. Thank God for you, Mr. President.

I thank you, sir, for yielding me the time.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

I would like to yield now to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, the great State of Wisconsin, and to extend whatever time she may need. I appreciate, again, her leadership, compassion, and dedication on so many issues, but particularly on bringing the voice and perspective of people who aren't always heard in this institution. I have great respect and admiration for her. I would like to yield time now to Representative GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Mr. HORSFORD.

I would first like to join my colleagues in grieving and celebrating the life of Michael Brown. I would hope that his short life will not have been lived in vain, that his death will teach us something that will serve the Nation, so that others will not have to endure this.

I am particularly feeling empathy with Ms. McFadden. Ms. McFadden is the mother. As the mother of two Black male children, Mr. HORSFORD, it has been a constant terror in my life that I would experience what Ms. McFadden has experienced.

After Ferguson, I watched an episode of a comedy, "Girlfriends," and a young Black mother was chastising her son for being arrested. She mentioned that she didn't appreciate having to come down to the police station to pick him up. They had just recently moved to a suburb.

She asked him: What were you doing? He said: I was just walking down the street. She commented—and there was laughter in the audience—Why were you walking down the street? You know we haven't had our meet-and-greet with the police department yet.

I am saying that to say this: we need a truth and reconciliation in this country similar to what they experienced in South Africa about the plight of young Black males. They are marginalized.

Every social institution fails them by the time they are 18 years old, like Michael Brown. The educational system has failed them. So often, as a State legislator, we would build a prison bed based on the third grade reading tests of young Black men.

The economy has failed young Black men by the time they are 18 years old. So what we find in these communities is a hypervigilant police force that is dealing with a preponderance of social failure, and we lay all of society's failures at the feet of the police department.

I do applaud you, Mr. HORSFORD, for the efforts you have made in this House. I am a proud cosponsor of your Universal RESPECT Act, which directs the President to do a comprehensive review of law enforcement policies across the country in order to eliminate procedures that result in racial profiling.

I think that this is really a threshold toward that end of a reconciliation. I have long been a supporter of the End Racial Profiling Act, which has been offered by one of the deans of this House, Representative JOHN CONYERS, that makes it clear that law enforcement agencies cannot engage in racial profiling anywhere in the country.

I do think that there are baby steps that we can take. Certainly, one giant step toward increasing accountability is to install these lapel cameras on all law enforcement agencies. As a matter of fact, I was very proud, in 2009, to secure \$100,000 for the police department in Milwaukee to purchase cameras for their cars.

I do think it is also important that law enforcement agency's members, police officers, be stakeholders in the communities that they are serving.

□ 2015

It did not escape my attention that the involved officer in the untimely death of Michael Brown lived 25 miles away, and that is why I am tremendously concerned about efforts in my own State, where Governor Scott Walker acted to end the residency requirements for police officers over a year ago. That is currently in litigation for that very reason. You don't want police officers to become a military occupying force in a community. You force a kind of transparency and accountability when those police officers go to your churches, they shop at your grocery stores, and they are a part of your community.

I certainly applaud the Justice Department involvement in this issue.

I do think that no one had ever heard of Ferguson, Missouri, before August 9, and certainly the name Michael Brown is a name shared probably by millions of people. I say that to say that this is not about Ferguson or just about Michael Brown. It is about the direction and the future of America and where we are going with this.

To paraphrase Dr. Martin Luther King:

We will either live together as brothers or we will perish as fools.

I think young Black men have tremendous talent. They have a lot to offer. The legacy of slavery has brought us to the point where seeing a 6-foot-4 Black man walking down the street in and of itself is a threat. We need some truth and reconciliation around that issue.

May Michael Brown rest in peace and may his life lift us to a greater understanding and reconciliation around this issue.

Thank you so much for this Special Order.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for your very compassionate remarks and the perspectives of so many people who are expecting this Congress to act. We will

take heed of your words and your recommendations.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject matter of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. May I inquire as to how much remaining time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also include for the RECORD the fact that the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recently issued a 14-page-long scathing report on the United States' failure to fully comply with our obligations under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in numerous areas affecting racial and ethnic minorities.

While the report commended the Obama administration for steps it has taken to combat racial discrimination, it highlighted the gaps stated commitments and the glaring reality of laws and practices that continue to discriminate against and disproportionately impact people of color and indigenous communities.

I think it is rather important for this body to know, particularly tonight, because I know there will be some who will ask: Why are they doing this Special Order on this topic? Why are they bringing attention to the need for reform?

Well, whether it is in your local community, in your State, or federally, we have an obligation to make sure that people are treated fairly and equally under the law, and where our laws or our practices fail to meet that standard, we have an obligation to change it.

For the United Nations to call into question the United States' failure in these areas I think speaks to the fact that this is not just a local issue, but it is also an international one. So I hope that my colleagues understand that that is, in part, why we are bringing attention to it.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for recognizing the fact that many Members have proposed legislation well before the Michael Brown case. Mr. CONYERS, the ranking member of the Judicial Committee, called for the End Racial Profiling Act. Representative HANK JOHNSON's legislation calls for greater accountability and a fundamental review of the militarization of our local law enforcement agencies. I am honored to be one of the sponsors for the Universal Respect Act, to have a re-

view and meaningful change, again, of our local law enforcement so that their practices meet the intent of our laws.

I would like to now yield to my good friend and a fellow freshman Member. He is actually a redshirt freshman because he came in a little earlier than the rest of us. He has been a dynamic leader that came to this Congress with the commitment to serve his constituents from the great State of New Jersey. I yield to my friend, Representative DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me say thank you to my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada, and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who have demonstrated true leadership in this freshman class and having shown and demonstrated time and time again during these Special Orders their commitment to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Ferguson, Missouri, and the people across this Nation have suffered a tremendous blow with the circumstances surrounding Michael Brown's death. Not only did we lose a young man, we as a Nation were once again reminded that although we have come so far, we still have a long way to go. We are trying to achieve equality and fairness under the law, regardless of race, religion, or sexual orientation. Now is the time for all of us to reflect on what has happened and to find a way to come together going forward.

We lost a young man, Michael Brown, in heartbreaking and tragic circumstances. He was only 18 years old. His family will never be able to hold or talk to him ever again.

When something like this happens, local authorities, including the police, have a responsibility to be open and transparent about how they are investigating the death and how they are protecting the people in our communities. The people of Ferguson and the people of this Nation deserve a transparent and thorough investigation. We deserve the truth and we deserve justice.

I am very pleased that the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division has stepped in and has launched a thorough investigation into the circumstances that led to Michael Brown's death. I want to commend President Obama and also Mr. Holder for their involvement and their commitment on seeing justice brought in this situation.

This issue around racial profiling is about a young man that was walking in the street with a friend, is told to get on the sidewalk, and just a little bit later lay dead in the street. It started out with him being told to get on the sidewalk, and he loses his life. It is unconscionable. It is not understandable, and it is unjust.

This is a situation that young African American men have had to deal with for centuries. It is a situation

that we all find ourselves in. Whether we are young men in Ferguson, Missouri; Newark, New Jersey; New York City; or Las Vegas, Nevada, we all have one common thread, and that is when you come across a police officer in certain circumstances, there is a manner in which you should conduct yourself to make sure you can get home alive that night.

I have been on that side of it, Mr. Speaker, on far too many occasions to count. One of the occasions that I remember so well, I was about 19 or 20. I was working for a company and had to go downtown in my hometown of Newark, New Jersey, to pay a bill at a department store. I was pulled over by the police.

I admit I made a driving infraction, and I was pulled over by the police. I was using my cousin's car. When the officer asked me for my identification, being a little nervous, I kind of scrambled and I didn't know where the registration of the vehicle was right away. This police officer decided to tell me that if I did not find that license and registration quick enough, he would throw me so far under the jail they would never find me.

Now, you can imagine the fright and panic that that would put in a young person. But I got my license—still looking for the registration—and I handed it to him, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, because my family was well-known in that town and my father was a sitting councilperson in that municipality at the time, all of a sudden the police officer's demeanor changed, because all of a sudden I was someone now.

Why did it take me to be related to a council member in that town to be someone? No more than 2 minutes prior to that, I would have been thrown so far under the jail that they would never find me. Now it was, Well, don't you understand you need to be careful? You could get hurt or you could hurt someone. All of a sudden, now there is some concern for me. What changed it, Mr. Speaker? What changed it?

But what concerns me is the callous thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of African American men that can't pull that license out and become someone. Those are the people that I am concerned about. They wrestle with this issue every single day. That is why I am proud to say that my uncle, the former assemblyman, William Payne, is the author of the racial profiling bill in the State of New Jersey that stands now. Because this is an issue, has been an issue, and obviously, based on what has happened in Ferguson, Missouri, still is an issue.

So we will continue to speak out, as we have done in our homes, in Ferguson, and on this floor, because we need the United States of America to live up to its creed.

With that, sir, I just have one last thing to say. It is something that just came to me.

In these communities that we talk about, when will they know their local police for protect and serve rather than stop and frisk?

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. Thank you for sharing your own personal experience. I know each of us can probably recall an incident where we have felt that we were being profiled, targeted, singled out, not because it was warranted necessarily, but because of some characteristic. And that is part of what we are here to bring attention to tonight. So thank you for your honesty and for your genuineness in expressing that personal story.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Empire State, New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my fellow coanchor. I have great respect for this gentleman. We have gotten to know each other very well, and I know that this is an issue, in particular, that he has provided direct leadership on because of the communities in which he serves in New York. And the comment by the gentleman, the previous comment about "stop and frisk" is something that you have worked to challenge, and because of that there is a change that is underway. That is what we are hoping to bring tonight.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the Silver State for anchoring the CBC Special Order on this incredibly important topic related to the ongoing problem, I would argue, epidemic, of police violence largely directed at communities of color.

The most recent situation, of course, occurred in Ferguson, Missouri, with the tragic killing of Michael Brown, and we all join our colleague, Lacy Clay, as well as the CBC chair, MARCIA FUDGE, in pushing for justice, which we believe is most likely to occur through a Federal investigation that is now ongoing.

But, unfortunately, the problem brought to light for so many across America, particularly the neighborhoods that I represent in Brooklyn, New York, by the killing of Michael Brown is all too familiar for many communities across this great Nation.

In fact, back in July of 1967, President Lyndon Baines Johnson appointed what came to be known as the Kerner Commission, an 11-member commission to study the causes of civil unrest in urban America that had been taking place since 1964 and into 1965 and throughout 1966 into 1967, prompting Lyndon Johnson—one of our greatest Presidents, though that is not often acknowledged, given the leadership he demonstrated on domestic issues—to appoint this Kerner Commission.

The vice chair of the commission was the then-New York City Mayor, John Lindsay, a former distinguished Member of this House.

The Commission concluded that some of the unrest that had taken place in cities like Detroit, Michigan, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in Los Angeles, in Watts, some of the things that had taken place, resulting in unrest, were caused by preexisting conditions of aggressive police activity in African American communities, followed by a triggering event, often a shooting of an unarmed African American, and then an overly aggressive police response.

This is what the Kerner Commission found when it issued its report in the late 1960s. But that same analysis could apply more than 45 years later in terms of what this country just witnessed in Ferguson, Missouri, a history, clearly, in that community of overly aggressive, excessive force, largely directed at the African American community, and then a triggering event, the killing of an unarmed African American, Michael Brown, who, of course, was shot twice in the head, and it appears a total of six times, and then, an overly aggressive police response, in fact, a military response.

The people at home in the district that I represent were shocked to see the images coming out of Ferguson, Missouri. It looked like Fallujah. It looked like a war zone in the Middle East or other parts of the world, not an American suburb.

What did we learn, if anything, from the Kerner Commission report?

Apparently, not much, and that is what we have got to confront in America.

There is a reality to police brutality and its impact, particularly on unarmed African American men, that, as a civilized society, we should no longer tolerate.

Now, let me pause, parenthetically, and agree with my good friend's point, Representative HORSFORD, that the overwhelming majority of police officers in America are good individuals, hard-working, decent men and women committed to enforcing the law in an evenhanded fashion.

But there are too many cases of excessive violence, often directed at unarmed African American men in America. We have got to address that epidemic.

Perhaps we could begin by just reviewing the Kerner Commission report issued under the Johnson administration. It is shameful that decade after decade after decade we have been unable to confront some of the realities brought to bear by that report. But perhaps the tragedy in Ferguson, Missouri, will wake us all up as a country.

Fannie Lou Hamer made the observation that she was sick and tired of being sick and tired. At what point will we in America be tired of seeing another unarmed African American

man's life being taken away prematurely by an officer using excessive force?

That is why we are hopeful that we not just deal with the law enforcement problem, but that we confront some of the underlying socioeconomic conditions that create a climate for some of these things to occur.

I look forward to that discussion as we move forward under the leadership of our chair, and certainly working closely with the distinguished gentleman from Las Vegas.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my coanchor, for this Special Order hour, and for your bringing to this body a reminder of the Kerner report, which is very instructive on what should be done as a model to move community policing approaches forward.

I think that is one of the absolute objectives that must come from any action that this body takes. And there is a role for Congress to play. Absolutely, there is a responsibility for the Department of Justice, which has a statutory objective, a responsibility to ensure profiling does not occur in our Nation's law enforcement.

In addition to the example of the Kerner report, I would also like to bring to attention the work of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the COPS office, which is working to develop an initiative known as the collaborative reform model.

Now, they came to my home State of Nevada in January of 2012, following growing community concern and scrutiny of its use of deadly force practices, and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, under the leadership of our sheriff, voluntarily agreed to have this review by the COPS department in order to identify areas of improvement.

So I believe that this report and this program, along with the Kerner report, are examples of what we could do to make sure that every local law enforcement agency has high standards and is not practicing profiling.

Mr. Speaker, I know our time has expired. I would like to thank my colleagues for this Special Order hour, and the gentleman from New York for co-anchoring.

I include for the RECORD the following material:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
BACKGROUND

In January 2012, under growing community concern and scrutiny of its use of deadly force practices, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) agreed to take part in an initiative sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office), known as the "Collaborative Reform Model."

As part of this initiative, LVMPD agreed to an in-depth assessment of its use of deadly force policies and practices. In support, the COPS Office and CNA would assist the LVMPD in adopting national standards and

best practices as they relate to officer-involved shootings (OIS), while ensuring that LVMPD's implementation was comprehensive and integrated. CNA conducted the assessment, focusing on four issue areas:

(1) policy and procedures, (2) training and tactics, (3) investigation and documentation, and (4) external view. CNA completed the assessment in November 2012, which documented a total of 75 reforms and recommendations. These included both new recommendations from the assessment team and reforms that LVMPD initiated before and during the assessment process. CNA published the final report Collaborative Reform Model: A Review of Officer-Involved Shootings in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (referred to as the "2012 report" throughout the remainder of this report) in November 2012.

The publication of the 2012 report did not complete the process. Sustainable policy and organizational change requires careful planning, implementation, and monitoring. The COPS Office, CNA, and LVMPD have continued in their collaboration throughout 2013. The COPS Office asked CNA to document reforms previously completed by LVMPD and to actively monitor those that resulted from the 2012 report. In September, CNA and the COPS Office published Collaborative Reform Model: Six-Month Status Report of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. The six-month report showed that LVMPD had made significant progress. A total of 56 reforms had been completed by the department and another 15 were in progress.

This report is the final assessment of LVMPD with respect to the Collaborative Reform Model. It has been two years since the beginning of the reform process, and one year since the reforms were recommended. The purpose of this report is to inform all stakeholders and interested parties of the progress made toward reforming LVMPD's policies and practices with respect to OISs.

APPROACH

CNA undertook a multifaceted approach in assessing LVMPD's progress, including site visits, direct observation, document reviews, and interviews. The assessment process was a holistic, comprehensive approach to assessing LVMPD's reforms that places an emphasis on the quality of the implementation as well as technical completion. The goal of the assessment was for the assessors to fully understand the steps the department had taken toward implementing the reforms, and to collect as much evidence as necessary to confirm that those steps had been completed.

Over the past year, LVMPD submitted for review more than 500 documents and files, including investigative reports, internal bulletins and memoranda, training videos and lesson plans, attendance records, evaluation plans, policies, audio recordings of review board hearings, and section manuals. The assessors critically reviewed these files for relevance and consistency with the recommendations, as well as for clarity and quality of the documents.

In this report, each recommendation is assigned one of five statuses, defined in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—RECOMMENDATION STATUS DEFINITIONS

Status	Definition
✓ Complete	The recommendation has been sufficiently demonstrated to be complete, based on the assessors' review of submitted materials, observations, and analysis.

TABLE 1.—RECOMMENDATION STATUS DEFINITIONS—Continued

Status	Definition
✓ Partially Complete.	The agency has submitted materials that they believe demonstrate completion of the recommendation. However, the assessors have deemed that additional effort is needed to complete the recommendation. As per the agency, no further work will be forthcoming on the recommendation.
▲ In progress	Implementation of the recommendation is currently in progress, based on the assessors' review of submitted materials, observations, and analysis.
X Not complete	The agency has not sufficiently demonstrated implementation of the recommendation, nor does the agency have future plans to do so.
No assessment at this time.	At the present time, not enough information is available to make a determination.

LVMPD PROGRESS

LVMPD has made impressive progress over the past year. The number of OISs by LVMPD continues to be historically low thanks, in part, to a cascade of events over the past three years that include changes to policy, and increased training, scrutiny, and oversight of OISs by LVMPD. LVMPD's internal review process for deadly force incidents continues to evolve as well. Over the past two years, the Use of Force Review Board (UoFRB) has issued an unprecedented number of findings that are critical of the officers' actions and how they were managed. Consequently, the board has recommended significant remedial action, including training, discipline, one demotion, and the termination of two officers.

Table 2 shows that, to date, LVMPD has initiated and completed 72 reforms, which account for 90 percent of the totality of reforms that have been initiated and recommended over the past three-plus years. Thirty-nine of the reforms were completed prior to the issuance of the 2012 report, whereas an additional 33 have been completed since. The department has made considerable progress on five reforms, but more work remains. Two reforms remain incomplete. Notably, one of the incomplete reforms is outside of the purview of the department and addresses the Police Protective Association's continued discouragement of officers involved in shootings to give interviews as part of the criminal investigation.

TABLE 2.—STATUS OF LVMPD REFORMS

Status	Recommendations/Reforms (N)	Percent (%)
✓ Complete	72	90
✓ Partially Complete	0	0
▲ In progress	5	6
X Not complete	2	3
No assessment at this time	1	1
Total	80	100

The department has completed two key policy reforms, regarding its use of force policy. The policy is now divided into smaller sub-components that can stand alone, making them easier to teach and learn for LVMPD officers. LVMPD has also begun an annual review of its policy to ensure that it is up to date with recent court rulings and other major events that can influence the direction in which the department wants to take the policy.

LVMPD has significantly revamped its training program and is now on the cutting edge of data-driven training. Ten training reforms have been implemented this past year. Together, the reforms enhance training requirements and departmental oversight of training development and delivery through audits. LVMPD officers are now being trained and recertified in essential skill sets more than ever before. There is still room for

growth, however, with respect to de-escalation training. Although the department does well in training officers to tactically de-escalate a situation, more focus could be given to verbal de-escalation skills for all officers.

Use of force investigations and documentation in LVMPD has significantly improved. Ten out of 12 recommendations have been completed. The department has made significant changes to its administrative review of OISSs. A new section manual dictates the review process and codifies a multi-tiered structure of findings that allows for remediating and disciplining officers when necessary. The process has now been split into two components, which, together, the department calls the Critical Incident Review Process (CIRP). A UoFRB, with a majority of citizen voting members, reviews the use of deadly force, whereas a Tactical Review Board (TRB), without voting citizen members, reviews all tactics and decision making of all officers, then makes recommendations. The process is impressive in many respects but is not without its design flaws. The assessors support the overall objectives, but remain concerned with the potential for conflict between the two boards. The department is actively working to address the conflict.

With respect to criminal investigations of OISSs, the department has recently decided to reconstitute a stand-alone Force Investigation Team (FIT) that specializes in deadly force investigations. The team will be separate from the Robbery and Homicide Bureau. LVMPD plans to ensure that FIT detectives have specialized training on the unique circumstances of OISSs. The department, however, declines to video-record officer interviews. On a related note, the police association continues to encourage officers involved in shootings to not give interviews to homicide investigators.

The department continues its impressive commitment to engage with the community and improve the transparency of OIS investigations. Various new policies have been put into place, which formalize the dissemination of OIS statistics and incident summaries. The department's new communications policy clearly describes the role of the Public Information Officer (PIO) and the sheriff's office in public information sharing with respect to OISSs.

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS ON THE COMBINED SEVENTH TO NINTH PERIODIC REPORTS OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. The Committee considered the seventh to ninth periodic reports of the United States of America, submitted in one document (CERD/C/USA/7-9), at its 2299th and 2300th meetings (CERD/C/SR.2299 and SR.2300), held on 13 and 14 August 2014. At its 2317th meeting, held on 26 August 2014, it adopted the following concluding observations.

A. INTRODUCTION

2. The Committee welcomes the combined seventh to ninth periodic reports submitted by the State party, which provides detailed information on the implementation of the previous recommendations of the Committee (CERD/C/USA/CO/6).

3. The Committee also welcomes the supplementary information provided orally by the large and diverse State party delegation to the issues raised by the Committee during the frank and constructive dialogue between the Committee and the delegation.

B. POSITIVE ASPECTS

4. The Committee notes with appreciation the legislative and policy developments in the State party to combat racial discrimination since its last report, including:

(a) The termination of the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System in April 2011, as recommended by the Committee in its previous concluding observations (CERD/C/USA/CO/6, para. 14);

(b) The issuance of Executive Order 13583 to require agencies to develop strategies to identify and remove existing barriers to equal employment opportunity in Government recruitment, hiring, promotion, retention, professional development and training, as well as Executive Order 13515 in October 2009 to improve the participation of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in federal programmes and employment;

(c) The increased use of the "Systemic Initiative" by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to target "class-based recruitment and hiring practices that discriminate against racial and ethnic groups", resulting in an increased number of systemic lawsuits and financial settlements;

(d) The adoption of the Fair Sentencing Act in August 2010, which has reduced, although not eliminated, the disparity between more lenient sentences for powder cocaine charges and more severe sentences for crack cocaine charges, which are more frequently brought against members of racial and ethnic minorities;

(e) The adoption of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act in October 2009, which inter alia creates a new federal prohibition on hate crimes and simplifies the jurisdictional predicate for prosecuting violent acts undertaken because of actual or perceived race, colour, or national origin; and

(f) The enactment of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act in January 2009, which overrides the Supreme Court decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.* and enables the 180-day statute of limitations for bringing a wage discrimination claim to be reset with each payment of wages, benefits, or other compensation.

C. CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APPLICABILITY OF THE CONVENTION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

5. While noting the applicability of the disparate impact doctrine in certain fields of life, the Committee remains concerned at its limited scope and applicability. It thus reiterates its previous concern that the definition of racial discrimination used in federal and state legislation, as well as in court practice, is not in line with article 1, paragraph 1 of the Convention, which requires States parties to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms, including practices and legislation that may not be discriminatory in purpose, but are discriminatory in effect (CERD/C/USA/CO/6, para. 10). The Committee expresses further concern at the lack of progress achieved in withdrawing or narrowing the scope of the reservation to article 2 of the Convention and in prohibiting all forms of discriminatory acts perpetrated by private individuals, groups or organizations (CERD/C/USA/CO/6, para. 11) (arts. 1(1), 2 and 6).

The Committee underlines the responsibility of the federal state for the implementation of the Convention, and calls upon the State party to take concrete steps to:

(a) Prohibit racial discrimination in all its forms in federal and state legislation, including indirect discrimination, covering all

fields of law and public life, in accordance with article 1, paragraph 1 of the Convention; and

(b) Consider withdrawing or narrowing its reservation to article 2 of the Convention, and broaden the protection afforded by law against all discriminatory acts perpetrated by private individuals, groups or organizations; and

(c) Improve the system of monitoring and response by federal bodies to prevent and challenge situations of racial discrimination.

NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTION

6. While taking note of the creation of the Equality Working Group, the Committee reiterates its concern at the lack of an institutionalized coordinating mechanism with capacities to ensure the effective implementation of the Convention at the federal, state and local levels (CERD/C/USA/CO/6, para. 13). Noting the role that an independent national human rights institution can play in this regard, the Committee expresses regret at the lack of progress in establishing a national human rights institution as recommended in its previous concluding observations (CERD/C/USA/CO/6, para. 12) (art. 2).

The Committee recommends that the State party create a permanent and effective coordinating mechanism, such as a national human rights institution established in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions (the "Paris Principles", General Assembly resolution 48/134, Annex), to ensure the effective implementation of the Convention throughout the State party and territories under its effective control; monitor compliance of domestic laws and policies with the provisions of the Convention; and systematically carry out anti-discrimination training and awareness-raising activities at the federal, state and local levels.

SPECIAL MEASURES

7. Taking note of the Supreme Court decision of April 2014 in *Schuetz v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action* and the measures adopted by several states against the use of affirmative action in school admissions, the Committee expresses concern at the increasing restrictions on the use of special measures as a tool to eliminate persistent disparities in the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms based on race or ethnic origin (art. 2(2)).

The Committee reiterates its previous recommendation to adopt and strengthen the use of special measures, which is an obligation arising from article 2, paragraph 2 of the Convention, when circumstances warrant their use as a tool to eliminate the persistent disparities in the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms based on race or ethnic origin. In this regard, it recommends that the State party take into account the Committee's general recommendation No. 32 (2009) on the meaning and scope of special measures in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms Racial Discrimination.

RACIAL PROFILING AND ILLEGAL SURVEILLANCE

8. While welcoming the acknowledgement made by the State party that racial or ethnic profiling is not effective law enforcement practice and is inconsistent with its commitment to fairness in the justice system, the Committee remains concerned at the practice of racial profiling of racial or ethnic minorities by law enforcement officials, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Transportation Security Administration, border enforcement officials, and local police (arts. 2, 4(c) and 5(b)).

Recalling its general recommendation No. 31 (2001) on the prevention of racial discrimination in the administration and functioning of the criminal justice system, the Committee urges the State party to intensify efforts to effectively combat and end the practice of racial profiling by federal, state and local law enforcement officials, including by:

(a) Adopting and implementing legislation which specifically prohibits law enforcement officials from engaging in racial profiling, such as the End Racial Profiling Act;

(b) Swiftly revising policies insofar as they permit racial profiling, illegal surveillance, monitoring and intelligence gathering, including the 2003 Guidance Regarding the Use of Race by Federal Law Enforcement Agencies;

(c) Ending immigration enforcement programmes and policies, which indirectly promote racial profiling, such as the Secure Communities programme and the 287(g) programme.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the implications of the crime committed against the late Michael Brown on August 9th, 2014 and the subsequent riots in Ferguson. It has been 59 years since the murder and kidnapping of Emmett Till, and in 2014, the cycle of mistreatment continues. What happened in Ferguson, Missouri was a tragedy. It is yet another reminder underlining the mistreatment of communities of color in the United States. The pain and discontent we all feel toward the Ferguson Police Department is valid, but we cannot express our anger without taking a formal stance against the militarization of law enforcement.

As Members of Congress who represent communities of color, the purpose of today's special order is to highlight community policing and lessons learned from Ferguson. Although, economic and social parity remain a constant issue in our communities, our focus now shifts to improper policing and blatant violations of civil rights. We are all citizens of this great nation, but we are also citizens of communities in crisis.

As a United States Congresswoman for over 20 years, I have fought to procure racial equity here in the United States. Though headway has been made, all of this work falls by the wayside when travesties like those seen in Ferguson continue to occur. Mr. Speaker, this is much more than a question of racial equality. It is a question of "what can be done today to safeguard human rights and the protection of human life in the future."

In the 1960's, the world watched in horror as civil rights demonstrators in Selma, Alabama faced local police officers armed with fire hoses and attack dogs. In 2014, the citizens of Ferguson faced local police officers armed with automatic weapons, sniper assault weapons and armored tanks provided by the Department of Defense. It is unconscionable that the local police could use military tactics and armaments against citizens exercising their right to peaceably assemble.

The Department of Justice has had the legal authority to investigate whether a law enforce-

ment organization is engaging in a "pattern of practice" in civil rights violations, since 1994. However, despite dozens of allegations filed against law enforcement in the city of Ferguson, nothing has been done to address the use of excessive police force. As a result, heinous crimes like those seen in the cases of Michael Brown have become our reality.

For this reason, as we stand united against the crimes committed in Ferguson, we must also focus our efforts on ensuring that local police departments are not authorized to wage war against communities of color. We must put an end to the federal grants that encourage local police forces to create war zones within our communities. The lesson learned from Ferguson is clear. We must stand against the militarization of law enforcement and improper community policing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 606. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

H.R. 1671. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office".

H.R. 2291. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office".

H.R. 3472. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3765. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building".

H.R. 4386. An act to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5195. An act to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on August 5, 2014, she presented to the president of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 76. Making an emergency supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, to provide funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.

H.R. 606. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the "Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building".

H.R. 1671. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6937 Village Parkway in Dublin, California, as the "James 'Jim' Kohnen Post Office".

H.R. 2291. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office".

H.R. 3472. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gorniewicz Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3765. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building".

H.R. 4386. To allow the Secretary of the Treasury to rely on State examinations for certain financial institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5195. To provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3548. To amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. To designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the "Jason Crisp Forest Service Building".

H.R. 4631. To reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. To redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as "30th Street Station", as the "William H. Gray III 30th Street Station".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REBECCA TALLENT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 11 AND JULY 14, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rebecca Tallent	7/11	7/14	Guatemala		649.00		³ 332.46		365.84		1,347.30
	7/13	7/13	Honduras				(³)		107.19		107.19
Committee total					649.00		332.46		473.03		1,454.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military Air transportation.

REBECCA TALLENT, Aug. 6, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MATT LEFFINGWELL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 11 AND JULY 14, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Matt Leffingwell	7/11	7/14	Guatemala		649.00		³ 332.46		365.84		1,347.30
	7/13	7/13	Honduras				(³)		107.19		107.19
Committee total					649.00		332.46		473.03		1,454.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

MATT LEFFINGWELL, Aug. 5, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, STEVAN PEARCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 11 AND JULY 14, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Stevan E. Pearce	7/11	7/14	Guatemala		649.00				365.84		1,347.30
	7/13	7/13	Honduras				(³)		107.19		107.19
Committee total					649.00		332.46		473.03		1,454.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. STEVAN PEARCE, Aug. 7, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Harold Rogers	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,227.00		706.11		1,170.67		
Hon. Henry Cuellar	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Anne Marie Chotvacs	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Jennifer Hing	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
BG Wright	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Brooke Boyer	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Clelia Alvarado	4/11	4/14	Columbia		1,340.00		706.11		1,170.67		
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		807.00		531.88		659.38		
Commercial airfare							426.23				
Hon. Mike Quigley	4/21	4/24	Ukraine		1,108.53		10,397.00				
Hon. Adam B. Schiff	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00						
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00						
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia								
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00						
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00						
Hon. Henry Cuellar	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00						
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00						
	5/15	5/15	Saudi Arabia								
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00						
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00						
Will Smith	6/1	6/4	Israel		1,464.00				333.95		
	6/4	6/7	Italy		1,575.11				135.59		
Commercial airfare							6,874.52				
Mike Robinson	6/1	6/4	Israel		1,464.00				333.95		
	6/4	6/7	Italy		1,575.11				135.59		
Commercial airfare							6,874.52				
Jennifer Hing	6/1	6/4	Israel		1,464.00				333.95		
	6/4	6/7	Italy		1,575.11				135.59		
Commercial airfare							6,874.52				
Anne Marie Chotvacs	6/1	6/4	Israel		1,464.00				333.95		

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	6/4	6/7	Italy		525.03				135.59		
David Pomerantz	6/1	6/4	Israel		1,464.00		7,246.02		333.95		
Commercial airfare							9,534.52				
Hon. Tom Latham	6/2	6/6	Vietnam		1,164.35						
	6/6	6/7	Singapore		450.27						
Committee total					39,547.51		57,599.37		16,193.13		113,340.01

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, July 30, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS STAFF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED
BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Turner, Chester L.	5/6	5/13	Seoul, Korea		2,122.75		9,771.50		403.40		12,297.65
Committee total					2,122.75		9,771.50		403.40		12,297.65

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, July 30, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to China, Vietnam With CODEL Leahy, April 11–24, 2014:											
Hon. Jim Cooper	4/14	4/15	China		1,072.53						1,072.53
	4/15	4/20	Vietnam		928.00						928.00
	4/20	4/22	China		637.62						637.62
Visit to United Arab Emirates, Afghanistan, Pakistan With CODEL Roby, May 9–14, 2014:											
Hon. Susan Davis	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates								
	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Commercial transportation							11,734.60				11,734.60
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates								
	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Commerical transportation							11,734.60				11,734.60
Hon. Tammy Duckworth	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates								
	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Commercial transportation							11,734.60				11,734.60
Jaime Cheshire	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates								
	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Commercial transportation							11,734.60				11,734.60
Debra Wada	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates								
	5/10	5/12	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Commercial transportation							11,734.60				11,734.60
Delegation Expenses	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates						631.26		631.26
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan						792.37		792.37
Visit to Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates With CODEL Bachmann, May 24–28, 2014:											
Hon. Pete Gallego	5/25	5/25	United Arab Emirates								
	5/25	5/27	Afghanistan		14.00						14.00
	5/27	5/27	United Arab Emirates								
Commerical transportation							11,348.70				11,348.70
Visit to Philippines, Vietnam, Singapore With STAFFDEL Karem, May 30–June 7, 2014:											
Peter Villano	5/30	6/3	Philippines		267.55						267.55
	6/3	6/5	Vietnam		374.18						374.18
Commercial transportation											
Michael Casey	5/30	6/3	Philippines		267.55						267.55
	6/3	6/5	Vietnam		374.18						374.18
Commercial transportation											
Visit to Vietnam, Singapore With CODEL Kline, May 30–June 8, 2014:											
Hon. Mike McIntyre	6/2	6/6	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	6/6	6/8	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	6/2	6/6	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	6/6	6/8	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Committee total					8,016.30		70,021.70		1,423.63		79,461.63

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, Chairman, July 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Kline	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Juliane Sullivan	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Janelle Belland	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Elizabeth Podgorski	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Brian Newell	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Hon. David "Phil" Roe	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Hon. Richard Hudson	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,023.38						1,023.38
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		442.45						442.45
Hon. Tom Price	06/02	06/06	Vietnam		1,164.35						1,164.35
	06/06	06/07	Singapore		450.27						450.27
Hon. Frederica Wilson	06/13	06/15	Nigeria		1,072.78		9,706.50				10,779.28
Committee total					13,840.95		9,706.50				23,547.45

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, July 29, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Renee Ellmers	5/10	5/10	United Arab Emirates				11,770.40				11,770.40
	5/10	5/11	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	5/12	5/14	Pakistan		114.29						114.29
Hon. Henry Waxman	5/11	5/17	Israel		2,568.00		1,737.32		18,214.79		22,520.11
Hon. John Barrow	5/24	5/28	Asia				2,480.70				2,480.70
David Redl	6/23	6/25	England		1,057.13		1,185.20				2,242.33
Shawn Chang	6/23	6/25	England		1,057.13		1,085.20				2,142.33
Committee total					4,852.55		18,258.82		18,214.79		41,326.16

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, July 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Patrick Murphy	5/25	5/27	Afghanistan				2,480.70				2,480.70
Hon. Michele Bachmann	6/2	6/4	Malta		828.00						828.00
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		516.00						516.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,557.00		18,183.80				19,740.80
Committee total					2,901.00		20,664.50				23,565.50

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, July 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Piero Tozzi	4/13	4/17	Tanzania		1,358.44		6,761.10				8,119.54
Hon. David Cicilline	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,222.29		30,264.10				31,486.39
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		856.34						856.34
	4/23	4/25	Armenia		552.00						552.00
Hon. Alan Lowenthal	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		858.53		12,681.00				13,539.53
Hon. Ted Poe	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		911.60		10,332.50				11,244.10
Marcus Micheli	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		743.64		8,826.30				9,569.94
	4/23	4/25	Armenia		751.88						751.88
Elizabeth Heng	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,123.79		13,511.10				14,634.89
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		811.84						811.84
	4/23	4/26	Armenia		971.82						971.82
Shane Wolfe	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,109.29		13,475.80				14,585.09
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		801.34						801.34
	4/23	4/26	Armenia		1,063.82						1,063.82
Hon. Edward Royce	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,160.29		13,511.10		*186.81		14,858.20
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		846.64				*12,088.39		12,935.03
	4/23	4/26	Armenia		971.74				*4,984.59		5,956.33
Hon. Eliot Engel	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,182.29		13,124.40				14,306.69
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		826.34						826.34
	4/23	4/26	Armenia		1,110.82						1,110.82

September 8, 2014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 160, Pt. 10

14159

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lois Frankel	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,222.29		13,591.00				14,813.29
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		856.34						856.34
	4/23	4/26	Armenia		1,160.82						1,160.82
Douglas Seay	4/21	4/24	Ukraine		1,024.53		1,854.00				2,878.53
Jason Steinbaum	4/18	4/21	Azerbaijan		1,162.29		8,771.40				9,933.69
	4/21	4/23	Ukraine		806.34						806.34
Hon. Steve Chabot	5/13	5/15	China		654.00		19,428.00				20,082.00
	5/15	5/16	Mongolia		267.00				*1,104.99		1,371.99
	5/17	5/18	Ukraine		324.00						324.00
Kevin Fitzpatrick	5/13	5/15	China		664.00		19,428.00				20,092.00
	5/15	5/16	Mongolia		235.00						235.00
	5/17	5/18	Ukraine		324.00						324.00
Mark Walker	5/11	5/14	Mexico		1,086.00		856.00				1,942.00
Eric Jacobstein	5/11	5/14	Mexico		1,086.00		862.18				1,948.18
Thomas Alexander	5/12	5/13	Algeria		129.00		3,365.60				3,494.60
	5/13	5/15	Tunisia		480.00						480.00
	5/15	5/16	Germany		461.00						461.00
Thomas Hill	5/11	5/13	Algeria		129.00		3,454.00				3,583.00
	5/13	5/16	Tunisia		720.00						720.00
Mira Resnick	5/12	5/13	Algeria		48.00		3,454.70				3,502.70
	5/13	5/16	Tunisia		725.45						725.45
Karen Bass	5/21	5/23	Nigeria		302.00		9,458.80				9,760.80
	5/23	5/24	Ethiopia		325.00		325.00				650.00
	5/24	5/25	London		366.00						366.00
Travis Adkins	5/21	5/23	Nigeria		368.00		6,452.22				6,820.22
	5/23	5/24	Ethiopia		325.00						325.00
	5/24	5/25	London		366.00						366.00
Hon. Steve Stockman	5/23	5/27	Ukraine		124.63		15,537.94				15,662.57
Hon. Juan Vargas	6/1	6/4	Malta		1,324.48		(³)				1,324.48
	6/4	6/5	Belgium		375.00		(³)				375.00
	6/5	6/8	United Kingdom		1,206.00		(³)				1,206.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	5/30	6/1	Mexico		78.00		468.00				546.00
Leah Campos	5/30	6/1	Mexico		78.00		761.50				839.50
Hon. Edward Royce	6/21	6/21	Mexico		78.00		292.00				370.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	6/21	6/21	Mexico		78.00						78.00
Leah Campos	6/21	6/21	Mexico		78.00						692.00
Hon. Steve Stockman	6/13	6/16	Nigeria		1,103.86		8,417.50				9,521.36
Hon. Lois Frankel	6/13	6/15	Nigeria		620.00		8,861.50				9,681.50
Elizabeth Heng	6/13	6/15	Nigeria		1,066.81		9,636.50				10,703.31
Jacqueline Quinones	6/13	6/15	Nigeria		1,138.00		9,671.50				10,809.50
Hon. Mark Meadows	4/11	4/14	Colombia		807.00		(³)				807.00
	4/14	4/16	Mexico		1,340.00		(³)				1,340.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	5/12	5/16	Peru		990.54		1,984.74				2,975.28
Piero Tozzi	5/12	5/16	Peru		1,254.60		1,653.74				2,908.34
Committee total					46,792.72		271,687.22		18,364.78		336,844.72

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

* Indicates Delegation Costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, July 30, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Reynold Schweickhardt	6/10	6/14	Italy		1,443.57		2,425.10				3,868.67
Committee total					1,443.57		2,425.10				3,868.67

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, July 28, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,977.39		1,180.79		3,800.18
Hon. Tom Marino	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,827.39		1,180.79		3,650.18
Hon. Steve King	4/13	4/16	Guatemala, Haiti		420.00		1,739.20		440.47		2,599.67
Hon. Luis Gutiérrez	4/10	4/12	Mexico		236.00		1,343.89		609.86		2,189.75
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	4/14	4/16	Mexico, Haiti		458.00		1,390.39		919.86		2,768.25
Hon. Gregory W. Meeks	4/11	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		2,166.39		1,180.79		3,989.18
Kayla Munro	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,937.39		1,180.79		3,760.18
Dimple Shah	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,937.39		1,180.79		3,760.18
Robert Parmiter	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,977.39		1,180.79		3,800.18
Carrie Meadows	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,937.39		1,180.79		3,760.18
Keenan Keller	4/10	4/16	Mexico, Guatemala, Haiti		642.00		1,937.39		1,180.79		3,760.18
Hon. Louie Gohmert	6/4	6/5	Nigeria		236.00		11,858.00		None		12,094.00
Committee total					6,486.00		32,029.60		11,416.51		49,932.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Aug. 1, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doc Hastings	6/2	6/6	Vietnam		368.00		796.35				1,164.35
	6/6	6/7	Singapore		144.00		306.27				450.27
Committee total					512.00		1,102.62				1,614.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, July 28, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Welch	4/14	4/16	China		637.62						637.62
	4/16	4/20	Vietnam		928.00						928.00
	4/20	4/22	Hong Kong		637.62						637.62
Hon. Stephen Lynch	5/13	5/15	China		754.00						754.00
	5/15	5/16	Mongolia		245.17						245.17
	5/16	5/18	Ukraine		374.00						374.00
Commercial airfare							19,538.70				19,538.70
Hon. Darrell Issa	6/29	7/1	United Kingdom		552.00						552.00
Commercial airfare							1,045.60				1,045.60
Brien Beattie	6/29	7/1	United Kingdom		552.00						552.00
Commercial airfare							1,045.60				1,045.60
Christopher Knauer	6/29	7/1	United Kingdom		552.00						552.00
Commercial airfare							1,045.60				1,045.60
Committee total					5,232.41		22,675.50				27,907.91

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL. E. ISSA, Chairman, July 30, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Schweikert	6/29	6/30	Georgia		105.00						105.00
	6/30	7/2	Azerbaijan		228.00						228.00
	7/2	7/3	Moldova		73.00						73.00
Committee total					406.00						406.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, July 29, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Stephen Claeys	5/17	5/21	Singapore		1,681.15		11,723.70		1,317.19		14,722.04
Jason Kearns	5/18	5/21	Singapore		1,210.07		12,825.30				14,035.37
Hon. Jim Gerlach	4/21	4/24	Ukraine		1,108.53		9,827.70		96.00		11,032.23
Hon. Vern Buchanan	5/11	5/14	Turkey		1,530.00		(³)				1,530.00
	5/14	5/15	Jordan		403.00		(³)				403.00
	5/15	5/15	Saudia Arabia				(³)				
	5/15	5/18	United Arab Emirates		1,718.00		(³)				1,718.00
	5/18	5/19	Italy		348.00		(³)				348.00
Committee total					7,998.75		34,376.70		1,413.19		43,788.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, July 31, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Katie Wheelbarger, Deputy Staff Director	4/20	4/24	Middle East		792.00						
	4/24	4/25	Middle East		459.30						
Commercial airfare							6,769.00				8,020.30
Chelsey Campbell, Professional Staff	4/20	4/24	Middle East		792.00						
	4/24	4/25	Middle East		459.30						
Commercial airfare							6,769.00				8,020.30

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Geof Kahn, Professional Staff	4/20	4/24	Middle East		792.00						
Commercial airfare	4/24	4/25	Middle East		459.30						
Ashley Barry, Chief Clerk	4/20	4/24	Middle East		792.00		6,769.00				8,020.30
Commercial airfare	4/24	4/25	Middle East		459.30						
Michael Bahar, Professional Staff	4/20	4/24	Middle East		792.00		6,769.00				8,020.30
Commercial airfare	4/24	4/25	Middle East		459.30						
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/21	4/24	Africa		992.00						
Commercial airfare							13,632.50				14,624.50
Linda Cohen, Professional Staff	4/21	4/24	Africa		992.00						
Commercial airfare							12,287.50				13,279.50
Michael Ellis, Lead Counsel	4/20	4/23	South America		1,010.00						
Commercial airfare	4/23	4/25	South America		669.14						
Allison Getty, Professional Staff	4/20	4/23	South America		1,010.00		2,089.89				3,769.03
Commercial airfare	4/23	4/25	South America		669.14						
Hon. Michele Bachmann	4/20	4/22	Europe		251.05		2,089.89				3,769.03
Commercial airfare	4/22	4/23	Europe		246.61						
	4/23	4/24	Europe		384.56						
	4/24	4/25	Europe		275.45						
	4/25	4/27	Eurasia		1,066.00						
Commercial airfare							16,732.80				18,956.47
Bryan Smith, Budget Director	4/20	4/22	Europe		251.05						
Commercial airfare	4/22	4/23	Europe		246.61						
	4/23	4/24	Europe		384.56						
	4/24	4/25	Europe		275.45						
	4/25	4/27	Eurasia		1,066.00						
Commercial airfare							15,490.00				17,713.67
Lisa Major, Research Assistant	4/20	4/22	Europe		251.05						
Commercial airfare	4/22	4/23	Europe		246.61						
	4/23	4/24	Europe		384.56						
	4/24	4/25	Europe		275.45						
	4/25	4/27	Eurasia		1,066.00						
Commercial airfare							15,490.00				17,713.67
Nathan Hauser, Professional Staff	5/11	5/13	Asia		474.00						
Commercial airfare	5/13	5/15	Asia		549.00						
	5/15	5/17	Asia		806.82						
Tom Corcoran, Professional Staff	5/11	5/13	Asia		474.00		15,246.20				17,076.02
Commercial airfare	5/13	5/15	Asia		549.00						
	5/15	5/17	Asia		806.82						
Khizer Syed, Research Assistant	5/11	5/13	Asia		474.00		15,246.20				17,076.02
Commercial airfare	5/13	5/15	Asia		549.00						
	5/15	5/17	Asia		806.82						
Hon. Michele Bachmann	5/25	5/28	Asia				15,246.20				17,076.02
Andrew Keiser, Professional Staff	6/2	6/4	Asia		564.64		(³)				(³)
Commercial airfare	6/5	6/7	Asia		851.47						
Amanda Rogers Thorpe, Professional Staff	6/2	6/4	Asia		564.64		12,237.80				13,653.91
Commercial airfare	6/5	6/7	Asia		851.47						
Katie Wheelbarger, Deputy Staff Director	6/2	6/3	Middle East		252.52		12,237.80				13,653.91
Commercial airfare	6/3	6/7	Asia								
Chelsey Campbell, Professional Staff	6/2	6/3	Middle East		252.52		9,871.80				10,124.32
Commercial airfare	6/3	6/7	Asia								
Michael Bahar, Professional Staff	6/2	6/3	Middle East		252.52		9,871.80				10,124.32
Commercial airfare	6/3	6/7	Asia								
Committee total							9,871.80				10,124.32
Committee total											256,549.88

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, July 29, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Burges	5/23	5/27	Ukraine	Hryvnia	1,157.08		12,271.44				13,428.52
Hon. Christopher H. Smith	6/04	6/07	Nigeria	Naira	1,165.75		7,593.10				8,758.85
	6/08	6/09	Italy	Euro	449.71						449.71
Mark Milosch	5/23	5/27	Ukraine	Hryvnia	1,347.60		2,764.70				4,112.30
	6/04	6/07	Nigeria	Naira	1,136.80		7,558.10				8,694.90
	6/08	6/09	Italy	Euro	449.71						449.71
Committee total					5,706.65		30,187.34				39,893.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Cochairman, Aug. 5, 2014.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6865. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approved Tests for Bovine Tuberculosis in Cervids [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0027] received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6866. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Blueberries From Morocco Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0016] (RIN: 0579-AD81) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6867. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Spear-mint Oil Produced in the Far West; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0027; FV14-985-3 FIR] received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6868. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Cotton Transition Assistance Program and General Provisions for Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage Programs (RIN: 0560-AI22) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6869. A letter from the Program Manager, BioPreferred Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA18) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6870. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2014 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Specifications [Docket No.: 140115049-4528-02] (RIN: 0648-XD092) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6871. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental appropriations request for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014; (H. Doc. No. 113-144); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6872. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1009(e); (H. Doc. No. 113-153); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

6873. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Standardizing Facility Condition Assessments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6874. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Department's facility repair and recapitalization goals based on the Quality (Q) ratings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6875. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting author-

ization of 8 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6876. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 report on activities to preserve and promote minority ownership of minority depository financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6877. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations [Release No.: 34-72936; File No. S7-18-11] (RIN: 3235-AL15) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a continuation of the national emergency regarding export control regulations, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 113-145); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6879. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-40, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6880. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of Guatemala (Transmittal No. 09-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6881. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-50, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6882. A letter from the Under Secretary, Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on Sanctions on Exports and Reexports of Commodities that are used to support Oil and Gas Operation in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6883. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 140627545-4617-01] (RIN: 0694-AG22) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6884. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Update of Export Control Classification Number 0Y521 Series Supplement — Biosensor Systems and Related Software and Technology [Docket No.: 140711578-4578-01] (RIN: 0694-AG23) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6885. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Defense Priorities and Allocations Systems [Docket No.: 0912311453-4308-03] (RIN: 0694-AE81) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6886. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of

Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wassenaar Arrangement 2013 Plenary Agreements Implementation: Commerce Control List, Definitions, and Reports; and Extension of Fly-by-Wire Technology and Software Controls [Docket No.: 131224999-3999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG05) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6887. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 14-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with the Republic of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6888. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 10-14 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Australia, Canada, the French Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kingdom of Norway, Kingdom of Spain, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6889. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6890. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-040, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6891. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of the U.S. supporting an operation to deliver humanitarian assistance to civilians in the town of Amirli, Iraq; (H. Doc. No. 113-146); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6892. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of an authorization of targeted airstrikes in Iraq; (H. Doc. No. 113-147); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6893. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of U.S. Armed Forces conducting targeted airstrikes in Iraq to protect American personnel; (H. Doc. No. 113-148); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6894. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of further targeted airstrikes to recapture the Mosul Dam; (H. Doc. No. 113-149); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6895. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to certain terrorist attacks is to continue for one year beyond September 14, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 113-150); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6896. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of a deployment of up to approximately 350 additional U.S. military personnel in Iraq; (H. Doc. No. 113-151); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6897. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for locality pay increases payable to civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule (GS) and certain other pay systems for 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5305(a)(3); (H. Doc. No. 113-152); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and ordered to be printed.

6898. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-422, "Fair Criminal Record Screening Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6899. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-385, "Sustainable DC Omnibus Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6900. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-386, "Board of Elections Nominating Petition Circulator Affidavit Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6901. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-387, "Party Officer Elections Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6902. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-388, "Driver's Safety Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6903. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-389, "Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System Conformity Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6904. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-415, "Tenant Bill of Rights Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6905. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-416, "Prohibition of the Harm of Police Animals Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6906. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-417, "Marriage License Issuance Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6907. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-418, "Child Development Home License Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6908. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-419, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6909. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-420, "Post-Arrest Process Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6910. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-421, "Other Post-Employment Benefits Fund Amendment Act of 2014"; pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6911. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6912. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6913. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6914. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6915. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Nondiscrimination Provisions (RIN: 3206-AM77) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6916. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the District's Eastern Market Program and Fund"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6917. A letter from the Architect, Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the AOC for the period of January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014; (H. Doc. No. 113-143); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6918. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve; Off-Road Vehicles [NPS-WRST-15781; PPAKWRSTPO, PPMPASIZ.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AE14) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6919. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6920. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Positive Train Control Systems (RRR) [Docket No.: FRA-2011-0061, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-AC32) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6921. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 2014 annual report on recommendations made by the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6922. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Notice, Comment, and Appeal Proce-

dures for National Forest System Projects and Activities and Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process (RIN: 0596-AD18) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Supplemental report on H.R. 5078. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-568, Pt. 2).

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3670. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113-572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for scientific frameworks with respect to vector-borne diseases; with amendments (Rept. 113-573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5057. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5161. A bill to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (Rept. 113-575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 744. A bill to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113-576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.J. Res. 120. A resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution (Rept. 113-577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3109. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaskan Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4751. A bill to make technical corrections to Public Law 110-229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-579). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3522. A bill to authorize

health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-580, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 715. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 644) condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists (Rept. 113-581). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3522 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5401. A bill to impose limitations on the immigration status and immigration benefits for Libyan and third country nationals acting on behalf of Libyan entities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5402. A bill to amend the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide that the Federal Trade Commission shall exercise authority with respect to mergers only under the Clayton Act and only in the same procedural manner as the Attorney General exercises such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUTZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5403. A bill to nullify certain guidance of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and to provide requirements for guidance issued by the Bureau with respect to indirect auto lending; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 5405. A bill to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5406. A bill to authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5407. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct a study on the cost of the purchase and use of body cameras by State and local law enforcement agencies, and to require law enforcement agencies to purchase and use body cameras as a condition on the receipt of Federal funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 5408. A bill to amend section 349(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to add certain acts of allegiance to a foreign terrorist organization to the list of acts for which nationals of the United States lose nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 5409. A bill to require consultation with State and local officials prior to awarding a grant or contract for housing facilities for unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5410. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New York Avenue in Sound Beach, New York, as the "John Moerlins Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5411. A bill to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5412. A bill to facilitate and streamline the Bureau of Reclamation process for creating or expanding surface water storage under Reclamation law; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5413. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that Federal, State, and local agencies to which surplus military equipment and personal property is sold or donated demonstrate that agency personnel are certified, trained, or licensed, as appropriate, in the proper operation of the equipment prior to the sale or donation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5414. A bill to require a patent correction involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado to protect bona fide private property rights in the Elkhorn Ranch adversely impacted by a 1949 resurvey of the southern boundary of Section 18 of Township 7 South, Range 93 West, Sixth Principle Meridian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 5415. A bill to authorize the use of military force against international terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5416. A bill to repeal the War Powers Resolution and to provide for proper war powers consultation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.J. Res. 123. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 714. A resolution reaffirming the peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea as provided for by universally recognized principles of international law, and reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 716. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President and the Secretary of State should ensure that the Canadian Government does not permanently store nuclear waste in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 5401.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 5402.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation

exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes;" Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and, Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 5403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution which gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 5404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 5408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 1

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 5409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United State Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 5414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the preamble of the Constitution providing for the "common defense" and in the powers governing national security in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the preamble of the Constitution providing for the "common defense" and in the powers governing national security in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.J. Res. 123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I Section 8, Clause 11

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 129: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 140: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 171: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 292: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 310: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 318: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 411: Mr. VELA, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 494: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 543: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 676: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 713: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 792: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 809: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 877: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 917: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 997: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1010: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1084: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1199: Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KIND, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1227: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1250: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1313: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1331: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1386: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1427: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1428: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1429: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1527: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1563: Mr. REED, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COOK, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1630: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1812: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1821: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1854: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1893: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1971: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1975: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 2058: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 2116: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2139: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2178: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2202: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2315: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2384: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2415: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2495: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2523: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. RUPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2591: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 2673: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 2697: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2794: Mr. FARR and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 2827: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2835: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2852: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2856: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 3024: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3040: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3043: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3146: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3215: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 3351: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3471: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3481: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3522: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3586: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 3673: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3698: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3708: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3712: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3723: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3742: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3833: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 3850: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 3877: Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3892: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3940: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 3954: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3978: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3997: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 4172: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4190: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4221: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 4299: Mr. HARPER and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 4347: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4351: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MICA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 4368: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4426: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4446: Mr. NADLER, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4498: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4538: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4567: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4577: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. REED, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 4613: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4632: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4664: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4682: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4695: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4717: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4720: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 4748: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 4749: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 4781: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 4811: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 4815: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 4837: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4857: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4878: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4879: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 4885: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4886: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4916: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 4920: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4930: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4934: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4966: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4969: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 4978: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4985: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4987: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 5004: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5033: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5051: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5059: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 5069: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. McALLISTER, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5071: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 5083: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5098: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 5154: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 5159: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5190: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5212: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5219: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5226: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 5227: Mr. HANNA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5228: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 5233: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5239: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5245: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 5253: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5262: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 5263: Mr. STIVERS and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5266: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 5279: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5285: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 5296: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 5320: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 5321: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 5360: Mr. BARR, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 5363: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5392: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HONDA.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. WALZ.
H.J. Res. 119: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. DENHAM.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. HUDSON.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Res. 30: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 109: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 147: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 428: Mr. COBLE.
H. Res. 440: Mr. BYRNE.
H. Res. 526: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 620: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 679: Mr. BARR.
H. Res. 697: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 701: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 705: Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 707: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Ms. MENG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 711: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FARR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative DEFAZIO, or a designee, to H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE ANGELINA COLLEGE LADY ROADRUNNERS FOR CLAIMING NJCAA CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to recognize the incredible 2013–2014 Angelina College Lady Roadrunner Softball team members who merit congratulations for their success, both on and off the field. This group of extraordinary women attained for their school the coveted title of NJCAA Division I National Softball Champions, an accomplishment which also represents the first national title for Angelina College.

In addition, the Lady Roadrunners became the first team from Texas to win the NJCAA Division I World Series since the tournament's inception in 1977.

From start to finish, this team had to overcome adversity at every turn—including mechanical malfunctions, bad weather and sleep deprivation. But on the field, this team exemplified what determination could accomplish.

The team lost in game one of the championship tournament, but the Lady Roadrunners rallied behind their defeat and triumphed in game two over Central Florida with a score of eight to five. The team finished out their season with forty-two wins, sixty-two homeruns and a national title.

Off the field and in the classroom, this group of women illustrate that determination can translate into success no matter the arena. These young women finished their championship season with a total grade point average for the team of three point three, landing them an appearance on the Academic All-American list.

It is my privilege to honor team members Madalyn Sumrall, Trina Deyo, Katelyn Barker, Kaylon Morvant, Kristin Boulware, Gia Johns, Taylor Harper, Shelby Bruner, Sage Martinez, Kassie James, Sidney Allen, Kayleigh Roy, Meranda Rodriguez, Samantha Moore, Melissa Boland, Ashley Ingle, and Tessa Thomas.

The team undoubtedly thrived under the skillful leadership of Head Coach Mark Mattson, Assistant Coach Barbara Mattson, Student Trainer Bridget Chandler, Athletic Secretary Debbie Mareno, Sports Information Director Gary Stallard, Athletic Director Guy Davis, and Angelina College President Dr. Larry Phillips.

It is with great pride that I join the constituents of the First District of Texas in congratulating the players and athletic staff of the 2014 NJCAA Division I National Champions, the Angelina College Lady Roadrunner Softball Team. Their legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

HONORING ATTORNEY WILL ELLIS PITTMAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Attorney Will Ellis Pittman.

Attorney Pittman was born and raised in Tutwiler, MS. Mr. Pittman is 51 years old. He is the owner and managing member of Pittman & Associates, PLLC law firm in Clarksdale, Mississippi where he also serves as the first African-American County Prosecutor for Coahoma County. Attorney Pittman also serves as the board attorney for the Tunica County Board of Supervisors and is the first African-American to represent the Tunica County Board of Supervisors. Attorney Pittman is recognized amongst family, his community, and his colleagues as a man of wisdom, service, a generous spirit, and passion. He regularly attends and serves on the finance committee of the Galena Missionary Baptist Church in Tutwiler, Mississippi which he grew up in and joined at eight years of age.

Ellis attended and graduated from public high school in Tallahatchie County, Mississippi. After earning his high school diploma, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. While in the Marine Corps, Ellis married his high school sweetheart, and they had two (2) children. After being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps, Ellis returned to his home town in Tutwiler.

However, he was unable to find employment anywhere in the delta area. Ellis returned to work and earned a living on the plantation in Tallahatchie County where he grew up. Ellis worked six (6) sometimes seven (7) days a week to provide food, shelter, and the bare necessities for his family. He always knew that if given the opportunity, he would provide them with a better way of life.

After working one full year and saving every penny that he could, Ellis departed for Dallas, Texas where he obtained a job with a janitorial service, cleaning grocery stores at night. Within two months Ellis saved enough funds for a deposit and first months' rent on an apartment. He then returned to Mississippi to get his wife and child and they returned to Dallas, Texas. Within six months, the store at which Ellis was employed took notice of his hard work and daily attendance and the store manager offered him a job as an apprentice baker that provided health insurance, dental, and vision benefits for both him and his family. With this break, Ellis used the extra earnings to provide a better place for his family to stay. Within six months, Ellis had worked his way from an apprentice baker to a journeyman baker and was able to provide his family with the kind of things that he had always dreamed of having.

Although he excelled in his employment, Ellis realized that in order to do more for his family he would have to obtain a college education. At the same time, Ellis desired to return home to be with his elderly father who became ill. So, he applied for and was hired with the Mississippi Department of Corrections as a correctional officer trainee.

He then made plans to attend Mississippi Valley State University to obtain a college degree. Prior to applying to Mississippi Valley State University, the Pittman's home caught on fire in which Ellis received second and third degree burns over a large portion of his body. His wife received severe burns as well. After a month, she passed away from the injuries she sustained from the fire. Ellis remained in the Greenville Burn Center for a month and half before he was released. After a short period of time, he returned to his place of employment at the Mississippi State Penitentiary. The home that he had purchased for his family had burned down, so the Department of Corrections provided him with a house on the grounds for him and his two minor sons to live.

At this point, he made the decision not to attend Mississippi Valley State University due to the drive because he would have to commute. Being a single parent and still having to work, Ellis applied to Delta State University which was closer to where he was living at the penitentiary and he could make the daily commute. He commuted five days a week for three years until he graduated from Delta State University with a degree in criminal justice and political science.

Prior to graduation from Delta State University, Ellis applied to law school at Mississippi College, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, and the University of Mississippi School of Law. He was accepted for admission at all three law schools. However, he chose to attend the University of Mississippi—School of Law due to the financial aid available for African-American applicants. After obtaining his law degree and license to practice law, Ellis returned to the Mississippi Delta from Memphis, Tennessee and opened Pittman Law Office in Clarksdale, Mississippi in 1996 where he continues to practice to this day.

Ellis has given countless young lawyers, that have recently graduated with no experience and unable to find a job, a position at his law office to give them a start. He realized that most people will do well if given the chance which he learned from personal experience when he needed someone to give him a chance. There has not been a time when a newly admitted lawyer came to Ellis looking for job and was turned down for employment.

Ellis' practice has included representing countless individuals in cases for excessive force, employment discrimination, criminal defense, family law, as well as personal injury and wrongful death.

Attorney Will Ellis Pittman's work ethic, passion, dedication, dependability, and service

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

have made him synonymous with being one of the best, if not the best, attorney around. At the end of the day, Ellis is recognized for his service to God, his family, his country, his community, and the people that seek his help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Attorney Will Ellis Pittman for his dedication to serving this great state and country.

IN RECOGNITION OF LESTER D. M. CHUN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lester Chun who is retiring after 33 years as Instrumental Music Specialist for the Hillsborough City School District. Mr. Chun has shared his love of music with hundreds of students and opened their ears and hearts to this universal art form.

I witnessed his infectious style of teaching in my own son whom Mr. Chun taught for three years at Crocker Middle School. He describes him a musician through and through and a teacher who created a great environment for learning. My son remembers that he was jovial, yet didn't allow talking during class. "Practice makes perfect." Mr. Chun would say—and of course he was right.

You can honestly say that music is Mr. Chun's life. When not teaching with an inexhaustible enthusiasm, creativity and dedication, he plays trumpet and is a pit musician.

My son wasn't the only one recognizing his talent and passion. Mr. Chun has received numerous awards including the Hillsborough Community Care Award, TONY Award—Teachers Outstanding Nurturing Youth, BRAVO Award—S.F. Bay Area awards for the Arts, the Kent Award for innovative instruction, and the Golden Bell Award for eight years of publishing the Viking Weekly for Crocker Middle School.

Lester Chun was born in Honolulu, Hawaii in 1954. He attended Damien Memorial High School in Honolulu. When he moved to the mainland for his higher education, he didn't leave the Aloha spirit behind; it is part of his soul. He earned his BA in Music at the College of Notre Dame in Belmont and did his graduate work in Music History at the University of Southern California.

He started his position as Instrumental Music Specialist in 1981 and is a member of the Hillsborough Teacher's Association, the California Teacher's Association and the California Music Educator's Association.

In his well-deserved retirement, Mr. Chun is looking forward to spending more time with his wife of 34 years, Janet, and their daughter Clarissa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Lester D. M. Chun, an exceptional music teacher who makes his students' hearts dance with joy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE JOB CORPS' 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to extend a heartfelt congratulations to the students, staff and supporters of the Job Corps as they celebrate 50 remarkable years of educating and training at-risk youth. The Turner Jobs Corps Center in Albany, Georgia celebrated this milestone with a citywide Birthday Bash held on Wednesday, August 20, 2014 at 9:15 a.m. on the campus at 2000 Schilling Avenue in Albany, Georgia.

Job Corps is a no-cost education and training program that helps young people train for a career, earn a high school diploma or GED, and find and keep a good job. For eligible young people at least 16 years of age that qualify as low-income, Job Corps gives them the opportunity to learn skilled trades and provides them with the all-around tools needed to succeed in life.

Job Corps is authorized by Title I-C of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and is administered by the U.S. Department of Labor. There are 125 Job Corps center campuses located throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.

For the past 50 years, the Job Corps program has had an enormous impact on millions of young people throughout the nation. As the national economy continues to recover, it is important that young people have the training and education they need to find and maintain stable jobs. I am grateful for the Job Corps program and its mission to give at-risk youth a second chance, equipping them with the resources they need to succeed now and into the future.

I would like to especially recognize the Turner Job Corps Center in Georgia's Second Congressional District. I have worked closely with the Turner Job Corps Center and I have seen some of the best and most hard-working young adults in Georgia and across the country emerge from its doors.

I commend the Job Corps program and its dedicated staff for all the wonderful work they have done and will continue to do. I am so glad to have the Turner Job Corps Center in my District and I look forward to continuing to collaborate with the Center in working for our young people and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask that my colleagues join me and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in expressing our collective and profound gratitude to the students, staff and supporters for their work to educate and train at-risk youth so that they have the opportunity to pursue good careers and lead successful lives.

RECOGNIZING MS. KATIE GLESSMAN

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Katie Glessman. She is one of two top Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (J.R.O.T.C.) cadets from Nebraska to receive the organizations highest commendation, the Legion of Valor Award.

A selection board reviews thousands of applications each year and total of twenty-nine awards were given out by the national J.R.O.T.C. program to receive this prestigious award. As a senior at Benson High School, Ms. Glessman rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel to command a battalion within J.R.O.T.C. program. This amazing accomplishment recognizes the progress of leadership skills and scholarly knowledge within military and academic achievements within our nation's college preparation programs.

Not only has she reached tremendous heights in the military preparation program, but she is also involved with National Honor Society, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and student government. This remarkable young lady has aspirations to attend West Point and continue to participate in officer preparation courses at a high level of education.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Katie Glessman and the J.R.O.T.C. Mentors within Omaha Benson High School J.R.O.T.C. on this accomplishment. I know that they have set the standards high and have become a symbol for Nebraskans for years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE DOUGLASS INDIANS FOR CLAIMING STATE BASEBALL CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride today that I enthusiastically recognize the 2014 Douglass Indians Baseball Team on an outstanding season, in which they have attained the title of 2014 Texas State Class A Baseball Champions.

To end their thirty-three to one season, the Indians defeated Flatonia Bulldogs in a shut-out, with a final score of 10-0. Throughout this outstanding season the Indians had, in thirty-four games, allowed only thirty-four runs and scored themselves a dazzling three hundred seventy-seven. The team's batting average for the season was an impressive .392. All in all, the team set the school record for wins and secured the first and only state baseball championship in the school's history.

With the support of coaches, teachers, administrators and their entire community, these young men bear witness that anything is achievable through hard work and determination. These are guiding principles that lead to success not only on the field, but will undoubtedly resonate through every endeavor these

valiant championship players undertake in their entire lifetimes.

Among the individual team members to be congratulated are Matthew Wallace, Logan Ammons, Cade James, Kolten Rhoudes, Grant Holland, Chase Dyson, Clayton Sestak, Trenton Carrigan, Bryce Westbrook, Bryce McLeod, Taylor Schroeder, John Sinz, Jake Spies, Hunter Lee, Brandon Stanfield, and Robert Campbell.

Douglass Indians' Team Manager Bonner Watson, Head Coach Eugene Lafitte, Assistant Coach Nick Freeman, and Principal Jeff Roquemore are to be praised for their support and unwavering leadership.

It is indeed an honor to join the constituents of the First District of Texas in congratulating the players and athletic staff of the 2014 Class A Champion Douglass High School Baseball Team. Their legacy is now recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE ALABAMA MOUNTAIN LAKES TOURIST ASSOCIATION FOR FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association on its fifty years of dedicated service and proclaim September 2014 as Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association Month. Established in 1964, the Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association's most important goal is to stimulate the economic and cultural development of North Alabama through the tourism and travel industry.

Representing the sixteen counties of North Alabama and an ever-expanding membership base, the Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association is committed to expanding, and not duplicating, the objectives or efforts of local associations, organizations, and chambers of commerce that represent specific industry components.

The Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association is committed to sharing with the rest of Alabama, the South and the nation the great attractions, festivals, restaurants, and other entertainment options that North Alabama has to offer. From the W.C. Handy Music Festival in Florence and Riverfest in Decatur to the U.S. Space and Rocket Center in Huntsville and the Limestone Sheriff's Rodeo in Athens, there is something for everyone to enjoy.

I congratulate the Alabama Mountain Lakes Tourist Association on their fifty years of unparalleled success and wish them well and best wishes as they continue to promote the North Alabama region.

TRIBUTE TO APLIN RIDGE METHODIST CHURCH

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Aplin Ridge Methodist Church located in Gay, Jackson County, West Virginia, who is celebrating its 100th anniversary with a Centennial Celebration on September 20 and 21, 2014.

Aplin Ridge Methodist Church was constructed in 1914, built with hand tools by church members over several months. There was no electricity during construction, so lanterns were used by workers to illuminate the site during work at night. The land and the timber for the church were donated by Ester Aplin Waybright Thomas. The church was named for her father William Henry Aplin and was dedicated on November 2, 1914.

Charles Westfall, a member of the church remembers hearing stories of his father standing on a ladder holding a lantern, while putting the final touches on the steeple and securing the church bell in preparation for the church's grand opening. Others recall that during winter months, dozens of lanterns could be seen lighting the ridge as church members headed to Aplin Ridge Methodist Church on foot, horseback or by wagon for evening worship services. Worshipers were warmed by a wood stove and the church was illuminated by oil lamps and candles until 1946, when electricity was made available. It is stories such as these, passed down from generation to generation, that enrich the history of the beloved church.

Many Aplin Ridge members answered the call to service for World Wars I and II, Korean and Vietnam Wars, Iraq and Afghanistan. The church survived and pulled together during many significant events, in addition to the wars, ranging from the Great Depression to Neil Armstrong's walk on the moon and the horrific attack on this country on September 11, 2001. Throughout its existence, Aplin Ridge Methodist Church has conducted hundreds of baptisms, weddings, and family celebrations. The church is proud of its 80 member congregation, of all ages, many of which are fourth generation members. The church is also known for its benevolence by providing substantial help and financial relief to community members experiencing difficult times. The motto of the Aplin Ridge Methodist Church follows the teachings of Jesus, "Love thy Neighbor."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by thanking Pastor Danny Cummings for his commitment to Aplin Ridge Methodist Church and its congregation for celebrating its greatness through this special Centennial celebration. Hopefully, this will be the beginning of the next 100 years of service Aplin Ridge Methodist Church will have as the spiritual, loving beacon of the community of Gay and Jackson County. I am truly privileged to serve such a distinguished group of West Virginians.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAULTSBY FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the mid 1800's, the Maultsby Family settled in Bladen County, North Carolina; since that time, they have blessed us with descendants across the country who have helped to shape and mold our nation; and

Whereas, today we honor all of the patriarchs and patriarchs, who are pillars of strength for the Maultsby family; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have many members of the Maultsby family who are some of our most productive citizens such as Ms. Marilyn Pruitt and Mr. Jerome Maultsby; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Maultsby family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Georgia's Fourth Congressional District; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Maultsby Family; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim, July 25, 2014 as The Maultsby Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of July, 2014.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MAESTRO LORIN MAAZEL

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative CAROLYN MALONEY, Representative MIKE DOYLE, and Representative MARCIA FUDGE, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of Maestro Lorin Maazel, who passed away July 13, 2014 at the age of 84.

An American born in Paris in 1930, Maazel quickly became a child prodigy, beginning violin lessons when he was just five years old. At age seven, Arturo Toscanini invited him to conduct the NBC Symphony, and only five years later, he debuted at the New York Philharmonic. He conducted nearly all of the major American orchestras before he was 15 years old. At the age of 16, he began studying philosophy, language, and mathematics at the University of Pittsburgh, while also playing violin with the Pittsburgh Symphony to help pay his tuition.

He would go on to conduct more than 150 orchestras in at least 5,000 opera and concert performances during his career and make over 300 recordings. Maazel was the Artistic Director of the Deutsche Oper Berlin and the

General Manager of the Vienna State Opera. He also served as the Music Director for the Cleveland Orchestra for 10 years, the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra for eight years, the Bavarian Radio Symphony Orchestra for nearly ten years, and the New York Philharmonic, America's oldest orchestra, for seven years.

Also a widely admired composer, Maazel wrote most of his operas over the last 15 years. His first opera, based on George Orwell's 1984, premiered at the Royal Opera House in London and later sold out its revival at La Scala in Milan.

Maazel shared his talents with the world, but he also believed deeply in mentoring the next generation of artists. Along with his wife, Dietlinde Turban Maazel, he founded the Castleton Festival in 2009, which was intended to be a "vista-opener," in his words, to nurture and mentor young musicians through annual summer performances and training seminars on their farm in Rappahannock County, Virginia. He was rehearsing and making preparations for this year's festival when he passed away at their home, Castleton Farms. His legacy will live on through the Castleton Festival and through all of the artists he mentored.

As Nina May, a member of the Castleton Festival Board of Directors wrote, "the maestro's life was based on years of giving—to the arts community, to young musicians who are called to their craft and to a world that wants to preserve the majesty of classical music."

Our thoughts remain with his wife, Dietlinde, and his seven children and four grandchildren. Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman DOYLE, Congresswoman FUDGE, and I note with great gratitude the life of a world-renowned musical icon.

HONORING ATTORNEYS TONEY AND SHUNDA BALDWIN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding, highly driven professional duo, Mr. and Mrs. Toney and Shunda Baldwin. Together, the Baldwins have established a reputable law firm with a primary focus of providing high quality legal services with integrity, professionalism, and respect for those they represent and the community.

Toney Baldwin obtained his Juris Doctorate degree in May of 2005 from Southern Law Center in Baton Rouge, LA. He moved back to Mississippi in June of 2005 where he began his career as a law clerk with the Honorable Dennis Sweet. He also clerked with Hinds County District Attorney Robert Smith. Toney Baldwin was admitted to the Mississippi Bar in 2006. Toney successfully operated and managed Toney Anthony Baldwin, PLLC as a sole practitioner.

In 2008, Toney was offered employment with Richard Schwartz and Associates, P.A. as a result of his zealous representation of a

client concerning a personal injury case that was being handled by that firm. Toney received extensive training in the areas of personal injury and trial advocacy, including the NITA Trial Advocacy Program. Toney was the leading producer of attorneys' fees for 2 out of the 3 years that he was with the Schwartz firm. After realizing that the sky was the limit, Toney decided to practice with his wife, Shunda Baldwin.

Shunda Baldwin graduated in the top percentile of the 2004 class of Mississippi College School of Law. While completing the Juris Doctorate program, Shunda served as a member of Law Review and was the Clerk of the Moot Court Board. As a result of her academic excellence and outstanding community service, Shunda was offered a clerkship with Justice Jess Dickinson of the Mississippi Supreme Court. Shunda was admitted to the Mississippi Bar in 2004 and was also admitted to practice in the Federal District Courts and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals during that time. She has received various accolades, including: selection for Who's Who Among American Law Students; selection as student participant of the Charles Clark Inn of Courts; receipt of the Outstanding Service Award from the Magnolia Bar Association; and various nominations. Shunda has co-chaired and/or served on the Capital Area Bar Association's diversity committee during several administrations. Shunda Baldwin is regarded as one of the leading attorneys under the age of 40. For almost seven years prior to creating Baldwin & Baldwin, Shunda practiced for one of the largest and most prestigious defense firms in Mississippi.

Both Toney and Shunda take great pride and joy through their involvement with the community. Toney is an active member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc., while Shunda also engages in community service through her membership with Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Toney and Shunda Baldwin as remarkable attorneys in the Jackson Metropolitan area.

RECOGNIZING THE ALPHA DELTA KAPPA INTERNATIONAL HONORARY ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN EDUCATORS

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on its sixty-seven years of dedicated service and proclaim October 2014 as Alpha Delta Kappa Month. Established in 1947, Alpha Delta Kappa's goals have been to establish high standards of education, give recognition to outstanding educators, build a fraternal fellowship among educators and to promote educational and charitable projects and activities enriching the lives of individuals everywhere.

With a membership of over 33,000 educators representing all fifty U.S. states, Puerto

Rico, Canada, Mexico, Jamaica and Australia, Alpha Delta Kappa is committed to educational excellence, personal and professional growth and for collectively channeling their energies toward the good of their schools, communities, the teaching profession and the world.

Women in education constitute a great portion of the nation's working force and are constantly striving to serve their communities and nation in educational, cultural, and charitable programs leading to harmony, happiness, and peace among all people.

Over the last few years, the members of Alpha Delta Kappa have given altruistically to the communities they serve by raising nearly \$14.5 million and volunteering over 2 million service hours. Alpha Delta Kappa also biennially awards over a quarter of a million dollars through its 11 scholarship programs.

I congratulate Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on their many years of unparalleled success and wish them well and best wishes as they continue to educate our children.

NATIONAL NIGHT OUT IN THE CITY OF BULVERDE, TEXAS

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the 31st year, the National Association of Town Watch is sponsoring an annual, nationwide crime, drug, and violence prevention program on October 7, 2014, entitled, "National Night Out". The City of Bulverde, which is located in the 21st Congressional District in Texas, will participate in this event for the ninth consecutive year.

National Night Out provides a unique opportunity for Bulverde, Texas, to join forces with thousands of other communities across the country in promoting cooperative, police-community crime prevention efforts. Police-community partnerships, and neighborhood safety awareness and cooperation are important themes of National Night Out.

Congratulations to the City of Bulverde for participating in this important event and for assisting the Bulverde Police Department by promoting joint crime, drug, and violence prevention efforts. These efforts keep our communities, and our citizens, more safe and secure.

Credit goes to the citizens of Bulverde, Texas as they join the Bulverde Police Department and the National Association of Town Watch in supporting the 31st Annual National Night Out on October 7, 2014.

HONORING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF CHICAGO RIDGE

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Village of Chicago Ridge, Illinois,

which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this month.

The history of Chicago Ridge is indeed unique as its beginnings coincide with The Chicago World's Fair, which in 1893 commemorated the 400th anniversary of Christopher Columbus's arrival in the new world. Trainloads of dirt, brought out by way of the Wabash railroad for the construction of the fair, formed the ridges from which Chicago Ridge takes its name.

Settlement increased with the establishment of rail yards in Chicago Ridge and in 1914 the village was incorporated. The newly incorporated government moved quickly to make investments to improve infrastructure and transportation, paving the way for economic growth.

The village and its residents also host RidgeFest—an annual summer celebration that draws thousands from the Chicago metropolitan area to enjoy live music, fireworks, and time with family and friends.

Today's Chicago Ridge owes much to the steady leadership provided for almost four decades by Eugene "Gene" Siegel who served as mayor from 1975 until his retirement in 2013. Mayor Siegel guided the town through a revitalization and population boom. He established a full-time fire department and led the development of a public works facility and municipal complex. Gene Siegel's accomplishments during his tenure as Mayor provided the foundation for Chicago Ridge to flourish for years to come. Chicago Ridge now prospers under the leadership of Mayor Charles Tokar who previously served 24 years as Village Clerk and 14 years as a trustee.

I am proud to represent the Village of Chicago Ridge. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring all of the citizens of the village as they celebrate the 100th anniversary. May they enjoy this centennial celebration and I look forward to many more years of growth and prosperity.

RECOGNIZING CORPORAL JEFF PAUL OF THE SOUTHLAKE POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Corporal Jeff Paul of the Southlake Police Department in Southlake, Texas. Corporal Paul was honored yesterday, September 7th, by the Southlake Baptist Church during a special service for first responders. His years of selfless service, at times in the face of personal adversity, demonstrate his being an outstanding officer and citizen.

Corporal Paul was raised near Chicago but has lived in northeast Tarrant County, Texas, for 27 years. Paul began his career in law enforcement as a Police Explorer in the early 1980s and then quickly became a Public Safety Dispatcher. In 1983, he joined the Southlake Department of Public Safety and, after briefly being a Reserve Police Officer, became a full-time Police Officer. He helped

implement the Southlake Police Department's first traffic division in 1989. Later on, in 2002, Paul became a Warrant Officer and Bailiff in the Southlake Municipal Court, and he continues to serve in that role.

In his time with the Southlake Police Department, Corporal Paul was trained as an accident reconstructionist and an Intoxilyzer operator. He is a graduate of the School of Police Supervision at the Institute for Law Enforcement Administration and has earned his Master Peace Officer Certification.

Paul is married with two sons and one grandson, and he thoroughly enjoys attending Dallas Stars hockey games as his favorite pastime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring Corporal Jeff Paul for his career of service and sacrifice.

HONORABLE RICHARD M. FREID

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Richard M. Freid who was celebrated for his retirement from judicial service on Friday, August 8, 2014 by his friends, family, and coworkers. He retires after a long career in which he faithfully upheld New Jersey's Constitution.

The Honorable Richard M. Freid is a graduate of Paterson's Eastside High School, Montclair State College and Rutgers School of Law.

Judge Freid was motivated by his uncle, the late Judge Edwin J. Nyklewicz, who became a role model and mentor who pushed him to attend law school.

Early in his legal career he developed a specialization in the representation of law enforcement officers of all ranks from entry level officers through Police Chiefs. He served as personal counsel to five Chiefs of Police for the City of Paterson and in branches from local, county and state police departments in all types of cases. Judge Freid enjoyed a perfect record of success in all of those cases which proceeded to a jury verdict.

He also served as Counsel to the Paterson Hispanic Police Association and as Counsel to the Italian-American Police Officers Association of New Jersey. He was a proud recipient of New Jersey PBA's Silver Card, its highest civilian award, in 1992 and still treasures many of the close friendships he made in the over 30 years of such service.

Judge Freid was appointed in 2004 by Governor McGreevy to the Superior Court of New Jersey and reappointed with tenure in 2011 by Governor Christie. He has served nine of his ten years on the bench in the Family Division and has sat in every case type possible in the Family Division except Juvenile Court.

His first year of judicial service was in Essex County where he was "taken under the wing" of Judge Peter Ryan who he credits with making his transition from Bar to Bench an easy one. Judge Ryan mentored him in both the application of the law but, more importantly, with how to approach each day on the bench

with a common touch and with some degree of humor when the circumstance permitted. Judge Freid continues to experience their close friendship to this day.

Although Judge Freid was required to retire from regular active Judicial service at age 70 pursuant to the New Jersey Constitution, he sought reappointment to recall service. Chief Justice Rabner signed that order which permitted Judge Freid to continue to serve here in Passaic County until his retirement this year.

He was a lifelong resident of the City of Paterson until 1998 when he moved to Hawthorne and then to North Haledon in 2004, where he currently resides with his wife State Senator Nellie Pou. Together they have four children, Christopher Freid, Jennifer Jaworowski, Edwin Pou II, and Taina Pou, along with four grandchildren.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the achievements of individuals like the Honorable Richard M. Freid.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Hon. Judge Freid's family, friends, coworkers, and all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing the Honorable Richard M. Freid.

IN MEMORY OF MIKE HOPKINS, SR.

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor Mike Hopkins, Sr.

He came into this world right outside the Texas state line on September 16, 1944, but became a Texan just as soon as he could.

Elizabeth Marie & David Flinnoy Hopkins raised a man who was a Texan deep in his heart—a man who leaves behind a legacy of achievement and purpose that his children embody.

Mike's son worked in my Washington, D.C. office and only left us to return to Texas to continue his education and start his family. Clearly he was raised right by a father who considered serving his community not just a necessity, but an honor.

Mike's personal philosophy of "Pass-It-On" has led many across our state to do the right thing. Because a person's legacy is all about the foundation they built with their heart and their spirit, to do the right thing for the right reasons with integrity and character.

From Mike's early days in Galveston, to his studies at Texas A&M University, his service to our nation as a proud Marine, and then a community-minded business man, those who knew him and learned from him were blessed to have a true visionary as a mentor and a friend.

Many didn't know Mike was the personal driver for General O.R. Simpson. With hard work and determination, he went from Marine to bartender to successful businessman.

You don't win by giving up. Mike believed you won by outworking the other guy and

using your head. Those who knew Mike knew his three A's of success: Ability, Aptitude and Ambition.

On July 14, 2014, Mike Hopkins, Sr. passed away peacefully in his sleep at his home in Brenham, Texas. Nina, his wife of nearly four decades was right by his side.

He leaves a strong legacy at Mike Hopkins Distributing Company and at the Wholesale Beer Distributors of Texas.

Our thoughts are with Nina, Holly, Mike Jr., and his grandson Tyler.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWNSHIP OF OCEAN HISTORICAL MUSEUM

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Township of Ocean Historical Museum as it celebrates its 30th anniversary this year. Since its founding, the Township of Ocean Historical Museum has continued to fulfill its mission of preserving and promoting local history through exhibits, archives, publications, events and educational programs. Its ongoing efforts are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

The Township of Ocean Historical Museum was officially incorporated on April 25, 1984 and was located in a classroom of the former Oakhurst School. The previous year, the Township of Ocean Historical Society, which was founded in 1970 to promote and preserve local, county and state history, merged with the Township of Ocean Historical Museum Association to establish the Museum. Over the years, the Museum continued to grow and in 2009, after several years of restoration, the Museum was opened in the historic Eden Woolley House.

Volunteers have been the backbone of the Museum since its beginning and continue to maintain and support it. It was a group of residents who had presented the community museum idea to the Board of Education in 1983. Volunteer efforts also helped advance the restoration of the Eden Woolley House through fundraising as well as some hands-on work. Today, the Museum boasts a membership of more than 400 families and many of the founding members are still active volunteers.

The Township of Ocean Historical Museum has grown considerably since it opened in a local classroom. It has two permanent exhibits and a third exhibit that changes annually; holds programs and events; produces a newsletter and much more. It is an important fixture to the community and has been recognized three times as the "Best Local Museum" by the Asbury Park Press Readers Poll.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the outstanding historical efforts of the Township of Ocean Historical Museum and congratulating it on 30 successful years.

HONORING JAMES BICEK ON HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. James Bicek, a very active resident of my district, who is celebrating his 70th birthday.

Jim Bicek was born on September 6th, 1944 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His family moved to the Chicago area shortly after his birth due to his father's military service. Since then, Jim has always lived in the area, growing up with his three younger siblings and raising his two daughters, Jennifer and Tricia.

Jim dedicated his professional life to the community he loved and pursued a career as a Sheriff's Deputy for the Markham Courthouse. He retired after 35 years of service on May 31st, 2009. While working at the courthouse Jim met Louise, and they married on September 19th, 2009, shortly after he retired. The two currently reside in Tinley Park, Illinois.

In his spare time, Jim is an avid singer. He began singing at the age of seven, following in the footsteps of his mother. For the past 11 years, Jim has been a member of a barber-shop chorus where he sings lead in the four-part harmony. Jim and his wife also volunteer as local senior advocates in their community.

Jim Bicek is a beloved and cherished husband, father, and grandfather to 11 grandchildren. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Jim Bicek a happy 70th birthday, and to thank him for being such a great contributor to his community and our nation.

RAYMOND SIPPLE RETIREMENT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Raymond Sipple on his retirement from the Bucks Township Board of Supervisors after 30 years of dedicated service.

Mr. Sipple was first elected to the Buck Township Board of Supervisors in 1980 and became chairman in January of 2000, a position he held until his retirement this past June. He is known as an honest man with a deep love for his community. A lifelong resident of our area, he worked tirelessly to ensure that the hard earned money of his constituents was spent wisely, going so far as to never vote to raise taxes. Even though his dear wife Betty, who passed in 2012, is not here to mark this milestone with him, I know he is excited to enjoy his retirement with his children, Frankie, Joey, Jimmy, Ann Marie, and Kathleen, 14 grandchildren, and 11 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, for thirty years of exemplary civil service to the citizens of Bucks Township, I thank Mr. Sipple and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEWIS SAXON SHUBERT FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, In the late 1700's, the Lewis Saxon Shubert family began with their oldest known family ancestor Amy Sharpe in Burke County, Georgia; since that time, they have blessed us with descendants across the country who have helped to shape and mold our nation; and

Whereas, today we honor all of the matriarchs and patriarchs, who are pillars of strength for the Lewis Saxon Shubert family; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have many members of the Lewis Saxon Shubert family who are some of our most productive citizens; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Lewis Saxon Shubert family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Lewis Saxon Shubert family; Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim, July 20, 2014 as The Lewis Saxon Shubert Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 20th day of July, 2014.

IN HONOR OF DR. EUNICE S. THOMAS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished public servant, devoted educator and dear friend to my wife, Vivian and me, Dr. Eunice S. Thomas. Sadly, Dr. Thomas passed away on Sunday, August 17, 2014. Her life will be celebrated at a funeral service on Friday, August 29, 2014 at 12:00 p.m. at First African Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

Dr. Thomas worked for four cabinet level secretaries in the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) during two consecutive United States Presidents' Administrations. At HHS, she worked as Acting Assistant Secretary for the Family Support Administration, managing a staff of more than 1,049 and a budget in excess of \$14 billion. She administered federal programs focused on strengthening families and increasing their self-sufficiency, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Child

Support Enforcement, Refugee Resettlement, and the Community Services programs. She directed the Implementation of Welfare reform as was embodied in the Family Support Act in 1988.

Dr. Thomas retired from HHS as Director of the Office of Community Services Administration for Children and Families where she oversaw the Community Services Block Grant, Social Services Block Grant, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance, the Family Violence Program, Demonstration Partnership Programs, and the Community Discretionary programs while managing a budget in excess of \$5.9 billion.

Dr. Thomas loved her community and loved her sorority and found a way to give her all to both when she became the 19th International Grand Basileus of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. in July 1986 at the 66th Anniversary Boulé. Her service led to one of Zeta's finest administrations, restructuring the organization and creating programs that reflected strong and effective leadership with integrity, compassion, and a sense of social responsibility. Programs were instated to address issues such as substance abuse, AIDS Awareness, lack of after school and child care, the decline of black men in college, and the rise in teen pregnancy rates. For her efforts, *Ebony* magazine named Grand Basileus Thomas one of the 100 Influential Black Americans each year from 1987 to 1992 and in 1987, President George H.W. Bush selected Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. as one of the "Thousand Points of Light." She was affectionately nicknamed the "Real Grand" because of the reverence so many Zetas had for her to the extent that the membership wanted to extend her term in office beyond the maximum six years, but she graciously declined. She was an active member of Epsilon Eta Zeta Chapter in Columbus, Georgia for over 45 years at the time of her death. She was instrumental in getting Kappa Epsilon Chapter chartered at Columbus State University (Columbus College) in 1974 while she was the Southeastern Regional Director.

In addition to her mentorship and guidance of Zetas of all ages, she touched and enriched the lives of countless young people during her time as an educator in the Muscogee County School System.

Dr. Thomas was more than a civil servant, she was a servant to all humankind. She gave herself to so many causes and organizations that are too numerous to mention. Dr. Maya Angelou once said that, "I've learned that you shouldn't go through life with a catcher's mitt on both hands; you need to be able to throw something back." Dr. Thomas threw a prodigious amount of love and service back to the Columbus, Georgia community and our nation that she loved so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Dr. Eunice S. Thomas for her outstanding contributions to her sorority, her community, and our nation. We extend our deepest sympathies to her family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time and we pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

IN HONOR OF ALICIA B. HARVEY-SMITH, PH.D. ON THE HONOR OF HER INAUGURATION AND INSTALLATION AS PRESIDENT OF RIVER VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the inauguration and installation of Dr. Alicia B. Harvey-Smith as the 10th President of River Valley Community College in Claremont, New Hampshire. River Valley Community College has long been a paradigm of quality education in New Hampshire, and this event signifies the first inauguration in the history of the institution.

Dr. Harvey-Smith has long served as a leader in the academic community with more than a quarter century of experience and training in education. After her years serving as a dean and Vice President of Student Affairs at Baltimore City Community College, Dr. Harvey-Smith has proven her dedication to education and the creation of a world-class learning environment.

Founded in 1968, River Valley Community College has served as a provider for quality education in the state of New Hampshire. With an intensive environment which allows for individualized attention and flexible class schedules that accommodate the lives of busy students, River Valley Community College has proven its commitment to the improvement and expansion of minds.

Over the past decades, River Valley Community College has expanded to provide thirty-five career-oriented programs that provide students with highly specialized skills and knowledge crucial to achievement in the job market in a variety of business, technical, and health-oriented fields. With a sincere dedication to the development of educational programs such as these, River Valley Community College has improved the lives of countless students across the Granite State.

With this ethic in mind, Dr. Alicia Harvey-Smith is an ideal choice for the President of River Valley Community College. Under the dedicated leadership of Dr. Harvey-Smith, I am confident that River Valley Community College will continue to grow and serve the public. She is truly a role model to all of us, and an asset to the State of New Hampshire.

It remains an honor to represent River Valley Community College in Congress. I wish Dr. Harvey-Smith the very best and congratulate her on this proud occasion.

HONORING BARBARA KENDRICK,
FNP

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resourceful and ambitious woman, Ms. Barbara Kendrick. Barbara

has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve others.

Ms. Kendrick was born in Chicago, Illinois, the youngest of nine children. She moved to Carthage, MS at five months old to live with her aunt and uncle upon the death of her mother.

Barbara earned her Bachelor of Science in Nursing in 1993 from Mississippi College and her Master of Science in Nursing in 2004 from Alcorn State University. She is certified through the American Accredited Nurses Association.

Barbara has practiced nursing for about 20 years; she has worked as a Family Nurse Practitioner for 10 years and has worked at the G. V. Sonny Montgomery VA Medical Center for 7 years. She has served about 933 veterans at the VA Medical Center. Barbara has a great appreciation for veterans because she was raised by her uncle who was a Korean Veteran.

Barbara is an active member of the American Nurses Association and volunteer with the American Kidney Foundation by conducting screenings. She also assists with outreach for Veteran enrollment. She is a member of Faith for Life Church located in Jackson, MS. Barbara enjoys singing gospel in her spare time.

Barbara lives in Clinton, MS along with her three sons. She strives every day to have a positive impact on her patients while remembering her motto, "If I can't help you, I'll find someone who can."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Barbara Kendrick for her passion and dedication to serving our great Country and a desire to make a difference in the lives of others.

LINGLESTOWN FIRE COMPANY 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Linglestown Fire Company as they celebrate their 80th anniversary.

The Linglestown Fire Company was officially founded in 1934 after a local barn caught fire during the month of February. However, attempts to create a fire company for the area date back to the mid 1700s, at which time Linglestown was established as the third oldest community in Dauphin County. While the company began with simple technology and resources, it has continued to undergo many changes in an effort to better improve service for the people of Linglestown and the surrounding areas. The Linglestown Fire Company is currently staffed by 52 active firefighters, as well as dozens of wildland firefighters, emergency medical technicians, fire police, and other members who provide support. These brave men and women repeatedly put their lives on the line to keep the people of Linglestown safe.

Mr. Speaker, on the 80th anniversary of its founding, I thank all of the members of the Linglestown Fire Company, past and present,

for their continued efforts to protect the citizens of Linglestown and Dauphin County, and wish the organization many more years of successful service.

CELEBRATING MR. MERL DEAN
SWIHART 86TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Mr. Merl Dean Swihart as he celebrates his 86th birthday. Merl is an extraordinary individual who has enriched the lives of many Hoosiers throughout Marshall County.

Merl was born in Argos, Indiana on July 7, 1928, to Ford and Faye Swihart, where along with his five siblings; spent their childhood working on the family's 80 acre farm. On the farm he helped raise livestock and tended to the crops. The values Merl learned while working on the family farm would have a profound impact on his future endeavors. Merl graduated from Argos High School in 1948. After high school Merl worked for two years at Indiana Metal and on his neighbor's farm. In 1951, Merl was called to serve his country and was drafted to the United States Marine Corps, where he served in Santa Ana, California at the Air Facility. In 1953, Merl was honorably discharged and returned to working for Indiana Metal and farming. Merl moved to Chicago where he used his G.I. Bill to further his education in agriculture at the Illinois School of Technology.

After several years in Illinois, Merl returned to Marshall County where he worked as a custodian and maintenance technician for Plymouth Community School Corporation for 36 years. Merl retired in 1993, and was awarded the key to the City of Plymouth for his dedicated service to the community. During his retirement Merl served as the Grand Marshall of Plymouth's Blueberry Festival Parade and generously donated his time and efforts to the community by mowing lawns, shoveling snow and volunteering to do handy work at the local church.

Throughout Merl's life, he has demonstrated a deep-rooted commitment to his family, friends and country. Our community owes a great deal of respect and gratitude to the incredible service of individuals like Merl who have devoted so much of their time to serve others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in celebration of Mr. Merl Dean Swihart's 86th birthday and admirable service to our great communities and nation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF COLONEL
ROBERT "BOB" W. GATES, USAF
RET.

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 2014, Northwest Florida and our Na-

tion lost a warrior—Colonel Robert "Bob" W. Gates, USAF Retired. Colonel Gates, a devoted family man and decorated veteran, honorably served as a member of the Armed Forces for over thirty years. He was a member of the Greatest Generation and served in three wars. I am humbled to rise and pay tribute to his life, his unwavering commitment to service, and his dedication to our Nation's heroes and their loved ones.

Born in Bradley, South Dakota on January 23, 1919, Colonel Gates joined the Army Air Corps, prior to World War II, and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Air Force in April 1942. His various tours of duty included commander of the 88th Troop Carrier Squadron, a C-47 squadron that dropped paratroopers over Normandy on D-Day; commander of the 4087th Air Transport Group, tasked with providing air supply for the Distant Early Warning Line across the Arctic; and commander of the Huron Task Force, which established the Huron radar sites on the Greenland Ice Cap. Following his command of the 6200th Material Wing at Clark AFB in the Philippines, Colonel Gates became the first commander of the 1st Special Operations Wing at Hurlburt Field, located in the Florida Panhandle and home to the Air Force Special Operations Command, before serving as the Inspector General for the 13th Air Force.

During his distinguished career spanning three decades, Colonel Gates served in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War and logged over 16,000 flight hours in several aircraft, including his assignment to fly entertainer Bob Hope and crew on a USO tour around the world. Colonel Gates received a Presidential Citation from President Franklin Roosevelt and was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, the Army Commendation medal, the French Croix-de-Guerre, and the USO Spirit of Hope Award for his lifetime contributions to the USO. Under his leadership, the 1st Special Operations Wing was bestowed the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, and Hurlburt Field was named the Most Improved Base in the Tactical Air Command.

Upon his retirement from the Air Force in 1972, Colonel Gates began a career in real estate and was integral in the construction of the Bob Hope Village, which provides home and care for Air Force widows. From 1978 to 1983, Colonel Gates served as mayor of Fort Walton Beach. He was a founder and charter member of The American Air Museum in Britain and the Air Armament Museum at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and was a member of various community and veterans organizations, including the Elks, Daedalians, Krewes of Bowlegs, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Air Commando Association, which inducted Colonel Gates into its Hall of Fame.

To many, Colonel Gates will be remembered for his devotion to his country and community, and to his family and friends, a loving family man with a great sense of humor. Without question, Colonel Gates lived a life full of service and has earned our Nation's highest respect and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is a privilege for me to honor Colonel Robert W. Gates' lifetime of service.

My wife Vicki and I extend our prayers and sincere condolences to his children—Robert, Bill, Michael, Kimberly, and Kathleen; ten grandchildren—Paula, Robert W. Gates III, Steve, Matthew, Sarah, Mary Kathryn, Peyton, Austin, Trevor, and Kendall; ten great-grandchildren; his loyal companion, Lucky, his rescued dog; and the entire Gates family.

THANKING MY STAFF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to serve in this body for 34 years. I have come to the floor countless times over the years to speak out and help give a voice to the voiceless for humanitarian causes, to raise national and international policy issues, such as getting our nation's spending under control, bringing attention to national security threats, like terrorism and cyberattacks, and focusing on ways to protect children and families from the scourge of legalized gambling. I also have raised issues important to the people of the 10th District of Virginia, such as improving transportation, preserving historic sites and educating the public about health threats from Lyme disease.

Today, though, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the dozens of men and women who have been on my staff over the years. As every Member knows, our jobs in the people's House would be next to impossible without the staff that works with us. I certainly would not have been able to accomplish so many of the projects and public policy initiatives I have been able to do without them by my side.

And in all honesty, if it were not for some loyal and dedicated staffers who stuck with me during my first term—when the growing pains of a new congressional office are the toughest—I am not sure I would have been re-elected early in my career.

I want to single out my first press secretary, Stephanie Bolick, who later became my chief of staff, or as we called it back then, my "AA" or administrative assistant. She may have been among the first women in a Hill office in the early 1980s to break that glass ceiling. I was blessed to find Stephanie, who helped me focus my work and build a foundation of public service. She was wise beyond her years and I am forever grateful to her for her counsel and for being there from the start.

I have been fortunate to have two long-tenured chiefs of staff. Charlie White was my top aide for 14 years, until cancer took his life in the summer of 2000. A retired Navy captain and submariner, Charlie had a heart of service and not only helped manage my office, but became a dear friend. A humble man, he had a way of putting everyone around him at ease. Even in the pain of illness, he inspired us by his grace. Charlie was a "Johnny Appleseed" kind of a guy. He was a mentor to young staffers and sowed seeds of goodness and kindness to scatter to all those we meet in our lives.

I believe it was providential when Dan Scandling followed Charlie as my chief of

staff. Dan had been the top aide to my Virginia colleague Herb Bateman, who died suddenly just four months before he was to retire from the House. Dan was just the right person at the right time. A trusted and loyal adviser and friend, he has been with me since late 2000.

When I would tell Dan that we needed to jump on a plane and get to a place in the world where people were suffering or war was imminent, he made it happen. He was there with me to document the trip in photos and write the report that I would share with House colleagues, leadership and the administration to help get the ball rolling to focus attention on a humanitarian cause. A superb journalist, Dan also has served as my press spokesman. He is indefatigable and a true professional and I cannot thank him enough for his counsel and public service.

I was a former staffer, both on Capitol Hill and in the executive branch. I know the daily grind—writing mail, stuffing envelopes, and answering phone calls from disgruntled constituents. Staffers are consumed by long hours with modest pay. Yet I also know how rewarding this job can be. So many of my staff over the years have told me that being in a position to help make people's lives better was really what counted the most.

I always said I wanted a staff that was on par with the late Senator Ted Kennedy's top-notch staff. There is no doubt in my mind that my staff was. I have no hesitation in saying I have had the best staff on Capitol Hill.

I have tried to treat my staff as family, whether they worked for me for only a year before heading off to law school or graduate school, or stayed with me for many years. I actually had two staffers who worked for me for more than 25 years. Judy McCary and Janet Shaffron served as the backbone of my office.

Judy was my longtime District director and worked more cases, particularly immigration cases, than you can count. Through the years I could rarely go anywhere in my District without someone thanking me for something Judy or someone else on my District staff did to solve a problem.

Judy, and all my District staff, were tireless—and continue to be tireless—advocates for the people of the 10th District, regardless of political strife. When you called my District staff with a problem, it didn't matter if you were a Democrat, an Independent or a Republican. You were a constituent and they were there to help.

Janet Shaffron was my legislative director for 28 years. She had an encyclopedic knowledge of every issue and every vote and was responsible for compiling my complete annual voting record, which I published for constituents. She was a whiz at parliamentary procedure and an extremely gifted writer and editor. Nothing rattled Janet. I don't think she ever had a bad day—even when she wore two hats and filled in as chief of staff, helping hold the staff together when Charlie became ill. My Washington staff adored Janet. She always was willing to help with a letter or speech. She was a mentor and always knew when to give a young staffer an encouraging word. And she was always willing to tell me when she thought I was going in the wrong direction.

Judy and Janet stood with me through thick and thin. They were there in the early years during the fits and starts of a new office and in the years that followed helping celebrate legislative or district successes. Both beat me to retirement. I cannot thank them enough.

I also want to talk about what is perhaps the hardest job in any congressional office—that of scheduler. I have had some great ones. Fortunately, they were blessed with patience and great attitudes because managing my schedule—and, of course, me—was never easy. I know I probably never told them enough how much I appreciated them and their loyalty. So today I say thank you to those incredible staffers.

As I approach retirement, I have reflected on the many issues with which I have become involved, and perhaps the one with the greatest visibility—especially on the international level—has been my work in the area of human rights. When I came to Congress, human rights, religious freedom and speaking out for the voiceless were not on my radar. But a trip to famine-riddled Ethiopia in 1984 when I held an emaciated child dying of hunger brought me new perspective. And while I was not happy with Charlie when he infamously told *The Washington Post*: “He does [local] transportation so he can do [international] human rights,” he was probably on to something.

Working on human rights and religious freedom issues has been some of my most rewarding work in Congress and right there with me were probably a dozen staffers who handled my human rights and foreign affairs portfolio over the years. I believe I have made a difference, but I couldn't have done it without the help of those staffers, who, to a person, shared my passion for humanitarian causes. They spent hours upon hours upon hours writing letters, preparing speeches, planning hearings, making phone calls, advising on strategy, meeting with dissidents and the oppressed and listening to tragic stories. I am proud of their work to help change lives for the better and to give a voice to the voiceless and I express my deep appreciation to each one.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Lucy Norment, who took over for Judy, and Tom Culligan, who replaced Janet, for the work they have done since assuming new roles in the office. Thank you.

I tried to build camaraderie among my staff and believe our successes can be attributed to teamwork and the Harry Truman adage that it's amazing what you can accomplish if you don't care who gets the credit. Everyone who has worked for me—whether answering phones, doing data entry, tracking legislation, formulating policy, working cases or managing my offices—has made a difference.

They also made my job easier, and for that, I am eternally grateful.

I want to take this opportunity to submit the names of all my staff through the years for history to see:

Tom Alexander, Jennifer Allen, Elyse Bauer Anderson, Julia Angelotti, Anne McClure Babson, Torrey Babson, Evan Baehr, Laurie Battle, John Beed, Andrew Bender, Nancy Suzich Bennett, Pat Bennett, Abby Berg, Debbie Blinn, Stephanie Bolick, Johnathan Bolls, Lisa Boothe, Jim Boyle, Kellie Malloy Boyle, Shelly Bressler.

Tom Brooke, Matthew Brown, Karen Burke, Teresa Burney, Jim Burroughs, Bridget Bustillos, Mary Ann Cannon, Jane Cantus, Dan Caprio, Mike Carlin, Jessica Carlton, Ted Cartwright, Stacey Chuma, Bob Clark, John Cole, Barbara Comstock, Melinda Bohn Conner, Mary Ann Cook, Evan Corcoran.

Pat Cox, Judy Hammond Craun, Donna Crowley, Tom Culligan, John Cusey, Jack Czerwinski, Chris Darling, Bryan Deoms, Dave Dettoni, Karen Foster Dick, Jeffrey Dingman, Brett Dody, Bennett Donovan, James Dornan III, Philip Draper, Ben Dutton, David Farajollahi, James Farel, Amy Farrel.

Susan Feaster, Karen Feaver, Larry Fineran, Marna Fisher, Dot Fleshman, Scott Flipse, Lee Kerr Fonvielle, Karen Foster, James Freik, Johnathon Friel, Tom Fulcher, James Gallagher, James Gallahan, Fernando Gebbs, Jill DiPuccio Giles, Geoff Gleason, Shannon Green, JT Griffin, Kristin Erb Griffin.

Suzanne Grimsley, Steve Hall, Andrew Hart, Susan Bullard Harmon, Buzz Hawley, Diana Haynes, Nancy Bennett Haynes, Bob Healey, Nancy Bruce Herbolzheimer, Tom Herrity, Heather Hixson Hershberger, Elise Ho Phuong, Sewell Hoff, Elizabeth Hoffman, Lynne Holden, Mike Holtz, Deborah Horness, Robert Houston, Lori-Beth Feld Hua.

Wayne Huggins, Carol Hughes, Peyton Hughes, Rosanne Dupras Hughes, Anne Campbell Huiskes, Wes Irvin, Michael Jackson, Jennifer Jacobsen, Jessica Jelgerhuis, Kevin James, Laurie Jenkins, James Jennings III, Fay Johnson, Gail Hoskins Johnson, William Troy Jones, Virginia Jones, Andrew Kauders, Cindy Rockholt Klapmust, Ramona Kledzik.

Heather Kolasch, Stephen Korfonta, Jill Kriser, Patrick Larkin, Mira Lezell, Caitlin Lietzan, Michael Linster, Marge Lynch, Tom Lynch, Charlie Lyons, Anne MacKenzie, Elizabeth Maier, Kellie Mallory, Christina Mangano, Will Marlow, Jeff Mascott, Robert McAdam, Judy McCary, Cheryl McCullough.

Mark McElwee, Barbara McGuire, Meghan Wedd McGuire, Joe McNulty, Justin Mentzer, Becky Earle Middleton, Molly Jurmu Miller, Bill Mims, Janet Minkler, Kenneth Minnick, Jen Foth Moody, Donald Morrissey, Tom Morr, Roger Morse, Will Moschella, Stacy Neal, Gracie Nelson, Debra Nesbitt, Ed Newberry.

Lucy Norment, William Palmer, Hae Park, Keith Pavlick, Angela Pecario, Kristin Peck, Anne Peters, Brendan Pevarski, Jillian Pevo, Rita Pfeiffer, Mark Planning, Ivan Plis, Ann Potacnak, Jan Powell, Brianna Puccini, Sara Boney Ratcliff, Elizabeth Becker Reiter, Denise Richardson, Ralph Rinaldi, Pat Russell.

Melinda Sadler, Colin Samples, Tom Santaniello, Chris Santora, Dan Scandling, Courtney Haller Schlieter, Meredith Schultz, Steve Schwartz, Janet Shaffron, Jill Shatzen, Neil Siefing, Sharon Snyder, Tim Starr, Dave Stegmaier, Kalinda Stephenson, Mike Stevens, Samantha Stockman, Katy Summerlin, Julie Sussman, Laura Swett, Melissa Temeles.

Susan Thompson, Randy Tift, Clark Unger, Sharon Vasky-Smith, Chris Walker, Linda Rollins Wallace, Jeff Walton, Elizabeth Ward, Brinton Warren, George Webb, Charlie White, Laura White, David Whitestone, Stiles Wilkins, Melinda Wilson, Craig Whitham, Sean Woo, Ralph Wunder, John Zemaitis.

HONORING CAPTAIN ANDREW
BUDUO III

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, I rise today to honor Captain Andrew Buduo III as he retires from the United States Navy after proudly serving our country for thirty years.

Captain Buduo completed a bachelor's degree in mathematics and physics from St. Lawrence University. He began his distinguished career with the United States Navy in 1984 after graduating from Aviation Officer Candidate School in Pensacola, Florida, and receiving his commission. Captain Buduo was designated as a Naval Aviator in 1986, and reported to Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 12 for flight training in the RH-53D airborne mine countermeasures helicopter.

Captain Buduo reported to his first Fleet squadron, Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron (HM-14) where he served as Aircraft Division Officer and Staff Mine Warfare (Tactics) Officer. During his tour, he deployed onboard USS *Guadalcanal* and USS *Okinawa* in support of Operation Earnest Will—the “Tanker War” of 1987/1988. Subsequently he reported to the Coastal Systems Station, Panama City. In 1983 he reported onboard the USS *Belleau Wood* eventually working his way up to Mini Boss. As the Mini Boss, he participated in Operation United Shield—the final withdrawal of coalition forces from Somalia during March of 1995.

Following his ship tour, Captain Buduo reported to the Command and General Staff College in Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas, where he earned his Joint Professional Military Education Phase I qualification. He returned to HM-14, serving as safety officer and aircraft maintenance officer.

In November 1998, Captain Buduo reported to the Airborne Mine Defense Program Office where he served in positions of increasing leadership responsibility. In May 2002, he moved to the Chief of Staff, Program Executive Office, Mine and Undersea Warfare billet.

In March 2003, Captain Buduo reported to the Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron FIFTEEN (HM-15) where he served as Executive Officer until he assumed command in April of 2004. While XO, he deployed to the Mediterranean in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM where he embarked USS *Cleveland* with HM-DET ONE. During his over two years onboard, HM-15 won the Navy “E” award twice and assumed responsibility for a four-helicopter detachment permanently forward deployed to Bahrain.

In April 2005, Captain Buduo reported to the Naval Sea Systems Command, where he served as Director, POM Integration Division, and later as NAVSEA's POM Integration Lead. He subsequently assumed command of Naval Surface Warfare Center, Panama City Division in September of that year.

Four years later, in November of 2009, Captain Buduo assumed command of Indian Head Division Naval Surface Warfare Center. After nearly three years in command at Naval Sur-

face Warfare Center, Captain Buduo was assigned to the Navy Combat Identification Capabilities Division at the Pentagon where he ultimately served as Director.

Among his many accomplishments, Captain Buduo is entitled to wear the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal with 1 gold star, Navy Commendation Medal with 2 gold stars, Navy Achievement Medal, and other service awards.

Our country is stronger and safer because of the courageous men and women of our armed forces who dedicate their lives to protecting and defending our beloved country. I'm honored to stand today to recognize Captain Buduo's exemplary service on behalf of the United States of America, and I am more grateful than I can express for his service.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of Captain Buduo's hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Captain Buduo's accomplishments and service to our nation. He is a proven leader and a credit to his family, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States of America. As he retires from military service, we wish Captain Buduo well, along with his wife, Charlene, as they look forward to this next chapter in their lives.

RECOGNIZING DOROTEO “D.M.”
MARTINEZ

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Doroteo “D.M.” Martinez, a dedicated public servant, proud family man, and devoted community leader, as he celebrates his 96th birthday.

D.M. grew up in the small town of Roy, New Mexico—a village of just over 300 people, and dedicated his life to the service of others, in both his local community and across the state of New Mexico. I was fortunate to work with D.M. when I was the state's Secretary of Aging, and I found him to be an intelligent, respected, and resolute individual. With D.M. and Travis Wood's help we were able to establish the Travis Wood Senior Center in Roy and provide support services to the senior community there.

Throughout his life, D.M. has continued to blaze trails in New Mexico, serving as President of the New Mexico Rural Electric Cooperative Association, member of the Roy School Board, Chair of the Democratic Party of New Mexico, organizer for his local church, and an active member of the American Legion, all while remaining an avid farmer and rancher.

D.M. personifies the idea that with hard work, persistence, and dedication nothing is unattainable. It is individuals like D.M. that make our country strong, and his vision and accomplishments serve as an inspiration for future generations of New Mexicans. D.M. truly has lived his life to the fullest and demonstrates the impact that one individual can have on an entire community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join his family and friends in celebrating all that D.M. has accom-

plished in 96 wonderful years and looking forward to the many more to come.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MID CITIES PREGNANCY CENTER

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 30th anniversary of the Mid Cities Pregnancy Center in Euless, Texas. In its history, MCPC has ministered to over 70,000 women by providing Christ-centered counseling, professional medical services, and connections with resources to help as many as possible choose life for their preborn child.

MCPC began in the First Baptist Church in Euless, Texas. First known as the “Crisis Pregnancy Center,” it was inspired by the preaching of Dr. James T. Draper in January of 1984. On August 20, 1984, after prayerful consideration, a small group of church staff and laymen opened the center to begin its life-saving ministry of outreach to any woman experiencing an unplanned pregnancy. Sixteen were served in the first month and were lovingly provided Biblical counseling by volunteers as well as community resources and options.

Since then, MCPC has grown tremendously and done great work as one of the first Christian pregnancy centers in the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex. In 2006, the Center was awarded a grant by Focus on the Family and Dr. James Dobson for a new ultrasound machine. Their site visit report included a positive review of practices and a recommendation that led to MCPC's incorporating independently. First Baptist Church continued to provide leadership to the center through board membership majority and ongoing support of their pregnancy mission. On March 26, 2009, the Center, after having operated in North Richland Hills for a time, opened a satellite facility in Irving, Texas. Not long after, the new opening was met by another generous grant for a new ultrasound machine. Three professional ultrasound techs joined the MCPC staff. Last year, MCPC's main office returned to Euless and moved into a new 7,800 square-foot building in the city's hospital district. A full-time nurse manager was added to supervise a staff of volunteer professional registered nurses to ensure that each client received medical attention and prenatal education.

Over the years, MCPC has helped promote health, security, life, and the Gospel for women in need. Of the 70,000 whom they have worked with, 40% had positive pregnancy tests, 25,000 said they would choose life as a result of MCPC's ministry, and thousands of others have received the Christian faith. In the future, MCPC plans to work even harder to specifically reach out to women in underserved communities who are the most desperate for hope and direction. This effort will include the use of a mobile unit that was donated last year.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of gratitude for their good work in my district's communities that I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Mid Cities Pregnancy Center.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORION INDUSTRIES

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long and distinguished career of Bruce Nesbitt. Fifty years ago, Mr. Nesbitt founded Orion Industries in his parent's basement on the Northwest side of Chicago by first applying coating to race car engine parts. He convinced any friends, relatives, and initial suppliers that would listen to his sales pitch to buy stock in his coating company. Today, Orion Industries applies Teflon coating on consumer bake ware, automotive, and industrial products and has grown from 3 employees to 138. Orion Industries continues to grow and create jobs in Chicago and recently announced relocating to a larger facility in the Fifth District to accommodate its booming production. Needless to say, those initial shareholders that believed in Bruce made a handsome return on their investment in what is now a leader in the industrial coatings industry.

The success of Orion Industries is due to the entrepreneurial creativity and work ethic of its founder who can often be found at his plant's in-house laboratory. Mr. Nesbitt was educated in public high schools and colleges on the Northwest side of Chicago. Even though he never received a college degree, Mr. Nesbitt holds 31 U.S. Patents and has 9 pending, earning him membership in the Chicago Entrepreneurial Hall of Fame. Under Mr. Nesbitt's leadership, Orion Industries was awarded the DuPont Plunkett Award for Industrial Innovation this past year. Amidst all these titles and distinctions, Mr. Nesbitt was also given the unofficial title of CTO, "Chief Tinkerologist" by his employees at Orion Industries. Best of all, Bruce remains a hard-working and humble "Chicago guy" amidst all his success.

Bruce would be the first to tell you that his family is his first priority, and they have provided support for all of his activities. His family includes his two daughters; Amber, her husband Ben Wood and their two children, Brecon Michael and newborn, Gwyneth Adele, and Greer and her husband, William Swearingen.

He and Diane Jacobson continue to reside in Chicago and support numerous local charities and civic organizations like the Time Line Theatre and Adaptive Adventures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Bruce Nesbitt and Orion Industries on the 50th anniversary of the company's founding. It is always encouraging to see someone follow their passion, open a successful business, and give back to their community. I wish Mr. Nesbitt and all the employees at Orion Industries the best of luck in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE FORT WALTON BEACH HIGH SCHOOL CHEERLEADERS AS 1A EXTRA LARGE VARSITY DIVISION STATE CHAMPIONS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate the First Congressional District of Florida's Fort Walton Beach High School Vikings for winning the Extra Large Varsity 1A Division State title at the Florida High School Athletic Association (FHSAA) Cheerleading State Championship on January 31, 2014. This victory marks Fort Walton Beach High School's 10th state title at the FHSAA Cheerleading State Championship.

Truly an outstanding team effort put forth by all twenty-nine members, under the leadership of their talented coaches, Ms. Rachel Pritchard and Ms. Natalie Schmidt, there is no question that several performances contributed to the overall title. Even weather delays could not dampen the young men and women's motivation and concentration. When they finally took the stage in Kissimmee, the Vikings excelled at the competition. They scored 92.65 out of 100 in the preliminaries before claiming their victory in the Extra Large Varsity division and before hurrying back to Fort Walton Beach High School to cheer on the Girl's Basketball team in the District Finals.

I commend the young men and women of the cheer team—Alexa Allen, Kate Blanchard, Kacie Daugherty, Ammilia Dubbs, Alexis Flores, Sidney Freeman, Alexa Gaddis, Mary Gashaw, Niki Grater, Jesi Harrell, Ashley Holz, Kristin Hyder, Justice Jones, Lindie Landinham, Tyla Lane, Natalie Lawson, Kaycee Lewis, Jamie Miglionico, Cathryn Palenske, Ashley Pullen, Jordyn Purifoy, Bailey Rathmann, Cassidy Raven, Alexis Richardson, Lauren Rigdon, Hannah Robertson, Darien Shoults, Hannah Steece, and Courtney Triplett—for both challenging themselves and setting an example for their fellow students and youth in our community.

Fort Walton Beach High's victory at the Florida High School Athletic Association Cheerleading State Championship is a testament to the commitment and dedication of all the members of the team, and it is a great reflection on the entire Fort Walton Beach and greater Northwest Florida community. On behalf of the United States Congress, my wife Vicki and I congratulate the Vikings for this extraordinary accomplishment and wish them continued success.

HONORING MARTIN GILCHRIST

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the mid-1800s, Martin Gilchrist migrated from Churchville, West Virginia to

Jefferson County, Mississippi and shortly after the Civil War, he married the love of his life; the union of Martin Gilchrist and Gracie Nettles Gilchrist began the Gilchrist family in Jefferson County, Mississippi, which has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the Gilchrist family has produced many well-respected citizens and five of the patriarchs and matriarchs of the family were born to Martin and Gracie Gilchrist. The children were Martin, Geoid, Joanna, Evalene and Marie all of whom served as pillars of strength for the Gilchrist family; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Gilchrist family, including Ms. Doretha McGlory one of our most beloved citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Gilchrist family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Gilchrist family in our District; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 11, 2014 as Gilchrist Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 11th day of July, 2014.

HONORING NOLAND SMITH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Noland Smith who is a native Jacksonian and was reared in the Virden Addition Community. He attended Lake, Brinkley and G. N. Smith Elementary Schools. He continued his education at Lanier High and graduated from Brinkley High School. Continuing his education, he graduated from Tennessee State University.

Mr. Smith played professional football with the Kansas City Chiefs and the San Francisco 49'ers.

He has had tenure with the City of Jackson in the Public Service Careers Department. He has served as Director of Youth Division/Allied Service Department, Contract Supervision-CATEC and Employer Service Representative.

Mr. Smith has received many special honors: Inducted into the Tennessee State University Hall of Fame, March of Dimes Hall of Fame, Heart of Gold Volunteer Award, Co-Founder/Co-Chairman of the National Football League Player Association of Mississippi Chapter and received the Jefferson Award for Community Service sponsored by Cablevision. He retired as the coordinator of the Medgar Evers Community Center.

Mr. Noland Smith is married to Gloria J. McKinnie Smith and they have three children: Nolan Jr., Tonya and Kelvin.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Noland Smith.

IN HONOR OF COMMANDER ERIK FRANZEN

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Commander Erik Franzen for his outstanding and invaluable service to his community and the United States of America, as he embarks on a new mission at his next command, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach.

Commander Erik Franzen began his naval career in 1991 after graduating from San Diego State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Liberal Studies and was commissioned through the NROTC program.

In 2010, Commander Erik Franzen reported onboard the Naval Air Facility (NAF) El Centro as the Executive Officer. He later assumed command of the installation on July 1, 2013 and spearheaded several infrastructure improvements to NAF El Centro. These enhancements included a complete remodel of the Naval Exchange Building and the Take 5 coffee shop, an overhaul of the sports complex, installation of artificial turf on the sports field and sundry improvements to workspaces throughout the base.

As a result of Commander Erik Franzen's guidance and leadership, NAF El Centro has increased in mission capability, improved customer service to visiting detachments and seen a tremendous boost to the overall morale of the base. I applaud Commander Erik Franzen for his distinguished service to NAF El Centro, the Imperial Valley, and the nation.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JOE SCHNEIDER

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joe Schneider. The recent emotion and debate surrounding immigration in the U.S. has detracted from some great stories about those immigrants who helped to found and shape this country. I would like to share a story about one of those immigrants.

Joe Schneider was born in Kernei, Yugoslavia in 1929. While his father was off fighting in World War II, Joe led his displaced family on a journey throughout Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and ultimately Vienna, Austria. As refugees, the war years were extremely challenging and although he lost a leg at age 15, he never lost his desire or ability to support and lead his mother and four younger siblings.

His family was given the opportunity to leave Austria and arrived in the U.S. as immigrants in 1951. Joe was extremely proud of his German heritage but his love for this country was something he never stopped talking about. Without speaking a word of English and missing a leg he set out to start working as a tailor. He often talked about living in the land

of opportunity and how it afforded anyone and everyone the chance to start and own their own business. He finally lived his dream when he founded Joe's Tailor Shop at age 50. For more than 25 years, Joe's small family business created employment and provided for more than 20 families.

In 1953, Joe met Katharina Schaeffer, who was also an immigrant from Kernei. They had three children, Hermann (Christine), Robert and Monica (John) as well as three grandchildren, Michael, Lauren and Megan. The family was blessed to be able to celebrate Joe and Katharina's 60th wedding anniversary in February of this year.

For the past ten years Joe had been the President of the Kerneier Pleasure Club in Chicago. As a leader in Chicago's German-American community, he balanced the preservation of old world traditions with a love and belief in the American way of life. The recent World Cup soccer match between the U.S. and Germany could have created a conflict but Joe clearly supported Team USA.

I'm not sure he had a bucket list but I do know he had watched a family grow and flourish, experienced all the richness life can offer, and was able to look back with very few regrets. I also know the investment he made in his family and friends paid dividends throughout his whole life. Although he will be sadly missed, his love for his country and family will live on forever.

CONGRATULATING THE LIONS CLUB OF RICHMOND, INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lions Club of Richmond, Indiana on its 90th Anniversary.

Lions Clubs International is the world's largest service club organization. These clubs provide invaluable services to people in communities across the county and around the globe. Lions Clubs help to fight blindness, protect the environment, feed the hungry, and assist seniors and people with disabilities. The Richmond Lions Club has been an asset to people in east-central Indiana, serving this community for nearly a century.

This outstanding achievement would not have been possible without the dedication, commitment and vision exhibited by today's club members and those over the past 90 years. These community leaders who diligently serve for the good of the public set an example for all Hoosiers to follow.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Lions Club of Richmond, Indiana on its 90th Anniversary and thanking them for their continued service. I have no doubt that the extraordinary individuals who make up this great institution will be serving the people of Richmond for many more years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE PAXTON LADY CATS AS CLASS 1A BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONS AND HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF COACH RANDY INFINGER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the First Congressional District of Florida's Paxton School girls basketball team for winning the Class 1A Basketball State Championship and honor the life of Coach Randy Infinger.

The Paxton Lady Cats ended a spectacular season with a record of 26-3 to clinch this year's state championship. The final game was played against Chipley High School on February 20, 2014, in Lakeland, Florida, with the Lady Cats claiming victory with a score of 39-34. Many of the exceptional plays leading up to the victory occurred in the final quarter of this tightly contested championship game. Senior Emily Murray scored a game-high 20 points on the strength of four 3-pointers, including a game-winning three pointer with just 38 seconds left on the clock. With their victory, the Lady Cats secured Paxton's fifth girls basketball state championship, moving them into fifth place on the all-time Florida girls basketball championship list. Their latest state championship marks another proud moment in the sports history of Northwest Florida high school basketball.

Sadly, on February 23, 2014, four days after their extraordinary victory, the Paxton Lady Cats and the entire Paxton community were struck by tragedy when long-time Paxton Assistant Coach Randy Infinger passed away. Throughout his dedicated 25-year career at Paxton School, Mr. Infinger coached several teams and touched the hearts of countless students and teachers. His contributions to Northwest Florida and Paxton School were truly exceptional, and his legacy will not be forgotten.

On behalf of the United States Congress and the citizens of Northwest Florida, I would like to honor and remember Coach Randy Infinger and congratulate players Katie Sebastian (#3), Quinn Williams (#4), Cortni McKee (#5), Faith Elmore (#11), Emily Murray (#12), Sidney Beck (#14), Genesis Long (#15), Lenora Dixon (#21), Allison Carnley (#22), Annie Myles (#23), Bethany Neale (#24), Cassidy Brazile (#25), Payton Malloy (#30), and Kristen Corbett (#45); Head Coach, Steve Williams; Assistant Coach, Kim Corbett; Bookkeeper, Laurie Gilbert; Statistician, Connor Williams; Principal Beth Tucker; Assistant Principal Mitch Jackson; and Athletic Director Steve Williams for their extraordinary victory. My wife Vicki joins me in offering our best wishes to Paxton School and its talented athletes and coaches for their continued academic and athletic success, as well as our prayers and most sincere condolences to the family of Mr. Infinger and the entire Paxton community for their tremendous loss.

REMEMBERING DAVID STEPHEN
CONRAD**HON. BRADLEY BYRNE**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a great Alabamian and a proud Mobilian, Mr. David Stephen Conrad, or just "D" as he was known to his family.

Mr. Conrad was born in Boston, Massachusetts on August 30, 1939, but he called Mobile home for the last 49 years. He graduated from the University of Alabama and Cumberland School of Law in Birmingham, Alabama. He passed away on September 3, 2014.

Mr. Speaker, David loved the law and took great pleasure in his profession. He co-founded the firm of Conrad & Hammond, which is known today as Conrad, Barlar, and McCulloch. He was well-known throughout the legal community as a lawyer possessing the difficult balance of class, respect, and courtesy, while always being the strongest advocate possible for his clients. He was always willing to assist and mentor his fellow lawyers, providing counsel on personal and professional matters wherever requested.

He was an active member of his personal and professional communities. He served as past Vice President and board member for the Alzheimer's Association, past member of the Board of Directors of the Springhill Avenue Temple, past member of the Board of Directors of the Mobile Jewish Welfare Association, past Secretary and Vice President of the Mobile Bar Association, past member of the Board of Directors of the Alabama Trial Lawyers Association, member of the Alabama and Mobile Bar Associations, past Regional Board Member for the Southern District of the Commercial Law League of America, past member of the Board of Directors of the Mobile Medical Endowment Fund, past member of the Board of Directors of the Gulf Coast Conservation Association, past member of Ducks Unlimited, and past officer of the Board of Directors for Mobile Big Game Fishing Association.

David Conrad always tried to see and find the best in every human. He approached every obstacle he faced with an unwavering positive attitude, the quintessential "eternal optimist." He loved his wife, children, and grandchildren deeply. He always enjoyed spending time with his family at their family house known as "Camp David."

David is survived by his wife, Norma, his son, Jeff (Chris) Conrad of Mobile, his daughters, Wendy (Neal) Aronson of Atlanta, Georgia, and Jill (Christopher) Hufnagel of Grand Rapids, Michigan. He is also survived by his 7 grandchildren: Matthew, Will, and Ellie Aronson; Stephen and Sydney Conrad; and Owen and Henry Hufnagel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my name to the chorus of individuals who were personally touched by David Conrad. I pray that his family and friends will find peace during this difficult time, but that they will find comfort in remembering the good times and great memories they shared with David.

IN HONOR OF N. MICHAEL RUCKA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor N. Michael Rucka, an important community leader whose entrepreneurial spirit, tenacity, and ethical standards enriched the lives of his family, law partners, friends, and clients. Mike was a dear friend and wonderful mentor. He was the very essence of life, compassion, generosity, and curiosity. World affairs and domestic politics were always on Mike's mind and he was never shy about sharing his thoughts with me. Mike passed away on July 28, 2014, after struggling with cancer. His passing has left a huge empty space in those of us who knew and loved him. But what we will remember the most is the way he enriched so many lives and made the Monterey Bay Area, and indeed the world, a better place.

Mike was born on October 3, 1939 in Brooklyn, New York. His parents, Nettie and Arthur, soon moved to Los Angeles and then settled in San Francisco. Mike graduated from Lowell High School before attending the University of California, Berkeley. Following his graduation from UC Berkeley and the University of San Francisco School of Law, Michael relocated to the Monterey Peninsula in the 1970s. There, he worked ambitiously alongside his friends Emmet O'Boyle, Alfred Lombardo, and J. Andrew McKenna to develop the Rucka, O'Boyle, Lombardo, and McKenna Law Firm in Salinas, California.

Mike devoted every day to representing injured parties in matters of workers compensation and Social Security disability. Mike won the Granado Case before the California Supreme Court, thus establishing the rule that temporary disability and medical treatment are not subject to apportionment. Thanks to his work, this rule has benefited all injured workers since.

Michael co-founded and acted as one-time National Chair of the Workplace Injury Law & Advocacy Group. He also served as the President of the California Applicant's Attorneys Association from 1975 to 1976. In 1993, Mike received the Eugene Marias Lifetime Achievement Award.

Mike was uniquely respected both in this community, throughout California, and by his peers throughout the country. In a small block of marble in his office is a short handled hoe, presented to Michael in honor of his instrumental work and help in getting the back-breaking short handled hoe banned from the agricultural fields of California. He donated his time, resources and energy to organizations that are committed to advancing the rights of injured workers and others who need a voice.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in honoring Mike's lifetime of achievement and in extending our heartfelt condolences to his friends, and family members, including his wife Corry, daughter Brandy, sons Greg and Nick, and his grandchildren.

LOUDON COUNTY COMMISSIONER
ROY H. BLEDSOE**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Loudon County Commissioner Roy H. Bledsoe is a long-time friend of my family, and one of the most honorable men I have ever known.

He recently retired from 55 years of public service to Tennessee. During that time, he impacted the lives of thousands of people in many positive ways. Our Nation would be a much better place if there were more people like Roy Bledsoe.

Roy's public service began in 1959 as a member of the Soil Conservation District in Sweetwater Creek. He then went on to be elected to the Loudon County Commission in 1966 and become the first mayor of the county in 1968.

His remarkable 48 years of service on the Loudon County Commission is unmatched.

Recently, the state of Tennessee honored Roy's service with a Joint House Resolution, which stated that he "distinguished himself as a public-spirited citizen of the highest order and as an exceptional asset to his community," and that his "remarkable success as a public servant and civic leader is directly attributable to his reliance on the time-honored values of hard work and common sense and his uncommon ability to work well with people from all walks of life."

Roy was a friend and supporter of my father, and I have been blessed to have his friendship and support over the years as well. I know even in retirement he will continue to impact the lives of many.

Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Roy H. Bledsoe is a patriotic and great American known for his work ethic and generosity. I bring his service to the attention of my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD and wish my friend well on the occasion of his well-earned retirement.

HONORING STANISLAUS COUNTY
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
MANAGER III DEBORAH
THRASHER**HON. JEFF DENHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Stanislaus County Office of Emergency Services Manager III Deborah Thrasher on her retirement. After 13 years of valuable service to the Emergency Operations Center and county, Mrs. Thrasher retired on September 5, 2014.

Mrs. Thrasher has been an integral part of the development and maintenance of emergency operations plans for Stanislaus County and nine other cities. She has developed and handled the annual maintenance and continuity of government plans and operations for the county and hosted workshops for local

agencies. Mrs. Thrasher managed the local hazard mitigation plan and developed several programs for the county, including the agriculture plan, avian influenza plan, and functional annexes for emergency operations plans.

Over the last 10 years, Mrs. Thrasher was also responsible for management and administration of all related grant programs. During that time, she became one of the most respected operational area managers of Homeland Security Grants. Additional duties included, coordinating FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grants and Public Safety Interoperable Communications Grant program.

Mrs. Thrasher served on several local and state committees representing Stanislaus County, including the Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee, California Emergency Services Association, Stanislaus County Healthcare Executives, and the Stanislaus County Operational Area Council. Through her leadership, she developed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Stanislaus County and United Way. Mrs. Thrasher would also swear in volunteers as emergency service workers and participate in full scale exercises with the county & State of California.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Stanislaus County Office of Emergency Services Manager III Deborah Thrasher on her retirement and in wishing her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

TO RECOGNIZE MS. ALEX HOLLEY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize Alex Holley who has joined FOX29 as the new anchor of Good Day Philadelphia.

Ms. Holley is a native Texan and comes to the City of Brotherly Love by way of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina where she previously served as a local news reporter and anchor.

Philadelphia, and our region, has a rich history of journalism dating back to the founding of our nation, including the likes of Benjamin Franklin, and the signing of the Bill of Rights which ensure a free and open press. It is my hope that Ms. Holley continues this tradition and will loyally report on the latest news from around the Delaware Valley.

As the federal representative of Bucks and Montgomery counties, and part of Good Morning Philadelphia's broadcasting area, I look forward to her reporting on the issues affecting the people and communities of our region. I join my neighbors in welcoming Ms. Holley and wish her the best of luck in this new, exciting position.

HONORING MS. DORIS HAYNES MILLER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding, highly driven professional, Doris Haynes Miller.

Doris Haynes Miller was born, raised and educated in Clarksdale, Mississippi where she attended public schools until she graduated from Clarksdale High School. She was baptized at the age of 12 at Chapel Hill Missionary Baptist Church. After graduation, she left Clarksdale to attend Jackson State University where she earned a Bachelor's degree in Business Marketing. She later moved to Europe and lived there for 8 1/2 years; primarily in Germany. While in Europe, she attended Boston University and the University of Southern California as she pursued a Master's degree in Human Resource Management. She was employed by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army as a Social Service Representative until her return to the United States.

Ms. Miller attests that it was the love of family and divine intervention that brought her back to Clarksdale. She lost her father, a cousin and two uncles to cancer within the past fifteen years. As a result of her losses, she has become strongly involved in cancer awareness. She is a champion for education and an advocate for youth, young people and the working class grassroots' community.

She was previously employed by Comprehensive Urban/Rural Ensemble with Tourism, a non-profit agency she assisted in creating during 1998 to spur positive economic and social change in Coahoma County and throughout the Mid-South Delta Region. It was primarily funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

She served as the first Executive Director of the Mississippi Conference of Black Mayors. She is the first African-American female member as well as the first African-American President of the Clarksdale Exchange Club. She has served as Vice-President and President of Clarksdale-Coahoma County Crime Stoppers, Inc. She has served as Vice-President of the Clarksdale/Coahoma County Association of Educators. She is also a member of the Clarksdale Community Council of The Mastery Foundation where she has assisted in planning, organizing and coordinating Community Empowerment Meetings since 2002.

As a result of her work and passion towards racial reconciliation and improving race relations in her community and the Delta Region, she was the only African-American selected to represent the state of Mississippi for the 2004 Ireland Intensive in Derry, Londonderry, Ireland. This global intensive was focused on bridging racial equality, religious beliefs and religion to positively impact lives internationally.

During the 2005 Clarksdale mayoral election, Ms. Miller was the first woman to seek the position. She presently serves as Chairperson of the Voter Registration Committee for the Mississippi State Democratic Party as well

as a member of the Mississippi Democratic Administrative Committee. She also presently serves as a member of the Coahoma County Democratic Committee.

She is currently employed by a subsidiary of Homeland Security as a Field Research Traveler and the Alcorn State University Extension Program as a Marketing Associate. Ms. Miller has other ongoing contracts as an Independent Consultant in the areas of Research, Community Development, Evaluation, Public Relations, Marketing, Education and Event Planning.

Ms. Miller enjoys traveling, cooking, entertaining family and friends, walking, attending concerts and watching good movies. She is the oldest of two sisters and one brother. Her favorite mottos are "always be true to yourself" and "wear life like a big t-shirt".

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing Professional Woman for her dedication and service to mankind, Ms. Doris Haynes Miller.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOLY ANGELS CHURCH

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 100th anniversary of Holy Angels Church in Colma, California. This diverse and close-knit parish beautifully calls itself a family of faith, sharing time, talent and treasure.

Today the church on San Pedro Road has a seating capacity of 1140, but its beginnings a century ago were much smaller. St. Anne Church was built in 1868 on land donated by Peter Dunks of Colma and named after his daughter Anne Dunks. Priests from San Mateo and San Francisco rode their horses to the church until the advent of the railroad. One priest, Reverend James Cooper, spent so much time in the saddle that he was known as "the horseback priest." It took him four days round trip to travel to the church.

From 1899 to 1914, St. Anne was a mission of St. Michael in the Ocean View district. In 1914, the mission received the status of parish and the name of the church was changed to Holy Angels. Catholics from the coast had to travel to Colma for mass and sacraments until Father Sorasio, the pastor at the time, set up a mission in a house near present-day Nick's Restaurant in Rockaway Beach.

By 1952, the parish had outgrown the size of the church. A growing number of Catholics from Broadmoor, Sterling Park, Sherman, Callan Heights and other new developments joined the church. A campaign to enlarge the church and build a parish school was launched in July of that year under the chairmanship of San Mateo County Supervisor Thomas Callan. As a result, Holy Angels underwent its first major alteration in 87 years. The church was enlarged and a school with eight grade levels, a library, office and convent was built.

In 1960, a fire destroyed the whole sacristy including all vestments and linens. It was accidentally started by children playing with candles in the sacristy.

The following year, the church once again needed to be enlarged and a new campaign began. The new Holy Angels Church and rectory were dedicated in September of 1962. Its mission architecture, mosaic murals and stained glass windows give it a simple beauty and grace.

Holy Angels has had 16 pastors since its establishment in 1914. Father Alex L. Legaspi became the newest one on July 1, 2013. Holy Angels has a rich parish because of its diversity, from its humble beginnings with German, Irish and Italian immigrants and more recently with parishioners from Mexico, Central and South America, the Philippines and other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the 100th anniversary of Holy Angels Church, a house of worship that enriches its parishioners with a close sense of community.

IN HONOR OF IRVING C. WEIL

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Santa Cruz resident Irving C. Weil on the occasion of his 100th birthday. I have had the great pleasure to know Irving as a community activist and political campaign volunteer. He has made his life an example of compassion and civic action for every citizen to emulate. I have had the honor of having a flag flown above the Capitol in honor of Irving in recognition of his many years of service.

Irving was born on August 27, 1914 in Brooklyn New York. During WWII he served in England as part of the U.S. Army, Medical Service Corps. He returned to the Army during the Korean war where he oversaw a Mobile Army Surgical Hospital, popularly known as a MASH. Following the Korean war, Irving continued to serve in the Army with postings in Germany and Fort Ord, from where he concluded his Army career in 1968.

Following his retirement from the Army, Irving moved to Los Angeles, where he pursued a college degree. He was then employed by the Mobil Oil Corporation as a chemist and supervisor. Irving later relocated to the Monterey Bay Area where he became active in the local community, particularly with Temple Beth El. He is the recipient of the B'nai B'rith "Akiba Award" for extraordinary service to his Jewish faith and heritage. And even as he turns 100, Irving is active with the Santa Cruz County singing group called the DOGS (Dominican Oaks Guys Singing).

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in wishing Irving a happy birthday and conveying our gratitude for his service to the United States. The world is a better place because of his efforts.

TRIBUTE TO MS. HATTIE CREWS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, reaching the age of 85 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Ms. Hattie Crews was born on August 18, 1929 in Effingham, South Carolina and is celebrating that milestone; and

Whereas, Ms. Crews has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Ms. Crews is celebrating her 85th Birthday with her family members, church members and friends here in Georgia, she celebrates a life of blessings; as a Mother, Grandmother, Great Grandmother, friend, a servant and a leader; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her life and she prays daily and is leading by example a blessed life; an advocate, faithful matriarch and a community leader; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her 85th birthday in Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Hattie Crews for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all, now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 18, 2014 as Ms. Hattie Crews Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 18th day of August, 2014.

RECOGNIZING THE CAMARADERIE FOUNDATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the Camaraderie Foundation, a Central Florida nonprofit organization that offers counseling, emotional support and spiritual guidance for military service members, veterans and their families.

The Camaraderie Foundation was founded in 2009 by Captain Michael Waldrop and his wife, Marnie. Following Capt. Waldrop's deployment to Afghanistan, the Waldrops sought counseling and found it to be vital to the wellbeing of their marriage and reintegration into the community. Capt. Waldrop noticed that stigma associated with counseling often dissuaded military members from benefitting from it. Believing that private counseling and spiritual community can alleviate post-deployment issues, the Waldrops started the Camaraderie Foundation to serve the military community.

The Camaraderie Foundation provides counseling scholarships to military service members and their families, community-building programs that create support networks before and after deployment, and a mentorship

program that assists military members with their transitions back into civilian life.

According to the Camaraderie Foundation, 84,803 service members have been deployed from Central Florida since September 11, 2001. To these men and women, we owe a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid. I thank them for their service, and I commend the Camaraderie Foundation for their extraordinary leadership and dedication to serving our nation's military.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JOE MAZE

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joe Maze, a beloved husband, father, grandfather, and war veteran. He was a devoted American and an exceptional servant to the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. While I never had the chance to meet Joe, the stories of his legacy should inspire us all.

He's remembered as a great warrior and dedicated serviceman who pledged his devotion to tirelessly fight for moralistic causes until the very end. After the completion of two tours in Vietnam and retiring from the U.S. Air Force in 1971, Joe decided that his calling was to continue serving by becoming a part of the law enforcement community. He was a Papillion City Police Officer who diligently worked to protect and serve our community until 1995. His success was apparent as he advanced from Deputy to Captain of the Sarpy County Police Department during his law enforcement career. Not only did he strive to protect our community, but he helped safeguard it as well by volunteering with the Papillion Fire Department in his off time.

Those who knew Joe describe a completely selfless member of our community who was passionate about helping others in need. Those who knew him best say he was devoted to service, and gave his time and energy to those less fortunate. He was active in Masonic organizations in both Nebraska and Oregon. He traveled to Minnesota to visit children in the Shriners Hospital where he dressed up as Snuffy the Clown and would spend the day visiting with sick children making them laugh. It's said his gentle demeanor would raise anyone's spirits. This one act of kindness demonstrates that Joe left a very positive impact on this world. May we all find comfort in remembering the joy he brought to others.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in offering my deepest condolences to the Maze family for their loss. Let us honor him by reflecting on his lifetime of selfless service to others and may his legacy live on.

HONORING PRIVATE SAMUEL
REED

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life of Private Samuel Reed, who served our nation during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Private Reed will be honored on September 13, 2014 with a Grave Marking Ceremony at Reid's Chapel United Methodist in Murphy, North Carolina. Private Reed's fourth-great grandson, Edward Wayne Reid, and his wife Carol, have organized the event.

Born in Rowan County, North Carolina around the year 1750, Private Reed was a true patriot, serving in the Revolutionary War with his father, Colonel James Reed, and his six brothers. He fought in multiple key battles between the years of 1778 and 1781 throughout North Carolina, Georgia, and South Carolina. Additionally, during the War of 1812, Private Reed served in the North Carolina Militia.

After many years of military service, Private Reed and his wife, Rachel Sparks Reed, settled in Cherokee County, North Carolina. Private Reed died in 1851 at the age of 101 and was buried in the old Reed Cemetery, close to where Reid's Chapel United Methodist is today.

We owe our freedom and independence to great men like Private Samuel Reed. I am proud to honor this brave man and his many accomplishments in defense of our nation.

COMMEMORATING THE TWENTY-
THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE
INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE
AND RECOGNIZING THE VIBRANT
AND ACTIVE UKRAINIAN COMMU-
NITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my esteemed honor to commemorate the twenty-third anniversary of the independence of Ukraine and recognize the Ukrainian community of Rochester, NY for their valuable contributions to the development of the Rochester region and their unshakable support for a stable, democratic, prosperous and sovereign Ukraine in the face of tremendous adversity.

Since the Ukrainian parliament officially proclaimed Ukraine as an independent state on August 24, 1991, the people of Ukraine have worked tirelessly to establish a stable democracy and a prosperous economy open to western trade and investment. Though there have been many setbacks along the way, the will and determination of the Ukrainian people has never wavered and they have repeatedly shown their unwillingness to accept injustice or autocratic rule, most recently during the EuroMaidan movement.

Since the ouster of President Viktor Yanukovich in February 2014, Ukraine has

encountered tremendous opposition and aggression from the Russian Federation and President Vladimir Putin. President Putin has used the full resources at his disposal to sow instability and unrest as Ukraine worked to elect a new President and integrate with Europe and the west. These tactics began with the Russian invasion and annexation of the Crimean Peninsula and continue to this day, as Russia arms and supports separatist rebels in eastern Ukraine so craven they shot down a commercial airliner carrying civilian passengers and blocked the international community's access to the crash site.

In response to Russia's actions, the United States Congress quickly passed legislation authorizing \$1 billion in loan guarantees to the Ukraine government, \$60 million in assistance for training and non-lethal equipment and material to the Ukrainian Armed Forces, National Guard, and State Border Guard Service, and over \$70 million to help Ukraine hold free and fair presidential elections, root out corruption, enhance their energy security, and stabilize their economy.

I also worked with my colleagues on the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus to introduce legislation to provide Ukraine with more robust military assistance as they battle well-funded separatist rebels supported by Russia in Eastern Ukraine. As the leading world power, the U.S. should give Ukraine the tools and resources it needs to stand up to this threat and maintain its independence, sovereignty, and democracy.

The city of Rochester, NY in my district has been blessed with a vibrant and active Ukrainian population that began settling the region as early as the 1880s. These hardworking and civic-minded citizens have left their mark in business, banking, medicine, public affairs, and other industries vital to the success of our community. They have also been active and engaged in Ukraine's struggle for political, economic and social stability. They have brought attention to injustice and lobbied public officials to take action. I am incredibly proud of this community and to have been made an honorary Ukrainian by my constituents. I have been pleased to work on their behalf during my years in Congress.

While Ukraine still has many miles left on its journey for peace, prosperity, and democracy, I am encouraged by the progress the Ukrainian people have made and their courage to continue fighting. I'm also reminded of their quest this year as we mark the bicentennial of the birth of the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko, whose strong advocacy for Ukraine as an independent state left a lasting impression on the people of Ukraine for generations.

As Mr. Shevchenko wrote in the 1858 poem Fate, "So let's march on, dear fate of mine! My humble, truthful, faithful friend! Keep marching on: there glory lies; March forward—that's my testament."

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ukraine on its 23rd Independence Day, and honoring and thanking the Ukrainian community of Rochester, NY, for their tireless work to promote a stable, democratic, prosperous and sovereign Ukraine at a time of tremendous adversity. I am honored to represent such a passionate and dedicated community.

IN HONOR OF THE 25TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF THE NONPROFITS IN-
SURANCE ALLIANCE OF CALI-
FORNIA (NIAC)

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Nonprofits Insurance Alliance of California (NIAC), a remarkable organization that provides essential risk-management services to enable nonprofit organizations to meet the needs of our citizens and contribute to our economy.

NIAC was conceived by Pamela Davis in her Master's thesis at UC Berkeley Graduate School of Public Policy in 1987. Despite no insurance background, she recognized the growing inability of nonprofit organizations to obtain necessary insurance coverage from commercial insurers. This, in turn, limited nonprofits' ability to fulfill their missions of service to our communities. During the mid-1980s, many insurance companies dropped coverage for nonprofits when, at the same time, evidence of insurance was required as a condition of providing government funded services to communities. As a result, nonprofits lost funding and were unable to offer many essential services to children, seniors, and our most fragile citizens because the insurance industry believed that the risk posed by these operations was too great.

Ms. Davis challenged insurance companies to produce data that would demonstrate the riskiness of nonprofit operations. When no such information was forthcoming, she concluded that the risk of nonprofits had not been properly evaluated. Looking ahead, she proposed that the nonprofit sector could better serve its own insurance needs by pooling together and creating their own insurance companies—essentially self-insuring each other.

The Davis thesis led directly to the formation of NIAC. It was published by the California Community Foundation and widely distributed as a possible solution to a difficult problem. With California Association of Nonprofits serving as fiscal agent, Ms. Davis spent two years raising funds and putting together all of the required infrastructure for NIAC. On November 1, 1989, with loans of \$1.3 million from foundations including Ford and Packard, NIAC's charitable risk pool welcomed its first member-insured.

Now, 25 years later, NIAC insures 8,500 nonprofits in California and holds an A (Excellent) rating from AM Best. It has demonstrated not only that nonprofits are eminently insurable, but also that the insurance prices that were being charged during the mid-1980s were too high. NIAC successfully reduced prices over its 25 years and returned \$31 million in dividends to its 501(c)(3) nonprofits because of better than expected claims experience. Those nonprofits have, in turn, been able to use those funds to bring more services to their communities.

Congress, in consideration of the public benefits provided by the nonprofit sector, passed legislation in 1996 to grant organizations like NIAC 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status.

By this legislation, Congress recognized the value of keeping funds at work in the nonprofit community.

Heeding the call in the late 1990s to assist nonprofits outside of California, NIAC was instrumental in creating the Alliance of Nonprofits, Risk Retention Group (ANI). ANI's formation in 2000 was enabled with grants of \$10 million from the Gates and Packard foundations. The company now insures nearly 5,000 nonprofits in 30 states for all types of liability insurance, just as NIAC has done in California.

In her thesis, Ms. Davis had proposed that if more resources could be allocated to providing training and risk management assistance, fewer accidents would occur and less money would be needed to pay for claims and litigation. From their inception, NIAC and ANI have provided free services to help nonprofits avoid injury and accidents to their clients and members of the public. They provide free driver training, webinars, in-person consultations and many, many other services to help nonprofits do their work more efficiently and safely. These programs have demonstrated the success of that idea.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported NIAC's efforts through its history and have watched the Nonprofits Insurance Alliance Group grow in its ability to serve our vital and vibrant nonprofit sector. Too often we fail to acknowledge the work of people and organizations who are dedicated to serving our community needs and making our neighborhoods a more livable and tolerant place for all of us. Today, I would like to recognize NIAC and its dedicated employees and volunteer board members for their work to help strengthen an important part of our economy—nonprofit organizations.

COMBATING THE EBOLA THREAT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last month, I convened an emergency hearing, during recess, to address a grave and serious health threat which has in recent weeks gripped mass media attention and heightened public fears of an epidemic—the Ebola virus.

What we gained from the hearing is a realistic understanding of what we are up against, while avoiding sensationalism.

Ebola is a severe, often fatal disease that first emerged in 1976 and has killed 90% of its victims in some past outbreaks.

Since March of this year, there have been more than 1,700 cases of Ebola, including more than 900 fatalities, in Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria.

This time, the average fatality rate in this outbreak is estimated at 55%—ranging from 74% in Guinea to 42% in Sierra Leone. The disparity in mortality rates is partially linked to the capacity of governments to treat and contain the disease and per capita health spending by affected country governments.

There is also concern that, given modern air travel and the latency time of the disease, the virus will jump borders and threaten lives else-

where in Africa and even here in the United States.

In my own state of New Jersey, at CentraState Hospital in Freehold, precautions were taken. A person who had traveled from West Africa began manifesting symptoms, including a high fever. He was put in isolation. Thankfully, it was not Ebola, and the patient has been released.

New Jersey Health Commissioner Mary O'Dowd reiterated to me yesterday that New Jersey hospitals have infection control programs in which they train and are ready to deal with potentially infectious patients that come through their doors. She also told me that physicians and hospital workers follow very specific protocols on how to protect themselves as well as other patients, and how to observe a patient if they have any concerns, which includes protocols like managing a patient in isolation so that they are not around others who are not appropriately protected.

The commissioner also underscored that the federal government has U.S. quarantine stations throughout the country to limit the introduction of any disease that might come into the United States at ports of entry like New Jersey's Newark Liberty International Airport.

As you know key symptoms of Ebola include fever; weakness; head, joint muscle, throat and stomach aches; and then vomiting and diarrhea, rashes and bleeding. These symptoms are also seen in other diseases besides Ebola, which makes an accurate diagnosis early on uncertain.

Ebola punches holes in blood vessels by breaking down the vessel walls, causing massive bleeding and shock. The virus spreads quickly before most people's bodies can fight the infection, effectively breaking down the development of antibodies. As a result, there is massive bleeding within 7 to 10 days after infection that too often results in the death of the infected person.

Fruit bats are suspected of being a primary transmitter of Ebola to humans in West Africa. The virus is transmitted to humans through close contact with the blood, secretions, organs or other bodily fluids of infected animals.

Some health care workers—such as heroic American missionary aid workers Dr. Kent Brantly and nursing assistant Nancy Writebol—contracted the disease despite taking every precaution while helping Ebola patients. Both of them were treated at Emory Hospital in Atlanta, Georgia, in an isolation unit after having been flown to the United States in a specially equipped “air ambulance.”

While there is no known cure for Ebola, both Dr. Brantly and Ms. Writebol were given doses of the experimental anti-viral drug cocktail ZMapp, developed by a San Diego company called Mapp Biopharmaceutical.

Mapp Biopharmaceutical has been working with the National Institutes of Health and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, an arm of the military responsible for countering weapons of mass destruction, to develop an Ebola treatment for several years. The drug, which attaches to the virus cells much like antibodies their compromised immune systems would have produced, had never been tested in humans before Dr. Brantly and Ms. Writebol, who gave their consent to be the first human trials.

There will be great hope if ZMapp works on the two Americans who bravely agreed to test its effect. Still, ZMapp is an experimental drug. Those who use it must be given the complete information on its use. Informed consent is vital in the use of any drug, but certainly one that has such limited trials among humans.

There is also promising research done by the Tekmira Pharmaceuticals Corporation—funded by the U.S. Department of Defense—on their TKM-Ebola, an anti-Ebola virus RNAi Therapeutic. TKM is on clinical hold, yet earlier preclinical studies were published in the medical journal, *The Lancet* and demonstrate that when siRNA targeting the Ebola virus and delivered by Tekmira's LNP technology were used to treat previously infected non-human primates, the result was 100 percent protection from an otherwise lethal dose of Zaire Ebola virus.

Unfortunately, there are other issues that impact on the ability of the international community to assist the affected governments in meeting this grave health challenge. Some of the leading doctors in these countries have died treating Ebola victims. The non-governmental medical personnel who are there say they feel besieged—not only because they are among the only medical personnel treating this exponentially spreading disease, but also because they are under suspicion by some people in these countries who are unfamiliar with this disease and fear that doctors who treat the disease may have brought it with them.

The current West African outbreak is unprecedented—and an anomaly. Many people are not cooperating with efforts to contain the disease. Some, such as Liberian-American Patrick Sawyer, refused to accept that they may be infected. His death sent chills through those outside the affected region who feared infected people leaving the area and arriving in metropolitan areas somewhere else in the world.

Because of the stigma of Ebola, many people in the affected region are reluctant to acknowledge the possibility of having the disease and don't seek medical treatment. This phenomenon was common in the early days of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Traditions also play a role in people not accepting suggested protocols. Many people are handling the bodies of their relatives who died of Ebola and burying them without taking proper precautions, and themselves become victims of this deadly disease.

Medical missionaries have given of their time and talent at great risk to their health and their very lives to apply the Christian principles to which they have committed themselves.

As we consider what we can do to meet this health challenge, I would suggest we need to reconsider the funding levels for pandemic preparedness. In the restricted budget environment in which our government operates today, funding to meet these pandemics has fallen from \$201 million in fiscal year 2010 to an estimated \$72.5 million in fiscal year 2014. The proposed budget for fiscal year 2015 is \$50 million, and we must not shortchange vital efforts to save the lives of people in developing countries, but also protect the health security of the American people. There are both practical and compassionate reasons to adequately fund pandemic response.

Dr. Tom Frieden, one of the witnesses we had, has tried to assure the American public that our government is doing what we can to address the Ebola crisis. USAID; WHO; the World Bank; DFID, the British development agency; the African Development Bank, and many other governments, international organizations and companies are joining to meet this crisis.

To those who say there is no plan, I would say that planning is underway to overcome obstacles to effective efforts to contain this virus. We have seen great success in treating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis. Polio has been largely eliminated. Tropical diseases are being treated through a public-private partnership. Still, we must take more seriously the research, surveillance, treatment, and prevention of diseases that limit the lives of people in developing countries.

This is why I have introduced the End Neglected Tropical Diseases Act. H.R. 4847 establishes that the policy of the United States is to support a broad range of implementation and research and development activities to achieve cost-effective and sustainable treatment, control and, where possible, elimination of neglected tropical diseases. Ebola is not on WHO's list of the top 17 neglected tropical diseases, but it does fit the definition of an infection caused by pathogens that disproportionately impact individuals living in extreme poverty, especially in developing countries.

Ebola had been thought to be limited to isolated areas where it could be contained. We know now that is no longer true. We need to take seriously the effort to devise more effective means of addressing this and all neglected tropical diseases.

IN MEMORY OF ALETHA HOWELL
BARSANTI

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Aletha Howell Barsanti, who passed away July 13, 2014. She was a devoted army wife, an exceptional mother and a loyal companion and friend to many.

Aletha was a Texas native and was born on September 27, 1920 in Corsicana, Texas. After graduating from high school in the west Texas town of Rankin, she followed her two older sisters, Fleda and Frances, to the University of Texas. While working at her father's law office she met Olinto Mark Barsanti, a career officer in the United States Army. They were married on October 22, 1942 at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas. Olinto went on to become a decorated combat veteran of World War II and Korea and also served as the Commanding General of the prestigious 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam. While Olinto served and protected our country, Aletha was an army wife who diligently and lovingly raised their daughter, Bette, on her own.

After the General's death in 1973, Aletha settled in Montgomery, Alabama in the late 1970s. There she met Colonel Lonnie Martin,

a retired member of the United States Air Force. For the next twenty years she and Lonnie traveled, attended the symphony, golfed and enjoyed retirement with one another. While residing in Montgomery, she also spent much of her time with a group of women who included her in their bridge games and other social activities and made her feel like a Montgomery native. The retired military community also welcomed her.

Aletha was a proud member of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Magna Carta Dames. She will be greatly missed by her family, including her daughter and son-in-law Bette and Bob Sherman of Denton, Texas.

HONORING FUTURE INC. DAYCARE
& EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING
CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable Future Inc. Daycare & Early Childhood Learning Center (F.U.T.U.R.E.).

Future Inc. Daycare & Early Childhood Learning Center (F.U.T.U.R.E.) was established on August 1, 2005. This is a Walk of Faith Church Ministry Product that offered a program that is child oriented. Children "learn by doing" in an environment which encourages the development of a joy for learning. Recognizing the uniqueness of each child, age-appropriate learning experiences are provided in an accepting, warm environment.

The play environment encourages positive development across a wide range of domains while building self-confidence, independence, and self-discipline.

Opportunities are provided for discovery, learning through concrete experiences, imaginative free play, observation, and positive peer and adult interaction.

F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc.'s Mission Statement is: To build competent families, competitive children, complimentary communities, and convincing futures. To provide a high quality early childhood program in a safe, nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of young children, while responding to the needs of families; and the vision of F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc. is to serve with excellence and integrity. This organization improves and enhances the quality of life for youth and families in the Copiah County area.

F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc. seeks to continue to have an accredited outreach program that prepares participants to become academically, physically, economically, mentally, spiritually, and socially ready to function at their highest levels in society and the ever changing world.

The fundamental goal of F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc. is to serve, improve, and enhance the quality of life for youth and parents of the Copiah County area. The philosophy, methodology, and program curriculums are based on the premise that all participants have "absorbent minds" and an innate desire to learn and func-

tion at their highest level of ability. Given the proper environment and stimulation, one will function at a high level in life in which they can demonstrate adequate behavior and success, individuals learn more when they are stimulated by their surroundings and will benefit most when both teacher and participants are consistent and supportive with the FUTURE philosophy.

Actions to provide high-quality services to children and families are to:

Maintain a quality partnership with ICS Head Start; Participate in QRS with a goal of five stars; Implement the Head Start Program Performance Standards and Regulations into the Pinnacle curriculum; Implement the Mississippi Early Learning Guidelines into the Pinnacle curriculum using the All About Preschoolers and The Creative Curriculum for Preschool as a basis for curriculum development; Implement quality early childhood practices through the use of the ITERS-R and ECERS-R guidelines.

F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc.'s desire is to maintain a partnership with ICS Head Start by following the Program Goals and Objectives which are to: Provide a classroom environment where children "learn by doing." Encourage the development of a joy for learning and provide age-appropriate learning experiences in an accepting, warm environment.

F.U.T.U.R.E., Inc. promotes physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of young children. They use basic health and developmental screenings as a means to determine the need for additional screening, referral for a comprehensive assessment, or needed professional services.

They use positive guidance techniques to provide a foundation for appropriate social interaction, positive self-esteem, and successful academic performance; Provide an environment in which diversity is a part of daily routines and activities; Teach hand washing and other health practices as part of the daily routine; Provide positive mealtimes to encourage the development of healthy lifetime eating habits; Provide outdoor play for the development of healthy bodies and minds; Provide activities for children which encourages a positive transition from preschool into the kindergarten setting; Provide a safe and secure environment in which learning is optimal; Provide a positive supporting environment in which children will develop self-directed, cooperative, trusting relationships; and Provide a high quality early childhood program which reaches beyond childcare to support the needs of families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Future Inc. Daycare & Early Childhood Learning Center (F.U.T.U.R.E.) for its dedication to serving others.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "STAR SPANGLED BANNER" AND HONORING OUR FLAG

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, two hundred years ago, on September 14, 1814, Francis

Scott Key and two other Americans, one a prisoner of the British whose release Key had been commissioned to negotiate, waited anxiously for the outcome of the battle begun nearly 24 hours earlier. Although Key had secured the release of Dr. William Beams, they were detained by the British overnight because they had overheard the British attack plans.

During the rainy night, Key had witnessed the bombardment of Fort M'Henry, and observed that the fort's smaller "storm flag" continued to fly. At dawn, Key was inspired by the American victory and the sight of a larger American flag, with fifteen stars and fifteen stripes flying triumphantly above the fort. This flag remains on public display in the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History.

The whole event inspired Key to write a poem, titled "Defence of Fort M'Henry." It was soon set to music and performed to an enthusiastic public audience as "The Star Spangled Banner" less than a month later. In 1931, Congress adopted it as the national anthem of the United States.

Orange County, California, which makes up most of the 39th Congressional District I represent, is home to one of Francis Scott Key's descendants. George Key, the great great grandson of the author of our national anthem, is a resident of San Clemente and a member of the "greatest generation." A veteran of both World War II and the Korean Conflict, Mr. Key has honored his heritage by leading efforts in his own community to honor the flag that inspired his ancestor.

Mr. Key is known as "The Flagman of San Clemente." Even at 90 years of age, he continues to work with local schools, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Boy Scouts, and others, teaching them U.S. history and how to properly dispose of American flags. He collects tattered flags from drop points in the city and arranges for their proper disposal. Along with a colleague, he created a program to honor veterans and their families by flying flags over San Clemente City Hall when the veterans pass away.

I am pleased to recognize the 200th Anniversary of the "Star Spangled Banner," and the legacy of the Key family in honoring our nation's flag.

**CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION
FOR THE TUCSON ARIZONA BOYS
CHORUS IN HONOR OF THEIR
75TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus, which will be celebrating its 75th anniversary this year.

Established in 1939, the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus was formed by Eduardo Caso, a teacher and singer in Arizona recovering from tuberculosis. The choir quickly rose to prominence, starring in early national radio and television broadcasts, and even performing at the 1950 Chicago World's Fair.

The Chorus continued to grow, aggressively traveling to all corners of the globe, a mission that continues to this day. They have performed in over 25 different countries, visiting every continent except Antarctica. From Tucson to the former Soviet Union, from the Vatican to Super Bowl XXX, this extraordinary institution has continuously embodied those qualities that make southern Arizona such a treasure.

Vital to the Chorus' mission is the development of its members through concentrated character growth. These young men learn core values such as leadership, responsibility, sincerity, integrity, reliability and honor.

Under the direction of Dr. Julian Ackerley, the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus shares the values and traditions of southern Arizona with the world. I congratulate the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus on 75 years of excellence and wish them the best for the next 75 years to come.

**HONORING CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATES
OF TABLE ROCK LAKE**

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Christian Associates of Table Rock Lake's 40th year of service to the Tri-Lakes community.

Christian Associates of Table Rock Lake provides multiple services to the people of Missouri who are facing hardship and was honored as the 2010 charity of the year by the Branson Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce.

It provides shelters for domestic violence and abuse and assists in case management and advocacy in order to help facilitate positive life changes. These shelters not only provide therapy and education, but also court advocacy and referrals to legal counsel.

Christian Associates of Table Rock Lake also assists low-income families with the establishment of the Little Oaks Apartments and its own thrift store for the community. Little Oaks Apartments provides affordable housing for low income families and is closely tied to the Footprints Learning Center, a state-approved childcare facility where the parents can enroll their children and pay based on their income. The Footprints Learning Center also provides care and education for children in the domestic violence shelter.

Christian Associates of Table Rock Lake continues to help the community by initiating outreach programs and by collaborating with churches, other non-profits, civic organizations, businesses, and schools.

I am honored to recognize the Christian Associates of Table Rock Lake for being "40 Years Strong, and Lighting the Way" for the Tri-Lakes community.

**TO RECOGNIZE GEORGE DIDDEN
GREENHOUSES' 100TH YEAR AN-
NIVERSARY**

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor George Didden Greenhouses, a greenhouse business in Hatfield Borough, which is celebrating its 100 years of excellent service to the community of Pennsylvania's Eighth District.

Didden's Greenhouses was founded by George Didden and his wife Laura in 1914. His three great-grandsons, Ken, Jon and Dan Ruch, now own and operate the greenhouse business, making it the oldest family business in Hatfield Borough. Over the years, Didden Greenhouses gained widespread recognition, not only as superb growers, but also as developers of their own flower species. During the late 1950's, Didden Greenhouses became instrumental in developing disease resistant varieties of plants, including the world famous "Didden's Improved Picardy". Today, Didden Greenhouses has grown to over 31 greenhouses and continues to provide service to the Bucks and Montgomery County area.

I am honored to represent those who do such influential work and wish them continued success in the next 100 years.

**HONORING RAINBOW LEARNING &
DAYCARE CENTER**

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable Rainbow Learning & Daycare Center.

Rainbow, opened in June 2007, is operated by the owner/director, Mrs. Pernada Jackson. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Rainbow's mission is to provide child care services and a safe learning environment that focuses on the developmental needs of the children. The center serves families in Leland, Mississippi, and the surrounding towns.

Rainbow strives to provide a quality early childhood education program filled with love and compassion for children. They believe that children are the most important resource and that the early childhood experiences are crucial in the development of their future.

Rainbow's belief is that the family is the strongest influence in the child's growth and development. They extend the child's home experience and provide new and different experiences of value. Rainbow's program is based on the knowledge that children learn best through play and active hands-on activities. Using developmental appropriate materials to stimulate and explore their potential is their goal.

Growth occurs in developmental stages and each stage must be offered, encouraged and supported. Rainbow's classrooms are arranged in an environment that presents maximum opportunities for cognitive development,

discovery learning and an awareness of cultural diversity. They offer clean and spacious learning centers that offer a wide variety of daily activities to encourage and challenge each child.

Rainbow's learning environment will empower children and enhance self-esteem by creating an atmosphere where social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development can take place. By encouraging children to learn and develop at their own level, they will gain the confidence of self-importance. Rainbow offers children guidance and understanding, so they will have the opportunity to explore their world in a safe and controlled environment.

Rainbow provides nutritional meals and snacks. All meals meet the nutritional guidelines set by the USDA.

Each caregiver receives on-going training through staff meetings and during early childhood conferences and workshops that are held throughout the year. All Rainbow employees are trained in Pediatric CPR and First Aid. Rainbow accepts all children regardless of race, color, creed, and sex, religious or ethnic backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Rainbow Learning & Daycare Center for its dedication to serving others.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR DICK
CALLAWAY

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dick Callaway, Mayor of the City of St. Albans, who has been honored by his peers at the West Virginia Municipal League recognizing him as 2014 Mayor of the Year. He has dutifully served the City of St. Albans as its Mayor for eight years, elected in 2009 and 2013. I have had the honor to work with Mayor Callaway on numerous occasions, and have always admired his professionalism, his vision and his concern for his constituents and the community.

Mayor Callaway is very involved with other organizations that affect the quality of life of the City of St. Albans and Kanawha County. He currently holds seats on the Board of Directors for the Charleston Area Alliance, Regional Development Authority, and Bridge Valley Community and Technical College Foundation. In addition, he is the Past President of the WV Municipal League and is currently Chairman of the Regional Intergovernmental Council, which provides an array of services that support economic development, infrastructure, planning and intergovernmental cooperation.

Before serving the City of St. Albans, Callaway was involved in broadcasting and education. He is a past president of the WV Associated Press Broadcasters Association. He is the former owner and operator of radio stations in both Charleston and Boone County, WV. He has served as a member of the executive council for AARP West Virginia. While with AARP, he produced and hosted the

AARP West Virginia television broadcast. Before becoming mayor, Callaway produced and hosted several television programs in the Charleston viewing area. Callaway is the current host of "Community Issues" for the West Virginia Library Network. In the field of Education, he served as the President of the WV Vocational Education Association.

These experiences have proven invaluable in his duties and performance as Mayor. Under his leadership, the St. Albans Drug Prevention Task Force was established; St. Alban's Main Street was opened for economic development; the old Alban Theater was purchased and transformed into a theatrical production house for theatrical performances and as a home for the Alban Arts Academy for classes in the performing and visual arts. He also oversaw the reconstruction of the Dick Henderson Bridge, an essential span over the Kanawha River connecting the Cities of St. Albans and Nitro. Callaway also saves the St. Albans Municipal Utility Commission at least \$75,000 annually by serving as its General Manager.

Callaway, and his wife Libby, celebrated their 51st wedding anniversary in July of this year. He and Libby have two daughters, six grandchildren, and are the loving pet parents to Becker the beagle and Roz the terrier. Even with his hectic schedule, Mayor Callaway takes his 90+ year-old Mother to the beauty parlor and shopping every Saturday morning.

His leadership gifts shine not only on the professional front, but also in his personal life. Callaway is a Deacon and Adult Bible Study Teacher at First Baptist Church in St. Albans. He is kind hearted, mild mannered and always ready to help others, which has gained him the support, love and respect of not only the citizens of St. Albans, but his employees as well.

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia, City of St. Albans, and indeed, the United States of America owe Mayor Dick Callaway a debt of gratitude for his many years of distinguished service. I would like to close by offering Congratulations to Mayor Callaway on this prestigious, much deserved honor. I am truly privileged to call him my friend and fellow West Virginian.

RECOGNIZING MR. JARED POLACK

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jared Polack. He is one of two top Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (J.R.O.T.C.) cadets from Nebraska to receive the organization's highest commendation, the Legion of Valor Award.

A selection board reviews thousands of applications each year and total of twenty-nine awards were given out by the national J.R.O.T.C. program to receive this prestigious award. As a senior at Burke High school, Mr. Polack rose to the rank of Major within J.R.O.T.C. program. This amazing accomplishment recognizes the progress of leadership skills and scholarly knowledge within mili-

tary and academic achievements within our nation's college preparation programs.

Not only has he reached tremendous heights in the military preparation program, but he is also involved with actively volunteering at the Friedel Jewish Academy, National Honor Society, and a member of student council. This remarkable young man has set goals to attend West Point, the Naval Academy in Annapolis, and continue to participate in officer preparation courses at a higher level of education.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Jared Polack and the J.R.O.T.C. Mentors within Omaha Burke High School—J.R.O.T.C. on this achievement. They have set the standards high and have become a symbol for Nebraskans within the Junior Reserve Training Corps for years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEVE K.
OSHITA

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Steve K. Oshita—affectionately called Mr. O—who retired after 37 years of teaching math and science at Crocker Middle School in Hillsborough, California. Mr. O is no ordinary math and science teacher because his students learn about life and leadership.

He starts out his new classes by announcing that "respect is the very first thing we will learn in this class." That is followed by his instruction that "body language is everything, students. If you are sitting up, you are ready to learn; if you slouch, you are not!"

Every student in his class sits up straight and is ready to learn. The respect is mutual. Mr. O is one of the most thoughtful and dedicated educators I have met. He gained the deepest respect of my two children whom he taught math, science and invaluable lessons for life. They remember him as personable, resolute, with a wonderful sense of humor and the gift of creating a great environment for learning.

In the Hillsborough community, Mr. O is known as one of the most beloved teachers at Crocker. Alumni often return just to visit with him. For one year he served as the Vice Principal, but that took too much time away from the classroom and he went back to teaching only.

Steve Oshita was born in San Francisco, California. His parents wanted him to become a dentist and he started his education at UC Berkeley in pre-medical technology, but his calling was science and he earned his degree in Biology and Entomology, the study of insects. He then earned his teaching credential at San Francisco State University and has been teaching ever since.

Not surprisingly, Mr. O married another Hillsborough teacher, Robyn Chamness. They met in 1986, married in 1995 and have two lovely children, Reid and Renee.

Mr. O loves to dress up at school events. A fan of Motown music, Saturday Night Fever and Miami Vice, he has been spotted as John

Travolta and Don Johnson. He is also an enthusiastic sports fan and enjoys SCUBA diving, basketball, tennis—religiously every Sunday—and the Giants.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Steve Oshita, a model educator who has inspired hundreds of children and set them on a path to lifelong learning and success.

TO RECOGNIZE THE 101ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE LADIES AUXILIARY TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on its 101st year of service. The organization honors military service and ensures that the history of America's veterans is preserved for future generations. Rallied behind National President Ann Pantekeakos's theme "Patriotism Begins at Home," 500,000 members across the country, including those from the seven auxiliaries in my home district, work to maintain veterans' memorials, share veterans' history with the community, volunteer at veterans' hospitals, and provide scholarships to students recognizing patriotism through art and volunteerism. I congratulate the Ladies Auxiliary on its outstanding work and wish its members continued success as they serve our veterans and their families.

IN RECOGNITION OF DANNY GLOVER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding actor, producer, humanitarian, activist and motivational speaker, Mr. Danny Glover. Mr. Glover was featured at a Health and Wellness Benefit on Friday, August 15, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. at the Occasion Event Center in Columbus, Georgia.

Mr. Glover was born in San Francisco, California on July 22, 1946. He trained at the Black Actors' Workshop of the American Conservatory Theatre. His Broadway debut in Athol Fugard's Master Harold . . . and the Boys earned him national recognition and led director Robert Benton to cast him in his first leading role in 1984's Academy Award-nominated Best Picture, Places in the Heart. Mr. Glover then starred in two more Best Picture-nominated films, Peter Weir's Witness and Steven Spielberg's The Color Purple. In 1987, Mr. Glover partnered with Mel Gibson in the first Lethal Weapon film and went on to star in three hugely successful Lethal Weapon sequels. Throughout his career, he has starred in a multitude of films, including in The Royal

Tenenbaums; Saw; Shooter; Death at a Funeral; 2012; and the critically-acclaimed Dreamgirls.

Mr. Glover has also invested his talents in more personal projects including the award-winning To Sleep With Anger, which he executive produced and for which he won an Independent Spirit Award for Best Actor; as well as Bopha!; Manderlay; Missing in America; and the film version of Fugard's play Boseman and Lena. In 2005, Mr. Glover co-founded New-York based Louverture Films, a company dedicated to the development and production of films of historical relevance, social purpose, commercial value and artistic integrity.

Not one to rest on his laurels, Mr. Glover dedicates much of his time to community activism and philanthropic efforts, concentrating on advocacy for economic justice and access to health care and education programs in the United States and Africa. He served as a Goodwill Ambassador for the United Nations Development Program from 1998–2004, focusing on issues of poverty, disease and economic development in Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean. He currently serves as a UNICEF Ambassador.

Among his many recognitions and accolades, Mr. Glover was the recipient of a 2006 Director's Guild Award; 2011 "Pioneer Award" from the National Civil Rights Museum; and several NAACP Image Awards and CableACE Awards. He earned an Emmy nomination for his performance in the title role of the HBO Movie Mandela.

Mr. Glover has not only been a commanding presence on screen, stage, and television but also a driving force on the international stage for humanitarianism. Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." Mr. Glover embodies this statement thoroughly, for in light of his enormous personal success, he continues to fight hard for the rights and freedoms of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in recognizing Mr. Danny Glover for his remarkable accomplishments as an actor and for his unwavering courage, strong values, and an avid pursuit of equality and justice as a humanitarian.

HONORING THE CARREKER-JONES FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, In the 1800's, the Carreker-Jones Family began with their oldest known family members in Talbotton, Talbot County, Georgia; since that time, they have blessed us with descendants across the country who have helped to shape and mold our nation; and

Whereas, today we honor all of the matriarchs and patriarchs, who are pillars of strength for the Carreker-Jones family; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have many members of the Carreker-Jones family who are some of our most productive citizens; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, we take pride in knowing that families such as the Carreker-Jones family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Washington, DC; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Carreker-Jones Family; Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim, July 25, 2014 as The Carreker-Jones Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 25th day of July, 2014.

DOMINICAN STATE PARADE AND FESTIVAL OF NEW JERSEY

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey on the 25th Anniversary of their dedication in the promotion and celebration of Dominican culture and values. The Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey has reached a milestone that few other organizations in our community can claim, and has made many valuable contributions throughout our great State of New Jersey over the past 25 years.

Founded in 1989, the Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey celebrated to commemorate the restoration of independence for the Dominican Republic. The Dominican Restoration War, a guerilla war between nationalists and Spain, who had recolonized the country 17 years after the Dominican Republic had gained independence from Haiti, ended with Dominican victory and is celebrated in August.

For the past 25 years, the Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey has been a great event in the Dominican community in the State of New Jersey. It was initially celebrated in August in celebration of the restoration of independence but is now celebrated during the month of September.

The Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey had its beginnings with the election of a board of directors composed of men and women members of Club Dominicano Ramon Matías Mella and Casa Dominicana de Paterson. My good friend, Ms. Elsa Mantilla, was elected as the first president followed by 15 other individuals who have led this organization.

Ms. Elsa Mantilla has returned to serve as president of the Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey and has been serving since 2004. For the past 10 years, Ms. Mantilla has devoted herself by taking on the management responsibility of the activity, with the help of previous presidents.

The Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey has served to project Dominican values in the State of New Jersey, which stand out in culture, sports, arts, folklore, as well as providing an opportunity for many youths to be recognized within the social and political environments of the state.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, all Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey members, and all Dominican-Americans in New Jersey as they celebrate this amazing milestone. It is without question that all those affiliated with the Dominican State Parade and Festival of New Jersey have a great love for their heritage and their dedication and loyalty to project Dominican values in America is commendable.

RECOGNIZING JON CASEY OF THE
SOUTHLAKE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jon Casey of the Southlake Fire Department in Southlake, Texas. Casey was honored yesterday, September 7th, by the Southlake Baptist Church during a special service for first responders. Though only having been a firefighter in Southlake for a short time, Casey has demonstrated noteworthy courage and dedication to serving others.

Jon Casey was hired by the Southlake Fire Department on June 17, 2013. In little more than a year, he has made a difference in the lives of those around him numerous times. He and his colleague, Kevin Barry, stayed with fellow firefighter, Justin Speaker, and cared for him as he went through a medical tragedy and eventually passed away. Later they helped his family when they came to town to mourn and settle affairs.

On another occasion, Mr. Casey was off duty and driving outside of Southlake with two other firefighters, Kyle Warden and Isaiah Gonzalez, when they approached an overturned and ablaze ATV. They sprang into action and gave medical attention to an 11 year old girl who had been trapped underneath it and found nearby with severe burns. They then accompanied the local paramedics who arrived afterward and continued to provide needed assistance. They have since visited her at Parkland Hospital's burn unit and have followed her recovery.

Instances of Mr. Casey going out of his way to help others have also been noted in ways that would seem small but that made a world of difference to those whom he has touched. He was among three firefighters who helped Betty Hawthorne, a woman who was traveling and had pulled over at their station for help with her power window that would not roll up. Little did they know that she was coming from the funeral of a dear friend and lost many other loved ones that year. She was deeply distraught and was driving hours on a blistering hot day to see her grandson play in a baseball game. Along with Lieutenant Marshall Urbanosky and Engineer Tony Peyton, Casey successfully repaired her window. Their com-

passion left Betty with such an impression that she wrote a letter to the Fire Chief, describing the whole story with great gratitude.

Southlake Fire Department Deputy Chief Wade Carroll, reflecting on Jon Casey, has written that he cannot "help but think that his kind heart toward those in need has driven his career choice, his actions, and the actions of his friends. Because of people like [Jon] the fire service will continue to stand for showing the compassion of Christ to those in need." The City of Southlake will be most fortunate as Casey continues to devote himself to public service, both on and off duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Jon Casey on his well-earned community recognition for his exceptionally sacrificial and caring service as a member of the Southlake Fire Department.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MS. LEE
STURTEVANT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues, Congress members ANNA ESHOO and MIKE HONDA, to recognize the impact of Ms. Lee Sturtevant's lifelong service on the County of Santa Clara. We would like to express our deep sadness over her passing on August 7, 2014, in San Jose at the age of 91.

Ms. Sturtevant was a life-long, dedicated, selfless, and influential activist in Santa Clara County, particularly in her tenacious leadership capacity within the Santa Clara County Democratic Central Committee and of Democratic Activists for Women Now (DAWN). A committed Democrat, she believed in the government's importance in advancing opportunities for those who had none.

Ms. Sturtevant dedicated her life to getting women involved in politics. In 1974, she successfully managed the campaign of Assemblywoman Leona Egeland, the only woman serving on the Assembly at the time. In 1981, Ms. Sturtevant served as my Chief of Staff when I was first elected to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. She was a staffer for many other Santa Clara County area elected officials over the years, including Congressman Honda.

Ms. Sturtevant was a dedicated advocate for those with developmental disabilities. She worked as a teacher and librarian for the Cupertino School District, and served on the San Jose Unified School District Board of Education. She had walked precincts for Franklin D. Roosevelt, organized community college professors, and conducted workshops on collective bargaining for the Detroit United Auto Workers. Ms. Sturtevant's continued hands-on involvement in key social issues cannot be overstated.

We join Ms. Sturtevant's family, colleagues, and the Santa Clara County community to express our heartbreak and great sense of loss. Ms. Lee Sturtevant was a source of tireless advocacy for social change and improvements in the lives of others and a tremendous force

for good. She was a leader, advisor, and a mentor to many women and girls over the course of her impressive career. She leaves Santa Clara County and our world a better place and will be dearly missed.

RECOGNIZING GARY RALPH
VANCOUR

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gary Ralph VanCour. For many years, Mr. VanCour has given his time and energy to promote his community and encourage its success.

Mr. VanCour has served for the past seven years as Co-Chair for the Battle of Plattsburgh Commemoration Committee, working diligently to promote the Commemoration and ensure that it continues to be an event of the highest quality. As a member of the War of 1812 Bicentennial Council: Lake Champlain Region, Mr. VanCour has worked with the Adirondack Coast Visitors Bureau to promote heritage tourism for the region.

Mr. VanCour is also a retired Social Studies teacher and Department chair for the Beekmantown Central School District in New York State. He served as President of the New York State Social Studies Supervisory Association and is currently the Town of Beekmantown Historian. He is widely respected for his work in the field of education, having led efforts to align the Beekmantown Central School curriculum with New York State Social Studies Standards.

Mr. VanCour is a father and grandfather as well as a musician and community volunteer. Each of us can learn from his extraordinary dedication to serving his community.

CONGRATULATING BRADEN
MUSCARELLO ON RECEIVING
PRESTIGIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Braden Muscarello for being awarded a Kennedy-Lugar YES Abroad scholarship to study in Oman during the 2014-2015 academic year. Braden, a sophomore at William P. Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas, is one of only 65 American students selected to serve as YES Abroad youth ambassador to educate other countries about American culture.

As a YES Abroad student, Braden will help foster mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Oman to promote friendly and peaceful relations. She will live with a host family in Muscat, attend a local high school and participate in activities with her Omani peers. Not only will she educate others about American culture, she'll also bring back her own experiences of Omani society and values and help

build a social foundation for the development of a strong bilateral relationship between our two countries.

I wish Braden the best of luck as she studies in Oman this year. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Braden Muscarello for earning a Kennedy-Lugar YES Abroad scholarship.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that while I was in Washington for much of Friday, August 1, 2014, I was unable to vote on legislation considered that day due to previously scheduled events in the district.

If I had been able to vote that day, I would have voted as follows:

On the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 700, roll No. 474, I would have voted "no."

On consideration of H. Res. 700, a resolution to waive certain requirements under Clause 6(a) of House Rule XIII, roll No. 475, I would have voted "no."

On the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 710, roll No. 476, I would have voted "no."

On consideration of H. Res. 710, a resolution providing the rule for H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272, roll No. 477, I would have voted "no."

On Passage of H.R. 5230, Supplemental Appropriations Related to the Humanitarian Crisis at the Southwest Border, roll No. 478, I would have voted "no."

On Passage of H.R. 5272, to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, roll No. 479, I would have voted "no."

On Concurring to the Senate Amendments to H.J. Res. 76, Emergency Supplemental Funding to Israel for the Iron Dome Defense System, roll No. 480, I would have voted "yes."

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,756,856,045,819.45. We've added \$7,129,978,996,906.37 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MS. SUSAN HAMMER

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Susan Hammer and congratulate her on her Cornerstone of the Arts Award, a timely and well-deserved honor.

From the beginning of her career in public service, Ms. Hammer worked tirelessly to link San Jose's civic future to the continued growth and development of its arts and cultural institutions. Indeed, she entered public life in 1969 by founding a community art museum that became the San Jose Museum of Art. She was instrumental in saving the historic building now home to its administrative offices from destruction.

Ms. Hammer's unwavering support of the arts continued throughout her illustrious career. As the 62nd Mayor of San Jose, Ms. Hammer led the creation of San Jose's first cultural plan, which served as the blueprint for the evolution of the Office of Cultural Affairs and led to arts education reform. Ms. Hammer created San Jose's first cultural tourism program, worked to build The Tech as a museum of national stature, and fought to complete the Guadalupe River Park. Ms. Hammer made sure that The Rep got a permanent home in San Jose. Together with the San Jose State University President, Ms. Hammer developed the idea of creating a joint library and was part of a committee that raised \$16.5 million for the completion of San Jose's stunning Martin Luther King Jr. Library.

Ms. Hammer is a trailblazer when it comes to the development of San Jose area's thriving community and dynamic culture. As Mayor, she focused on affordable housing, child care, education, the arts, and the revitalization of the San Jose Downtown.

Ms. Hammer is truly the "cornerstone" of the San Jose arts community and sets the highest standard for public service. Unsurprisingly, in her retirement, Ms. Hammer continues to be civically involved and active in community and educational organizations.

I wish to congratulate Ms. Susan Hammer on her Cornerstone of the Arts Award and express my gratitude for her exceptional leadership and lasting impact on the San Jose art and cultural landscape.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL JOB CORPS ASSOCIATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing and congratulating the National Job Corps Association on their 50th Anniversary. Over the course of 50 years, millions of at-risk youth have been forever changed by Job Corps' comprehensive residential, academic and career preparation programs.

In my hometown, the Flint Genesee Job Corps Center provides a vital service to our community by serving hundreds of disadvantaged youth between 16 and 24 years of age, inclusive, by providing high school diplomas and career technical education to young men and women.

In addition to academic and employment training, these Job Corps Centers throughout the country provide social skills training and other services to empower young men and women to obtain and hold a job, enroll in advanced training, attend college, or enter the Armed Forces to defend the interest of the United States around the world.

It is timely and appropriate that we join Flint and Genesee County in celebrating the National Job Corps Association and its accomplishments, including reducing the cycle of poverty, strengthening our local community, and improving the quality of thousands of lives.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the National Job Corps Association, and the Flint Genesee Job Corps Center, for their unwavering commitment and service to our great country.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEONARD PEEVY'S 60 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. Leonard Peavy. Mr. Peavy has been a dedicated member of American Legion Post No. 79 for 60 years.

Leonard Peavy is an Alabama Army National Guard Veteran who has served our country through three tours. These tours took him to the Korean War and Berlin. He joined the American Legion after returning from war, and he has served the American Legion in numerous capacities. He has served on local, district and state levels. Mr. Peavy served as the state commander of the American Legion in 1993. He was also awarded a certificate from the national American Legion for his dedication over the past 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. Leonard Peavy for his tireless dedication to serving our nation's Veterans. His service to our state and country is an inspiration.

CONGRATULATING CINCO RANCH'S ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cinco Ranch High School's Robotics Team CRYptonite 624 and its robot "Sidewinder" for winning the 2014 Texas Robot Roundup Tournament. This is the third year in a row Cinco Ranch has won the highly competitive statewide contest that requires advanced scientific, technical, and engineering skill.

At the fourth annual Texas Robot Roundup in Austin, Team CRyptonite 624 designed and built a robot to throw a fitness ball over trusses and into goals. The strength of the robot's performance reflects their dedication to learning and innovation.

I am proud of the scientific and engineering ingenuity Team CRyptonite 624 demonstrated. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Cinco Ranch High School's Team CRyptonite 624 for winning its third consecutive Texas Robot Roundup Tournament.

RECOGNIZING REV. DR. ROOSEVELT AUSTIN, SR. FOR HIS EXEMPLARY LEADERSHIP AND COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Rev. Dr. Roosevelt Austin, Sr., a spiritual pillar in the city of Saginaw, with more than 60 years of dedicated service to his community.

Rev. Dr. Roosevelt Austin served as Pastor of Zion Baptist Church in Saginaw for 44 years. He has also served as Interim Pastor for St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church in Saginaw, Foss Ave. Baptist Church in Flint and Mt. Olive Baptist Church in Flint.

Rev. Dr. Austin received his primary education in Opelousas, Louisiana. He went on to receive his Bachelor of Theology from McKinley Roosevelt College in Chicago, Illinois; a Master of Theology from Ohio Christian College in Columbus, Ohio; a Doctor of Divinity Degree from American Divinity School in Chicago, Illinois; and a Doctor of Humanities from Saginaw Valley State University.

Rev. Dr. Austin is a vital voice that has embraced our community through the spirit of service. He has served through many entities, some including Saginaw City Council, Opportunity Industrial Center, Pastors Concern for the Poor, Saginaw Public Schools, and as member of the Board of Directors for Citizens Bank.

Rev. Dr. Austin also holds the honor of Past President, Saginaw Valley District Congress of Christian Education; Past President, Michigan Wolverine State Congress of Christian Education; Seminar Leader, National Congress of Christian Education; and Moderator for the Saginaw Valley District Association.

Now retired, Dr. Austin enjoys spending time with his wife, Dr. Nurame Austin, his children, grandchildren, and great grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Rev. Dr. Roosevelt Austin for his strong leadership and unwavering commitment to our community.

HONORING KIMBERLY EVANS

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Kimberly Evans, an outstanding community leader, public servant, and tireless advocate for military members, veterans, and their families in Ventura County. Kim Evans demonstrates remarkable service to our community as the Founder and Director of the Ventura County Military Collaborative, which fosters invaluable collaboration among government, non-profit, and community agencies, organizations and individuals to strengthen and promote the military network of care throughout the region.

Kim earned a Master's Degree in Clinical Psychology from Pepperdine University and is a Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist and Licensed Professional Clinic Counselor in Ventura County. Additionally, Kim was trained at the National Center for PTSD and has been an Embedded Therapist for the Army National Guard and Director of Psychological Health, specializing in working with military members and their families.

Kim Evans has devoted over 14 years in service to our military community and is an acknowledged expert on the effects of military deployment on service members and their families. She has tirelessly dedicated her expertise to brief over 8,000 military personnel and family members on mental health issues, and train over 1,200 clinicians throughout the state of California on military culture and working with military members and their families.

As Director of the Ventura County Military Collaborative, her outstanding leadership has culminated in three annual Military and Veteran Expos, providing community, fellowship, food, and entertainment, along with free employment, legal, and benefits assistance, which serves to reduce unemployment and homelessness among veterans in our community. Furthermore, Kim has organized numerous community events serving military and veteran families, including Operation Snow Flake, an annual event bringing together Ventura County Military Collaborative members and local volunteers to provide a holiday celebration filled with presents, food, and special guests for military and veteran families in need.

Currently, Kim also works with the Ventura County Superior Court as the Veterans Court Liaison, training California police departments on how to work with veterans and how to create successful reintegration for returning law enforcement officers who have been mobilized for combat. Kim's committed involvement in Veterans Court has led directly to a program expansion of over 30% and now includes the Mentor Program, building relationships between veterans. Kim also developed a Veterans Legal Clinic to provide free legal information and advice.

For these reasons, it is my distinct honor to recognize and express my sincere appreciation to Kimberly Evans for her remarkable accomplishments and unwavering support and service to the military and veteran population

of Ventura County. She is an exemplary citizen, and her tireless advocacy for current and former members of the United States Armed Forces has made an immeasurable impact upon our community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN TRANSPARENCY ACT

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to empower governors and local elected officials to control whether or not the federal government can place unaccompanied minors, who have illegally entered the country, into their communities.

For the last several months, the United States' southern border with Mexico has been flooded by illegal immigrants, many of them whom are unaccompanied minors.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been a leading voice in arguing for securing our borders. I have also opposed amnesty for illegal immigrants who are already here. And I have fought for a biometric exit system to make sure that we know exactly who has entered the United States on a visa, and who has not returned home as they were supposed to.

More than 60 thousand so-called "unaccompanied minors" have arrived at our southern border, mostly from the Central American countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. This is a 10-fold increase in unaccompanied minors crossing the border since 2011. We have heard a lot of excuses for why they have come here in violation of our immigration laws. We have been told that they are fleeing violence in their home countries, but there has not been any substantial increase in violence there. So it must be something else.

What has changed is that the Obama administration implemented its DACA policy—Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—in 2012. This policy tells people that, so long as they make it to this country safely, they won't be asked to leave. The president has put out the welcome mat for residents of other countries, and told them that our immigration laws will not be enforced.

I went down to the border, near McAllen, Texas, and saw the situation with my own eyes. Some of the individual cases I heard were heartbreaking.

But when I talked to the Border Patrol agents, they told me a different story. Many of the "unaccompanied minors" are in fact arriving with members of their families, or they are seeking to meet up with members of their families who are already here illegally. In addition, over three-fourths of them are males, between the ages of 14 and 17. And many of them are affiliated with violent, criminal gangs, or are being recruited for gang membership right there at the border.

And many of them carry communicable diseases.

And, the administration has begun to transport thousands of these illegal immigrants to communities all across the country.

That's where the problems in our own backyard begin.

Just a couple of months ago, I learned from city officials in Hazleton, my hometown, that they had been contacted by a non-profit group, the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, about housing some of the minors at a location right across the street from my district office.

That's how I found out—because the organization had called the city. The federal government didn't tell anyone about the plan: not the Governor, not the Department of Public Welfare, not Luzerne County.

When I made the information public, residents of Hazleton rightly expressed their concerns, and the plan was dropped.

But we learned an important lesson in that episode: the federal government is working with organizations across the country to place unaccompanied minors in various communities . . . without telling anyone in the state or locality that they are doing so.

As of July 31st, we know that at least 456 unaccompanied minor illegal immigrants have been released to sponsors in Pennsylvania. The shelters and facilities—according to the best information available right now—are in Mechanicsburg, Womelsdorf, Bethlehem, Montgomery County, and Philadelphia.

There could be others, and there could be plans—right now—being made to house more . . . all without telling state or local governments.

This must stop.

So today I am introducing legislation that will give state and local governments a heads-up when such plans are in the works.

My "Unaccompanied Alien Children Transparency Act" is very straightforward.

It truly will empower states—governors of states—and local governments by providing them with all of the information they need to make an informed decision about relocation plans, and giving them an opportunity to either approve or reject those plans.

First, it will require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, also known as HHS, to provide detailed information regarding the pending relocation of unaccompanied minors. The Secretary will have to inform state and local elected officials of the locations and durations of any housing contracts awarded, and also provide an assessment of the costs associated with and potential impact on education, health, and public safety. The Secretary must also certify to state and local officials that the unaccompanied minors have undergone health screenings, including vaccinations, and that they pose no public health threat. Additionally, the Secretary must certify that the unaccompanied minors and the individuals who will take custody of them have undergone background checks and pose no public safety threat.

Not only should states and localities know about these relocation plans, they ought to know what impact the unaccompanied minors will have on the community. Who exactly are they, and what kind of background screenings have been done? If they will be educated locally in public schools, how much is that going to cost? These are important questions that any community would ask.

The legislation will also require HHS to provide a 30-day notice and comment period for

states and localities to review any proposed contract and accompanying certifications of health and public safety background checks. At the conclusion of the 30-day comment period, HHS will have to hold a public hearing within 10 days and provide a representative to address community concerns or questions.

At the end of the initial comment period, the governor of the state in question must decide whether to affirm the contract within seven days. If the governor does not affirm the contract, it is effectively vetoed. If the governor does affirm the contract, then the county commissioners for that jurisdiction will have seven additional days in which to object to the contract. If a majority of the county commissioners do not affirm the contract, then it is again effectively vetoed.

The people in my home city of Hazleton found out about the plans to bring unaccompanied minors into our community, and they made their voices heard. It's only fair that Americans everywhere have the same opportunity, through their elected officials at the local and state level.

Last week I held a press conference in Hazleton to announce my intention to introduce this legislation, and I was joined by our Chief of Police, Frank DeAndrea, and the Superintendent of Hazleton Area Public Schools, Dr. Frank Antonelli.

Dr. Antonelli told me that this school year, four teenagers—part of the wave of the so-called "unaccompanied minors"—came forward to enroll in the Hazleton school system. They are all males, ranging in age from 14 to 17. Two of them have had no formal education at all in their entire lives. Dr. Antonelli is still trying to find out the educational background for the other two.

Take one for an example. He is 17-years-old, has no education whatsoever, and speaks not a word of English. How, Mr. Speaker, is a local school division expected to deal with this new student? What grade does he go into?

And since we know that there are as many as 14 distinct dialects of Spanish spoken in some Central American countries, how exactly are the schools expected to communicate with him?

This is a problem that the federal government has dropped on the doorsteps of localities around the country.

This bill is especially important right now, because we have seen the federal government act in secrecy.

The administration has denied "right to know" requests from various organizations, and refuses to disclose exactly where the children are being transported.

This is from a president who promised to be transparent.

Unfortunately, this legislation is necessary to make sure that our states and localities know exactly what the federal government is doing right in their own backyards.

Now, I'm a father and grandfather, and I have seen the conditions of some of the people who have come to the southern border. I have compassion for their situations.

But I also believe that the responsibility for them should rest largely on the countries that they came from.

This should not be America's problem alone.

And it certainly shouldn't be the problem of states and localities, which are right now being kept in the dark about the movements of illegal immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the federal government to do its job in enforcing immigration laws should not become a growing burden on the folks back home.

RECOGNIZING MARY CATHERINE ABBOTT

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, with the new school year upon us, we are reminded of the great role education has played in our personal and professional growth. And we can't help but smile as we remember the educators, the teachers, school administrators and staff who, through the years, so enriched our lives. One individual who devoted her career and most of her adult life to education certainly comes to mind, Ms. Mary Abbott.

Ms. Abbott passed away late last year. And yet, Mr. Speaker, Mary Abbott's influence lives on. In fact, as has been said, a teacher affects eternity; they never know where their influence ends. Mary Abbott taught sound lessons throughout her productive life; even long after her formal role in education had come to an end, her selfless service continued for her community.

Ms. Abbott devoted a great deal of time educating herself so she could serve others. She graduated from Woodrow Wilson High School and received Bachelor Degrees from St. Mary of the Springs College in Columbus, Ohio, and Concord College in Athens, West Virginia. She received a Masters Degree in Elementary Education from West Virginia University and did advanced studies at the University.

Ms. Abbott taught at Rhodell, Stoco and Hollywood Elementary Schools. She served as curriculum supervisor for Raleigh County Schools for 28 years and served on numerous committees at the county, state and national levels.

Retiring from the Raleigh County School system in 1988, Ms. Abbott became active in the West Virginia and Raleigh County Associations of Retired School Employees, and was a West Virginia State volunteer for AARP serving as the West Virginia Retired Educators Liaison. She was a Prisoner Visitation and Support Volunteer at the Federal Correctional Institution of Beckley, a member of the Woman's Club of Beckley serving as the president in 2008–2010, Delta Kappa Gamma Honorary Society for teachers, and a member of the Raleigh County Democrat Executive Committee.

It's not surprising that Ms. Abbott's love for our great Nation and her passion for learning continue to benefit her community. On September 17th the first Mary Abbott Memorial Scholarship awards will be presented to three worthy Raleigh County high school students who have penned winning essays titled, "What the United States Constitution Means to Me."

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the contributions of dedicated, devoted citizens, like Mary

Abbott, that this Nation has been so blessed. And because of the lessons Mary Abbott so selflessly imparted to generations, her work will continue without end.

HONORING LEAH LACAYO

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Leah Lacayo, an exemplary civil servant, advocate, and community leader in Ventura County.

Leah Lacayo has defined civil service through her leadership roles in her community. Her volunteer work has included serving as a trustee of the Ventura County Fair Foundation, a founding member of Destino: The Hispanic Legacy Fund, a board member to the Jewish Labor Committee, and member of the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement.

She is a staunch advocate for young people and a passionate supporter for women's rights. Leah has also been a steward for the senior community working alongside her husband, Hank, with the Congress of California Seniors.

Additionally, Leah Lacayo has been an active community leader and champion for California State University at Channel Islands (CSUCI) since the university's inception in 2002. More recently, she was elected as the Alumni and Friends Association's Executive Board President in 2009. While serving in this capacity, her goals were to promote a self-sustaining board and create scholarship opportunities for students. Over the years, Leah has been a steadfast supporter of CSUCI students as a voice that encourages and empowers them to pursue their academic endeavors.

The work Leah has done, and continues to do, has strengthened our community in a remarkable way. Never failing to rise to the occasion when being asked to serve, the Board of Directors to the 31st District Agricultural Association elected Leah Lacayo as President while serving her second appointment to the board. In this capacity, she oversees the legal body governing the fair and fairgrounds in Ventura County. Leah has upheld the fair as a regional enterprise and continuing source of income for the area.

Leah is a good friend to many and I certainly cherish our friendship. She has been a steadfast supporter and has always been willing to offer honest counsel to me over the years both in the California Legislature and in the US Congress on policy issues affecting Ventura County.

For these reasons, it is my sincere pleasure to join the Jewish Labor Committee in recognizing Leah Lacayo with the Elinor Glenn Leadership Award for her extraordinary life of leadership, engagement, and dedication to her community.

HONORING CAPT. JOSE ACOSTA ON THE OCCASION OF THE CHANGE OF COMMAND AT THE CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL FEDERAL HEALTH CARE CENTER

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to honor Captain Jose Acosta, who will be relinquishing Command at the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center (FHCC) in the suburban Chicago district that I represent.

In 2010, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Department of Defense (DoD) opened Lovell FHCC, our nation's first integrated VA-DoD federal health care center. Lovell FHCC was the culmination of years of vision, planning and hard work. It was and is an example of excellence for all other VA and DoD health care facilities.

Capt. Acosta joined Lovell FHCC in 2012 as the Commanding Officer and Deputy Director, and he was subsequently named Acting Director. In this capacity, Capt. Acosta managed the day-to-day operations of the federal health center, which provides medical care for the veterans and military families in the area. Additionally, Lovell FHCC is responsible for maintaining the military readiness of the more than 40,000 new sailors receiving basic training each year at Naval Station Great Lakes, as well as the 4,000 active duty personnel on base.

Under Capt. Acosta's leadership, Lovell FHCC made the vision of an integrated health system a reality, raising the bar of achievement. Currently in its fourth year, Lovell FHCC provides world-class medical service to the veterans, active duty personnel, military family and recruits in North Chicago and the surrounding communities, holding more than 800,000 patient visits in 2013 alone.

Throughout his distinguished career, Capt. Acosta has displayed extraordinary commitment to his country and dedication to his fellow soldiers. He fully embraced and brought to life Lovell FHCC's mission of "Readying Warriors and Caring for Heroes."

I want to personally thank Capt. Acosta for everything that he has done at Lovell FHCC, and wish him the best of luck as he continues his service as the Commanding Officer for Naval Medical Center San Diego.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDNA FARRELL, 2014 MS. ALABAMA NURSING HOME

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mrs. Edna Farrell, a resident of Arbor Springs Health and Rehabilitation Center in Opelika. Mrs. Farrell was recently named the 2014 Ms. Alabama Nursing Home.

Edna Farrell is a native of Brooklyn, New York. She is also a Cornell graduate and a retired nurse and was a member of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps. When she graduated from the corps, she had three Maltese crosses on her shoulders, a sign of high ranking. Her husband who fought in World War II and Vietnam, took the family from Brooklyn to Fort Benning, Korea and Honolulu.

Mrs. Farrell was named Ms. Arbor Springs Health and Rehab Center in the nursing home's pageant last year. Farrell was named the 2014 Ms. Alabama Nursing Home this July during the pageant, which was held in Birmingham.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mrs. Edna Farrell on her achievement and wishing her great success during her reign as 2014's Ms. Alabama Nursing Home.

RECOGNIZING SARA LOUISE STEVENS BOOTH AND CHRISTOPHER "KIT" HENRY BOOTH FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sara Louise Stevens Booth and Christopher "Kit" Henry Booth for their extraordinary community service.

The Commemoration of the Battle of Plattsburgh began in 1997 as a weekend event and this year will take place during sixteen days. It is an event that captures the interest of history buffs, authors of history books, children and adults of all ages.

Kit and Sally Booth, people that I have known for well over thirty years, have been the prime movers for the development of this exciting historical event in our community. It now provides concerts, the Children's Old Time Village Fair, offers dances and authentic food from the period, all of which appeal to not only those interested in the historical importance of the Battle of Plattsburgh but those just interested in having a fun weekend.

The historical highlight, of course, is the reenactment, which helps to demonstrate the importance of the Battle of Plattsburgh to the outcome of the War of 1812. The entertainment is highlighted by a parade and includes notable bands including the Navy Band, a thirty piece brass band from Coberg, Ontario and approximately ten bagpipe bands.

All of this was made possible through the hard work of Sally and Kit, both in terms of the work that they have done themselves, which has been in and of itself enormous, but also their leadership in inspiring numerous volunteers to participate. This year we again expect numerous volunteers working over the course of sixteen days to make this event a success.

In honor of the two hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Plattsburgh, there will be two nights of fireworks and a local physician has created a musical play which will have five performances in the newly renovated Strand Theatre.

The economic impact of this event is demonstrated by the American Bus Association's

recognition of it as one of the top twenty themed events in the country as well as the many vendors and tourists who now attend the event. The Commemoration Committee has purchased five thousand buttons over the last several years which are sold as evidence of admission to all the venues for \$10, raising well over \$50,000 to support this event.

Sally and Kit will be serving their final year as the Co-Chairs after dedicating seventeen years to the development of this event. Their commitment has been outstanding and represents only one of the many community services that they have performed over their lives in Plattsburgh.

Kit Booth is a father and grandfather who also served as an Alderman for Ward 1 in the City of Plattsburgh, as a Clinton County legislator and as a member of the United States Armed Services during the Korean conflict. In addition to his work in Commemoration of the Battle of Plattsburgh, he volunteers at CVPH Medical Center, is an active member of the Rotary Club and is an accomplished wood carver.

Sally Booth is a mother and grandmother who has is a talented and creative writer and artist, a member of the League of Woman Voters and serves as a board member for the Kent Delord House Museum and as a Docent for the Rockwell Kent Museum. She is widely respected for her many years of volunteerism, serving on countless boards and volunteering for numerous organizations in the community.

The Booths owned Booth's Gifts for many years and provided a great service to the community as local entrepreneurs.

Kit and Sally Booth have made immeasurable contributions to the Plattsburgh community and deserve recognition and high praise for all they have done and continue to do, and we hope will continue to do for their community for years to come.

CONGRATULATING KAYLA McDONALD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Stephen F. Austin High School incoming freshman, Kayla McDonald for earning a bronze medal in the 400-meter relay at the 37th Hershey's Track & Field Games North American Final in Hershey, Pennsylvania. Kayla was part of a quartet that sprinted to a time of 51.77 seconds, just 1.22 seconds from the gold medal finishers.

With this achievement, Kayla has established herself as a top young track athlete in Texas. For two consecutive years she has won the 400-meter dash at the Fort Bend ISD district championships. She was also an honor roll student and a member of Peer Assistance Leadership at Garcia Middle School. I'm confident Kayla will continue to excel in high school, both in the class room and on the track.

We are proud of Kayla for this outstanding accomplishment and I wish Kayla the best of luck in the coming school year. On behalf of

the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, I again congratulate Kayla McDonald for her victory at the Hershey's Track & Field Games North American Final.

HONORING SKIP SCHRAYER FOR RECEIVING THE 2014 JULIUS ROSENWALD MEMORIAL AWARD

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend, an exceptional leader, Max Robert (Skip) Schrayer for receiving the Julius Rosenwald Memorial Award from the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago.

Skip has been a leader in the Jewish community for much of life, holding formal leadership positions within the Jewish United Fund/Jewish Federation (JUF) for more than 30 years.

This commitment to strengthening the Jewish community runs deep in Skip's heritage as he is the fourth member of his family to receive this, JUF's most prestigious award.

Whether it has been spearheading record fundraising efforts or co-founding the Nacshon Mission, Skip pours himself into the community and exemplifies all of the finest ideals that JUF and the Jewish community hold dear. I am grateful for Skip's friendship, and the entire JUF community is lucky to have his leadership, vision and drive.

His work for humanitarian causes and determination to make a profound difference at home and around the world are inspiring and help galvanize an entire community to action.

The breadth of Skip's experience, his many leadership roles and countless successes, earned him this distinct honor and the gratitude of our community.

Leaders like Skip Schrayer, with their focus and passion, make the Jewish community stronger. I congratulate my good friend for receiving the Julius Rosenwald Memorial Award, and I look forward to Skip's many successes still ahead.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks

section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 9, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine cybersecurity, terrorism, and beyond, focusing on addressing evolving threats to the homeland.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lisa Afua Serwah Mensah, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development.

SR-328A

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Matthew Vincent Masterson, of Ohio, and Christy A. McCormick, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission.

SR-301

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of William V. Roebuck, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu, and Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine Older Americans and student loan debt.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine freight rail service, focusing on improving the performance of America's rail system.

SR-253

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine irrigation projects in Indian country.

SD-628

SEPTEMBER 11

Time to be announced

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, and Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

TBA

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall,

of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1690, to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007, S. 1535, to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, S. 2646, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and the nominations of Madeline Cox Arleo, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wendy Beetlestone, Mark A. Kearney, Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., and Gerald J. Pappert, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Victor Allen Bolden, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Armando Ormar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Stephen R. Bough, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, David J. Hale, and Gregory N. Stivers, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, and Arthur Lee Bentley III, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida, Department of Justice.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

3:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of James Peter Zumwalt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, Robert T. Yamate, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Union of the Comoros, and Virginia E. Palmer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

SEPTEMBER 15

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine equality for the District of Columbia, focusing on discussing the implications of S. 132, to

provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

SD-342

SEPTEMBER 16

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

9:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States policy towards Iraq and Syria and the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 18

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SENATE—Tuesday, September 9, 2014

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, the fountain of our joy, You see our thoughts from a distance, comprehending the nuances of our motives. Lord, You understand our desire to please and honor You with our lives. You know our remorse for neglected duties, missed opportunities, and selfish pursuits. Give our lawmakers strength for today and hope for tomorrow. Today, meet the needs of our Senators as they confront our dangerous world, providing them with more than human wisdom to accomplish Your will. Give them faith to trust that Your sovereign providence will prevail in the unfolding events of our world. Remind them that they are never alone, for You will never leave or forsake them. We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, if any, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for an hour, with Senators permitted to speak during that time for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority the final 30 minutes. Following morning business the Senate will resume consideration of a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 postcloture. The Senate will recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2779 is at the desk, I understand, and is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2779) to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to start today by reading a few quotes on the issue of campaign finance reform. Here is the first one from 1987:

What we ought to do is eliminate the political action committee contributions because those are the ones that raise the specter of undue influence. And those can be gone tomorrow. We can pass a bill tomorrow to take care of that problem.

Another quote from the next year:

We Republicans have put together a responsible and constitutional campaign reform agenda. It would restrict the power of special interest PACs, stop the flow of all soft money, keep wealthy individuals from buying public office.

Two years later, 1990:

We would eliminate PACs altogether. It would be interesting to see whether our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be willing to eliminate PACs altogether. And we would have the money come from individuals in small and fully disclosed amounts.

A few years later, 1997:

Public disclosure of campaign contributions and spending should be expedited so voters can judge for themselves what is appropriate. These are reforms which respect the Constitution and would enhance our democracy.

Three years later, in 2000, another quote:

We need to have real disclosure. And so what we ought to do is broaden the disclosure to include at least labor unions and tax-exempt business associations and trial lawyers so that you include the major political players in America. Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?

A quote from 2003:

Money is essential in politics and not something we should feel squeamish about, provided the donations are limited and disclosed, everyone knows who is supporting everyone else.

So, Mr. President, who did these statements come from? TOM UDALL, the sponsor of the vote that we had last night? MICHAEL BENNET from Colorado? He and TOM UDALL sponsored the constitutional amendment. Did it come from them or some other Democrat?

No, that is not the case.

Let me quote a few more things:

Keep wealthy individuals from buying public office and stop the flow of soft money and public campaign contributions and spending should be expedited so voters can judge for themselves what's appropriate.

Those are quotes. Did these quotes come from BERNIE SANDERS, who is known as being a liberal? He has been an outspoken advocate for campaign finance reform.

The author of these quotes is none other than my friend the distinguished Republican leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky. These are all his quotes word for word. The senior Senator from Kentucky has a track record of campaign finance reform spanning two decades or more. I was with him there 25 years ago, fighting the undue influence of unlimited campaign donations. I cosponsored his 1989 constitutional amendment that would have given Congress power to enact laws regulating the amount of independent expenditures. I was there with him. But I guess times have changed. I am aware that the Republican leader has stated that his views on the matter of campaign finance have changed over the years. What a gross understatement. But as Victor Hugo wrote:

Change your opinions, but keep your principles. Change your leaves, but keep your roots.

At one time the Republican leader was rooted in the principle that the wealthy shouldn't be able to buy public office whether for themselves or for others. Even as recently as late in 2007 he was preaching donor disclosure. What has changed in the last few years?

Over the last several years we have witnessed the Koch brothers trying to buy America, to pump untold millions into our democracy, hoping to get a government that would serve their bottom line and make them more money. The news today says they are out promoting themselves, and that is easy to do because they are worth \$150 billion.

So we are watching the corrupting influence that the Republican leader foretold 27 years ago and many years thereafter before our very eyes. He switched teams. What could have possibly convinced the senior Senator from Kentucky that limitless, untraceable campaign donations aren't really that bad after all?

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

MIDDLE EAST STRATEGY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now that the President has conducted initial consultations with our allies and stated his objective to degrade and destroy ISIL, it is time to present a strategy to Congress. I hope he will begin to do that today.

He needs to identify military objectives and explain how those ends will be accomplished. He needs to present this plan to Congress and the American people, and where the President believes he lacks authority to execute such a strategy, he needs to explain to Congress how additional authority for the use of force will protect America. The threat from ISIL is real and is growing. It is time for President Obama to exercise some leadership in launching a response.

We know the administration has authorized military actions to protect American lives. Now we need to hear what additional measures will be taken to defeat ISIL.

SPEECH SUPPRESSION

Earlier today one Democratic Senator urged his colleagues to get serious about the real challenges facing our country—challenges such as dealing with the threat of ISIL. He implored fellow Democrats not to focus all their time instead “doing things that are of lesser importance.”

Yet his voice seems to have been ignored by the Democrats who run the Senate, because here we stand debating their proposal on whether to take an eraser—an eraser—to the First Amendment. Here we are debating whether to grant politicians the extraordinary authority to ban speech they don't like. That is what Democratic leaders have brought to the floor this week as their top priority. It is a measure so extreme it could even open the door to government officials banning books and pamphlets that threaten or annoy them. That is not my argument. That is essentially the Obama administration's own position, one that his own lawyers advocated in the Supreme Court in the Citizens United case. As one USA Today columnist put it at the time: “It isn't often that a government lawyer stands before the Supreme Court and acknowledges that, yes, it would be constitutional to ban a book. But that is what happened.”

Truly shocking.

These are the depths to which the Obama administration and its Democratic majority appear willing to drag our country in order to retain their hold on power. They are tired of listening to criticism of their failed policies. They are sick of having to sell the middle class on ideas that actually hurt the middle class. And with the Democrats' fragile Senate majority hanging by a thread, it seems they are done playing with the normal rules of democracy. It seems they would rather just rewrite the rules altogether to

shut up their critics and shut down their opponents, even as they continue to give a path to leftwing tycoons they like—folks who preach higher taxes and more regulations for everybody else—while jealously guarding pet projects and sweetheart deals for themselves.

The aim here, just as with the IRS scandal, is to use the levers of power to shut down the voice of we the people when we the people don't see things their way. The First Amendment is the only thing standing in the way.

We all know the real reason Senate Democrats are so determined to push this measure now. They are not actually all that serious about passing it this week. In fact, they designed it to fail because they think its failure would help turn more leftwingers out to the polls. The entire spectacle is mostly about saving the jobs of Democratic Senators come November. Yet it must be admitted that it is getting harder to tell which of our Democratic friends are cynical in their support of this and which are sincere, because the number of true believers in speech suppression appears to be growing on the other side, and that is really worrying for the future of our democracy.

So look, if the Democrats who run Washington are so determined to force the Senate into debate over repealing the free speech protections of the First Amendment, then fine, let's have a full and proper debate. Let's make the country see what this is really all about. Let's expose this extremist effort to the light of public scrutiny.

I suspect our Democratic friends don't really want that, though. I suspect they hope to just drop a few talking points, have their proposal fail, shoot some indignant e-mails to their supporters and move on. I don't think they counted on Senators standing up for the American people. I don't think they counted on Senators exposing their plans to entrench the tools of government speech suppression. So they would rather not have a debate they can't win.

Then here is a better idea. We all just spent the past several weeks back in our home States talking to our constituents. They have a lot on their minds these days—important issues they expect the Democrat-run Senate to address—things such as high unemployment, rising health care costs, and an ongoing crisis at the border. I, for one, will be interested to hear how repealing part of the First Amendment creates jobs for Americans or reduces health care costs. The answer of course is it doesn't, and the Republican-controlled House has already sent over countless bills that continue to collect dust on the majority leader's desk. There are many bills on job creation alone, including legislation that passed the House, with significant bipartisan support.

So if Senate Democrats want to take up some of that serious House-passed legislation instead of endless designed-to-fail political votes, we will be happy to do it. Just say the word.

Let's end the Democrats' endless gridlock and get some bills to the President's desk for once because Americans are not demanding that Congress repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment. That is certainly not on their minds. They are looking to us to work together to get some things done for them for a change, and we can as soon as our Democratic friends want to get serious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I agree with the Republican leader's defense of the First Amendment, but the constitutional amendment before us is not about limiting free speech. My Democratic colleagues and I are trying to address the special interest money that threatens to create a government of elected officials who are beholden to a few wealthy individuals.

As the respected Justice John Paul Stevens recently told us, money is not speech. Of course it isn't, and we know that.

Last week there was a recorded speech given at the Koch brothers' secret meeting place in San Diego or thereabouts. It was a secret meeting on their political strategy. They called it a summit. They had security guards. They cleared everybody who could come. It was very delicate. You had to be the right person or they would not let you into the meeting. However, there was one person who was able to record what went on at that meeting.

One of the speakers who was recorded—no others—was a man by the name of Richard Fink, who is vice president of Koch Industries. He is a big shot with the Koch brothers. Of course the Koch brothers were there listening to his speech. He said some pretty terrible and vicious things about unemployed Americans. He basically called them lazy. He went on to say that the minimum wage leads to fascism. I am not making this up. That is what he said—fascism. He even compared minimum wage with tactics utilized by Nazi Germany and modern-day suicide bombers. That is what the Koch brothers' representative said in their presence and in the presence of a number of higher ranking Republican officials.

He has a right to say whatever he wants; that is the country we live in. But as Senators we have a responsibility to stand for constituents who are unemployed or on minimum wage, and on this side of the aisle we have done that. The American people agree with us—not just Democrats and Independents. Republicans believe there should be an increase in the minimum wage.

The Republican leader was at the summit the very day Mr. Fink made

his offensive remarks. He was there. Why has he not gone on Record repudiating these vicious and unfair comments about the poor? In fact, it has been reported the Republican leader referred to the speeches given at the Koch brothers' conference that day as inspiring—inspiring.

There are 150,000 unemployed Kentuckians. Are they leaning toward fascism? There are families in Kentucky who live on minimum wage—or try to. I don't think my friend the Republican leader views them as fascist stooges or lazy, but he should stand and repudiate what the Koch brothers, through their representatives, said at the conference he attended. If any Member of this body said as much, I have no doubt my friend would come to his constituents' immediate defense. But be careful what you say about the Koch brothers. They are very sensitive. They want that to protect their \$75 billion. There are two of them, and together they are worth \$150 billion. Nobody messes with them because they have money to try to buy America, and that is what they are trying to do.

Do we need campaign finance reform? Of course we do. I gave some quotes earlier, and my friend the Presiding Officer is a very smart man. As well as being a Rhodes Scholar, he graduated from one of the most famous educational institutions in the world, Stanford University. He is a pretty bright guy as a Presiding Officer. But you don't have to be a bright guy to understand the flip-flop. I don't know how else to describe it. He gave his little speech a minute ago about the First Amendment. I am not making this up. This is what the man said. The same man complaining about how the First Amendment has been violated is the same man who has sponsored basically the same legislation we are now trying to pass.

I will give some of his quotes again. Let's make sure they are spread across the RECORD.

What we ought to do is eliminate the political action committee contributions, because those are the ones that raise the specter of undue influence. And those can be gone tomorrow. We can pass a bill tomorrow to take care of that problem.

Here is another quote:

We Republicans have put together a responsible and Constitutional campaign reform agenda. It would restrict the power of special interest PACS, stop the flow of all soft money, keep wealthy individuals from buying public office.

Hallelujah. I am glad he said that.

He also said:

We would eliminate PACs altogether. It will be interesting to see whether our colleagues—

Talking about Democrats—

on the other side of the aisle will be willing to eliminate PACs altogether. And we would have the money come from individuals in small and fully undisclosed amounts.

Next quote:

Public disclosure of campaign contributions and spending should be expedited so voters can judge for themselves what is appropriate. These are the reforms which respect the Constitution and would enhance our democracy.

I didn't rewrite this. This is a direct, word-for-word quote. Next:

We need to have real disclosure. And so what we ought to do is broaden the disclosure to include at least labor unions and tax-exempt business associations and trial lawyers so that you include the major political players in America. Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?

He also went on to say:

Money is essential in politics, and not something that we should feel squeamish about, provided the donations are limited and disclosed, everyone knows who's supporting everyone else.

I repeat. The Presiding Officer is one of the smartest people we have in the entire Senate. With all due respect to the Presiding Officer, you don't have to be a Rhodes Scholar or a graduate from Stanford University to understand how absolutely irrational my friend is with what he just came and said. He said this constitutional amendment is violating the First Amendment of our Constitution. I am using his remarks to state and show the importance of our amendment.

Congress and the States have the authority—or they should have the authority—to set reasonable limits on campaign spending. It is just common sense. Americans clearly believe in this amendment. The amendment would restore the authority back to Congress and the States, not to two wealthy brothers who are trying to buy America—two wealthy brothers who control most of the tar sands in the world. They have a huge oil, gas, and chemical interest. They control lots of stuff.

Today the paper said they are going to spend their millions to tell everybody what great people they are. That is all over the news today. Be aware of the Koch brothers because they have unlimited sums of money. They are going to tell you how they are all about apple pie and motherhood and great for America. They are not great for America. They are trying to buy America.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

POLITICAL SPEECH

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, political speech is not on the fringes of the First Amendment, it is the core freedom of democracy. The entire point of the First Amendment is to say the government has no business telling the citizens what constitutes reasonable political speech.

Congress is not allowed to ban books. Congress is not allowed to ban magazines or pamphlets. Congress is not allowed to silence dissent. The idea behind this amendment is that government should have the power to silence criticism of the government. This amendment, referring to Senate Joint Resolution 19, is an attempt to control the words Americans speak and the ideas Americans hear. Every great movement in our democracy has been based on ideas that were at one time or another at the outset deemed unreasonable by the government. It is dangerous and it is un-American in the extreme. Under this proposed amendment, the Federal Government would have the power to decide which groups, which causes, which arguments, and ultimately which citizens would be allowed to enter the public square.

The amendment would even empower Congress to distinguish between natural individuals and artificial entities; that is, rich and powerful people will still be free to influence our government but everyone else can be barred from coming together and pooling their resources for that very purpose.

What is an artificial entity with restricted speech rights? Churches, neighborhood associations, civic groups, single-issue organizations such as the national right to life, or NARAL, trade associations, businesses or labor unions, schools. The target of this amendment is America. Civil society. When politicians talk about outside groups, they mean outside Washington. They mean ordinary citizens coming together, rallying behind a common cause. They mean the abolition movement, the women's suffrage movement, and the labor movement, as well as the civil rights movement, antiwar movements, the pro-life movement, and the consumer rights movement. They mean citizens. That is who the authors of this amendment believe are outside intruders whose speech somehow needs to be regulated, needs to be restricted by Congress—people with ideas that are “unreasonable,” people such as Thomas Paine or Thomas Jefferson and Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony and Martin Luther King, Jr.

The true danger of the idea is even put into the text in the section 3 carveout for the press. So wealthy individuals, those who happen to own newspapers or happen to own a television station or a radio network, do, under this proposed amendment, continue to have free speech. But the people who read and watch the media do

not. Or the people who do not own those companies, do they not have the same rights? Under this proposed amendment, they would not. This is Orwellian. Under this amendment, Congress could establish a Federal ministry of truth of sorts to monitor the political speech of citizens and make sure they are reasonable, to make sure the activities in which they engage, those that are attempted to influence elections, are, in fact, reasonable.

Congress would, of course, be empowered to define what constitutes journalism, what falls within the parameters of this freedom of the press carveout so that irritating bloggers and reporters and producers could perhaps be silenced, assuming they were carved out of that definition. This provision will not guarantee equality. It will rather guarantee inequality.

It is right there in the text of the amendment. Some citizens' rights to free speech would be more equal than others under this proposed amendment. It is sometimes appealing at a surface level to start from the proposition that something such as this might be desirable to some for the simple reason that we do not want any one person or any one group of persons having a disproportionate impact on the electoral process. We do not want anyone or anything to be able to buy an election. But that misses the point. This would not solve that problem. In fact, this would make that problem worse.

Consider, for example, the fact that under this proposed amendment, as I read it, and as I think most would read it, an individual would be free to spend unlimited amounts of money, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, maybe even millions or tens of millions of dollars supporting the candidate of her choice if that individual happens to own a newspaper or if that individual perhaps happened to own a television company or a radio broadcast network. That would be no problem. That would be beyond the scope of this proposed amendment, because under section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 19, it makes clear that: "Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge the freedom of the press."

So in light of section 3, everything else in Senate Joint Resolution 19 might either do a lot or it might do a little. It might do practically nothing or it might do practically everything.

Let me explain what I mean. Let's examine the text of the first two sections of this provision.

Section 1 says: "To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of the government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections."

If your intent is deemed to involve influencing the outcome of an election, then you are subject to these reasonable limits. Well, what people in Congress think is reasonable might be different than what the American people think is reasonable.

Then in section 2 it says that: "Congress and the States shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence elections."

Herein lies the problem: Getting back to our hypothetical a few minutes ago, if the idea behind this is to prevent any person or any group of persons from having too much influence over elections taking place in the United States of America, this does not do that. Depending on how broadly or how narrowly Congress chooses to define this contest of freedom of the press, which it carves out and holds harmless, this legislation might do everything or it might do nothing. Let me explain what I mean.

Most of the money that is spent by political campaigns, whether by individual candidates or by organizations attempting to influence the outcome of elections, comes in the form of disseminating a message, comes in the form of either printed material, in the form of pamphlets or the electronic equivalent of pamphlets, or it comes in the form of some type of advertising. Maybe it is an advertisement in a newspaper, maybe it is an advertisement on television. But that is where most political money ends up getting spent.

As understood by the founding generation and as understood and interpreted by the Supreme Court to this day, most of that material is protected in the sense that most of that material constitutes something that falls under the category of freedom of the press. Freedom of the press, of course, does not belong solely, does not belong exclusively, to those who have a press badge or those who are part of what has historically been considered our news media.

If, on the other hand, those who have drafted this amendment—if, on the other hand, those who would decide what laws to pass under this amendment to give it force, if they were to conclude that they wanted to more narrowly define "press" to include only credentialed media, perhaps newspaper reporters, perhaps newspaper reporters and radio and television reporters, then they would be significantly changing the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court. They would be significantly changing the nature of freedom of the press as recognized by the Supreme Court over the last two centuries.

If, in fact, they choose to do it that way, then we would find ourselves in an awful situation in which the owner of a newspaper would be able to spend potentially millions of dollars, perhaps tens of millions, promoting the candidate of her choice simply because she owns a newspaper. But what about someone who does not own a newspaper but nonetheless wants her views to be expressed, wants to have some way of contributing to the national debate? What if there is someone out there who is really concerned, concerned about a particular issue?

Let's say there is a voter who is concerned about the PATRIOT Act and she wants to contribute to an organization, let's say the ACLU, which would, in turn, perhaps make statements to try to influence the public debate about the PATRIOT Act. This could run afoul of all of that. In fact, under the plain language of it, it likely would. In fact, the ACLU itself has expressed this concern in a letter dated June 3, 2014, to Chairman PAT LEAHY of the Senate Judiciary Committee on which I sit.

On page 4 of that letter, the ACLU presents the following hypothetical:

For instance, would an ACLU ad urging Members of Congress to support Patriot Act reform, which runs shortly before the November 2004 election, when that issue is at play in the election, be construed as an issue ad exhorting voters to support reform, or a covert attempt to influence voters who oppose Members who do not support reform?

Similarly, would an ad by a group urging repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which runs before the 2012 presidential election, be issue advocacy or covert express advocacy?

These are questions raised by the ACLU itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that I be given 2 additional minutes to wrap up my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. What all of this boils down to is that the core values, the core protections underlying the First Amendment are not just important, they are not just nice to talk about, they are at the very foundation of our representative democracy. They are at the very foundation of our Republic and how it operates. If this amendment were to pass, if this were to become part of the Constitution of the United States, Congress would become more powerful at the expense of the American people.

Ultimately this will inure to the benefit of the political establishment in Washington. It would inure to the benefit, perhaps, of two political parties but everybody else would suffer. It would be more difficult for more Americans to speak on issues that concerned them. Congress would have more power and the States would have more power to restrict the speech of the American people.

It has been said in the past that this is about restricting money, not speech.

It is a little bit like saying a city ordinance prohibiting people from using either an automobile or a subway car to get to a protest rally isn't restricting their access to a protest rally or the right to participate in that protest rally.

When money is the means by which the American people can have the ability to express their concern on an issue voters are facing in an upcoming election, that should concern us all. This is an attempt to weaken the most fundamental components of our rights as U.S. citizens. I must, therefore, oppose Senate Joint Resolution 19 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I know many Senators were back home over the last number of weeks talking to and listening to their constituents about issues on their minds. I was also at home. As a doctor and as a Senator, I heard from many people in my home State of Wyoming who have a lot of concerns about the health care law and the devastating side effects the law has on them.

Over the past few weeks there have been headlines just about every day all across the country with bad news about the health care law and its impact on the American people. Just this morning the local newspaper, *The Hill*, has a headline: "Support for ObamaCare continues to fall."

Public approval of ObamaCare continued to sink this summer, issuing the latest warning for vulnerable Democrats who will face voters this fall after backing the law.

It says that just 35 percent of voters now support the health care law. This is a monthly poll done by the Kaiser Health Foundation which was released yesterday.

It says:

Healthcare remains one of the most important issues in midterm elections, ranking only behind the economy and jobs as voters' top issue.

I talk about health care repeatedly because I am a physician. I have taken care of patients for 25 years in my home State of Wyoming, and I have taken care of families from all around the State. They come to me with their concerns about the health care law.

President Obama says the Democrats who voted for the law should, as he said, "forcefully defend and be proud of the law." Is the President proud of the ways families across America are suffering because of his health care law and the dangerous side effects people continue to face?

Here is a headline from last Friday, September 5, front page of the *Wall Street Journal*. It says: "Hacker Breaches Part Of Federal Health Site."

A computer hacker breached the Federal health site. The article says the hacker broke into part of the healthcare.gov Web site in July—in July—and uploaded malicious software, according to Federal officials.

The administration now admits it. It goes on to say that "the break-in raised concerns among Federal officials because of how easily the intruder gained access and how much damage could have occurred." This is a concern Republicans have warned about for a long time.

The Obama administration didn't do the basic things any business in America would have done to protect people and their personal information. According to this report, part of the problem in this case was that the Web site's developers never—and taxpayers have paid plenty to these developers—bothered to change a default password for the system. No one can believe it. Hackers didn't have to go around some complicated security system or break in through a back door. Oh, no. The Obama administration official admitted to the *Wall Street Journal* there was a door left open—a door left open.

The Obama administration said that so far the hackers haven't stolen anybody's personal information that they know of. Apparently, they didn't know about this breach for weeks. The hacker walked in through an open door in July, and the Obama administration didn't know anything about it until August 25. Healthcare.gov stores huge amounts of personal and private information about people, including their access information and their health care information, and people have a right to know the information is secure.

Where are the Democrats on the floor of the Senate today ready to forcefully defend leaving the door open for these hackers?

Here is another headline from the September 2 *New York Times*: "Bracing for New Challenges in Year Two of Health Care Law."

We all remember how terrible the launch of the health care program was last fall. We remember right after the President sat down with Bill Clinton and he said: Oh, easier to use than Amazon, cheaper than your cell phone bill, and you can keep your doctor.

America knows those things weren't true.

We all remember the terrible launch last October. The new head of the exchange talked about what he expects it to be like this year, year two. They have had a full year now to get ready and fix the problems. Yet this Obama administration official just recently told the *New York Times*: "In some respects, it's going to be more complicated. Part of me thinks that this year is going to make last year look like the good old days."

America is not ready to go back to the Obama Web site good old days.

That is what the Obama administration's person in charge of the health care exchange told the *New York Times*. Are the Democrats going to come to the floor and forcefully defend this kind of chaos and confusion with the health care enrollment for a second year in a row? It is another disgraceful side effect of the President's unworkable, unmanageable health care law.

I will give one more example of what the American people are learning about how the health care law is harming them individually. Insurance companies have been releasing their preliminary rates for 2015, and in many places for many people, premiums are going up. According to the consulting group PricewaterhouseCoopers, premiums are going up about 8 percent on average across the country. That is not what Democrats promised when they wrote the health care law. Democrats in Washington, here in the Senate, promised the rates would go down. President Obama went around the country and said people would see their health care costs go down by an average of \$2,500 per family per year. NANCY PELOSI went on "Meet the Press" and said rates will go down for everyone. That hasn't happened. Premiums have gone up. Copays are up. Deductibles have gone up. Out-of-pocket costs have gone up for millions of Americans.

As chairman of the Republican policy committee, one of the things I do is look around the country and try to find out how the policies that come out of Washington affect people all across the country. I have traveled over the past month and heard from many people that the President's health care law is hurting them individually and costing them more.

One place people are really being hurt by the health care law is Alaska. Here is a headline from *The Hill* newspaper on Monday: "Alaska insurance rates set to spike." According to the article, Alaskans buying health insurance through the State's exchange can expect a surprise spike of more than 30 percent on average.

Another place being hit is Iowa. PricewaterhouseCoopers says the average person in Iowa who buys health insurance through the exchange is going to pay 11.5 percent more next year in premiums. For others, premiums will be as high as 14 percent higher. Those Iowa families aren't getting a cut of \$2,500 as promised by the Democrats who voted for this health care law and as the President said. What they are getting instead is an increase of 14 percent—more money out of their pockets.

We can go round and round with individual stories. They are paying more. So it is no surprise then that today the headline in *The Hill* newspaper is that it is more unpopular now and continues to lose popularity.

Then the impact. It is astonishing. I picked up today's *Investor's Business*

Daily. The headline is "ObamaCare Spurs College Blues For Working Students." A lot of students have to work their way through college. Page 1, above the fold, "ObamaCare Goes To College."

More than 200 colleges and universities—

This is because of the law, the way they define part-time work and full-time work, and full-time is defined as 30 hours.

"ObamaCare Goes To College."

More than 200 colleges and universities have restricted work hours for students, for part-time faculty, or both, citing the costs of complying with the employer mandate related to the President's health care law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, what I do is come to the floor to talk about the concerns I have for Americans who are concerned about their jobs, concerned about the economy, concerned about their opportunity to get the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. They see all of these issues as troublesome under the President's health care law. So I am going to continue to talk about this and the impact this has on the American family. I am going to talk about restoring people's freedom to buy insurance that works for them and their families because they know what is best for them, not the Obama administration. I am going to talk about reforms that get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. I am going to talk about giving people choices, not Washington mandates.

Republicans are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these tragic side effects.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AFFORDABLE HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to talk about a fair shot for American families on quality, affordable higher education. It is very appropriate that the Senator from New Jersey is presiding because he has been one of the great leaders in the Senate on the affordability of higher education, and it has been a pleasure to work with him.

Let me go through some of the numbers because they are somewhat shocking. We have 20 million students who enter college every year, and 60 percent will exit with student debt. The majority of students who now attend college will have to borrow money in order to be able to get a college education. Thirty-seven million Americans today have college loans that are out-

standing. Yes, we know some are young professionals and some are older people. I was surprised to learn that almost 8 million Americans over the age of 50 have college loans that are still outstanding. So this is a burden many American families will have for the rest of their lives.

The average debt today is \$29,000, and that number is rising dramatically every year. So when a student graduates, the average debt they carry is \$29,000. There is \$1.2 trillion in outstanding college loans—more than credit card debt.

As the Senator from New Jersey pointed out earlier today, the percentage of a family's disposable income they need in order to pay for a college education—which we need for global competition and for competition in this country—is far higher than any other industrialized country in the world by far, equaling almost 50 percent of disposable income. That is a shocking number. Education is the great equalizer, and for many American families it is out of reach because of the cost and the necessity to borrow money.

Let me get beyond the numbers for a moment and talk a little bit about the people. Last Thursday Senator MIKULSKI and I were on the campus of Bowie State University and UMBC. Bowie State is one of our historically Black colleges and universities in Maryland, located in Prince George's County. We had a chance to not only meet with Dr. Mickey Burnim, the president of Bowie State University, but with students as well around a table to talk about how they go about trying to arrange for scholarships and loans in order to be able to afford a college education.

Bowie State University is a good buy compared to other colleges; tuition is only around \$5,000. One would think those students are in good shape, but let me tell my colleagues about the realities.

Dr. Burnim was explaining to us that on the first day of school, many students who they thought would be enrolled were not enrolled. Why? Because they couldn't put together the total financial package in order to satisfy the tuition costs, so they were not formally enrolled.

I was talking to some students at that roundtable discussion who explained to me that there were students who showed up for the first day of class without the textbook because they couldn't afford the textbook. Now they are going to be behind before they even start because of the high cost of a college education.

Here we are at a State college, and the average debt held by a student graduating from Bowie is \$27,800—at a State college. That is a shocking number.

The same number, if we go through the same thing at UMBC—where the

president is Dr. Freeman Hrabowski—one of the great universities of our country—they find so many tools to help their students with loans, scholarships, work-study programs, and the debt there is also over \$20,000 a year for their graduating seniors. It is affecting their ability to perform in college.

What do I mean by that? There are large amounts of debt they have to take care of. The students do everything they can to reduce their debt, so they work. In some cases they work more than one job and attend college. It affects their ability to perform and successfully complete college.

At Bowie State it takes about 6 years to do a 4-year program because the students are working and are having a hard time meeting the credit requirements.

In some cases I was told there are students who want to take a summer class because it was offered, it was needed for their major, and it would allow them to graduate in a more timely way, but they couldn't afford to take the summer class because the Pell grants aren't available in the summer-time.

I thank Senator HARKIN, the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, for offering legislation that would correct that, that would allow for Pell grants to be available on a 12-month basis. That would help.

Yes, the effect of the high cost of education is first and foremost on the individual. Too many children are not going to college, too many children are not going to the college of their choice, and too many students are taking too many years to graduate because of the high cost of college. Too many students aren't going on to those advanced degrees because they have too much debt, they have to work, and they have to pay off their student loans.

Too many students don't have all the training they need in order to do the best for themselves, and it is affecting their ability to succeed economically. They are delayed in their career choices because of extra years of college, and it is affecting their ability to buy homes because they have student debt.

It is affecting our communities. There are less retail consumers than there would otherwise be. Yes, it is affecting our global competition; yes, we have to increase Pell grants; yes, we have to increase public support; and, yes, we have to increase transparency, but we can, this week and next, do something about it by passing the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

I thank Senator WARREN and Senator FRANKEN for leading our effort. This will allow us to refinance loans. People can't today, they can't refinance student loans. They can't take advantage of the lower interest rates. People who

have student loans are paying thousands of dollars of extra interest costs.

Let's refinance it. The government shouldn't be making money off the backs of student loan holders because the interest rates are lower than what they are charging. Let's refinance. That will save thousands of dollars for families and would help us have more affordable opportunities for education in our community.

Let's give a fair shot to American families. Let's take up and pass the Bank on Student Emergency Loan Refinancing Act to allow those millions of Americans who are currently holding student debt to refinance at lower rates, saving thousands of dollars and helping Americans afford a college education.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Minnesota.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. I am on the floor with the Senator from Washington, Senator CANTWELL, who has been such a leader as head of the small business committee on this issue.

As I heard the Senator from Maryland talk about the importance of student loans to our economy and the importance to our economy for having people being able to go out there and get the education and fill the jobs today, another piece of this is to make sure those markets are available, to make sure our businesses are able to compete internationally, both small and big, with companies from across the world. This means jobs in America. Exports are critical to the U.S. economy, and we need to help our businesses, small and large, boost their exports.

When 95 percent of the world's customers live outside of our borders, there is literally a world of opportunity out there for U.S. business. It used to be we were just focused on Canada, especially in Minnesota, and Mexico, but we know there is a world of opportunity in emerging markets in places such as Asia and Africa, for us to finally be making things in America and having people buy them in other countries.

As a Senator, I have been working to boost America's ability to compete in the global economy and to open up these markets. That is why I strongly support reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

I thank Senator CANTWELL for her efforts in leading this fight, and I thank leadership on both sides of the banking committee.

As Senate chair of the Joint Economic Committee, today I am releasing a report on "The Contribution of Exports to Economic Growth and the

Important Role of the Export-Import Bank."

According to one analysis, exports are projected to account for almost 40 percent of real U.S. GDP growth over this decade.

We know we have stabilized the economy in America, but the only way we are going to be able to expand it, to add more jobs, to make sure people are working at their fullest potential, is to be able to export things to other countries with these emerging middle classes in places such as India and other countries where we can actually sell our goods.

This report highlights that the Export-Import Bank plays a crucial role in supporting businesses, particularly small businesses, to find markets for their products. What does the report show? Well, first it shows the economy has expanded for the past 4 years and U.S. exports have been the ticket to that growth.

Last year U.S. exports of goods reached an all-time high, \$2.3 trillion or 13.5 percent of U.S. GDP, an increase of 35 percent since 2009. Think of the jobs that means in America.

In 2013, U.S. exports of goods and services were responsible for 11.3 million jobs, an increase of 1.6 million jobs since 2009.

Manufacturing and agricultural producers have also been able to increase their exports, supporting economic recovery and job growth. In the manufacturing sector, nearly 25 percent of production is exported and these exports are responsible for about 3 million jobs.

I see this in Minnesota. In 2013, our goods and services exports rose to \$20.7 billion, and Minnesota was ranked the fourth largest agriculture exporting State in 2012, up from sixth in 2011.

Do you know what that means in real terms? Our unemployment rate is down to 4.5 percent. Our Twin Cities area has the lowest unemployment rate of any metropolitan area in the country, and it is very much about exports. Companies—not just the big ones, but the small ones—that have learned to export and are willing to use the tools to export, means using the Export-Import Bank.

Yet U.S. exporters, as we all know, are competing with foreign producers in places such as Germany, France, and China, which are backed by their own countries' credit export programs and often receive other government subsidies.

I ask my friends who are slowing down this reauthorization, how can we say to our U.S. companies, big and small, that we are going to allow 60 other countries, including the top 10 exporting countries globally—that they can have credit export programs but our companies can't have them in the United States?

I will show you what I mean by this report.

I commend to colleagues the September 2014 Joint Economic Committee report, "The Contribution of Exports to Economic Growth and the Important Role of the Export-Import Bank," that I referred to earlier.

On the graph and report in figure 2 we show "Comparison between U.S. and Other Countries' Export Credit Subsidies."

What do these numbers show? This number is about "New medium- and long-term official export credit volumes, 2013, billions of U.S. dollars." It shows that China's medium- and long-term credit export volumes are at \$45.5 billion.

That is what we are doing and that is why we see them—as Senator CANTWELL will discuss—going into markets such as Africa and opening those markets up for their companies, because they are willing to help them out of their own version of the Export-Import Bank—\$45.5 billion in China.

Germany, a very successful economy, is at \$22.6 billion in credit volume. Where is the United States? We are at \$14.5 billion. We are above countries such as France, Italy, and Brazil, but we are below countries such as China, Germany, and South Korea.

You can imagine the impact if we got rid of the Export-Import Bank. You can imagine—which we cannot allow to happen.

The Export-Import Bank was first authorized in 1934. It supports U.S. businesses by providing financing that the private sector that may be unable or unwilling to do at competitive rates. The Export-Import Bank does this by providing loans, loan guarantees, and insurance policies to increase export opportunities.

In 2013, as our study shows, the Export-Import Bank supported approximately 205,000 U.S. jobs and \$37.4 billion in U.S. exports. It made 745 new loans and loan guarantees worth \$21.8 billion.

By issuing these loans, loan guarantees, and insurance policies, the Export-Import Bank helped provide funding for projects ranging from short-term investments to more complex and long-term transactions such as transportation and other infrastructure projects.

The Export-Import Bank also steps in to provide credit to open up these new markets such as Africa, as I have focused on. For example, in the past 4 years the Export-Import Bank has provided authorization for more than \$4 billion in support for U.S. export to sub-Saharan Africa, yet China is still ahead of us.

The Export-Import Bank provides support to many industries, everything from gas and oil, to space and telecommunications, to agribusiness.

The Export-Import Bank supports U.S. exports to more than 150 countries, small business. This is what I

hear all across our State since 114 small Minnesota businesses have received financing over the past few years.

The big businesses tend to have trade exports, right? They have exports they want to go to Uruguay or Kazakhstan or somewhere in the world. They can have some special person who knows the language and who can help them and hire a consultant in the country. How can a small business do that? Yet they know their product is going to sell in these other countries.

That is where the Export-Import Bank comes in, because working with our foreign commercial service, they are able to get the tools they need, small businesses, to compete at the same level as big businesses.

In August I visited Balzer, an agricultural equipment manufacturer based in Mountain Lake, MN, a town of about 2,000 people. Balzer currently employs 74 people in Mountain Lake, 74 people out of 2,000. It has made a real difference, the Export-Import Bank, for their company. Exports are approximately 15 percent of their sales.

Or how about Superior Industries in Morris. There are 5,000 people in that town and 500 people employed at the company. They are now exporting, thanks to the Ex-Im Bank, to Canada, Australia, Russia, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Brazil.

How would they would get into Uruguay? Do we think their small community bank—which we love—is going to be able to help them figure out Uruguay financing? No.

That is why we have the Ex-Im Bank. It helps these small businesses to make major decisions, to finance major products and major deals, so they can actually have jobs in the United States that are providing exports to these other countries.

That is what this is all about. It is critical. We have to reauthorize this proven Ex-Im Bank and make sure our exporters are competing on a level playing field in a global market.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate my colleague, co-chair of the Joint Economic Committee, for her report on the importance of the contribution of exports to our economy and for the Export-Import Bank.

The report she is issuing today has a picture of cargo container ships leaving the Port of Miami. I could say that this picture could be any number of ports around the United States of America, certainly in my State, where one in three jobs is related to trade.

I very much appreciate the Joint Economic Committee highlighting at this point in time how important the export economy is to the U.S. economy. My colleague comes from a simi-

lar State where we like to say we make a lot of great manufactured products—and we are very proud they are sold in the international marketplace—but now is no time to basically curtail credit agencies' ability to help make those sales a reality when we have had fabulous U.S.-made products.

So I very much appreciate the Joint Economic Committee's release of this report. It is showing that our economy—even though we faced this very disastrous financial collapse 6 years ago—that report basically shows that last week the trade deficit continued to decline. A headline just recently said: "Trade deficit at 6-month low as exports climb."

So it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that a growing middle class around the globe is an excellent opportunity for us to sell U.S. manufactured products. In fact, the middle class is going to double over the next 15 years. So that is a great opportunity for us to take American-made products and get them into this marketplace.

In fact, last year American companies exported more goods and services—totaling \$2.3 trillion in value, 13.5 percent of our gross domestic product. So that is a step in the right direction. But that is being threatened if Congress does not reauthorize this important credit agency to make sure these deals get closed. That is why today we are here to make sure that a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank is implemented.

Now, I know we already have about 240 Members of the House of Representatives who are on record saying they support a long-term extension of the Export-Import Bank. I know there are many Senators here in the Senate who support that. So why is this taking so long? Some people are even suggesting that we can do just a 2-month extension or a 3-month extension. Well, I can tell you how ridiculous that idea is because it does not give any certainty and predictability to businesses that are trying to close deals.

In fact, one business exporter from Texas said:

The Export-Import Bank is absolutely essential to maintain and grow our businesses. . . . Recent reports on the uncertainty of the Bank's future may have already impacted our bottom line. Our customers need the certainty of export credit to continue many of their sales abroad.

So this individual Texas company is such a reflection of the fact that exports are U.S. jobs. In fact, it is \$2.3 trillion in goods and services, and 11.3 million jobs in the United States are related to exports, many of those in manufactured products.

So why would we take and risk these kinds of numbers with the uncertainty of a credit agency that helps close these deals? With that many jobs and that much economic impact at stake, why would we suggest that we only

want to reauthorize it for a couple of months? I think that is a very wrong-headed approach.

We have heard from many other companies. One from Georgia was able to increase its annual sales from roughly \$500,000 to over \$20 million in just a few years and was able to do so with the Export-Import Bank.

We have 21 days left to get this right and to help our economy continue to grow, but we have to do something here in the Senate; and that is, pass the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

While we were home in August, we heard many people talk about this issue. In fact, I would like to put up a few newspaper headlines that we saw around the country. One is from the Roanoke Times, which was an editorial that said: "In our view, small businesses need this." They called for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Another newspaper, the Wichita Eagle, editorialized in support: "Reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank." And the Columbus Dispatch editorialized: "Ohioans benefit from Export-Import bank."

So these are just three of the editorials heard all around the country that are asking us to reauthorize this important credit agency and make sure we are giving small businesses and manufacturers the tools it takes to export.

But my colleague, who is the Joint Economic Committee chair, brought up an even more specific point; that is, where are we going to be in competition as it relates to China when they are chasing economic opportunity all around the globe? In fact, an editorial that was in the Chicago Tribune on August 15 said: "Sub-Saharan Africa's economy is growing about 5.4 percent a year—outpacing the global rate of 3.6 percent . . ." So here is Africa with lots of economic opportunity. It is home to many very fast-growing economies in Angola, Nigeria, and Ethiopia. They go on to say: "The Ex-Im Bank plays a vital niche role in the U.S. economy as backstop because commercial banks and other financial firms often find ways to say 'no' to deals involving selling goods in developing countries." That is from the Chicago Tribune.

So newspapers around America get it. This is a key tool for us to access new opportunities that are emerging in developing countries. The fact is, China is already there, they are selling products, they are using their credit agency to help close deals. Why? Because a lot of banks are uncomfortable, either with the size of the deal, the lack of financial players in those emerging markets, and the inability to get these deals closed without the export bank and its assistants.

Another editorial that was in the Boston Globe actually talked about a U.S. company that lost a deal because

of our inability to make a decision here. A California company "lost a \$57 million contract this year because of ideological posturing in Washington." It is "a self-inflicted economic wound." They are talking about a firm that "lost its bid to sell technology" that was going to be used in the Philippines only because the Korean competitor could guarantee that their export-import bank would be there.

That is another example that we are not even waiting right now to have the negative impact; we are already having the negative impact because we are not getting this done.

So it is very important we make sure we reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. As one company in my State said, the Norwest Ingredients company: "Loss of the export insurance provided by EX-IM Bank would be devastating to my business . . .," that a short-term extension of the Export-Import Bank does not provide the certainty that we need to finance these deals.

I think this is so much what we need to be focusing on. I appreciate my colleague's contribution from the Joint Economic Committee to this report. She talked again about the specifics of what other countries are doing.

This chart shows you the percentage of credit agency resources against a country's GDP—how much they are investing in selling their products around the globe. So we can see what India, China, France, and Germany are doing to basically dwarf what we are doing as far as making sure our products are sold around the globe.

I wish the financial market was there to help close these transactions. But just as we have a small business administration that helps get financial backers to back small businesses, the Export-Import Bank helps U.S. manufacturers sell their products overseas.

We have too much of a supply chain in the United States of America, with manufacturing in aerospace, in agriculture, and in automobiles, to give it all away by simply not reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank in a timely fashion.

So I again appreciate the cochair of the Joint Economic Committee in the release of a report focusing on why exports are so important to our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have no time remaining. There are 3 minutes on the Democratic side.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I just want to be recognized for the 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, one, I want to thank my colleague, Senator

KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, of the Joint Economic Committee, for making the case on why the Ex-Im Bank is a good government program essential to creating jobs in America from export sales.

Boeing is in South Carolina; they are in Washington. Senator CANTWELL has been a champion of this issue as long as I have been around. Now that Boeing is making 787s in South Carolina, I will just put this on the table: 8 out of 10 787s made in South Carolina are Ex-Im financed. We are competing in the wide-body market with countries such as France; China will be getting in this market. Every competitor of Boeing—GE makes gas turbines in Greenville. Most of those are sold in the Mideast through Ex-Im financing. Every competitor of these two large companies in South Carolina has an Ex-Im Bank.

So to my colleagues in the House, I think I am a pretty conservative guy, but I am also practical. Why in the world would we shut our bank down when China is growing their bank? The Chinese would support closing the Ex-Im Bank in America; so would the French; so would the Canadians; so would the British. If you really want to give the American economy a kick in the wrong place, shut our bank down and allow the other countries that compete with us to keep theirs open.

There is plenty of waste in the government. So we pick one program that is small in number, in terms of actual volume that makes money for the Treasury and creates hundreds of thousands of job opportunities. This is smart conservatism? This is what conservatism has come to be, that you take a program—that allows American companies to compete in the international market, that makes money for the American taxpayer—and you shut it down just to prove to people you are ideologically pure? That is not conservatism. That is crazy, and we are not going to let it happen.

To my Democratic friends, we should have reauthorized this a long time ago in a process befitting the Senate. There is well over half of my conference ready to vote for reforms on the Ex-Im Bank, but we are not doing anything in this body, and you are not going to pick our amendments. So there is plenty of blame to go around.

I hope we are smart enough as a House and a Senate to get this right, not to shut down the Ex-Im Bank that makes money for the taxpayer, creates thousands of American jobs, for some ideological reason disconnected with reality.

China would love this. France would love this. When it comes to my State, it would be devastating to the small businesses that benefit from Ex-Im financing. If you can close their banks down, count me in, we will close ours. But I will be damned if we are going to close ours when they have theirs up

and running to put people out of work in my State and all over this country when you are talking about the best-paying jobs in America.

I look forward to a further discussion on this topic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

ISIS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the situation that the United States is facing regarding the new terrorist threat from the new caliphate—so-called caliphate state of ISIS.

The President has announced that tomorrow he will address the American people and explain what he proposes to do about this new situation that faces us, this Islamic state of Iraq and Syria, otherwise called ISIS or IS.

We are at a critical moment facing a serious danger, and now is the time to act together. For action to be effective, it needs our united support. That is why the President's address tomorrow is so important.

I was alarmed by his admission in a press conference 10 days ago that he had no strategic policy in mind. So I welcome this opportunity now to learn what this strategy is, and I truly hope that it will be articulated fully and completely with clarity so that not only the American people but their representatives here in the House and the Senate know exactly what the President intends on doing and proposing.

The unspeakable depravities committed by ISIS seem to have no limits. The alarm bells have become louder as ISIS henchmen continue their beheadings and their brutality and their barbarism. One of the most acute dangers

ISIS poses is the wide scope of their ambitions.

First Syria, then Iraq, now Lebanon, later possibly Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and others are in their target sites.

ISIS is now widely and correctly judged to be the largest, best organized, best financed, most capable, and most ambitious terrorist organization in history.

So when the President explains his plan to degrade and defeat ISIS, I plan to carefully examine it and look through what I believe are the essential elements and hallmarks necessary for us to succeed: its determination, its courage, its resources to enact the plan, its vision for where we want to go, a clearly outlined goal that we want to achieve, and a realism that we can be successful.

President Obama must outline the task of defending our Nation and degrading and defeating ISIS and clearly lay out before us how we will accomplish this.

When I first addressed this subject last month, I outlined five areas in which I believed urgent action was required, and I hope the President's plan will include these five areas.

First, as I have just said, I called for the Obama administration to articulate their own plan to confront ISIS and protect America. I trust this will happen tomorrow.

Second, I called for a vigorous, concerted push with Islamic states and communities to stand up to the outrageous ISIS perversion of their religion and their culture. We haven't seen outrage in the region from those moderates, the leadership, the political as well as the people who simply see this action of ISIS as a perversion of their religion. As destructive and brutal as it is, where have they been? It is time for them to step up. I believe we must make a concerted push with Islamic states and communities to stand up to this outrage that is taking place.

We should work with all political and religious authorities to speak out about how their faith and their culture is being co-opted and perverted by these ISIS criminals. We then must press them to take effective action to undercut the popular, political, and economic support ISIS extremists are getting. Genuine Muslim leaders—imams and others—need to take center stage to discredit the violent radicals and weaken their outreach and recruitment among Muslim youth.

Third, last month I called for much greater security assistance for our potential partners in this fight against ISIS. The United States should move quickly to provide arms, training, and other requested assistance to Iraqi Kurdistan's Peshmerga forces and to other states that need and request support and will work with us to address this challenge. We need to find effective ways to support and directly arm

the reliable, vetted Sunni tribes and Sunni leaders in Iraq who are essential partners in combating this ISIS extremism that ultimately are Sunni Islam's greatest interest and threat.

Fourth, it is clear ISIS cannot be defeated without our participation. Therefore, I believe our current bombing campaign against ISIS targets should be continued and expanded to include ISIS bases in Syria.

If we have learned anything from the wars in Vietnam, Korea and Serbia and our experience along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, we have learned the futility of attacking military forces that have safe haven bases just across the border or nearby leads to less than success and leads to potential defeat.

Fifth, and lastly, I believe we need to address new dangers to our homeland by reassessing border security and determining whether it can be improved to address the threat of foreign fighters returning to the United States.

The threat of Western, homegrown, radical, and violent jihadist terrorists is real and it is growing. We know that. ISIS boasts that they have trained and motivated fighters who are already embedded in many countries throughout the world and that they have their sights trained on the United States and Europe. There is no reason to disbelieve them. So we must respond to this threat to our country in every possible way.

One effective step is to reevaluate our entry procedures, including the Visa Waiver Program. I know this is controversial. I know countries that have been loyal allies will raise alarms. But we have to understand that we need to conduct a thorough, candid assessment of how this Visa Waiver Program affects our national security interests and whether there are changes to the program that would enhance our security.

Similar reviews of our refugee and asylum policies are also necessary. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee and a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, I will seek such an assessment and pursue legislation that is responsive to the new danger we face.

In conclusion, when President Obama unveils his strategy to defeat ISIS—not manage ISIS, not contain ISIS, but to defeat ISIS—I am hopeful his presentation will include at least the essential elements I talked about: clarity and coherence, sound diplomacy to bring Muslim nations and communities into firm opposition to ISIS extremism, appropriate expanded security assistance to partners in the struggle, enhanced military action to include Syria, and greater attention to border security.

If what the President says tomorrow includes these elements, and hopefully more, then I will look very carefully at

to how I can support the President and the strategy and encourage my colleagues to do the same, because I believe it is essential that to succeed against this threat, we need to speak with one voice.

We need to be united as Americans—as a Congress and Americans throughout the country in terms of the nature of the threat, what we need to do to address it, and the plan and strategy to successfully achieve that goal.

If it falls short, then I hope the Congress can work with the President to bring about the necessary steps to give us every opportunity to succeed in this challenging task. I hope we don't come to that point. I hope we can unite. I look forward to carefully examining the proposal. I trust we will be receiving at last leadership from the President of the United States and his team in terms of addressing what I think is a major crisis that cannot wait, cannot be managed. It cannot be classified as hoping something will work out.

The world is yearning for leadership. On matters of foreign policy, it looks to the United States and it looks to the leader of the United States. We need to restore their confidence that we are taking this threat seriously and that we are engaging in an effort to address this successfully.

So we wait with great anticipation for the remarks of the President that will occur tomorrow.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, during the past month, two American journalists were murdered by a fanatical Islamic terrorist group, the Islamic State, known as ISIL. The murder of these two journalists is part of a campaign of horrific brutality that has included crucifixions, rape, the slaughter of civilians, and prosecution of religious minorities, including Christians and Yazidis.

Currently ISIL holds large sections of land in both Iraq and Syria, and the group has made clear that its ambitions extend even further. Meanwhile, Iran continues its efforts to enrich uranium, Ukraine is struggling to prevent further Russian incursions, and the Islamic militants in Libya recently seized the U.S. Embassy compound after Americans were forced to evacuate the war-torn country.

Here at home we are facing a crisis on our southern border thanks to the

President's policies which have encouraged thousands of unaccompanied children to undertake the dangerous journey to the United States.

On the economic front, millions of middle-class families are being squeezed by the Obama economy and Obamacare. Job growth last month was a disappointing 142,000 jobs, the worst report this year, and far from the numbers we need to get the economy going again. Unemployment remains high, and the unemployment rate would be even higher if millions of Americans hadn't gotten so discouraged by the lack of job prospects that they gave up looking for work altogether.

Meanwhile, ObamaCare has not only failed to fix the problems in our health care system, it has made them worse. American families are facing higher health care premiums and fewer health care choices. In short, our country is facing serious challenges both at home and abroad.

What are Democrats doing about all these challenges? Well, this week they are taking up legislation that limits Americans' First Amendment rights. That is right; instead of taking up any of the 40 House-passed jobs bills, addressing our border crisis, or focusing on the international challenges we are facing, Democrats have decided to spend the first part of a brief 2-week session rewriting the First Amendment. It is no wonder a George Washington University Battleground poll found that 70 percent of Americans think the country is on the wrong track.

Our First Amendment right to freedom of speech is one of our most fundamental rights. It is the right that helps protect all of our other rights by keeping government accountable and ensuring that all Americans, not just those whose party is in power, get to make their voices heard.

The Democrats' proposed constitutional amendment would severely curtail this freedom by giving Congress and State governments the authority to regulate political speech. That means Congress will get to decide how much of a voice Americans are allowed in the political process. And that is bad news for Americans of every political affiliation. Under the Democrats' legislation, the party in power could effectively silence the voices of those who disagree with them.

Democrats are unhappy about recent decisions by the Supreme Court that rolled back some of the restrictions on free speech and increased individuals' voices in the political process. So their solution is a constitutional amendment to shut down the voices of those who disagree with them. Apparently they don't realize that is not the way the American system works.

In America, if you don't like what your opponents are saying, you have the freedom to persuade your oppo-

nents to adopt your position or you persuade the American people to vote against them. You don't try to revoke their right to speak. That is what they do in totalitarian societies. It is not what we do here in America.

In the United States your political power is supposed to exist in proportion to the strength of your ideas, not in proportion to your ability to silence your critics. Fortunately for Americans of every political persuasion, the Democrats' amendment is unlikely to go anywhere in Congress—as Democrats well know.

So why are they taking up this legislation this week when there are so many problems, foreign and domestic, that need to be addressed? The answer is simple. Democrats are worried about reelection, and they think this legislation somehow will help them get re-elected. They have passed this amendment to appeal to members in the far-left base who want restrictions on political speech or at least on political speech with which they disagree. Democrats are betting that seeing this amendment defeated in Congress will encourage members of their political base to come to the polls in November. That, of course, has been Democrats' legislative strategy all year.

The New York Times reported back in March that Democrats plan to spend the spring and summer on messaging votes, "timed"—and I quote, "to coincide with campaign-style trips by President Obama."

"Democrats concede," the Times reported, "that making new laws is not really the point. Rather, they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them."

Let me repeat that. Despite the economic challenges facing American families and steadily growing international unrest, the Democrats have spent the past several months pursuing a legislative strategy in which "making new laws is really not the point."

We have seen that time and time again here over the past several months on the floor of the Senate where we come here on a daily basis casting political show votes, knowing they are not going anywhere, designed to appeal to a political constituency that they hope will come out and support them during the November elections. Instead of pursuing political consensus—the only way to actually accomplish anything in a divided Congress—Senate Democrats have brought up bill after bill to pander to their political base. It is disappointing that the Democrats have put their electoral prospects over Americans' freedom of speech this week. And it is disappointing that Democrats have spent this entire year on political show votes instead of substantial legislation to address the many challenges that are facing American families. The President has been no help. Instead of urging

Democrats in Congress to work with Republicans on Senate legislation to deal with our country's most serious problems, he has been focused on campaigning. It wouldn't be a stretch to say that campaigning has been the President's main concern for the majority of his Presidency, whether it is involved in delaying Obama regulations to protect Democrats in the 2012 elections or his decision last week to defer his executive action on immigration until after the election in what White House officials essentially admitted was an attempt to protect Democrats in November.

There is a place for campaigning—we all know that. We all do it—but it is not in the halls of Congress or in the Oval Office. We were elected to govern, and that means we should be spending our time on legislation to meet our Nation's challenges. We should be taking up legislation to support job creation. We should be fighting to give middle-class families a break from ObamaCare's high premiums and reduced choices. We should be taking up measures to advance energy independence in this country and make energy more affordable for working families. We should be focused on what we need to do to address the crises abroad and America's security here at home.

Republicans are working to create jobs; Democrats are trying to save their own. It is not too late for Democrats to join Republicans to come up with bipartisan solutions to the challenges facing our country. The House of Representatives passed somewhere on the order of 350 bills, all of which are collecting dust here in the Senate, 40 of which specifically deal with the issues of the economy and job creation which every poll says is the American people's No. 1 priority. Yet here we are again in a shortened work period where we have a couple of weeks to actually do some things that would bend the curve in the direction of lowering the unemployment rate, growing the economy, creating more jobs. We have a whole series of bills that have been passed by the other Chamber, the House of Representatives, that have been sent here which specifically deal with the issue of jobs and the economy that are sitting at the desk collecting dust because the majority leader has chosen instead to try to bring to the floor a whole bunch of things he thinks are additive in terms of getting the vote out for Democrats in November elections but frankly do absolutely nothing to address the serious concerns and challenges that are facing middle-class families all across this country. The people's representatives can do better. The people's representatives should do better. Whenever Democrats here decide they are ready to stop campaigning and start governing, Republicans are ready to go to work.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I will just come out and say it. Citizens United was one of the worst decisions in the history of the Supreme Court. It was a disaster, a radical exercise of pro-corporate judicial activism. It was seriously flawed both legally and factually.

Legally, the Court trampled its own precedence—cases such as *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce* and *McConnell v. Federal Elections Commission*, which had been on the books for years and stood for the obvious proposition that the people can enact reasonable limits on money and politics.

Factually, the Court rested its conclusions on the faultiest of premises—that unlimited campaign expenditures by outside groups, including corporations, do not give rise to corruption or even the appearance of corruption. That assessment is disconnected from reality and is horribly out of touch with the sentiments of most Americans. For example, the Minnesota League of Women Voters issued a report in which it concluded that “the influence of money in politics represents a dangerous threat to the health of our democracy in Minnesota and nationally.” I think if you asked most people whether unlimited spending on campaigns has a corrupting effect, they would agree and say, yes, of course it does, and I think they would be right. But the decision in *Citizens United* was based on this unfounded and unbelievable idea that we have no reason to be concerned about the effects of unlimited campaign spending.

So we have this 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision that ignores the law, ignores precedent, invents facts, and as a result we ended up with a campaign finance system in tatters—one in which deep-pocketed corporations, super-wealthy individuals, and well-funded special interests can flood our elections with money, thereby drowning out the voices of middle-class Americans who don't have the luxury of spending hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars to influence the political process.

This is real. Spending by outside groups more than tripled from the 2008 Presidential campaign to the 2012 Presidential campaign when it topped \$1 billion. Outside spending went from \$330 million in 2008 to over \$1 billion in 2012. What happened in the interim? Well, it was *Citizens United* in 2010 and the floodgates were opened.

The middle class is not just being flooded, it is being blindfolded too, because these wealthy special interest groups can often spend the money anonymously, so voters have no idea who is behind the endless attack ads that fill the airwaves.

Here is how it works: If you have millions of dollars you want to spend, you can funnel it through back channels so that it ends up in the hands of a group—typically one with a generic and benign-sounding name.

I was trying to invent a name, such as “Americans for More America” and “American America.” I was kind of joking around, and it turns out there is group that has that name. They use this money to buy ads and very often without disclosing the source of their funds. To me, this whole thing looks a lot like money laundering, except now it is perfectly legal.

Again, this is real. A study just came out which showed that in the current election cycle alone there have already been over 150,000 ads run by groups that don't have to disclose the source of their funding, and things are just getting worse. Earlier this year, in a case called *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission*, the Supreme Court was at it again, recklessly doing away with a law that prohibited people from giving more than \$123,000 in the aggregate directly to candidates in an election cycle. The limit had been \$123,000. Who has that kind of money? Who has that kind of money lying around to spend on elections? Well, I guess the super-rich have that kind of money, but the middle class certainly doesn't. The folks I meet with in Minnesota are trying to make ends meet, pay off their student loans, train for a new job, or save some money to start a family. They sure don't have that kind of money just lying around, and they are the folks who need a voice here in Washington.

In June the Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the subject, and we heard from a witness whose presentation I found particularly persuasive and compelling. I suggest that my colleagues read his testimony. He was a State senator from North Carolina. He said:

Suddenly, no matter what the race was, money came flooding in. Even elected officials who had been in office for decades told me they'd never seen anything like it. We were barraged by television ads that were uglier and less honest than I would have thought possible. And they all seemed to be coming from groups with names we had never heard of. But it was clear that corporations and individuals who could write giant checks had a new level of power in the state.

He went on to explain that the vast majority of outside money that was spent on State races, including the Governor's race, came from one man—just one man—who reportedly poured hundreds of thousands of dollars into State politics. Before the Governor was

even sworn into office, he announced who would write the State's budget. Yes, it was that same donor. Apparently, the donor got his money's worth. The budget he drafted was loaded with goodies for corporate interests and the super-rich, provided at the expense of middle-class and working folks.

I find this whole thing incredibly disturbing, this idea that a handful of superwealthy corporate interests in effect can buy our democracy—or in this case one guy. That is not how it is supposed to work. Everyone is supposed to have an equal say in our democracy regardless of his or her wealth. The guy in the assembly line gets as many votes as the CEO—one. You don't get extra influence just because you have extra money—or you shouldn't. The government should be responsive to everyone and not just the wealthiest among us.

The way I see it is we can go two ways from here. On the one hand, we can continue to let *Citizens United* be the law of the land. We can perpetuate the fallacy that corporations have the constitutional right to flood our elections with undisclosed money. We can let deep-pocketed special interests buy influence and access and then set the agenda for the rest of the country or we can say enough is enough. We can restore the law to what it was before *Citizens United* was decided. More to the point, we can restore the voice to millions upon millions of everyday Americans who want nothing more than to see their government represent them. That is the choice we have before us this week. For those of us who believe the measure of democracy's strength is in votes cast, not dollars spent—for us, I think it is an easy choice.

I am going to vote to reverse *Citizens United*, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the proceedings on the amendment before us show just how broken the Senate is under the current leadership.

Yesterday the majority leader stated:

We're going to have a cloture vote to stop debate on this. [Republicans] say, well, great, we'll go ahead and support that because we can stall.

He also said:

There will be no amendments. Either you're for campaign spending reform or not. So my Republican colleagues, they can stall for time here.

This is an “Alice in Wonderland,” upside-down world the majority leader is describing. You can bet that if Republicans were blocking Democrats from

describing this amendment, we would be accused of obstruction. But when we vote to proceed to this amendment, as we did yesterday, we are also accused of obstruction. It goes to show that whatever Republicans do, we will be accused of obstruction. That is a catch-22. That is the majority's game plan—bring up partisan measures for political posturing, avoid working together to solve problems, and blame the other side no matter what the other side does. That is why the Senate is broken.

The amendment before us would amend the Bill of Rights and do it for the first time. It would amend one of the most important of those rights—the right of free speech. The First Amendment provides that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech. The proposed amendment would give Congress and States the power to abridge that freedom of free speech. According to the amendment, it would allow them to impose reasonable limits, whatever those reasonable limits might be, on contributions and expenditures—in other words, limiting speech that influences elections. It would allow speech by corporations that would influence elections to be banned altogether.

This amendment is as dangerous as anything Congress could pass. Passing for the first time an amendment to the Constitution amending the Bill of Rights is a slippery slope. Were it to be adopted—and I believe it will not be—the damage done could be reversed only if two-thirds of both Houses of Congress voted to repeal it through a new constitutional amendment, with three-fourths of the States ratifying that new amendment.

So let's start with first principles. The Declaration of Independence states that everyone is endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights that governments are created to protect. Those preexisting rights include the right to liberty.

The Constitution was adopted to secure the blessings of liberty to Americans. Americans rejected the view that the structural limits on governmental power contained in the original Constitution would adequately protect the liberties they had fought in that revolution to preserve. So before the Colonies would approve the Constitution, the Colonies—or then the States under the Articles of Confederation—insisted on the adoption—or the addition to the original Constitution—of the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights protects individual rights regardless of whether the government or a majority approves of their use. The First Amendment in the Bill of Rights protects the freedom of speech. That freedom is basic to self-government. Other parts of the Constitution foster equality or justice or representative government, but the Bill of Rights is only about individual freedom.

Free speech creates a marketplace of ideas in which citizens can learn, debate, and persuade fellow citizens on the issues of the day. At its core, it enables our citizenry to be educated, to cast votes, to elect their leaders.

Today freedom of speech is threatened as it has not been in many decades. Too many people do not seem to want to listen and debate and persuade. Instead, they want to punish, intimidate, and silence those with whom they disagree. For instance, a corporate executive who opposed same-sex marriage—the same position President Obama held at that very time—is to be fired. Universities that are supposed to be fostering academic freedom cancel graduation speeches by speakers some students find offensive. Government officials order other government officials not to deviate from the party line concerning proposed legislation.

The resolution before us—the proposed constitutional amendment cut from the same cloth—would amend the Constitution for the first time to diminish an important right of Americans that is contained in the Bill of Rights. In fact, it will cut back on one of the most important of those rights—core free speech about who should be elected to govern.

The proposed constitutional amendment would enable governments to limit funds contributed to candidates and funds spent to influence elections. That would give the government the ability to limit speech. The amendment would allow the government to set the limit at low levels. There could be little in the way of contributions or election spending. There would be restrictions on public debate on who should be elected. For sure, incumbents—those of us who sit in this body—would find that outcome to be acceptable because it would weaken possible opposition. They would know no challenger could run an effective campaign against them.

What precedent would this amendment create? Suppose Congress passed limits on what people could spend on abortion or what doctors or hospitals could spend to perform them. What if Congress limited the amount of money people can spend on guns or limited how much people could spend of their own money on health care? Under this amendment Congress could do what the Citizens United decision rightfully said it could not; example: Make it a criminal offense for the Sierra Club to run an ad urging the public to defeat a Congressman who favors logging in the national forests; another example: Prohibiting the National Rifle Association from publishing a book seeking public support for a challenger to a Senator who favors a handgun ban or for the ACLU to post on its Web site a plea for voters to support a Presidential candidate because of his stance on free speech. Nobody wants a government

that powerful which could enforce those examples I just gave as well as other examples.

Don't take my word for it. In fact, at oral argument in *Citizens United*, the Obama administration told the Court it would be legal for a corporation to be prosecuted for publishing a book that expressly advocated for or against the election of a candidate. Sounds impossible, but that is what was said. Consequently, the Obama administration and the Democratic leadership support banning books they don't agree with. Consequently, that should be a frightening prospect for all of us.

Under this amendment, Congress and the States could limit campaign contributions and expenditures without complying with existing constitutional provisions. Congress could pass a law limiting expenditures by Democrats but not by Republicans, by opponents of ObamaCare but not by its supporters.

What does the amendment mean when it says Congress can limit funds spent to influence elections? If an elected official says he or she plans to run again, long before any election, Congress under this amendment could criminalize criticism of that official as spending to influence elections. A Senator on the Senate floor, as I am right now, appearing on C-SPAN free of charge, could, with constitutional immunity, defame a private citizen. The Member could say the citizen was buying elections. If the citizen spent what Congress said was too much money to rebut that charge, he could possibly go to jail. We would be back to the days when criticism of elected officials was a criminal offense. If people think that cannot happen, it did happen in 1798 when the Alien and Sedition Acts were passed—and that is since our country was formed and since our Constitution has been governing our relationships.

Yet the supporters of this constitutional amendment say this amendment is necessary for democracy. That is outrageous. The only existing right the amendment says it will not harm is freedom of the press. So Congress and the States could limit the speech of anyone except the corporations that control the media. In other words, under this amendment, some corporations are OK and other corporations are not OK. That would produce an Orwellian world in which every speaker is equal, but some speakers are more equal than others. Freedom of the press has never been understood to give the media special constitutional rights denied to others.

Even though the amendment by its terms would not affect freedom of the press, I was heartened to read that the largest newspaper in my State, the *Des Moines Register*, editorialized against this proposed constitutional amendment. They cited testimony from the Judiciary Committee hearing, and they

recognized the threat the proposed amendment poses to freedom.

But in light of recent Supreme Court decisions, an amendment soon may not be needed at all. Four Justices right now would allow core political speech to be restricted. Were a fifth Justice with this same view to be appointed, there would be no need to amend the Constitution to cut back on this political freedom.

Justice Breyer's dissent for these four Justices in the *McCutcheon* decision does not view freedom of speech as an end in itself, as was so important to our Founding Fathers. He thinks free political speech is about advancing, in his words, "the public's interest in preserving a democratic order in which collective speech matters."

To be sure, individual rights often do advance socially desirable goals, but our constitutional rights do not depend on whether unelected judges believe they advance democracy as they conceive it. Our constitutional rights are individual. They are not "collective"—the word the Justice used. Never in 225 years has any Supreme Court opinion described our rights as collective. Our rights come from God and not from the government or from the public, and if they did, they could be taken away from us at any time. So I don't put much stock in the comment from one Justice quoted on the floor today that the Court's campaign finance decisions are wrong.

Consider the history of the last 100 years. Freedom has flourished where rights belonged to individuals that governments were bound to respect. Where rights were collective and existed only at the whim of a government that determines when they serve socially desirable purposes, the results in those countries have been literally horrific.

We should not move even 1 inch in the direction the liberal Justices and this amendment would take us. The stakes could not be higher for all Americans who value their rights and their freedoms.

Speech concerning who the people's elected representatives should be, speech setting the agenda for public discourse, speech designed to open and change the minds of our fellow citizens, speech criticizing politicians, speech challenging government policies—all of these forms of speech are vital rights. This amendment puts all of those examples in jeopardy upon penalty of imprisonment.

It would make America no longer America.

Contrary to the arguments of its supporters, the amendment would not advance self-government against corruption and the drowning out of voices of ordinary citizens. Quite the opposite. It would harm the rights of ordinary citizens, individually and in free association, to advance their political views and to elect candidates who support

their views. By limiting campaign speech, it would limit the information voters receive in deciding how to vote, and it would limit the amount people can spend on advancing what they consider to be the best political ideas.

Its restrictions on speech apply to individuals. Politicians could apply the same rules to individuals who govern corporations. Perhaps individuals cannot be totally prohibited from speaking, but the word "reasonable" is in this amendment. Reasonable limits can mean almost anything. Incumbents likely would set a low limit on how much an individual can spend to criticize him. Then the individual will have to risk criminal prosecution in deciding whether to speak, hoping a court would later find the limit he or she exceeded was unreasonable. That would create not a chilling effect on speech but a freezing effect.

This does not further democratic self-government like we are used to in this country.

When supporters such as the Senator from Illinois say that those who spend money in campaigns silence their critics, they have it exactly backwards. One person speaking does not silence anyone, but the government prosecuting people for speaking does.

My friend says that candidates, unlike individual groups, "abide by strict rules on . . . how much is being spent." This is simply not so. That Senator is factually wrong. The rules are the same. The First Amendment requires that candidates be able to spend as much as they want. That is true for individuals, corporations, and unions as well. Individuals are limited in current law on how much they can contribute to candidates. Corporations cannot contribute to candidates at all.

The rules for expenditures are different. Candidate expenditures are expenditures by others independent of the candidate and are unlimited because they are simply free expression. Individuals and corporations cannot and, in fact, do not make unlimited campaign contributions under current law.

My friend also discussed fraud in voting, which he says does not exist, and opposed voter ID laws. The amendment before us has nothing to do with voting. Even if it did, polls consistently show that about 75 percent of Americans support a requirement that voters produce photo ID.

Prevention of fraud is common sense. Voter fraud exists, despite the tactic of voter ID opponents repeating over and over that it does not. In my State of Iowa, there have been successful prosecutions for in-person voter fraud.

In North Carolina recently, 765 registered voters appeared, based on their names, birth dates, and last four digits of their Social Security numbers, to have voted in another State. That certainly warrants investigation. We

would have more evidence of voter fraud if this administration did not block efforts to prosecute its existence.

When Florida sought from the Department of Homeland Security a list of noncitizens it could compare against its voter rolls, the Department refused to supply it.

Let's turn back to the amendment before us, which affects only free speech rights, not voting rights. Keep our eye on the ball. The amendment would apply to some campaign speech that could not give rise to corruption.

As my friend from Illinois stated, under current law an individual could spend any amount of his or her own money to run for office, but an individual could not corrupt himself by his own money and could not be bought by others if he or she did not rely on outside money.

Yet the amendment would allow Congress and the States to strictly limit what an individual could contribute to or spend on his or her own campaign. That would make beating the incumbents who would benefit from the new powers to restrict speech much more difficult.

In practice, individuals seeking to elect candidates in the democratic process must exercise their First Amendment freedom of association in order to work together with others for a common political purpose. This amendment could prohibit that altogether. It would permit Congress and the States to prohibit "corporations or artificial entities . . . from spending money to influence elections."

That means labor unions. That means nonprofit corporations such as the NAACP Legal and Educational Defense Fund, Inc. That means political parties.

The amendment would allow Congress to prohibit political parties from spending money to influence the elections. If they can't spend money on elections, then these political parties would be rendered as mere social clubs.

The prohibition on political spending by for-profit corporations also does not advance democracy. Were this amendment to take effect, a company that wanted to advertise beer or deodorant would be given more constitutional protection than a corporation of any kind that wanted to influence an election.

The philosophy of the amendment, as you can see, is very elitist. It says the ordinary citizen cannot be trusted to listen, to understand political arguments, and evaluate which ones are persuasive. Instead, incumbent politicians interested in securing their own reelection are trusted to be high-minded. Surely they would not use this new power to develop rules that could silence not only their actual opposing candidate but associations of ordinary citizens who have the nerve to want to vote them out of office.

As First Amendment luminary Floyd Abrams told the Judiciary Committee:

[P]ermitting unlimited expenditures from virtually all parties leads to more speech from more candidates for longer time periods, and ultimately to more competitive elections.

Why would anybody want to destroy that political environment—more speech, more candidates, longer time periods, and ultimately competitive elections? Incumbents are unlikely to use this new power to welcome competition.

In fact, the committee report indicates that State and Federal legislators are not the only people who would have the ability to limit campaign speech under the amendment. It says States and the Federal Government can promulgate regulations to enforce the amendment. So unelected State and Federal bureaucrats who do not answer to anyone would be empowered to regulate what is now the freedom of speech for individuals and entities that has been protected for 227 years by our Bill of Rights. That would make a mockery of the idea that this proposed amendment advances democracy.

Another argument for the amendment—some voices should not drown out others—also runs counter to free speech, and it is also very elitist. It assumes voters will be manipulated into voting against their interests because large sums will produce so much speech as to drown out others and blind them to the voters' true interests.

We had a perfect example very recently in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District. The incumbent Congressman outspent his opponent 26 to 1. Newspaper reports state that large sums were spent on independent expenditures on the incumbent's behalf, many by corporations. No independent expenditures were made for his opponent. His opponent won. That sounds like really drowning out a political point of view.

That appears to be undue influence? No. The winner of that primary spent just over \$200,000 to win 55 percent of the vote.

Since a limit that allowed a challenger to win would presumably be "reasonable" under the amendment, Congress or the States could limit spending on House primaries to as little as \$200,000, all by the candidate, with no obviously unnecessary outside spending allowed.

The second set of unpersuasive arguments used by the proponents concerns *Citizens United*. That case has been mischaracterized as activist. As Mr. Abrams stated, that case continues a view of free speech rights by unions and corporations that was expressed by President Truman and by liberal Justices in the 1950s. What *Citizens United* overruled was the departure from precedent, and *Citizens United* did not give rise to unfettered campaign spending.

The Supreme Court in 1976, in *Buckley v. Valeo*, ruled that independent expenditures could not be limited. That decision was not the work of supposed conservative judicial activists.

Wealthy individuals have been able to spend unlimited amounts since then. And corporations and others have been able to make unlimited donations to 501(c)(4) corporations since then as well.

As Mr. Abrams wrote to the Judiciary Committee in questions for the record, "What *Citizens United* did do, however, is permit corporations to contribute to PACs that are required to disclose all donors and engage only in independent expenditures. If anything, *Citizens United* is a pro-disclosure ruling which brought corporate money further into the light." So I do not think my colleagues are correct in saying that this amendment is about so-called "dark money." And limiting speech is totally separate from disclosure of speech. This amendment says nothing about disclosure.

And it is the amendment, not *Citizens United*, that fails to respect precedent. It does not simply overturn one case.

As Mr. Abrams responded, it overturns 12 cases, some of which date back almost 40 years. As the amendment has been redrafted, it may be 11½ now, depending on what "reasonable" means.

Justice Stevens, whom the Committee Democrats relied on at length in support of the amendment, voted with the majority in three of the cases the amendment would overturn.

Some members of the Committee may not like the long established broad protections for free speech that the Supreme Court has reaffirmed. But that does not mean there are 5 activists on the Supreme Court. The Court ruled unanimously in more cases this year than it has in 60 or 75 years, depending on whose figures you use. Its unanimity was frequently demonstrated in rejecting arguments of the Obama administration.

I have made clear that this amendment abridges fundamental freedoms that are the birthright of Americans. The arguments made to support it are unconvincing. The amendment will weaken, not strengthen, democracy. It will not reduce corruption, but will open the door for elected officials to bend democracy's rules to benefit themselves.

The fact that the Senate is considering such a dreadful amendment is a great testament to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in insisting on and adopting a Bill of Rights in the first place.

As Justice Jackson famously wrote, "The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to

establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts.

"One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

We must preserve our Bill of Rights including our rights to free speech. We must not allow officials to diminish and ration that right. We must not let this proposal become the supreme law of the land.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. We have heard on this floor some lengthy speeches that brought a number of arguments to bear in an effort to appear learned, insightful, founded in law and founded in history, all to obscure the fundamental fact before this body, which is some on this floor today want to see a government owned and operated by the powerful, not the people. But that is exactly the opposite of what our Constitution was set up to do. The Founders of our Nation proceeded to lay out in very clear terms that the entire premise of our government would not be ruled by the few over the many. It would not be a system of government set up of, by, and for the powerful. They laid that vision out in the very first words of our Constitution.

This premise is so well-known to citizens that when you say: What are the first three words of our Constitution, they will say, together: "We the People," because that is what animates our system of government—"We the People." Those who came to argue for the government by and for the powerful are simply trying to destroy our Constitution and our vision of government.

Citizens United, a court case that absolutely ignores the fundamental premises on which our Nation is founded, is a dagger poised at the heart of our democracy. It is a decision by five Justices that this framework doesn't matter.

The writers of the Constitution felt this was so important to convey to every citizen that this is the meaning, the core meaning of what our government is about, that they proceeded to write those words in a font that is approximately 10 times the size of everything that comes after "We the People of the United States. . . ." And all that follows is to illuminate, expand on that vision.

It was President Lincoln who summarized the genius of our democracy in his speech at Gettysburg: ". . . of the people, by the people, and for the people." He proceeded to say that we must

not let this vision perish from this Earth.

Yet Citizens United, day by day, election by election, is diminishing and destroying the very vision that President Lincoln summarized in that speech on the battlefield at Gettysburg.

What does Citizens United say? It says that entities that are not individuals, that have no claim to the Bill of Rights, can spend unlimited sums to inundate the airwaves and drown out the voice of the people.

Imagine, if you will, the town square. Let's turn the clock back to the early phase of our democracy.

There we are at the town square and everyone is supposed to have their chance to have their say in influencing the decisions that are to come. The town council says: Do you know what, Mr. Jones or Mrs. Anderson, you get 30 seconds, but now over here we are going to give 4 hours to your opponent. Would anyone consider that an exercise in democracy? Oh, yes, the individuals get 30 seconds, but the powerful entity—maybe the big landholder—gets 4 hours to make his or her case. That is not democracy. That is not “We the People.” That is rules that are twisted to fix the game on behalf of the powerful against the people, and that is what Citizens United represents.

Our system of government is such that it is essential that citizens believe that every citizen has a fair shot to participate because if they do not believe there is a fair shot, then, in fact, the premise of democracy—“We the People”—is destroyed because why participate if the system is rigged? That is what we are talking about—the rigging of the system. I think those five Justices simply have not read the Constitution, have not read the first three words, do not understand the premise, the foundation, the heart of our system of government and what it is intended to accomplish. It is as if they scratched out the first three words of the Constitution and said: We are rewriting it. We are going to rig the system for “We the Powerful” over the people. That is what this debate is about.

In Citizens United, these five Justices—a one-vote majority over the four who protested against this bizarre effort to destroy the premises of our democracy—said: Unlimited sums, dark money—such sums “do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption.” They could not be more wrong. Corruption in this sense is the rigging of the game such that citizens do not have a fair voice, and rigging the game is exactly what Citizens United does. It is so obvious that, of course, it gives rise to the appearance that the game is rigged because it is.

Think about the situation I described where the town council says to Mr. Anderson or Mrs. Jones: You get 30 seconds; the opponent on the other side gets 4 hours. That is exactly what we

are seeing in elections across the country. You may see in some elections that the average donation may be \$50. Along come the Koch brothers, who in most States would be out-of-State, out-of-State oil and coal billionaires, coming in and maybe spending \$3 million or \$5 million or more through a variety of front groups they have set up.

How many individual donations does it take to get the same time to present your case as the Koch brothers spending, say, \$3 million? Well, it would take about 60,000 \$50 donations to buy the same opportunity to speak. So Citizens United is very much like that town council saying: You, madam citizen, get 30 seconds, but you, mister rich, powerful individual, get 4 hours. So, of course, it is corrosive and corrupting. It erodes fair opportunity for all citizens to have their voice heard. And because it does erode the ability of all citizens to have their voice heard, of course, it enhances the belief, that is, the appearance that the system is rigged, the appearance of corruption.

It changes the debate in this Chamber because colleagues look at these millions of dollars brought to bear by just a couple individuals and they say to themselves in the back of their head: I better not step on the toes of that group that can now spend millions of dollars in my election way down in a southern State or way out in a western State or way up in the northeast. I better not step on their toes. If that is not corrosive and corrupting to a “We the People” debate and decision-making, I do not know what is.

Let's take an example. Not so long ago the party across the aisle was saying: We think we have a good idea on how to use a market-based system to control sulfur dioxide. Rather than putting a limit on each smokestack, we will create an overall limit and allow the market to allocate the most cost-effective way to reduce that sulfur dioxide pollution. That cap-and-trade system invented across the aisle, proposed across the aisle, passed across the aisle, actually worked pretty well. In fact, it worked spectacularly. Sulfur dioxide and acid rain were decreased faster, more cheaply than anyone envisioned. If the range of possible outcomes was considered to be 1 through 10, this was a 25. It was a resounding success.

But along come two individuals who have these billions of dollars who are getting into elections all over the country, who are threatening to put millions in to those who disagree, and they say: No, no, no. Sulfur dioxide, hmm, do not apply this idea that worked so well for the carbon dioxide pollution; do not do that; no matter how well this idea worked, do not do that because we won't fund your election. If you are with us, we will fund massive amounts of campaign ads to attack your opponents. That is exactly

what the Koch brothers have done, and they reversed the entire position of my colleagues across the aisle in a couple years—in about a 2-year period—from a market-based control of a major pollutant, carbon dioxide, to arguing that no, no, no, it cannot be controlled. That would be an energy tax.

Well, this happens time and time again, and the people across this Nation do, in fact, pay attention. They are seeing the system is rigged. That is why in one poll 92 percent of Americans said this program is broken. I thought to myself: What is wrong with the other 8 percent? Haven't they paid attention? Don't they know how much this system is being corrupted by Citizens United, by the decision of those five Justices?

Well, in addition, there is another form of corruption that comes from Citizens United; and that is those individuals who have been elected by these vast sums are beholden to those who elected them and they will choose no policy that goes against those who have pulled their strings and gotten them elected. That is definitely a form of serious corruption in a democracy, where ideas are supposed to be debated and decided, analyzed, not where vast corporate or individual wealthy billionaires pull the strings. So it is destroying the competition between ideas on how to take a path that works for “We the People” instead of “We the Powerful.”

When people back home see those in this Chamber arguing to cut food stamps while not cutting a single egregious tax giveaway to powerful oil companies, they see the corrosive influence of Citizens United. When they see folks across the aisle arguing that you should not eliminate these subsidies that go to companies that ship our jobs overseas, and that you should oppose subsidies to bring those jobs home, they see the powerful influence of Citizens United. The list could go on and on.

We have a particular challenge because the concentration of wealth in America is greater than it has been since 1920, greater than it has been for virtually a century. And now we have a system, thanks to our Supreme Court majority of five, that says wealth can be brought to bear to buy elections across this Nation. This is not the system that colonists thought about when they were trying to set up a government that would serve every American—not the few—that would serve humble, ordinary working Americans—not the most powerful—that would serve those in every economic level for a better vision, a better opportunity for employment, a better opportunity for health, a better opportunity to live a quality life, instead of just those who have the biggest bank checkbooks.

I urge my colleagues, let's take up this issue. How could any issue be more

important than this issue that goes to the very core of our democracy? Let's not try to run these lengthy, lengthy speeches with learned, learned quotes, to try to disguise what this is about: the wealthiest, the most powerful oppressing the fundamental nature of our democracy.

Together we can stay the hand that holds the dagger aimed at the heart of democracy, and it is our responsibility to do so for this generation and for the generations to come.

Thank you, Madam President.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:56 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, more than 40 years ago, in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, Justice William Brennan described "a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open." The measure now before the Senate shows that this commitment is in serious jeopardy.

Next week marks the 227th anniversary of the drafting of the U.S. Constitution. Those who participated in that process agreed that individual liberty requires limits on government power, but they differed on how explicit and extensive those limits should be. Many thought the simple act of delegating enumerated powers to the Federal Government and reserving the rest to the States would be enough. Others were more skeptical of government power and insisted that the Constitution needed a bill of rights. Those skeptics, however, were not skeptical enough. The measure before us today, S.J. Res. 19, would allow the government to control and even prohibit what Americans say and do in the political process.

Yesterday a member of the majority leadership said this measure is "narrowly tailored." It is possible to believe that only if you have never read S.J. Res. 19 and know nothing about either the Supreme Court's precedents or past proposals of this kind. This is not the first attempt at empowering the government to suppress political speech, but it is the most extreme.

Four elements of this proposal are particularly troubling.

First, its purpose is to advance what it calls "political equality." None of the constitutional amendments previously proposed to control political speech has made such a claim. The irony is astounding. At the very time in our history when technology is naturally leveling the political playing field, this proposal would give the power to define political equality to government. If simply suggesting that the government should have the power to enforce its own version of political equality is not enough to oppose this proposal, then our liberties are in even greater danger than I thought.

In addition to its stated purpose, this proposal is also troubling because of the power it would give to government. Past proposals of this kind were very specific about what government could or should regulate. One measure, for example, covered expenditures made "to expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for Federal office." More recently, proposed amendments covered expenditures made "in support of, or opposition to, a candidate." The proposal before us today, however, says that government may regulate "the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections." That is all it says. It would allow government to control the raising and spending of money by anyone doing anything at any time to influence elections. No proposal of this kind has ever been drafted more broadly.

The same Democratic Senator who yesterday claimed this proposal is narrowly tailored referred to big-money campaign donors, high rollers, and for-profit corporations with unlimited budgets. I urge not only my colleagues but everyone listening to this debate to read S.J. Res. 19. Just read it. My liberal friends may want to paint certain billionaires or for-profit corporations as the big bad wolf, but this proposal goes far beyond that. It would allow government to regulate the raising and spending of money not only by billionaires or corporations but by what it simply labels "others." That means everyone everywhere. It means individuals as well as groups, rich as well as poor, for-profits, nonprofits. Under this proposal, government could control them all.

It takes no imagination whatsoever to realize that virtually everything can influence elections. Voter registration drives, get-out-the-vote efforts, non-partisan voter information, discussion about issues, town meetings—all of these activities and many more influence elections.

Once again, I urge everyone to read the proposal before us. It would give government the power to regulate anything done by anyone at any time to influence elections.

The third troubling element of this proposal is that it would suppress the

First Amendment freedom of speech for individual citizens but protect the First Amendment freedom of the press for Big Media. Supporters of this amendment want to manipulate and control how individual citizens influence elections but are perfectly happy with how Big Media influences elections. This proposal would allow government to prohibit nonprofit organizations from raising or spending a single dollar to influence elections but leaves multibillion-dollar media corporations free to influence elections as much as they choose. That set of priorities represents a twisted sense of political equality that I cannot believe most Americans share.

Finally, this proposal would allow government to distinguish between what it calls natural persons and "corporations or other artificial entities created by law." Unlike other provisions of the Bill of Rights, such as the Fourth or Fifth Amendment, the First Amendment does not use the word "person;" it simply protects the freedom of speech—a freedom that obviously can be exercised not only individually but also collectively.

Yesterday a Democratic Senator dismissed the notion that corporations can be treated as persons under the law because corporations never get married, raise kids, or care for sick relatives.

Is he kidding? A corporation cannot care for sick relatives, but it certainly can speak, and that is what this debate is all about. As the Supreme Court observed more than a century ago, corporations are "merely associations of individuals."

Perhaps I need to remind my colleagues that the first section of the first title of the United States Code is the Dictionary Act. It defines the word "person" to include "corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals."

Many of what this proposal labels "artificial entities"—such as nonprofit organizations, associations, or societies—exist to magnify the voices of individuals. The Supreme Court case that sparked this debate, *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, was brought not by a for-profit corporation but by a nonprofit organization. S.J. Res. 19 would allow government not only to regulate but to prohibit the raising or spending of money by these nonprofits, associations, and societies to influence elections. They could be banned from speaking on behalf of what my Democratic colleagues like to refer to as ordinary, average Americans. Suppressing the speech of organizations that speak for individuals would leave millions of those Americans with no voice at all.

We should eliminate rather than create barriers to participation in the political process. We should encourage

rather than discourage activities by our fellow citizens to influence the election of their leaders. We should prohibit rather than empower government to control how Americans participate in the political process. We should, to return to Justice Brennan's words, strengthen rather than dismantle our national commitment to uninhibited, robust, and wide-open debate on public issues. Making S.J. Res. 19 part of the Constitution would instead make that debate inhibited, weak, and closed.

As the Supreme Court has recognized, the First Amendment is premised on a mistrust of government power. Neither the nature of government power nor its impact on individual liberty has changed. S.J. Res. 19, therefore, proves three things. It proves that the government's temptation to control what Americans say and do in the political process is as strong as ever. It proves that the majority believes it can retain power only by suppressing the liberties of our fellow Americans. It proves that the profound national consensus Justice Brennan described may no longer exist.

Another irony is that the majority in what we often call the world's greatest deliberative body is trying to stifle the free speech of citizens with whom they disagree. This is nothing more than election-year misdirection, an attempt to distract attention from the majority's complete failure to address the real problems facing our Nation.

We should heed the advice of our late colleague from Massachusetts, my friend Senator Ted Kennedy. We were often called "the odd couple" because we worked so well together but came from disparate or different political areas. In March 1997 this body was debating another proposed constitutional amendment to control political speech. That measure, I want my colleagues to know, was more narrowly drawn than the one before us today. It was limited to expenditures supporting or opposing candidates and did not exempt Big Media. Yet Senator Kennedy rose to oppose it and said:

In the entire history of the Constitution, we have never amended the Bill of Rights, and now is no time to start. It would be wrong to carve an exception in the First Amendment. Campaign finance reform is a serious problem, but it does not require that we twist the meaning of the Constitution.

That was said by Senator Kennedy, and he was right. The Senate voted 38 to 61 against that proposal. And Senator Kennedy's words apply with even more force today, there is no question about it.

The real purpose of S.J. Res. 19 is exactly what America's Founders ratified the First Amendment to prevent. Supporters of this radical proposal apparently believe that freedom itself is the problem. That view is contrary to the most fundamental principles of this

Republic and incompatible with a free society. Freedom is not the problem; it is the solution.

I am really amazed that my colleagues on the other side would attempt to pull this stunt at this time in our country's history, when almost anybody who looks at it knows it is done just for publicity and political reasons. At the same time, what an awful amendment it is. It makes one wonder if people in the Congress today are really as serious about our country as they were back at the beginning of this country. Those people didn't have nearly the knowledge from books of learning and capacities we have today, but for some reason they were inspired. They were well educated. They were strong people. They knew what was right, they stood up for what was right, and they did it in very carefully selected words, which would be surely diminished by what the Democrats are trying to do here today.

I sometimes wonder, is politics more important than the Constitution? They know they are not going to pass this resolution. We are not going to let them pass it. It is crazy. It is wrong. It is out of whack. It is against almost everything the Founding Fathers stood for. It is against Supreme Court precedent. It basically would limit the rights of far too many people.

I know my colleagues are going to ultimately vote this down. This will never get 67 votes and never should. It never should have seen the light of day and never should have seen a minute on the floor of this august body. It diminishes this body, that this type of amendment is being brought to the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

FAIR SHOT AGENDA

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, over the last several weeks I spent a lot of time traveling across my home State of Washington hearing from workers and families about the challenges they face in today's economy. While there is no question the economy has made a lot of progress, I spoke with far too many people who are working as hard as they can and still feel as though they are running in place. Despite their best efforts, they have not achieved the kind of economic security that allows them to buy a home or save for retirement or start the new business they have been thinking about. I think we can all agree more Americans should have those kinds of opportunities.

So I am proud that this year Senate Democrats have focused on legislation that would go a long way toward giving our families and Americans a fair shot.

We have made the case for giving millions of Americans across this country a raise, helping students get out from the crushing burden of student loan debt, ensuring that in the 21st century working women get equal pay, and so much more.

In the coming days we are going to bring these issues to the forefront once again and make another push for our Republican colleagues to join us. Each one of these policies would do so much for our families and for economic growth, and that is especially true because each would help women in today's workforce. I have come to the floor to focus on that last point in particular and talk about why each of these bills would make a real difference for women across the country.

You may remember that my Republican colleagues blocked these bills the last time the Democrats brought them to the floor. So I am going to encourage my Republican colleagues to say something besides no when it comes to higher wages for workers or college affordability or pay equity, because if they have a reason for opposing legislation that would help women and families get ahead, I think the American people deserve to hear it.

The role of women and families in our economy has shifted dramatically in the last several decades. Today 60 percent of families rely on earnings from both parents—up from 37 percent in 1975. Women today make up nearly half of the workforce, and more than ever women are likely to be the primary breadwinner in their families. Women are making a difference across the economy in boardrooms and lecture halls and small businesses, but our Nation's policies have not caught up with the times. In fact, today they are holding women back.

Across the country women still earn 77 cents on the dollar on average compared to men. That difference adds up. In Seattle last year women earned 73 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts, and that translated to a yearly gap for women of \$16,346. Nationwide, over a typical woman's lifetime, pay discrimination amounts to \$464,320 in lost wages. The gender wage gap makes dealing with other financial burdens such as student loans even more challenging.

This past spring I invited a woman from Massachusetts named AnnMarie Duchon to our Budget Committee hearing to testify about her own personal experience with pay inequity. AnnMarie told us that over the years she missed out on more than \$12,000 in wages compared to a male coworker who was doing the same job. She told us she and her husband both have student loan debt and those lost wages—\$12,000—would have covered 10 months of payments. AnnMarie said thinking about that setback was "heart-breaking."

AnnMarie said she was ultimately able to go back and convince her employers to give her equal pay, but unfortunately most women are not able to do that. Many don't even know they are earning unequal wages. That is a real loss, both for our families and for our economy as a whole. That is why we need the Paycheck Fairness Act to tackle pay discrimination head-on and help ensure that in this 21st century workers are compensated based on how they do their job, not on their gender.

Another policy that needs an update is our Federal minimum wage. Two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women. Many of them are the sole breadwinners and sole caregivers for their family, and I know if you ask them how \$7.25 an hour translates to a grocery trip for a family of four or shopping for school supplies or just paying transportation to and from work, they will give you a straight answer: It doesn't. Democrats know it is time they got a raise. Republicans disagree. They said no earlier this year to a raise for 15 million women, and I think the American people deserve to hear why.

Women aren't the only ones affected by these challenges, because when working women aren't getting equal pay, when they haven't gotten a raise in years, when they are struggling to make ends meet, that means their families are too—and our economy as a whole is weaker for it.

Democrats have put forward ideas throughout this year that would help level the playing field. It has been, I must say, deeply disappointing that time after time our Republican colleagues have simply said no—no to tax and pay discrimination through the Paycheck Fairness Act, no to giving millions of workers across the country—including 15 million women—a raise, no to legislation that would relieve some of the crushing burden of student loan debt, and the list goes on.

Republicans rejected so much as a debate on each of those bills just a few months ago, and that is a shame because we know these are issues women and families truly care about. They rightly expect us to be working together to come up with solutions. If Republicans are just going to reject our ideas, I think their constituents deserve to hear what else they have to offer.

When I was in my home State of Washington last month I spoke with an entrepreneur named Leilani Finau. Leilani has worked very hard to get her own business off the ground. She told me for the last 12 years she has only been able to pay the interest on her student loans. So more than a decade later she still owes the same amount of principal.

I also talked to a woman named Veronica Donoso. She is an administrative specialist and a single mom from

my home State. Veronica told me about the financial burdens she is dealing with—not only student loans but childcare for her daughter. She said, "I try not to let my daughter see my struggles, but I feel terrible knowing that she is suffering too."

I think women such as AnnMarie, Leilani, Veronica, and a lot of other women across the country deserve to hear more than just no from Republicans when it comes to legislation that could make a difference for them and their families.

In the next few days Republicans will have an opportunity to take a different approach than they have so far this year. I am calling on the Senate Republican leader to take advantage of it. We should be able to debate these important issues. Democrats have put solutions on the table, a higher minimum wage, student debt relief, giving women more tools to fight pay discrimination, and more. If Republicans have more to say than no, it is time for them to do it.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Madam President. I would ask to speak for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you. First, I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for her words and her work on focusing on middle-class families and making sure the economy grows for everyone. I wish to echo and expand upon the very same topics our distinguished chairwoman has been talking about.

First, I think it is important to note that we have seen an improvement in the economy. We are seeing a stock market that has doubled since President Obama took office. We have seen deficits going down. We are seeing projections of slowing increases as they relate to health care and Medicare costs. We are seeing more jobs being created.

The challenge for us is making sure everyone has an opportunity in that economy. We see an economy that has turned, but yet we see way too many people who are not able to benefit from that economy and who don't have a fair shot to create the opportunities for themselves and their families.

So there is more work to be done and that is what the "fair shot" agenda is all about. I thank the Presiding Officer for her leadership around this whole question of how to make sure the economy works for everyone, how to make sure we have a middle class in this country—and we will not have a middle class unless everybody has a fair shot to make it.

We have put together five issues we have voted on that we will continue to bring up over and over again until they

get passed—and certainly there are other issues as well but five that would make a tremendous difference to Americans in terms of creating opportunity.

The first one is the minimum wage. If you work, you ought to be receiving more wages than if you were in poverty. Why not be over the poverty line if you are working 40 hours a week. We ought to value work in our economy. Raising the minimum wage is an important piece of that. It is the floor, the foundation that is high enough that your family is not in poverty if you are working 40 hours a week. We raised this issue and we voted on this issue of raising the minimum wage above the poverty line and it was blocked by our Republican colleagues in April.

We then came back and looked at the fact that another part of the burden on middle-class families and those aspiring to get into the middle class is the cost of student loans. In fact, it is shocking to know we have more student loan debt than credit card debt in this country. We are seeing that people are able to refinance their homes to lower interest rates and benefit from lower interest rates for a variety of things, but they cannot refinance their student loans. People are locked in, whether it is current students, people recently out of college—we know there is a certain percentage of the trillion dollars in student loans that are paid by people who are retired, actually on Medicare and still paying off student loans. The law currently does not allow them to even just refinance to the low rates that one can get in other parts of the economy. Back in June we put forward a refinancing bill that would help 25 million Americans—including 1 million in Michigan alone—reduce their student loan debt, put more money in their pocket so they can buy a house, they can raise a family. I know realtors in my State of Michigan and those who are involved in mortgage banking are now deeply concerned about this issue because the debt they have is disqualifying people from buying a home or being able to make other investments, starting a small business or other opportunities for refinancing.

So this is a critically important issue. If someone is following the rules of working hard and doing what we all say to do, getting skills so they can compete and be part of the new economy and get a job, but folks find themselves in a situation where all they can do is create crushing debt in all of this and spend years and years and years, oftentimes hundreds of thousands of dollars in student loan debt, this is a concern. This is getting in the way of allowing people to be successful and have a middle class in this country. We have our student loan bill based on students, and it was unfortunately voted down by Republicans in June.

Then we go on to an issue we didn't originally have on our agenda until the Supreme Court made what I believe was an outrageous decision that affects women in their personal health care decisions, basically saying that for a woman to get a certain kind of coverage for birth control or contraception, she would have to walk into her boss's office and sit down and explain her personal health care issues and get approval for birth control. I don't know any other part of the health care system that requires a boss to oversee a decision made by an employee. But this was something that was decided as being a legitimate option under a Supreme Court decision called the Hobby Lobby decision.

So we put forth legislation to make it clear it is not your boss's business, that women ought to be able to receive coverage for preventive care for women just as men do for their health care decisions. We voted on a bill that would make sure women could make their own basic health decisions in privacy, and that was blocked in July by Republicans, indicating they did not believe women should have the opportunity to make their own health care decisions.

Then a bill of mine with Senator WALSH called the Bring Jobs Home Act came before us. It is a very simple premise again. We are a global economy. We want to export our products but not our jobs, and we have tax policy right now that incentivizes those who want to take the jobs overseas. Some of this is craziness in the Tax Code, I believe.

One of those very simple policies that has sent a message that it is OK to ship jobs overseas is the fact that if a company closes shop in places such as Michigan or Wisconsin or Ohio or anywhere in the country—we have seen too much of this in Michigan over the last decade—they can actually write off the cost of the move. The employer can say to the employees, you pack up the boxes, and by the way—through the Tax Code—you will end up paying for the move. The Bring Jobs Home Act says, no, we are not paying, as American taxpayers, for your move if you are moving outside the country with those jobs. If you want to come back, great, you can not only write off those costs, we will give you an extra 20-percent tax credit for the cost on top of it.

Very simply put, the Bring Jobs Home Act is for those who want to come home to America. We are all for it. We will support you and help you do that. If you want to leave America, you are on your own. That was blocked by the Republicans in July.

As if blocking those four very important, commonsense bills was not outrageous enough, Republicans once again blocked a bill to guarantee women equal pay for equal work. I can't believe we are talking about this in 2014. Everybody says, wait a minute,

we have equal pay for equal work. We have a law on the books that is not enforced at this point in time. We have court decisions that do not allow the actual equal pay for equal work statute to truly be enforced in this country, which is why we find ourselves in a situation where nationally women still only receive 77 cents on a dollar. In Michigan, it is 74 cents on a dollar.

It is hard to believe that in this day and age—in 2014—42 of our Republican colleagues voted against the Paycheck Fairness Act. I hope we are going to have another chance in the near future to vote on that and again give them an opportunity to support equal pay for equal work.

When we look at Michigan, where women are working very hard every day, I find it stunning that they are making only 74 cents on every dollar. They are getting 26 cents less for every dollar that they work. When you go to the grocery store, you don't get a 26-percent reduction. They can't say: Hey, I am paid less. Here is my 26-percent discount. When they go to the gas station, they don't get a 26-percent discount. When they pay their mortgage, they don't get a 26-percent discount. Obviously it doesn't make sense and the numbers don't add up, but it is much more than just about numbers.

I remember when Kerri Sleeman from Houghton, MI—up in the Upper Peninsula—came here to testify in the Senate. She was a senior engineer supervising a group of engineers at the company. After the company closed and went bankrupt, she was reviewing the legal documents and found that she, as the engineering supervisor, had, in fact, been paid less than those whom she supervised.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for another minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Kerri Sleeman, as a supervisor, deserved to receive the kind of pay she should receive as a supervisor.

One of the things I find outrageous is when we hear folks on the other side of the aisle say equal pay for equal work is nonsense; the bill is nonsense. It is a distraction. In Michigan we have heard people say: Women don't care about equal pay, they want flexibility. Well, flexibility doesn't pay for my groceries. The truth of the matter is women want to have the opportunity to receive equal pay.

We are at a point in time where we ought to move forward quickly in passing each one of these issues. As we know, this is about the economy and growing the middle class in this country. We are not going to have a middle class unless everybody has a fair shot to participate and work hard and be successful, and we need to get about the business of making sure that happens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I can't tell you how disappointed I am that the majority leader has continued to persist in blocking votes on more than 300 different pieces of bipartisan legislation that have passed the House of Representatives and that he refuses to bring up in the Senate. Rather than work together on a bipartisan basis to try to get the economy moving and get Americans back to work, we have these focus group, poll-tested show votes. The distinguished Senator from Michigan just admitted that equal pay for equal work is already the law of the land and then said we need to vote on it again. Well, it should be renamed "The Trial Lawyer Relief Act" because that is what it is. It is going to benefit the trial lawyers by encouraging litigation and will do nothing to make sure there is equal pay for equal work. We all agree that is and should be the law of the land, but encouraging legislation such as lawsuits against small businesses would do nothing to create jobs and grow the economy.

There is a reason why the congressional approval rating is at 14 percent. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN—in a display of what I guess could be called gallows humor—said we are down to paid staff and blood relatives. Those are the only ones who still approve of what Congress is doing, and it is easy to understand why.

We just came back off of a recess where we had a chance to go back home and talk to our constituents. More importantly than talk to them, we had a chance to listen to them and hear what is on their minds. What are their concerns? What are their hopes? What are their dreams? What are they worried about? I guarantee that none of my constituents suggested we need to repeal the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. That is the particular legislation that is on the floor today. That is the priority of the Democratic majority leader. It is a show vote to try to deny people an equal opportunity to participate in the political process—to shut them out if you disagree with them and silence them. Tell them to sit down, be quiet, we are in charge and in control.

I cannot tell you how disappointed I am that it seems as though it is all politics all the time. Every perceived or real problem that our Democratic friends seem to identify—what is their solution? It is more government. The most feared words in the English language where I come from are "I'm from the Federal Government and I'm here to help."

We had an experiment over the last 5½ years since President Obama was elected and the electorate gave the Democratic Party control of both the

House and Senate. We have had a scientific experiment in the size and role of government and the results are in, and they are pretty pathetic. Unemployment is still unacceptably high. The labor participation rate, which is the percentage of people actually participating in the workforce, is at a 30-year low. People have given up looking for work, which is a great human tragedy.

Then there is the President's approval rating. He is doing better than Congress, I will give him that, but it is down around 40 percent. Here is the troubling thing—and this is not a partisan comment. As an American, I worry when the Commander in Chief has the sort of poll numbers we are talking about. There was a poll reported by the Washington Post and ABC News on September 9. The poll showed that Americans say, by 52 percent to 42 percent, that President Obama has been more of a failure than a success as President of the United States. That is terrible. But it demonstrates his refusal to engage with Congress on a bipartisan basis to do the country's work. It also reflects the mistakes he has made when it comes to leadership around the world.

President Obama wanted his second term to be about nation building here at home rather than conflicts and crises abroad. But, as we all know by now, the world is not cooperating. Even worse, the President is not leading. Instead, he has embraced a dangerously reactive foreign policy marked by empty rhetoric and wishful thinking, and the results are now plain to see.

When we look at the Middle East, we see a massive terrorist enclave spanning western Iraq and eastern Syria. The border between Syria and Iraq is gone. It is the site of a new caliphate. They are the Islamic radicals who were deemed so bad that Al Qaeda didn't want to have anything to do with them—ISIS. They have created what they believe is an Islamic state or caliphate, where Shari'a law will rule and women will have virtually no rights and people will have no liberty or freedom. We have seen American journalists being decapitated on video. We see a brutal Syrian civil war in which about 200,000 civilians have been killed—200,000 human beings are dead as a result of a Syrian civil war—and millions more Syrians have been displaced internally within this country or else living in refugee camps in Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan.

We see a failed state in Libya. We see a terrorist-sponsoring Iranian theocracy that continues to pursue a nuclear weapon, and we see a violent Iranian axis stretching from Tehran to Damascus to Beirut and Gaza.

Meanwhile, let's not forget about Eastern Europe. We see an aggressive, autocratic gangster state conducting a cross-border invasion of democratic

neighbors and taking sovereign territory by force in a manner not seen on the European continent since World War II.

A few weeks ago the President announced that Western sanctions against Russia were working as intended. Yet, in late August a large number of Russian troops began launching major incursions into Eastern and Southern Ukraine in the hopes of seizing even more territory. They already have Crimea; that is yesterday's news. Now they are making further gains in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. One Ukrainian official called it a full-scale invasion. It doesn't sound to me as though the sanctions that were issued by the United States are working as intended as the President has said.

Our existing sanctions are inadequate. They are not working as intended. Vladimir Putin is not deterred by economic sanctions. In fact, according to one Italian newspaper, Putin recently told the President of the European Commission that if Russia wanted to, it could take Kiev in 2 weeks. I am sure Mr. Putin is OK if it takes a little bit longer, just as long as he gets the territory he needs to try to restore the Russian empire to his former visions of glory.

White House officials famously describe the President's foreign policy as "don't do stupid stuff." That is one for the history textbooks. That is the sort of policy our students need to study in high school: Don't do stupid stuff. Come on.

Time and time again in country after country on issue after issue, this administration has, by its inaction and its ambivalence, undermined America's partners, adversaries are emboldened, and it has weakened American credibility.

Let's start with the Middle East. In Libya, President Obama launched a war against Moammar Qadhafi in Libya and then he did virtually nothing to help stabilize the country after Qadhafi's fall. That neglect ultimately led to the tragic death of four Americans in Benghazi in September 2012. It also led to the emergence of terrorist havens. What do they look for other than a power vacuum that they can fill where they can seek sanctuary and launch attacks in the region or against other adversaries? This has led to Libya's collapse as a functioning state. It is a failed state.

It has also enabled jihadist groups in Mali and Africa until they were driven out by the French.

Then there is Syria. Remember when the President said Bashir Assad needs to step down? He then did virtually nothing to help see that happen. He did nothing to arm the moderate rebel forces opposing Assad in the Syrian civil war. The irony is that U.S. officials had a plan to support those

rebels, and they recommended it to the President in the summer of 2012 a plan proposed by then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, then-CIA Director David Petraeus, and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Mark Dempsey. They recommended a plan to deal with Assad and to facilitate the regime change President Obama called for. What did the President do? He rejected it, even though his stated policy in Syria since August 2011 has been regime change.

It has become commonplace to say that the United States has no good options in Syria. But President Obama's chronic passivity has helped the jihadists. I know that is not his intention, but it has helped the result. It has helped embolden the Iranians, and it has made the Syrian war even more dangerous for the United States and the United States' interests.

Then there is Iraq. President Obama failed to secure a new status of forces or bilateral security agreement that would have protected American forces that served on a transitional basis in Iraq after the conclusion of the Iraq war. We kept troops in Japan and Germany after World War II, and indeed the Americans were the only glue capable of holding the country of Iraq together and avoiding the sort of sectarian civil war we have seen ensue. But his complete withdrawal of U.S. forces in 2011 was a huge gift to Iraq's Shiite militias, their Iranian patrons, and the Sunni terrorists of Al Qaeda who would later form the so-called Islamic State or ISIS or ISIL, as they are now called. I have to tell my colleagues, as I reflect on the American casualties in Ramadi, in Fallujah—our marines, our brave American soldiers, men and women, their loss of life or injuries incurred in liberating Iraq from Saddam Hussein and to see all of that forfeited by the President's unwillingness to secure a bilateral security agreement and leave a transitional, small footprint force there to help the Iraqis transition to self government and democracy—it breaks my heart. I don't know how we explain that to someone who lost a loved one in Ramadi or Fallujah or anywhere else in the Iraq war.

According to the Wall Street Journal, at least 8 million Syrians and Iraqis live under full or partial Islamic State control. Eight million Syrians and Iraqis are living under the rule of medieval barbarians who not only decapitated two American captives but have accumulated a frightening amount of territory and wealth. They control a lot of the natural resources, the oil wells, in Iraq now because we have allowed them to capture it, and now that is the source of revenue for them to continue their terror. They have accumulated a frightening amount of territory and wealth by robbing, raping, extorting, and murdering innocent civilians.

By allowing the Islamic State to take over such a large part of Iraq and Syrian territory, President Obama has neglected one of the key recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. We remember the 9/11 Commission. It was a bipartisan commission set up after the tragedy of 9/11 to ask: How do we keep this from ever happening again?

One of the key recommendations of the 9/11 Commission is that the U.S. Government identify and prioritize actual or potential terrorist sanctuaries; in other words, safe havens. Instead, the President has stood by and watched like a spectator while the Islamic State, over the course of many months, carved out its own safe haven, right in the heart of the Middle East.

I am grateful to the President that he now has made a pledge to destroy ISIS. I believe this is not a threat that can be managed; I think it needs to be eliminated. So I congratulate the President for having evolved to this point where he understands the nature of the threat to American interests and to the American people, and I hope he is serious about doing that. But as one person recently noted, the Obama administration has persuaded just about every leadership cadre in the Middle East that the United States can be safely ignored when its principals make threats or promises. Remember the red line in Syria with chemical weapons. Well, the red line was crossed, and there were virtually no consequences associated with it. What is the lesson we learn? I guess I can get away with it and I am going to keep on coming—such as Vladimir Putin in Crimea and Ukraine.

Speaking of threats and promises, President Obama has repeatedly threatened Russia with serious consequences over its invasion of Ukraine, and he has repeatedly promised to help the Ukrainian people uphold their sovereignty. Yet he continues to stubbornly refuse to provide the very arms to the Ukrainian patriots needed in order to deter and deflect and defeat Russian aggression. What are we giving them? Our good wishes? Sending them some food and medical supplies? That is fine as far as it goes. But without the actual weapons and the training they need in order to defeat Russian aggression and to raise the cost for Vladimir Putin, he is not going to stop. Yet the President's threats haven't been reinforced with the kind of action necessary to change Moscow's calculations, and his promises to the government of Kiev now look rather empty.

The tragedy is it seems as though there is one world crisis after another, and we have long since forgotten about Libya, Syria, and the red lines and the chemical weapons there. They seem like a vague and distant memory because now we are focused on ISIS. But they are all part of the same problem.

There is a very real danger in Ukraine that last week's cease-fire will

only solidify Russia's recent territorial gains and legitimize its ongoing invasion and further embolden Vladimir Putin to seize even more Ukrainian territory or the territory of another Eastern European country when the time seems right. Amidst all of this upheaval, all of this violence, all of these challenges, all of these threats to U.S. interests and allies, the President seems disturbingly aloof. Here is what he said about the ongoing global turmoil at a recent fundraising event on August 29. This was reported in the press. He said:

The world has always been messy. In part, we are just noticing it now because of social media and our capacity to see in intimate detail the hardships that people are going through.

But make no mistake about it. The Middle East has not always been consumed by the type of violence and chaos we are seeing today, and European countries have not always been facing cross-border invasions such as that posed by Russia today.

The world needs strong American leadership. Ronald Reagan was right. We have a safer, more peaceful world when America is strong and does not create the safe havens for terrorists or by our timidity or our rhetoric that is not followed up on by actions that create the impression that people can get away with it. It just encourages the thugs, the dictators, and the terrorists.

The President's refusal to accept any real responsibility for the consequences of his foreign policy is troubling enough, but what is even more troubling is he doesn't seem to fully grasp the magnitude of the threats and challenges that America is now dealing with. If he thinks this is all about social media and people being aware of things that were happening before but they weren't aware of before, I hope he will think again. Indeed, his overall record is looking more and more like a case study in the perils of weaknesses, naivete, and indecision. I can only hope that recent events will force him to change course.

That could start by his coming to Congress with a strategy to eliminate ISIS, to eliminate this threat. I believe there would be bipartisan support for a strategy the President would present that has a reasonable chance of success. But just to have open-ended air strikes and maybe just a strategy comprising hopes and dreams but not one with the likelihood of working is not good enough. But if he came to us and worked with Congress, I think it would serve multiple purposes.

First, it would comply with the Constitution and the laws of the United States. That is important.

Second, by engaging in bipartisan support in Congress, he would build support necessarily for this policy among the American people. I don't believe Americans should ever go to war

without the support of the American people. We see what happens when that support fades and crumbles, and it is not good.

The third reason he ought to come to Congress is I read in some of the news clips today he is going to come and ask us for \$5 billion to fight ISIS. Well, the President—who is famous for saying, I am going to go it alone; I have a pen and a phone—can't go it alone when it comes to appropriating money. He needs Congress to appropriate that money. And Congress should not appropriate money without a strategy that has a reasonable likelihood of working or without an explanation of how this strategy is going to protect America and Americans' interests.

So in his remarks on U.S. policy toward the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria tomorrow night when he makes this nationwide address, I urge the President to go beyond the rhetoric and offer a clear explanation of our military objectives and our strategic objectives. I urge him to explain how and why the Islamic State poses a dangerous threat to U.S. national security interests, which I believe it does and I believe he thinks it does. So I hope he will explain it to the American people so they can understand it. I urge him to explain how U.S. allies and partners can help support America's mission, because we can't and should not do it alone. Indeed, we do need that coalition, particularly of people in the region who have the most direct interest and stake in the outcome. We need them to come to the table and help too.

Finally, I urge him to explain what his strategy is and how U.S. operations in Iraq and Syria fit within the broader role on radical Islamic terrorism. If the President gave such a speech—and I hope he does—I hope it is followed with true negotiations and deliberations and consultation with Congress. I know Minority Leader PELOSI and Majority Leader REID and the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator MCCONNELL, and Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY are visiting with the President perhaps as I speak. Maybe that is just the beginning of the kind of consultation that should take place. But I hope it is followed on by true collaboration and consultation with all Members of Congress so that we as Americans can come together and do what is in our national interests. But we can't do it without leadership, and we don't do it without a strategy to accomplish that goal.

I think in the process the President could inject some much needed clarity and direction into a foreign policy that has become hopelessly muddled and aimless.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Illinois.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DURBIN. I am going to give a brief statement about corporate inversion, but before I do I wish to respond to the Senator from Texas, who is my friend, and we have served together for many years. He has taken the floor for a period of time and spoken about some of the problems facing this Nation at home and abroad and has been largely been critical of the President in both categories. I didn't arrive early enough to hear his parade of horrors when it came to domestic policy; I just caught the end of it when he suggested there was something wrong with this President because America's labor force, its workforce, is shrinking. People are giving up looking for work. Well, that is a serious concern, and we ought to ask a question: Why are they giving up looking for work? It turns out it has, perhaps, something to do with the policy of our government, but it also has something to do with the life expectancy of Americans.

I am a little older than the Presiding Officer, and I just barely missed what we call baby boomers. Baby boomers are those born after World War II when the returning soldiers and their wives and spouses sat down and said: We are going to build a family. And they did. A lot of kids were born in America. It was called a baby boom.

Guess what. Baby boomers are facing retirement age. The workforce is shrinking because they are retiring. I would like to blame Barack Obama for that, but I think maybe that is a stretch. I don't think you can blame him for the baby boom. He wasn't even around after World War II, and he certainly can't be blamed because people decide to retire. Longevity kind of suggests when that might happen.

But still in all, it is another one of the things that is ticked off: The shrinking labor pool is an indication of the failure of the Obama labor policy. No. It is an indication of the shrinking baby boomers, who are aging out and retiring—and God bless them; they are entitled to it. Folks ought to think twice about that particular criticism.

I would like to address the foreign policy side, and I do wish to put in perspective what the Senator from Texas had to say, which was a long list—going all across the world—of problems this President has either failed to fix or has created.

I listened carefully, and I always do, because critics of the President have every right to do that. That is part of democracy. But they also bear some responsibility to suggest what we should do as an alternative. Many of them said we have to be more manly, we have to stand up, and we have to show the world we are assertive. What does that mean? What are they saying?

What the President is saying is that we have to be careful that we invest American lives, American treasure,

and the American military in this world in places where we can make a difference and take care not to do, as they said inartfully, stupid stuff by sending our military into places where they cannot achieve their goal and reasonably come home in a short period of time. That is the President's position.

I have not heard those on the other side be more specific when they say we have to be more assertive in America.

The date was October 11, 2002, on the floor of the Senate—and I was here. It was 12 years ago, and it was the night we voted on giving President George W. Bush the authority to invade Iraq. The rollcall took place late at night, and I stuck around afterward. There were about three or four of us left on the floor. In the final rollcall there were 23 Senators who voted no on the invasion of Iraq. I was one of them. There was 1 Republican, and the rest were Democrats—1 Independent and 21 Democrats, I should say. Twenty-three of us voted no on invading Iraq. Twenty-three of us questioned whether being assertive at that moment in history was the right thing to do. Remember, we were told about weapons of mass destruction and threats to the United States. Some of us were skeptical. The case had not been made. But we went forward.

I would like to make a note as well that even though there was a difference of opinion about the policy of Iraq under President George W. Bush after the decision was made to go forward, many of us who voted no joined in with those who voted yes to say: Now that we have made the decision, we stand together as a nation. We are going to provide for President George W. Bush the resources for these men and women in uniform so they can accomplish their mission and come home safely.

In other words, partisanship ended at the water's edge after we had made our decision. I still think that is the right course in foreign policy. Even though I voted against that war, I voted for the resources for the troop to execute it.

I thought: What if it were your son, Senator? What if it were someone you loved? Do you want them to have everything they need to get them home safely?

Of course.

I wish that longstanding tradition in Congress would return. Wouldn't it be healthy and inspiring if after a heated debate over a foreign policy issue we said: Now we stand together. The decision has been made. We are going to stand as a nation.

But instead what I hear from the other side when it comes to foreign policy issues: We are going to be critical of whatever he does, whenever he does it, wherever he does it.

I don't think that is constructive. I don't think it speaks well of the United States. The debate is important. The debate is part of us, part of who we are as a democracy. But after the debate, let's get on with working together.

Do you remember that it wasn't that long ago when they discovered chemical weapons in Syria? The President said: This isn't just a threat to Syria; this is a threat to the Middle East and beyond. I am going to make a stand to dismantle those chemical weapons in Syria, and I ask Congress for the authority not to send in troops but, if necessary, a missile, a bomber, a fighter plane to support our efforts to eradicate this chemical weapons stockpile.

Do you remember what happened? I do. What happened was we had a debate in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a vote—a bipartisan vote—which supported the President. Then we couldn't bring it to the floor because there was not adequate support from the other side of the aisle to stand by the President when it came to dismantling chemical weapons in Syria. He went forward, working then with Russian leader Vladimir Putin, and basically all of those weapons have been dismantled. When the President asked for the authority to dismantle those weapons, he couldn't get the support of the other party. That was the reality.

Now we face a new challenge, and there are those who say that if we had just been bold and assertive—and I wonder if what they are saying is if we had just shown the strength we showed with the invasion of Iraq, this might not have occurred.

Make no mistake. I am honored to chair the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. It is the biggest. Our budget is just under \$600 billion a year. It is almost half of domestic discretionary spending. I have come to learn that our military is really the best in the world, starting with the men and women who serve but way beyond that—our technology, our intelligence. We have the very best, but we have learned the hard way that even the best military in the world can run into obstacles they did not anticipate.

The first time I went to Walter Reed, I visited with a disabled Iraqi veteran. He was a sergeant from Ohio who had his right leg blown off below the knee.

I said: What happened?

He said: It was an IED.

I said: What is that?

He said: Well, it is an explosive device, roadside bomb. And we were in the best military equipment in the world, and this crude roadside bomb went off and blew off my leg.

I thought to myself: I wonder, if the greatest military in the world with the greatest technology in the world can be brought to a stop by a crude roadside bomb, if we are properly evaluating war today, fighting terrorism today.

What the President is trying to do is to find effective ways to stop this onset of terrorism in the Middle East, this new round of terrorism in the Middle East, this group called Islamic State.

Why are we picking this group out of all the other terrorist groups—and

there are many of them. They are quantitatively, qualitatively different. They are the first terrorist group we know that has taken and held territory. Usually terrorist groups set off a bomb in the marketplace and they are gone. No, they take and hold territory. They capture banks—go inside and take all the resources out—so they have a treasury. Some people think they earn as much as \$1 million a week off the oil wells they are controlling in Iraq. They use American equipment that has been left behind or stolen, and they engage in the worst level of savagery we have seen in modern times. The beheading of those two innocent Americans was heartbreaking—heartbreaking in one respect as I thought about their poor families and what they face, but it also enraged me to think that this group, the Islamic State, would do that to two innocent Americans, defying us and saying to us: This is just the beginning. It is a serious threat, and it is a threat to the stability in Iraq.

Here we are 12 years after we invaded Iraq, after we have lost 4,476 American lives in Iraq, after 30,000 of our troops have come home seriously injured, after we put \$1 trillion more on our national debt to pay for the Iraqi struggle, and the country is virtually in chaos.

The President is saying to the American people: I want to fight terrorism, I want to do it effectively, and I want to do it smartly. I want to do it in a way where we are not sending in troops who are there for long periods of time to just be targets for terrorists. Let's use our resources and our forces in a thoughtful way.

I am awaiting a speech tomorrow night because I want to hear, as he lays this out, what he hopes to accomplish, how long we are going to be there, where we are going to be, and by what authority he is moving forward and using these military resources. Those are all legitimate questions, and it is right for the loyal opposition to raise questions about where he is going, why he is going, and what he wants to do. But for the time being, I think the American people want the President to present his case and then make their judgment as to what is fair to bring stability to this critical part of the world.

CORPORATE INVERSION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when a company moves its corporate headquarters overseas, but only on paper so it can avoid paying its fair share of U.S. taxes, these companies, are called corporate inverters. But let's call them what they really are: corporate deserters.

These companies profit using roads and bridges built with American tax dollars to deliver goods to U.S. customers. They benefit from access to America's educated workforce . . .

American investments in basic research . . . and American patent protections. And some have even made millions, if not billions, of dollars from taxpayer-funded government contracts and programs like Medicare.

But when it comes time to pay their fair share of U.S. taxes—the very taxes that pay America's roads and bridges . . . our colleges and universities . . . basic research . . . patent protections . . . Medicare . . . and other competitive advantages—these companies do everything they can to dodge U.S. taxes. And they have gotten very good at shirking their fair share.

Let me tell you how this corporate "Three Card Monte" works. First, a company in the U.S. purchases a company in Switzerland, Ireland or another country with a lower corporate tax rate. The U.S. company then files papers saying it is relocating overseas.

In many cases, almost nothing changes. The CEO and other senior executives stay in the U.S., no new headquarters are opened overseas, and up to 80 percent of the shareholders are the same, but suddenly the company gets a huge tax break.

But this is only the beginning of the story. Next, the new parent company—headquartered overseas—shifts the debts off its own books and onto the books of its U.S. subsidiary. Abacadabra: Another huge tax break, because the company can write off its debt and interests on that debt. This is called "earnings stripping."

Now, here is the third card in the Three Card Monte: the hopscotch loophole. U.S. corporations currently have nearly \$2 trillion in foreign earnings stashed overseas. As long as they keep that money parked overseas, they can defer paying taxes on it.

But when a company "inverts," the inverted company—the corporate deserter—can access the millions—sometimes billions—of dollars they I have parked overseas without paying US taxes on the money. So the "hopscotch loophole" gives these corporations another massive tax break. The inverted company can use the money it had parked overseas to pay back the loans it used to finance the inversion . . . or to pay dividends to U.S. investors—and pay little to no taxes.

Let me give you an example. Let's say a U.S. company wants a big tax break by inverting and purchasing an overseas company.

It doesn't have enough cash in the U.S. to buy the overseas company and it doesn't want to use the money it has stashed overseas—because once the money comes home, it is subject to U.S. taxes. So what does the corporation do?

First, it gets a short-term loan from a bank to fund the inversion. Once that transaction is complete, the company can use the money it has stashed overseas to pay off the short-term loan

while dodging U.S. taxes on those overseas profits.

The result of this corporate Three Card Monte? Corporate deserters are able to avoid billions in U.S. taxes—and other folks—families and companies that are working hard to make it in America—have to pay more taxes. To add insult to injury, some of these corporate deserters have made their millions and billions off of federal contracts paid for by U.S. taxpayers—the very taxpayers who will have to pay for their tax dodging.

I'm not the only person who thinks this is wrong. Mark Cuban is a billionaire investor. Listen to this warning he tweeted to corporate deserters—quote: "If I own stock in your company and you move offshore for tax reasons I'm selling your stock."

Why did he say that? Because when companies move off shore to save on taxes, American workers and companies that stay in America, that believe in America, have to make up the shortfall.

That's not right, it's not fair, and we should take action to stop these corporations from dodging taxes and taking advantage of earning stripping and hopscotch loopholes.

REDUCING CORPORATE TAX RATES NOT A SOLUTION

Many of our Republicans colleagues point to our broken tax code and say if we just reduce the corporate tax rate, it will stop companies from inverting.

They are wrong, plain and simple. Absolutely, our tax code is broken and Congress should reform it. We should close loopholes that allow some to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. We should fix the tax system so it works for hard-working Americans and for companies that want to help America succeed.

But let's not try to fool people into thinking that if we just lower our corporate tax rate the deficit will disappear and all of our economic challenges will be solved. There is no realistic tax reform proposal that would reduce U.S. tax rates to compete with Ireland, which has a tax rate of 12.5 percent, or Switzerland, with its 17 percent corporate tax rate.

This is a race to the bottom the United States can't win and should not be lured into entering.

Instead, we should immediately act to stop companies from inverting and then we should get to work on reforming our tax code. Before a doctor can perform heart surgery, she or he first has to stop the bleeding and that is what we need to do.

There are at least a dozen companies that have announced they are inverting or are considering inversion. We should act now—either through Congressional or executive action—to close the tax loopholes that allow inverters—these corporate deserters—to avoid their fair share of taxes and push

their tax obligations off onto the rest of us. Once we stop the bleeding, we can turn our attention to real tax reform where and a long-term, comprehensive solution.

Senator LEVIN's bill would stop the bleeding by placing a 2-year moratorium on many inversions. Only inversions where no more than 50 percent of the shareholders remain the same after the inversion would be allowed to go forward.

We should also limit the damage caused by inversions by limiting the practice of "earnings stripping"—that's the tax-lawyer's trick where you load all the debt onto the U.S. subsidiary and then write off the debt and the interest payments as a tax deduction.

That is the purpose of a bill I am introducing tomorrow (Wednesday) with Senator SCHUMER. Our proposal would prevent certain corporations from taking excessive interest deductions and sticking U.S. taxpayers with the tab.

Our bill would reduce the cap on interest deductions from 50 percent of adjusted taxable income to 25 percent. It would eliminate the ability of a company to carry forward any excluded interest.

It would also require the IRS to pre-approve related-party transactions for up to 10 years after these companies move their headquarters overseas to ensure greater transparency.

This bill is a targeted approach to a serious problem.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

There's more we need to do. I plan to work with my colleagues to develop a more comprehensive proposal to address both earnings stripping by foreign corporations and the hopscotch rule.

Foreign corporations should not be allowed to load up the U.S. subsidiaries with debt and expect U.S. taxpayers to pay their debts. Inverted corporations should not be rewarded with additional tax breaks by dodging taxes on their profits earned overseas.

These two proposals, along with Senator LEVIN's Stop Corporate Inversion Act, must be part of any comprehensive tax reform proposal.

Before I close, let me mention one other issue.

Some of the very companies that move their headquarters overseas in order to avoid paying their fair share of U.S. taxes then have the nerve to come back to the U.S. with their hand out asking to profit from U.S. government contracts.

Yes, that is right. Over the past 5 years, these corporate deserters have received \$1 billion in federal contracts paid for by U.S. taxpayers, while avoiding U.S. taxes. This has to stop.

That is why I introduced a bill with Senators LEVIN and JACK REED to ban federal contracts for these corporate

deserters. There is a companion bill in the House that is sponsored by Representatives DELAURO, DOGGETT and SANDER LEVIN.

This isn't a new idea. In 2008, Congress prohibited inverted corporations from obtaining any Federal contract under the annual appropriations bills, and for the most part this ban has worked.

But these companies found a loophole. That is why they pay their tax attorneys and advisors the big bucks—to find the little loopholes worth billions of dollars. We need to close this loophole so that corporate deserters aren't able to profit from taxpayer-funded government contracts.

About 50 companies have inverted in the last decade. Another dozen companies—including three headquartered in my State of Illinois—have announced that they are planning or considering inversion. If these companies want to renounce their corporate citizenship, that is their choice. I think it is a bad choice, but it is their choice.

But they should not expect American workers and other American companies to pick up the tab for them while they take advantage of all that America offers. That is not a free market. That is freeloading.

This isn't a partisan issue. Every inversion increases the burden on you and me to make up for the lost tax revenue.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the President to address this important issue.

It was about 2 weeks ago that I was in central Illinois and I was heading to a forum for Senate candidates. It was put on by the farmers in downstate Illinois. I have a lot of friends there. We went off to a farm, and before we arrived I had an extra 45 minutes. I hadn't had lunch. So we were driving around Bloomington-Normal, IL, in McLean County.

I said: Let's stop and get a sandwich somewhere.

My driver said: Well, there is a Burger King.

I said: No, thanks. There is a Steak 'n Shake—which happens to be a franchise we are very proud of in the Midwest and in Illinois.

I consciously decided not to stop at Burger King. Why? Because in the past several weeks Burger King has consciously decided they are leaving the United States. This iconic hamburger chain—second largest in the world—has bought a doughnut chain in Canada, and now they want to move their headquarters to Canada from Miami, FL. Why would they move their corporate headquarters out of the United States of America, where they have most of their restaurants? To cut their taxes. It is called inversion.

If you can pick up and on paper move your corporation to Switzerland, Ire-

land, the island of Jersey, Canada—you name it—there are ways that accountants and lawyers have figured out how to reduce your tax burden. But, of course, as companies decide to do that, they are also making conscious decisions to stop paying U.S. taxes or avoid paying U.S. taxes—at least some part of them.

We have seen a lot of companies announce this. AbbVie, which is a pharmaceutical company in the northern suburbs of Chicago, used to be Abbott Laboratories. AbbVie has decided they want to move overseas.

I took a look at it and thought for a moment: Interesting. A pharmaceutical company wants to move overseas.

How important was the United States to the success of a pharmaceutical company such as AbbVie, to the fact they developed drugs and products that were profitable? How important was this country to that company? I would say critically important. Companies don't usually come up with all the ideas for new drugs. They rely on the National Institutes of Health, the premier biomedical research agency in the world. The annual budget is in the range of \$31 billion, and they do research which they then turn over free of charge to pharmaceutical companies to develop drugs to make money. The National Institutes of Health is supported by American taxpayers.

If a pharmaceutical company develops a new drug they think has the potential to be a blockbuster and sell a lot, there is another step. They have to go to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and the FDA tests it.

If at the end of testing they come up with the conclusion that it is not only safe but effective for what it is being used for, they give it a seal of approval. It is the gold standard of safety of pharmaceuticals. The Food and Drug Administration is supported by the U.S. Government and American taxpayers. Then it is not over. There is at least one last stop. You go to the patent office to make sure you protect your intellectual property, this pharmaceutical formula. The U.S. patent office is supported by the government and U.S. taxpayers.

So here is a pharmaceutical company using research, using testing, and using protections of patents from our government that says: Incidentally, we are leaving. We don't want to pay taxes to this government. We want to reduce our tax burden to this government.

There is something wrong with this picture. Mr. President, 49 or 50 corporations have done it, and more are threatening. Take Burger King. The sale of hamburgers does not involve a great deal of research, but the product that you are cooking at your store has been inspected for safety by the U.S. Federal Government. And the place

where your store is located probably is on a highway or street supported by our government.

But then there is one other element. The people who work in fast food in America are not usually paid a lot of money. Their income is supplemented by government programs such as food stamps. It turns out to the tune of about \$7 billion a year. That is what taxpayers in America pay to subsidize the income of workers in fast food restaurants. So here is Burger King that is using the largess, protection, rule of law in the United States to do their business, counting on our government to step in and supplement the income of the person frying the hamburgers and serving it, and saying: Incidentally, we are leaving; we don't have any obligation to this country to pay taxes; we are going to Canada—on paper.

There is something wrong with this picture. To me, if you are going to desert this country as a corporation, consumers first ought to be aware of it. That is why I drove past Burger King. I do not care to do business with a company that does not think it owes its fair share of taxes. Because if they do not pay their fair share of taxes, other good American companies will be forced to pay more and other individuals will too.

So it is right for us to speak up now about this process of inversion and bringing it to an end. It is not just a matter of escaping taxes. There are accounting techniques. There are countless techniques which these inverted corporations can use to even reduce their corporate taxation more.

Some people say the U.S. corporate income tax is too high. The nominal rate is 35 percent. The effective rate is closer to 25 percent, and the major corporations pay in the range of 10 to 15 percent. When you look at the countries they are going to—Ireland, I believe their corporate income tax rate is 12.5 percent; the Cayman Islands, zero. So we cannot play it to the lowest denominator, play to the bottom line, the bottom corporate income tax. It is a lose-lose situation.

What we have to do is to make sure that the inversion comes with a price. I am joined with Senator SCHUMER. We will put in a bill later this week to talk about this whole question of inversion as it relates to the Tax Code. It is a technical bill Senator SCHUMER has largely written as a member of the Senate Finance Committee and asked me to join him on because of my interest on the subject. It limits the practice of "earnings stripping"—a tax lawyer's trick where you load all the debt on to the U.S. subsidiary and then write off the debt and the interest payments as a tax deduction. The bill which I will introduce with Senator SCHUMER is designed to prevent corporations from taking excessive inter-

est deductions and sticking U.S. taxpayers with the tab. There are other parts of that bill.

I believe the Tax Code should be written in a positive fashion. It is not positive in our Tax Code to set the stage for corporations to move their jobs and headquarters overseas. In fact, we allow under our Tax Code for these corporations to deduct their moving expenses if they are going overseas. What are we thinking? Why would we create an incentive, a deduction, for taking jobs out of America? I think there is a better approach. When the time comes for tax reform—and I hope it is soon—I am going to propose that we have something called the patriot employer tax credit. Here is what it says. It is pretty simple. If your headquarters for your corporation are in the United States; if you have kept your jobs here in the United States; if at least 90 percent of your employees are paid at least \$15 an hour; if you have good health insurance, according to the standards of the Affordable Care Act; if you will contribute at least 5 percent of your employees' earnings toward their retirement; and if you will give a veterans preference, we will give you a tax credit.

We want to reward—we should reward—and incentivize companies that build their future in America, companies that believe in America, companies that pay a decent wage in benefits to the people who work for them.

That is what should be in the Tax Code. Let's start incentivizing job building and job expansion here in the United States. Let's stop these deductions for moving jobs overseas. And let's put an end to this corporate inversion.

These folks have to realize we are not going to stand still for them gaming the Tax Code to avoid their responsibility to the country which, by and large, created the success of most of their corporations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President:

Attention all citizens. To assure the fairness of elections by preventing disproportionate expression of the views of any single powerful group, your Government has decided that the following associations of persons shall be prohibited from speaking or writing in support of any candidate. . . .

This is a statement that I have taken directly from a dissenting opinion issued by Associate Justice Antonin Scalia in a case called *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*—a 1989 ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The concern expressed in that dissenting opinion, the opening line of which I have just read, comes to mind when we review the legislation in front of this body right now, S.J. Res. 19—an attempt, a wholesale effort to repeal

the First Amendment of the United States, to undo its most fundamental protections, protections that protect the right of every American to speak out on issues of public concern, to try to influence the outcome of elections, to try to dictate the course of our entire country.

Now, fortunately, this precedent that Justice Scalia was expressing concerns with was overruled. It was overruled in a case called *Citizens United*, which has itself become the target of S.J. Res. 19. In other words, because the Constitution has now been properly interpreted to protect the right of the American people to join together and form voluntarily associations and to use those associations to try to influence the outcome of elections, my colleagues across the aisle have decided—rather than to follow the Constitution to change it, rather than to follow its dictates to get rid of those portions that would interfere with the power of government—this is something we cannot tolerate, this is something we cannot ignore, this is something that we must do something about, and we have to do it today.

As Justice Scalia explained in his dissent in the *Austin* case, this principle, this type of approach whereby we allow the government to limit the expressive capabilities of the American people, to limit the ability of the American people to form voluntarily associations and speak out on matters of public concern, is utterly contrary not only to our case law but to the text of the First Amendment, and it is inconsistent with the absolutely central proof underlying the First Amendment. The idea here is that government cannot be trusted to assure through censorship—and make no mistake, that is what this is about, censorship—the "fairness of political debate."

So we are here ostensibly to debate the relative merits of S.J. Res. 19, which would up end well over two centuries of understanding that there are certain things the government cannot do, that there are certain things that the government can never be trusted to, that the government cannot censor our speech, particularly our political speech. We are here to debate that, and yet among those who have introduced this legislation, among those who have sponsored this legislation, we have heard, if I am not mistaken, from only three today. We have heard only three speeches today.

This is a profound and disturbing message to the American people. We are trying to upend the cornerstone of American republican democracy, and yet we have had two speeches in support of it. This is something that ought to alarm us terribly.

I was pleased to hear moments ago from my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois. I respect the senior Senator from Illinois. He

and I have worked together on a lot of pieces of legislation. We have worked together most recently on the Smarter Sentencing Act, which I think is an important bipartisan attempt to reform our Federal criminal sentencing code, which is in serious need of being reformed.

I also respect the senior Senator from Illinois for some statements he made a few years ago when another amendment had been proposed. I at least respect the approach that he took in urging caution before undertaking any effort to undo, to weaken, to undermine the Bill of Rights. Here is a statement that he made on June 26, 2006: "The Bill of Rights has served this Nation since 1791, and with one swift blow of this ax, we are going to chop into the first amendment." He was concerned about that.

He was concerned also when on the same day he made a similar comment, instructive here, I think, when he noted: "It is a matter which we will likely debate the rest of this week"—the week in which he was speaking in 2006—meaning this is an urgent matter, it is a matter of great concern to the American people when we are talking about changing the First Amendment or any component of the Bill of Rights. He continued:

The reason we are going to spend this much time on it is because this one-page document represents a historic change in America. If this amendment were to be ratified, it would mark the first time in our nation's history that we would amend the Bill of Rights [to the United States Constitution].

On the same day he also said:

It takes a great deal of audacity for anyone to step up and suggest to change the Constitution. . . . I think we should show a little humility around here when it comes to changing the Constitution. So many of my colleagues are anxious to take a roller to a Rembrandt.

I could not agree more, especially when we are talking about not just freedom of speech but core political speech, which is the subject of S.J. Res. 19. Make no mistake, the fundamental purpose, the most important objective underlying the free speech clause and the free press clause was to protect the right of the people to engage in political speech. And make no mistake, the purpose of this is to enhance Congress's power to restrict political speech. In fact, its entire purpose focuses on efforts to spend money to influence elections—the core of political speech.

Let's go back for a minute to the dissenting opinion issued by Justice Scalia in the Austin case I referenced a few minutes ago. He explained in that dissenting opinion that there are some things that we understandably do not want government to do. There are a lot of things we do in the Constitution that are all about outlining what the powers of government are. We explain what power Congress has, what power

the President has. We explain further that powers not delegated to Congress are reserved to the States or the people.

Then we also identify in the Bill of Rights that there are certain areas that are just out of bounds for government, areas where we do not want government to tread. This is one of those areas. As Justice Scalia explained:

The premise of our Bill of Rights . . . is that there are some things—even some seemingly desirable things—that government cannot be trusted to do. The very first of these is establishing the restrictions upon speech that will assure "fair" political debate. The incumbent politician who says he welcomes full and fair debate is no more to be believed than the entrenched monopolist who says he welcomes full and fair competition.

This is what we face here. This is the risk we face here. We are assured by the proponents of this legislation—that is, both of them, both of those who have shown up so far to speak in support of this—that this will still allow debate to occur. Yet how are we to believe this when what they are proposing is to expand Congress's power to limit that right to participate in an open, public debate, to undertake efforts to influence the outcome of elections and thus dictate the course of an entire Nation.

Justice Scalia concluded with the thought that, as he put it:

The premise of our system is that there is no such thing as too much speech—that the people are not foolish, but intelligent, and will separate the wheat from the chaff.

He refutes the notion:

. . . that a healthy democratic system can survive the legislative power to prescribe how much political speech is too much, who may speak, and who may not.

When we try to weaken this understanding, we are playing with fire. Whenever Congress attempts to expand its power—for that matter, whenever any government attempts to expand its power—it does so inevitably at the expense of individual liberty.

Here, where it tries to expand its influence over political debate, where it purports to have the ability to expand its power over core political speech, it does so—inevitably, inescapably, unavoidably—at the expense of the free expressive rights of a free people.

This is one of the main core principles upon which our country was founded. We became a nation against a backdrop in which we found ourselves subject to a large, distant, powerful national government, one headed by a king and a parliament. Our former London-based national government recognized no boundaries around its authority. It had for centuries interfered with the right of the people to express their grievances. It had for centuries supported criminal actions against persons who engaged in what they described under their laws as seditious libel. In other words, if you criticized the government—if you criticized

a government official—you could be, and presumably would be, criminally prosecuted for doing so. The truth was not a defense. In fact, truth made it even worse from the viewpoint of the government, because it was more difficult to refute. So people were routinely prosecuted for criticizing the government.

We cannot—we must not—take even one step in the direction of expanding government's authority when it comes to speech that is at the core of our political system.

Look, our political system isn't perfect. Our political system isn't something that everybody necessarily is inclined to enjoy. But our political system does keep us free, and it keeps us free only to the extent that individuals are allowed to speak their mind without fear of retribution from the government, only to the extent that individuals, rich and poor alike, are able to say what they want and join together and form voluntary associations for the purpose of influencing the outcome of elections so they can have some chance at standing up to a big government that affects so many of their rights, that affects so much of how they are going to provide for the needs of their families and their communities.

When the people are intimidated by a government that recognizes no boundaries around its authority, everyone suffers. This is an issue that is neither Republican nor Democratic, it is neither liberal nor conservative. It is simply American.

It is time for the American people to stop simply expecting Congress to continue to expand its power at the expense of their individual liberty. It is time for the American people to stop simply expecting their rights have to bow to the interests of an all-powerful incumbency in Washington, DC. It is time for the American people to expect more. It is time for the American people to expect freedom.

We expect freedom, and we will defend freedom when we defeat Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

ISIL

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, 1 month ago the President initiated an air campaign against ISIL in Iraq. ISIL is a dangerous terrorist organization committing atrocities against thousands of people, including American hostages, and a strong American response, to include military action, is certainly warranted.

In the first month of this air campaign, two explanations for the mission were given by the President. We began with a mission for humanitarian purpose and also the need to protect American embassy personnel. Since

that time, the White House has stated that the air strikes may go on for some open-ended period of time. Despite a pledge not to place American boots on the ground, more American military personnel have been deployed to Iraq as advisers and are on the ground there now.

In order to clarify what is at stake and set out a path forward, many of my colleagues and I have called for the President to bring before Congress and the Nation a clear plan for defeating ISIL. I am gratified that the President will address the Nation on this topic tomorrow night.

I am supportive generally of the limited and prudent steps taken thus far, while Congress was in recess, to slow ISIL's momentum. I expect to hear a comprehensive strategy tomorrow.

I support the strong U.S. diplomatic push that has forced Iraqi government formation, and I am pleased with Iraqi political developments to form a unity government. Now Iraqi leaders must govern inclusively.

I am especially heartened by reports that the administration has worked to find a number of nations willing to partner with America to deal with the ISIL threat, including nations in the region. The United States cannot be a police force for a region unwilling to police itself. The United States should not bear the sole burden of defeating a terrorist organization that poses a more imminent threat to many other nations than the threat it does to America.

I look forward to the President's address, and I am confident that a well-thought-out plan against ISIL will compel the support of the Nation and of Congress.

We are a nation of laws but also of values. I rise today particularly to urge the President to not just inform us of what he plans to do but to follow the Constitution and to seek congressional approval to defeat ISIL. I do so for two reasons.

First, I don't believe the President has the authority to go on the offense and wage an open-ended war on ISIL without congressional approval; and, second, in making the momentous decision to authorize military action, we owe it to our troops who risk their lives to do our collective jobs and reach a consensus supporting the military mission they are ordered to complete.

Let me first deal with the legal issue. The Constitution is clear. It is the job of Congress, not the President, to declare war. Some parts of the Constitution frankly are vague and open to interpretation: What is due process? What is cruel and unusual punishment? Some parts of the Constitution are clear and specific: You have to be 35 years old to be President of the United States. The power to declare war is a clear and specific power. It is an enumerated power of Congress in article I.

The clear wording of the Constitution is additionally illuminated by writings of the principal drafter, the Virginian James Madison. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson after the Constitution was ratified, Madison explained the war powers clause in article I:

Our Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates—that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the Legislature.

So a President must seek congressional approval for significant military action. As Commander in Chief, a President can always take steps to defend America from imminent threats. The Framers understood this. But even in those instances, they intended that the President return to Congress to seek ratification of such actions.

If we take the Constitution seriously, as we pledge to do when we take our oaths of office, we must follow the command that the President must come to Congress to initiate major military action.

During a congressional recess, President Obama began a new military action against ISIL. He has indicated that the military action may continue for an extended period of time. He has stated that the action is evolving from a narrow effort to protect Americans from imminent threat to a campaign to go on offense in order to degrade the ability of ISIL to cause harm. This is precisely the kind of situation that calls for congressional action and approval.

Some have asserted that the administration need not seek congressional approval for an extended campaign of air strikes. Humbly and respectfully, I deeply disagree with that assertion. The President's article II power allows him to defend America from imminent threat, but it does not allow him the ability to wage an offensive war without Congress. The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, crafted by President Bush and Congress in the days after the 9/11 attacks, limits the President's power to actions against the perpetrators of those attacks. ISIL was not a 9/11 perpetrator. It didn't form until 2003.

President Bush sought a broader AUMF at that time to allow action against terrorist groups posing a threat to the United States. Had Congress granted such a power, the war against ISIL would have been covered by that AUMF. But Congress explicitly rejected giving the President power to wage preemptive war against unnamed terrorist organizations without additional congressional approval. Any attempt to justify action against ISIL by reference to the 2001 AUMF would fly directly in the face of the clear congressional action rejecting the preemptive war doctrine.

Congress passed a second AUMF in 2002 to allow military action to topple the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. That task was completed long ago. American troops left Iraq in 2011, and the administration has testified recently before the Senate that the Iraq AUMF is now obsolete and should be repealed. It provides no support for military action against ISIL. There is no treaty of collective defense ratified by Congress that would justify the President commencing military action against ISIL. The Iraqi Government has asked for our help, which solves international law sovereignty questions, but that request does not create its own domestic legal justification.

Finally, the 1973 War Powers Resolution creates a set of timing rules for Presidential action and congressional response in matters of war. The resolution has been widely viewed as unconstitutional for a variety of reasons. But even accepting its validity—and the President, like most, almost certainly does not accept its 60-day limitation on his article II powers—it does not change the basic constitutional framework vesting the declaration of war in the legislative branch.

I believe a reluctance to engage Congress on this mission against ISIL is less due to any legal analysis supporting broad executive power than to a general attitude, held by all Presidents, that coming to Congress on a question such as this is too cumbersome and unpredictable. That attitude is shared on the Hill by some who view questions of military action, especially in a difficult circumstance such as this, as politically explosive and best avoided, if at all possible.

I urge the President and my colleagues to resist the understandable temptation to cut corners on this process. There is no more important business done in the Halls of Congress than weighing whether to take military action and send servicemembers into harm's way. If we have learned nothing else in the last 13 years, we should have certainly learned that. Coming to Congress is challenging, but the Framers designed it to be so, and we all pledged to serve in a government known for particular checks and balances between the branches of government.

Remember in the days after 9/11, whose anniversary we commemorate this week, the President brought to Congress a request for military action. The ruins of the Pentagon and the World Trade Center were still smoking and the search for the lost was still ongoing. Certainly the American public would have supported the President's strong and immediate Executive action in that circumstance, but President Bush knew that the Nation would be stronger if he came to Congress to seek authority. Similarly President Bush came to Congress prior to initiating

military action in Iraq. So many painful lessons were learned in the aftermath of that authorization, but it is important to remember that it was not a unilateral Executive decision but Congress was included and voted to support the mission.

I believe it would be a grievous mistake after 13 years of war to evolve toward a new strategy of taking prolonged military action without bothering to seek congressional approval, and I particularly worry about the precedent it would create for future Presidents to assert that they have the unilateral right to engage in long-term military action without the full participation of the people's legislative branch. As President Obama said last year when announcing that he would come to Congress to seek military authorization to combat the use of chemical weapons in Syria:

This is not about who occupies the office at any given time, it is about who we are as a country. I believe the people's representatives must be invested in what America does abroad . . .

Mr. President, I focus my remarks on the legal reasons for the President to engage Congress on any plan to defeat ISIL.

Let me conclude by offering an additional reason—even a more important reason—about why the President and Congress should work together to craft a suitable mission for this important effort. When we engage in military action, even only an air campaign, we ask our troops to risk their lives and their health—physical and mental. Of course we pray for their complete safety and success, but let's be realistic enough to acknowledge that some may die or be injured or be captured or see these things happen to their comrades in arms. Even those who come home physically safe may see or do things in war that will affect them for the rest of their lives. The long lines of people waiting for VA appointments today or hoping to have their VA disability benefit claims adjudicated are proof of this.

In short, during a time of war we ask our troops to give their best, even to the point of sacrificing their own lives. When compared against that, how much of a sacrifice is it for a President to engage in a possibly contentious debate with Congress about whether military action is a good idea? How much of a sacrifice is it for a Member of Congress to debate and vote about whether military action is a good idea? While Congressional Members face the political costs of debate on military action, our servicemembers bear the human cost of those decisions. If we choose to avoid debate, avoid accountability, avoid a hard decision, how can we demand that our military willingly sacrifice their very lives?

So I await the President's address on the real and significant threat posed by

ISIL with a firm willingness to offer support to a well-crafted military mission. I believe the American public and this Congress will support such a mission. It is my deepest hope that we have the opportunity to debate and vote on the mission in the halls of Congress as our Framers intended and as our troops deserve.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am glad I had the opportunity to be on the floor today to hear the remarks of the Senator from Virginia. All of us look forward to the President's remarks tomorrow night. I am going to reserve my comments because of the seriousness of the subject and out of respect for the Office of the President until after the President addresses the Nation. But I would say this. Having heard the Senator from Virginia, I hope the President and his advisers listened carefully to what the Senator from Virginia said. None of us want to see another military adventure in the Middle East. As in Virginia and West Virginia and Tennessee, we have had thousands—tens of thousands of Tennesseans who have been in Iraq and Afghanistan three, four, five, or six times on tours of duty. But this ISIS threat is a different kind of threat to civilization, and very well could be a threat to the United States. It requires a response. It requires the President's leadership. He is the Commander in Chief, and it is his job to lay out for us a firm and clear strategy for, in the words of his administration, how we will defeat and destroy this new movement.

In thinking about whether to come to the Congress, I think it is useful for the President to think back to the first President Bush and the decision he had to make. I was in his cabinet. I came just about that time and the idea of a ground war in the Middle East was a shocking thought. We had not had something like that in this country for a while, and the President was reluctant at first to come to the Congress to seek approval for that, but he did it. And he said after he had done it that in retrospect he was glad he did. What did he gain?

Even though it was a contentious debate and the margin of the vote wasn't large, it gave a clear signal to the world that we were united as a country against the threat at that time. It gave a clear signal to the country that regardless of party we were united with the President of the United States on what he saw as an urgent mission for our country. As a result of that, he had an enormously successful operation. It was well planned, funded by other countries, primarily, and had a limited objective. They got to the gates of Baghdad, the objective was realized, and we came home. I think the fact

that the President sought the advice of Congress was a part of that.

In this case I think this President would find in this body careful listeners to what he has to say, a willingness on both sides of the aisle to consider his strategy, and a willingness to support a carefully crafted plan to meet his objectives. This is not Libya, this is not Grenada, and this is not Panama. This is at least 2 or 3 years. Any time our country is expected to have a military action especially in the Middle East again, it needs to have the full support of the American people, and that starts here.

So I will wait until Wednesday night to hear what the President has to say, but the Senator from Virginia has given some very careful and reasonable advice, and I hope the President and his advisers will consider that very carefully.

I am here today to speak on another subject. I am here today because Senate Democrats want to amend the Bill of Rights—at least 48 of them do. Forty-eight of them want to say: Let's amend the United States Constitution and the free exercise clause of the First Amendment. Let's amend the guarantee of free speech. That is an extraordinary development.

If passed, Senate Joint Resolution 19, which is the subject on the floor today, would give Congress and State governments the power to decide which Americans can speak in elections, what they can say, when they can say it, and how they say it. This measure would gut the free speech provisions of the First Amendment. It is a shocking proposal—a shocking proposal made even more so by the fact that it is supported by 48 Democratic Senators and President Obama. I wonder if any of them have taken the time to see the writing on the wall of the Newseum down the street. In big bold letters carved into the concrete it says: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech . . ." That is in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Our Founders passed the Constitution, and they said, well, we forgot to do the Bill of Rights. So they came back with the Bill of Rights, and this is in the First Amendment. Free speech is one of the defining characteristics of liberal democracies worldwide. No country has embraced free speech and protected it as much as has the United States of America. Other countries look to us as a model for this remarkable freedom. So why would anyone attempt to amend the Constitution, amend the Bill of Rights, and change the free speech clause in the First Amendment?

When we look at the Democratic leadership in the Senate we see a pattern of using a gag rule to silence Senators who were sent here on behalf of the people who elected them to represent their views. The majority leader

has prevented Tennesseans, for example, from having their say through their Senators, their elected officials, for years now, by using the gag rule in this body to keep amendments from being considered and voted on. Senators have listened to their constituents and proposed amendments on ObamaCare, taxes, the National Labor Relations Board, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, etc., and they are told by the Democratic leadership that they won't get votes. I have said on this floor many times, it is like being invited to join the Grand Ole Opry and not being allowed to sing.

But the consequences are much more serious than that. It is not just my amendment or my colleague Senator CORKER's amendment, and it is not just Tennesseans' amendments. It is the voters of every State who sent us here to have a say on their behalf. Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming has counted that since July of 2013, last year, only 14 Republican amendments and 9 Democratic amendments have received votes. That is an astounding number. There are 100 Senators here representing more than 300 million Americans. This is said to be the world's greatest deliberative body. The new book "The American Senate" describes this body, saying: "This is the one authentic touch of genius in the American political system." What makes it "the one authentic touch of genius in the American political system" then? It is that you take a difficult message or a difficult bill, you put it on the floor, and you talk about it and you talk about it, and you debate it, and you amend it, until finally you say that is enough and 60 of us say it is time to cut off debate. Let's vote and have a result.

Yet in a year's time there have only been 23 amendments to legislation that have received votes. Some Members of this body who are running for re-election and have never had a vote on any amendment they offered on the Senate floor. Someone might well ask, well, what have you been doing?

Then this summer the Democrats extended the gag rule from the Senate floor to the Senate committee rooms. The bills of some members of the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, were indefinitely postponed because the Senate leadership wanted to avoid difficult votes on those amendments—no vote on clean water, no vote on energy, no vote because it was a difficult vote.

Now in this provision Democrats and the President are trying to extend the gag rule to the free speech clause of the First Amendment. What this proposal would do is give Congress the power to silence the groups or organizations that threaten their reelection. For example, the government could tell a gun owner in Johnson City, TN, that he or she cannot spend money to advocate in

defense of Second Amendment rights if that speech falls too close to an election and threatens to influence the campaign of incumbents. Or similarly, Congress might tell Tennessee Right to Life: You cannot advertise to protect the rights of the unborn. Congress could decide that such speech should be restricted or prohibited because incumbents fear it is really an endorsement of a candidate for political office.

Also incumbents could seek to stop new political movements like the tea party by placing unachievable conditions on their ability to raise and spend funds on behalf of candidates they support. They can do this under the guise of protecting donors by saying you can't receive donations unless you've been successful in a previous election or you have a real chance of being successful in the future. The decision of whether a new political movement is politically viable would of course be made by their political competitors. Or Congress might criminalize expenditures by organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who might oppose a plan by Senate Democrats to increase the minimum wage on the grounds that the funds spent by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are the equivalent of attack ads against Democratic candidates in tight reelection races.

Who might be exempt from this gag rule on free speech? Well, freedom of the press—that is mentioned in the amendment. And who would freedom of the press be? Who might this be? Well, it would be billionaires who could buy television stations, billionaires who could buy a newspaper and buy any form of this new media that we see around us. So ordinary Americans could have their ability to advocate their views restricted, but billionaires could buy TV stations or buy a newspaper or buy any form of media and say whatever they think. Those are the people exempt from the gag rule proposed by the Democrats.

What about millionaire candidates? It has been considered by the Supreme Court and by all who looked at it that while Congress might put rules on raising from others that it could never place on spending your own money. So we have candidates running for President, running for the Senate, who spend their own money. So we might not be limiting the millionaire candidates to the Senate and their right to free speech. We might not be limiting the billionaire owners of television stations and newspapers and their right to free speech, but ordinary Americans would have a gag rule. So the gag rule that began on the Senate floor and went to the Senate hearing rooms would now be applied by Congress to the ordinary Americans across this country. The Founders would never have imagined that. They passed the First Amendment to protect against

this very concern—that government censors would tell ordinary Americans what they can and cannot say.

President Harry Truman, who liked to exercise a lot of free speech himself, warned about this in a message to Congress on August 8, 1950. He said:

Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures until it becomes a source of terror to all of its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear.

That is President Harry Truman.

That is not a description of this country. That is not a description of America. That is a description of our enemies.

Look through our history. How would this law apply in our history? What about Harriet Beecher Stowe before the Civil War, writing "Uncle Tom's Cabin?" Maybe she would want to buy an ad in the local newspaper saying: Mr. Lincoln is a nice man. Read my book. The State might not like that. They might like holding slaves. They might not like what she says and what she wants to advertise.

What about Thomas Payne at the beginning of our country's history writing "Common Sense"? Would a law such as this apply to his tract—the 1 he published or if he published 10 or if he published 20?

Taken to its logical conclusion, this proposal could be used by a Congress or a State to ban books, to ban writings. It is shocking that we are standing here today and debating such a proposal. It is not surprising that so few from the other side of the aisle are streaming through the door and standing on the floor—as the Senator from Utah mentioned—to defend this proposal.

Every American ought to be concerned about this proposal to amend the Bill of Rights and the free speech clause in the First Amendment. They should be deeply concerned that the Senate majority leader and his gag rule have effectively silenced their elected representatives here in the Senate, and now he wants to silence them.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today, as I have for many years, to urge my colleagues to fix our Nation's broken campaign finance system. I do so after much deliberation and consideration of a series of Supreme Court decisions and the explosion of undisclosed and potentially unlimited campaign spending that has Americans of all political backgrounds concerned. Indeed, I remember when this was an issue that brought Republicans and Democrats together, and I was proud to support Senator MCCAIN's efforts at campaign finance reform.

Unfortunately, the recent Supreme Court decisions, such as *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, have given more than the mere appearance that money—and corporate money at that—has a louder voice than everyday Americans. Indeed, Justice Breyer wrote in his *McCutcheon* dissent that “taken together with *Citizens United* . . . [McCutcheon] eviscerates our Nation’s campaign finance laws, leaving a remnant incapable of dealing with the grave problems of democratic legitimacy that those laws were intended to resolve.” In my view, these misguided decisions by a slim majority of the Court have allowed spending on political campaigns to get out of control.

There is a pervasive and corrosive view of politics felt by too many in this country that their ability to express their concerns and wishes to their elected officials is being crowded out by narrow interests and campaign funds. Rhode Islanders don’t want their voices drowned out by unlimited money with little or no transparency or no disclosure on where that money comes from.

In order to have a broad-based democratic system, we need reasonable campaign finance laws which ensure that those with large financial resources cannot drown out the voice of everyday Americans. That is what this constitutional amendment we are seeking to debate is all about.

The system is broken, and as much as individual candidates can pledge to provide more disclosure or take other steps to increase transparency, that is not the solution to fixing the problem. We need to give Congress and the States the ability to set reasonable rules for all candidates.

The constitutional amendment we are considering today does three straightforward things:

First, in order to advance democratic self-governance and political equality, it gives Congress and the States the power to regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

Second, it grants Congress and States the power to enforce the amendment and to distinguish between people and corporations or other artificial entities.

Third, it ensures that nothing in the amendment could be used to abridge the freedom of the press.

This amendment doesn’t create any new and specific campaign finance rules; rather, it gives Congress and the States the power to pass legislation and to distinguish between real people and legally created artificial entities, such as corporations. Whatever legislation that would be enacted pursuant to this constitutional amendment would be the result of a serious and lengthy debate in Congress and in the States. I welcome that debate, and I believe

most Americans want that debate as well. It would begin a process that is so necessary to rebuild a sense of trust in our government and our electoral system.

I urge my colleagues to support this constitutional amendment to fix our broken campaign finance system by giving Congress and the States the power to reasonably regulate political spending, thereby reducing the influence of wealthy special interests. It is these same wealthy special interests that obfuscate the facts of a debate and block efforts that could give our country and our economy a shot in the arm.

Indeed, I hope we can also find bipartisan support to give more Americans the ability to have a fair shot at success. For example, we need to make college more affordable and ease the burden of student debt on millions of Americans, invest in our infrastructure, raise the minimum wage, expand job training, close the pay gap for women, boost jobs through manufacturing—and that is just for starters.

We need to pass these kinds of bills and send them to the House and urge them to act. The Senate was able to come together and pass a bill to provide relief to the long-term unemployed earlier this year, but with 9.6 million Americans still out of a job and looking for work—3 million of whom have been doing so for more than 6 months—House Republicans have refused to follow suit. It is imperative that we keep working to strengthen our economy, create jobs, and provide a fair shot for everyone.

I believe fixing the campaign finance system through this constitutional amendment will provide a foundation so we can have reasonable debate that is responsive to the interests of the American people and not responsive to the interests of a narrow class of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to take up this bill, pass it, and get on with the business of giving everyone a fair chance at success.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, at a time of extraordinary challenges across the globe and here at home, we are not gathered in the Senate to discuss how to confront the threat of ISIS. We are not gathered in the Senate to discuss how to prevent Putin’s Russia from invading its neighbors. We are not gathered in the Senate today to discuss how to solve the humanitarian crisis at the border with some 90,000 unaccompanied

children coming into the country this year. We are not gathered in the Senate today to discuss how to bring back jobs and economic growth, or how to correct the fact that the Obama economy has produced the lowest labor force participation since 1978—92 million Americans not working today. And we are not gathered in the Senate to discuss how to stop the disaster that has been ObamaCare, which has caused millions of Americans to lose their jobs, to be forced into part-time work, to lose their health insurance, to lose their doctors, and to see their premiums skyrocket. No.

Instead, we are gathered today in the Senate for a very different topic. The majority leader and the Democratic majority in this Senate have determined that the most important priority this Senate has, which we are spending the entire week addressing, is the proposal of 49 Democrats to repeal the free speech provisions of the First Amendment. That is not hyperbole. Typically, when Americans hear that Members of the Senate are proposing repealing the free speech protections of the First Amendment, the usual reaction is a gasp of disbelief. Could we really have entered a world so extreme that our common ground no longer even includes the First Amendment of the Constitution?

The First Amendment protects our most foundational rights. Yet, under the amendment we are debating today that 49 Democrats have signed their name to, the First Amendment would, in effect, have crossed out freedom of speech. Why? Because 49 Democrats have cosponsored a constitutional amendment that is currently on the floor of the Senate, being voted on this week, that would give Congress blanket authority to regulate political speech.

From the dawn of our Republic we have respected the rights of citizens to express their views. It is the right upon which every other civil liberty is predicated. But in the Democratic Senate of 2014, citizens’ free speech rights are tools for partisan warfare.

This proposal before the Senate is, bar none, the most radical proposal that has been considered by the Senate in the time I have served. If this proposal were to pass, its effects would be breathtaking. It would be the most massive intrusion on civil liberties and expansion of Federal Government power in modern times.

Let’s talk about how and why that is the case. The text of the amendment that is currently in the Bill of Rights says, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech. So right now we operate under a First Amendment that says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech—not some laws; not laws that

some politicians think would help them politically; but no law abridging the freedom of speech is what our First Amendment says.

What would the new First Amendment say? Well, according to our Democratic friends, the new First Amendment would have two sections. The first section says, Congress and States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections. Now, "reasonable." Who could oppose reasonable limits? Isn't that the essence of reasonableness? Perhaps I have forgotten my spectacles, but I don't see in the current First Amendment, Congress can make reasonable restrictions on the freedom of speech. It doesn't say that. It says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

What is the difference? The First Amendment is not about reasonable speech. The First Amendment was enacted to protect unreasonable speech. I, for one, certainly don't want our speech limited to speech that elected politicians in Washington think is reasonable.

There was a time this body thought the Alien and Sedition Acts prohibiting criticizing the government were reasonable. There is a reason the Constitution doesn't say let's trust politicians to determine what speech is reasonable and what isn't.

I would note the Supreme Court has long made clear the First Amendment is all about unreasonable speech. For example, when the Nazis wanted to march on Skokie, IL—Nazi speeches, the paradigm example of unreasonable speech; it is hateful, bigoted, ignorant speech—the Supreme Court said the Nazis have a constitutional right to march down the street in Skokie, IL, with their hateful, bigoted, ignorant speech. Now every one of us then has a moral obligation to condemn it as hateful and bigoted and ignorant. But the First Amendment is all about saying government doesn't get to decide what you say is reasonable and what you say is not.

The First Amendment is all about saying we will not censor American citizens. What is this amendment about? Saying the Federal Government now has the power to censor each and every American who dares speak about politics. So if a person has a political view at home, they better hope politicians in Washington think that view is reasonable. I will tell my colleagues that very little of what we do in this town is reasonable and the idea that elected politicians would seek to arrogate power to themselves to censor the citizens is anathema to who we are as a country.

This bill, if adopted, raises three simple questions—questions I raised at three hearings in the Judiciary Committee and in the Constitution sub-

committee, and I am the ranking member on the Constitution subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. We have had extensive debates on this amendment. I wish to pose three simple questions that I would ask every Democrat who has put his name to this—and I notice, sadly, my friend, the Presiding Officer, is one of them, but he didn't serve on the committee. So I would ask him to consider these questions, and I would hope every Democrat who has put his name to this, upon thinking about it, will have second thoughts and pull his name off.

So here are three questions every one of us should ask. No. 1, should Congress have the constitutional authority to ban movies?

No. 2, should Congress have the constitutional authority to ban books?

And No. 3, should Congress have the constitutional authority to ban the NAACP from speaking about politics?

My answer to these three questions is unequivocally, unquestionably no. Yet every single Democrat who has put his name on this amendment has no choice but to answer yes to all three of these questions.

I posed these questions in the Constitution subcommittee. When I posed them to the committee, the chairman of the committee, Senator DURBIN, gaveled the hearing shut because he could not answer those questions. But at the full Judiciary Committee hearing, I was told by my Democratic friends: This is hyperbole. This is exaggeration. We don't intend to ban movies or books or the NAACP. My response in those hearings was that this is the Senate. Forty-nine Senators are proposing an amendment to the Bill of Rights. The inchoate intentions that may be buried in the hearts of each and every Senator are utterly irrelevant to the question. The question is, What is the language that would be inserted into the Bill of Rights of our Constitution?

Let's look to the language. Section 2 of this amendment says Congress and the States shall have the power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence elections.

That is very specific language that would now become part of our Bill of Rights. It is breathtaking. It is staggering in its scope.

I wish to take these one at a time because the Democrats, I am sure—all 49 Democrats—say, We don't intend to ban movies, books, or ban the NAACP. Well, let's look to the language they put their names to.

No. 1, let's start with movies. We have all heard a lot about the Citizens United case. In fact, we remember President Obama during the State of

the Union hectoring the Supreme Court of the United States for the Citizens United case.

Relatively few people know the facts that underlie the Citizens United case. The facts in those circumstances are that a nonprofit corporation made a movie critical of Hillary Clinton, and for making a movie critical of Hillary Clinton the Obama administration tried to impose massive fines on them. Citizens United, which President Obama and the Senate Democrats decry as the most pernicious thing in modern times, it seems, was all about the government trying to fine a movie maker for daring to make a movie about Hillary Clinton.

Listen, let me be very clear. There are movie makers—Michael Moore's movies I think are complete nonsense. To quote the bard, they are full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Michael Moore has a right to keep making those movies over and over again and spewing his nonsense as long as he likes. The First Amendment protects his right to be wrong.

And as a simple legal matter, would this amendment give Congress the constitutional authority to ban movies?

Paramount Pictures is a corporation. Under the text of the amendment, what could Congress do to a corporation? It can prohibit—and that is the language in the amendment—it can prohibit the corporation from spending money to influence elections. So if a movie talks about politics, Congress can make it a criminal offense. Go down to Hollywood, take the producers, the directors, the actors and everyone involved in the movie and put them in handcuffs. That is breathtaking.

Now, again, the Democratic Senators say, We don't intend to do that. Then why did they submit a constitutional amendment to the Bill of Rights that says Congress can prohibit Paramount Pictures from speaking about politics? That means Congress can ban movies.

How about the second question: Should Congress be able to ban books? That is an extreme question by anyone's measure. Surely, nobody in Washington is talking about banning books. Well, if we assumed that, our assumption would be wrong. Indeed, during the oral argument in Citizens United, the Supreme Court asked the Obama administration: Your position is that under the Constitution, the sale for the book itself could be prohibited. The answer from the Obama administration: Yes, if the book contained the functional equivalent of express advocacy. The Obama administration went in front of the Supreme Court and argued: We have the power to ban books.

This is in the record. This is in the official transcript. People can go and listen to this argument, listen to the Obama administration say they believe the Federal Government has the ability to ban books from your house. That is breathtaking.

I recognize in today's partisan society there are some people who may be watching these remarks who aren't inclined to believe me. They might say: Listen, you are a Republican. You are a conservative. And coming from the spot in the political aisle that I do, I don't tend to trust Republicans or conservatives.

I understand that. I would tell you that if you don't believe me, perhaps you would believe that famed right-wing organization, the ACLU. The ACLU said this amendment, to which 49 Democrats have signed their names—what would it do? It would “fundamentally ‘break’ the Constitution and endanger civil rights and civil liberties for generations.” I said a few minutes ago that this was the most radical legislation that has been put before this body. Why is that? Because it is legislation the ACLU says would “fundamentally ‘break’ the Constitution.” Breaking the Constitution is no minor matter, and endangering civil rights and civil liberties for generations ought to concern every Member of this body.

One still might say: Surely banning books is hyperbole.

Well, if you don't believe me, the ACLU in writing told the Senate this amendment—to which 49 Democrats have put their names—would give Congress the power to ban Hillary Clinton's new book, “Hard Choices.” I want that to sink in for a moment. Forty-nine Democrats have just put their names to a constitutional amendment, and the ACLU rightly tells us that the express language of the amendment gives the government the power to ban Hillary Clinton's new book, “Hard Choices.”

I have that letter from the ACLU. I also have a subsequent letter from the ACLU doing something which they haven't done before and which I don't know they will do again—thanking me and thanking all of us who have been fighting against this amendment for standing up for civil liberties. It is truly a shame the Democratic Party is not among them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD both of the letters from the ACLU I referred to earlier.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE,
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2014.

Re ACLU Opposes the Udall Amendment.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: The American Civil Liberties Union strongly opposes S.J. Res. 19, a proposed constitutional amendment, sponsored

by Sen. Tom Udall (D-NM), that would severely limit the First Amendment, lead directly to government censorship of political speech and result in a host of unintended consequences that would undermine the goals the amendment has been introduced to advance—namely encouraging vigorous political dissent and providing voice to the voiceless, which we, of course, support.

As we have said in the past, this and similar constitutional amendments would “fundamentally break” the Constitution and endanger civil rights and civil liberties for generations.”

Were it to pass, the amendment would be the first time, save for the failed policies of Prohibition, that the Constitution has ever been amended to limit rights and freedoms. Congress has had the wisdom to reject other rights-limiting amendments in the past, including the Federal Marriage Amendment, the School Prayer Amendment, the Victims' Rights Amendment and, of course, the Flag Desecration Amendment, which many of the sponsors of this resolution opposed. It should likewise reject the Udall amendment.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE AMENDMENT

While short, the Udall amendment is deceptively complex and presents several concerns.

Section 1 provides that “[t]o advance the fundamental principle of political equality for all, and to protect the integrity of the legislative and electoral processes, Congress shall have power to regulate the raising and spending of money and in-kind equivalents with respect to Federal elections.”

Specifically, Subsection (1)(1) would allow limits on “contributions to candidates for nomination for election to, or for election to, Federal office.” Subsection (1)(2) would allow limits on “the amount of funds that may be spent by, in support of, or in opposition to such candidates.” Section 2 provides the same authorities to each state with respect to state elections.

Section 3 says that “[n]othing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress the power to abridge the freedom of the press.” And, Section 4 grants express authority to the states and Congress to implement these limits through “appropriate legislation.”

2. THE AMENDMENT IS UNNECESSARY AND WOULD BE CORROSIVE TO VIGOROUS POLITICAL DEBATE ABOUT THE ISSUES OF THE DAY

Congress and the states already have the authority to limit contributions to candidates, including limits on expenditures like advertisements in support of a campaign or candidate paid for by an outside group and coordinated with that campaign or candidate. They have had this authority since the landmark *Buckley v. Valeo* Supreme Court case in the 1970s, which remains good law and only placed First Amendment limits on the ability of the government to control independent expenditures (that is, uncoordinated express advocacy for or against a candidate).

Citizens United's holding, that corporations (including non-profit advocacy groups like the ACLU and thousands of others) and labor organizations may spend general treasury funds on independent expenditures, is entirely consistent with the reasoning of *Buckley*.

Subsections (1)(1) and (2)(1) are therefore both unnecessary and redundant of existing law, which, notably, already also places some limits on independent expenditures, namely reporting requirements and less favorable tax treatment. Such redundancy can be dangerous for civil liberties, in that it in-

vites courts to ask why lawmakers said the same thing twice, and whether duplication means that the second statement confers additional powers.

In other words, while the inclusion of contribution limits in the Udall amendment is presumably an attempt to get at McCutcheon's ban on aggregate limits, it could also permit other laws limiting contributions that would severely harm political debate, exacerbate the incumbency advantage, give certain political parties an unfair leg up and disproportionately impair third parties, many of whom cannot afford the sophisticated legal counsel necessary to navigate the complex new laws this amendment would allow. The contribution section could, for instance, allow a federal law limiting contributions to the point where challengers cannot mount an effective campaign, and third parties simply can't afford to stay in business.

More important, however, is the proposed change in Subsections (1)(2) and (2)(2), which would permit the federal and state governments to limit the amount of funds spent “in support of, or in opposition to” candidates for office. Right now, under existing law, there is a distinction between express advocacy (“vote Romney/Ryan” or “support Obama/Biden”) and “issue advocacy” (“call Speaker Boehner and tell him to stop blocking NSA surveillance reform”). Historically, campaign finance reform efforts, including constitutional amendments such as this one, have sought to restrict “sham” issue advocacy—that is, communications that some claim are express advocacy disguised as issue advocacy.

As a practical matter, however, the staff vested with the responsibility of distinguishing between the two at the Federal Election Commission (“FEC”) or the Exempt Organizations Division of the Internal Revenue Service are ill-equipped to draw these lines in a consistent and principled manner.

For instance, would an ACLU ad urging members of Congress to support Patriot Act reform, which runs shortly before the November 2004 election (when that issue is at play in the election), be construed as an issue ad exhorting voters to support reform or a covert attempt to influence voters to oppose members who do not support reform? Similarly, would an ad by a group urging repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which runs before the 2012 presidential election, be issue advocacy or covert express advocacy?

Given the inability of the world's best election law lawyers, let alone overworked line revenue agents and attorney-advisors, to make a principled determination on any such ads, lawmakers tend to overcorrect and restrict all issue advocacy in order to suppress any covert express advocacy. The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act attempted to do exactly that by criminalizing any broadcast, cable or satellite communication that simply mentioned a candidate in the 30 days before a primary or 60 days before a general election.

Recognizing both the severe harm to political debate through overbroad laws that suppress all issue advocacy mentioning a candidate for office, and the difficulty in making principled distinctions between issue and express advocacy under a totality of the circumstances approach, the courts have rightly rejected measures that allow the government to restrict issue advocacy at all.

Sections (1)(2) and (2)(2) are designed to, and would, completely overturn that legal distinction between issue and express advocacy and permit the government to criminalize and censor all issue advocacy that

mentions or refers to a candidate under the argument that it supports or opposes that candidate.

To give just a few hypotheticals of what would be possible in a world where the Udall proposal is the 28th Amendment:

Congress would be allowed to restrict the publication of Secretary Hillary Clinton's forthcoming memoir "Hard Choices" were she to run for office;

Congress could criminalize a blog on the Huffington Post by Gene Karpinski, president of the League of Conservation Voters, that accuses Sen. Marco Rubio (R-FL) of being a "climate change denier";

Congress could regulate this website by reform group Public Citizen, which urges voters to contact their members of Congress in support of a constitutional amendment addressing Citizens United and the recent McCutcheon case, under the theory that it is, in effect, a sham issue communication in favor of the Democratic Party;

A state election agency, run by a corrupt patronage appointee, could use state law to limit speech by anti-corruption groups supporting reform;

A local sheriff running for reelection and facing vociferous public criticism for draconian immigration policies and prisoner abuse could use state campaign finance laws to harass and prosecute his own detractors;

A district attorney running for reelection could selectively prosecute political opponents using state campaign finance restrictions; and

Congress could pass a law regulating this letter for noting that all 41 sponsors of this amendment, which the ACLU opposes, are Democrats (or independents who caucus with Democrats).

Such examples are not only plausible, they are endless. Currently, we do not have to worry about viewpoint discrimination, selective enforcement and unreasonable regulations that unnecessarily stifle free speech without advancing a legitimate state interest because of the First Amendment, and these protections would not apply to speech covered by this proposed amendment. Tinkering with the First Amendment in this way opens the door to vague and overbroad laws, which both fail to address the problem that Congress wishes to solve and invariably pull in vast amounts of protected speech.

Vague and overbroad laws regulating pure speech are also exceedingly dangerous to democratic processes because they can be misused by various parochial interests. During the civil rights era, for instance, southern states often tried to use laws forcing groups exercising their First Amendment rights to disclose their membership, in a bid to run them out of town.

Rather than "equalizing" the debate and giving voice to the voiceless, laws that allow criminalization of issue advocacy—which this, on its face, would permit—actually give the advantage to special interests with significant resources, because they can now call on the law to regulate their policy opponents. By exempting this class of political speech from the scope of the First Amendment (and potentially other rights), it would provide no protection at all for disfavored minority groups on both the left and right. Congress would, for instance, be free to pass laws targeting only "political" speech by groups like ACORN.

3. THE AMENDMENT COULD PERVERSELY HARM FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND WOULD DIRECTLY EVISCERATE THE FREEDOMS OF SPEECH, ASSEMBLY AND PETITION

In addition to allowing Congress and the states to criminalize issue advocacy, the

amendment's third section, exempting "freedom of the press" from its reach, poses four major problems.

First, it could actually make matters worse. Those with enough money can afford to buy newspapers or journalistic websites, which are indisputably press outlets, and would be completely outside the scope of the laws permitted by this amendment. William Randolph Hearst's newspaper empire, for instance, was at first a vigorously partisan supporter of Franklin Roosevelt (and then critic), and such partisan electioneering by the mass media would unquestionably be permitted under this amendment.

Second, it invites government inquiry into what constitutes "the press," which is increasingly problematic in the age of citizen journalism and the internet. Here, the government would have to determine if the Daily Kos or Red State qualify as "the press." If yes, they can blog freely. If no, they could be censored or even go to jail. The potential for abuse is obvious.

Accordingly, the reference to freedom of the press could perversely limit that freedom. Legally, "the press" has been defined broadly. It encompasses not only the "large metropolitan publisher" but also the "lonely pamphleteer." "Freedom of the press is a fundamental personal right," the Supreme Court has written, "which is not confined to newspapers and periodicals. It necessarily embraces pamphlets and leaflets. The press in its historic connotation comprehends every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion."

The reference to freedom of the press will force the government and courts to draw difficult lines between non-traditional media and the "large metropolitan publisher." More often than not, the latter, simply because of the breadth of issues covered in their media, is going to appear less "political" than the pamphleteer handing out circulars urging greater gun control, reproductive freedom or a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. The courts interpreting the laws permitted by this amendment are therefore more likely to move away from the notion of "lonely pamphleteer" as press.

Finally, fourth, the reference to the press clause expressly incorporates the speech, assembly and petition clauses into the Udall amendment by omission. In other words, the amendment makes clear—through lack of reference to the speech clause—that this amendment is meant to directly constrain the existing speech, assembly and petition rights, and potentially all other constitutional rights that could conceivably apply, with respect to both the state and federal governments. That is both unprecedented and exceedingly worrisome.

Additionally, we note that Section 3 appears to only apply to Congress, suggesting that states may be free to "abridge" the freedom of the press.

4. AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION TO LIMIT A SPECIFICALLY ENUMERATED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT IS UNPRECEDENTED IN THE HISTORY OF THE REPUBLIC

It bears emphasizing that this would be the first time the amendatory process has been used to directly limit specifically enumerated rights and freedoms. Many argue that such an amendment is not unprecedented. What they mean, however, is that amending the Constitution in response to an unpopular court case is not unprecedented. In those cases, however, the amendment either had little to do with individual rights or it restored lost rights. In no case, did it limit the

right and freedom that vouchsafes our ability to advocate for all of our other rights and freedoms.

Finally, while rights-limiting amendments are unprecedented, proposals to do so are legion.

The ACLU has aggressively lobbied against, to name just a few, the Flag Desecration Amendment, which would have overturned the Supreme Court cases prohibiting the state and federal governments from criminalizing defacement of the American flag; the Victims' Rights Amendment, which would have limited the rights of criminal defendants; an amendment to deny automatic citizenship to all persons born in the United States; the School Prayer Amendment, which would have given school officials the power to dictate how, when and where students pray; and the Federal Marriage Amendment, which would have denied marriage rights to same-sex couples in committed relationships.

Were this to pass, the Udall amendment would grease the skids of these and other proposals to limit fundamental constitutional rights.

For all of these reasons, we strongly urge you to oppose the Udall amendment, and to focus Congress's attention on enacting effective public financing laws, tightening up the coordination rules, ensuring prosecutors have effective resources to pursue straw donations and other common sense measures for promoting the integrity of our political system.

What you must not do is "break" the Constitution by amending the First Amendment.

Please do not hesitate to contact Legislative Counsel/Policy Advisor Gabe Rottman at 202-675-2325 or grottman@aclu.org if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

LAURA W. MURPHY,
Director, Washington
Legislative Office.

GABRIEL ROTTMAN,
Legislative Counsel/
Policy Advisor.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2014.

Hon. TED CRUZ,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRUZ: We write to offer our thanks for your co-sponsorship of the USA Freedom Act and your ardent defense of the First Amendment in two important areas. As you so aptly said, "Republicans and Democrats are showing America that the government can respect the privacy rights of law-abiding Americans, while at the same time, giving law enforcement the tools needed to target terrorists."

The American Civil Liberties Union has long sought to work with members at all points on the political spectrum to advance fundamental American principles of individual liberty and personal privacy. We are heartened that you have been willing to reach across the aisle to further those essential values and implement needed reforms of our growing surveillance state.

We would also note that, while many of the objections to the bulk surveillance programs revealed in the past year have focused on privacy, the ACLU has long been critical of mass surveillance on First Amendment grounds as well. Indiscriminate government spying abrogates our constitutional right to anonymous speech and chills associational activity.

Indeed, it raises many of the same concerns that have led the Supreme Court to

prohibit the compelled disclosure of political associations and beliefs in landmark cases like *National Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449 (1958); *Shelton v. Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479 (1960); *Gibson v. Florida Legislative Committee*, 372 U.S. 539 (1963); *Brown v. Socialist Workers Party*, 459 U.S. 87 (1982); *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission*, 514 U.S. 334 (1995); and *Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. v. Village of Stratton*, 536 U.S. 150 (2002).

One of the key civil liberties concerns with indiscriminate bulk surveillance, for either criminal investigative purposes or national security, is that it gives the government a detailed record of those dissenting from official policy—on both the right and left. Surveillance chills such dissent, which results in poor policy outcomes. Anonymity is essential for the dissemination of unpopular ideas, which often enrich the marketplace of ideas. Anonymous speech and association have driven social progress on numerous fronts, from civil and labor rights to, tellingly, our expansive modern view of free speech.

For these and other reasons, the ACLU also opposes S.J. Res. 19, a proposed constitutional amendment that would limit the First Amendment to allow the government—federal and state—to “regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.”

While we certainly appreciate the good intentions of the measure’s supporters, we fear—based on long historical experience—that such an open ended remit would result in the censorship of pure issue advocacy by non-partisan, non-profit groups. Likewise, we anticipate the amendment would be used, much like programmatic national security surveillance, to compel disclosure of constitutionally protected anonymous political activity and association by those espousing controversial or minority views.

The fact this would be the first time any enumerated right in the Constitution has been restricted through the amendatory process underscores the gravity of the threat to the First Amendment posed by S.J. Res. 19. We thank you for your support for the First Amendment in your staunch opposition to the constitutional amendment and your original co-sponsorship of the USA Freedom Act.

We look forward to working with you on other First Amendment issues. Please contact Legislative Counsel/Policy Advisor Gabe Rottman if you should have any questions at 202-675-2325 or grottman@aclu.org.

Sincerely,

LAURA W. MURPHY,
*Director, Washington
Legislative Office.*

MICHAEL W. MACLEOD-
BALL,
*Chief of Staff/First
Amendment Counsel.*

GABRIEL ROTTMAN,
*Legislative Counsel/
Policy Advisor.*

Mr. CRUZ. The third question every Senator who has put his name to this amendment must answer is this: Should Congress have the constitutional authority to ban the NAACP from speaking about politics? Well, why is that? Because the NAACP is a corporation. We hear the word “corporation,” and we tend to think of ExxonMobil, Walmart, or what have you, but the NAACP is a corporation.

What could Congress do under this amendment, under the explicit language of this amendment? Congress could prohibit the NAACP from speaking about politics.

Let me state some other corporations Congress would have the constitutional authority to silence. The ACLU is a corporation. The AARP—the American Association of Retired Persons—is a corporation. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals is a corporation. Amnesty International is a corporation. Americans United for Separation of Church and State is a corporation. The Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders is a corporation. The National Organization for Women is a corporation. The Center for Reproductive Rights is a corporation. The Sierra Club is a corporation. La Raza is a corporation. NARAL is a corporation. Planned Parenthood is a corporation. Moveon.org is a corporation. The Human Rights Campaign is a corporation. Greenpeace is a corporation.

People will note that every one I listed is a group that in our political discourse is often associated with being on the left. Many of those groups are not particular fans of mine as an elected official, and that is their right. Indeed, it is their right to scream from the mountaintops their criticism of my political positions. I will defend their right to criticize me or any other Member of this body all day long because the Bill of Rights says Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.

Forty-nine Democrats just said that every organization I read—that it should be constitutional for Congress to prohibit them from speaking about politics.

It seems to me that when we return to our home States, every Senate Democrat who put his or her name to this amendment should expect to answer questions from citizens: Senator, why did you vote for a constitutional amendment to silence my free speech rights? That is a question we should all expect.

I would like to address a couple of red herrings in this debate because there are arguments put forth by the Democrats who say: No, no, no. Pay no attention to the text of the amendment we have introduced. Pay no attention to the fact that it would give Congress the power to ban movies, books, and to silence the NAACP. Pay no attention to any of that. It is something else.

There are three red herrings that are tossed forward.

First, money is not speech. How many times have we heard that over and over in floor speeches? Yesterday and today Democrats have stood and said: Money is not speech. Money is not speech. It has been repeated over and over. It is a good talking point. It is simply, on its face, demonstrably false. It is certainly true that all money is not speech.

If you go out and buy a Ferrari, that is not speech, but if you go out and erect a billboard and pay money to put up a billboard that says “Senator JOE MANCHIN is a terrific guy,” that is speech. It takes money to do that. They don’t put up billboards with pixie dust. It actually takes some dollars to erect that billboard and to express that speech.

If you decide you want to run a radio ad saying that Senator so-and-so is terrible or wonderful, they don’t run radio ads just because you asked “pretty please.” It takes money.

Let’s say you want to run a television ad. It takes money.

Let’s say you want to launch a Web site. Have you ever launched a Web site for free?

Let’s say you are a little old lady who wants to put a yard sign on your front yard, and it is going to take \$5 to buy some poster board and a stick and some crayons and markers and write: I love the First Amendment; I love free speech. That takes money.

The Federalist Papers were the essence of speech, and it took money to print them. Thomas Paine’s “Common Sense”—it took money to print it. It took money to print pamphlets.

Everyone in the tech community—and I would note that all of our Democratic friends and sponsors of this amendment almost to a person go routinely to the tech community and say: Give us money. Give us campaign contributions.

Every Senate Democrat should expect the tech community to say: Wait a second. Why did you vote for a constitutional amendment to give Congress the power to regulate every Web site in America?

If a Web site talks about politics, this amendment gives Congress the power to regulate that Web site.

Listen, I understand there are Members in this body on both sides of the aisle who find it really pesky when citizens dare criticize us. If you don’t want to be criticized, don’t run for office. Democracy is messy.

I guarantee there is no one in this country who truly believes money is not speech. It is a talking point, but those examples are unquestionably speech, and they have been from the very first days of our Republic.

A second canard is that corporations are not people. That is often said. Citizens United said that corporations are people.

Of course corporations are not people, but that is not the right question. It never was the question. Nobody thinks corporations are people. They don’t breathe, they don’t walk, and they are not human beings. The question is, Do corporations have rights under our Constitution? Again, I guarantee that every person in this Chamber and every person in the gallery believes the answer to that question is

yes. If they don't, the New York Times is a corporation. Do we really think the New York Times has no First Amendment rights?

If the canard were true—corporations are not people, so they don't have rights—Congress could pass a law tomorrow that says the New York Times can never again criticize any Republican Member of Congress. I think the paper would probably go out of publication if it had to remove that from its content.

But it, of course, cannot. Why can't it? Because corporations have rights. Every one of us knows that. We would be horrified. That legislation would be blatantly unconstitutional. Why? Because the New York Times has a First Amendment right to speak about politics however it likes, whether wrong-headed or right-headed.

The groups I mentioned before—the NAACP is a corporation. I challenge any Senator to stand and say the NAACP has no First Amendment rights. But every Senator who has said on this Senate floor that corporations aren't people, that they have no rights, has said the NAACP has no constitutional rights—if you were a first-year law student and put that answer in any constitutional law class in the country, you would get an F. It wouldn't be a D-plus or a D-minus; it would be an F. It is an obviously blatantly false statement. Yet 49 Democrats rely on it to justify trying to gut the First Amendment.

The third red herring the Democrats in this body point to is they paint a specter of evil billionaires coming to steal our democracy.

We have all heard of our friends the Koch brothers—in part because the majority leader has launched an unprecedented slander campaign on two private citizens. Almost on a daily basis the majority leader stands and demagogues two private citizens who have committed the sin of creating hundreds of thousands of jobs, being successful in the private sector, and then exercising their First Amendment rights to speak out about the grave challenges facing this country.

If one Member of this body impugns the integrity of another Member of this body, we can rise on a point of personal privilege. I ask the Presiding Officer, where is the point of personal privilege for a private citizen when the majority leader drags his name through the mud day after day?

What Senator REID is doing to two private citizens who are fighting to exercise their free speech rights is reprehensible. It is an embarrassment to this institution. Yet perhaps one might say there is some truth to the matter. We are told these nefarious brothers are responsible for almost everything bad in the world, so it must be that they are playing a huge role in our body politic.

Well, if you go look at OpenSecrets, which compiles campaign giving from 1989 to 2014, so for the past 25 years—and it compiles them from the biggest givers down to the smallest givers—if you look at first 16 names on that list—I have heard what our Democratic Members of this body have said: There are evil, nefarious Republicans trying to steal our democracy. And the implication is that they are backing Republicans. So my assumption is, as I look at the list of the top donors, the top 16—how many of them give predominantly to Republicans? Well, one would assume, given how great the magnitude is, that it has to be a lot of them, probably all of them, or if not all of them, most of them—at least half of them.

Mr. President, do you know how many of the top 16 groups give predominantly to Republicans? Zero. The top 16 political donors in this country all give either overwhelmingly to Democrats or at best evenly between the two parties. You have to fall to No. 17 to find a group that gives more heavily to Republicans than to Democrats. Now, that is curious given the story that is being told by our Democratic friends about these evil Republican billionaires stealing democracy. Gosh, the top 16 donors are not Republicans.

And how about the Koch brothers who we are told are somewhat like the Grinch who stole Christmas? Where do they fall? We have to go down to No. 59 on the list to find Koch Industries.

But perhaps you believe there is something to this claim of secret money. That too is a red herring. The Federal Election Commission estimates that over \$7 billion was spent in the 2012 election cycle. We have heard from Democrat after Democrat after Democrat that secret money—money where the donors are not disclosed—is this enormous problem in our democracy that justifies gutting the First Amendment. So of that \$7 billion, I assume a lot of that is secret money. Well, if you were to assume that, you would be wrong. The Center for Responsive Politics estimates that in 2012 about \$315 million was spent by groups that do not disclose all of their donors. That is less than 4.5 percent of all the political speech in 2012.

So this entire effort to gut the First Amendment, to give Congress the power to ban movies, books, and the NAACP from speaking about politics is justified because of 4.5 percent of political spending, a whole bunch of which is being spent to help Democrats. Those are the facts. As John Adams famously said: Facts are stubborn things. (Ms. WARREN assumed the Chair.)

So it raises the question: If the problems they are telling us about are not real, why are the Democrats doing this? Why are we spending a week debating this constitutional amendment, the most radical constitutional amendment this body has ever considered,

particularly because every single Member of this body knows the outcome? There are not sufficient votes to adopt this amendment. The Democrats all know this. The Republicans all know this. Then why would they be doing it?

Well, if you are a Democrat running for reelection in 2014, you cannot run on the economy. The Obama economy is a disaster. Millions of people are out of work. The people who have been hurt the most by the Obama economy are the most vulnerable among us—young people, Hispanics, African Americans, single moms. We have not seen such a low labor force participation since 1978, since the stagnation and misery and malaise under Jimmy Carter. The Obama economy has recreated that. So if you are a Democrat, you cannot run on the disastrous economic record of the Obama administration.

If you are a Democrat, you certainly cannot run on ObamaCare—the most harmful social services legislation in modern times that has cost millions of Americans their jobs, their health care, their doctors. If you do not believe me, take a look at how the Democrats are running in their States. You do not see Democrats running saying: We passed ObamaCare. When you take away millions of people's health care and doctors, and when you look in the TV camera and repeatedly state falsehoods: If you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it, if you like your doctor, you can keep them, you do not really want to remind the American people that you deliberately lied to them.

And the Democrats certainly cannot run on the Obama-Clinton foreign policy—a policy about which we heard last week the President has no strategy for dealing with the great threats facing this country. Leading from behind is not a strategy, and we can see the consequences of the Obama-Clinton foreign policy, which is that the entire world is on fire.

If you are a Democratic Senator running for reelection in 2014, you have a problem. You cannot run on your record because the record is abysmal. So what is done instead? It is smoke and mirrors. It is distraction.

The only explanation I can come up with for why we are spending a week—with all the challenges in the world—a week debating an amendment that will never ever pass is this is designed to fuel a bunch of TV commercials for Democratic Senators, to paint the picture of nefarious billionaires coming to steal our democracy. Facts do not get in the way of their story. But yet the breadth of this is rather enormous.

I serve on the constitution subcommittee with the Senator from Minnesota, who before being a Senator was a very talented comedic actor and comedic writer on "Saturday Night Live." I grew up watching "Saturday Night Live." I love "Saturday Night Live."

"Saturday Night Live" over the years has had some of the most tremendous political satire—for decades. Who can forget Chevy Chase tripping and falling over just about everything? Who can forget portrayals—Dana Carvey's George Herbert Walker Bush: "Not going to do it." Who can forget Bill Clinton, Ronald Reagan, Al Gore? Who can forget in 2008 the "Saturday Night Live" wickedly funny characterization of the Republican Vice Presidential nominee Sarah Palin? It was wickedly funny and also had a profoundly powerful effect on people's assessment of Governor Palin, who is a friend of mine.

When I asked the Senator from Minnesota in the Senate Judiciary Committee: Do you believe that Congress should have the constitutional authority to prohibit "Saturday Night Live" from making fun of politicians, the good Senator promptly reassured me he had no intention of doing any such thing. But what we are debating is not the intentions of 100 Senators. What we are debating is a constitutional amendment that 49 Democrats are proposing to be inserted into the Bill of Rights.

The only question—it is not the intention of those Senators—but, rather, what would that amendment say? What the amendment says is for any corporation Congress would have the constitutional authority to prohibit it from engaging in political speech.

Well, NBC, which airs "Saturday Night Live," is a corporation. Under this amendment 49 Democrats have signed their name to, Congress would have the power to make it a criminal offense. Lorne Michaels could be put in jail under this amendment for making fun of any politician. That is extraordinary, it is breathtaking, and it is dangerous.

The idea of banning books is not new. Advocates of government power, statisticians, have long favored silencing the citizenry. It is why our First Amendment was such a revolutionary concept, the idea that the individual citizen has the authority to challenge any elected official, from local magistrate all the way up to the President of the United States.

But if you are an advocate of governmental power, the citizens having the liberty to speak out is inconvenient; it can lead to inconvenient truths. So on some level it should not be surprising that the modern Democratic Party, which has become the party of government power over every aspect of our lives, would take it to the final conclusion of giving government the power to silence our political speech and to ban books.

I am reminded, in Ray Bradbury's immortal book "Fahrenheit 451," of the words of Captain Beatty: "If you don't want a man unhappy politically, don't give him two sides to a question to worry him; give him one. Better yet,

give him none." That was, of course, the chief fireman in charge of burning books in "Fahrenheit 451." In the book that is the temperature at which book paper ignites. It breaks my heart that today we are seeing the Fahrenheit 451 Democrats. Today we have seen 49 Democrats put their name to a constitutional amendment that would give Congress the power to ban books.

Some might dismiss it and say: What does it matter? It is an exercise in politics. They do not really believe it. They know it is not going to pass. Politicians will be politicians. No wonder the American people are cynical. I would be embarrassed if one Senator put his or her name to an amendment repealing the free speech protections of the First Amendment. Instead of one, it is 49. And much like with Sherlock Holmes and "the dog that didn't bark," every bit as troubling as the 49 names of the Senators who are willing to repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment are the Senators who are not speaking out. In particular, we have not seen a single Democrat have the courage to speak out against this abominable provision.

It was not always so. There was a time not long ago when there was bipartisan agreement on questions of civil liberties. There was a time when you could find Democrats for whom the First Amendment meant something.

In 1997, Democrats attempted a similar amendment to give Congress the power to regulate free speech, and that lion of the left Ted Kennedy stood up and said: "In the entire history of the Constitution, we have never amended the Bill of Rights, and now is no time to start."

Where are the Ted Kennedys? Where are the Democrats? Where are the liberals?

Also in 1997, Senator Russ Feingold, another passionate liberal, stood up and said:

... the Constitution of this country was not a rough draft. We must stop treating it as such. The First Amendment is the bedrock of the Bill of Rights. It has as its underpinnings that each individual has a natural and fundamental right to disagree with their elected leaders.

I agree with Ted Kennedy, I agree with Russ Feingold, and I will tell you, privately I have urged Democratic colleagues to come and join me in defense of the First Amendment—the handful who have not put their names to this amendment—and all I can surmise is that the partisan pressures of Washington are too much.

This amendment is not going to pass, but it is profoundly dangerous that in the U.S. Senate not a single Democratic Senator will come to the floor in defense of the First Amendment. It is profoundly dangerous that the modern Democratic Party now thinks it is good politics to campaign on repealing the First Amendment. The hashtag

#don'trepeallA has echoed through twitter as individual citizens are amazed.

Earlier this year we saw all 55 Democrats stand together against religious liberty, supporting an amendment that would gut the Religious Freedom Restoration Act which was passed with overwhelming bipartisan support and signed into law by Bill Clinton.

It used to be on religious liberty there was a bipartisan consensus. The same used to be true on free speech. When did Democrats abandon the Bill of Rights? When did Democrats abandon civil liberties? I assure you, if it were my party proposing this egregious amendment, I would be standing on the floor of this Senate giving the very same speech trying to hold my party to account. Because at the end of the day, when we take our oath of office, it is not to a Democratic Party or the Republican Party, it is to represent the citizens of our State—in my case, 26 million Texans—to fight for their rights and to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

There is nothing the United States has done in the just under 2 years that I have been in this body that I find more disturbing and more dangerous than the fact that 49 Democrats would put their name to a proposal to repeal the First Amendment.

When my daughters Caroline, 6, and Catherine, 3, came up from Texas to Washington for a weekend to visit, I took them to the Newseum. It is a terrific museum. The front facade of the Newseum has in gigantic letters the text of the First Amendment carved in granite.

If the Democratic Party has its way, the Bill of Rights will be forever altered. We will have to send up workmen to that facade to carve with jackhammers the words of the First Amendment out of the granite in the front of the Newseum.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee I introduced a substitute amendment. It was an amendment to replace every word of this extraordinarily dangerous amendment with the following words:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

It was word-for-word verbatim the text of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and I am sorry to tell you every single Senate Democrat on the Judiciary Committee voted against the text of the First Amendment. It was a straight party-line vote.

Going back to Senator Kennedy, Senator Kennedy and I would have agreed on very little. On matters of policy, he was a big government man and I most assuredly am not. On matters of foreign policy, he supported a far weaker

military than do I and a far weaker defense of our Nation. But on the question of the First Amendment, I am proud to stand side by side with Ted Kennedy.

What does it say about the modern Democratic Party that not a single Democrat is willing to honor Senator Kennedy's legacy? His words are every bit as true now as they were in 1997.

In the entire history of the Constitution, we have never amended the Bill of Rights, and now is no time to start.

It is my plea to the Democratic Members of this body that they reconsider the decision of putting their name on this amendment. It may seem like harmless election-year politicking that will help in political campaigns, but it is dangerous when 49 Senators come together and say: We no longer support the First Amendment.

We have a two-party system—a two-party system on which there should be robust debate. It is even more dangerous when one of the two parties becomes so extreme and so radical that it becomes seen as good politics to campaign against the First Amendment.

This will not pass this week, but I hope my Democratic colleagues will have second thoughts. I hope we can return to the day where there is a bipartisan consensus in favor of civil liberties, in favor of protecting the free speech rights of every American.

I hope we will listen to the wise counsel of Senator Kennedy, and I hope we will recognize, as Senator Kennedy and Senator Finegold observed, that there are no James Madisons or Thomas Jeffersons serving in this body today.

The Bill of Rights is not a rough draft, and the U.S. Senate should not be proposing to repeal the First Amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, listening to the good Senator from Texas, I feel as though I am in a parallel universe.

I rise to support S.J. Res. 19, an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that ensures our democracy is for the people—for the people, not for corporations.

I am proud to cosponsor this measure. I am also proud to stand with the overwhelming majority of this country in support of restoring commonsense and fair campaign finance rules.

The current Supreme Court has been noted as among the most pro-corporate Supreme Courts in our history. In decision after decision, a narrow conservative majority of the Court has placed the voices of the corporations and special interests over the voices of the people.

The Court decided *Citizens United* in 2010. Corporations are people with free speech rights, said the Court's 5-to-4

majority. Under this construct that corporations are people, this ruling, *Citizens United*, granted special interests the right to use corporate treasuries to drown out the voices of the people without being subject to meaningful disclosure requirements.

We have already seen the impact of this decision. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, this election year outside groups have spent triple the amount they had at the same time in 2010, and the election is still months away.

The Court thrust the floodgates even wider with the ruling in the *McCutcheon* case. This ruling struck down aggregate limits on contributions by individuals. So now billionaires could spend hundreds of millions of dollars to influence elections—and they are doing just that.

In these two decisions, the majority willfully ignored the reality of the corrupting influence of Big Money in our democracy. It is clear to me that the Court got it wrong in both cases. To fix what has been done, Congress must act.

The need for action is not just a Democratic or Republican issue. Nearly 80 percent of Americans support overturning the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision. Campaign spending is out of control, and the American people strongly support reform. Seventy-one percent believe that individual contributions should be limited, and 76 percent believe that spending by outside groups should also be limited.

The American public is clear on this issue. Only in Washington, DC, has this become such a polarized debate. Unchecked and unaccountable, spending on campaigns impacts politics and policy across the country, even at the State and local levels. From Arizona to Montana to my home State of Hawaii, the Supreme Court's extreme decisions on campaign finance are undermining fair, democratic processes.

The *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* cases also limit the ability of Congress and the States to fix the problems caused by these decisions. Why? Because the Supreme Court has decided that unfettered spending in elections is a constitutional right. So the only way we can fix these wrong decisions is by amending the Constitution.

The Supreme Court's majority claims that allowing unlimited spending in elections is essential to protecting the First Amendment, that unlimited spending by corporations and individuals is a constitutional right.

Guess what. Before the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon*, the First Amendment and constitutional rights were alive and well. So the Court argued that restricting campaign spending would limit the right of individuals and groups to participate in our democratic process—never mind that they have been participating in our democratic processes before these decisions.

In reality, these rulings institutionalize the power of Big Money in politics at the expense of regular Americans. The Court's decisions have the effect of saying that in our democracy those with the most money should have the loudest voices and that the very identity of those voices can be hidden from the voters. The huge undisclosed expenditures that these decisions allow have diluted the core principle of democracy: one person, one vote.

The vast majority of the American people disagree with the Supreme Court's unprecedented interpretation of the First Amendment. The Court has left us with the option we are pursuing today—amending the U.S. Constitution. When the Supreme Court said that women did not have the right to vote, Congress and the people passed the 19th Amendment. So amending the Constitution to protect our democracy is not some new or radical idea. When the Supreme Court said States could impose poll taxes on the poor, Congress and the people passed the 24th Amendment, and the list goes on. Why? Because the Supreme Court is made up of human beings, and as human beings they sometimes get it wrong, as they did in the *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* decisions.

As retired Justice John Paul Stevens wrote in his dissent to *Citizens United*:

The Court's opinion is thus a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining self-government since the founding, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

Justice Stevens has it right and so does the overwhelming majority of Americans. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents all agree that the Court's ruling in *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* stand for something that is completely inconsistent with America's Constitution, history, and values. I say that the First Amendment was alive and well before the *Citizens United* and the *McCutcheon* decisions.

The constitutional amendment before us does not repeal anything in the Constitution; rather, it undoes the damage that five members of the Supreme Court have done to free and fair elections. By the way, money buys speech, it is not speech. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 19.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Thank you, Madam President. Let me first say how much I appreciate all of my colleagues coming to the floor and talking about this amendment. Senator HIRONO is here. I know Senator WHITEHOUSE is coming down. A number

of Senators have come down and spoken very eloquently. The Presiding Officer has also taken a good strong position and we so much appreciate all of her good work.

An earlier speaker said that the NAACP is against this amendment. In fact, the NAACP is for this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement off their Web page of their endorsement of the constitutional amendment I am going to talk about.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the NAACP.org]

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT CORRUPTING ROLE OF BIG MONEY CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

S.J. RES. 19/H.J. RES. 20, WOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT CONGRESS, INDIVIDUAL STATES AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO MEANINGFULLY REGULATE CAMPAIGN FINANCE

It is no secret that the role of money in politics is ever increasing, and that money plays a major role in who stands for office, who wins, and, most critically, the eventual public policy Congress enacts. With the decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 2010 *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (FEC) and 2014 *McCutcheon vs. FEC* cases, the role of big money, donated by wealthy corporations and individuals, will only continue to grow.

Because it is becoming increasingly clear that income and wealth inequality is rooted in political inequality, the NAACP strongly supports several legislative initiatives—including H.R. 20, the Government By the People Act, and S. 2023, the Fair Elections Now Act, which put voluntary curbs on campaign spending. Together, these two bills are comprehensive reform packages designed to combat the influence of big money politics, raise civic engagement and amplify the voices of everyday Americans.

Yet some have concerns about the voluntary nature of these bills—candidates may opt out of participating and adhering to limits on the amounts raised and spent. Thus, in addition to supporting the legislation, the NAACP supports a constitutional amendment that would make clear that Congress, individual states and the American people have the authority to meaningfully regulate campaign finance and to restore transparency and safeguard the role of individual voices in our elections. The constitutional amendment has been proposed by Senator Tom Udall (NM) (S.J. Res. 19) and in the House of Representatives by Congressman Jim McGovern (MA) (H.J. Res. 20).

Amending the Constitution is hard—and it should be. But it is not impossible. Already 16 states and hundreds of local governments across the country have called on Congress to take action, showing strong public support for reform from all sides of the political spectrum. Furthermore, supporters of a Constitutional amendment have been promised a vote by the full Senate on S.J. Res. 19 before the end of the year.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Thank you, Madam President.

Some of our opponents have come down to the floor and asked: Why do this now? Why bother? I would answer:

Ask the American people. I think they will tell you. People are listening—not just Democrats but Republicans too—all across the Nation. They are listening and here is what they are hearing. They are hearing that the Supreme Court has put a for sale sign on our elections. They are hearing our political process is on life support, drowning in cash, and most of it coming from just a few people.

Sixty percent of all super PAC money in 2012 was doled out by 100 billionaires and corporations. They are hearing about elections bought and paid for by shadowy outside groups given a green light by the Supreme Court. Special interests are shelling out at least \$216 million in 2014 and likely \$1 billion by election day. That is 15 times more money than in 2006 before *Citizens United*, before the Supreme Court defied common sense and said corporations are people. They are hearing that a lot of money is hidden when over half the money spent in this year's top nine Senate races is not fully disclosed, over half not fully disclosed. So in 2 months we will know the outcome of these elections, but we will not know who paid for them.

The result is not surprising. The American people have lost faith in us as they watch this merry-go-round, this constant money chasing, and very little else getting done. This is a vital debate about what democracy we will have and whether democracy will survive. Will we have one that caters to billionaires and the privileged few or one that listens to the American people; one that keeps chasing money from special interests or one that says it is the quality of our ideas, not the size of our bank accounts, that should matter; a democracy that answers to the middle class or to the moneyed class?

This debate is crucial. This debate is absolutely crucial to the future of our country, and I believe the American people are not only listening, they are demanding to be heard, because every voice counts, and that is why the majority of Americans support reform. They know the system is broken.

There is only one way to truly fix it. Give power back to the elected representatives of the people, to the Congress, and to the States. We have a job to do, but the Supreme Court has rendered us powerless to do it. There is one way to change this, one way for real reform; that is, a constitutional amendment.

That is what this debate is all about. The Supreme Court opened the floodgates. The American people want us to close them.

The Huffington Post published an article yesterday titled "Is Washington The Only Place Where Campaign Finance Is A Partisan Issue?" The answer is yes. Poll after poll shows this.

A strong majority of Democrats and Republicans outside of Washington

want reform, Republicans such as my good friend former Senator Al Simpson from Wyoming. Yesterday The Hill published an op-ed that Al and I wrote together. As most people know, he has always been someone to speak his mind. When Al edited our draft he added that "the playing field in our democracy is far from level, and that is driving cynicism, disgust, and mistrust of the political process to dangerous levels."

Sadly, he is right. It is time for us to listen to our constituents. Over 3 million people have signed petitions in support of a constitutional amendment. There are 16 States, over 550 cities and towns pushing for reform, demanding a more level playing field and fairness, including 75 percent of the voters in Montana, a State where Mitt Romney won by a 10-point margin. So this is a partisan issue only in Washington and in the backrooms of billionaires determined to keep the money flowing and the influence intact.

So opponents have ramped up the noise and distraction about the First Amendment and free speech. I would not lose any sleep about billionaires and their free speech, but a lot of us are up late nights thinking about the rest of America.

As Justice Breyer wrote in his dissent to *McCutcheon*, "Where enough money calls the tune, the general public will not be heard." Too many Americans feel they are not being heard. The First Amendment has already been hijacked. Our amendment rescues it.

Congress has a long history of regulating campaign finance, of doing its job and standing up to Big Money and powerful interests. We can go all the way back to 1867, and later with the Pendleton Act, the Hatch Act, the Bipartisan Campaign Act of 2002—a long history and I would argue an honorable one, and without banning books, suppressing teachers, suppressing preachers or shutting down newspapers. Reforms have been modest, reasonable, and responsive, passed by both Houses of Congress, signed by the President.

The other side can talk about imaginary horrors. That is one way to go. But that argument is not supported by history, by logic or by the law. Our amendment is not radical. It is a simple idea. It will give power back to the elected representatives of the people, to Congress, and to the States. That is it, period.

What is so terrifying about this? Not one thing, except for wealthy special interests that have their place at the table bought and paid for and want to keep it. That is the bottom line. They oppose any reforms, any restrictions on campaign spending. They are listening too. Their message is very clear and unyielding: No reform. None. They want to keep writing their checks and staying at the head of the table.

This debate is about special interests trying to buy elections in secret with

no limits. The Supreme Court says that is just fine. We say, no, in fact, it isn't. Our amendment has a long bipartisan tradition back to 1983 when Senator Ted Stevens, a Republican, was the lead sponsor. It is common sense. It is fair.

We do not dictate specific reforms. We do say Congress has a duty and a right to enact sensible campaign finance reform. Any specific proposals are debatable and answerable to the American people. This amendment has the support of most Americans because they understand beyond all the noise, beyond all the tortured logic of our opponents that we have a train wreck and we need to get the train back on track before yet another scandal, before we are back in the Watergate era.

The voice of Americans should not be drowned out by billionaires lobbying for favors, hiding in the corner with gold-plated megaphones. It is time to limit the power of Big Money, to give everyone a say, not just the rich, not just the powerful—everyone.

Americans are listening, they are watching, and they are waiting because they know and we know a simple truth: We cannot hand over our democracy to the biggest spender.

Thank you, Madam President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the op-ed I mentioned authored by myself and Senator Simpson and that the Huffington Post article I referenced be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From thehill.com, Sept. 8, 2014]

BIPARTISAN CASE FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE

(By Sen. Tom Udall (D-N.M.) and former Sen. Alan Simpson (R-Wy.))

Following recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions dismantling our nation's campaign finance laws, all Americans are certainly not equal on Election Day. With 5-4 split decisions, the court has given corporations the ability to spend unlimited money to persuade voters, and also declared limits on large donations to be the equivalent of infringement on speech. The result is an electoral system in which a billionaire can influence elections across the country, while regular voters have just one shot—by casting a single ballot.

This is surely not the equality as envisioned by our founders, who would be appalled by corporate spending in elections and unlimited personal donations by billionaires. The solution is to clarify the Constitution so that the people may decide how, when and why to regulate campaign finance. This week, the Senate will vote to begin debate on a constitutional amendment which now has the support of nearly half the Senate, 16 states and over 550 municipalities, including large cities like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and Philadelphia—all of whom are sick of out-of-control spending in elections and disturbed at the direction the court has taken.

The original and honest intent of our campaign finance laws is to rein in the culture of

money in politics and ensure that a few donors can't buy an election by spending to benefit one candidate over another. They are rooted in the public's disgust with political corruption. Yet the court's rulings indicate we are headed back to that pre-Watergate era of corruption. We were troubled that Chief Justice Roberts wrote in the McCutcheon decision that quid pro quo corruption—bribery—is the only sufficient justification for Congress to pass regulations. As a result, we are likely to see new challenges against laws that limit the amount an individual may contribute to a candidate, or laws prohibiting contributions to candidates from corporations. The largest corporations are multi-national organizations worth hundreds of billions of dollars and the Supreme Court is leaving us with no way to set reasonable standards.

McCutcheon is the most recent case, but there is a history of the court narrowly overturning reasonable campaign finance laws. In 2010, *Citizens United v. FEC* gave free speech rights to corporations and special interests. But this problem goes all the way back to 1976, when the court held in *Buckley v. Valeo* that restricting independent campaign expenditures violates the First Amendment right to free speech. In effect, the court said money and speech are the same thing.

This is tortured logic that leads to an unacceptable result—that a citizen's access to a constitutional right is dependent on his or her net worth. A result that says the wealthy get to shout, but the rest of you may only whisper.

The constitutional amendment would make it clear that campaign finance regulations are up to voters who elect Congress and state legislatures. It would not dictate any specific policies or regulations, but instead would protect sensible and workable campaign finance laws from constitutional challenges.

Critics have claimed that the amendment would repeal the First Amendment's free speech protections. But it does the exact opposite—the proposal is an effort to restore the First Amendment so that it applies equally to all Americans. When a few billionaires can drown out the voices of millions of Americans, we can't have any real political debate.

The amendment would not simply benefit one party or incumbent. It is similar to bipartisan proposals introduced in nearly every Congress since 1983, when Republican Sen. Ted Stevens (Alaska) was the lead sponsor. Over the years, it has been supported by many Republicans, including Sens. John McCain (Ariz.), Thad Cochran (Miss.), Arlen Specter (Pa.), and Nancy Kassebaum (Kan.), as well as many Democrats.

In April, retired Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens said in his testimony before the Senate Rules Committee that campaign finance regulations "should create a level playing field . . . to give rival candidates—irrespective of their political party and incumbency status—an equal opportunity to persuade citizens to vote for them." Most Americans would agree with Justice Stevens. However, until the Constitution is amended, such laws would be struck down by the current court.

The national debate should not be dictated by a handful of wealthy individuals and corporations. After the McCutcheon decision wealthy donors can, and many will, contribute up to \$3.6 million in an election cycle. For an average person making minimum wage, it would take 239 years to make that much money. The playing field in our

democracy is far from level, and that is driving cynicism, disgust and mistrust of the political process to dangerous levels.

Over the course of our Senate careers, spending on campaigns has gotten out of control. According to a joint study by Brookings and the American Enterprise Institute, outside groups spent \$457 million to influence Senate and House races in 2012. In the 1978 election, when Senator Simpson was first elected, outside groups spent only \$303,000. There is a deeply troubling trend here, and we cannot let it continue.

Amending the Constitution is difficult—as it should be—but it is long past time to have an honest and thoughtful national dialogue about our broken electoral process and how we voters can fix it.

[From the Huffington Post, Sept. 8, 2014]

IS WASHINGTON THE ONLY PLACE WHERE CAMPAIGN FINANCE IS A PARTISAN ISSUE?

(By Paul Blumenthal)

WASHINGTON.—The Senate voted Monday to debate a constitutional amendment overturning the Supreme Court's 2010 *Citizens United* decision and allowing Congress and the states to enhance limits on the amount of money raised and spent in elections. The proposed amendment is nearly universally supported by Democrats and opposed by Republicans.

Division over the role of money in politics, however, is far less severe among the broader populace. In fact, the majority of Americans in both parties say they think there is too much big money in politics and support the rationale offered by amendment proponents as a reason to amend the Constitution.

The amendment up for Senate debate would roll back Supreme Court rulings on campaign finance from the 1976 *Buckley v. Valeo* decision that first applied First Amendment free speech protection to money raised and spent in elections. That decision allowed Congress to limit contributions, but held that spending limits were a burden on spenders' free speech rights.

Americans appear to broadly disagree that money used in political campaigns should be protected by the First Amendment.

In February 2013, 55 percent of respondents to a HuffPost/YouGov poll said they did not consider "money given to political candidates to be a form of free speech protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution." Just 23 percent agreed that campaign contributions were a form of free speech.

That poll touches only on the issue of campaign contributions. The main issue supporters of the constitutional amendment have with the *Buckley* decision and subsequent court rulings is the full free speech rights granted to campaign spending.

A Gallup poll taken in June 2013 found that 79 percent supported limiting both the amounts politicians can raise and the amounts they can spend. This was supported at almost equal rates by Democrats, Republicans and independents, and in every part of the country.

There also are a handful of polls commissioned by groups campaigning for the amendment that asked more specific questions. In one such poll, the reform group Public Citizen released findings in August showing 55 percent in support of a constitutional amendment to overturn the *Citizens United* decision. Support topped 50 percent for Democrats, Republicans and independents.

The divide between Republican voters and their representatives in Washington also can be seen at the state and local levels. The pro-amendment group Free Speech For People

has compiled a list of 137 current and former state Republican officials who support an amendment to enhance limits on campaign finance.

This list includes a number of Republican officials who voted for resolutions in support of an amendment to overturn Citizens United and establish other limits to campaign finance. Overall, 16 states have backed resolutions calling for an amendment.

In Colorado and Montana, the resolutions were sent to the electorate as ballot initiatives in 2012. In both states—one a tossup in presidential elections, the other solid red—more than 70 percent of voters approved the resolutions. In both states, the amendment outpolled both President Barack Obama, the victor in Colorado, and Mitt Romney, who won Montana.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, may I ask that at the conclusion of Senator WALSH's remarks I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I rise to speak in support of S.J. Res. 19, a constitutional amendment that would give both States and Congress the power to undo the damage caused by Citizens United and restore our Democratic traditions.

Passing this amendment is vital if we are going to begin to roll back the coercive influence of money in our democracy. Because of the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United, political power has become increasingly concentrated in the hands of corporations and modern-day copper kings. In fact, less than 1 percent of Americans provide over two-thirds of the money spent on elections. The voices of everyday Americans are simply being silenced.

In Montana we have seen firsthand the damage to the process. Turn-of-the-century mining companies made rich off the copper seams in Butte, MT, my hometown, bought up the State press and bought off the State legislature. In response to these abuses, Montana banned corporate political spending by citizen initiative over 100 years ago. However, the recent Supreme Court's Citizens United decision overturned this century-old protection in an instant, silencing Montanans' voices with dark, secretive money and corporate political spending.

Montana's experience with the Butte copper kings shows that corporate political spending, even if it is supposedly independent, corrupts the political process. We cannot let anonymous, unaccountable corporate spending drown out the voices of everyday Americans. When the voices of individual voters become less relevant to politicians, policy decisions are divorced from the folks they impact.

We simply cannot allow a dysfunctional system of campaign finance to eliminate our government's responsiveness to its citizens or its ability to tax our most pressing issues. Montana's history should be learned from, and it

is our responsibility to ensure it never happens again.

That is why this amendment is so important to the American people. In 2012 Montana voters overwhelmingly directed the congressional delegation to work to overturn Citizens United to get corporate money out of politics. I have heard from thousands of Montanans that they want Congress to refocus on issues that are important to them, to come together and to do our jobs. Passing this amendment will help us do just that.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, before I give my "Time to Wake Up" speech, I want to react to something that was said on the Senate floor about this joint resolution to correct the error of Citizens United. What was said on the floor was that the position of those of us who support this joint resolution and who think Citizens United was wrongly decided, that our position is an attack on the First Amendment, that we are attacking the First Amendment. That may have some rhetorical utility, but it is simply not accurate.

The very question we are here to answer is whether the First Amendment properly allows unlimited corporate spending. It never did. It never did until Citizens United came along. So the question before this body is, Was Citizens United correctly decided?

To say we are attacking the First Amendment is to presume that Citizens United was correctly decided. You don't win an argument by presuming you are right; you win an argument by making the case why you are right.

Frankly, I have great reverence for the First Amendment, and I think it is extremely unfortunate that an argument would be made that is really nothing more than a rhetorical trick and does not respond to the gravamen of the dispute, which is whether the First Amendment should protect unlimited corporate spending when in the history of this country—until the decision by Citizens United—it never had.

TRIBUTE TO AARON GOLDNER

Before I continue, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Aaron Goldner. He has been instrumental in helping me research and prepare the "Time to Wake Up" speeches, and his fellowship in my office came to an end yesterday.

Aaron earned his Ph.D. in Earth, atmospheric, and planetary sciences at Purdue University. He came to my office as an American member of the Geophysical Union Congressional Science Fellow, whose research specialty was the development of sophisticated models to help build greater understanding of the past, present, and future effects of carbon pollution on our climate.

He lent his considerable scientific expertise and analysis to these floor

speeches. He also did research for legislation and prepared for hearings in the Environment and Public Works Committee. Since we apparently somehow were not keeping him busy enough, he managed to find the time to publish a peer-reviewed article over the summer in the prestigious journal *Nature* on the climatic conditions surrounding the origination of the Antarctic ice cap.

Aaron said this week as he left that he gained a sense of humor working here, which is probably fitting for a scientist having to deal with this body in its present state.

I gained the benefit of Aaron's hard work and gracious spirit, and the Senate and the American people gained the benefit of Aaron's passion for bringing the best scientific thinking to address our greatest challenges.

Aaron is now taking his talents to the Department of Energy, where he will continue to help our government tackle these important questions. I am grateful for his service in my office and wish him the best success.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The 113th Congress is now winding down, an election is upon us that will decide the makeup of the next Congress, and I am here for the 77th time to say it is time for my Republican colleagues to wake up to the threat of climate change both for the good of our country and our world and ultimately for the good of their own party. No political party can long remain a credible force in our democracy if their position on one of the defining threats of our time is to deny its existence or to plead total ignorance about it. "I am not a scientist," some have begun to say. Well, when it comes to interfering with women's rights, they don't say, "I am not a gynecologist." But when it is carbon pollution, they say, "I am not a scientist." Some would say that if you are not a scientist, all the more reason to listen to the scientists.

Look at what the scientists are saying today. The top person at the World Meteorological Organization, which knows a little bit about this area, just said:

We know without any doubt that our climate is changing and our weather is becoming more extreme due to human activities such as the burning of fossil fuels.

Here is the point: "I am not a scientist" is not the stance of a party that is ready to lead; it is the stance of a party that is beholden to polluting interests, petrified of losing the millions in polluter campaign spending supporting their candidates.

We have heard over and over during the last 6 years that Republicans want President Obama to lead. It is a familiar chorus: "It is time to lead." "Where is the leadership?" "Why isn't America leading?"

One of my Republican Senate colleagues put it this way:

Every American can agree that the light of peace and liberty would benefit our world. But who will spread it if not America? There is no other Nation that can, and that is why, despite the challenges we face here at home, America must continue to hold this torch. America must continue to lead the way.

Well, on climate change we are finally leading the way thanks in large part to President Obama's Climate Action Plan and Secretary Kerry's passionate efforts. Yet they criticize the Obama administration's leadership on climate change because other countries, such as China and India, are also big carbon emitters. So Republicans want America to lead except on climate change. On this one issue they would prefer to await leadership from China or India. How convenient that is when you think of all the polluter money funding the Republicans and how badly out of step with America. Just look at the numbers. A recent Wall Street Journal poll showed—withstanding years of relentless polluter propaganda—that 61 percent of Americans agree that climate change is occurring and that action should be taken, and 67 percent of Americans support the administration's proposed rule to limit carbon pollution from powerplants.

Here is my personal favorite: A survey conducted for the League of Conservation Voters found that more than half of young Republican voters—to be specific, 53 percent of Republicans under the age of 35—would describe a politician who denies climate change is happening as “ignorant,” “out of touch,” or “crazy.” That is the young Republican view of the Republican position on climate change.

On September 21 thousands of concerned Americans will converge on New York City for what will be known as the People's Climate March. Organizers expect that as many as half a million people will take part in this historic citizen action to call attention to the global crisis of climate change.

However you look at it, the American people are sending a message loud and clear: They want responsible leadership on carbon pollution. What is the Republican answer? Well, look at the House. Given control of the House, Republicans have already forced over 100 votes to undermine the EPA. That is even more times than they have voted to repeal ObamaCare.

PAUL RYAN, the Republican chairman of the House Budget Committee, said last week that the Republican strategy next year will be to send the President bills they know he will veto, including approval of the Keystone XL tar sands crude pipeline, and thereby create “shutdown by veto.”

Over here in the Senate, our Republican leader already threatens—if the Republicans win the Senate—to force onto key legislation what he called “a lot of restrictions on the activities of the bureaucracy.” Gee, what agency

could he possibly mean? The threat is plain: Give the Republicans polluter-backed, anti-environment legislation or they will shut down the government. Again. This is the Republican version of leadership.

What about out on the campaign trail? Republicans in Congress ignore the public's call for climate action, but are Republican candidates out there listening to the people or are they listening to the polluters led by the infamous Koch brothers? Look at how much money the polluters are spending on Republicans and take a wild guess. News flash: They are not listening to the people.

The Republican nominee for Senate in Iowa has said of climate change: “I'm skeptical. It's been changing since the dawn of time. I'm not going to blame it . . . on the human race.”

In New Hampshire the leading Republican Senate candidate recently said that he does not believe manmade climate change has been scientifically proven. Never mind that the underlying science was first measured back when Abraham Lincoln was President. In North Carolina the Republican nominee has referred to climate change as “false science.”

Well, in the last year I visited Iowa and New Hampshire and North Carolina, and I saw firsthand how climate change is already affecting those States. I heard over and over deep concern about climate change. I heard about cold-weather sports and tourism threatened by warming temperatures in New Hampshire. I heard about crops threatened by shifting weather patterns and about how a booming wind power industry has emerged in Iowa. In North Carolina I heard about homes and businesses and even air bases threatened by rising seas.

If you doubt me, go to the State universities in Iowa and New Hampshire and North Carolina. They are not denying it. They are actively working on and warning about climate change. Iowa State has an entire climate science program and wants to be a “leader in the science of regional climate change.” The University of New Hampshire scientists told me about the danger to New Hampshire's iconic moose from tick infestations because of climate change. Researchers from the University of North Carolina, Duke University, and North Carolina State took me out on a research vessel to see firsthand the effects of climate change on North Carolina's shoreline. The home State universities are clear; it is just the polluter-funded candidates who are denying.

It is the same story across the country. Republicans running for the Senate, from Alaska to Georgia, from Colorado to West Virginia, question or outright deny the established climate science. Figure it out. Do the math. There is overwhelming consensus

among knowledgeable scientists that climate change is real and being caused by humans. Denying that fact serves the economic interest of a narrow group of big-spending polluters, and the polluters are spending vast fortunes to support climate deniers.

Senate Republican candidates even attended a secret retreat organized by the Koch brothers earlier this year and praised the Kochs' political network for helping to support their campaign—the polluter political lifeline to the Republican Party.

A lot of blame here attaches to the Republicans' confederates on the Supreme Court—the five Republican-appointed Justices who kicked open the floodgates of corporate special interest spending for Republicans in the disastrous Citizens United decision in January of 2010. With Citizens United in their pocket, the polluters went right to work.

By the 2012 election cycle, the Washington Post and the Center for Responsive Politics determined that a donor network organized by the Koch brothers spent \$400 million to influence that election. This graphic shows the complex apparatus the Koch brothers used to pull those political strings.

In the 2014 election cycle, the government accountability group Common Cause has tallied over \$34 million in political donations already from 30 of the country's largest oil, gas, coal, and utility corporations. That does not include the dark money fossil fuel corporations have given to political groups which do not disclose their donors—groups such as the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Koch brothers own so-called Americans for Prosperity organization, or the secretive identity-laundering machine known as the Donors Trust. We don't know how much these groups have actually raised or spent on election activities, but the Koch network is expected to spend nearly \$300 million on the 2014 midterm elections.

The Center for Public Integrity reported last week that the Koch brothers are sponsoring 10 percent of all ads in competitive Senate races. That is more than 43,900 Senate ads between January 2013 and last month. Americans for Prosperity alone—that Koch brothers organization—sponsored 27,000 ads. That is one in every 16 ads in all Senate races this cycle. And, of course, those polluter-funded ads make up way more than 10 percent of just the Republican ads. Why is that? Because the focus of this apparatus is on Republicans, on buying and co-opting the Republican Party as the polluters' political instrument.

The numbers are staggering. Let's be clear about one thing: Their intention is not to add to constructive debate on carbon pollution and climate change. The polluters are determined to silence

meaningful debate on the catastrophic effects of their carbon pollution, and it is working. There was a lot of Republican activity on climate change until January of 2010 when Citizens United was brought down. And after that, we can't find carbon pollution activity on the Republican side. They have been buried in the threats and the promises of that polluter funding.

Well, climate denial may work for Republicans in the short run if it keeps wide open that spigot of polluter money that is funding Republican candidates. We will see how that works out. But no matter how much money the polluters pour into the Republican Party, even a Republican Senate cannot repeal the laws of science—of physics, of chemistry, of oceanography.

If they win the Senate, it is not just going to be time for them to wake up, it is going to be time for them to grow up. Being in the majority means responsibility, not just obstruction and mischief. Being in the majority means answering your country and the world, not just your polluter funding base. Being in the majority means hearing the vast majority of Americans who want U.S. leadership on climate change, not telling voters the problem doesn't exist or that America should abdicate any responsibility for forging an international solution.

Our Republican colleagues will discover, if they don't know it already—and many do know it already—that former Senator and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was right when she recently called climate change the “most consequential, urgent, sweeping collection of challenges we face as a nation and a world.”

Secretary Clinton went on to say:

The data is unforgiving no matter what the deniers try to assert. . . . If we come together to make the hard choices, the smart investment in infrastructure, technology and environmental protection, America can be the clean energy superpower of the 21st century. . . . This is about our strategic position in the world, this is about our competitiveness, our job creation, our economic growth as well as dealing with a challenge that we ignore at our detriment and our peril.

So the choice for Republicans stands before them: America as a clean energy superpower, leading the world, or America bedeviled with polluter-fueled political gridlock and climate denial. Their choice so far is obvious.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I wish to return to the discussion of the constitutional amendment to restrict speech. I made considerable comments yesterday, and there are some other comments I feel should be said about this—probably a dozen or more things. However, I wish to return to that discussion.

We have heard a lot in this debate about commercials. Everybody is con-

cerned about commercials—those 30-second ads that are driving everybody crazy, that everyone wants taken off the air, and that we want to regulate and restrict and punish. We don't like them. No one likes them. We want to make them go away.

Well, let's forget about the commercials for just a second. Let's talk about the show. Does anybody watch the show? It sometimes seems as though the only thing on TV that my colleagues care about are the commercials about themselves. But there actually are other things on TV. There are actual programs that fill up the time between the commercials. Let's talk about those.

There is, of course, all sorts of programming on television: sports, movies, sitcoms, reality shows. Pretty much everything—and I mean everything—is on TV now.

There are a lot of politics on TV. The politics come in a range of formats. It comes unvarnished on C-SPAN. It is delivered through news and commentary on cable channels. It is satirized and made fun of on the late night shows. It appears in documentaries and feature films.

The Citizens United case itself was the result of a political film—a film about Hillary Clinton. During the litigation there were arguments over whether the film and its advertisements could be treated as “electioneering communications” and, therefore, regulated and restricted by campaign finance laws. In rendering its decision, the Court properly saw, in my view, the film for what it was: An encouragement for people to vote against Hillary Clinton. This is what the Court said in its holding: The movie, in essence, is a feature-length negative advertisement that urges viewers to vote against then-Senator Clinton for President. In light of this historical footage, interviews with persons critical of her, and voiceover narration, the film would be understood by most viewers as an extended criticism of the Senator's character and her fitness for the Office of the Presidency. The narrative may contain more suggestions and arguments than facts, but there is little doubt that the thesis of the film is that she is unfit for the Presidency.

Then the Court went on to say:

The narrator reminds viewers that Americans have never been keen on dynasties and that a vote for Hillary is a vote to continue 20 years of a Bush or a Clinton in the White House.

Then the Court found this:

There is no reasonable interpretation of Hillary other than as an appeal to vote against Senator Clinton. The film qualifies as the functional equivalent of express advocacy.

Having made that determination, the question then becomes, Should the government be able to prevent it from being seen? The court held the answer

to that question was no and struck down as unconstitutional the laws that would prevent or constrain the distribution of the film.

My colleagues on the other side want those laws to be put back in place. They believe the government should be able to control the content, the financing, the distribution of films that reference candidates for office, and they are pushing this constitutional amendment to make that possible.

Now, we can expect there will be a lot more about Hillary Clinton on TV over the next couple of years. Some of it will be favorable and some of it will be unfavorable. Thanks to the Citizens United decision, the government won't be able to control what is said about her or any other potential candidate for the presidency—either party.

My colleagues do not have much to worry about when it comes to programming about Hillary Clinton. I don't think they need to worry about the show. They know there are a small number of conservative film makers who will attack her and whatever they produce is unlikely to reach a wide audience.

On the other hand, there is a huge multitude of liberal film producers, directors, and writers who like—if not love—Hillary Clinton and want to see her get elected to the Presidency, and they will do whatever they can to help her achieve that goal.

Secretary Clinton's recent book tour provided a good preview of the kind of programming we can expect to see more of should she decide to run for President. And luckily for her, there are plenty of television personalities who will help her sell herself to Americans, not just her book.

For example, one recent appearance on the Stephen Colbert show was clearly designed to soften her image. In an extended segment that could be seen as either amusing or nauseating, depending on your perspective, Colbert conducted a phony interview designed to show his viewers how smart and funny Hillary Clinton is.

Of course, Colbert can do whatever he wants with his show. No one questions that. But it should be obvious that the show amounts to a corporate-financed and political expenditure. Everything on the show—the studio, the host, the equipment, the writers, the director, the cameraman—everything is paid for by a corporation. Is there anyone in the Chamber who thinks that a corporation doesn't have the right to do that? Of course not. They like the show. And those on the other side know they can expect all sorts of similar programming in the months and years ahead. That doesn't bother them.

But the commercials are a different story. What if someone wanted to buy a 30-second ad during the show to present an alternative perspective. Well, we can't have that, can we? That

would be intolerable. It would present a threat to our democracy. We have to amend the Constitution to prevent that. The absurdity is evident.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle think our First Amendment allows one sort of programming to have unrestricted and unhindered access to the media, while other sorts must be limited and constrained. I submit that is preposterous.

In our system of government, all voices have the right to be heard. The First Amendment gives them that right. There is so much nonsense in this debate about buying elections and drowning out voices. We have a system that allows all voices to be heard, even those that oppose the majority. That is not the antithetical to democracy; it is the essence of democracy.

So it is time, it seems to me, to stop pretending that allowing more voices to be heard somehow poses a danger just because we don't like what they are saying.

Elections can't be bought. Voters will decide who wins them. They will make that decision based on what they think of the candidates, and what they think will be based on what they see and hear of the candidates. Then they will vote. When they do so, their vote will be equal to that of every other citizen. It doesn't matter how rich they are or what they do for a living or whether they even have their own TV show or never even watch TV. Every citizen gets one vote.

As they make their decision about how we are going to cast it, we need to make sure they are able to hear all voices. That is what the First Amendment does. It ensures that all voices have the right to be heard, and we don't need to change it to make that happen.

Those who are pushing this constitutional amendment don't want more voices to be heard, they want less.

There should never be any confusion about the intent of this constitutional amendment. It is to allow this majority to pass laws that will silence their opponents and ignores all the pious claims about the grand intent to recognize it for what it is—a cynical attempt to protect themselves from criticism.

Don't be fooled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, one man, one woman, one American, one vote—that is what the writers of our Constitution put in the Constitution—not one corporation, one vote.

What I hear on the Senate floor today and yesterday from those candidates who seem to rely on corporate money, who are the beneficiaries of a showering of—not thousands, not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands, not millions—tens of millions of dollars, candidates who benefit from

the showering of tens of millions of dollars for their campaigns, what they are saying on this Senate floor is almost laughable.

It would be laughable if it weren't so serious. It would be laughable if it didn't contribute to the corruption of this institution, of this government of which we are so proud—"of the people, by the people, for the people"—one man, one American, one vote.

With Citizens United, with McCutcheon the Supreme Court has effectively ruled the more money you have, the more influence you have over our democracy.

When what I hear from the other side—again, those who are the beneficiaries of the millions, of the tens of millions of corporate dollars, often Wall Street, often oil companies, often big drug companies, often big tobacco companies—when they come to the floor and plead, they are pleading in many ways that the supporters of this constitutional amendment are restricting the right to free speech. I agree. Whether it is the Koch brothers, whether it is the Big Tobacco executives, they should get one vote.

But when they can spend millions and millions of dollars and shower some of my colleagues with this kind of corporate money to get their way, we know what is happening in this country. We know for the richest 1 percent of this country incomes have grown and grown, gone up and up.

We know for the broad middle, for the bottom 90 percent, for the middle, for the great majority of people in this country, their wages have been flat. No, they have actually been worse than flat over the past 20 years.

The wealthy are getting extraordinarily wealthy, extraordinarily wealthier. The middle class, even sort of the upper middle class—let alone those who are making minimum wage or making \$15 an hour, their wages have been stagnant or worse.

One reason for that is—the Presiding Officer from Massachusetts has spoken out about this nationally over and over again—one of the reasons wages have been flat in this country—and the rich are getting richer and richer—is the corruption of Big Money in our political system.

I know how it works. In my race for reelection in 2012—and I am not complaining about this. As my wife's book publisher said: No whining on the yacht. If you get to be in the Senate, don't complain. But I also understand when they spent \$42 million against me in my campaign—I am a big boy, I can take it—it was oil money, it was tobacco money, it was mostly out-of-State money. It was money from some of the richest people in the United States of America.

What did they want? They didn't dislike me personally, I assume. Maybe they did. I don't really care. But what

it was really about is they wanted—whether the person came from Troy, OH, or Troy, MI, or Troy, NY—a politician in office from Ohio, as they wanted in Massachusetts, as they want this year in New Hampshire, as they want this year in Arkansas, as they want this year in Kansas, as they want this year in North Carolina, in Louisiana, Alaska, and Colorado—they want a lap dog. They want somebody who will go to the well and vote with Big Tobacco, go to the well and vote for Wall Street, and go to the well and vote for oil companies.

That is what they will get if we continue this corrupt way of campaign financing.

The Presiding Officer remembers—after we passed the Dodd-Frank legislation in this Congress 4 years ago and when she was working to establish a consumer protection agency—after the vote on Dodd-Frank, do we remember what the leading financial services lobbyist in this town said? The President signed the bill—within an hour or two, or at least the same day—and the lobbyist said: Well, folks, it is half-time.

What did that mean? He wasn't talking about the NFL. He was talking about: Well, we lost in Congress. They actually passed a bill that Wall Street wasn't wild about. They actually passed a bill that the largest financial institutions were not particularly happy about, but they knew they could use their lobbying, and they have thousands of lobbyists in this town.

They have a number of lobbyists for every Member of Congress. They knew they could use their lobbying force.

They knew they could use the politicians they had—I won't say people here were bought, but you might suggest they are on a long-term lease in some cases. They were suggesting just the threat of spending money.

So if you cast a vote in this institution next week, let's say, on a controversial issue, we know a couple of things. You know you should do the right thing. You know what your constituents back in Florida, Massachusetts or Ohio are saying, but you also know one other thing. You know if you cast a vote that Wall Street might not like, if you cast a vote that Big Tobacco might not like, if you cast a vote that oil companies may not like, do you know what is going to happen? What is in your mind if they come to your State in the next election and spend \$10 million or \$20 million or \$30 million or \$40 million.

I had \$40 million spent against me because I don't do what Wall Street wants. I don't do what tobacco wants. I don't do what the oil industry wants. Of course, they are going to come after me.

They fell short in 2012—not by much but they fell short. But we know they will do it again. We know every time we cast a vote they are keeping a

scorecard and saying: Well, we like what that Senator did, we will help him or her—usually him in that case. We don't like what she did, we don't like what he did, so we may be looking out to spend that kind of money. One man, one woman, one American, one vote—not one corporation, one vote.

Fortune 500 companies straddle the globe. They reap millions of dollars of profits. American corporations are at their most profitable time perhaps in their history sitting on tens, hundreds of millions of dollars in profit.

It doesn't take a Ph.D. in math to understand they spent a small, small, microfraction of the money they are making to protect those profits.

How do they do it? They come to Ohio, they come to Massachusetts, they come to Florida, they come anywhere in the country and they spend millions. They spend tens of millions to protect themselves on behalf of Wall Street, on behalf of Big Oil, on behalf of these big tobacco companies. It is all pretty simple: one man, one woman, one American, one vote.

Citizens United and McCutcheon make clear there is now an entry fee for participating in our democracy. That is why I support the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator UDALL that curbs unlimited campaign spending: one man, one woman, one American.

This amendment grants Congress the authority to regulate and limit the raising and spending of money. We are not shutting anybody off. Anybody can still give fairly significant amounts of money. But we do know—do the math. After the McCutcheon decision, donors can now contribute up to \$3.6 million an election cycle.

I don't know for sure, because I have not met most of the 300 million people in our country, but I don't think there are all that many that have the wherewithal financially to contribute \$3.6 million. But I also know—because my staff did the math on this one, I acknowledge—the average person making minimum wage at \$7.25 an hour—and, parenthetically, the same people who love McCutcheon love the millions of dollars spent, showered on us from Wall Street or against us from Wall Street, from Big Tobacco or from Big Oil. Those same people are stopping the minimum wage from being increased.

The minimum wage is at its lowest level in buying power since 1968. It has been stuck at \$7.25 an hour.

Back in the era of bipartisanship on minimum wage—we actually passed one in 2007, my first year in the Senate, signed by Republican President Bush. Those days seem to be past.

Think about the math. At \$7.25 an hour, people are allowed to give \$3.6 million under the McCutcheon decision—pushed by corporations and handed down by the Supreme Court—that says corporations are people too, more or less.

For a minimum wage worker, it would take 239 years, working full time, making \$7.25 an hour, to make \$3.6 million. And then they would have to give it all away in that election cycle to be able to compete with the oil companies, the drug companies, and Big Tobacco and Wall Street.

This is very clear. We can change it.

Again, back to the arguments on the other side. They are laughable at home. I don't think I know anybody who thinks it is OK that we are allowing somebody to come in and spend—except for colleagues whom I like. Most of the people on the other side of this issue, I like them personally, but I don't know very many people, unless they are in Washington, unless they have a stake in this system—I don't know people who think it is a great idea to let people spend \$3.6 million. They are not spending it out of their charitable whims. They are spending it because they want their people, their water boys, their water girls for the drug companies, the water boys and the water girls for Wall Street, the water boys and the water girls for Big Tobacco, they want those people elected, not people who will stand up to those interest groups and do the right thing.

To restore voters' faith in the political system, to ensure voters that their voices are being heard, one man, one woman, one American, one vote, that is what we stand for. Those are our values. That is why this is an important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Florida for allowing me to do this before his final remarks of the evening.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEETING HOUSE FARM CENTENNIAL

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, Vermont has always been a farming State, and it is the dairy, livestock, vegetable, and fruit farms to which we owe thanks for the open pastures and spectacular vistas that Vermonters and all those who visit our State cherish. None is more beautiful than Meeting House Farm in Norwich, owned by Deb and Jay Van Arman. The farm, located on a hill outside of the village, with an expansive view down the beautiful Connecticut River Valley, has been in the family since Deb's and her brother

David Pierce's grandparents arrived in a Sears, Roebuck & Company wagon from Quechee in 1914.

On Saturday, August 2, Deb, Jay and David hosted a centennial reunion for a grateful crowd of family and friends who came from as far as California, Holland and South America. The reunion was a celebration of farming, family, and community for those who grew up on or visited the farm over the years. They shared stories of haying and collecting maple sap with Deb and David's father "Bub," riding the tractor and collecting eggs, and sitting around the kitchen table sharing one of their mother Janet's bountiful meals. Janet ran a day care at the farm for local children and later became Norwich's beloved town clerk.

The dairy herd was sold in the 1980s, but the haying goes on. There are goats and Deb's big vegetable garden, and half a dozen Holstein cows from another farm graze the hillside. Meeting House Farm represents the best of Vermont, and we owe a debt of gratitude to the Pierce-Van Arman family for keeping it a farm all these years.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about the centennial on the front page of the August 3rd Valley News be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Valley News, Aug. 3, 2014]

A CENTURY OF FARMING IN NORWICH: FAMILY MEMBERS FLOCK FROM AROUND THE WORLD TO MARK ANNIVERSARY

(By Aimee Caruso)

NORWICH.—A Norwich family marked 100 years of farm life yesterday with hayrides, games and dinner, photographs, storytelling and socializing.

Meeting House Farm, owned by Jay and Deb Van Arman, has been in the family for a century, and the trend is set to continue into the future.

Yesterday, however, was all about celebrating the crop of longtime friendships and family bonds the Union Village Road farm has produced over the decades. Wearing name tags, people of all ages mingled yesterday, snacking and sharing memories. Milling near a table laden with pies, candy-studded cookies and other goodies, they described the farm as a warm and lively place.

Jeff Bradley, who grew up just down the road, was in 4-H with the Van Armans' children and spent many days on the farm, tossing hay bales and collecting sap for maple syrup. He longingly recalled the yeast doughnuts and dill pickles, both of which were eaten dipped in maple syrup, made by Deb's late mother, Janet. And he remembered something else that left a big impression on him.

"No matter what, you stopped by and they had time for you," said Bradley, who now lives in Massachusetts with his family. "Time for a story, time to sit down and have coffee."

People have always dropped in and visited the farm, said Deb Van Arman, seated under a large white tent set up for the occasion. "It's been important to encourage that so we have a sense of community. We have that, and we're very grateful."

Yesterday's gathering, months in the making, drew about 240 people from across the country and beyond, including 26 of 27 first cousins. The 27th wanted to come, but couldn't make it because his wife was sick, Deb Van Arman explained.

The Van Armans' children and their families came in from New York state, Chile and Holland. One family friend came from Taipei, Taiwan; others made the trip from Hamburg, Germany. In addition to relatives, the group included people who had worked on the farm, neighbors, and former neighbors, "people who have helped us over the years," Deb said, choking up. "It's just great."

Some spent the night on the farm; others bunked with neighbors who had opened their houses for the occasion and provided food and beer, said the Van Armans' son, Tom. "It's like Airbnb on steroids."

The 116-acre farm, established in the 1780s, is thought to be the town's oldest working farm. It's named for the timbers in the original barn. When Norwich's first meeting house was torn down, the farm's owner, Constant Murdock, bought the beams for his barn, said Nancy Hoggson, president of the Norwich Historical Society. Initially a subsistence farm, it would eventually grow into a dairy business.

Deb Van Arman's grandparents, Charles and Lucy Pierce, bought the property in 1913 and moved there from a small farm in Quechee. The Pierces' son, Charles "Bub" Pierce, and his wife, Janet, lived with them on the farm, where Janet ran a day care and Bub farmed until he became ill in 1970, the same year the Van Armans married. Bub died the following year, and Janet farmed with the neighbors' help until later in 1971, when Jay took over. They expanded their herd and carried on with the dairy business until 1986.

With three children to put through college, a farmer's pay wouldn't cut it, so the couple took part in a federal herd buy-out program, selling their dairy cows. Both are officially retired—Jay was a mail carrier in Norwich, and Deb, a physical therapist, worked at the VA. But their work on the farm didn't end. Deb keeps up the grounds, including the vegetable, herb and flower gardens. Jay runs a composting business and makes hay—he puts up and sells about 14,000 bales a year, their main income. They also depend on the state's current use plan to reduce taxes, he said. "If it wasn't for current use, we wouldn't be here."

Theirs is one of eight farms featured in *Cycles of Change: Farming in Norwich*, now on display at the historical society. The exhibit, comprising photographs, video, oral histories and text, will run through next spring.

Farming has seen big changes over the past several decades, and rolling with the times has taken perseverance, financial investments and plenty of hard work. New federal regulations in the mid 1900s meant expensive upgrades for dairy farms, Hoggson said. "A lot of small farmers couldn't adjust to those changes, so they had to close up shop."

She called the fact that the same family has owned Meeting House Farm for a century "extraordinary."

"Keeping that land together has been really, really important to the whole family," she said. "It's very unusual, I think, and a real credit to them as individuals and to their commitment to the land, the importance of family, and place that they have been able to do this."

Yesterday's event was, in part, a tribute to that effort.

"We wanted to celebrate all the happiness (the farm) has brought and all the hard work my parents have done through thick and thin," said daughter Emily Myers. "It's not easy, having a lot of property. . . . It can be very expensive, especially with taxes, and they have been able to make it work."

As with most farm kids, summers and the hours after school found the Van Arman children tending to chores. Growing up on the farm has had a lasting impact on them, Myers said. "It gave us great morals, great values and always a sense of home."

On display yesterday was the Sears and Roebuck wagon Deb's grandparents bought to travel to the farm with their young children. The family had hitched their cows to the wagon, and on the way, one gave birth on Christian Street. Her father retrieved the calf the following day. Their move from Quechee to the farm, made in mud season, was quite a journey, Deb Van Arman said.

Within the next few years, a similar, if much more modern, trek will take place, as the Van Armans' daughters, Kate and Emily, plan to return to the farm with their families.

"The only thing I ever knew was this farm," Deb Van Arman said. Knowing her children will carry on the tradition "is very special."

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, a landmark piece of legislation that continues to improve the lives of millions of women, their families, and the communities that support them. I was proud to cosponsor this legislation when it was originally enacted in 1994, led by then-Senator, now-Vice President BIDEN. And I was proud to fight for its reauthorizations in 2000, 2005, and 2013, each time refining and building upon the great work that VAWA does each day.

This legislation stands today as an example of what we are really called here to do—meeting people's day-to-day needs. That means protecting people, making their lives better, and providing vital resources to those in need. No woman in this country should live in fear that her partner will hurt or kill her or her kids. I have zero tolerance for domestic violence. If you are beaten and abused, you should have somewhere to turn for help and a path to recovery.

VAWA is crucial in all of our communities. Every day VAWA is providing services to families in desperate need. I hear from my constituents far too often about the challenges they are facing, often involving significant economic struggles only to be complicated by deep emotional pain and fear.

Here are the statistics: 1 in 4 women will be victims of domestic violence. 16 million children are exposed to domestic violence every day. And over 2 million will be victims themselves of physical or sexual violence each year. 20,000 of these cases are in my own State of

Maryland. Since we created the legislation in 1994, the national hotline has received millions of calls. Millions of women felt in danger and had the chance of being rescued.

In my own State of Maryland VAWA is making recovery possible for victims by finding them legal help to separate from their abusers. They are also getting vital services at rape crisis centers and navigating our immigration system to ensure protection.

Through the years I have heard from too many Marylanders about their struggles. Fortunately, VAWA programs existed to help them. I heard from one of my constituents, Jean on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. Jean was married to her husband for 10 years and shared 2 children. She benefited from VAWA's Legal Assistance for Victims Grant after being abused so brutally one evening. Jean called the hotline and got the legal assistance to file for a protective order, which she ultimately was awarded and is now living her life safely with her children.

I also heard from Danielle. Danielle was sexually assaulted at the age of 19 by an associate that she knew. She was aided by VAWA's Sexual Assault Services program when she made the connection with the rape crisis center a few days after her attack. Danielle got the support she needed at the crisis center. She received personalized safety planning and counseling and was provided a lawyer to help her get a peace order.

I also hear from law enforcement in Maryland who say VAWA is helping them make communities safer. The Lethality Assessment Program, pioneered in Maryland and now a model for the Nation, was strengthened in the last VAWA reauthorization. The program is used to identify high risk situations at the outset to link up local police with domestic violence professionals to provide wrap around services and empowerment to get victims out of harm's way and reduce homicides. This was made possible because of VAWA which provided the Federal funding to make this a reality.

As chair of the appropriations subcommittee that funds the Justice Department, I have secured funding for the Violence Against Women Act programs at the highest levels ever. These programs ensure tougher penalties for abusers, coordinated assistance with community organizations, and court advocates for abused women to boost reporting and prosecution.

In the fiscal year 2015 CJS spending bill I provided a robust \$430 million for Violence Against Women grants, continuing a strong commitment to VAWA programs. I also provide strong investments in core VAWA programs including: \$195 million for STOP formula grants, which coordinates community response to domestic violence and also trains police, prosecutors and

judicial staff; \$30 million for sexual assault services that direct services for victims of rape; \$26 million for transitional housing grants so victims have safe and affordable housing after shelters; and \$50 million for Grants to Encourage Arrests, which teaches police and prosecutors how to support victims and ensure offender accountability.

So today, as we mark 20 years of VAWA, we reflect on what it has done for families across our country and women in desperate need. But we also reflect with the renewed knowledge that the programs that have been in place are reducing domestic violence and improving outcomes. If it is anything that the last 20 years have shown us, it is that VAWA works. I am proud of it and am so happy to mark this important milestone.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I was absent on July 28, 2014, and missed the opportunity to vote on the confirmation of Ms. Pamela Harris to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Vote No. 242.

I wish to state for the record my support for Ms. Harris's nomination, and that I would have voted aye on Ms. Harris's nomination.

RECOGNIZING JOE SCOTT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, on September 16, the Boys and Girls Club of Central Wyoming will celebrate their 16th Annual Awards and Recognition Breakfast. During the event, they will honor a member of the community who has significantly contributed to the Boys and Girls Club. I am delighted that this year's honoree is Joe Scott, a Casper, Wyoming-native, entrepreneur, and philanthropist.

Joe was born and raised in Casper. He attended St. Anthony's Catholic School, East Junior High, and Kelly Walsh High School. His uncle, Jack Sullivan, put Joe to work on the family's ranch in Wyoming's Shirley Basin. Joe collected his first paycheck when he was in the third grade and has continued to work hard ever since. As a young man he worked as an oil pumpjack for McMurtry Oil Company. The McMurtry's could always count on Joe to get the job done. Joe stayed with the company through the 1990s as they discovered and developed the Jonah Field. Following his long career with McMurtry Oil, he used his tenacity and entrepreneurial spirit to found energy ventures, including a water treatment company and a mud motor company.

The Boys and Girls Clubs of Central Wyoming are grateful for Joe Scott's contributions to their critically important mission. The club offers programs and services that promote and enhance the development of our youth. Their activities provide the youth with a

sense of competence, usefulness and belonging.

My wife Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations to Joe and thanking him for his dedication to Wyoming and its youth. He is the perfect example of a citizen who has truly paid back to his community.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL STEPHANIE A. HOLCOMBE

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to recognize Oklahoma resident Col. Stephanie A. Holcombe of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, or JIEDDO, who will retire from the U.S. Air Force on January 1, 2015, after 25 years of distinguished service. Col. Holcombe significantly impacted the global fight against improvised explosive devices during her final tour of duty as JIEDDO's chief of public affairs. She directly contributed to creating a global awareness about the IED threat; and helped inform and educate people about JIEDDO's work to reduce the effectiveness of IEDs and eliminate the enemy networks that seek to use these devices to harm our troops.

Col. Holcombe is a distinguished graduate of Oklahoma State University's Reserve Officers' Training Corps in Stillwater, OK, class of 1989, with a degree in photo journalism. She also achieved two master's degrees from the University of Florida and the National War College.

During her 25-year long career as a public affairs officer, she held assignments with Air Combat Command, Air Mobility Command, Air Force Material Command, Air Force Special Operations Command and on the Headquarters Air Staff. In 2004, she deployed to Baghdad where she worked with the U.S. Embassy and conducted operations for Multi-National Forces—Iraq.

Col. Holcombe earned numerous awards and decorations including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal and the Air Force Achievement Medal, among others. She also received Air Force wide accolades for her excellence in journalism, twice earning the Thomas Jefferson Award.

I am proud to share in the celebration of Col. Stephanie A. Holcombe's military career. I wish her all the best in her retirement.●

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST WILLIAM E. ALLMON

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SPC William E. Allmon, of Ardmore, OK who died on

April 12, 2008, of wounds suffered when his vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

William was a combat engineer who joined the Army in June 2000 and was on his second deployment to Iraq. He previously deployed as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom from January 2005 to January 2006. He was assigned to 1st Battalion, 64th Armor Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Stewart, GA.

"If you didn't know him, you missed out on a lot," wrote SGT Richard White in a letter read tearfully by his wife during a funeral service. "You are not only my best friend, you are my brother."

A funeral service was held on April 22, 2008 at Pleasant Valley South Baptist Church in Silver Creek, GA.

William is survived by his wife Jennifer, their son Damien and stepson Jason "Luke" Johnson, his mother Donna Fortune, and his father William Allmon.

He loved his family and his children. "We're going to miss his smile and his antics—he was a kid at heart. When we went to Chuck E. Cheese, he'd get as much out of it as the kids," said the soldier's father, William Allmon.

Today we remember Army SPC William E. Allmon, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

STAFF SERGEANT KEVIN R. BROWN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to also honor the life and sacrifice of Army SSG Kevin R. Brown, of Harrah, OK who died on September 25, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Muqdadiyah, Iraq.

A cavalry scout, Brown joined the military in September 1988, a year after graduating from Harrah High School. He was inspired to join the military by his father Richard Haynes Brown, a senior master sergeant who retired at Tinker Air Force Base, OK after 22 years of service.

In April 2006 he was assigned 6th Squadron, 9th Cavalry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, based in Fort Hood, TX and deployed for his second tour to Iraq in October 2006.

A funeral service was held at the Brown family plot in Rineyville, KY, near Fort Knox, TN.

Kevin is survived by his parents Glenda and Richard Haynes Brown, his wife Lena of Killeen, TX, the couple's daughters Maria, 13, and Charlene, 14, a sister Brandy Ross of Moore, OK, and two stepchildren Jeremy and Pamela.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Kevin's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American

hero who twice volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS CODY M. CARVER

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I also wish to remember Army PFC Cody M. Carver who died on October 30, 2007 of wounds sustained when enemy forces engaged his unit with small-arms fire and an improvised explosive device in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born June 23, 1988, Cody joined the Army in November 2006. Upon completing basic training he returned to Oklahoma to serve as a hometown recruiter. He was then assigned to 1st Battalion, 15th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Benning, GA where he was deployed to Iraq on September 28, 2007.

Cody's father, Darrell Lee Carver, was wounded during the Vietnam war. That, along with the September 11, 2001 attacks was his motivation for joining the Army, his mother said. "He had talked about joining the Army since the ninth grade. I guess it was about the same time 9/11 happened. That bothered him so bad, he just wanted to go and make it right," she said.

A memorial service was held on November 10, 2007 at Coweta High School, with burial at the Vernon Cemetery in Coweta, OK.

His mother remembers him as very much a single man with a huge sense of humor. "I asked him at Valentine's Day if there was anyone he wanted me to send flowers to," said his mother. "He said, 'Mom, that would be too many flowers. You couldn't afford it.'"

Cody is survived by his parents Darrel and Pam Carver of Haskell, OK, brothers Lee and Jake Carver of Haskell, OK, and his grandparents Charles Orsburn and Barbara Phillippe of Waggoner, OK, and Ronald and Edna Carver of Coweta, OK.

Today we remember Army PFC Cody M. Carver, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DAVID R. HURST

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to also honor the life and sacrifice of Army SFC David R. Hurst, of Fort Sill, OK who died on June 8, 2008, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born October 21, 1976, David was a 1994 graduate of Ridgewood Prep School in Metairie, LA. He enlisted in the Army in March 1995 and completed basic and advanced individual training at Fort Benning, GA before being honorably discharged in June 1998.

Returning to active duty in August 1999, he served as a basic training drill sergeant at Fort Sill, OK, from November 2005 to October 2007 and was then reassigned to 2nd Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division (Light Infantry), Fort Polk, LA.

A funeral service was held on June 17, 2008 at Schoen Funeral home with internment at Lake Lawn Park Cemetery and Mausoleum in New Orleans, LA.

David is preceded in death by his mother Harryette Kock and survived by his father Max Wayne Hurst, his stepmother Lillian T. Hurst, his brothers Chris and Mark Hurst, and numerous nieces, nephews, other relatives, and friends.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to David's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who twice volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS JEFFRY D. KETTLE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to also honor the life and sacrifice of Army SFC Jeffery D. Kettle who died on August 12, 2007 of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Nangarhar province near Kuzkalakhel, Afghanistan.

Born August 26, 1975 and listing Madill, OK as his home of record, Jeff was a product of Texas City, TX. Military service ran in his family with his grandfather, uncles, brother, and father also completing service time. "Jeff was the ultimate warrior," said Ronald Kettle, noting his son joined the Army in 1993 right after graduating from high school. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group based at Fort Bragg, NC and was on his fourth deployment.

A memorial service was held August 31, 2007, at Calvary Baptist Church in Texas City, TX. Jeff was buried with military honors at Arlington National Cemetery on August 22, 2007. His flag-draped coffin was carried to the grave site by a six-man casket team of soldiers from the 3rd Infantry Regiment. In the brief ceremony, relatives including his parents and his wife recited the Lord's Prayer. His father said his son, 31, wished to be at Arlington because "he wanted to be buried among heroes."

Jeff is survived by his parents Ron and Cindy Kettle, his wife Brandi Kettle, two sons Jeffrey and Logan, grandmother Anne Moore, and two brothers Ryan and Clay Kettle.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Jeff's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

CAPTAIN TORRE R. MALLARD

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to remember another remarkable

young man, Army CPT Torre R. Mallard. Assigned to 2nd Squadron, 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Hood, TX., Torre died March 10, 2008 of wounds suffered from an improvised explosive device while serving his Nation in Balad Ruz, Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The son of a retired army master sergeant, Torre was born August 20, 1980 in Anniston, AL, and lived throughout the United States and Europe, eventually graduating from Salmen High School in Slidell, LA, in 1998.

While attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, Torre was actively involved in the boxing and football programs. During the spring semester of his sophomore year at the academy he served a 4-month term as a company commander, one of the highest positions in the Cadet Chain of Command at the academy. In June 2002 he earned a commission in the Army and graduated with a degree in computer science.

A memorial service was held on March 12, 2008 in Anniston, with burial in the U.S. Military Academy Post Cemetery at West Point, NY.

Torre is survived by his wife Bonita, two young sons Torre Jr. and Joshua, and his parents Mose and Robin Mallard.

Today we remember Army CPT Torre R. Mallard, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST MICHAEL E. PHILLIPS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to also pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Michael E. Phillips who died on February 24, 2008 in Baghdad, Iraq.

Michael left for basic training on June 24, 2006. Upon finishing advanced infantry training, he was assigned to Bravo Company 1 of the 502nd Strike Brigade of the 101st Airborne Division.

On October 13, 2007, he and his teammates deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Just 4 months into his deployment an improvised explosive device tore through the door of the vehicle he was driving. Despite the severity of his injuries he continued to smile and reassure those taking care of him. Even in the most grim and serious times, Michael still fought and lifted up those around him.

He is survived by his parents Steven and Angelia Phillips, his brothers David and Anthony, and his sister Barbara—all of Ardmore, OK.

Michael excelled at drawing and had been offered admission to the San Francisco Art Institute, his mother said. But serving his country meant more than going to college, she said.

"He came home one day and said he wanted to join the Army, and we got in the car and went down to the recruiting station," Angelia Phillips said. "He said terrorism was like a virus. It had to be stopped. It had to be contained."

Her son was reenlisting to join for 2 more years because "he didn't want to leave his squad, his guys," she said.

Today we remember Army SPC Michael E. Phillips, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL BRYAN J. SCRIPSICK

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I also wish to remember Marine Corps Cpl Bryan J. Scripsick who, along with three other Marines, succumbed to injuries sustained after a suicide bomber attacked their position in Anbar province north of Baghdad, Iraq on September 6, 2007.

Bryan was born August 21, 1985. Although the family home is in Wayne, OK, he graduated in 2004 from Pauls Valley High School, where he played safety and wide receiver on the football team.

Rather than pursuing his dream of playing college football, Bryan chose to join the Marine Corps right after his 19th birthday in August 2004. He was assigned to 3rd Assault amphibian Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA and was on his second tour to Iraq.

More than 100 people filled the First United Methodist Church for a memorial service held on September 13, 2007. Burial took place at the Mount Olivet Cemetery in Pauls Valley, OK. At the cemetery, members of the Marine honor guard carried the casket to the gravesite where the flag was folded above the casket and presented to Bryan's parents and his brother. He was then honored with three volleys from a rifle party and the playing of Taps.

Bryan is survived by his parents Jon and Jan Scripsick, and his brother Brett Scripsick of Pauls Valley, OK.

Today we remember Marine Corps Cpl Bryan J. Scripsick, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.●

CONGRATULATING THE MARLTON REDS BASEBALL TEAM

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I wish to honor the 12 young athletes of the Marlton Reds 10-and-Under Baseball Team from Evesham Township, NJ for their commendable victory at the 2014 Cal Ripken 10-Year-Old World Series on August 16, 2014. Led by the unwavering leadership of Manager Robert Reynolds, Coach Mark Bergstrom, and Coach Joe Morgan, the Marlton Reds won the 2014 10-and-Under Babe Ruth/Cal Ripken Baseball New Jersey District 5 Championship, the New Jersey State Championship, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Championship, and the 10-Year-Old Cal Ripken World Series. The twelve players of the Marlton Reds 10-and-Under Baseball Team that won the World Series are: Colby Reynolds, Jackson Edelman, Zach Weiner, Blake Weinstein, Chris Bonafiglia, Adrian Hernandez, Aaron Bergstrom, Blake

Morgan, Raymond Stutzer, Josh Free, Ryan Furman, and Ethan Stith.

These wonderful young athletes have displayed the hard work and dedication that make goals and dreams attainable. Throughout their victorious season, the Marlton Reds garnered the support of their community, receiving countless donations to help them travel to Winchester, VA for the World Series tournament. Upon arrival, the Marlton Reds won all 6 of their games, including the Cal Ripken 10-and-Under Championship Game against a very talented team from Southeastern Lexington, KY by a score of 9 to 1. While every member of the Marlton Reds played exceptionally well, Blake Morgan made the All World Series Team while winning the World Series Batting Title and Most Outstanding Player award, while Jackson Edelman made the All World Series Team and the All Defensive Team.

I would also like to applaud the parents, coaches, and volunteers that work tirelessly to ensure athletes like the 12 members of the Marlton Reds have a place to grow and achieve in sports and in life. It is through the commitment of the entire community that our youth will develop into champions, both on and off the field. I commend the Marlton Reds 10-and-Under Baseball Team, as well as the people of Evesham Township who supported them throughout the season, for winning the Cal Ripken 10-Year-Old World Series.●

CONGRATULATING THE BROOKLAWN BROOKERS BASEBALL TEAM

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, today I wish to honor the eighteen young athletes of the Brooklawn Brookers Baseball Team of the American Legion Post 72 from Brooklawn, NJ for their commendable victory at the 2014 American Legion Senior World Series on August 19, 2014. Led by the unwavering leadership of coach Dennis Barth, the Brooklawn Brookers won the 2014 New Jersey State American Legion Championship, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Championship, and their second consecutive American Legion World Series Championship. The 18 players of the Brooklawn Brookers Team that won the World Series are: Eric Becker, Joe Bobiak, Sean Breen, Austin Darrow, Phil Dickinson, Pete Farlow, Eric Grafton, John Malatesta, Anthony Harrold, Rocco Mazzeo, Steven Mondile, Tyler Mondile, Eric Schorr, Ray Taylor, Kevin Terifay, Fran Kinsey, Tre Todd, and Matt Parr.

These wonderful young athletes have displayed the hard work and dedication that make goals and dreams attainable. Throughout their victorious season, the Brooklawn Brookers played with the passion and determination that made it possible to collectively

win a championship despite the passing of their longtime Manager, Joe Barth, Sr. Upon their arrival at the World Series in Shelby, NC, the Brookers won all five of their games, including the American Legion Senior World Series Championship Game against a very talented team from Midland, MI. While every member of the Brookers played exceptionally well, Sean Breen was named the 2014 World Series Tournament Most Valuable Player while also receiving the 2014 George W. Rulon Player of the Year Award, the 2014 Louisville Slugger Batting Championship, and sharing the 2014 Rawlings Big Stick Award with teammate Anthony Harrold.

I would also like to applaud the parents, coaches, and volunteers that work tirelessly to ensure athletes like the 18 members of the Brooklawn Brookers have a place to grow and achieve in sports and in life. It is through the commitment of the entire community that our youth will develop into champions, both on and off the field. I commend the Brooklawn Brookers American Legion Post 72 Baseball Team, as well as the people of the State of New Jersey who supported them throughout the season, for winning the 2014 American Legion Senior World Series.●

REMEMBERING THE REVEREND JOSEPH DAY

● Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, it is appropriate that the Senate take note on occasion of those who ably and honestly serve the country and their fellow man. Our government has many who do so every day.

The Reverend Joseph Day was born in rural Dixons Mill, AL, being one of eight children. He grew up in Toulminville, near Mobile, AL, and was a contemporary of baseball great Hank Aaron. They played baseball together and both attended the Greater Morning Star Missionary Baptist Church.

He started work as a U.S. government civilian employee at Brookley Air Force Base in Mobile. When Brookley closed, Day transferred to what is now Robins Air Force Base, in Warner Robins, GA, retiring after 40 years of service. After returning to Mobile, he then spent 17 years working for Volkert, Inc., in Mobile.

He was passionate about helping others. He served as executive director of the Macon, GA chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and while in Macon was called to preach. Returning to Mobile, he founded the House of Joshua Christian Center Church where he pastored until his death. His influence is demonstrated in the remarkable fact that the Day family has produced several Christian ministers.

He was an activist and a leader in the causes he believed in. In 1991, he stood

for 7 hours before bulldozers to save a spring fed lake. In the end, the Mobile City Council voted to save the lake and named it Day Lake in his honor.

His wife of 65 years, Ruby Nell James Day, predeceased him. She was a wonderful and beloved woman and a member of the respected James family of Mobile.

Reverend Day's funeral service was a true celebration of a remarkable life well-lived. Speakers at the service included former Mobile Mayor Sam Jones, State Representative James Busky, State Senator Vivian Figures, and City Councilman Fred Richardson. I was also honored to speak. Several prominent pastors from Mobile conducted the service. They were: Ronald McCree, pastor—Greater Morning Star Baptist Church (Eulogy); Clinton Johnson, pastor—New Shiloh Baptist Church (Officiating); Fleet Bell, pastor—Rock of Faith Baptist Church (Song); Darlett-Lucy Gulley, pastor—New Life Methodist Church (Prayer of Comfort); Minister Ronald Suggs, Greater Morning Star Baptist Church (Old Testament Reading); and Minister Gregory Palmer, Sr., Greater Morning Star Baptist Church (New Testament Reading). These pastors have earned the respect of the community over many years for their faith and service to others.

I came to know and respect Reverend Day's son, Eric, when I hired him as the law enforcement coordinator for the U.S. attorney's office in Mobile, where he still works. He reflects the integrity and faith of his father. I am also proud that Eric's wonderful wife Valerie Day has served as my field representative since I was elected to the Senate almost 18 years ago.

This Nation must continue to produce leaders like Reverend Day who, in turn, produce families of energy, drive, faith and service. It is they who provide the vision and faith, and the service, that are the qualities that make America exceptional. •

REMEMBERING EDMOND LEE JUNEAU

• Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to honor Edmond Lee Juneau, a veteran of the U.S. Army.

It is my honor to share the story of Edmond's service because no veteran's story should ever go unrecognized.

Edmond was born in Green Bay, WI, on November 9, 1920, but grew up in Browning, MT, where he was known for his tremendous athleticism, playing football, basketball, and baseball.

He graduated from Browning High School and married the love of his life Margie Bird Juneau. He and Margie had eight children: seven boys and one girl.

On June 22, 1944, Edmond began his service in the U.S. Army with the 69th Armored Infantry Battalion Company

A. He served alongside his cousin William "Bill" Big Springs and former Montana Governor, Tim Babcock. Edmond and Tim became close friends, and it was their time overseas that built a strong bond between the two men.

Edmond served in three different campaigns: Rhineland, the Ardennes, and Central Europe. Edmond didn't talk much about the war but told his son Stan one specific memory.

Near the end of the war, Edmond and his fellow soldiers were sitting on their tanks at the Russian border waiting for orders to advance. The Russians, just a short distance away, were also sitting on their tanks waiting for their orders. The orders never came, so at night the two units would come together and talk. Edmond was doing diplomacy with the Russians before the Cold War even started.

Edmond separated from the military on October 23, 1945, passing on his military legacy to his family. Three of his sons, Edmond Jr., Samson, and Robert, all went on to bravely serve our country.

Edmond's life of service extended far beyond the military. His work as a schoolbus driver and officer for the Browning Public Schools demonstrates an unwavering commitment to civic duty and responsibility. Edmond passed away on September 20, 1967.

Last week, in the presence of his family, it was my honor to present Stan Juneau and the entire Juneau family with Edmond's medals. The first medal was the highest medal I had ever given out: the Distinguished Service Medal. It is awarded to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the U.S. Army, has distinguished him or herself with exceptionally meritorious service to the government in a duty of great responsibility. The act must merit recognition for service which is clearly exceptional.

Edmond also earned the following medals: the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and the Good Conduct Medal.

It was my honor to present a European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with Three Bronze Service Stars, a World War II Victory Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge First Award.

I was also honored to present the Sharpshooter Badge with Rifle Bar and the Honorable Service Lapel Button, World War II.

These decorations are small tokens but powerful symbols of true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service.

These medals are presented on behalf of a grateful nation. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 78. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

H.R. 744. An act to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2495. An act to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2819. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3109. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaskan Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4283. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4527. An act to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, as the "Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4939. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office".

H.R. 5019. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office".

H.R. 5030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

H.R. 5089. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office".

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo,

California, as the “Philmore Graham Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5309. An act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 78. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the “George Thomas ‘Mickey’ Leland Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2495. An act to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2819. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 275 Front Street in Marietta, Ohio, as the “Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3109. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to exempt certain Alaskan Native articles from prohibitions against sale of items containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the “Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the “Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4283. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the “Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4527. An act to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, as the “Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office”; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4939. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the “Neil Havens Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5019. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the “Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5089. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the “Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the “Philmore Graham Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5309. An act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 744. An act to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6764. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands; Final Annual Harvest Estimates for 2014-2016” (RIN0648-BE03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6765. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6766. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Material Advisor Penalty for Failure to Furnish Information Regarding Reportable Transactions” ((RIN1545-BF59) (TD 9686)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6767. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Foreign Tax Credit Guidance under Section 901(m)” (Notice 2014-45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6768. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Segregation Rule Effective Date” ((RIN1545-BM18) (TD 9685)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6769. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Dixon v. Commissioner, 141 T.C. No. 3 (2013)” (AOD 2014-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6770. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2014 National Pool” (Rev. Proc. 2014-52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6771. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clarification and Modification of Notice 2013-29 and Notice 2013-60” (Notice 2014-46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6772. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates” (Notice 2014-48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6773. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Awards for Information Relating to Detecting Underpayments of Tax or Violations of the Internal Revenue Laws” ((RIN1545-BL08) (TD 9687)) received during adjournment of the Senate

in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6774. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities for FY 2015" (RIN0938-AS07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6775. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2015" ((RIN0938-AS09) (CMS-1608-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6776. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2014 (FY 2015)" ((RIN0938-AS08) (CMS-1606-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6777. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of the Treasury Regulations for the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund" ((RIN1505-AC44) (31 CFR Part 34)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6778. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of the Manton Valley Viticultural Area" (RIN1513-AC03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6779. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1229); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6780. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1154); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6781. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1152); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6782. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military

Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-1153); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6783. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2014-1173); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-087); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6785. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-031); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6786. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-061); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6787. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-075); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6788. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-083); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6789. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-055); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6790. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-086); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-040); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6792. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0090–2014-0094); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, eighteen (18) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6794. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collec-

tion—IDEA Data Management Center" (CFDA No. 84.373M.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6795. A communication from the Director, Office of Special Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priority. Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program—Rehabilitation Specialty Areas" (CFDA Nos. 84.129C, E, F, H, J, P, Q, R, and W.) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6796. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Simplification: Change to the Compliance Date for the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10-CM and ICD-10-PCS) Medical Data Code Sets" ((RIN0938-AS31) (CMS-0043-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6797. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority; Rehabilitation Services Administration-Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program" (CFDA No. 84.224D.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6798. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection—IDEA Fiscal Data Center" (34 CFR Chapter III) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6799. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority; Technical Assistance on State Data Collection—IDEA Data Management Center" (CFDA No. 84.373M.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6800. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority; Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Long-Term Training Program—Rehabilitation Specialty Areas" ((34 CFR Chapter III) (Docket No. ED-2014-OSERS-0068)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6801. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory

Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priorities; Rehabilitation Services Administration—Capacity Building Program for Traditionally Underserved Populations—Vocational Rehabilitation Training Institute for the Preparation of Personnel in American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Projects" ((CFDA No. 84.315C.) (Docket No. ED-2014-OSERS-0024)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6802. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Priority. Rehabilitation Training: Job-Driven Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center" (CFDA No. 84.264A.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6803. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6804. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6805. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6806. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under the Employee Protection Provision of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010" (RIN1218-AC58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6807. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendment to the List of CBP Preclearance Offices in Foreign Countries: Addition of Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates" (CBP Dec. 14-09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6808. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination Provisions" (RIN3206-AM77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6809. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Phased Retirement" (RIN3206-AM71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6810. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6811. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6812. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Sufficiency Certification for the Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operating and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6813. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Audit of the District's Eastern Market Program and Fund"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6814. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Report on The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6815. A communication from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Management and Budget, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 15, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6816. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Veteran Hiring in the Civil Service: Practices and Perceptions"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6817. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department's activities during calendar year

2013 relative to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6818. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Elimination of Firearms Transaction Record, ATF Form 4473 (Low Volume) (2008R-21P)" (RIN1140-AA34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6819. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-6820. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6821. A communication from the Chief of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance—Veterans' Group Life Insurance Regulation Update—ABO, VGLI Application, SGLI 2-Year Disability Extension" (RIN2900-A074) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6822. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule for Rating Disabilities—Mental Disorders and Definition of Psychosis for Certain VA Purposes" (RIN2900-A096) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6823. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance Information Access" (RIN2900-A042) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6824. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting, pursuant to the Congressional Accountability Act, a report relative to proposed procedural rulemaking; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6825. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting, pursuant to the Congressional Accountability Act, a report relative to proposed rulemaking; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 2780. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. 2781. A bill to improve student and exchange visitor visa programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2782. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to improve the Federal charter for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 538. A resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REID, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINES, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 539. A resolution relative to the death of James M. Jeffords, former United States Senator for the State of Vermont; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 375

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1628

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1628, a bill to provide Federal death and disability benefits for contractors who serve as firefighters of the Forest Service, Department of the Interior agencies, or any State or local entity.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1695, a bill to

designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 2223

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2223, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2462

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2462, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain educational institutions from the employer health insurance mandate.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2591

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2591, a bill to authorize the Secretary

of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2643

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2643, a bill to require a report by the Federal Communications Commission on designated market areas.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2650

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2650, a bill to provide for congressional review of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 2655

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2655, a bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2694, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 2706

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2706, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 2709

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2709, a bill to extend and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt private foundations from the tax on excess business holdings in the case of certain

philanthropic enterprises which are independently supervised, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2732

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2732, a bill to increase from \$10,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 2780. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties, Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2780

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BATTLE OF MILL SPRINGS STUDY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) In 1994, the Mills Springs Battlefield in Pulaski and Wayne Counties in Kentucky was designated as a National Historic Landmark by the Department of the Interior.

(2) The Battle of Mill Springs was the first significant Union victory in the western theater of the Civil War.

(3) The outcome of the Battle of Mill Springs, along with Union victories at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson paved the way for a major battle at Shiloh, Tennessee.

(4) In 1991, the National Park Service placed the Mill Springs Battlefield on a list of endangered battlefields, noting the impact of this battle to the course of the Civil War.

(5) In 1992, the Mill Springs Battlefield Association formed, and utilizing Federal, State, and local support has managed to preserve important tracts of the battlefield, construct an interactive visitor center, and educate the public about this historic event.

(6) There is strong community interest in incorporating the Mill Springs Battlefield into the National Park Service.

(7) The Mill Springs Battlefield Association has expressed its desire to give the pre-

served battlefield as a gift to the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) MILL SPRINGS BATTLEFIELD.—The term "Mill Springs Battlefield" means the area encompassed by the National Historic Landmark designations relating to the 1862 Battle of Mill Springs located in the counties of Pulaski and Wayne in Kentucky.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 3 years from the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Mill Springs Battlefield in Kentucky, and the feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System.

(d) CRITERIA FOR STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct the study authorized by this Act in accordance with 8(b) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(b)).

(e) CONTENT OF STUDY.—The study shall include an analysis of the following:

(1) The significance of the Battle of Mill Springs to the outcome of the Civil War.

(2) Opportunities for public education about the Civil War in Kentucky.

(3) Operational issues that should be considered if the National Park System were to incorporate the Mill Springs Battlefield.

(4) The feasibility of administering the Mill Springs Battlefield considering its size, configuration, and other factors, to include an annual cost estimate.

(5) The economic, educational, and other impacts the inclusion of Mill Springs Battlefield into the National Park System would have on the surrounding communities in Pulaski and Wayne Counties.

(6) The effect of the designation of the Mill Springs Battlefield as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing commercial and recreational activities, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities.

(7) The identification of any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the Mill Springs Battlefield is designated a unit of the National Park System.

(f) NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.—Upon commencement of the study, owners of private property adjacent to the battlefield will be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(g) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Upon completion of the study, the Secretary shall submit a report on the findings of the study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 538—EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE TO THE FAMILIES OF JAMES FOLEY AND STEVEN SOTLOFF, AND CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ACTS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 538

Whereas James Foley and Steven Sotloff were highly respected journalists whose integrity and dedication were a credit to their profession;

Whereas James Foley and Steven Sotloff embodied the spirit of our Nation's First Amendment liberties, including the freedom of the press;

Whereas James Foley and Steven Sotloff made significant contributions to our Nation through their courageous reporting of events in Libya, Syria, and elsewhere;

Whereas the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) is a terrorist organization responsible for committing barbaric acts against United States citizens;

Whereas ISIL continues to hold hostages in blatant contravention of international law;

Whereas ISIL has committed despicable acts of violence against Iraqi Christians, forcing many to flee their ancient homeland;

Whereas ISIL has committed despicable acts of violence against Muslims who do not subscribe to ISIL's depraved, violent, and oppressive ideology;

Whereas ISIL has threatened to decimate the ancient Yazidi population of Iraq while abducting Yazidi women and children and subjecting them to rape, forced marriage, and slavery;

Whereas ISIL has targeted many other religious and ethnic minority groups, including Turkmen populations; and

Whereas ISIL threatens to conduct terrorist attacks internationally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) strongly condemns the terrorist acts of ISIL, including the barbaric and deplorable murders of James Foley and Steven Sotloff;

(2) mourns the deaths of James Foley and Steven Sotloff and expresses its condolences to their families;

(3) salutes James Foley and Steven Sotloff for their unwavering and courageous pursuit of journalistic excellence under the most difficult and dangerous of conditions;

(4) supports efforts to vigorously pursue and bring to justice those responsible for the murders of James Foley and Steven Sotloff;

(5) demands the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages being held by ISIL; and

(6) calls on the United States and the international community, working in partnership with the governments and citizens of the Middle East, to address the threat posed by ISIL.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as a declaration of war or authorization to use force.

SENATE RESOLUTION 539—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JAMES M. JEFFORDS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 539

Whereas James M. Jeffords was born in the state of Vermont, and graduated Yale University and Harvard Law School;

Whereas James M. Jeffords served in the United States Navy from 1956 to 1959 and later in the Naval Reserve, retiring as captain;

Whereas James M. Jeffords began his service to his beloved state of Vermont by serving in the Vermont Senate from 1967 to 1968 and as Vermont Attorney General from 1969 to 1973;

Whereas James M. Jeffords was first elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1974 and served seven terms as Representative from the State of Vermont;

Whereas in 1988, James M. Jeffords was first elected to the United States Senate and faithfully served the people of the State of Vermont for three terms as a Senator;

Whereas James M. Jeffords held a lifetime voting percentage of 96.2, casting over 5,800 votes over 18 years;

Whereas James M. Jeffords served as the Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Environment and Public Works; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable

James M. Jeffords, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable James M. Jeffords.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3787. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3788. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3789. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3787. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission by the Congress:

“ARTICLE —

“SECTION 1. No person who has served 3 terms as a Representative shall be eligible for election to the House of Representatives. For purposes of this section, the election of a person to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives shall be included as 1 term in determining the number of terms that such person has served as a Representative if the person fills the vacancy for more than 1 year.

“SECTION 2. No person who has served 2 terms as a Senator shall be eligible for election or appointment to the Senate. For purposes of this section, the election or appointment of a person to fill a vacancy in the Senate shall be included as 1 term in determining the number of terms that such person has served as a Senator if the person fills the vacancy for more than 3 years.

“SECTION 3. No term beginning before the date of the ratification of this article shall be taken into account in determining eligibility for election or appointment under this article.”

SA 3788. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1647. ALIGNMENT AND OPERATIONAL REPORTING OF CYBER RED TEAMS OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the appropriate alignment and operational reporting for the personnel and capacity of the cyber red teams of the Air National Guard of the United States.

(2) ANALYSIS.—The determination required by paragraph (1) shall include an analysis regarding the rebalance of personnel or capacity of the cyber red teams of the Air National Guard of the United States with respect to cyber red team requirements of the Air Force, cyber team requirements of the United States Cyber Command, and assimilation into the cyber mission force of the Department of Defense.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not reduce or rebalance the personnel or capacity of the cyber red teams of the Air National Guard of the United States unless the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a certification that—

(1) the capabilities to be reduced or rebalanced are not required by components of the Department of Defense that use cyber red team capabilities; or

(2) based on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the determination made under subsection (a), such capabilities will be retained under an altered operational reporting construct.

SA 3789. Mrs. HAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 186, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 188, line 4.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing to receive testimony on "Irrigation Projects in Indian Country." Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Wall Street Reform: Assessing and Enhancing the Financial Regulatory System."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate of September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2014, at 4 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled, "CLOSED/TS/SCI: Arms Control Compliance Issues."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Hearing on the nomination of Sharon Block to serve as a Member of the National Labor Relations Board."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of Federal Programs for Equipping State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "The State of VA Health Care."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 9, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Benji McMurray, a detailee in my office from the Federal Public Defender's Office in Salt Lake City, be granted floor privileges during the duration of the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff, Maeve Whelan-Wuest, for the duration of today, September 9, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE-MAKING ("NPRM"), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached documentation from the Office of Compliance be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, September 9, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 210(e) of the Congressional Accountability Act ("CAA"), 2 U.S.C. §1331(e), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") to issue regulations implementing Section 210 of the CAA relating to provisions of Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183 and 12198, made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(1).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting "such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first

day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached notice of proposed rulemaking to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. I request that this notice be published in the Senate section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period of 30 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

All inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540; (202) 724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Compliance.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING ("NPRM"), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

REGULATIONS EXTENDING RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ("ADA") RELATING TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND ACCOMMODATIONS, NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING, AS REQUIRED BY 2 U.S.C. § 1331, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED ("CAA").

Background:

The purpose of this Notice is to propose substantive regulations that will implement Section 210 of the CAA, which provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodation under Titles II and III of the ADA shall apply to entities covered by the CAA.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations?

Section 210(b) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to the following entities:

- (1) each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee;
- (2) each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee;
- (3) each joint committee of the Congress;
- (4) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;
- (5) the Capitol Police;
- (6) the Congressional Budget Office;
- (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden);
- (8) the Office of the Attending Physician; and
- (9) the Office of Compliance.

2 U.S.C. 1331(b).

Title II of the ADA generally prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of services, programs, or activities by any "public entity". Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA defines the term "public entity" for Title II purposes as any entity listed above that provides public services, programs, or activities. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2).

Title III of the ADA generally prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial fa-

cilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with accessibility standards. Section 225(f) of the CAA provides that, "[e]xcept where inconsistent with definitions and exemptions provided in this Act, the definitions and exemptions of the [ADA] shall apply under this Act." 2 U.S.C. § 1361(f)(1).

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, conduct periodic inspections of all covered facilities and report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under section 210. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f).

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") established under the CAA to issue regulations implementing the section. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e). Section 210(e) further states that such regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." *Id.* Section 210(e) further provides that the regulations shall include a method of identifying, for purposes of this section and for different categories of violations of subsection (b), the entity responsible for correction of a particular violation. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e).

Additional authority for proposing these regulations is found in CAA Section 304, which sets forth the procedure to be followed for the rulemaking process in general, including notice and comment; Board consideration of comments and adoption of regulations; transmittal to the Speaker and President Pro Tempore for publication in the Congressional Record; and approval by the Congress.

Are there ADA public access regulations already in force under the CAA?

Yes. The CAA was enacted on January 23, 1995. It applied to the legislative branch of the federal government the protections of 12 (now 13) statutes that previously had applied to the executive branch and/or the private sector, including laws providing for family and medical leave, prohibiting discrimination against eligible veterans, and affording labor-management rights and responsibilities, among others. The CAA established the Office of Compliance as an independent agency to administer and enforce the CAA. The OOC administers an administrative dispute resolution system to resolve certain disputes arising under the Act. The General Counsel of the OOC has independent investigatory and enforcement authority for other violations of the Act, including certain portions of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12150, 12182, 12183, & 12189.

As set forth in the previous answer, the CAA requires the Board to issue regulations implementing the statutory protections provided by the CAA. *See, e.g.,* CAA Sections 202(d) (Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993), 206(c) (Veterans' Employment and Re-employment), 212 (d) (Federal Service Labor Management Relations Act). 2 U.S.C. sections 1312(d), 1316(c), 1351(d). The Board's regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and Secretary of Transportation . . . except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of

such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e)(2).

The CAA does not simply apply to the legislative branch the substantive protections of these laws, and direct that the implementing regulations essentially mirror those of the executive branch. The statute further provides that, while the CAA rulemaking procedure is underway, the corresponding executive branch regulations are to be applied. Section 411 of the Act provides:

"Effect of failure to issue regulations.

In any proceeding under section 1405, 1406, 1407, or 1408 of this title . . . if the Board has not issued a regulation on a matter for which this chapter requires a regulation to be issued, the hearing officer, Board, or court, as the case may be, shall apply, to the extent necessary and appropriate, the most relevant substantive executive agency regulation promulgated to implement the statutory provision at issue in the proceeding."

This statutory scheme makes plain that ADA public access regulations are presently in force. First, regulations virtually identical to these were adopted by the Board, presented to the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 19, 1996, and published on January 7, 1997, 142 Cong. Rec. S10984-11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30-66. No action was taken and thus the regulations were not issued. As set forth above, in these circumstances the CAA applies "the most relevant substantive executive agency regulations," i.e., the Departments of Justice ("DOJ") and Department of Transportation ("DOT") ADA public access regulations. 2 U.S.C. § 1411.

A contrary interpretation would render meaningless several sections of the CAA. For example, Congress directed the AOC and other employing offices to conduct an initial study of legislative branch facilities from January 23, 1995 through December 31, 1996, "to identify any violations of subsection (b) of [section 210], to determine the costs of compliance, and to take any necessary corrective action to abate any violations." 2 U.S.C. section 1331(f)(3). Congress instructed the OOC to assist the employing offices by "arranging for inspections and other technical assistance at their request." *Id.* The CAA was enacted on January 23, 1995. No implementing regulations could have taken effect as of that date. Plainly, Congress intended the employing offices and the OOC to look to the DOJ and DOT ADA public access regulations, with which the CAA explicitly required employing offices to comply, when conducting the initial study and abatement actions.

Other sections of the CAA support this reading. For example, the CAA requires the Board to exclude from labor relations regulations employees of Member offices, Senate and House Legislative Counsel, the Congressional Budget Office and several other employing offices if the Board finds a conflict of interest or appearance thereof. 2 U.S.C. § 1351(e)(1)(B). Where, as here, a statute explicitly provides for certain regulatory exemptions, it would be illogical to interpret language that expressly provides for regulatory compliance to mean anything else. When Congress intended to exempt employing offices from regulations, the CAA did so explicitly.

Why are these regulations being proposed at this time?

As set forth in the previous answer, the CAA requires employing offices to comply with ADA public access regulations issued by the DOJ and DOT pursuant to the ADA. The

CAA also requires the Board to issue its own regulations implementing the ADA public access provisions of the CAA. The statute obligates the Board's regulations to be the same as the DOJ and DOT regulations except to the extent that the Board may determine that a modification would be more effective in implementing ADA public access protections. CAA section 210(e)(2). These proposed regulations will clarify that covered entities must comply with the ADA public access provisions applied to public entities and accommodations to implement Titles II and III of the ADA. Congressional approval and Board issuance of ADA public access under the CAA will also eliminate any question as to the ADA public access protections that are applicable in the legislative branch.

The Board adopted proposed regulations and presented them to the House of Representatives and the Senate in 1996. The regulations were published on January 7, 1997, during the 105th Congress. 142 Cong. Rec. S10984-11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30-66. No Congressional action was taken and therefore the regulations were not issued. The Board adopted the present proposal, with updated proposed regulations, to facilitate Congressional consideration of the ADA regulations.

Which ADA public access regulations are applied to covered entities in 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e)?

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the Board to issue regulations that are "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions . . . except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e).

Consistent with its prior decisions on this issue, the Board has determined that all regulations promulgated after a notice and comment by the DOJ and/or the DOT to implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA are "substantive regulations" within the meaning of section 210(e). See, e.g., 142 Cong. Rec. S5070, S5071-72 (daily ed. May 15, 1996) (NPRM implementing section 220(d) regulations); 141 Cong. Rec. S17605 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations).

See also *Reves v. Ernst & Young*, 494 U.S. 56, 64 (1993) (where same phrase or term is used in two different places in the same statute, it is reasonable for court to give each use a similar construction); *Sorenson v. Secretary of the Treasury*, 475 U.S. 851, 860 (1986) (normal rule of statutory construction assumes that identical words in different parts of the same act are intended to have the same meaning).

In this regard, the Board has reviewed the provisions of section 210 of the CAA, the sections of the ADA applied by that section, and the regulations of the DOJ and DOT, to determine whether and to what extent those regulations are substantive regulations which implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA. As explained more fully below, the Board proposes to adopt the following otherwise applicable regulations of the DOJ published at Parts 35 and 36 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations ("CFR") and those of the DOT published at Parts 37 and 38 of Title 49 of the CFR:

1. DOJ's regulations at Part 35 of Title 28 of the CFR: The DOJ's regulations at Part 35

implement subtitle A of Title II of the ADA (sections 201 through 205), the rights and protections of which are applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. See 28 CFR § 35.101 (Purpose). Therefore, the Board determines that these regulations will be adopted in the proposed regulations under section 210(e).

2. DOJ's regulations at Part 36 of Title 28 of the CFR: The DOJ's regulations at Part 36 implement Title III of the ADA (sections 301 through 309). See 28 CFR § 36.101 (Purpose). Section 210(b) only applies the rights and protections of three sections of Title III with respect to public accommodations: prohibitions against discrimination (section 302), provisions regarding new construction and alterations (section 303), and provisions regarding examinations and courses (section 309). Therefore, only those regulations in Part 36 that are reasonably necessary to implement the statutory provisions of sections 302, 303, and 309 will be adopted by the Board under section 210(e) of the CAA.

3. DOT's regulations at Parts 37 and 38 of Title 49 of the CFR: The DOT's regulations at Parts 37 and 38 implement the transportation provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA. See 49 CFR §§ 37.101 (Purpose) and 38.1 (Purpose). The provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA relating to transportation and applied to covered entities by section 210(b) of the CAA are subtitle B of Title II (sections 221 through 230) and certain portions of section 302 of Title III. Thus, those regulations of the Secretary that are reasonably necessary to implement the statutory provisions of sections 221 through 230, 302, and 303 of the ADA will be adopted by the Board under section 210(e) of the CAA.

The Board proposes not to adopt those regulatory provisions of the regulations of the DOJ or DOT that have no conceivable applicability to operations of entities within the Legislative Branch or are unlikely to be invoked. See 141 Cong. Rec. at S17604 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations). Unless public comments demonstrate otherwise, the Board intends to include in the adopted regulations a provision stating that the Board has issued substantive regulations on all matters for which section 210(e) requires a regulation. See section 411 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. § 1411.

In addition, the Board has proposed to make technical changes in definitions and nomenclature so that the regulations comport with the CAA and the organizational structure of the Office of Compliance. In the Board's judgment, making such changes satisfies the CAA's "good cause" requirement. With the exception of these technical and nomenclature changes and additional proposed regulations relating to the investigation and inspection authority granted to the General Counsel under the CAA, the Board does not propose substantial departure from otherwise applicable regulations.

The Board notes that the General Counsel applied the above-referenced standards of Parts 35 and 36 of the DOJ's regulations and Parts 37 and 38 of the DOT's regulations during the past inspections of Legislative Branch facilities pursuant to section 210(f) of the CAA. In contrast to other sections of the CAA, which generally give the Office of Compliance only adjudicatory and regulatory responsibilities, the General Counsel has the authority to investigate and prosecute alleged violations of disability standards under section 210, as well as the responsibility for inspecting covered facilities to ensure compliance. According to the General Counsel's final inspection reports, the Title II and

Title III regulations encompass the following requirements:

1. Program accessibility: This standard is applied to ensure physical access to public programs, services, or activities. Under this standard, covered entities must modify policies, practices, and procedures to ensure an equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities. If policy and procedural modifications are ineffective, then structural modifications may be required.

2. Effective communication: This standard requires covered entities to make sure that their communications with individuals with disabilities (such as in the context of constituent meetings and committee hearings) are as effective as their communications with others. Covered entities are required to make information available in alternate formats such as large print, Braille, or audio tape, or use methods that provide individuals with disabilities the opportunity to effectively communicate, such as sign language interpreters or the use of pen and paper. Primary consideration must be given to the method preferred by the individual.

3. ADA Standards for Accessible Design: These standards are applied to architectural barriers, including structural barriers to communication, such as telephone booths, to ensure that existing facilities, new construction, and new alterations, are accessible to individuals with disabilities.

The Board recognizes that, as with other obligations under the CAA, covered entities will need information and guidance regarding compliance with these ADA standards as adopted in these proposed regulations, which the Office will provide as part of its education and information activities.

How do these regulations differ from those proposed by the Board on January 7, 1997?

These regulations are very similar to those proposed by the Board in 1997; however, there are three significant differences:

1. These regulations have been updated to incorporate the changes made in the DOJ and DOT regulations since 1997. One of the most significant changes made by the DOJ occurred on September 15, 2010 when the DOJ published regulations adopting the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design ("2010 Standards"). The 2010 Standards became fully effective on March 15, 2012 and replaced the 1991 Standards for Accessible Design ("1991 Standards") that were referenced in the regulations proposed by the Board in 1997. These regulations incorporate by reference the pertinent DOJ and DOT regulations that are in effect as of the date of the publication of this notice, which means that the 2010 Standards will be applied. The Board has also changed the format of the incorporated regulations. Rather than reprinting each of the regulations with minor changes to reflect different nomenclature used in the CAA (i.e., changing references to "Assistant Attorney General," "Department of Justice," "FTA Administrator," "FTA regional office," "Administrator," and "Secretary" to "General Counsel"), these regulations contain a definitional section in § 1.105(a) which make these changes and incorporates the DOJ and DOT regulations by reference.

2. Unlike the Board in 1997, the current Board has decided not to propose adoption of the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. § 35.140. The Board notes that since 1997 most courts considering this issue have decided that employees of public entities must use the procedures in Title I of the ADA to pursue employment discrimination claims and that these claims cannot be pursued under Title

II. See, e.g., *Brumfield v. City of Chicago*, 735 F.3d 619 (7th Cir. 2013); *Elwell v. Okla. ex rel. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.*, 693 F.3d 1303 (10th Cir. 2012); *Zimmerman v. Or. Dep't of Justice*, 170 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 1999). The prohibition against employment discrimination because of disability in Title I of the ADA is incorporated into section 201(a)(3) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1311(a)(3). Under section 210(c) of the CAA, "with respect to any claim of employment discrimination asserted by any covered employee, the exclusive remedy shall be under section 1311 of this title." 2 U.S.C. §1331(c). Similarly, under section 225(e) of the CAA, "[o]nly a covered entity who has undertaken and completed the procedures in sections 1402 and 1403 of this title may be granted a remedy under part A of this subchapter." 2 U.S.C. §1361(e). When taken together, these sections of the CAA make it clear that the exclusive method for obtaining relief for employment discrimination because of disability is under section 201, which involves using the counseling and mediation procedures contained in sections 402 and 403 of the CAA. For these reasons, the Board has found good cause not to incorporate the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. §35.140, into these regulations.

3. In Parts 2 and 3 of these regulations, the Board has proposed regulations relating to the two unique statutory duties imposed by the CAA upon the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance that are not imposed upon the DOJ and DOT: (1) the investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination using the Office's mediation and hearing processes (section 210(d) of the CAA) and (2) the biennial inspection and reporting obligations (section 210(f) of the CAA). Parts 2 and 3 of these regulations were not contained in the regulations proposed in 1997; however, the Board has determined that there is good cause to propose these regulations to fully implement section 210 of the CAA. See, 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(1). In formulating the substance of these regulations, the Board has directed the Office's statutory employees to consult with stakeholders and has considered their comments and suggestions.

The Board has also reviewed the biennial ADA reports from the General Counsel and considered what the General Counsel has learned since 1995 while investigating charges of discrimination and conducting and reporting upon ADA inspections. Of particular note is the regulation proposed as §3.103(d) which addresses concerns raised by oversight and appropriations staff over finding a cost-efficient process that would allow better identification and elimination of potential ADA compliance issues during the pre-construction phases of new construction and alteration projects.

Procedural Summary:

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA?

Pursuant to Section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384, the procedure for proposing and approving such substantive regulations provides that:

(1) the Board of Directors propose substantive regulations and publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the Congressional Record;

(2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking;

(3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, the Board adopt regulations and transmit notice of such action (together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Con-

gressional approval of the regulations) to the Speaker of the House and President [P]ro [T]empore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record;

(4) there be committee referral and action on the proposed regulations by resolution in each House, concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution; and

(5) final publication of the approved regulations in the Congressional Record, with an effective date prescribed in the final publication.

For more detail, please reference the text of 2 U.S.C. §1384. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is step (1) of the outline set forth above.

Are these proposed regulations also recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives?

As required by Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), the substance of these regulations is also recommended by the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

Has the Board of Directors previously proposed substantive regulations implementing the ADA public access provisions pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §1331?

Yes. Proposed regulations were previously adopted by the Board and presented to the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 19, 1996. The regulations were published on January 7, 1997, 142 Cong. Rec. S10984-11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30-66. No Congressional action was taken on these regulations.

What is the approach taken by these proposed substantive regulations?

The Board will follow the procedure as enumerated above and as required by statute. The Board will review any comments received under step (2) of the outline above, and respond to the comments and make any changes necessary to ensure that the regulations fully implement section 210 of the CAA and reflect the practices and policies particular to the legislative branch.

What responsibilities would covered entities have in effectively implementing these regulations?

The CAA charges covered entities with the responsibility to comply with these regulations. CAA §210, 2 U.S.C. §1331.

Are there substantive differences in the proposed regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the other employing offices?

No. The Board of Directors has identified no "good cause" for proposing different regulations for these entities and accordingly has not done so. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2).

Are these proposed substantive regulations available to persons with disabilities in an alternate format?

This Notice of Proposed Regulations is available on the OOC's web site, www.compliance.gov, which is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, 29 U.S.C. §794d. This Notice can also be made available in large print or Braille. Requests for this Notice in an alternate format should be made to: Annie Leftwood, Executive Assistant, Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540; 202-724-9250; TDD: 202-426-1912; FAX: 202-426-1913.

30 Day Comment Period Regarding the Proposed Regulations

How long do I have to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations?

Comments regarding the proposed regulations of the OOC set forth in this Notice are invited for a **period of thirty (30) days** following the date of the appearance of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

How do I submit comments?

Comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided either on an accompanying computer disk or e-mailed to the OOC via its web site. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non-toll-free number).

Am I allowed to view copies of comments submitted by others?

Yes. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review on the Office's web site at www.compliance.gov, and at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-Federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Summary:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of thirteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 210 of the CAA applies that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to Legislative Branch entities covered by the CAA. The above provisions of section 210 became effective on January 1, 1997, 2 U.S.C. §1331(h).

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is now publishing proposed regulations to implement Section 210 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA"), 2 U.S.C. §1301-1438, as applied to covered entities of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and certain Congressional instrumentalities listed below.

In addition to inviting comment in this Notice, the Board, through the statutory appointees of the Office, sought consultation with the stakeholders regarding the development of these regulations. The Board also notes that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance has completed inspections of covered facilities for compliance with disability access standards under section 210 of the CAA during each Congress since the CAA was enacted and has submitted reports to Congress after each of these inspections. Based on information gleaned from these consultations and the experience gained from the General Counsel's inspections, the Board is publishing these proposed regulations, pursuant to section 210(e) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1331(e).

The purpose of these regulations is to implement section 210 of the CAA. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM" or "Notice") the Board proposes that virtually identical regulations be adopted for the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the seven Congressional instrumentalities. Accordingly:

(1) Senate. It is proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the

body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the Senate, and this proposal regarding the Senate entities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Deputy Executive Director for the Senate.

(2) House of Representatives. It is further proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the House of Representatives, and this proposal regarding the House of Representatives entities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

(3) Certain Congressional instrumentalities. It is further proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; and this proposal regarding these six Congressional instrumentalities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director.

Dates: Comments are due within 30 days after the date of publication of this Notice in the Congressional Record.

Supplementary Information:

The regulations set forth below (Parts 1, 2, and 3) are the substantive regulations that the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance are proposing pursuant to section 210(e) of the CAA. Part 1 contains the general provisions applicable to all regulations under section 210, the method of identifying entities responsible for correcting a violation of section 210, and the list of executive branch regulations incorporated by reference which define and clarify the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations. Part 2 contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. Part 3 contains the provisions regarding the periodic inspections and reports to Congress on compliance with the disability access standards. These three parts correspond to the three general duties imposed upon the Office of Compliance by section 210 which are as follows:

1. Under section 210(e) of the CAA, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance must promulgate substantive regulations which implement the rights and protections provided by section 210. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(1).

2. Under Section 210(d) of the CAA, the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance must receive and investigate charges of discrimination alleging violations of the rights and protections provided by Titles II and III of the ADA, may request mediation of such charges upon believing that a violation may have occurred, and, if mediation has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, may file a complaint and prosecute the complaint through the Office of Compliance's hearing and review process 2 U.S.C. §1331(d).

3. Under section 210(f) of the CAA, the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, must conduct periodic inspections of all covered facilities and report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under section 210. 2 U.S.C. §1331(f).

Regulations proposed in Part 1.

§1.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and cites the sections of Title II and III of the ADA incorporated by reference into the CAA, follows the statutory language of

the CAA to identify the covered entities and the statutory duties of the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance and describes how the regulations are organized.

§1.102 Definitions. This section describes the abbreviations that are used throughout the regulations.

§1.103 Authority of the Board. This section describes the authority of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to issue regulations under section 210 of the CAA and the intended effect of the technical and nomenclature changes made to the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and Secretary of Transportation.

§1.104 Method for identifying the entity responsible for correcting violations of section 210. The regulation in this section is required by section 210(e)(3) of the CAA. This regulation hues very closely to the DOJ Title III regulation set forth in 28 C.F.R. §36.201 which in turn is based on the statutory language in 42 U.S.C. §12182(a) (one of the ADA statutory sections incorporated by reference in section 210(b) of the CAA). Under section 302 of the ADA, owners, operators, lessors and lessees are all jointly and severally liable for ADA violations. *See, e.g., Botosan v. McNally Realty*, 216 F.3d 827, 832 (9th Cir. 2000). The proposed regulation allows consideration of relevant statutes, contracts, orders, and other enforceable arrangements or relationships to allocate responsibility. The term "enforceable arrangement" is used intentionally since certain indemnification and contribution contracts allocating liability under the ADA have been found to be unenforceable. *See, e.g., Equal Rights Center v. Archstone-Smith Trust*, 602 F.3d 597 (4th Cir. 2010, *cert denied*, 131 S. Ct. 504 (2010)). Although the concepts of "ownership" or "leasing" do not appear to apply to Legislative Branch facilities on Capitol Hill, the Architect of the Capitol does have statutory superintendence responsibility for certain legislative branch buildings and facilities, including the Capitol Building, which includes duties and responsibilities analogous to those of a "landlord". *See* 40 U.S.C. §§163-166 (Capitol Building), 167-175 and 185a (House and Senate office buildings), 193a (Capitol grounds), 216b (Botanical Garden) and 2 U.S.C. §141(a)(1) (Library of Congress buildings). The Board believes that, where two or more entities may have compliance obligations under section 210(b) as "responsible entities" under the proposed regulations, those entities should have the ability to allocate responsibility by agreement similar to the case of landlords and tenants with respect to public accommodations under Title III of the ADA. Thus, the proposed regulations adopt such provisions modeled after section 36.201(b) of the DOJ regulations. However, by promulgating this provision, the Board does not intend any substantive change in the statutory responsibility of entities under section 210(b) or the applicable substantive rights and protections of the ADA applied thereunder. *See* 142 Cong. Rec. at S270 (final rule under section 205 of the CAA substitutes the term "privatization" for "sale of business" in the Secretary of Labor's regulations under the Worker Adjustment Retraining and Notification Act).

§1.105 Regulations incorporated by reference. As explained above, consistent with its prior decisions on this issue, the Board has determined that all regulations promulgated after a notice and comment by the DOJ and/or the DOT to implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA are "substantive regulations" within the meaning of

section 210(e). *See, e.g.*, 142 Cong. Rec. S5070, S5071-72 (daily ed. May 15, 1996) (NPRM implementing section 220(d) regulations); 141 Cong. Rec. S17605 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations). In this regard, the Board has reviewed the provisions of section 210 of the CAA, the sections of the ADA applied by that section, and the regulations of the DOJ and DOT, to determine whether and to what extent those regulations are substantive regulations which implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA.

In section 1.105(a)(1), the Board has modified the nomenclature used in the incorporated regulations to comport with the CAA and the organizational structure of the Office of Compliance. In the Board's judgment, making such changes satisfies the CAA's "good cause" requirement. With the exception of these technical and nomenclature changes and additional proposed regulations relating to the investigation and inspection authority granted to the General Counsel under the CAA, the Board does not propose substantial departure from otherwise applicable regulations. The dates referenced in section 1.105(a)(2) reflect that the ADA public access provisions of the CAA became effective on January 1, 1997 rather than effective date of the ADA which was January 26, 1992. 2 U.S.C. §1331(h). The three year provision in section 1.105(a)(3) was developed after consultation with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol regarding what would be a reasonable time frame for implementing these provisions of the regulations. In several portions of DOJ and DOT regulations, references are made to dates such as the effective date of the regulations or effective dates derived from the statutory provisions of the ADA. The Board proposes to substitute dates which correspond to analogous periods for the purposes of the CAA. In this way covered entities under section 210 may have the same time to come into compliance relative to the effective date of section 210 of the CAA afforded public entities subject to Title II of the ADA. In the Board's judgment, such changes satisfy the CAA's "good cause" requirement. In section 1.105(a)(4), which was also developed based upon consultations with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol ("AOC"), the Board modified the exception for "historic" property to include properties, buildings, or facilities designated as an historic or heritage assets by the AOC. This was necessary because the DOJ regulations limit the definition of historic properties to those "listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or properties designated as historic under State or local law" 28 C.F.R. §35.104. While there are certainly properties on Capitol Hill which have historically significant features that are worthy of preservation, these properties are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or considered historic under State or local law. *See, Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, 16 U.S.C. 470g (exempting the White House and its grounds, the Supreme Court building and its grounds, and the United States Capitol and its related buildings and grounds from the provisions of the Historic Preservation Act).

In section 1.105(b), the Board has adopted a rule of interpretation to cover the few instances where there are differences between regulations implementing Title II and Title III of the ADA. The CAA is unique in that it applies both Title II and Title III provisions to covered public entities. The public accommodation provisions of Title III of the ADA

are otherwise only applicable to private entities. See, 42 U.S.C. §12181(7). This section of the regulation reflects the Board's determination that Congress applied provisions of both Title II and Title III of the ADA to legislative branch entities to ensure that individuals with disabilities are provided the most access to public services, programs, activities and accommodations provided by law.

In section 1.105(c), the Board has listed the specific DOJ regulations incorporated into the regulations being issued under section 210 of the CAA. As noted earlier, the Board has adopted all of the DOJ regulations implementing Titles II and III of the ADA with the following exceptions:

1. The Board is not incorporating the DOJ regulations regarding retaliation or coercion (28 C.F.R. §§35.134 & 36.206). Sections 35.134 and 36.206 of the DOJ's regulations implement section 503 of the ADA, which prohibits retaliation against any individual who exercises his or her rights under the ADA. 28 CFR pt. 35, App. A at 464 & pt. 36, App. B at 598 (section-by-section analysis). Sections 35.134 and 36.206 are not provisions which implement a right or protection applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and, therefore, they will not be included within the adopted regulations. The Board notes, however, that section 207 of the CAA provides a comprehensive retaliation protection for employees (including applicants and former employees) who may invoke their rights under section 210, although section 207 does not apply to nonemployees who may enjoy rights and protections against discrimination under section 210.

2. As noted above, unlike the Board in 1997, the current Board has decided not to propose adoption of the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. §35.140. The Board notes that since 1997 most courts considering this issue have decided that employees of public entities must use the procedures in Title I of the ADA to pursue employment discrimination claims and that these claims cannot be pursued under Title II. See, e.g., *Brumfield v. City of Chicago*, 735 F.3d 619 (7th Cir. 2013); *Elwell v. Okla. ex rel. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.*, 693 F.3d 1303 (10th Cir. 2012); *Zimmerman v. Or. Dep't of Justice*, 170 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 1999). The prohibition against employment discrimination because of disability in Title I of the ADA is incorporated into section 201(a)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1311(a)(3). Under section 210(c) of the CAA, "with respect to any claim of employment discrimination asserted by any covered employee, the exclusive remedy shall be under section 1311 of this title." 2 U.S.C. §1331(c). Similarly, under section 225(e) of the CAA, "[o]nly a covered entity who has undertaken and completed the procedures in sections 1402 and 1403 of this title may be granted a remedy under part A of this subchapter." 2 U.S.C. §1361(e). When taken together, these sections of the CAA make it clear that the exclusive method for obtaining relief for employment discrimination because of disability is under section 201, which involves using the counseling and mediation procedures contained in sections 402 and 403 of the CAA. For these reasons, the Board has found good cause not to incorporate the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. §35.140, into these regulations.

3. The Board has not incorporated Subpart F of the DOJ's regulations (28 C.F.R. §§35.170-35.189), which set forth administrative enforcement procedures under Title II.

Subpart F implements the provisions of section 203 of the ADA, which is applied to covered entities under section 210 of the CAA. Although procedural in nature, such provisions address the remedies, procedures, and rights under section 203 of the ADA, and thus the otherwise applicable provisions of these regulations are "substantive regulations" for section 210(e) purposes. See 142 Cong. Rec. at S5071-72 (similar analysis under section 220(d) of the CAA). However, since section 303 of the CAA reserves to the Executive Director the authority to promulgate regulations that "govern the procedures of the Office," and since the Board believes that the benefit of having one set of procedural rules provides the "good cause" for modifying the DOJ's regulations, the Board proposes to incorporate the provisions of Subpart F into the Office's procedural rules, to omit provisions that set forth procedures which conflict with express provisions of section 210 of the CAA or are already provided for under comparable provisions of the Office's rules, and to omit rules with no applicability to the Legislative Branch (such as provisions covering entities subject to section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, provisions regarding State immunity, and provisions regarding referral of complaints to the Justice Department). See 142 Cong. Rec. at S5071-72 (similar analysis and conclusion under section 220(d) of the CAA).

4. The Board has not incorporated Subpart G of the DOJ's regulations, which designates the Federal agencies responsible for investigating complaints under Title II of the ADA. Given the structure of the CAA, such provisions are not applicable to covered Legislative Branch entities and, therefore, will not be adopted under section 210(e).

5. The Board has not incorporated the insurance provisions contained in 28 C.F.R. §36.212. Section 36.212 of the DOJ's regulations restates section 501(c) of the ADA, which provides that the ADA shall not be construed to restrict certain insurance practices on the part of insurance companies and employers, so long as such practices are not used to evade the purposes of the ADA. Section 501(c) of the ADA is not incorporated by reference into section 210 of the CAA. Because section 36.212 implements a section of the ADA which is not incorporated into the CAA and appears intended primarily to cover insurance companies which are not covered entities under the CAA, the Board finds good cause not to incorporate this regulation.

6. The Board has not incorporated Subpart E of the DOJ's regulations (sections 36.501 through 36.599) setting forth the enforcement procedures under Title III of the ADA. As the Justice Department noted in its NPRM regarding subpart E, the Department of Justice does not have the authority to establish procedures for judicial review and enforcement and, therefore, "Subpart E generally restates the statutory procedures for enforcement." 28 CFR pt. 36, App. B at 638 (section-by-section analysis). Additionally, the regulations derive from the provisions of section 308 of the ADA, which is not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. Thus, the regulations in subpart E are not promulgated by the Attorney General as substantive regulations to implement the statutory provisions of the ADA referred to in section 210(b), within the meaning of section 210(e).

7. The Board has not incorporated Subpart F of the DOJ's regulations which establishes procedures to implement section 308(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the ADA regarding compliance with State laws or building codes as evidence of compliance with accessibility

standards under the ADA. 28 CFR pt. 36, App. B at 640 (section-by-section analysis). Section 308 is not one of the laws applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and, therefore, these regulations will not be adopted under section 210(e).

In section 1.105(d), the Board has listed the specific DOT regulations incorporated into the regulations being issued under section 210 of the CAA. As noted earlier, the Board has adopted all of the DOT regulations implementing Titles II and III of the ADA with the following exceptions:

1. Although the Board has adopted the definitions in section 37.3 of the DOT's regulations, relating to implementation of Part II of Title II of the ADA (sections 241 through 246), those definitions dealing with public transportation by intercity and commuter rail are not adopted because sections 241 through 246 of the ADA were not within the rights and protections applied to covered entities under section 210(b) and, therefore, the regulations implementing such sections are not substantive regulations of the DOT required to be adopted by the Board within the meaning of section 210(e). Accordingly, the Board will give no effect to the definitions of terms such as "commerce," "commuter authority," "commuter rail car," "commuter rail transportation," "intercity rail passenger car," and "intercity rail transportation," which relate to sections 241 through 246 of the ADA.

2. Although the Board has adopted the Nondiscrimination regulation set forth in section 37.5 of the DOT's regulations, subsection (f) of section 37.5 of the this regulation relates to private entities primarily engaged in the business of transporting people and whose operations affect commerce. This subsection implements section 304 of the ADA, which is not a right or protection applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. See 56 Fed. Reg. 13856, 13858 (April 4, 1991) (preamble to NPRM regarding Part 37). Therefore, it is not a regulation of the DOT included within the scope of rule-making under section 210(e) of the CAA and will not be considered by the Board to be included in these regulations.

3. Several portions of the DOT's regulations refer to obligations of entities regulated by state agencies administering federal transportation funds. See, e.g., sections 37.77(d) (requires filing of equivalent service certificates with state administering agency), 37.135(f) (submission of paratransit development plan to state administering agency) and 37.145 (State comments on paratransit plans). Any references to obligations not imposed on covered entities, such as state law requirements and laws regulating entities that receive Federal financial assistance, will be considered excluded from these proposed regulations.

4. The Board has not adopted section 37.11 of the DOT's regulations relating to administrative enforcement because it does not implement any provision of the ADA applied to covered entities under section 210 of the CAA. Moreover, the enforcement procedures of section 210 are explicitly provided for in section 210(d) ("Available Procedures"). Accordingly, this section will not be included within the incorporated regulations. The subject matter of enforcement procedures is addressed in the Office's procedural rules and in Part 2 of these regulations.

5. Certain sections of Subparts B (Applicability) and C (Transportation Facilities) of the Secretary's regulations were promulgated to implement sections 242 and 304 of the ADA, provisions that are not applied to

covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA or are otherwise inapplicable to Legislative Branch entities. Therefore, the Board will exclude the following sections from its substantive regulations on that basis: 37.21(a)(2) and (b) (relating to private entities under section 304 of the ADA and private entities receiving Federal assistance from the Transportation Department), 37.25 (university transportation systems), 37.29 (private taxi services), 37.33 (airport transportation systems), 37.37(a) and 37.37(e)–(g) (relating to coverage of private entities and other entities under section 304 of the ADA), and 37.49–37.57 (relating to intercity and commuter rail systems). Similarly, the Board proposes modifying sections 37.21(c), 37.37(d), and 37.37(h) and other sections where references are made to requirements or circumstances strictly encompassed by the provisions of section 304 of the ADA and, therefore, not applicable to covered entities under the CAA. See, e.g., sections 37.25–37.27 (transportation for elementary and secondary education systems).

6. Subpart D (sections 37.71 through 37.95) of the DOT's regulations relate to acquisition of accessible vehicles by public entities. Certain sections of subpart D were promulgated to implement sections 242 and 304 of the ADA, which were not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA, or are otherwise inapplicable to Legislative Branch entities. Therefore, the Board will exclude the following sections from its substantive regulations on that basis: 37.87–37.91 and 37.93(b) (relating to intercity and commuter rail service).

7. Subpart E (sections 37.101 through 37.109) of the DOT's regulations relates to acquisition of accessible vehicles by private entities. Section 37.101, relating to acquisition of vehicles by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people, implements section 302 of the ADA, which is applied to covered entities under section 210(b). Therefore, the Board will adopt section 37.101 as part of its section 210(e) regulations. Sections 37.103, 37.107, and 37.109 of the regulations implement section 304 of the ADA, which is inapplicable to covered entities under the ADA. Therefore, the Board proposes not to include them within its substantive regulations under section 210(e) of the CAA.

8. Part 37 of the DOT's regulations includes several appendices, only two of which the Board proposes to adopt as part of these regulations. The Board proposes to adopt as an appendix to these regulations Appendix A (Modifications to Standards for Accessible Transportation Facilities, ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities), which provides guidance regarding the design, construction, and alteration of buildings and facilities covered by Titles II and III of the ADA. 49 CFR pt. 37, App. A. Such guidelines, where not inconsistent with express provisions of the CAA or of the regulations adopted by the Board, may be relied upon by covered entities and other in proceedings under section 210 of the CAA to the same extent as similarly situated persons may rely upon them in actions brought under Title II and Title III of the ADA. See 142 Cong. Rec. at S222 and 141 Cong. Rec. at S17606 (similar resolution regarding Secretary of Labor's interpretative bulletins under the Fair Labor Standards Act for section 203 purposes). The Board proposes not to adopt Appendix B, which gives the addresses of FTA regional offices. Such information is not relevant to covered entities under the CAA. The Board also proposes not to adopt

Appendix C, which contain forms for certification of equivalent service. These forms appears to be irrelevant to entities covered by the CAA and therefore will not be adopted by the Board. Finally, the Board will adopt Appendix D to Part 37, the section-by-section analysis of Part 37. The Board notes that the section-by-section analysis may have some relevance in interpreting the sections of Part 37 that the Board has adopted.

9. The Board proposes to adopt, with minimal technical and nomenclature changes, the regulations contained in Part 38 and accompanying appendix, with the exception of the following subparts which the Board has determined implement portions of the ADA not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and/or the Board believe have no conceivable applicability to legislative branch operations: Subpart E, Commuter Rail Cars and Systems; and Subpart F, Intercity Rail Cars and Systems.

In section 1.105(d), the Board has proposed the adoption of one regulation promulgated by the Access Board, 36 C.F.R. §1190.34, relating to the accessibility of leased buildings and facilities. While the DOJ does not have a regulation pertaining to leased buildings and facilities, the Access Board has promulgated this regulation that sets minimal accessible standards whenever the federal government leases a building or facility (or a portion thereof). Generally, this regulation requires that fully accessible space be leased when available, but also sets some minimal accessibility requirements when fully accessible spaces are not available. These minimum requirements include at least one accessible entrance, an accessible route to major function areas, an accessible toilet, and accessible parking (if that is included in the rent). If there is no space available that meets even these minimal requirements, the regulation does contain an exception that would permit the short term leasing of spaces that do not even meet these minimal standards. The most common ADA public access complaint received by the General Counsel from members of the public relates to the lack of ADA access to spaces being leased by legislative branch offices. The Board therefore finds good cause to clarify the ADA access obligations regarding leased spaces by adopting 36 C.F.R. §1190.34.

Regulations proposed in Part 2.

§2.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and notes that Part 2 of these regulations implements section 210(d) of the CAA which requires that the General Counsel accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. It also notes that by procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by section 210(d) of the CAA. The Board notes that the Executive Director is proposing amendments to the Office's Procedural Rules that do include provisions relating to section 210(d) of the CAA.

§2.102 Definitions. This section provides definitions for the undefined terms used in section 210(d) of the CAA. In §2.102(a), the term "charge" is defined in a manner consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Fed. Express Corp. v. Holowecki*, 552 U.S. 389, 402 (2008). In §2.102(b), the definition of the term "file a charge" clarifies how charges can be presented to the General Counsel by listing the methods by which the General Counsel has accepted charges in the past. In §2.102(c), the term "occurrence of the alleged

violation" is defined in a manner that includes both isolated acts of discrimination and continuing violations. See, e.g., *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 380 (1982). In §2.102(d), the term "the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations" is defined by referencing the specific sections of Titles II and III that are incorporated into the CAA in section 210(b)(1). 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(1).

§2.103 Investigatory Authority. This section explains the investigatory methods that the General Counsel will use when investigating charges of discrimination and clarifies the duty of cooperation owed by all parties. The language used to describe the investigatory methods listed in §2.103(a) is derived from the Supreme Court's decision in *Dow Chemical Co. v. United States*, 476 U.S. 227, 233 (1986) which describes what is intended when an agency is granted investigatory authority that is not otherwise defined in the statute. The duty to cooperate with investigations described in §2.103(b) is implicit in the CAA. By empowering the General Counsel to investigate potential violations of the the ADA, Congress expressed its expectation that legislative branch employees and offices would cooperate fully with investigations conducted by the General Counsel pursuant to this authority. This regulation is consistent with prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

§2.104 Mediation. This section explains when the General Counsel will request mediation of a charge of discrimination. The language in §2.104(a) is derived from section 210(d)(2) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(2). The explanation of what happens when mediation results in a settlement is contained in §2.104(b) and is consistent with the language in section 210(d)(3) and with the General Counsel's past practice of closing cases that are resolved during mediation. The language in §2.104(c) is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.105 Complaint. The language in this section is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.106 Intervention by charging individual. The language in this section is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.107 Remedies and Compliance. This section describes the remedies available and the compliance dates when a violation of section 210 is found. The remedy language in §2.107(a) is based upon the statutory language in section 210(c) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3). The allowance of attorney's fees and costs described in §2.107(a)(1) is based upon the language in 28 C.F.R. §35.175 & 36.505 which recognize that attorney's fees may be awarded under both Titles II and III of the ADA. The availability of compensatory damages described in §2.107(a)(2) derives from sections 210(c) and of the CAA which incorporates by reference the remedies contained sections 203 and 308(a) of the ADA. Section 203 of the ADA provides that the remedies set forth in the Rehabilitation Act (at 29 U.S.C. §794a) shall be the remedies for violations of Title II of the ADA. The Supreme Court has made clear that the remedies available under Title II of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act are "coextensive with the remedies available in a private cause of action brought under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" which includes compensatory, but not punitive, damages. *Barnes v. Gorman*, 536 U.S. 181, 185 (2002). The language

in § 2.107(a)(1) & (a)(2) requiring that payment be made by the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation is from section 415(c) of the CAA which requires that funds to correct ADA violations “may be paid only from funds appropriated to the employing office or entity responsible for correcting such violations.” 2 U.S.C. § 1415(c). The compliance date set forth in § 2.107(b) is from section 210(d)(5) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(d)(5).

§ 2.108 Judicial Review. This section is from section 210(d)(4) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(d)(4).

Regulations proposed in Part 3.

§ 3.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and notes that Part 3 of these regulations implements section 210(f) of the CAA which requires that the General Counsel, on a regular basis, at least once each Congress, inspect the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA and to prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections, describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement. It also notes that by procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by section 210(d) of the CAA. The Board notes that the Executive Director is proposing amendments to the Office's Procedural Rules that do include provisions relating to section 210(f) of the CAA.

§ 3.102 Definitions. This section defines terms used in section 210(f) of the CAA which are not defined in the statute. In § 3.102(a), the term “facilities of covered entities” is defined. The term “facility” is defined in 28 C.F.R. § 35.104, which is incorporated by reference into these regulations. See § 1.105(c). “Facilities of covered entities” is defined to include all facilities where covered entities provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations, including those facilities designed, maintained, altered or constructed by a covered entity. Because the General Counsel's inspections under section 210(f) of the CAA are focused upon finding barriers to access in facilities, the term “violation” is defined in § 3.102(b) as any barrier to access caused by noncompliance with the applicable standards. The definition of “estimated cost and time needed for abatement” was developed in consultation with Office of the Architect of the Capitol which proposed that reporting regarding estimated abatement cost and time be provided using a range of dollar amounts and dates due to the difficulty in precisely estimating such costs and dates.

§ 3.103 Inspection authority. This section describes the general scope of the General Counsel's inspection authority [§ 3.103(a)] and recognizes that the General Counsel has the right to review information and documents [§ 3.103(b)], receive cooperation from covered entities [§ 3.103(c)], and become involved in pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects [§ 3.103(d)].

The general scope of authority in § 3.103(a) is derived from the language in section 210(f)(1) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f)(1). This subsection also describes the discretion that the General Counsel has exercised when conducting these inspections since the enactment of the CAA.

The document and information review described in § 3.103(b) recognizes that a thorough inspection of facilities can require the review of documents and other information

to ascertain whether a covered entity is in compliance with the ADA. The language in this subsection is based upon prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

The duty to cooperate with inspections described in § 3.103(c), like the duty to cooperate with investigations described in § 2.103(b), is implicit in the CAA. By empowering the General Counsel to inspect all facilities for potential violations of the the ADA, Congress expressed its expectation that legislative branch employees and offices would cooperate fully with such inspections conducted by the General Counsel pursuant to this authority. This regulation is consistent with prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

The pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects described in § 3.103(d) was developed after consultation with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and addresses concerns raised by oversight and appropriations staff over finding a cost efficient process that would allow better identification and elimination of potential ADA compliance issues during the pre-construction phases of new construction and alteration projects.

§ 3.104 Reporting, estimating cost & time and compliance date. This section describes the reporting obligations of the General Counsel set forth in section 210(f)(2) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f)(2). The language in § 3.104(a) is directly from section 210(f)(2) of the CAA. Subsection 3.104(b) merely recognizes that the General Counsel needs the cooperation of covered entities to provide the cost and time estimates for abatement required by section 210(f)(2). The compliance date set forth in § 3.104(c) is from section 210(d)(5) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(d)(5).

Proposed Regulations:

PART 1—MATTERS OF GENERAL APPLICATION TO ALL REGULATIONS PROMULGATED UNDER SECTION 210 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

§ 1.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

§ 1.102 DEFINITIONS

§ 1.103 AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD

§ 1.104 METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRECTING VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 210

§ 1.105 REGULATIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

§ 1.101 Purpose and scope.

(a) CAA. Enacted into law on January 23, 1995, the Congressional Accountability Act (“CAA”) in Section 210(b) provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Title II and III (Sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 (“ADA”) shall apply to the following entities:

- (1) each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee;
- (2) each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee;
- (3) each joint committee of the Congress;
- (4) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;
- (5) the United States Capitol Police;
- (6) the Congressional Budget Office;
- (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden);
- (8) the Office of the Attending Physician; and

(9) the Office of Compliance;

Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services, programs, activities by any “public entity.” Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA provides that for the purpose of applying Title II of the ADA the term “public entity” means any entity listed above that provides public services, programs, or activities. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with accessibility standards. Section 225(f) of the CAA provides that, “[e]xcept where inconsistent with definitions and exemptions provided in this Act, the definitions and exemptions of the [ADA] shall apply under this Act.” 2 U.S.C. § 1361(f)(1).

Section 210(d) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. If the General Counsel believes that a violation may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation. 2 U.S.C. § 1361(d).

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, conduct periodic inspections of all covered facilities and to report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under Section 210. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f).

(b) **Purpose and scope of regulations.** The regulations set forth herein (Parts 1, 2, and 3) are the substantive regulations that the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance has promulgated pursuant to Section 210(e) of the CAA. Part 1 contains the general provisions applicable to all regulations under Section 210, the method of identifying entities responsible for correcting a violation of Section 210, and the list of executive branch regulations incorporated by reference which define and clarify the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations. Part 2 contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. Part 3 contains the provisions regarding the periodic inspections and reports to Congress on compliance with the disability access standards.

§ 1.102 Definitions.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in these regulations, as used in these regulations:

(a) **Act** or **CAA** means the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–1, 109 Stat. 3, 2 U.S.C. §§ 1301–1438).

(b) **ADA** means the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189) as applied to covered entities by Section 210 of the CAA.

(c) **Covered entity** and **public entity** include any of the entities listed in § 1.101(a) that provide public services, programs, or activities, or operates a place of public accommodation within the meaning of Section 210 of the CAA. In the regulations implementing Title III, **private entity** includes **covered entities**.

(d) **Board** means the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

(e) **Office** means the Office of Compliance.

(f) **General Counsel** means the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance.

§ 1.103 Authority of the Board.

Pursuant to Sections 210 and 304 of the CAA, the Board is authorized to issue regulations to implement the rights and protections against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations under the ADA. Section 210(e) of the CAA directs the Board to promulgate regulations implementing Section 210 that are "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e). Specifically, it is the Board's considered judgment, based on the information available to it at the time of promulgation of these regulations, that, with the exception of the regulations adopted and set forth herein, there are no other "substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) [of Section 210 of the CAA]" that need be adopted.

In promulgating these regulations, the Board has made certain technical and nomenclature changes to the regulations as promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation. Such changes are intended to make the provisions adopted accord more naturally to situations in the Legislative Branch. However, by making these changes, the Board does not intend a substantive difference between these regulations and those of the Attorney General and/or the Secretary from which they are derived. Moreover, such changes, in and of themselves, are not intended to constitute an interpretation of the regulations or of the statutory provisions of the CAA upon which they are based.

§ 1.104 Method for identifying the entity responsible for correction of violations of section 210.

(a) **Purpose and scope.** Section 210(e)(3) of the CAA provides that regulations under Section 210(e) include a method of identifying, for purposes of this section and for categories of violations of Section 210(b), the entity responsible for correcting a particular violation. This section sets forth the method for identifying responsible entities for the purpose of allocating responsibility for correcting violations of Section 210(b).

(b) **Violations.** A covered entity may violate Section 210(b) if it discriminates against a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of Title II or Title III of the ADA.

(c) **Entities Responsible for Correcting Violations.** Correction of a violation of the rights and protections against discrimination is the responsibility of the entities listed in subsection (a) of Section 210 of the CAA that provide the specific public service, program, activity, or accommodation that forms the basis for the particular violation of Title II or Title III rights and protections and, when the violation involves a physical access barrier, the entities responsible for designing, maintaining, managing, altering or constructing the facility in which the specific public service program, activity or accommodation is conducted or provided.

(d) **Allocation of Responsibility for Correction of Title II and/or Title III Violations.** Where more than one entity is found to be an entity responsible for correction of a viola-

tion of Title II and/or Title III rights and protections under the method set forth in this section, as between those parties, allocation of responsibility for correcting the violations of Title II or Title III of the ADA may be determined by statute, contract, order, or other enforceable arrangement or relationship.

§ 1.105 Regulations incorporated by reference.

(a) **Technical and Nomenclature Changes to Regulations Incorporated by Reference.** The definitions in the regulations incorporated by reference ("incorporated regulations") shall be used to interpret these regulations except when they differ from the definitions in § 1.102 or the modifications listed below, in which case the definition in § 1.102 or the modification listed below shall be used. The incorporated regulations are hereby modified as follows:

(1) When the incorporated regulations refer to "Assistant Attorney General," "Department of Justice," "FTA Administrator," "FTA regional office," "Administrator," "Secretary," or any other executive branch office or officer, "General Counsel" is hereby substituted.

(2) When the incorporated regulations refer to the date "January 26, 1992," the date "January 1, 1997" is hereby substituted.

(3) When the incorporated regulations otherwise specify a date by which some action must be completed, the date that is three years from the effective date of these regulations is hereby substituted.

(4) When the incorporated regulations contain an exception for an "historic" property, building, or facility that exception shall apply to properties, buildings, or facilities designated as an historic or heritage asset by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with its preservation policy and standards and where, in accordance with its preservation policy and standards, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol determines that compliance with the requirements for accessible routes, entrances, or toilet facilities would threaten or destroy the historic significance of the building or facility, the exceptions for alterations to qualified historic buildings or facilities for that element shall be permitted to apply.

(b) **Rule of Interpretation.** When a covered entity is subject to conflicting regulations implementing both Title II and Title III of the ADA, the regulation providing the most access shall apply.

(c) **Incorporated Regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36.** The following regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

§ 35.101 Purpose.

§ 35.102 Application.

§ 35.103 Relationship to other laws.

§ 35.104 Definitions.

§ 35.105 Self-evaluation

§ 35.106 Notice.

§ 35.107 Designation of responsible employee and adoption of grievance procedures.

§ 35.130 General prohibitions against discrimination.

§ 35.131 Illegal use of drugs.

§ 35.132 Smoking.

§ 35.133 Maintenance of accessible features.

§ 35.135 Personal devices and services.

§ 35.136 Service animals

§ 35.137 Mobility devices.

§ 35.138 Ticketing

§ 35.139 Direct threat.

§ 35.149 Discrimination prohibited.

§ 35.150 Existing facilities.

§ 35.151 New Construction and alterations.

§ 35.152 Jails, detention and correctional facilities.

§ 35.160 General.

§ 35.161 Telecommunications.

§ 35.162 Telephone emergency services.

§ 35.163 Information and signage.

§ 35.164 Duties.

§ 36.101 Purpose.

§ 36.102 Application.

§ 36.103 Relationship to other laws.

§ 36.104 Definitions.

§ 36.201 General.

§ 36.202 Activities.

§ 36.203 Integrated settings.

§ 36.204 Administrative methods.

§ 36.205 Association.

§ 36.207 Places of public accommodations located in private residences.

§ 36.208 Direct threat.

§ 36.209 Illegal use of drugs.

§ 36.210 Smoking.

§ 36.211 Maintenance of accessible features.

§ 36.213 Relationship of subpart B to subparts C and D of this part.

§ 36.301 Eligibility criteria.

§ 36.302 Modifications in policies, practices, or procedures.

§ 36.303 Auxiliary aids and services.

§ 36.304 Removal of barriers.

§ 36.305 Alternatives to barrier removal.

§ 36.306 Personal devices and services.

§ 36.307 Accessible or special goods.

§ 36.308 Seating in assembly areas.

§ 36.309 Examinations and courses.

§ 36.310 Transportation provided by public accommodations.

§ 36.402 Alterations.

§ 36.403 Alterations: Path of travel.

§ 36.404 Alterations: Elevator exemption.

§ 36.405 Alterations: Historic preservation.

§ 36.406 Standards for new construction and alterations.

Appendix A to Part 36—Standards for Accessible Design.

Appendix B to Part 36—Preamble to Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations (Published July 26, 1991).

(d) **Incorporated Regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38.** The following regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

§ 37.1 Purpose.

§ 37.3 Definitions.

§ 37.5 Nondiscrimination.

§ 37.7 Standards for accessible vehicles.

§ 37.9 Standards for accessible transportation facilities.

§ 37.13 Effective date for certain vehicle specifications.

§ 37.21 Applicability: General.

§ 37.23 Service under contract.

§ 37.27 Transportation for elementary and secondary education systems.

§ 37.31 Vanpools.

§ 37.37 Other applications.

§ 37.41 Construction of transportation facilities by public entities.

§ 37.43 Alteration of transportation facilities by public entities.

§ 37.45 Construction and alteration of transportation facilities by private entities.

§ 37.47 Key stations in light and rapid rail systems.

§ 37.61 Public transportation programs and activities in existing facilities.

§ 37.71 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.

§ 37.73 Purchase or lease of used non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.

§ 37.75 Remanufacture of non-rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.

§ 37.77 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating a demand responsive system for the general public.

§ 37.79 Purchase or lease of new rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§ 37.81 Purchase or lease of used rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§ 37.83 Remanufacture of rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§ 37.101 Purchase or lease of vehicles by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.

§ 37.105 Equivalent service standard.

§ 37.121 Requirement for comparable complementary paratransit service.

§ 37.123 ADA paratransit eligibility: Standards.

§ 37.125 ADA paratransit eligibility: Process.

§ 37.127 Complementary paratransit service for visitors.

§ 37.129 Types of service.

§ 37.131 Service criteria for complementary paratransit.

§ 37.133 Subscription service.

§ 37.135 Submission of paratransit plan.

§ 37.137 Paratransit plan development.

§ 37.139 Plan contents.

§ 37.141 Requirements for a joint paratransit plan.

§ 37.143 Paratransit plan implementation.

§ 37.147 Considerations during FTA review.

§ 37.149 Disapproved plans.

§ 37.151 Waiver for undue financial burden.

§ 37.153 FTA waiver determination.

§ 37.155 Factors in decision to grant an undue financial burden waiver.

§ 37.161 Maintenance of accessible features: General.

§ 37.163 Keeping vehicle lifts in operative condition: Public entities.

§ 37.165 Lift and securement use.

§ 37.167 Other service requirements.

§ 37.171 Equivalency requirement for demand responsive service operated by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.

§ 37.173 Training requirements.

Appendix A to Part 37—Modifications to Standards for Accessible Transportation Facilities.

Appendix D to Part 37—Construction and Interpretation of Provisions of 49 CFR Part 37.

§ 38.1 Purpose.

§ 38.2 Equivalent facilitation.

§ 38.3 Definitions.

§ 38.4 Miscellaneous instructions.

§ 38.21 General.

§ 38.23 Mobility aid accessibility.

§ 38.25 Doors, steps and thresholds.

§ 38.27 Priority seating signs.

§ 38.29 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.

§ 38.31 Lighting.

§ 38.33 Fare box.

§ 38.35 Public information system.

§ 38.37 Stop request.

§ 38.39 Destination and route signs.

§ 38.51 General.

§ 38.53 Doorways.

§ 38.55 Priority seating signs.

§ 38.57 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.

§ 38.59 Floor surfaces.

§ 38.61 Public information system.

§ 38.63 Between-car barriers.

§ 38.71 General.

§ 38.73 Doorways.

§ 38.75 Priority seating signs.

§ 38.77 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.

§ 38.79 Floors, steps and thresholds.

§ 38.81 Lighting.

§ 38.83 Mobility aid accessibility.

§ 38.85 Between-car barriers.

§ 38.87 Public information system.

§ 38.171 General.

§ 38.173 Automated guideway transit vehicles and systems.

§ 38.179 Trams, and similar vehicles, and systems.

Figures to Part 38.

Appendix to Part 38—Guidance Material.

(e) **Incorporated Regulation from 36 C.F.R. Part 1190.** The following regulation from 36 C.F.R. Part 1190 that is published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations is hereby incorporated by reference as though detail herein:

§ 1190.3—Accessible buildings and facilities: Leased.

PART 2—MATTERS PERTAINING TO INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CHARGES OF DISCRIMINATION.

§ 2.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

§ 2.102 DEFINITIONS

§ 2.103 INVESTIGATORY AUTHORITY

§ 2.104 MEDIATION

§ 2.105 COMPLAINT

§ 2.106 INTERVENTION BY CHARGING INDIVIDUAL

§ 2.107 REMEDIES AND COMPLIANCE

§ 2.108 JUDICIAL REVIEW

§ 2.101 Purpose and Scope.

Section 210(d) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. Part 2 of these regulations contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. By procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by Section 210.

§ 2.102 Definitions.

(a) **Charge** means any written document from a qualified individual with a disability or that individual's designated representative which suggests or alleges that a covered entity denied that individual the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations provided in Section 210(b)(1) of the CAA.

(b) **File a charge** means providing a charge to the General Counsel in person, by mail, by electronic transmission, or by any other means used by the General Counsel to receive documents. Charges shall be filed within 180 days of the occurrence of the alleged violation.

(c) **The occurrence of the alleged violation** means the later of (1) the date on which the charging individual was allegedly discriminated against; or (2) the last date on which the service, activity, program or public accommodation described by the charging party was operated in a way that denied access in the manner alleged by the charging party.

(d) **The rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations** means all of the rights and protections provided by Section 210(b)(1) of the CAA through incorporation of Sections 201 through 230, 203, 303, and 309 of the ADA and by the regulations issued by the Board to implement Section 210 of the CAA.

§ 2.103 Investigatory Authority.

(a) **Investigatory Methods.** When investigating charges of discrimination and conducting inspections, the General Counsel is authorized to use all the modes of inquiry and investigation traditionally employed or useful to execute this investigatory authority. The authorized methods of investigation include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) requiring the parties to provide or produce ready access to: all physical areas subject to an inspection or investigation, individuals with relevant knowledge concerning the inspection or investigation who can be interviewed or questioned, and documents pertinent to the investigation; and (2) requiring the parties to provide written answers to questions, statements of position, and any other information relating to a potential violation or demonstrating compliance.

(b) **Duty to Cooperate with Investigations.** Charging individuals and covered entities shall cooperate with investigations conducted by the General Counsel. Cooperation includes providing timely responses to reasonable requests for information and documents (including the making and retention of copies of records and documents), allowing the General Counsel to review documents and interview relevant witnesses confidentially and without managerial interference or influence, and granting the General Counsel ready access to all facilities where covered services, programs and activities are being provided and all places of public accommodation.

§ 2.104 Mediation.

(a) **Belief that violation may have occurred.** If, after investigation, the General Counsel believes that a violation of the ADA may have occurred and that mediation may be helpful in resolving the dispute, prior to filing a complaint, the General Counsel may request, but not participate in, mediation under subsections (b) through (d) of Section 403 of the CAA between the charging individual and any entity responsible for correcting the alleged violation.

(b) **Settlement.** If, prior to the filing of a complaint, the charging individual and the entity responsible for correcting the violation reach a settlement agreement that fully resolves the dispute, the General Counsel shall close the investigation of the charge without taking further action.

(c) **Mediation Unsuccessful.** If mediation under (a) has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, and if the General Counsel believes that a violation of the ADA may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation.

§ 2.105 Complaint.

The complaint filed by the General Counsel shall be submitted to a hearing officer for decision pursuant to subsections (b) through (h) of Section 405 of the CAA. The decision of the hearing officer shall be subject to review by the Board pursuant to Section 406 of the CAA.

§ 2.106 Intervention by Charging Individual.

Any person who has filed a charge may intervene as of right, with the full rights of a

party, whenever a complaint is filed by the General Counsel.

§ 2.107 Remedies and Compliance.

(a) **Remedy.** The remedy for a violation of Section 210 of the CAA shall be such remedy as would be appropriate if awarded under Section 203 or 308(a) of the ADA.

(1) **Attorney Fees and Costs.** In any action commenced pursuant to Section 210 of the CAA by the General Counsel, when a charging individual has intervened, the hearing officer and the Board, in their discretion, may allow the prevailing charging individual a reasonable attorney's fee, including litigation expenses, and costs, and the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation shall pay such fees, expenses and costs from its appropriated funds as part of the funds to correct violations of Section 210 under Section 415(c) of the CAA.

(2) **Compensatory Damages.** In any action commenced pursuant to Section 210 of the CAA by the General Counsel, when a charging individual has intervened, the hearing officer and the Board, in their discretion, may award compensatory damages to the prevailing charging individual, and the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation shall pay such compensatory damages from its appropriated funds as part of the funds to correct violations of Section 210 under Section 415(c) of the CAA.

(b) **Compliance Date.** Compliance shall take place as soon as possible, but no later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the order requiring correction becomes final and not subject to further review.

§ 2.108 Judicial Review.

A charging individual who has intervened or any respondent to the complaint, if aggrieved by a final decision of the Board, may file a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, pursuant to Section 407 of the CAA.

PART 3—MATTERS PERTAINING TO PERIODIC INSPECTIONS AND REPORTING.

§ 3.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

§ 3.102 DEFINITIONS

§ 3.103 INSPECTION AUTHORITY

§ 3.104 REPORTING, ESTIMATED COST & TIME AND COMPLIANCE

§ 3.101 Purpose and scope.

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel, on a regular basis, at least once each Congress, inspect the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA and to prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections, describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement. Part 3 of these regulations contains the provisions pertaining to these inspection and reporting duties. By procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise this statutory authority provided by Section 210.

§ 3.102 Definitions.

(a) **The facilities of covered entities** means all facilities used to provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations that are designed, maintained, altered or constructed by a covered entity and all facilities where covered entities provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations.

(b) **Violation** means any barrier to access caused by noncompliance with the applicable standards.

(c) **Estimated cost and time needed for abatement** means cost and time estimates that can be reported as falling within a range of dollar amounts and dates.

§ 3.103 Inspection authority.

(a) **General scope of authority.** On a regular basis, at least once each Congress, the General Counsel shall inspect the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA. When conducting these inspections, the General Counsel has the discretion to decide which facilities will be inspected and how inspections will be conducted. The General Counsel may receive requests for ADA inspections, including anonymous requests, and conduct inspections for compliance with Titles II and III of the ADA in the same manner that the General Counsel receives and investigates requests for inspections under Section 215(c)(1) of the CAA.

(b) **Review of information and documents.** When conducting inspections under Section 210(f) of the CAA, the General Counsel may request, obtain, and review any and all information or documents deemed by the General Counsel to be relevant to a determination of whether the covered entity is in compliance with Section 210 of the CAA.

(c) **Duty to cooperate.** Covered entities shall cooperate with any inspection conducted by the General Counsel in the manner provided by § 2.103(b).

(d) **Pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects.** Any project involving alteration or new construction of facilities of covered entities are subject to inspection by the General Counsel for compliance with Titles II and III of the ADA during the design, pre-construction, construction, and post construction phases of the project. The Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall, within one year from the effective date of these regulations, develop a process with the General Counsel to identify potential barriers to access prior to the completion of alteration and construction projects that may include the following provisions:

- (1) Design review or approval;
- (2) Inspections of ongoing alteration and construction projects;
- (3) Training on the applicable ADA standards;
- (4) Final inspections of completed projects for compliance; and
- (5) Any other provision that would likely reduce the number of ADA barriers in alterations and new construction and the costs associated with correcting them.

§ 3.104 Reporting, estimating cost & time and compliance date.

(a) **Reporting duty.** On a regular basis, at least once each Congress, the General Counsel shall prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections conducted under § 3.103(a), describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement.

(b) **Estimated cost & time.** Covered entities shall cooperate with the General Counsel by providing information needed to provide the estimated cost and time needed for abatement in the manner provided by § 2.103(b).

(c) **Compliance date.** All barriers to access identified by the General Counsel in its periodic reports shall be removed or otherwise corrected as soon as possible, but no later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the report describing the barrier to access was issued by the General Counsel.

Recommended Method of Approval:

The Board recommends that (1) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply

to the Senate and entities and facilities of the Senate be approved by the Senate by resolution; (2) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply to the House of Representatives and entities and facilities of the House of Representatives be approved by the House of Representatives by resolution; and (3) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply to other covered entities and facilities be approved by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on this 9th day of September, 2014.

BARBARA L. CAMENS,

Chair of the Board, Office of Compliance.

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 303(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1383(a), requires that, with regard to the initial proposal of procedural rules under the CAA, the Executive Director "shall, subject to the approval of the Board [of Directors], adopt rules governing the procedures of the Office . . . publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking" and "shall transmit such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

Having obtained the approval of the Board as required by Section 303(b) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1383(b), I am transmitting the attached notice of proposed procedural rulemaking to the President pro tempore of the Senate. I request that this notice be published in the Senate section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following the receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 303(b) of the CAA, a comment period of 30 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street SE., Washington, DC 20540; 202-724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA J. SAPIN,
Executive Director,
Office of Compliance.

Attachment.

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING ("NPRM"), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE, NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING, AS REQUIRED BY 2 U.S.C. § 1383, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED ("CAA").

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Shortly after the creation of the Office of Compliance (Office) in 1995, Procedural Rules were adopted to govern the processing of cases and controversies under the administrative procedures established in subchapter IV of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) 2 U.S.C. 1401-1407. The Rules of Procedure were amended in 1998 and again in 2004. The existing Rules of Procedure are available in their entirety on the Office of Compliance's web site: www.compliance.gov. The web site is fully compliant with section

508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

Pursuant to section 303(a) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1383(a)), the Executive Director of the Office has obtained approval of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance regarding certain amendments to the Rules of Procedure.

After obtaining the Board's approval, the Executive Director must then "publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking . . . for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal." (Section 303(b) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1383(b)).

NOTICE

Comments regarding the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Office of Compliance set forth in this NOTICE are invited for a **period of thirty (30) days** following the date of the appearance of this NOTICE in the Congressional Record. In addition to being posted on the Office of Compliance's section 508 compliant web site (www.compliance.gov), this NOTICE is also available in the following alternative formats: Large Print, Braille. Requests for this NOTICE in an alternative format should be made to Annie Leftwood, Office of Compliance, at 202/724-9272 (voice). Submission of comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided via e-mail to: Annie Leftwood: annie.leftwood@compliance.gov. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non toll-free number). Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-Federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA applies the rights and protections of 13 federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the Legislative Branch of Government. Section 301 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1381) establishes the Office of Compliance as an independent office within that Branch. Section 303 (2 U.S.C. 1383) directs that the Executive Director, as the Chief Operating Officer of the agency, adopt rules of procedure governing the Office of Compliance, subject to approval by the Board of Directors of the Office.

The rules of procedure establish the process by which alleged violations of the 13 laws made applicable to the Legislative Branch under the CAA will be considered and resolved. Subpart A covers general provisions pertaining to scope and policy, definitions, and information on various filings and computation of time. Proposed Amendments to Subpart A provide for electronic filing and clarify requirements and procedures concerning confidentiality. Subpart B provides procedures for counseling, mediation, and election between filing an administrative complaint with the Office of Compliance or filing a civil action in U.S. District Court. A new Subpart C of the Procedural Rules sets forth the proposed rules and procedures for enforcement of the inspection, investigation

and complaint sections 210(d) and (f) of the CAA relating to Public Services and Accommodations under Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Subpart C has been reserved for these rules since 1995. Because the Office of the General Counsel conducts ADA inspections and investigates ADA charges using procedures that are similar to what are used in its Occupational, Safety and Health (OSH) inspections and investigations conducted under section 215 of the CAA, the procedural rules are similar to what are contained in Subpart D of the Procedural Rules relating to OSH inspections and investigations. The proposed Amendments to Subpart D clarify potential ambiguities in the rules and procedures and make modifications in terminology to better comport with the statutory language used in Section 215 of the CAA. Subparts E, F, and G include the process for the conduct of administrative hearings held as the result of the filing of an administrative complaint. Subpart H sets forth the procedures for appeals of decisions by hearing officers to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance and for appeals of decisions by the Board of Directors to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Proposed Amendments to Subpart H also reference procedures for other proceedings before the Board. Subpart I of the Rules contain other matters of general applicability to the dispute resolution process and to the operation of the Office of Compliance, including proposed Amendments concerning attorney's fees and violations of formal settlement agreements.

These proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure are the result of the experience of the Office in processing disputes under the CAA since the original adoption of these Rules in 1995. The proposed Amendments to Subpart D of the Procedural Rules reflect the experience of the Office of General Counsel in conducting OSH inspections and investigations since 1995.

EXPLANATION REGARDING THE TEXT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Material from the 2004 version of the Rules is printed in roman type. The text of the proposed amendments shows **[deletions in italicized type within bold italics brackets]** and **added text in bold**. Only subsections of the Rules that include proposed amendments are reproduced in this NOTICE. The insertion of a series of small dots (. . .) indicates additional, unamended text within a section has not been reproduced in this document. The insertion of a series of asterisks (* * * * *) indicates that the unamended text of entire sections of the Rules have not been reproduced in this document. For the text of other portions of the Rules which are not proposed to be amended, please access the Office of Compliance web site at www.compliance.gov.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Subpart A—General Provisions

§ 1.01 Scope and Policy

§ 1.02 Definitions

§ 1.03 Filing and Computation of Time

§ 1.04 Availability of Official Information

§ 1.05 Designation of Representative

§ 1.06 Maintenance of Confidentiality

§ 1.07 Breach of Confidentiality Provisions

§ 1.01 Scope and Policy.

These rules of the Office of Compliance govern the procedures for consideration and resolution of alleged violations of the laws made applicable under Parts A, B, C, and D of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995. The rules include **definitions**, procedures for counseling, mediation,

and for electing between filing a complaint with the Office of Compliance and filing a civil action in a district court of the United States **under Part A of title II**. The rules also address the procedures for **compliance, investigation and enforcement under Part B of title II, [variances]** and for compliance, investigation, **[and]** enforcement, **and variance under Part C of title II. The rules include [and]** procedures for the conduct of hearings held as a result of the filing of a complaint and for appeals to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance from Hearing Officer decisions, as well as other matters of general applicability to the dispute resolution process and to the operations of the Office of Compliance. It is the policy of the Office that these rules shall be applied with due regard to the rights of all parties and in a manner that expedites the resolution of disputes.

§ 1.02 Definitions.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in these rules, for purposes of this Part:

(b) *Covered Employee*. The term "covered employee" means any employee of

(3) the **[Capitol Guide Service] Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;**

(4) the **United States Capitol Police;**

(9) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** or the Library of Congress.

(d) *Employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol*. The term "employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol" includes any employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, **or** the Botanic Garden **[or the Senate Restaurants]**.

(e) *Employee of the Capitol Police*. The term "employee of the Capitol Police" includes civilian employees and any member or officer of the Capitol Police.

(f) *Employee of the House of Representatives*. The term "employee of the House of Representatives" includes an individual occupying a position the pay for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or another official designated by the House of Representatives, or any employment position in an entity that is paid with funds derived from the clerk-hire allowance of the House of Representatives, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) of paragraph (b) above.

(g) *Employee of the Senate*. The term "employee of the Senate" includes any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) of paragraph (b) above.

(h) *Employing Office*. The term "employing office" means:

(4) the **[Capitol Guide Service] Office of Congressional Accessibility Services**, the **United States Capitol Police**, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; or

(5) for the purposes stated in paragraph **[(q)] (r)** of this section, the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** and the Library of Congress

(j) *Designated Representative*. The term "designated representative" means an individual, firm, or other entity designated in

writing by a party to represent the interests of that party in a matter filed with the Office.

—Re-letter subsequent paragraphs—

[(o)](p) *General Counsel.* The term “General Counsel” means the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance and any authorized representative or designee of the General Counsel.

[(p)](q) *Hearing Officer.* The term “Hearing Officer” means any individual [designated] appointed by the Executive Director to preside over a hearing conducted on matters within the Office’s jurisdiction.

[(q)](r) *Coverage of the [General Accounting] Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress and their Employees.* The term “employing office” shall include the [General Accounting] Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress, and the term “covered employee” shall include employees of the [General Accounting] Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress, for purposes of the proceedings and rulemakings described in subparagraphs (1) and (2):

§ 1.03 Filing and Computation of Time

(a) *Method of Filing.* Documents may be filed in person, electronically, by facsimile (FAX), or by mail, including express, overnight and other expedited delivery. [When specifically requested by the Executive Director, or by a Hearing Officer in the case of a matter pending before the Hearing Officer, or by the Board of Directors in the case of an appeal to the Board, any document may also be filed by electronic transmittal in a designated format, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format. Requests for counseling under section 2.03, requests for mediation under section 2.04 and complaints under section 5.01 of these rules may also be filed by facsimile (FAX) transmission. In addition, the Board or a Hearing Officer may order other documents to be filed by FAX. The original copies of documents filed by FAX must also be mailed to the Office no later than the day following FAX transmission.] The filing of all documents is subject to the limitations set forth below. The Board, Hearing Officer, the Executive Director, or the General Counsel may, in their discretion, determine the method by which documents may be filed in a particular proceeding, including ordering one or more parties to use mail, FAX, electronic filing, or personal delivery. Parties and their representatives are responsible for ensuring that the Office always has their current postal mailing and e-mail addresses and FAX numbers.

(2) [Mailing] By Mail.

(i) *Requests for Mediation.* If mailed, including express, overnight and other expedited delivery, a request for mediation [or a complaint] is deemed filed on the date of its receipt in the Office.

(ii) *Other Documents.* [A document,] Documents, other than a request for mediation, [or a complaint, is] are deemed filed on the date of [its] their postmark or proof of mailing to the Office. Parties, including those using franked mail, are responsible for ensuring that any mailed document bears a postmark date or other proof of the actual date of mailing. In the absence of a legible postmark a document will be deemed timely filed if it is received by the Office at Adams Building, Room LA 200, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, by mail within five (5) days of the expiration of the applicable filing period.

(3) [Faxing Documents] By FAX. Documents transmitted by FAX machine will be deemed filed on the date received at the Office at 202-426-1913, or [, in the case of any document to be filed or submitted to the General Counsel.] on the date received at the Office of the General Counsel at 202-426-1663 if received by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. Faxed documents received after 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time will be deemed filed the following business day. A FAX filing will be timely only if the document is received no later than [5:00 PM] 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the last day of the applicable filing period. Any party using a FAX machine to file a document bears the responsibility for ensuring both that the document is timely and accurately transmitted and confirming that the Office has received a facsimile of the document. [The party or individual filing the document may rely on its FAX status report sheet to show that it filed the document in a timely manner, provided that the status report indicates the date of the FAX, the receiver’s FAX number, the number of pages included in the FAX, and that transmission was completed.] The time displayed as received by the Office on its FAX status report will be used to show the time that the document was filed. When the Office serves a document by FAX, the time displayed as sent by the Office on its FAX status report will be used to show the time that the document was served. A FAX filing cannot exceed 75 pages, inclusive of table of contents, table of authorities, and attachments. Attachments exceeding 75 pages must be submitted to the Office in person or by electronic delivery. The date of filing will be determined by the date the brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum is received in the Office, rather than the date the attachments were received in the Office.

(4) *By Electronic Mail.* Documents transmitted electronically will be deemed filed on the date received at the Office at oocemail@compliance.gov, or on the date received at the Office of the General Counsel at OSH@compliance.gov if received by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. Documents received electronically after 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time will be deemed filed the following business day. An electronic filing will be timely only if the document is received no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the last day of the applicable filing period. Any party filing a document electronically bears the responsibility for ensuring both that the document is timely and accurately transmitted and for confirming that the Office has received the document. The time displayed as received by the Office will be used to show the time that the document has been filed. When the Office serves a document electronically, the time displayed as sent by the Office will be used to show the time that the document was served.

(b) *Service by the Office.* At its discretion, the Office may serve documents by mail, FAX, electronic transmission, or personal or commercial delivery.

[(b)](c) *Computation of Time.* All time periods in these rules that are stated in terms of days are calendar days unless otherwise noted. However, when the period of time prescribed is five (5) days or less, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, federal government holidays, and other full days that the Office is officially closed for business shall be excluded in the computation. To compute the number of days for taking any action required or permitted under these rules, the first day shall be the day after the event from which the time period begins to run and the last day for filing or service shall be included in the computation. When the last day falls on a Saturday, Sunday, [or] federal

government holiday, or a day the Office is officially closed, the last day for taking the action shall be the next regular federal government workday.

[(c)](d) *Time Allowances for Mailing, Fax, or Electronic Delivery of Official Notices.* Whenever a person or party has the right or is required to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice or other document upon him or her and the notice or document is served by [regular, first-class] mail, five (5) days shall be added to the prescribed period. [Only two (2) days shall be added if a document is served by express mail or other form of expedited delivery.] When documents are served by certified mail, return receipt requested, the prescribed period shall be calculated from the date of receipt as evidenced by the return receipt. When documents are served electronically or by FAX, the prescribed period shall be calculated from the date of transmission by the Office.

[(d) Service or filing of documents by certified mail, return receipt requested. Whenever these rules permit or require service or filing of documents by certified mail, return receipt requested, such documents may also be served or filed by express mail or other forms of expedited delivery in which proof of date of receipt by the addressee is provided.]

§ 9.01 § 1.04 Filing, Service, and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and Other Documents.

(a) *Filing with the Office; Number and Format.* One copy of requests for counseling and mediation, requests for inspection under OSH, unfair labor practice charges, charges under titles II and III of the ADA, [one original and three copies of] all motions, briefs, responses, and other documents must be filed [, whenever required,] with the Office [or Hearing Officer]. [However, when a party aggrieved by the decision of a Hearing Officer or a party to any other matter or determination reviewable by the Board files an appeal or other submission with the Board, one original and seven copies of any submission and any responses must be filed with the Office. The Office, Hearing Officer, or Board may also request a] A party [to submit] may file an electronic version of any submission in a [designated] format designated by the Executive Director, General Counsel, Hearing Officer, or Board, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format.

(b) *Service.* The parties shall serve on each other one copy of all motions, briefs, responses and other documents filed with the Office, other than the request for counseling, the request for mediation and complaint. Service shall be made by mailing, by fax or e-mailing, or by hand delivering a copy of the motion, brief, response or other document to each party, or if represented, the party’s representative, on the service list previously provided by the Office. Each of these documents must be accompanied by a certificate of service specifying how, when and on whom service was made. It shall be the duty of each party to notify the Office and all other parties in writing of any changes in the names or addresses on the service list.

(d) *Size Limitations.* Except as otherwise specified [by the Hearing Officer, or these rules,] no brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum filed with the Office shall exceed 35 double-spaced pages, [or 8,750 words,] exclusive of the table of contents, table of authorities and attachments. The Board, the Executive Director, or Hearing Officer may [waive, raise or reduce] modify this limitation upon motion and for good cause

shown; or on *[its]* their own initiative. Briefs, motions, responses, and supporting memoranda shall be on standard letter-size paper (8-1/2" x 11"). **To the extent that such a filing exceeds 35 double-spaced pages, the Hearing Officer, Board, or Executive Director may, in their discretion, reject the filing in whole or in part, and may provide the parties an opportunity to refile.**

§ 9.02 § 1.05 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violation of Rules; Sanctions.

(a) **Signing.** Every pleading, motion, and other filing of a party represented by an attorney or other designated representative shall be signed by the attorney or representative. A party who is not represented shall sign the pleading, motion or other filing. **In the case of an electronic filing, an electronic signature is acceptable.** The signature of a representative or party constitutes a certificate by the signer that the signer has read the pleading, motion, or other filing; that to the best of the signer's knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.

(b) **Sanctions.** If a pleading, motion, or other filing is not signed, it shall be stricken unless it is signed promptly after the omission is called to the attention of the person who is required to sign. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is signed in violation of this rule, a Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or upon *[its]* their own initiative, *[shall]* may impose *[upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both,]* an appropriate sanction, which may include *[an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of the filing of the pleading, motion, or other filing, including a reasonable attorney's fee. A Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or its own initiative may also impose an appropriate sanction, which may include]* the sanctions specified in section 7.02 *[, for any other violation of these rules that does not result from reasonable error].*

§ 1.04 § 1.06 Availability of Official Information.

(a) **Policy.** It is the policy of the Board, the **[Office] Executive Director,** and the General Counsel, except as otherwise ordered by the Board, to make available for public inspection and copying final decisions and orders of the Board and the Office, as specified and described in paragraph (d) below.

(c) **Copies of Forms.** Copies of blank forms prescribed by the Office for the filing of complaints and other actions or requests may be obtained from the Office **or on line at www.compliance.gov.**

(f) **Access by Committees of Congress.** *[At the discretion of the Executive Director, the]* **The Executive Director, at his or her discretion,** may provide to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives (**House Committee on Ethics**) and the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate (**Senate Select Committee on Ethics**) access to the records of the hearings and decisions of the Hearing Officers and the Board, including all written and oral testimony in the possession of the Office. The

identifying information in these records may be redacted at the discretion of the Executive Director. The Executive Director shall not provide such access until the Executive Director has consulted with the individual filing the complaint at issue, and until a final decision has been entered under section 405(g) or 406(e) of the Act.

§ 1.05 § 1.07 Designation of Representative.

(a) *[An employee, other charging individual or]* A party *[a witness, a labor organization, an employing office, or an entity alleged to be responsible for correcting a violation]* wishing to be represented *[by another individual,]* must file with the Office a written notice of designation of representative. **No more than one representative, *[or]* firm, or other entity may be designated as representative for a party, unless approved in writing by the Hearing Officer or Executive Director.** The representative may be, but is not required to be, an attorney. **If the representative is an attorney, he or she may sign the designation of representative on behalf of the party.**

(b) *Service Where There is a Representative.* **[All service]** Service of documents shall be *[directed to]* on the representative unless and until such time as the represented *[individual, labor organization, or employing office]* party or representative, with notice to the party, *[specifies otherwise and until such time as that individual, labor organization, or employing office]* notifies the Executive Director, in writing, of *[an amendment]* a modification or revocation of the designation of representative. Where a designation of representative is in effect, all time limitations for receipt of materials *[by the represented individual or entity]* shall be computed in the same manner as for those who are unrepresented *[individuals or entities],* with service of the documents, however, directed to the representative *[, as provided].*

(c) **Revocation of a Designation of Representative.** A revocation of a designation of representative, whether made by the party or by the representative with notice to the party, must be made in writing and filed with the Office. The revocation will be deemed effective the date of receipt by the Office. At the discretion of the Executive Director, General Counsel, mediator, hearing officer, or Board, additional time may be provided to allow the party to designate a new representative as consistent with the Act.

§ 1.06 § 1.08 [Maintenance of] Confidentiality.

(a) **Policy.** *[In accord with section 416 of the Act, it is the policy of]* **Except as provided in sections 416(d), (e), and (f) of the Act,** the Office *[to]* shall maintain *[, to the fullest extent possible, the]* confidentiality in counseling, mediation, and *[of]* the proceedings and deliberations of hearing officers and the Board in accordance with sections 416(a), (b), and (c) of the Act. *[Of the participants in proceedings conducted under sections 402, 403, 405 and 406 of the Act and these rules.]*

(b) *[At the time that any individual, employing office or party, including a designated representative, becomes a participant in counseling under section 402, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding, the Office will advise the participant of the confidentiality requirements of section 416 of the Act and these rules and that sanctions may be imposed for a violation of those requirements.]* **Participant.** For the purposes of this rule, participant means an individual or entity who takes part as either a party, witness, or designated representative in counseling under Section 402

of the Act, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under Section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding which is expressly or by necessity deemed confidential under the Act or these rules.

(c) **Prohibition.** Unless specifically authorized by the provisions of the Act or by these rules, no participant in counseling, mediation or other proceedings made confidential under Section 416 of the Act ("confidential proceedings") may disclose a written or oral communication that is prepared for the purpose of or that occurs during counseling, mediation, and the proceedings and deliberations of hearing officers and the Board.

(d) **Exceptions.** Nothing in these rules prohibits a party or its representative from disclosing information obtained in confidential proceedings when reasonably necessary to investigate claims, ensure compliance with the Act or prepare its prosecution or defense. However, the party making the disclosure shall take all reasonably appropriate steps to ensure that persons to whom the information is disclosed maintain the confidentiality of such information. These rules do not preclude a mediator from consulting with the Office, except that when the covered employee is an employee of the Office a mediator shall not consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness. These rules do not preclude the Office from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives.

(e) **Waiver.** Participants may agree to waive confidentiality. Such a waiver must be in writing and provided to the Office.

(f) **Sanctions.** The Office will advise the participants of the confidentiality requirements of Section 416 of the Act and that sanctions may be imposed by the Hearing Officer for a violation of those requirements. No sanctions may be imposed except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.

§ 1.07 Breach of Confidentiality Provisions.

(a) **In General.** Section 416(a) of the CAA provides that counseling under section 402 shall be strictly confidential, except that the Office and a covered employee may agree to notify the employing office of the allegations. Section 416(b) provides that all mediation shall be strictly confidential. Section 416(c) provides that all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including any related records shall be confidential, except for release of records necessary for judicial actions, access by certain committees of Congress, and, in accordance with section 416(f), publication of certain final decisions. Section 416(c) does not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but does apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under section 215. See also sections 1.06, 5.04, and 7.12 of these rules.

(b) **Prohibition.** Unless specifically authorized by the provisions of the CAA or by order of the Board, the Hearing Officer or a court, or by the procedural rules of the Office, no participant in counseling, mediation or other proceedings made confidential under section 416 of the CAA ("confidential proceedings") may disclose the contents or records of those proceedings to any person or entity. Nothing in these rules prohibits a bona fide representative of a party under section 1.05 from engaging in communications with that party for the purpose of participation in the proceedings, provided that such disclosure is not made in the presence of individuals not reasonably necessary to the representative's representation of that party. Moreover, nothing in these rules prohibits a party or its representative from disclosing information obtained in confidential proceedings for the limited purposes of investigating claims, ensuring

compliance with the Act or preparing its prosecution or defense, to the extent that such disclosure is reasonably necessary to accomplish the aforementioned purposes and provided that the party making the disclosure takes all reasonably appropriate steps to ensure that persons to whom the information is disclosed maintain the confidentiality of such information.

(c) **Participant.** For the purposes of this rule, participant means any individual or party, including a designated representative, that becomes a participant in counseling under section 402, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding which is expressly or by necessity deemed confidential under the Act or these rules.

(d) **Contents or Records of Confidential Proceedings.** For the purpose of this rule, the contents or records of counseling, mediation or other proceeding includes information disclosed by participants to the proceedings, and records disclosed by either the opposing party, witnesses or the Office. A participant is free to disclose facts and other information obtained from any source outside of the confidential proceedings. For example, an employing office or its representatives may disclose information about its employment practices and personnel actions, provided that the information was not obtained in a confidential proceeding. However, an employee who obtains that information in mediation or other confidential proceeding may not disclose such information. Similarly, information forming the basis for the allegation of a complaining employee may be disclosed by that employee, provided that the information contained in those allegations was not obtained in a confidential proceeding. However, the employing office or its representatives may not disclose that information if it was obtained a confidential proceeding.

(e) **Violation of Confidentiality.** Any complaint regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions must be made to the Executive Director no later than 30 days after the date of the alleged violation. Such complaints may be referred by the Executive Director to a Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer is also authorized to initiate proceedings on his or her own initiative, or at the direction of the Board, if the alleged violation occurred in the context of Board proceedings. Upon a finding of a violation of the confidentiality provisions, the Hearing Officer, after notice and hearing, may impose an appropriate sanction, which may include any of the sanctions listed in section 7.02 of these rules, as well as any of the following:

(1) an order that the matters regarding which the violation occurred or any other designated facts shall be taken to be established against the violating party for the purposes of the action in accordance with the claim of the other party;

(2) an order refusing to allow the violating party to support or oppose designated claims or defenses, or prohibiting him from introducing designated matters in evidence;

(3) an order striking out pleadings or parts thereof, or staying further proceedings until the order is obeyed, or dismissing with or without prejudice the action or proceedings or any part thereof, or rendering a judgment by default against the violating party;

(4) in lieu of any of the foregoing orders or in addition thereto, the Hearing Officer shall require the party violating the confidentiality provisions or the representative advising him, or both, to pay, at such time as ordered by the Hearing Officer, the reasonable expenses, including attorney fees, caused by the violation, unless the Hearing Officer finds that the failure was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust.

Such an order shall be subject to review on appeal of the final decision of the Hearing Officer under section 406 of the Act. No sanctions may be imposed under this section except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.]

Subpart B—Pre-Complaint Procedures Applicable to Consideration of Alleged Violations of Part A of Title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995

§ 2.01 Matters Covered by Subpart B

§ 2.02 Requests for Advice and Information

§ 2.03 Counseling

§ 2.04 Mediation

§ 2.05 Election of Proceedings

§ 2.06 Filing of Civil Action

§ 2.01 Matters Covered by Subpart B.

(a) These rules govern the processing of any allegation that sections 201 through 206 of the Act have been violated and any allegation of intimidation or reprisal prohibited under section 207 of the Act. Sections 201 through 206 of the Act apply to covered employees and employing offices certain rights and protections of the following laws:

(10) Chapter 35 (relating to veteran's preference) of title 5, United States Code

(11) Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008.

(b) This subpart applies to the covered employees and employing offices as defined in section 1.02(b) and (h) of these rules and any activities within the coverage of sections 201 through 206(a) and 207 of the Act and referenced above in section 2.01(a) of these rules.

§ 2.03 Counseling.

(a) **Initiating a Proceeding; Formal Request for Counseling.** [In order] To initiate a proceeding under these rules regarding an alleged violation of the Act, as referred to in section 2.01(a), above, an employee shall file a written request for counseling with the Office [I]. [Regarding an alleged violation of the Act, as referred to in section 2.01(a), above.] The written formal request for counseling should be on an official form provided by the Office and can be found on the Office's website at www.compliance.gov. [All requests for counseling shall be confidential, unless the employee agrees to waive his or her right to confidentiality under section 2.03(e)(2), below.]

(b) **Who May Request Counseling.** A covered employee who, in good faith, believes that he or she has been or is the subject of a violation of the Act as referred to in section 2.01(a) may formally request counseling.

(d) [Purpose] **Overview of the Counseling Period.** The Office will maintain strict confidentiality throughout the counseling period. The [purpose of the] counseling period [shall] should be used: to discuss the employee's concerns and elicit information regarding the matter(s) which the employee believes constitute a violation(s) of the Act; to advise the employee of his or her rights and responsibilities under the Act and the procedures of the Office under these rules; to evaluate the matter; and to assist the employee in achieving an early resolution of the matter, if possible.

(e) **Confidentiality and Waiver.**

(1) Absent a waiver under paragraph 2, below, all counseling shall be kept strictly confidential and shall not be subject to discovery. All participants in counseling shall be advised of the requirement for confidentiality and that disclosure of information deemed confidential could result in sanctions

later in the proceedings. Nothing in these rules shall prevent a counselor from consulting with personnel within the Office concerning a matter in counseling, except that, when the person being counseled is an employee of the Office, the counselor shall not consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness without the consent of the person requesting counseling. Nothing contained in these rules shall prevent the Executive Director from compiling and publishing statistical information such as that required by Section 301(h)(3) of the Act. [so long as that statistical information does not reveal the identity of the employees involved or of employing offices that are the subject of a request for counseling.]

(2) The employee and the Office may agree to waive confidentiality [of] during the counseling process for the limited purpose of allowing the Office [contacting the employing office] to [obtain information] notify the employing office of the allegations. [to be used in counseling the employee or to attempt a resolution of any disputed matter(s).] Such a limited waiver must be written on the form supplied by the Office and signed by both the counselor and the employee.

(g) **Role of Counselor [in Defining Concerns].** The counselor [may] shall:

(1) obtain the name, home and office mailing and e-mail addresses, and home and office telephone numbers of the person being counseled;

(2) obtain the name and title of the person(s) whom the employee claims has engaged in a violation of the Act, e-mail address, if known, and the employing office in which this person(s) works;

(5) obtain the name, business and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the employee's representative, if any, and whether the representative is an attorney.

[(i)] (h) **Counselor Not a Representative.** The counselor shall inform the person being counseled that the counselor does not represent either the employing office or the employee. The counselor provides information regarding the Act and the Office and may act as a third-party intermediary with the goals of increasing the individual's understanding of his or her rights and responsibilities under the Act and of promoting the early resolution of the matter.

[(j)] (i) **Duration of Counseling Period.** The period for counseling shall be 30 days, beginning on the date that the request for counseling is [received by the Office] filed by the employee in accordance with section 1.03(a) of these rules, unless the employee requests in writing on a form provided by the Office to reduce the period and the [Office] Executive Director agrees [to reduce the period].

[(h)] (j) **Role of Counselor in Attempting Informal Resolution.** In order to attempt to resolve the matter brought to the attention of the counselor, the counselor must obtain a waiver of confidentiality pursuant to section 2.03(e)(2) of these rules. If the employee executes such a waiver, the counselor may:

(1) conduct a limited inquiry for the purpose of obtaining any information necessary to attempt an informal resolution or formal settlement;

(2) reduce to writing any formal settlement achieved and secure the signatures of the employee, his or her representative, if any, and a member of the employing office who is authorized to enter into a settlement on the employing office's behalf; and, pursuant to section 414 of the Act and section 9.05 of

these rules, seek the approval of the Executive Director. Nothing in this subsection, however, precludes the employee, the employing office or their representatives from reducing to writing any formal settlement.

(k) *Duty to Proceed.* An employee who initiates a proceeding under this part shall be responsible at all times for proceeding, regardless of whether he or she has designated a representative, **and shall notify the Office in writing of any change in pertinent contact information, such as address, e-mail, fax number, etc.** An employee, however, may withdraw from counseling once without prejudice to the employee's right to reinstate counseling regarding the same matter, provided that the request to reinstate counseling **must be in writing and is [received in] filed with the Office not later than 180 days after the date of the alleged violation of the Act and that counseling on a single matter will not last longer than a total of 30 days.**

(l) *Conclusion of the Counseling Period and Notice.* The Executive Director shall notify the employee in writing of the end of the counseling period **[.] by [certified mail, return receipt requested,] first class mail, [or by] personal delivery evidenced by a written receipt, or electronic transmission.** The Executive Director, as part of the notification of the end of the counseling period, shall inform the employee of the right and obligation, should the employee choose to pursue his or her claim, to file with the Office a request for mediation within 15 days after receipt by the employee of the notice of the end of the counseling period.

(m) *Employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and Capitol Police.*

(1) Where an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police requests counseling under the Act and these rules, the Executive Director, **in his or her sole discretion,** may recommend that the employee use the **[grievance] internal procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Architect of the Capitol and the Office or the Capitol Police and the Office addressing certain procedural and notification requirements.** The term "**[grievance] internal procedure(s)**" refers to **any internal procedure of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police, including grievance procedures referred to in section 401 of the Act,** that can provide a resolution of the matter(s) about which counseling was requested. Pursuant to section 401 of the Act when the Executive Director makes such a recommendation, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The Executive Director shall recommend **in writing** to the employee that the employee use **an [grievance] internal procedure of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police,** as appropriate, for a period generally up to 90 days, unless the Executive Director determines, **in writing,** that a longer period is appropriate **[for resolution of the employee's complaint through the grievance procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police]. Once the employee notifies the Office that he or she is using the internal procedure, the employee shall provide a waiver of confidentiality to allow the Executive Director to notify the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police that the employee will be using the internal procedure.**

(ii) The period during which the matter is pending in the internal procedure shall not count against the time available for counseling or mediation under the Act.

(iii) If the dispute is resolved to the employee's satisfaction, the employee shall so

notify the Office within 20 days after the employee has been served with a final decision.

[(ii)] (iv) After [having contacted the Office and having utilized] using the [grievance] internal procedures [of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police], the employee may notify the Office that he or she wishes to return to the procedures under these rules:

(A) within 60 days after the expiration of the period recommended by the Executive Director, **or longer if the Executive Director has extended the time period,** if the matter has not resulted in a final decision **or a decision not to proceed; or**

(B) within 20 days after service of a final decision **or a decision not to proceed,** resulting from the **[grievance] internal procedures [of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police Board.]**

[(iii)] The period during which the matter is pending in the internal grievance procedure shall not count against the time available for counseling or mediation under the Act. If the grievance is resolved to the employee's satisfaction, the employee shall so notify the Office within 20 days after the employee has received service of the final decision resulting from the grievance procedure. If no request to return to the procedures under these rules is received within 60 days after the expiration of the period recommended by the Executive Director the Office will issue a Notice of End of Counseling, as specified in section 2.04(i) of these Rules.]

(v) If a request to return to counseling is not made by the employee within the time periods outlined above, the Office will issue a Notice of the End of Counseling.

(2) Notice to Employees who Have Not Initiated Counseling with the Office. When an employee of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police raises in the internal procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police **[Board]** an allegation which may also be raised under the procedures set forth in this subpart, the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police **[Board should] shall, in accordance with the MOU with the Office,** advise the employee in writing that a request for counseling about the allegation must be initiated with the Office within 180 days after the alleged violation of law occurred if the employee intends to use the procedures of the Office.

(3) Notice in Final Decisions when Employees Have Not Initiated Counseling with the Office. When an employee raises in the internal procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police **[Board]** an allegation which may also be raised under the procedures set forth in this subpart, any **[final] decision issued [pursuant to the procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police Board should] under such procedure, shall, pursuant to the MOU with the Office,** include notice to the employee of his or her right to initiate the procedures under these rules within 180 days after the alleged violation occurred.

(4) Notice in Final Decisions when There Has Been a Recommendation by the Executive Director. When the Executive Director has made a recommendation under paragraph 1 above, the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police **[Board should] shall, pursuant to the MOU with the Office,** include with the final decision notice to the employee of his or her right to resume the procedures under these rules within 20 days after service on the employee of the final decision and shall transmit a copy of the final decision, settlement agreement, or other final disposition of the case to the Executive Director.

§ 2.04 Mediation.

(a) **[Explanation] Overview.** Mediation is a process in which employees, employing offices and their representatives, if any, meet separately and/or jointly with a **[neutral] mediator** trained to assist them in resolving disputes. As **[parties to] participants in** the mediation, employees, employing offices, and their representatives discuss alternatives to continuing their dispute, including the possibility of reaching a voluntary, mutually satisfactory resolution. The **[neutral] mediator** has no power to impose a specific resolution, and the mediation process, whether or not a resolution is reached, is strictly confidential, pursuant to section 416 of the Act.

(b) *Initiation.* Not more than 15 days after receipt by the employee of the notice of the conclusion of the counseling period under section 2.03(l), the employee may file with the Office a written request for mediation. **Except to provide for the services of a mediator and notice to the employing office, the invocation of mediation shall be kept confidential by the Office.** The request for mediation shall contain the employee's name, home and e-mail addresses, **[and] telephone number, and the name of the employing office that is the subject of the request.** Failure to request mediation within the prescribed period **[will] may** preclude the employee's further pursuit of his or her claim. **If a request for mediation is not filed within 15 days of receipt of a Notice of the End of Counseling, without good cause shown, the case will be closed and the employee will be so notified.**

(d) *Selection of [Neutrals] Mediators; Disqualification.* Upon receipt of the request for mediation, the Executive Director shall assign one or more **[neutrals] mediators** to commence the mediation process. In the event that a **[neutral] mediator** considers him or herself unable to perform in a neutral role in a given situation, he or she shall withdraw from the matter and immediately shall notify the Office of the withdrawal. Any party may ask the Office to disqualify a **[neutral] mediator** by filing a written request, including the reasons for such request, with the Executive Director. This request shall be filed as soon as the party has reason to believe there is a basis for disqualification. The Executive Director's decision on this request shall be final and unreviewable.

(e) *Duration and Extension.*

(2) The **[Office] Executive Director** may extend the mediation period upon the joint written request of the parties, or of the appointed mediator on behalf of the parties **[, to the attention of the Executive Director].** The request shall be written and filed with the **[Office] Executive Director** no later than the last day of the mediation period. The request shall set forth the joint nature of the request and the reasons therefore, and specify when the parties expect to conclude their discussions. Requests for additional extensions may be made in the same manner. Approval of any extensions shall be within the sole discretion of the **[Office] Executive Director.**

(f) *Procedures.*

(1) The **[Neutral's] Mediator's Role.** After assignment of the case, the **[neutral] mediator** will promptly contact the parties. The **[neutral] mediator** has the responsibility to conduct the mediation, including deciding how many meetings are necessary and who may participate in each meeting. The **[neutral] mediator** may accept and may ask the parties to provide written submissions.

(2) The Agreement to Mediate. At the commencement of the mediation, the [neutral] mediator will ask the [parties] participants and/or their representatives to sign an agreement prepared by the Office ("the Agreement to Mediate"). The Agreement to Mediate will define what is to be kept confidential during mediation and set out the conditions under which mediation will occur, including the requirement that the participants adhere to the confidentiality of the process and a notice that a breach of the mediation agreement could result in sanctions later in the proceedings. The Agreement to Mediate will also provide that the parties to the mediation will not seek to have the counselor or the [neutral] mediator participate, testify or otherwise present evidence in any subsequent administrative action under section 405 or any civil action under section 408 of the Act or any other proceeding.

(g) Who May Participate. The covered employee[,] and the employing office [,] their respective representatives, and the Office may meet, jointly or separately, with the neutral. A representative of the employee and a representative of the employing who has actual authority to agree to a settlement agreement on behalf of the employee or the employing office, as the case may be, must be present at the mediation or must be immediately accessible by telephone during the mediation. [] may elect to participate in mediation proceedings through a designated representative, provided, that the representative has actual authority to agree to a settlement agreement or has immediate access by telephone to someone with actual settlement authority, and provided further, that should the mediator deem it appropriate at any time, the physical presence in mediation of any party may be required. The Office may participate in the mediation process through a representative and/or observer. The mediator will determine, as best serves the interests of mediation, whether the participants may meet jointly or separately with the mediator.

(h) Informal Resolutions and Settlement Agreements. At any time during mediation the parties may resolve or settle a dispute in accordance with section [9.05] 9.03 of these rules.

(i) Conclusion of the Mediation Period and Notice. If, at the end of the mediation period, the parties have not resolved the matter that forms the basis of the request for mediation, the Office shall provide the employee, and the employing office, and their representatives, with written notice that the mediation period has concluded. The written notice [to the employee] will be [sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, or will be] personally delivered evidenced by a written receipt, or sent by first class mail, e-mail, or fax. [, and it] The notice will specify the mode of delivery and also [notify] provide information about the employee's [of his or her] right to elect to file a complaint with the Office in accordance with section 405 of the Act and section 5.01 of these rules or to file a civil action pursuant to section 408 of the Act and section [2.06] 2.07 of these rules.

(j) Independence of the Mediation Process and the [Neutral] Mediator. The Office will maintain the independence of the mediation process and the [neutral] mediator. No individual, who is appointed by the Executive Director to mediate, may conduct or aid in a hearing conducted under section 405 of the Act with respect to the same matter or shall be subject to subpoena or any other compulsory process with respect to the same matter.

[(k) Confidentiality. Except as necessary to consult with the parties, the parties' coun-

sel or other designated representatives, the parties to, the mediation, the neutral and the Office shall not disclose, in whole or in part, any information or records obtained through, or prepared specifically for, the mediation process. This rule shall not preclude a neutral from consulting with the Office, except that when the covered employee is an employee of the Office a neutral shall not consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness. This rule shall also not preclude the Office from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives that does not reveal the identity of the employees or employing offices involved in the mediation. All parties to the action and their representatives will be advised of the confidentiality requirements of this process and of the sanctions that might be imposed for violating these requirements.]

(k) Violation of Confidentiality in Mediation. An allegation regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions may be made by a party in a mediation to the mediator during the mediation period and, if not resolved by agreement in mediation, to a Hearing Officer during proceedings brought under Section 405 of the Act.

§ 2.05 Election of Proceeding.

(a) Pursuant to section 404 of the Act, not later than 90 days after a covered employee receives notice of the end of mediation under section 2.04(i) of these rules but no sooner than 30 days after that date, the covered employee may either:

(2) file a civil action in accordance with section 408 of the Act and section 2.06 2.07, below in the United States [District Court] district court for the district in which the employee is employed or for the District of Columbia.

(b) A covered employee who files a civil action pursuant to section [2.06] 408 of the Act and section 2.07 below, may not thereafter file a complaint under section 405 of the Act and section 5.01 below on the same matter.

§ 2.06 Certification of the Official Record

(a) Certification of the Official Record shall contain the date the Request for Counseling was made; the date and method of delivery the Notification of End of Counseling Period was sent to the complainant; the date the Notice was deemed by the Office to have been received by the complainant; the date the Request for Mediation was filed; the date and method of delivery the Notification of End of Mediation Period was sent to the complainant; and the date the Notice was deemed by the Office to have been received by the complainant.

(b) At any time after a complaint has been filed with the Office in accordance with section 405 of the Act and the procedure set out in section 5.01, below; or a civil action filed in accordance with section 408 of the Act and section 2.07 below in the United States district court, a party may request and receive from the Office Certification of the Official Record.

(c) Certification of the Official Record will not be provided until after a complaint has been filed with the Office or the Office has been notified that a civil action has been filed in district court.

§ [2.06] 2.07 Filing of Civil Action.

(c) Communication Regarding Civil Actions Filed with District Court. The party filing any civil action with the United States District Court pursuant to sections 404(2) and 408 of

the Act shall provide a written notice to the Office that the party has filed a civil action, specifying the district court in which the civil action was filed and the case number. Failure to notify the Office that such action has been filed may result in delay in the preparation and receipt of the Certification of the Official Record.

Subpart C—Compliance, Investigation, and Enforcement under Section 210 of the CAA (ADA Public Services)—Inspections and Complaints

§ 3.01 Purpose and Scope

§ 3.02 Authority for Inspection

§ 3.03 Request for Inspections by Members of the Public

§ 3.04 Objection to Inspection

§ 3.05 Entry Not a Waiver

§ 3.06 Advance Notice of Inspection

§ 3.07 Conduct of Inspections

§ 3.08 Representatives of Covered Entities

§ 3.09 Consultation with Individuals with Disabilities

§ 3.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review

§ 3.11 Charge filed with the General Counsel

§ 3.12 Service of charge or notice of charge

§ 3.13 Investigations by the General Counsel

§ 3.14 Mediation

§ 3.15 Dismissal of charge

§ 3.16 Complaint by the General Counsel

§ 3.17 Settlement

§ 3.18 Compliance date

§ 3.01 Purpose and Scope.

The purpose of sections 3.01 through 3.18 of this subpart is to prescribe rules and procedures for enforcement of the inspection and complaint provisions of sections 210(d) and (f) of the CAA. For the purpose of sections 3.01 through 3.18, references to the "General Counsel" include any authorized representative of the General Counsel. In situations where sections 3.01 through 3.18 set forth general enforcement policies rather than substantive or procedural rules, such policies may be modified in specific circumstances where the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee determines that an alternative course of action would better serve the objectives of section 210 of the CAA.

§ 3.02 Authority for Inspection.

(a) Under section 210(f)(1) of the CAA, the General Counsel is authorized to enter without delay and at reasonable times any facility of any entity listed in section 210(a) ("covered entities"), to inspect and investigate during regular working hours and at other reasonable times, and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, any facility, and all pertinent conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment and materials therein; to question privately any covered entity, employee, operator, or agent; and to review records maintained by or under the control of the covered entity.

(b) Prior to inspecting areas containing information which is classified by an agency of the United States Government (and/or by any congressional committee or other authorized entity within the Legislative Branch) in the interest of national security, and for which security clearance is required as a condition for access to the area(s) to be inspected, the individual(s) conducting the inspection shall have obtained the appropriate security clearance.

§ 3.03 Requests for Inspections by Members of the Public and Covered Entities.

(a) By Members of the Public.

(1) Any person who believes that a violation of section 210 of the CAA exists in any facility of a covered entity may request an inspection of such facility by giving notice of

the alleged violation to the General Counsel. Any such notice shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice, and shall be signed by the person or the representative of the person. A copy shall be provided to the covered entity or its agent by the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee no later than at the time of inspection, except that, upon the written request of the person giving such notice, his or her name and the names of individual employees referred to therein shall not appear in such copy or on any record published, released, or made available by the General Counsel. If the person making the request is a qualified individual with a disability, as defined by section 201(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (42 U.S.C. 12131(2)), the request for inspection shall be considered a charge of discrimination within the meaning of section 210(d)(1) of the CAA.

(2) If upon receipt of such notification the General Counsel's designee determines that the notice meets the requirements set forth in subparagraph (1) of this section, and that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the alleged violation exists, he or she shall cause an inspection to be made as soon as practicable, to determine if such alleged violation exists. Inspections under this section shall not be limited to matters referred to in the notice.

(3) Prior to or during any inspection of a facility, any person may notify the General Counsel's designee, in writing, of any violation of section 210 of the CAA which he or she has reason to believe exists in such facility. Any such notice shall comply with the requirements of subparagraph (1) of this section.

(b) *By Covered Entities.* Upon written request of any covered entity, the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee shall inspect and investigate facilities of covered entities under section 210(d) of the CAA. Any such requests shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office.

§ 3.04 Objection to Inspection.

Upon a refusal to permit the General Counsel's designee, in exercise of his or her official duties, to enter without delay and at reasonable times any place of employment or any place therein, to inspect, to review records, or to question any covered entity, operator, agent, or employee, in accordance with section 3.02 or to permit a representative of employees to accompany the General Counsel's designee during the physical inspection of any facility in accordance with section 3.07, the General Counsel's designee shall terminate the inspection or confine the inspection to other areas, conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment, materials, records, or interviews concerning which no objection is raised. The General Counsel's designee shall endeavor to ascertain the reason for such refusal, and shall immediately report the refusal and the reason therefor to the General Counsel, who shall take appropriate action.

§ 3.05 Entry Not a Waiver.

Any permission to enter, inspect, review records, or question any person, shall not imply or be conditioned upon a waiver of any cause of action under section 210 of the CAA.

§ 3.06 Advance Notice of Inspections.

(a) Advance notice of inspections may not be given, except in the following situations:

(1) in circumstances where the inspection can most effectively be conducted after regular business hours or where special preparations are necessary for an inspection;

(2) where necessary to assure the presence of representatives of the covered entity and employees or the appropriate personnel needed to aid in the inspection; and

(3) in other circumstances where the General Counsel determines that the giving of advance notice would enhance the probability of an effective and thorough inspection.

(b) In the situations described in paragraph (a) of this section, advance notice of inspections may be given only if authorized by the General Counsel or by the General Counsel's designee.

§ 3.07 Conduct of Inspections.

(a) Subject to the provisions of section 3.02, inspections shall take place at such times and in such places of employment as the General Counsel may direct. At the beginning of an inspection, the General Counsel's designee shall present his or her credentials to the operator of the facility or the management employee in charge at the facility to be inspected; explain the nature and purpose of the inspection; and indicate generally the scope of the inspection and the records specified in section 3.02 which he or she wishes to review. However, such designation of records shall not preclude access to additional records specified in section 3.02.

(b) The General Counsel's designee shall have authority to take or obtain photographs related to the purpose of the inspection, employ other reasonable investigative techniques, and question privately, any covered entity, operator, agent or employee of a covered facility. As used herein, the term "employ other reasonable investigative techniques" includes, but is not limited to, the use of measuring devices, testing equipment, or other equipment used to assess accessibility or compliance with the ADA Standards.

(c) In taking photographs and samples, the General Counsel's designees shall take reasonable precautions to insure that such actions with flash, spark-producing, or other equipment would not be hazardous. The General Counsel's designees shall comply with all employing office safety and health rules and practices at the workplace or location being inspected, and they shall wear and use appropriate protective clothing and equipment.

(d) The conduct of inspections shall be such as to preclude unreasonable disruption of the operations of the covered entity.

(e) At the conclusion of an inspection, the General Counsel's designee shall confer with the covered entity or its representative and informally advise it of any apparent ADA violations disclosed by the inspection. During such conference, the employing office shall be afforded an opportunity to bring to the attention of the General Counsel's designee any pertinent information regarding accessibility in the facility.

(f) Inspections shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of this subpart.

§ 3.08 Representatives of Covered Entities.

(a) The General Counsel's designee shall be in charge of inspections and questioning of persons. A representative of the covered entity shall be given an opportunity to accompany the General Counsel's designee during the physical inspection of any facility for the purpose of aiding such inspection. The General Counsel's designee may permit additional representatives from the covered entity to accompany the designee where he or she determines that such additional representatives will further aid the inspection. A different covered entity representative may accompany the General Counsel's designee

during each different phase of an inspection if this will not interfere with the conduct of the inspection.

(b) The General Counsel's designee shall have authority to resolve all disputes as to whom is the representative authorized by the covered entity for the purpose of this section.

(c) If in the judgment of the General Counsel's designee, good cause has been shown why accompaniment by a third party who is not the requestor or an employee of the covered entity (such as a sign language interpreter, braille reader, architect or accessibility expert) is reasonably necessary to the conduct of an effective and thorough physical inspection of the workplace, such third party may accompany the General Counsel's designee during the inspection.

(d) The General Counsel's designee may deny the right of accompaniment under this section to any person whose conduct interferes with a fair and orderly inspection. With regard to information classified by an agency of the U.S. Government (and/or by any congressional committee or other authorized entity within the Legislative Branch) in the interest of national security, only persons authorized to have access to such information may accompany the General Counsel's designee in areas containing such information.

§ 3.09 Consultation with Individuals with Disabilities

The General Counsel's designee may consult with individuals with disabilities concerning matters of accessibility to the extent he or she deems necessary for the conduct of an effective and thorough inspection. During the course of an inspection, any person shall be afforded an opportunity to bring any violation of section 210 of the CAA which he or she has reason to believe exists in the facility to the attention of the General Counsel's designee.

§ 3.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review.

(a) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a violation exists under section 210 of the CAA, he or she shall notify the party making the request of such determination. The complaining party may obtain review of such determination by submitting a written statement of position with the General Counsel and, at the same time, providing the covered entity with a copy of such statement. The covered entity may submit an opposing written statement of position with the General Counsel and, at the same time, provide the complaining party with a copy of such statement. Upon the request of the complaining party or the covered entity, the General Counsel, at his or her discretion, may hold an informal conference in which the complaining party and the covered entity may orally present their views. After considering all written and oral views presented, the General Counsel shall affirm, modify, or reverse the designee's determination and furnish the complaining party and the covered entity with written notification of this decision and the reasons therefor. The decision of the General Counsel shall be final and not reviewable.

(b) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because the requirements of section 3.03(a)(1) have not been met, he or she shall notify the complaining party in writing of such determination. Such determination shall be without prejudice to the filing of a new notice of alleged violation meeting the requirements of section 3.03(a)(1).

§ 3.11 Charge filed with the General Counsel.**(a) Who may file.**

(1) Any qualified individual with a disability, as defined in section 201(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131(2)), as applied by section 210 of the CAA, who believes that he or she has been subjected to discrimination on the basis of a disability in violation of section 210 of the CAA by a covered entity, may file a charge against any entity responsible for correcting the violation with the General Counsel. A charge may not be filed under section 210 of the CAA by a covered employee alleging employment discrimination on the basis of disability; the exclusive remedy for such discrimination are the procedures under section 201 of the CAA and subpart B of the Office's procedural rules.

(b) When to file. A charge under this section must be filed with the General Counsel not later than 180 days from the date of the alleged discrimination.

(c) Form and Contents. A charge shall be written or typed on a charge form available from the Office. All charges shall be signed and verified by the qualified individual with a disability (hereinafter referred to as the "charging party"), or his or her representative, and shall contain the following information:

(i) the full name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number(s) of the charging party;

(ii) the name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the covered entity(ies) against which the charge is brought, if known (hereinafter referred to as the "respondent");

(iii) the name(s) and title(s) of the individual(s), if known, involved in the conduct that the charging party claims is a violation of section 210 and/or the location and description of the places or conditions within covered facilities that the charging party claims is a violation of section 210;

(iv) a description of the conduct, locations, or conditions that form the basis of the charge, and a brief description of why the charging party believes the conduct, locations, or conditions is a violation of section 210; and (v) the name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the representative, if any, who will act on behalf of the charging party.

§ 3.12 Service of charge or notice of charge.

Within ten (10) days after the filing of a charge with the General Counsel's Office (excluding weekends or holidays), the General Counsel shall serve the respondent with a copy of the charge, except when it is determined that providing a copy of the charge would impede the law enforcement functions of the General Counsel. Where a copy of the charge is not provided, the respondent will be served with a notice of the charge within ten (10) days after the filing of the charge. The notice shall include the date, place and circumstances of the alleged violation of section 210. The notice may not include the identity of the person filing the charge if that person has requested anonymity.

§ 3.13 Investigations by the General Counsel.

The General Counsel or the General Counsel's designated representative shall promptly investigate each charge alleging violations of section 210 of the CAA. As part of the investigation, the General Counsel will accept any statement of position or evidence with respect to the charge which the charging party or the respondent wishes to submit. The General Counsel will use other methods to investigate the charge, as appropriate.

§ 3.14 Mediation.

If, upon investigation, the General Counsel believes that a violation of section 210 may have occurred and that mediation may be helpful in resolving the dispute, the General Counsel may request, but not participate in, mediation under subsections (b) through (d) of section 403 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder, between the charging party and any entity responsible for correcting the alleged violation.

§ 3.15 Dismissal of charge.

Where the General Counsel determines that a complaint will not be filed, the General Counsel shall dismiss the charge.

§ 3.16 Complaint by the General Counsel.

(a) After completing the investigation, and where mediation under section 3.14, if any, has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, and where the General Counsel has not settled or dismissed the charge, and if the General Counsel believes that a violation of section 210 may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation.

(b) The complaint filed by the General Counsel under subsection (a) shall be submitted to a hearing officer for decision pursuant to subsections (b) through (h) of section 405 of the CAA. Any person who has filed a charge under section 3.11 of these rules may intervene as of right with the full rights of a party. The procedures of sections 405 through 407 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder shall apply to hearings and related proceedings under this subpart.

§ 3.17 Settlement.

Any settlement entered into by the parties to any process described in section 210 of the CAA shall be in writing and not become effective unless it is approved by the Executive Director under section 414 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder.

§ 3.18 Compliance Date.

In any proceedings under this section, compliance shall take place as soon as possible, but not later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the order requiring correction becomes final and not subject to further review.

Subpart D—Compliance, Investigation, Enforcement and Variance Process under Section 215 of the CAA (Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970)—Inspections, Citations, and Complaints**§ 4.01 Purpose and Scope****§ 4.02 Authority for Inspection****§ 4.03 Request for Inspections by Employees and Employing Offices****§ 4.04 Objection to Inspection****§ 4.05 Entry Not a Waiver****§ 4.06 Advance Notice of Inspection****§ 4.07 Conduct of Inspections****§ 4.08 Representatives of Employing Offices and Employees****§ 4.09 Consultation with Employees****§ 4.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review****§ 4.11 Citations****§ 4.12 Imminent Danger****§ 4.13 Posting of Citations****§ 4.14 Failure to Correct a Violation for Which a Citation Has Been Issued; Notice of Failure to Correct Violation; Complaint****§ 4.15 Informal Conferences****Rules of Practice for Variances, Limitations, Variations, Tolerances, and Exemptions****§ 4.20 Purpose and Scope****§ 4.21 Definitions****§ 4.22 Effect of Variances****§ 4.23 Public Notice of a Granted Variance, Limitation, Variation, Tolerance, or Exemption****§ 4.24 Form of Documents****§ 4.25 Applications for Temporary Variances and other Relief****§ 4.26 Applications for Permanent Variances and other Relief****§ 4.27 Modification or Revocation of Orders****§ 4.28 Action on Applications § 4.29 Consolidation of Proceedings****§ 4.30 Consent Findings and Rules or Orders****§ 4.31 Order of Proceedings and Burden of Proof****Inspections, Citations and Complaints**

* * * * *

§ 4.02 Authority for Inspection.

(a) Under section 215(c)(1) of the CAA, upon written request of any employing office or covered employee, the General Counsel is authorized to enter without delay and at reasonable times any place **where covered employees work ("place of employment")** [of employment under the jurisdiction of an employing office]; to inspect and investigate during regular working hours and at other reasonable times, and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, any such place of employment, and all pertinent conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment and materials therein; to question privately any employing office, operator, agent or employee; and to review records **maintained by or under the control of the covered entity.** [required by the CAA and regulations promulgated thereunder, and other records which are directly related to the purpose of the inspection.]

§ 4.03 Requests for Inspections by Employees and Covered Employing Offices.

(a) *By Covered Employees and Representatives.*

(1) Any covered employee or representative of covered employees who believes that a violation of section 215 of the CAA exists in any place of employment [under the jurisdiction of employing offices] may request an inspection of such place of employment by giving notice of the alleged violation to the General Counsel. Any such notice shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice, and shall be signed by the employee or the representative of the employees. A copy shall be provided to the employing office or its agent by the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee no later than at the time of inspection, except that, upon the written request of the person giving such notice, his or her name and the names of individual employees referred to therein shall not appear in such copy or on any record published, released, or made available by the General Counsel.

* * * * *

(b) *By Employing Offices.* Upon written request of any employing office, the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee shall inspect and investigate places of employment [under the jurisdiction of employing offices] under section 215(c)(1) of the CAA. Any such requests shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office.

* * * * *

§ 4.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review.

(a) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because there are no reasonable grounds to

believe that a violation or danger exists with respect to a notice of violation under section 4.03(a), he or she shall notify the party giving the notice **[in writing]** of such determination **in writing**. The complaining party may obtain review of such determination by submitting **and serving** a written statement of position with the General Counsel~~[,]~~ and **[, at the same time, providing]** the employing office **[with a copy of such statement by certified mail]**. The employing office may submit **and serve** an opposing written statement of position with the General Counsel~~[,]~~ **[and [, at the same time, provide]** the complaining party **[with a copy of such statement by certified mail]**.

Upon the request of the complaining party or the employing office, the General Counsel, at his or her discretion, may hold an informal conference in which the complaining party and the employing office may orally present their views. After considering all written and oral views presented, the General Counsel shall affirm, modify, or reverse the designee's determination and furnish the complaining party and the employing office with written notification of this decision and the reasons therefor. The decision of the General Counsel shall be final and not reviewable.

* * * * *

§ 4.11 Citations.

(a) If, on the basis of the inspection, the General Counsel believes that a violation of any requirement of section 215 of the CAA, **[or of] including any occupational safety or health standard promulgated by the Secretary of Labor under Title 29 of the U.S. Code, section 655, or of any other regulation [standard],** rule or order promulgated pursuant to section 215 of the CAA, has occurred, he or she shall issue to the employing office responsible for correction of the violation **[, as determined under section 1.106 of the Board's regulations implementing section 215 of the CAA,]** either a citation or a notice of de minimis violations that **[have] has** no direct or immediate relationship to safety or health. An appropriate citation or notice of de minimis violations shall be issued even though, after being informed of an alleged violation by the General Counsel, the employing office immediately abates, or initiates steps to abate, such alleged violation. Any citation shall be issued with reasonable promptness after termination of the inspection. No citation may be issued under this section after the expiration of 6 months following the occurrence of any alleged violation **unless the violation is continuing or the employing office has agreed to toll the deadline for filing the citation.**

* * * * *

§ 4.13 Posting of Citations.

(a) Upon receipt of any citation under section 215 of the CAA, the employing office shall immediately post such citation, or a copy thereof, unedited, at or near each place an alleged violation referred to in the citation occurred, except as provided below. Where, because of the nature of the employing office's operations, it is not practicable to post the citation at or near each place of alleged violation, such citation shall be posted, unedited, in a prominent place where it will be readily observable by all affected employees. For example, where employing offices are engaged in activities which are physically dispersed, the citation may be posted at the location to which employees report each day. Where employees do not primarily work at or report to a single location, the citation may be posted at the location

from which the employees operate to carry out their activities. **When a citation contains security information as defined in Title 2 of the U.S. Code, section 1979, the General Counsel may edit or redact the security information from the copy of the citation used for posting or may provide to the employing office a notice for posting that describes the alleged violation without referencing the security information.** The employing office shall take steps to ensure that the citation or notice is not altered, defaced, or covered by other material. Notices of de minimis violations need not be posted.

(b) Each citation, **notice**, or a copy thereof, shall remain posted until the violation has been abated, or for 3 working days, whichever is later. The pendency of any proceedings regarding the citation shall not affect its posting responsibility under this section unless and until the Board issues a final order vacating the citation.

§ 4.15 Informal Conferences.

At the request of an affected employing office, employee, or representative of employees, the General Counsel may hold an informal conference for the purpose of discussing any issues raised by an inspection, citation, or notice issued by the General Counsel. Any settlement entered into by the parties at such conference shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Director under section 414 of the CAA and section **[9.05] 9.03** of these rules. If the conference is requested by the employing office, an affected employee or the employee's representative shall be afforded an opportunity to participate, at the discretion of the General Counsel. If the conference is requested by an employee or representative of employees, the employing office shall be afforded an opportunity to participate, at the discretion of the General Counsel. Any party may be represented by counsel at such conference.

Subpart E—Complaints

§ 5.01 Complaints

§ 5.02 Appointment of the Hearing Officer

§ 5.03 Dismissal, Summary Judgment, and Withdrawal of Complaint

§ 5.04 Confidentiality

§ 5.01 Complaints.

(a) *Who May File.*

(1) An employee who has completed the mediation **period** under section 2.04 may timely file a complaint with the Office alleging any violation of sections 201 through 207 of the Act~~[,]~~, under the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, or any other statute made applicable under the Act.

(2) The General Counsel may **timely** file a complaint alleging a violation of section 210, 215 or 220 of the Act.

(b) *When to File.*

(1) A complaint may be filed by an employee no sooner than 30 days after the date of receipt of the notice under section 2.04(i), but no later than 90 days after receipt of that notice. **In cases where a complaint is filed with the Office sooner than 30 days after the date of receipt of the notice under section 2.04(i), the Executive Director, at his or her discretion, may return the complaint to the employee for filing during the prescribed period without prejudice and with an explanation of the prescribed period of filing.**

(c) *Form and Contents.*

(1) *Complaints Filed by Covered Employees.* A complaint shall be **in writing and may be written or typed on a complaint form avail-**

able from the Office. All complaints shall be signed by the covered employee, or his or her representative, and shall contain the following information:

(i) the name, mailing and e-mail addresses, and telephone number(s) of the complainant;

(v) a brief description of why the complainant believes the challenged conduct is a violation of **the Act or the relevant sections of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act** and the section(s) of the Act involved;

(vii) the name, **mailing and e-mail** addresses, and telephone number of the representative, if any, who will act on behalf of the complainant.

(2) *Complaints Filed by the General Counsel.* A complaint filed by the General Counsel shall be in writing, signed by the General Counsel or his designee and shall contain the following information:

(i) the name, **mail and e-mail** addresses, if available, and telephone number of, as applicable, (A) each entity responsible for correction of an alleged violation of section 210(b), (B) each employing office alleged to have violated section 215, or (C) each employing office and/or labor organization alleged to have violated section 220, against which complaint is brought;

(e) *Service of Complaint.* Upon receipt of a complaint or an amended complaint, the Office shall serve the respondent, or its designated representative, by hand delivery **[or certified mail] or first class mail, e-mail, or facsimile** with a copy of the complaint or amended complaint and **[a copy of these rules] written notice of the availability of these rules at www.compliance.gov. A copy of these rules may also be provided if requested by either party.** The Office shall include a service list containing the names and addresses of the parties and their designated representatives.

(f) *Answer.* Within 15 days after receipt of a copy of a complaint or an amended complaint, the respondent shall file an answer with the Office and serve one copy on the complainant. **[The answer shall contain a statement of the position of the respondent on each of the issues raised in the complaint or amended complaint, including admissions, denials, or explanations of each allegation made in the complaint and any affirmative defenses or other defenses to the complaint.] In answering a complaint, a party must state in short and plain terms its defenses to each claim asserted against it and admit or deny the allegations asserted against it by an opposing party. Failure to [file an answer] deny an allegation, other than one relating to the amount of damages, or to raise a claim or defense as to any allegation(s) shall constitute an admission of such allegation(s). Affirmative defenses not raised in an answer that could have reasonably been anticipated based on the facts alleged in the complaint shall be deemed waived. A respondent's motion for leave to amend an answer to interpose a denial or affirmative defense will ordinarily be granted unless to do so would unduly prejudice the rights of the other party or unduly delay or otherwise interfere with or impede the proceedings.**

(g) *Motion to Dismiss.* In addition to an answer, a respondent may file a motion to dismiss, or other responsive pleading with the Office and serve one copy on the complainant. Responses to any motions shall be in compliance with section 1.04(c) of these rules.

(h) **Confidentiality.** The fact that a complaint has been filed with the Office by a covered employee shall be kept confidential by the Office, except as allowed by these rules.

§ 5.02 Appointment of the Hearing Officer.

Upon the filing of a complaint, the Executive Director will appoint an independent Hearing Officer, who shall have the authority specified in sections 5.03 and 7.01(b) below. The Hearing Officer shall not be the counselor involved in or the [neutral] mediator who mediated the matter under sections 2.03 and 2.04 of these rules.

§ 5.03 Dismissal, Summary Judgment and Withdrawal of Complaints.

(f) **Withdrawal of Complaint by Complainant.** At any time a complainant may withdraw his or her own complaint by filing a notice with the Office for transmittal to the Hearing Officer and by serving a copy on the employing office or representative. Any such withdrawal must be approved by the Hearing Officer and may be with or without prejudice to refile at the Hearing Officer's discretion.

(g) **Withdrawal of Complaint by the General Counsel.** At any time prior to the opening of the hearing the General Counsel may withdraw his complaint by filing a notice with the Executive Director and the Hearing Officer and by serving a copy on the respondent. After opening of the hearing, any such withdrawal must be approved by the Hearing Officer and may be with or without prejudice to refile at the Hearing Officer's discretion.

(h) **Withdrawal From a Case by a Representative.** A representative must provide sufficient notice to the Hearing Officer and the parties of record of his or her withdrawal. Until the party designates another representative in writing, the party will be regarded as *pro se*.

§ 5.04 Confidentiality.

Pursuant to section 416(c) of the Act, except as provided in sub-sections 416(d), (e) and (f), all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including any related records, shall be confidential. Section 416(c) does not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but does apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under section 215. A violation of the confidentiality requirements of the Act and these rules [could] may result in the imposition of **procedural or evidentiary** sanctions. [Nothing in these rules shall prevent the Executive Director from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives, so long as that statistical information does not reveal the identity of the employees involved or of employing offices that are the subject of a matter.] See also sections [1.06] [1.07] 1.08 and 7.12 of these rules.

Subpart F—Discovery and Subpoenas

§ 6.01 Discovery

§ 6.02 Requests for Subpoenas

§ 6.03 Service

§ 6.04 Proof of Service

§ 6.05 Motion to Quash

§ 6.06 Enforcement

§ 6.01 Discovery.

(a) [Explanation] **Description.** Discovery is the process by which a party may obtain from another person, including a party, information, not privileged, reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, for the purpose of assisting that party in developing, preparing and presenting its case at the hearing. **No discovery, oral or written, by any party shall [This provision shall not be construed to permit any discovery, oral or written, to] be taken of, or**

from, an employee of the Office of Compliance, [or the] counselor[(s)], or mediator [the neutral(s) involved in counseling and mediation.], including files, records, or notes produced during counseling and mediation and maintained by the Office.

(b) **Initial Disclosure.** [Office Policy Regarding Discovery. It is the policy of the Office to encourage the early and voluntary exchange of relevant and material nonprivileged information between the parties, including the names and addresses of witnesses and copies of relevant and material documents, and to encourage Hearing Officers to develop procedures which allow for the greatest exchange of relevant and material information and which minimizes the need for parties to formally request such information.] **Within 14 days after the pre-hearing conference and except as otherwise stipulated or ordered by the Hearing Officer, a party must, without awaiting a discovery request, provide to the other parties: the name and, if known, mail and e-mail addresses and telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information that the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses; and a copy or a description by category and location of all documents, electronically stored information, and tangible things that the disclosing party has in its possession, custody, or control and may use to support its claims or defenses.**

(c) **Discovery Availability.** Pursuant to section 405(e) of the Act, [the Hearing Officer in his or her discretion may permit] **the parties may engage in reasonable prehearing discovery. [In exercising that discretion, the Hearing Officer may be guided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.]**

(1) The [Hearing Officer may authorize] **parties may take discovery by one or more of the following methods: depositions upon oral examination or written questions; written interrogatories; production of documents or things or permission to enter upon land or other property for inspection or other purposes; physical and mental examinations; and requests for admission.**

(2) The Hearing Officer may **adopt standing orders** or make any order setting forth the forms and extent of discovery, including orders limiting the number of depositions, interrogatories, and requests for production of documents, and may also limit the length of depositions.

(d) **Claims of Privilege.**

(1) **Information Withheld.** Whenever a party withholds information otherwise discoverable under these rules by claiming that it is privileged or confidential or subject to protection as hearing or trial preparation materials, the party shall make the claim expressly **in writing** and shall describe the nature of the documents, communications or things not produced or disclosed in a manner that, without revealing the information itself privileged or protected, will enable other parties to assess the applicability of the privilege or protection. **A party must make a claim for privilege no later than the due date for the production of the information.**

(2) **Information Produced As Inadvertent Disclosure.** If information produced in discovery is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as hearing preparation material, the party making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must

take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information to the Hearing Officer or the Board under seal for a determination of the claim. The producing party must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.

§ 6.02 Request for Subpoena.

(a) **Authority to Issue Subpoenas.** At the request of a party, a Hearing Officer may issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and for the production of correspondence, books, papers, documents, or other records. The attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required from any place within the United States. However, no subpoena by any party may be issued for the attendance or testimony of an employee [with] of the Office of Compliance, a counselor, or a mediator, including files, records, or notes produced during counseling and mediation and maintained by the Office. Employing offices shall make their employees available for discovery and hearing without requiring a subpoena.

(d) **Rulings.** The Hearing Officer shall promptly rule on the request for the subpoena.

* * * * *

Subpart G—Hearings

§ 7.01 The Hearing Officer

§ 7.02 Sanctions

§ 7.03 Disqualification of the Hearing Officer

§ 7.04 Motions and Prehearing Conference

§ 7.05 Scheduling the Hearing

§ 7.06 Consolidation and Joinder of Cases

§ 7.07 Conduct of Hearing; Disqualification of Representatives

§ 7.08 Transcript

§ 7.09 Admissibility of Evidence

§ 7.10 Stipulations

§ 7.11 Official Notice

§ 7.12 Confidentiality

§ 7.13 Immediate Board Review of a Ruling by a Hearing Officer

§ 7.14 Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; Posthearing Briefs

§ 7.15 Closing the record

§ 7.16 Hearing Officer Decisions; Entry in Records of the Office; Corrections to the Record; Motions to Alter, Amend or Vacate the Decision.

§ 7.01 The Hearing Officer.

* * * * *

(b) **Authority.** Hearing Officers shall conduct fair and impartial hearings and take all necessary action to avoid undue delay in the disposition of all proceedings. They shall have all powers necessary to that end unless otherwise limited by law, including, but not limited to, the authority to:

(14) maintain and enforce the confidentiality of proceedings; and

§ 7.02 Sanctions.

* * * * *

(b) The Hearing Officer may impose sanctions upon the parties under, but not limited to, the circumstances set forth in this section.

(1) **Failure to Comply with an Order.** When a party fails to comply with an order (including an order for the taking of a deposition, for the production of evidence within the party's control, or for production of witnesses), the Hearing Officer may:

[(a)](A) draw an inference in favor of the requesting party on the issue related to the information sought;

[(b)](B) stay further proceedings until the order is obeyed;

[(c)](C) prohibit the party failing to comply with such order from introducing evidence concerning, or otherwise relying upon, evidence relating to the information sought;

[(d)](D) permit the requesting party to introduce secondary evidence concerning the information sought;

[(e)](E) strike, in whole or in part, *[any part of]* the complaint, briefs, answer, or other submissions of the party failing to comply with the order, as appropriate;

[(f)](F) direct judgment against the non-complying party in whole or in part; or

[(g)](G) order that the non-complying party, or the representative advising that party, pay all or part of the attorney's fees and reasonable expenses of the other party or parties or of the Office, caused by such non-compliance, unless the Hearing Officer or the Board finds that the failure was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of attorney's fees and/or expenses unjust.

(2) *Failure to Prosecute or Defend.* If a party fails to prosecute or defend a position, the Hearing Officer may dismiss the action with prejudice or *[rule for the complainant]* decide the matter, where appropriate.

(4) *Filing of frivolous claims.* If a party files a frivolous claim, the Hearing Officer may dismiss the claim, in whole or in part, with prejudice or decide the matter for the party alleging the filing of the frivolous claim.

(5) *Failure to maintain confidentiality.* An allegation regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions may be made to a Hearing Officer in proceedings under Section 405 of the CAA. If, after notice and hearing, the Hearing Officer determines that a party has violated the confidentiality provisions, the Hearing Officer may:

(A) direct that the matters related to the breach of confidentiality or other designated facts be taken as established for purposes of the action, as the prevailing party claims;

(B) prohibit the party breaching confidentiality from supporting or opposing designated claims or defenses, or from introducing designated matters in evidence;

(C) strike the pleadings in whole or in part;

(D) stay further proceedings until the breach of confidentiality is resolved to the extent possible;

(E) dismiss the action or proceeding in whole or in part; or

(F) render a default judgment against the party breaching confidentiality.

(c) No sanctions may be imposed under this section except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.

§ 7.04 Motions and Prehearing Conference.

(b) *Scheduling of the Prehearing Conference.* Within 7 days after assignment, the Hearing Officer shall serve on the parties and their designated representatives written notice setting forth the time, date, and place of the prehearing conference, except that the Executive Director may, for good cause, extend up to an additional 7 days the time for serving notice of the prehearing conference.

(c) *Prehearing Conference Memoranda.* The Hearing Officer may order each party to prepare a prehearing conference memorandum. At his or her discretion, the Hearing Officer may direct the filing of the memorandum after discovery by the parties has concluded. *[That]* The memorandum may include:

(3) the specific relief, including, where known, a calculation of *[the amount of]* any

monetary relief *[,]* or damages that is being or will be requested;

(4) the names of potential witnesses for the party's case, except for potential impeachment or rebuttal witnesses, and the purpose for which they will be called and a list of documents that the party is seeking from the opposing party, and, if discovery was permitted, the status of any pending request for discovery. (It is not necessary to list each document requested. Instead, the party may refer to the request for discovery.); and

(d) At the prehearing conference, the Hearing Officer may discuss the subjects specified in paragraph (c) above and the manner in which the hearing will be conducted *[and proceed]*. In addition, the Hearing Officer may explore settlement possibilities and consider how the factual and legal issues might be simplified and any other issues that might expedite the resolution of the dispute. The Hearing Officer shall issue an order, which recites the action taken at the conference and the agreements made by the parties as to any of the matters considered and which limits the issues to those not disposed of by admissions, stipulations, or agreements of the parties. Such order, when entered, shall control the course of the proceeding, subject to later modification by the Hearing Officer by his or her own motion or upon proper request of a party for good cause shown.

§ 7.05 Scheduling the Hearing.

(b) *Motions for Postponement or a Continuance.* Motions for postponement or for a continuance by either party shall be made in writing to the *[Office]* Hearing Officer, shall set forth the reasons for the request, and shall state whether the opposing party consents to such postponement. Such a motion may be granted by the Hearing Officer upon a showing of good cause. In no event will a hearing commence later than 90 days after the filing of the complaint.

§ 7.06 Consolidation and Joinder of Cases.

(b) *Authority.* The Executive Director prior to the assignment of a complaint to a Hearing Officer; a Hearing Officer during the hearing; or the Board *[, the Office, or a Hearing Officer]* during an appeal may consolidate or join cases on their own initiative or on the motion of a party if to do so would expedite processing of the cases and not adversely affect the interests of the parties, taking into account the confidentiality requirements of section 416 of the Act.

§ 7.07 Conduct of Hearing; Disqualification of Representatives.

(c) No later than the opening of the hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Hearing Officer, each party shall submit to the Hearing Officer and to the opposing party typed lists of the hearing exhibits and the witnesses expected to be called to testify, excluding impeachment or rebuttal witnesses *[, expected to be called to testify]*.

(f) *Failure of either party to appear, present witnesses, or respond to an evidentiary order may result in an adverse finding or ruling by the Hearing Officer. At the discretion of the Hearing Officer, the hearing may also be held in absence of the complaining party if the representative for that party is present.*

[(f)](g) If the Hearing Officer concludes that a representative of an employee, a wit-

ness, a charging party, a labor organization, an employing office, or an entity alleged to be responsible for correcting a violation has a conflict of interest, he or she may, after giving the representative an opportunity to respond, disqualify the representative. In that event, within the time limits for hearing and decision established by the Act, the affected party shall be afforded reasonable time to retain other representation.

§ 7.08 Transcript.

(b) *Corrections.* Corrections to the official transcript will be permitted. Motions for correction must be submitted within 10 days of service of the transcript upon the *[party]* parties. Corrections of the official transcript will be permitted only upon approval of the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer may make corrections at any time with notice to the parties.

§ 7.12 Confidentiality.

(a) Pursuant to section 416 of the Act and section 1.08 of these Rules, all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including the transcripts of hearings and any related records, shall be confidential, except as specified in sections 416(d), (e), and (f) of the Act and section 1.08(d) of these Rules. All parties to the proceeding and their representatives, and witnesses who appear at the hearing, will be advised of the importance of confidentiality in this process and of their obligations, subject to sanctions, to maintain it. This provision shall not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but shall apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under that section.

(b) *Violation of Confidentiality.* An allegation regarding a violation of confidentiality occurring during a hearing may be resolved by a Hearing Officer in proceedings under Section 405 of the CAA. After providing notice and an opportunity to the parties to be heard, the Hearing Officer, in accordance with section 1.08(f) of these Rules, may make a finding of a violation of confidentiality and impose appropriate procedural or evidentiary sanctions, which may include any of the sanctions listed in section 7.02 of these Rules.

§ 7.13 Immediate Board Review of a Ruling by a Hearing Officer.

(b) *Time for Filing.* A motion by a party for interlocutory review of a ruling of the Hearing Officer shall be filed with the Hearing Officer within 5 days after service of the ruling upon the parties. The motion shall include arguments in support of both interlocutory review and the determination requested to be made by the Board upon review. Responses, if any, shall be filed with the Hearing Officer within 3 days after service of the motion.

[(b)](c) Standards for Review. In determining whether to certify and forward a request for interlocutory review to the Board, the Hearing Officer shall consider all of the following:

[(c)] Time for Filing. A motion by a party for interlocutory review of a ruling of the Hearing Officer shall be filed with the Hearing Officer within 5 days after service of the ruling upon the parties. The motion shall include arguments in support of both interlocutory review and the determination requested to be made by the Board upon review. Responses, if any, shall be filed with the Hearing Officer within 3 days after service of the motion.]

(d) *Hearing Officer Action.* If **all** the conditions set forth in paragraph **[(b)•](c)** above are met, the Hearing Officer shall **certify** and forward a request for interlocutory review to the Board for its immediate consideration. Any such submission shall explain the basis on which the Hearing Officer concluded that the standards in paragraph **[(b)•](c)** have been met. **The decision of the Hearing Office to forward or decline to forward a request for review is not appealable.**

(e) *Grant of Interlocutory Review Within Board's Sole Discretion.* **Upon the Hearing Officer's certification and decision to forward a request for review, [T]he Board, in its sole discretion, may grant interlocutory review. The Board's decision to grant or deny interlocutory review is not appealable.**

[(g) Denial of Motion not Appealable; Mandamus. The grant or denial of a motion for a request for interlocutory review shall not be appealable. The Hearing Officer shall promptly bring a denial of such a motion, and the reasons therefor, to the attention of the Board. If, upon consideration of the motion and the reason for denial, the Board believes that interlocutory review is warranted, it may grant the review *sua sponte*. In addition, the Board may in its discretion, in extraordinary circumstances, entertain directly from a party a writ of mandamus to review a ruling of a Hearing Officer.]

[(h)•](g) Procedures before Board. Upon its [acceptance of a ruling of the Hearing Officer for] decision to grant interlocutory review, the Board shall issue an order setting forth the procedures that will be followed in the conduct of that review.

[(i)•](h) Review of a Final Decision. Denial of interlocutory review will not affect a party's right to challenge rulings, which are otherwise appealable, as part of an appeal to the Board under section 8.01 from the Hearing Officer's decision issued under section 7.16 of these rules.

§ 7.14 Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; Posthearing Briefs.

[(a)•] May be [Filed] Required. The Hearing Officer may **[permit]** require the parties to file **proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and/or** posthearing briefs on the factual and the legal issues presented in the case.

[(b) Length. No principal brief shall exceed 50 pages, or 12,500 words, and no reply brief shall exceed 25 pages, or 6,250 words, exclusive of tables and pages limited only to quotations of statutes, rules, and the like. Motions to file extended briefs shall be granted only for good cause shown; the Hearing Officer may in his or her discretion also reduce the page limits. Briefs in excess of 10 pages shall include an index and a table of authorities.

(c) Format. Every brief must be easily readable. Briefs must have double spacing between each line of text, except for quoted texts and footnotes, which may be single-spaced.]

§ 7.15 Closing the Record of the Hearing.

(a) Except as provided in section 7.14, the record shall be closed at the conclusion of the hearing. However, when the Hearing Officer allows the parties to submit **argument, briefs, documents** or additional evidence previously identified for introduction, **the record will remain open for as much time as the judge grants for that purpose** [additional evidence previously identified for introduction, the Hearing Officer may allow an additional period before the conclusion of the hearing as is necessary for that purpose].

(b) Once the record is closed, no additional evidence or argument shall be accepted into the hearing record except upon a showing

that new and material evidence has become available that was not available despite due diligence prior to the closing of the record or **it is in rebuttal to new evidence or argument submitted by the other party just before the record closed.** **[However, the] The Hearing Officer shall also make part of the record any [motions for attorney fees, supporting documentation, and determinations thereon, and] approved correction to the transcript.**

§ 7.16 Hearing Officer Decisions; Entry in Records of the Office; Corrections to the Record; Motions to Alter, Amend or Vacate the Decision.

(b) **The Hearing Officer's written decision shall:**

- (1) state the issues raised in the complaint;
- (2) describe the evidence in record;
- (3) contain findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the reasons or basis therefore, on all the material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record;

(4) contain a determination of whether a violation has occurred; and (5) order such remedies as are appropriate under the CAA.

[(b)•](c) Upon issuance, the decision and order of the Hearing Officer shall be entered into the records of the Office.

[(c)•](d) The Office shall promptly provide a copy of the decision and order of the Hearing Officer to the parties.

[(d)•](e) If there is no appeal of a decision and order of a Hearing Officer, that decision becomes a final decision of the Office, which is subject to enforcement under section 8.03 of these rules.

(f) Corrections to the Record. After a decision of the Hearing Officer has been issued, but before an appeal is made to the Board, or in the absence of an appeal, before the decision becomes final, the Hearing Officer may issue an erratum notice to correct simple errors or easily correctible mistakes. The Hearing Officer may do so on motion of the parties or on his or her own motion with or without advance notice.

(g) After a decision of the Hearing Officer has been issued, but before an appeal is made to the Board, or in the absence of an appeal, before the decision becomes final, a party to the proceeding before the Hearing Officer may move to alter, amend or vacate the decision. The moving party must establish that relief from the decision is warranted because: (1) of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) there is newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new hearing; (3) there has been fraud (misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the decision is void; or (5) the decision has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier decision that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable. The motion shall be filed within 15 days after service of the Hearing Officer's decision. No response shall be filed unless the Hearing Officer so orders. The filing and pendency of a motion under this provision shall not relieve a party of the obligation to file a timely appeal or operate to stay the action of the Hearing Officer unless so ordered by the Hearing Officer.

Subpart H—Proceedings before the Board

§ 8.01 Appeal to the Board

§ 8.02 Reconsideration

§ 8.03 Compliance with Final Decisions, Requests for Enforcement

§ 8.04 Judicial Review

§ 8.05 Application for Review of an Executive Director Action

§ 8.06 Exceptions to Arbitration Awards

§ 8.07 Expedited Review of Negotiability

§ 8.08 Procedures of the Board in Impasse Proceedings

§ 8.01 Appeal to the Board.

(a) No later than 30 days after the entry of the final decision and order of the Hearing Officer in the records of the Office, an aggrieved party may seek review of that decision and order by the Board by filing with the Office a petition for review by the Board. The appeal must be served on the opposing party or its representative.

(3) [Upon written delegation by the Board,] In any case in which the Board has not rendered a determination on the merits, the Executive Director is authorized to: determine any request for extensions of time to file any post-petition for review document or submission with the Board [in any case in which the Executive Director has not rendered a determination on the merits,]; determine any request for enlargement of page limitation of any post-petition for review document or submission with the Board; or require proof of service where there are questions of proper service. [Such delegation shall continue until revoked by the Board.]

(d) Upon appeal, the Board shall issue a written decision setting forth the reasons for its decision. The Board may **dismiss the appeal** or affirm, reverse, modify or remand the decision and order of the Hearing Officer in whole or in part. Where there is no remand the decision of the Board shall be entered in the records of the Office as the final decision of the Board and shall be subject to judicial review.

(e) The Board may remand the matter to **[the] a Hearing Officer** for further action or proceedings, including the reopening of the record for the taking of additional evidence. The decision by the Board to remand a case is not subject to judicial review under Section 407 of the Act. The procedures for a remanded hearing shall be governed by subparts F, G, and H of these Rules. The Hearing Officer shall render a decision or report to the Board, as ordered, at the conclusion of proceedings on the remanded matters. **[Upon receipt of the decision or report, the Board shall determine whether the views of the parties on the content of the decision or report should be obtained in writing and, where necessary, shall fix by order the time for the submission of those views.]** A decision of the Board following completion of the remand shall be entered in the records of the Office as the final decision of the Board and shall be subject to judicial review under Section 407 of the Act.

(h) Record. The **docket sheet**, complaint and any amendments, notice of hearing, answer and any amendments, motions, rulings, orders, stipulations, exhibits, documentary evidence, any portions of depositions admitted into evidence, **docketed Memoranda for the Record, or correspondence between the Office and the parties**, and the transcript of the hearing (together with any electronic recording of the hearing if the original reporting was performed electronically) together with the Hearing Officer's decision and the petition for review, any response thereto, any reply to the response and any other pleadings shall constitute the record in the case.

(j) An appellant may move to withdraw a petition for review at any time before the

Board renders a decision. The motion must be in writing and submitted to the Board. The Board, at its discretion, may grant such a motion and take whatever action is required.

§ 8.02 Reconsideration.

After a final decision or order of the Board has been issued, a party to the proceeding before the Board, who can establish in its moving papers that reconsideration is necessary because the Board has overlooked or misapprehended points of law or fact, may move for reconsideration of such final decision or order. The motion shall be filed within 15 days after service of the Board's decision or order. No response shall be filed unless the Board so orders. The filing and pendency of a motion under this provision shall not relieve a party of the obligation to file a timely appeal or operate to stay the action of the Board unless so ordered by the Board. **The decision to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration is within the sole discretion of the Board and is not appealable.**

§ 8.03 Compliance with Final Decisions, Requests for Enforcement.

(a) Unless the Board has, in its discretion, stayed the final decision of the Office during the pendency of an appeal pursuant to section 407 of the Act, and except as provided in sections 210(d)(5) and 215(c)(6) of the Act, a party required to take any action under the terms of a final decision of the Office shall carry out its terms promptly, and shall within 30 days after the decision or order becomes final and goes into effect by its terms, provide the Office and all other parties to the proceedings with a compliance report specifying the manner in which compliance with the provisions of the decision or order has been accomplished. If complete compliance has not been accomplished within 30 days, the party required to take any such action shall submit a compliance report specifying why compliance with any provision of the decision or order has not yet been fully accomplished, the steps being taken to assure full compliance, and the anticipated date by which full compliance will be achieved. **A party may also file a petition for attorneys fees and/or damages unless the Board has, in its discretion, stayed the final decision of the Office during the pendency of the appeal pursuant to Section 407 of the Act.**

(d) **To the extent provided in Section 407(a) of the Act and Section 8.04 of this section, the appropriate [Any] party may petition the Board for enforcement of a final decision of the Office or the Board. The petition shall specifically set forth the reasons why the petitioner believes enforcement is necessary.**

§ 8.05 Application for Review of an Executive Director Action.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's review of an Executive Director action in Representation proceedings, refer to Parts 2422.30–31 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.06 Expedited Review of Negotiability Issues.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's expedited review of negotiability issues, refer to Part 2424 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.07 Review of Arbitration Awards.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's review of arbitration

awards, refer to Part 2425 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.08 Procedures of the Board in Impasse Proceedings.

For additional rules on the procedures of the Board in impasse proceedings, refer to Part 2471 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

Subpart I—Other Matters of General Applicability

§ 9.01 Filing, Service and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and other Documents.

§ 9.02 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violations of Rules; Sanctions]

§ 9.03 § 9.01 Attorney's Fees and Costs

§ 9.04 § 9.02 Ex parte Communications

§ 9.05 § 9.03 Settlement Agreements

§ 9.06 § 9.04 Revocation, Amendment or Waiver of Rules

§ 9.01 Filing, Service, and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and Other Documents.

(a) **Filing with the Office; Number.** One original and three copies of all motions, briefs, responses, and other documents, must be filed, whenever required, with the Office or Hearing Officer. However, when a party aggrieved by the decision of a Hearing Officer or a party to any other matter or determination reviewable by the Board files an appeal or other submission with the Board, one original and seven copies of any submission and any responses must be filed with the Office. The Office, Hearing Officer, or Board may also request a party to submit an electronic version of any submission in a designated format, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format.

(b) **Service.** The parties shall serve on each other one copy of all motions, briefs, responses and other documents filed with the Office, other than the request for counseling, the request for mediation and complaint. Service shall be made by mailing or by hand delivering a copy of the motion, brief, response or other document to each party, or if represented, the party's representative, on the service list previously provided by the Office. Each of these documents, must be accompanied by a certificate of service specifying how, when and on whom service was made. It shall be the duty of each party to notify the Office and all other parties in writing of any changes in the names or addresses on the service list.

(c) **Time Limitations for Response to Motions or Briefs and Reply.** Unless otherwise specified by the Hearing Officer or these rules, a party shall file a response to a motion or brief within 15 days of the service of the motion or brief upon the party. Any reply to such response shall be filed and served within 5 days of the service of the response. Only with the Hearing Officer's advance approval may either party file additional responses or replies.

(d) **Size Limitations.** Except as otherwise specified by the Hearing Officer or these rules, no brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum filed with the Office shall exceed 35 pages, or 8,750 words, exclusive of the table of contents, table of authorities and attachments. The Board, the Office, Executive Director, or Hearing Officer may waive, raise or reduce this limitation for good cause shown or on its own initiative. Briefs, motions, responses, and supporting memoranda shall be on standard letter-size paper (8½" x 11").

§ 9.02 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violation of Rules; Sanctions.

Every pleading, motion, and other filing of a party represented by an attorney or other designated representative shall be signed by the at-

torney or representative. A party who is not represented shall sign the pleading, motion or other filing. The signature of a representative or party constitutes a certificate by the signer that the signer has read the pleading, motion, or other filing; that to the best of the signer's knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is not signed, it shall be stricken unless it is signed promptly after the omission is called to the attention of the person who is required to sign. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is signed in violation of this rule, a Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or upon its own initiative, shall impose upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both, an appropriate sanction, which may include an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of the filing of the pleading, motion, or other filing, including a reasonable attorney's fee. A Hearing Officer, the Executive Director, or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or its own initiative may also impose an appropriate sanction, which may include the sanctions specified in section 7.02, for any other violation of these rules that does not result from reasonable error.]

§ 9.03 § 9.01 Attorney's Fees and Costs.

(a) **Request.** No later than [20] 30 days after the entry of a final [Hearing Officer's] decision of the Office, [under section 7.16, or after service of a Board decision by the Office the complainant, if he or she is a] the prevailing party[,] may submit to the Hearing Officer or Arbitrator who [heard] decided the case [initially] a motion for the award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, following the form specified in paragraph (b) below. [All motions for attorney's fees and costs shall be submitted to the Hearing Officer.] The Hearing Officer or Arbitrator, after giving the respondent an opportunity to reply, shall rule on the motion. Decisions regarding attorney's fees and costs are collateral and do not affect the finality or appealability of a final decision issued by the [Hearing Officer] Office. [A ruling on a motion for attorney's fees and costs may be appealed together with the final decision of the Hearing Officer. If the motion for attorney's fees is ruled on after the final decision has been issued by the Hearing Officer, the ruling may be appealed in the same manner as a final decision, pursuant to section 8.01 of these Rules.]

(b) **Form of Motion.** In addition to setting forth the legal and factual bases upon which the attorney's fees and/or costs are sought, a motion for an award of attorney's fees and/or costs shall be accompanied by:

(3) the attorney's customary billing rate for similar work with evidence that the rate is consistent with the prevailing community rate for similar services in the community in which the attorney ordinarily practices; [and]

(4) an itemization of costs related to the matter in question[.]; and

(5) evidence of an established attorney-client relationship.

§ 9.04 § 9.02 Ex parte Communications.

(a) **Definitions.**

(3) For purposes of section [9.04] 9.02, the term proceeding means the complaint and hearing proceeding under section 405 of the

CAA, an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the CAA, a pre-election investigatory hearing under section 220 of the CAA, and any other proceeding of the Office established pursuant to regulations issued by the Board under the CAA.

(b) *Prohibited Ex Parte Communications and Exceptions.*

(2) **The Hearing Officer or the Office may initiate attempts to settle a matter informally at any time. The parties may agree to waive the prohibitions against *ex parte* communications during settlement discussions, and they may agree to any limits on the waiver.**

—Renumber subsequent paragraphs in subsection—

[§9.05] §9.03 Informal Resolutions and Settlement Agreements.

(b) *Formal Settlement Agreement.* The parties may agree formally to settle all or part of a disputed matter in accordance with section 414 of the Act. In that event, the agreement shall be in writing and submitted to the Executive Director for review and approval. **The settlement is not effective until it has been approved by the Executive Director.** If the Executive Director does not approve the settlement, such disapproval shall be in writing, shall set forth the grounds therefor, and shall render the settlement ineffective.

(c) *Requirements for a Formal Settlement Agreement.* A formal settlement agreement requires the signature of all parties or their designated representatives on the agreement document before the agreement can be submitted to the Executive Director for signature. **A formal settlement agreement cannot be submitted to the Executive Director for signature until the appropriate revocation periods have expired.** A formal settlement agreement cannot be rescinded after the signatures of all parties have been affixed to the agreement, unless by written revocation of the agreement voluntarily signed by all parties, or as otherwise permitted by law.

(d) *Violation of a Formal Settlement Agreement.* If a party should allege that a formal settlement agreement has been violated, the issue shall be determined by reference to the formal dispute resolution procedures of the agreement. **Parties are encouraged to include in their settlements specific dispute resolution procedures.** If the *[particular]* formal settlement agreement does not have a stipulated method for dispute resolution of an alleged violation *[of the agreement]*, the Office may provide assistance in resolving the dispute, including the services of a mediator as determined by the Executive Director. *[The following dispute resolution procedure shall be deemed to be a part of each formal settlement agreement approved by the Executive Director pursuant to section 414 of the Act:]* Where the settlement agreement does not have a stipulated method for resolving violation allegations, *[Any complaint]* an allegation *[regarding]* of a violation *[of a formal settlement agreement may]* must be filed with the Executive Director no later than 60 days after the party to the agreement becomes aware of the alleged violation. Such *[complaints may be referred by the Executive Director to a Hearing Officer for a final decision. The procedures for hearing and determining such complaints shall be governed by subparts F, G, and H of these Rule.]* allegations will be reviewed, investigated or mediated, as appropriate, by the Executive Director or designee.

[§9.06] §9.04 Payments required pursuant to Decisions, Awards, or Settlements under section 415(a) of the Act.

Whenever a **final** decision or award pursuant to sections 405(g), 406(e), 407, or 408 of the Act, or an approved settlement pursuant to section 414 of the Act, require the payment of funds pursuant to section 415(a) of the Act, the decision, award, or settlement shall be submitted to the Executive Director to be processed by the Office for requisition from the account of the Office of Compliance in the Department of the Treasury, and payment. **No payment shall be made from such account until the time for appeal of a decision has expired.**

[§9.07] §9.05 Revocation, Amendment or Waiver of Rules.

(a) The Executive Director, subject to the approval of the Board, may revoke or amend these rules by publishing proposed changes in the Congressional Record and providing for a comment period of not less than 30 days. Following the comment period, any changes to the rules are final once they are published in the Congressional Record.

(b) The Board or a Hearing Officer may waive a procedural rule contained in this Part in an individual case for good cause shown if application of the rule is not required by law.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN FEDERAL COURTHOUSE CONVEYANCE ACT

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, FEDERAL LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 423, S. 1934, and Calendar No. 418, S. 898 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1934) to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse back to Teton County, Wyoming, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 1934

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Teton County, Wyoming.

(3) **COURTHOUSE.**—The term “Courthouse” means—

(A) the parcel of land located at 145 East Simpson Street, Jackson, Wyoming; and

(B) the building located on the land described in subparagraph (A), which is known as the “Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse”.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL COURTHOUSE TO TETON COUNTY, WYOMING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall offer to convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Courthouse.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—In exchange for the conveyance of the Courthouse to the County under

this Act, the Administrator shall require the County to pay to the Administrator—

(1) nominal consideration for the parcel of land described in section 2(3)(A); and

(2) subject to subsection (c), consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the building described in section 2(3)(B), as determined based on an appraisal of the building that is acceptable to the Administrator.

(c) **CREDITS.**—In lieu of all or a portion of the amount of consideration for the building described in section 2(3)(B), the Administrator may accept as consideration for the conveyance of the building under subsection (b)(2) any credits or waivers against lease payments, amounts expended by the County under facility maintenance agreements, or other charges for the continued occupancy or use by the Federal Government of the building.

(d) **RESTRICTIONS ON USE.**—The deed for the conveyance of the Courthouse to the County under this Act shall include a covenant that provides that the Courthouse will be used for public use purposes.

(e) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—The County shall be responsible for paying—

(1) the costs of an appraisal conducted under subsection (b)(2); and

(2) any other costs relating to the conveyance of the Courthouse under this Act.

(f) **PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **DEPOSIT.**—Any net proceeds received by the Administrator as a result of the conveyance under this Act, as applicable, shall be paid into the Federal Buildings Fund established under section 592 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) **EXPENDITURE.**—Amounts paid into the Federal Buildings Fund under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Administrator, in amounts specified in appropriations Acts, for expenditure for any lawful purpose consistent with existing authorities granted to the Administrator.

(g) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Administrator may establish such additional terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance under this Act as the Administrator considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 898) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Albuquerque, New Mexico, to the Amy Biehl High School Foundation.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to S. 1934 be agreed to, the bills, as amended if amended, be read a third time and passed en bloc, and that the title amendment to S. 1934 be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1934), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title amendment was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse to Teton County, Wyoming.”.

The bill (S. 898) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 898

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Albuquerque, New Mexico, Federal Land Conveyance Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the real property located in Albuquerque, New Mexico, that, as determined by the Administrator, subject to survey, generally consists of lots 12 through 19, and for the westerly boundary, the portion of either lot 19 or 20 which is the outside west wall of the basement level of the Old Post Office building, and which has a municipal address of 123 Fourth Street, SW, in Block 18, New Mexico Town Company’s Original Townsite, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

(3) **FOUNDATION.**—The term “Foundation” means the Amy Biehl High School Foundation.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY IN ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, TO THE AMY BIEHL HIGH SCHOOL FOUNDATION.

(a) **CONVEYANCE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall offer to convey to the Foundation, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), the Administrator shall require the Foundation to pay to the Administrator consideration in an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land, as determined based on an appraisal that is acceptable to the Administrator.

(c) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—The Foundation shall be responsible for paying—

(1) the costs of an appraisal conducted under subsection (b); and

(2) any other costs relating to the conveyance of the Federal land under this Act.

(d) **PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **DEPOSIT.**—Net proceeds received under subsection (b) shall be paid into the Federal Buildings Fund established under section 592 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) **EXPENDITURE.**—Amounts paid into the Federal Buildings Fund under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Administrator, in amounts specified in appropriations Acts, for expenditure for any lawful purpose consistent with existing authorities granted to the Administrator, except that the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate 30 days advance written notice of any expenditure of the proceeds.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Administrator may require that any conveyance under subsection (a) be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) **DEADLINE.**—The conveyance of the Federal land under this Act shall occur not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF JAMES FOLEY AND STEVEN SOTLOFF

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 538, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 538) expressing the condolences of the Senate to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 538) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JAMES M. JEFFORDS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 539, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 539) relative to the death of James M. Jeffords, former United States Senator for the State of Vermont.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 539) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2014

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday,

September 10, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 postcloture; further, that at 2 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, we expect a voice vote on the motion to proceed to the constitutional amendment on campaign finance reform. Shortly after 2 p.m., we expect a roll-call vote relative to the paycheck fairness bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 539, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator James M. Jeffords, former United States Senator for the State of Vermont, following the remarks of Senator RUBIO. And a special mention: My chief of staff, Mark Powden, who used to be the chief of staff for Senator Jeffords, gave a eulogy at his funeral and had immense respect for the late Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida.

CONGRATULATING BOOKER T. WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few moments this evening before the Senate adjourns its workday.

I begin with a couple points of personal privilege. One is to congratulate a local high school in Miami, FL, by the name of Booker T. Washington. This is a school which has now won 29 consecutive games. They were the national champions last year in high school football, and I think they are headed to that again this year.

But what really impresses me about this program is the work they do with these young men. These young men come from a very challenging part of Miami, of Overtown, and have really overcome tremendous obstacles in their personal lives to achieve both in the classroom and on the field.

What I am most impressed about, as I tell Coach Harris every time I get to see him, is that it is not the kind of

football players he has made them—because they are excellent—but the kind of young men they are becoming. I think they are worthy of congratulations.

I was at their game on Friday against another very good team from South Florida, both ranked in the top 10 nationally in high school. I assure my colleagues from States such as California and Texas that while their football is good, our football is special.

Enough bragging on them. They are a great team, and we are fortunate to be able to witness what they have been able to do over the last couple of years.

REMEMBERING STEVEN SOTLOFF

The second point, which is related to my comments here in a moment, is toward the family of Steven Sotloff, who lost his life tragically in the Middle East over the last few days. We are all familiar with that horrific tale.

Steven actually lived in Miami, FL, with his family literally blocks away from where I go to church, literally blocks away from where I live. He was a member of our community.

As I said last week at his memorial service, Steven had dedicated his life to revealing the suffering and the reality of what was happening in some of the most dangerous areas of the world. And while he lost his life tragically, I think it is both ironic and appropriate that in his last act, as he lost his life he revealed the true nature of what we confront in that part of the world and the true nature of the Islamic State, who they are, and what they are all about. This was a young man who, as I said, dedicated his life not just to journalism but to journalism in the most dangerous part of the world and in so doing was able to bring that reality to us even in the last moments of his life.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Intriguing, of course, is the debate which has occurred here over the last couple of days on this very interesting political matter. There is a lot of hyperbole being thrown around about the influence money has on our political process. I have found there is plenty of money on both sides of every issue, and certainly all of my colleagues here, including those who support this amendment before us, have been the beneficiaries of vast amounts of campaign spending. In fact, as some of my colleagues pointed to earlier, the majority of the money being raised and spent in political campaigns, including from Wall Street, is on behalf of many of the same people who are now here condemning it. If in fact it is so unseemly, as they say, then perhaps they should take a unilateral pledge not to accept these sources of funds. Of course they won't, but it is an interesting dynamic at a time when our Nation faces so many struggles.

ECONOMIC CHALLENGES

What I hope and wish is that more time in this Chamber would be dedi-

cated to the issues this country faces, the ones that threaten our status as a special and unique nation.

When we look across the country today at the economic challenges our people are facing, they are pervasive and they are real. We see that the 21st century has brought extraordinary and rapid change to our lives. The economy that once produced millions of jobs which allowed people to make it to the middle class and achieve that American dream—many of those jobs have been outsourced. They are automated. They have gone away.

Millions of people who have worked their entire lives are now struggling to find a job that allows them to keep pace with the cost of living. People are stuck in low-wage jobs, and I will have more to say about that later this week. People are working for \$9 or \$10 an hour and cannot make ends meet, especially when the cost of living continues to rise in every facet of our lives.

We have students who have gone to school, graduated with a degree, have done everything they were told they needed to do to succeed, and now cannot find a job with the degree they sought, but they potentially owe tens of thousands of dollars in student loans—an issue I am both sensitive to and familiar with because I myself owed well over \$100,000, including on the day I swore into the Senate. This is a real strain on people.

Whatever it may be, there are millions of Americans who are starting to doubt whether that fundamental promise of America—that if they work hard, they can get ahead and achieve happiness as they define it—is still true. We understand the reasons why, and this is something we need to address, and we address it by addressing the core challenges of our time, which are not the different issues I heard thrown around here today.

The core challenges of our time are that, first and foremost, the nature of our economy has changed rapidly. America faces more global competition than ever for investment and for innovation. There are more countries than ever competing with us for investment and for innovation, and tragically we haven't kept pace with that change. We still have policies in this country deeply rooted in the last century, in an era that has come and gone. We continue to impose taxes and regulations and a national debt and a health care law and all sorts of other measures that put us at a competitive disadvantage.

I wish the No. 1 priority of the Senate was to make America once again the single-best place in the world to invest and to innovate so we could create millions of higher paying 21st-century jobs.

I wish that were our No. 1 priority, followed closely by our No. 2 priority, which is equipping people with the skills they need for the jobs of the 21st

century. It wasn't that long ago that someone could come to this country or grow up in this country, not have a lot of advanced education, and still make it to the middle class. My parents did it. They worked service sector jobs. My mother was a maid and a cashier at hotels, and my father was a banquet bartender. They never made a lot of money. Yet they achieved the American dream.

The American dream has never been about how much money you make or how many things you own; it is about achieving happiness. For them, achieving happiness was giving us the chance to do all the things they never could, and they were able to do that in the 20th century in service sector jobs.

That is still possible in America for many people, but it is increasingly more difficult. I wish we would address that because the reason it has become more difficult is because almost all the higher paying jobs of the 21st century require some sort of advanced skill acquisition, and millions of our people simply don't have it. The reason is because our educational system is not a 21st-century one. Why have we stigmatized vocational education in America? Why have we told people that if they want to be an electrician or a plumber or a truckdriver or a welder or any other number of vocational professions—why have we stigmatized that when we know there are jobs available in those fields and we need people to fill them?

The second issue is, what about the people trapped in those low-paying jobs—the single mother who works as a home health aide for \$10 an hour, the receptionist at a law firm making \$11 an hour, the people working in a fast food restaurant for \$9 an hour? There is nothing wrong with those jobs, but I am sure that as time goes on they want more, and we have to equip them with the skills to be able to do more so that the home health aide can become an ultrasound technician or a dental hygienist not making \$12 an hour but making \$30 an hour, so that the young man who is on the unemployment line can become a welder or a building specialist or some other 21st-century career or profession that gives him the skills he needs for those better paying jobs. I wish we were focused on that.

By the way, how about informing our college students about the true value of their degrees? In America—a free country—you can study anything you want, but before you borrow \$50,000 to attain a major in Greek philosophy, you deserve to know that the market for Greek philosophers is tight and that it is going to be difficult to pay off that loan. I think every student in America who is taking out student loans has the right to know how much people make when they graduate from their school with that degree so they

can make informed and educated decisions about whether they should borrow money to pay for the specific degree they seek.

This is an important issue, and I wish that was our second top priority here, that we would focus more on how to help people trapped in low-paying jobs, how to help people who are struggling with the challenges of the 21st century, how to help these people acquire the skills they need for better paying jobs. We have seen virtually no conversations about those two issues here in the last few days.

No wonder people are disgusted with Washington. We don't spend any time here talking about what they are worried about. We spend very little time talking about what they are concerned about. Our discourse in this body is so irrelevant to their daily lives that they have reason not just to be disgusted with politics but quite frankly to be tempted to give up on us and our ability to address any of these challenges.

WORLD EVENTS

There is a third 21st-century challenge and one I hope to speak about in the moments I have remaining; that is, the reality that world events have an impact on us greater than ever before. I am not saying world events never used to matter. Of course they did. But we are increasingly members of a growing global economy, which means that today when there is instability on this planet, it isn't just our national security that is threatened, it is our economic security as well.

We are 6 percent of the world's population. In order to achieve more prosperity, we have to sell more things to more people everywhere in the world. But that depends on peace and stability across the planet, and we can't have peace and stability when the world is in chaos. So I would say today that foreign relations and foreign policy matter more from an economic perspective than they ever have in the history of this Nation. I wish there were more focus in this body on what is happening all over the world because the world is in total chaos.

In the Asia-Pacific region, China is undergoing a dramatic modernization of its military capabilities—increasingly challenging, for example, U.S. air power in the region and increasingly acting out on illegitimate territorial claims.

In Latin America we have seen an erosion of democratic order, the rise of antidemocratic governments that threaten to erode almost two decades of democratic progress in the region.

By the way, in this body we have endeavored to address one of those challenges in Venezuela—an outrage, a place full of corruption and human rights violations, an anti-American government that does everything possible to undermine us and our interests, not just the interests of their own

people. We have been blocked in our efforts to address it because somehow the Venezuelan Government, acting through CITGO—a wholly owned company of the Venezuelan Government—got lobbyists to come here to the Senate and lobby for blockage and stoppage of a measure we were ready to pass by unanimous consent.

So I come to the floor to ask the majority leader to please schedule a vote on these sanctions on Venezuela because it will pass overwhelmingly. Do not allow lobbyists for the Venezuelan Government to be able to come to Washington, DC, and impede action on this matter.

In Europe we see chaos too. Russia has invaded Ukraine. Maybe they switched uniforms and have lied about it, but they have invaded Ukraine, and NATO has been helpless to do anything about it. I hope we will be more forceful in our response because the implications not just for that region but for the world are very significant.

But the one I want to close on tonight is focused on—and this relates to Steven Sotloff, as discussed a moment ago—what is happening with ISIL.

Tomorrow night I believe the President will give the most important address of his Presidency—perhaps the most important address of any Presidency in the last decade. Tomorrow night I hope he comes before the American people and explains to them what is truly at stake. I was about to say that I thought he should have done this weeks ago, maybe months ago, but I am glad he is doing this.

I would ask my Republican colleagues—all of my colleagues—that at this time of such critical national security importance, we try as much as possible to rally behind our efforts to address this challenge because it is a real challenge. If and when this group comes after the United States, both around the world or here at home, they will not be coming after Republicans and they will not be coming after Democrats; they will be coming after Americans; the threat we face is real.

We have a tradition in this government of rallying together and acting in a nonpartisan way when it comes to national security. That is not just something we do because it is polite; it is something we must do because unity is important in order to address these challenges.

I have been critical of the President. I have been critical of the slow response. I think it is valid to point out the mistakes he has made so we can learn and so he can be held accountable. But I also think it is important to look forward at what we can do now.

While I thought that what the President is about to do he should have done weeks and months ago, I am glad he is finally doing it. Tomorrow night's address to the Nation is an important one. I hope all Americans tune in.

Here are the three points I hope the President will make: First, I hope he clearly outlines to our fellow Americans what is at stake here. ISIL is not just a collection of crazy terrorists. It is the single most dangerous terrorist challenge this Nation has ever faced. We faced some dangerous terrorists before. We are familiar with Al Qaeda and their capability. We are familiar with some of the nation-states we faced down in the past.

This group is uniquely dangerous for a number of reasons. First, it is by far the best funded terrorist operation perhaps in all of human history. They are generating millions of dollars a day alone just from oil revenue. Second, they are replete with foreign fighters, including thousands of foreign fighters that have visa waiver passports from countries where all they have to do is buy a plane ticket to come to the United States. Among those, by the way, are Americans, including one who is from Florida who even came back to the United States for a number of weeks and then returned and conducted a suicide attack on behalf of this group.

Last but not least, they control territory. We know that in order to carry out the 9/11 attacks Al Qaeda needed a safe haven in parts of Afghanistan. These folks in the Islamic State—these lunatics—control a vast space. Most of northern Syria and vast portions of Iraq are under their control. This makes this group very significant and dangerous with intentions not just on taking over Iraq but dominating the region, ultimately moving into Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, and other places, and conducting attacks against the United States.

It is simple. ISIL cannot fulfill its regional ambitions if it doesn't drive the United States out of the Middle East, and the only way they can draw us out of the Middle East is by terrorizing us out of the Middle East. To terrorize us they will have to conduct terrorist attacks against us both abroad and here in the homeland. Here we have the most well-funded, most capable terrorist group in modern history with a clear intention and desire to attack us in order to terrorize us out of the region. This is a very serious national security threat, and it is important for the President to clearly explain that to our fellow Americans.

The second thing I hope we will do is outline a clear goal about what we intend to achieve and that goal should be unequivocal: the complete defeat and annihilation of ISIL. That goal is accomplished in three steps: first, by stopping their continued spread; second, by eroding their capability and control of territory; and ultimately by defeating them as an organization—by eliminating them as an organization.

So after he has outlined who this group is and why it is in our national

interest to defeat them and he has outlined his goal to defeat them, I hope the President will explain to the American people in as much detail as possible—and clearly there are things he cannot share for operational security purposes—but in as much detail as possible how he intends to defeat them.

I think this is a multi-faceted process, but it should include the continued air strikes in northern Iraq. Air strikes are most successful when they are done in coordination with Kurds and Iraqi ground forces there on the ground now—by continuing to supply and equip the Kurds by giving them logistical support they need in order to take on the supplies and get them out to the troops by hopefully working with the new Iraqi government that was just formed to stand as a unified Iraqi government that is capable not just of supplying a government that unites all of the people of Iraq but also one that is capable of fielding security forces capable of conducting operations without dividing the country along the Shia and Sunni lines.

We also need more cooperation from Arabs in the region because they are immediately threatened. They are coming after the Crown in Saudi Arabia; they are coming after the Crown in Jordan. They are eventually going to move into Lebanon as well. They pose a real and present threat to all the nations in this region and they must act. We need their cooperation both militarily and diplomatically but also by using the megaphone that the government and state-run media provides to stigmatize this group by revealing them for who they truly are. There should be nothing romantic about ISIL in the minds of any Arab, about joining their ranks or their efforts. We need the government's help in spreading that word and revealing that reality.

By the way, we also need to work with them and other regional governments—especially the Turks—to help cut off ISIL's access to funds and to fighters. The Turks need to step up and do a better job of securing that border.

Cutting off their funds requires us to go after their most significant source of funds and that is the refinery capacity in Syria. I will have more to say about that in a moment. We should target that because the black market sale of oil in Syria is the single and fastest growing source of revenue for ISIL, but it is also a fuel for their terrorist operations.

But ultimately there is no way to defeat ISIL without defeating them in Syria. Someone is going to have to confront them in Syria and defeat them. It is my hope that it will be a combination of U.S. air power and qualified, well-equipped, well-trained competent moderate rebel forces within Syria, because here is the problem: If you eliminate ISIL but you don't have some sort of capable moderate group left behind, then all you are doing is replacing ISIL with al-Nusra or some other radical Islamic group on the ground there. So it is important that we do both.

I know no one wants to get into another conflict. We have no choice. We are going to have to deal with ISIL. The choice is not whether we deal with them. The choice is do we deal with them now while they are still growing or do we deal with them later when they have grown and when they have controlled vast and larger territories than they do now, when they have more fighters and are better funded. That is the choice before us.

I submit to you that I know of no medical condition that is easier to treat later rather than earlier. Every medical condition that I know—ISIL has been compared to cancer—every cancer that I know is easier to treat if you catch it earlier rather than later. I would say this is true with this cancer, ISIL. If we deal with them sooner, it will not be costless or fast, but it will be easier to deal with them then, than if we wait until later. But to do so will ultimately require someone to confront them and defeat them within Syria itself, and defeating them in Syria alone is not enough. We have to

ensure that there is some group there on the ground, some moderate rebel force that can take over not just from them but from the Assad regime.

There is collusion between Assad and ISIL. The refineries that ISIL controls in Syria are former Assad refineries which he won't bomb because he hopes to take them one day intact so he can use them. There is collusion between them. If anybody has any illusions about who Assad really is, I hope the President will outline this for us tomorrow. It is important for us and for our future.

I will make one more point about why this is the most important speech that the President will give. Because this threat will probably outlive his Presidency. We have to be prepared for the fact that ISIL may not be defeated in 24 months, that the next President of the United States and many of us—whether it is serving here, whether it is controlled by Republicans or Democrats—will have to remain committed to this goal, because this threat in all likelihood will outlive the Presidency of Barack Obama. It is important for him to put in place a clear goal and a plan that can survive his Presidency so that we can carry out this task. It is critical for our country.

I wish the President the best on his address tomorrow, and I hope we can come together in a bipartisan way to confront and defeat this evil before it is too late.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow under the provisions of S. Res. 539, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable James M. Jeffords.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:53 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 9, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 9, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SELFLESS SERVICE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS SAMUEL C. "SAM" HAIRSTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen and decorated American hero.

Army Sergeant First Class Samuel C. "Sam" Hairston of Houston, Texas, was killed on August 12, 2014, in Ghazni, Afghanistan, from injuries sustained when his unit was engaged while in support of Operation Enduring Freedom by enemy small-arms fire.

Sergeant First Class Hairston was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Born to Bennett and Josephine Hairston June 22, 1979, at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, Sergeant First Class Hairston was raised in Shalimar, Florida, and graduated from Choctawhatchee High School in 1997.

Sergeant First Class Hairston wanted to follow in the footsteps of his father

and brother by joining our Nation's Armed Forces. After pursuing a Division I football scholarship as defensive lineman at the University of Houston and earning a bachelor's degree in economics, he joined the U.S. Army in 2003 as an infantryman.

Upon completion of the basic airborne course at Fort Benning, Georgia, he was assigned to 1st Brigade Combat Team, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, in August of 2013. He selflessly served four combat tours throughout his career, which included two tours in support of both Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Sergeant First Class Hairston has been described as someone whose smile could light up a room, and to his wife Tawana and stepson Hayden, he was a loving and devoted husband and father.

In terms of his military service, whenever he was thanked, he responded that serving our country was his choice and his service was so Americans can enjoy the freedoms that are all too often taken for granted.

He took pride in every mission and never expected anything in return. "An exceptional noncommissioned officer and a valued member of our team," is how he was described by Lieutenant Colonel Chris Hockenberry, Hairston's battalion commander.

Sergeant First Class Hairston's qualifications included the Ranger Tab, Combat Infantryman Badge, Pathfinder Badge, Military Master Free Fall Parachutist Badge, and the Army Parachutist Badge.

Throughout his time in service, he was awarded the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal with three oakleaf clusters, Army Achievement Medal, Meritorious Unit Citation with two oakleaf clusters, Army Good Conduct Medal with two oakleaf clusters, the National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with two campaign stars, Iraqi Campaign Medal with two campaign stars, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

Throughout his unwavering dedication to country, Sergeant First Class Hairston helped ensure that our constitutional rights were upheld and that our Nation was protected from harm, both here and abroad. His ultimate sacrifice will never be forgotten.

To Sergeant First Class Hairston's loving wife Mrs. Tawana Hairston; his stepson Hayden; his parents Bennett and Josephine Hairston; his brothers

Junnee Cardama, Broady Hairston, and T.J. Hairston; his entire family; and friends, my wife Vicki joins me in offering our sincerest condolences and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful United States Congress and Nation, I stand here to honor Sergeant First Class Sam C. Hairston and all of those heroes we have lost.

May God continue to bless them, the men and women of our United States Armed Forces, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is much that Congress deals with that seems intractable. We struggle with the great issues of war and peace. We view climate change and its devastating impacts and are paralyzed. We look at this still-simmering racial unrest and the painful events of Ferguson, Missouri, and largely are ignoring the underlying issues.

There is one area where government at the State and local level and here in Congress can make things a little easier, a little more sensible, and that is dealing with our failed policy of marijuana prohibition.

There was a sad article on the front page of The Times yesterday about a call center employee, paralyzed since he was 16 years old, who was fired from his job because he used medical marijuana in a State where it is legal, on his off-hours, at home at night, to control his back spasms.

That had nothing to do with his job performance, yet this person was terminated. There is a certain degree of hypocrisy, where someone having a glass of wine at home is treated radically different.

This is just one small example of a much larger problem. The cost of our failed prohibition causes untold damage to racial minorities, especially African American young men who are much more likely to be arrested and jailed, even though they use marijuana no more frequently than young White men, jailed for something most Americans now think should be legal.

That hypocrisy was on display with the NFL, who suspended a player for a year for smoking marijuana, but remember, the wifebeater was suspended for only two games until an even more

graphic video of the beating forced the NFL's hand because of the public outrage; yet this is the same NFL that encourages—some would say pressures—players to be pumped with shots and pills to dull their pain, which often leads to serious consequences for these players later in life, especially prescription drug dependency.

Remember, we have an epidemic of prescription drug abuse that kills more people every year than heroin, methamphetamines, and cocaine combined, and of course, no one has ever been killed from a marijuana overdose.

We are wasting lives, law enforcement resources, and money when we have more important issues to tackle. I am pleased that my State of Oregon, which was the first State to decriminalize a small amount of marijuana, now may become the next State to legalize adult use.

We have seen significant progress here in Congress to allow the cultivation of industrial hemp, allow Kentucky tobacco farmers and Oregon ranchers to grow hemp for products that are perfectly legal and you can buy in any city in America.

We have helped rein in the Federal Government interference with the 23 States that allow over 1 million people to use medical marijuana. People are picking up and moving to States that permit medical marijuana to get access to the therapeutic benefits of marijuana, which can reduce the violent epileptic seizures that torture their children.

It is time for us to do a reality check. Let's legalize, regulate, and tax marijuana, and then get on to those bigger problems that need our attention, like war and peace, the consequence of a failure to deal with climate change, and the epidemic of prescription drug abuse that is killing three or four Americans every hour. Let's get our priorities straight.

RADICALIZED AMERICANS FIGHTING WITH ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, according to a new poll released by CNN last evening, "Americans are increasingly concerned that ISIS represents a direct terror threat" and that they are "fearful that ISIS agents are living in the United States."

A Washington Post poll released this morning shows that 90 percent of the American people believe that ISIS poses a "serious" threat to the U.S.

This threat is growing, largely due to the fact that an increasing number radicalized westerners, including more than 140 Americans, are freely traveling to Syria to link up with ISIS and al Qaeda-affiliated groups.

Consider that over the last month, while this Congress was out on recess,

the number of Americans killed fighting with terrorist organizations in Syria quickly grew, signaling a trend that should be troubling to all Americans.

Earlier this summer, Moner Mohammad Abu-Salha, a 22-year-old from Florida, became the first American suicide bomber fighting in Syria for the al Qaeda-affiliated al-Nusra.

Equally concerning as his deadly act was the fact that he traveled from Syria to Florida and back again in the months before his deadly terrorist act. In August, two more Americans were reportedly killed fighting with ISIS—Douglas McArthur McCain and Abdurahmaan Muhumed, both originally from Minneapolis, Minnesota.

We must take proactive steps to discourage Americans from traveling to Syria to link up with these groups. Unfortunately, current law does not prevent Americans from traveling freely to Syria and back, which creates loopholes would-be jihadists can exploit.

Currently, unless the U.S. has solid evidence that they have joined one of these terrorist groups, the FBI cannot arrest suspects upon their return. Unfortunately, it can be very hard to prove that suspects fought with a terrorist group in Syria, due to limited U.S. intelligence about their activities in the region.

I am concerned that the absence of laws preventing unrestricted travel to Syria means the U.S. is not taking any substantial steps to discourage Americans from going over to fight. This is an untenable situation that puts our country at greater risk of attack from a radicalized American who trains and fights with these groups and later returns home. That is why I have introduced legislation in March, aimed at curbing this threat.

Over the last 6 months, since its introduction, the dramatic gains by ISIS and a growing number of foreign fighters has only reaffirmed the need for legislation to address this issue.

My bill, H.R. 4223, the International Conflicts of Concern Act, will give the President authority to temporarily restrict travel and material support to countries like Syria, and the President could add additional countries of concern when conflicts spill over into other countries, as we have seen in Iraq.

The bill would also contain important protections, allowing legitimate travel by licensed humanitarian aid workers, journalists, and other groups cleared by the U.S. Government. I want to add that this bill was developed with the input of the FBI and has been supported by Director Comey of the FBI.

I believe it is a commonsense solution to an increasingly urgent threat, and the House should bring up this bill and pass it before it recesses. Should we fail to do so, I believe that one day we will regret not doing all that we can

to protect our homeland from the radicalized fighting with ISIS in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to close by encouraging the President to call on the expertise of two men who know more about fighting terrorists and insurgent threats in Iraq than anyone, General David Petraeus and General Stanley McChrystal.

Although both have retired and neither work for this administration anymore, our country would benefit greatly from their expertise as the military and intelligence community address the growing threat in Iraq. I hope the President and his team will ask for their assistance.

THE SEPTEMBER MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, September should be a particularly important month for this House. It will be a month of contrasts. It will be a month in which the American people will be able to see that the Republican message to the American people is, "You are on your own," while Democrats say, "We are on your side."

All right. Well, what does that mean? The Republicans' announced agenda for this month ought to be no surprise to anyone who has been paying attention to the gridlock in Congress.

Instead of focusing on the issues that matter—creating jobs, raising the minimum wage, fixing our broken immigration system—they are planning to reintroduce partisan messaging bills the House has already passed.

So we are repeating what we have already done, as little as that may be.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, it appears as if the Republican House majority in the 113th Congress will go out much as it came in: fixated on a single goal. The Republican chairman of the Rules Committee, PETE SESSIONS, summed up that goal late last year when he said—and I quote Congressman SESSIONS, Republican chairman of the Rules Committee: "Everything we do in this body should be about messaging to win back the Senate." Not about creating jobs, not about making America more secure, not about energy, not about the minimum wage, not about immigration reform, not about making sure that women get equal pay for equal work, not about any of those things. The chairman of the Rules Committee that controls how we consider legislation on this floor said it is about messaging so we can take back the Senate.

All of us should remember that when Senator MCCONNELL was asked a few years ago in the first term of the President of the United States, Barack Obama, he said, when asked, What is your major objective? his response was,

To ensure that President Obama is a one-term President. Again, not about jobs, not about the economy, not about growing the middle class, not about making sure voting rights were secured, but making sure that President Obama only served one term. He failed in that objective, but the fact of the matter is they have stayed on that messaging and objective.

Central to achieving that goal Republicans believe is to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act. And it comes without a shock to anyone that this month will also feature—as a matter of fact, this week—the 53rd vote to do just that.

However, Mr. Speaker, the American people are obviously tired of partisan gridlock. All of us hear that and all of us on both sides of the aisle say we don't want partisan gridlock, but we have seen wasted opportunities in this House over and over again for Congress to make headway on the challenges that we face as a nation.

Many are asking what happened to the promise Republicans made in 2010 when, in their pledge to America, they wrote—and again I quote—in their pledge to America: a plan to create jobs, end economic uncertainty—by the way, they are the ones who threatened to default on the debt twice and who shut down the greatest government on the face of the Earth and the greatest country on the face of the Earth, shut down its government for 16 days at a cost of \$24 billion. A plan, they said, to create jobs and economic certainty—it was uncertainty they created—and make America more competitive. They said that must be the first and most urgent domestic priority of our government.

That is what they said in the pledge, but Chairman SESSIONS said, of course, messaging to take back the Senate was their major objective; therefore, that was a promise forgotten.

Throughout September, House Democrats will be outlining how Republicans have failed to focus on the issues Americans care about and what Congress should be doing instead. House Democrats are ready to jump-start the middle class. That is not just a phrase.

We know the middle class is shrinking, and we know to the extent the middle class is shrinking, America will not be doing as well. We need to expand the middle class, giving opportunities for those who are not in the middle class to climb ladders of opportunity to get into the middle class. We need to move our economy beyond recovery and into prosperity. We are for raising the minimum wage and ensuring equal pay for equal work. The overwhelming majority of Americans are for that.

Poll after poll after poll shows that over 70 percent of America is for those two propositions. In my opinion, both have majority votes on this House floor. But Americans must be surprised

that those two issues are not brought to this floor for action so that the people's House can speak.

Now, there may be differences of opinion. Many Republicans may want to vote against the minimum wage, but America deserves to have a vote on that issue, and it has a right to have a vote on making sure that women get paid equally to what men get paid for the same job. They do that in the House of Representatives. Women are paid exactly what men are paid. That is right. That is what ought to happen.

We need to fix our broken immigration system. My friend, Mr. Cantor, who is no longer with us, and I had colloquies, week after week after week, in which Mr. Cantor said, We understand the immigration system is broken. I said, We agree, it is broken. And we have done nothing to fix it.

The Republicans have passed some five or six bills to fix it. They haven't brought their own bills to the floor so that the House could work its will. I don't believe that is the kind of Congress, Mr. Speaker, that America wants. We need to fix that system in a way that secures our border and brings millions out of the shadows.

Mr. Speaker, we need to bring to the floor bipartisan Make It In America jobs bills designed to grow our manufacturing base, help our businesses to compete, and attract jobs that pay well and open doors of opportunity to workers and their families.

The Republican-led committee passed out a bill sponsored by Mr. LIPINSKI almost unanimously—I think it was on a voice vote—a bill that passed in the last Congress with over 300 votes. I have been asking for the last 10 months that that bill be brought to the floor. All it says is America needs to have a playbook, a plan, a strategy, if you will, to grow our manufacturing sector, create more middle class jobs and compete with the rest of the world. We cannot get that bill to the floor. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that is the kind of Congress America wants.

These are the issues that the American people want Congress to focus on, not undoing the patient protections and cost savings that health care reform has brought, not rebranding an antiregulatory and antiworker platform as a jobs package that would add—Mr. Speaker, Americans are going to be astounded, legislation we are going to consider this week will add \$560 billion to the debt. Now, we passed most of those bills and created a larger debt by more than that \$560 billion already, but we are going to do it again—not wasting taxpayers' money and time on partisan lawsuits and investigations, not giving the American people the least productive, and least open Congress in modern history.

The pledge to America talked about transparency. We have had more closed

rules in this Congress than any Congress in which I have served.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want leaders who are on their side, not ones who have broken their promises. They need and deserve a people's House that is truly on their side.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this September 29 marks the 115th birthday of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is a day that will be celebrated at VFW posts and in communities around the country, and it is a day that deserves our recognition here in Congress as well.

As a member of our local VFW Ladies Auxiliary and the proud wife of a Vietnam veteran and a VFW member, I have seen firsthand how our VFW makes good on its promise every day to honor the dead by helping the living.

Each year, the nearly 2 million VFW and Auxiliary members contribute more than 8.6 million hours of volunteerism in their communities. These are men and women who have already sacrificed for their country by traveling into harm's way to defend our freedoms or waiting anxiously for our loved ones to return home from combat, yet they continue to serve wherever they see a need.

At our VFW post in Hendersonville, for example, members maintain a food pantry for disadvantaged veterans, and they started an Operation Spearhead to specifically serve the families of those called to serve in the war on terror.

Perhaps most importantly, the VFW has always risen above partisanship and politics to maintain a strong, steady voice on behalf of our heroes since its founding in 1899.

On this upcoming Veterans of Foreign Wars Day, may we pause to honor the many contributions of this organization and be reminded to pray for those who continue serving around the world.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are disappointed that sometime on the floor today we will spend precious time that could be utilized for our focus on ISIS, focus on increasing the minimum wage and addressing social issues across America on condemning the President for authority that he had and for, in essence, rescuing Sergeant Bergdahl. But that is, unfortunately, where we find ourselves. I am here to indicate that the President has enormous responsibilities and

has been thoughtful but forceful on behalf of the American people.

As they indicated, there are many issues that we have great concern with, and last evening colleagues of mine in the Congressional Black Caucus stood on the floor of the House to address the heinous killing of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri.

First, let me thank Congressman LACY CLAY and Congressman CLEAVER for their leadership. They had to be on the front lines embracing the family members and community. But those of us in distance want to extend our deepest sympathy to the family of Michael Brown and indicate that we have had great police-community relations through many of our districts overcoming some very serious obstacles, as we did in Houston, Texas. We started community-oriented policing at the leadership of former Mayor Lee P. Brown. It can be done.

On the Judiciary Committee, I have worked with funding for community-oriented policing, and, therefore, I don't take a backseat to my support of law enforcement across this Nation. The actions that were played out by the media in video, to me, took the life of a boy who had a life in front of him.

So it is crucial that this body does not leave for its recess again and not address, in some direct way, the killing of Michael Brown, hearings regarding the militarization of our police, adding more funding back to community-oriented policing, and, yes, asking the question of the utilization of firepower against an unarmed Black boy.

The epidemic of the killing of Black men is real; you can see the numbers. Those of us who are mothers who have to tell our sons how they ought to respond when they are on the street—educated, military personnel, high school graduates or not—this is something that all of America should be concerned about because we are America. I hope to be part of the solution and not the problem.

We will be looking to introduce legislation that addresses the question of how we utilize equipment that was given for natural disasters and fighting terrorism, not to go against unarmed civilians. That is, I believe, a charge for this body.

Let me also indicate that, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, having just come from the Mideast, I know that ISIS is real, and I believe that the President had a strategy. It was a deliberative strategy. It was one that was not to be spoken of precipitously or to announce what you are going to do next. But as he engages in consultation with our leadership, it is crucial that he engages in consultation with Members of Congress. I know that that is the President's effort. He has done so in the past.

We have willing allies in the Mideast who are willing to stand up with

United States leadership on strategy where they are in the front. We must define what boots on the ground means, what does the 1,000 individuals who are there now who are military personnel. We must find a way to address Syria without collaborating with President Assad. And we must be reminded that the religious minorities in Iraq are still under siege and attack, and there are, in the wake of those attacks, often children that we must address.

□ 1030

We must be able to provide international resources for the children who are left after the bloody siege of ISIS. And then we must explain to the American people that we have their national security in our hands, that we realize that the rising numbers wanting to attack Syria and wanting to continue to attack Iraq in those areas where ISIS is is because of the fear of the homeland.

As I indicated, as the senior member on Homeland Security, we get that. We will be holding a hearing in the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, where I serve as ranking member, along with my chairwoman, Congresswoman MILLER. I have introduced legislation as an aside to declare the Russian rebels as terrorists. I look forward to looking at this question, as Congressman WOLF has, this issue of those with U.S. passports and this question of how do we keep them from flying, adding them to the no-fly list. We are looking at ways of getting our walls around those individuals being able to attack the homeland.

Again, we have many issues to come together on as a body. We must address the crisis of the killing of Michael Brown. But we also have to say that we can do it together. We must address this crisis of dealing with ISIS. It is real, it can be assessed, and it can be handled. Collaborate with our Western allies and our friends in the Mideast. It is our duty, and we must do it now.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, "cowardly," "a heathen," "selfish"—those are the words some used to describe Robin Williams' suicide. These underscore that there is a great deal of ignorance and misunderstanding about suicide.

Myths surrounding suicide are pervasive and persistent. Given that September is National Suicide Prevention Month, we have an opportunity to dispel these common misconceptions, such as "suicide is not that common." This year, 9.3 million adults will have

serious thoughts of suicide, 2.7 million will make suicide plans, 1.3 million will attempt suicide, and nearly 40,000 will die by suicide. One suicide occurs every 16 minutes, and one veteran commits suicide every hour. More will die by suicide this year than in car accidents.

Here is another misconception: "Those who die by suicide should just have sucked it up." But the vast majority of individuals who have died by suicide had a diagnosable mental illness. Mental illness is a contributing factor in 90 percent of suicides, and the risk of suicide increases more than 50 percent in individuals experiencing depression.

Consider this mistaken belief: "Suicide is well planned and a thoughtful act." Twenty-five percent of people who attempt suicide do so within 5 minutes of their initial decision, and 75 percent do so within the first hour.

Although there is a lot we know about suicide, these myths continue to perpetuate because we don't understand enough why certain populations are at higher risk and what is happening in the brain at the time of suicide.

A recent report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that in the last decade, here is what happened with suicide rates:

The rate for those 35 to 64 years of age increased 28 percent; for women, it increased 31 percent; for white Americans, it increased 40 percent; for American Indian and Alaska Natives, it increased 65 percent; and the use of suffocation or hanging increased 81 percent. And despite a continued focus on youth suicide, it remains either the second- or third-leading cause of death for those between the ages 10 and 25. Rates have also increased dramatically among elderly White men.

The report goes on to note that "additional research is needed to understand the cause of the increase and why the extent of the increase varies."

Suicide is a public health crisis demanding a policy response that, to date, has been tepid at best. The impulsive nature and correlation with mental illness requires us to treat suicide as a mental health crisis. To this end, I have introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717, which authorizes research at the National Institute of Mental Health to enhance our understanding of suicide and advance evidence-based approaches to prevention that are not solely centered around raising awareness.

Families of those with serious mental illness already are aware that there is a problem. Unfortunately, a small percentage of those with serious mental illness are not aware they have a problem, but everybody is also painfully aware they cannot get help when someone is in mental health crisis.

We can save lives and help families in mental health crisis, but only if we, as

a Nation, have the courage to confront mental illness head on rather than just use phony, feel-good measures.

My legislation also reauthorizes the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act, which is the largest youth suicide prevention and early intervention program in the country. However, this program does not address the full scope of suicide, which can affect individuals of any age.

Thus, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chair, will continue its investigation into our Nation's broken mental health system by looking at proven strategies to reduce the staggering number of suicides. It begins with fixing our broken mental health system and providing hope and evidence-based treatment to individuals and families in crisis. I call upon Members to cosponsor that bill.

Mr. Speaker, we need to tell Americans that if someone you know needs help, they should call 1-800-273-8255 for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. They can also find more online at www.afsp.org, the Web site of the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention.

It is clear that this is a national crisis. If we saw any other disease in this country that had numbers as high as these—1 million attempts and 40,000 deaths—we would call upon Americans, the National Institutes of Health, and others to take action. Certainly, we would call upon Congress to take action. This is demanding our action, for every day more and more take their lives from this serious public health problem. Let us address this. Let us no longer ignore it. So many more lives are at stake.

THE ENDURING STRUGGLE OF THE CRIMEAN TATARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk a little bit about the enduring struggle of the Crimean Tatars, a people who have suffered much over the many generations of war that they have seen in their region. I had an opportunity to meet with many of them when I was in Ukraine. ELIOT ENGEL and I sat down with all of the different minority groups that have been through so much in that region.

I just wanted to say this to the Members of the House, and that is that Russia's aggression in Ukraine has produced many tragedies, but none—none—more so than that of the Crimean Tatars. For centuries, this Muslim community has suffered greatly at the hands of Russia's rulers. Russia's rulers have devastated the population, and they have driven countless numbers from their homes. And now, Moscow's forcible occupation of Crimea has

imposed a new oppression on this long-suffering community, forcing large numbers to flee and making the rest increasingly unwelcome in their ancestral homeland.

When I was in Ukraine, besides meeting with senior Ukrainian officials, we had these conversations with the representatives of their community as well as other minority groups, other ethnic Russian communities. And I was privileged to meet and talk at length with the most prominent Tatar leader, Mustafa Dzhemilev, who is the former head of the Mejlis, the executive body of the Tatar parliament, as well as with other senior leaders in their community. He and his colleagues have been blocked from returning to Crimea by the ruling authorities there, as so many other Tatars have been blocked once they go over the border from Crimea to come back into their home. They are refugees unable to go home.

During our meeting, we discussed the increasing pressure on the Tatars in Crimea and the situation they live under. Thousands have fled, and those who remain face a very uncertain future. They are subject to increasing pressure and restrictions by the local authorities, who they believe are trying to force them out because of their ethnicity and because they didn't welcome Russia's armed occupation and illegal annexation. Of course, there was never any possibility that they would be allowed to participate in the phony referendum held in March in which 97 percent of the population supposedly voted one way in that election to join Russia, even though the entire ethnic Russian population numbers only 58 percent of that overall community. The Tatar population is about 12 percent. Knowing that the vote would be rigged, they refused to provide the propaganda exercise with any credibility, and they and many other ethnic groups there in Crimea urged a boycott and undertook that boycott.

Unfortunately, their current struggle is only the latest chapter in their long history of great suffering and very brave perseverance. Many times in the past, they have been subjected to mass deportation and assaults, with great loss of life. The most terrible was Stalin's mass deportation of the Muslim Tatar population to Central Asia in 1944. Over half—over half—of the men, women, and children died in what only can be called a genocidal process. And those that survived the privations found themselves in an alien world, forced to begin their lives again in great hardship.

In the mid-1980s, the Tatars were finally allowed to return to Crimea. Most of the surviving population—and it was a fraction of the original population—eventually did come back. In the last census, they comprised 12 percent of the population. There they reestablished their ancient community

and proudly took their place in Ukraine's new democracy.

All of the people I spoke with in Ukraine, including the ethnic Russians whose interests Moscow claims it is protecting, said that they opposed Russian intervention, and at the end of the day they supported a united Ukraine. And that was especially true of every ethnic community and civil society group in eastern Ukraine that we talked with. And the Tatars, including some still alive who survived Stalin's crimes, have a deep historical memory of Russia's actions in Crimea. They are not fooled by Moscow's protestations of peace there.

In our efforts to secure a lasting peace in Ukraine, the U.S. and our allies must not accept Russia's forcible expulsion of Tatars from Crimea, but that is, once again, what the Russian Government is doing to these people. They must recognize the religious and ethnic rights there. And we must not forget the people there. We must not leave them to this fate at the hands of merciless authorities who seek a region cleansed of all those they deem to be enemies of their imperial ambitions.

By refusing to surrender to endless threats and centuries of oppression, the Tatar people continue to give hope to all those around the world who are battling overwhelming forces in defense of their homes and of their freedom.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Glen Berteau, The House Modesto, Modesto, California, offered the following prayer:

I thank God for the men and women of this House and their commitment, concern, and call to help America to be a great nation. I bless them and their families with health, wisdom, and supernatural peace.

George Washington said: "It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible."

We need a visitation from Heaven. We need Your word to answer our questions. We need Your love to resolve our differences, and we need Your understanding to embrace our purpose.

Thank you, Lord, for sending us what mankind needed, a savior, Jesus Christ,

who paid the ultimate price for freedom on the cross.

Thank you, Lord, for the men and women in the United States military who have paid the ultimate price, who gave their lives for our freedom.

We repent of our pride, embrace humility, and call the Creator of creation to bless America.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND GLEN BERTEAU

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today to introduce to the House our guest chaplain, Glen Berteau, of Modesto, from The House. Glen currently serves as senior pastor at The House in Modesto. A church of more than 8,000, his congregation was named as one of the 50 top largest churches in America.

The House's outreach has touched the lives of people all across the Central Valley. He is a leader who has pulled our faith-based community together and our pastors together to address so many of our issues in California's Central Valley.

Glen is a youth pastor and author of a popular youth manual and two books: "Christianity Life" and "Christianity to Go." He is a gifted speaker and evangelist and teacher, speaking not only in California's Central Valley but in conferences all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Glen this afternoon. We thank him for offering this morning's opening prayer in the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY). The Chair will entertain up

to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING DAIMLER TRUCKS NORTH AMERICA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark a momentous occasion at the Daimler Trucks North America Cleveland plant in Rowan County, North Carolina.

The plant, which began manufacturing Freightliner trucks in 1989, recently rolled truck number 3 million off the assembly line. This milestone is a testament to the high-quality workforce that can be found in Rowan County specifically and North Carolina in general.

In 1989, the plant began building Freightliners with 124 employees. While market forces have caused fluctuation over the years, the plant currently employs about 2,600 people, making it the third-largest employer in Rowan County. All together, the company employs about 8,000 people throughout North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Daimler on its successful North American truck business, and I commend the good people of Rowan County, North Carolina, for making that business thrive.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize September as National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. Cancer continues to be a leading cause of death by disease for America's children.

Every year in the United States, almost 16,000 children under the age of 21 are diagnosed with cancer. Approximately one-fourth of these children will not survive. Two prominent health institutions in western New York, Roswell Park Cancer Institute and Women & Children's Hospital in Buffalo, work collaboratively to conduct research, provide treatment, and raise awareness on behalf of these children.

I urge my colleagues to support increased funding for the National Cancer Institute.

SEPTEMBER IS HUNGER ACTION MONTH

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Hunger Action Month to raise the alarm of food insecurity and hunger that afflicts our fellow citizens.

Many of us cannot imagine going to bed hungry and then waking up still hungry, but this is the sad reality for far too many people. Nearly 200,000 of those who are food insecure in northern Illinois—one in five—are children who lack adequate food and nutrition to grow up healthy.

Chicago's suburban hunger grew by a stunning 99 percent over the past decade, notwithstanding the great efforts of hardworking volunteers at places like the Northern Illinois Food Bank, Between Friends Food Pantry, and Kendall County Food Bank. I have seen firsthand their service to our communities.

This September let's redouble all of our volunteer efforts and use our resources to help our neighbors in need.

Colder months are up ahead when families feel the harsh brunt of food insecurity. It takes the effort of community to care for our neighbors, as Jesus called us to do without judgment or stigma. Whatever we do for these, the least of these, we do for Him.

PGA 2017 PRESIDENTS CUP IN JERSEY CITY

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the people of Jersey City, New Jersey, upon the recent announcement to host the PGA 2017 Presidents Cup at the premier Liberty National Golf Club.

The prestigious tournament will not only expose golf fans to Jersey City, but also bolster tourism, investment, and raise awareness for charities in the area. In addition, all the living Presidents will be at the opening ceremony as honorary chairmen. The Presidents Cup is one of 10 PGA events that will be held at Liberty National during a span of 25 years.

I congratulate the father and son team of Dan and Paul Fireman for their unwavering commitment and vision to bring a world-class course to Jersey City, New Jersey. Built on top of an old landfill, Liberty National offers sweeping views of the Hudson River and views of the Statue of Liberty nearly at every hole.

The Firemans' dedication to bringing a world-class golf course to the area was never about a profit, rather, giving back to the game and the community. In correlation with the tournament, the Firemans announced a \$5 million, 5-year commitment to the First Tee program, an international youth organization that promotes life skills and leadership through the game of golf.

I congratulate the city of Jersey City and the Fireman family.

FEDS COOK UP NEW RULES FOR BAKE SALES IN SCHOOLS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, turn off the ovens; the school bake sales are over.

Bake sales in schools are as American as apple pie and the flag. Parents like Janet Huberty in Atascocita, Texas, and other parents and PTAs and PTOs use bake sales to raise money for the school band, cheerleader uniforms, and iPads for students.

But now the almighty Federal Government has cooked up new rules controlling public school bake sales. No more cupcakes, oatmeal raisin cookies, popcorn, or pizza can be sold for playground equipment or student trips. The Washington regulators, many of whom have their kids go to private schools that are not covered by the new rules, say kale chips and quinoa are to replace snow cones and Valentine candy. Isn't that lovely.

Local parents and educators should control bake sales, not the Federal Government. So today I am introducing legislation to keep the Feds from interfering with bake sales by local schools. What is sold in bake sales to help schoolkids in Texas or anyplace across America is, frankly, none of the business of the Federal Government food police.

And that is just the way it is.

RETURN TO REGULAR ORDER

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, the simple truth is that this Congress is the most unaccomplished Congress in the history of the country. The fact is the people's House has become a very undemocratic institution where bills are brought to the floor without hearings, without authorizing committee consideration, where a few leaders make all the major decisions, and where the people's business is constantly ignored in favor of legislation advanced solely for political purposes.

The fact is we need to return to and restore regular order, where every bill brought to the floor of the House is required to be considered by committee, with open rules, where every amendment, every idea is debated, voted on, and fully considered. To do that, the Congress needs to go to work 5 days a week, like everybody else in America.

With that in mind, Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in support of my Restore Democracy Act, H. Res. 695. This bill represents a roadmap to change the way we do politics in America, take the corruptive effect of money out of our politics and return to regular order.

Madam Speaker, it is about time we restore democracy right here in the House of Representatives, the people's Chamber.

THE WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5078, Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act, which is basically going to get boiled down to tell the Federal Government to stay away from our water. There seems to be plans to make every drop of water that falls or pools in the United States Federal waterways; therefore, they can be regulated by Federal regulators.

In our State of Texas, water is as precious as oil. It is the lifeblood of our people and of our economy. Without water, Texas dies. We are not ready to put the control of water in the hands of the inept Federal Government. Water belongs in the hands of the States.

This bill will keep it where it belongs. Support H.R. 5078 and keep the Federal Government out of our water.

MIDDLE CLASS JUMPSTART

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, while House Republicans spend the next 2 weeks bringing up silly partisan bills aimed at embarrassing the President, House Democrats remain focused on the real solutions that matter to the American people.

It is time to put the middle class above partisan politics. It is time to vote to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour and give struggling families a real chance to be in the middle class.

What is wrong with women receiving equal pay for equal work? Let's bring the Paycheck Fairness Act to the floor to make sure that women are treated equally in the workplace.

These bills and many others are part of the Democrats' Middle Class Jumpstart America agenda, a plan to fight for the middle class, put families before special interests, and reignite the American Dream for all those who want to work hard for it.

Let's put partisan politics aside and help the people that are struggling out there in the middle class to get back on their feet.

□ 1215

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government is attempting yet

another power grab in our own backyards. A new rule proposed by the EPA will mandate the most significant expansion of Federal Government water regulation in more than a quarter of a century.

In Florida alone, preliminary costs to projects in eight counties are estimated at over \$182 million. In my district, all this rule will do is make it harder for farmers to grow food and more difficult for local businesses to thrive.

Floridians understand and respect our waterways unlike any other State. Environmentalists, farmers, and businesses have all come together in Florida to protect our environment and eliminate water pollutants. And their efforts are working. The Obama administration, in its never-ending quest to bypass Congress and the States, is seeking to upend this functioning dynamic.

Therefore, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support Congressman STEVE SOUTHERLAND's bill, H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, the news that the White House will not take action this summer on immigration reform came as a huge disappointment, not just to me, but to millions across this country. Our broken immigration system hurts millions of families, and every day that we delay leaves both these families and our economy suffering. But immigration reform can and should come from Congress.

It has been well over a year since the Senate did their job and passed fair, bipartisan legislation that would bring people out of the shadows and on a pathway to citizenship. Let's not blame the President. Here in the House, my friends on the other side of the aisle have not brought the Senate bill to the floor for a vote. That is how we have comprehensive immigration reform not through executive orders. If we held a vote tomorrow, I am confident that it would pass.

Madam Speaker, it is time for my Republican friends to realize the damage that not taking up comprehensive immigration reform does to our Nation every day. This issue is too important to be put on the back burner until after the election. Enough is enough. It is time to bring the Senate bill on comprehensive immigration reform to a vote.

ESTABLISHING FEDERAL GUIDELINES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CUSTODIAL TRANSFERS

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I was first made aware of the practice of re-homing earlier this year when it was discovered that a girl who had been adopted from Haiti was transferred back and forth from an abusive environment in central Iowa, where I live, to Idaho via a Yahoo Internet forum.

Rehoming is the transfer of children into the custody of unvetted strangers without the use of the child welfare system, and currently there is no Federal law prohibiting it. That means there is nothing stopping dangerous and unfit individuals from using online mediums like Craigslist to seek custody and then abuse, neglect, or exploit children.

As a father of two young children, the idea of children being treated as goods or property is reprehensible. Our Nation must address rehoming. That is why I am introducing legislation to establish Federal guidelines and reporting requirements for custodial transfers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help me solve this problem of rehoming.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, Boko Haram's attacks on the people of Nigeria have become more vicious. Their wicked deeds are devastating men, women, and children, Christians, and Muslims. Everyone is a target. Like ISIS, the terrorist organization they align themselves with, Boko Haram, has beheaded hundreds of innocent people, including a 6-year-old Christian boy in June.

Madam Speaker, this week, I am introducing a bill to help combat Boko Haram, and today I am meeting with five of the kidnapped girls who escaped from the terror of Boko Haram.

Madam Speaker, we have a major international crisis to deal with in the Middle East and in Nigeria. Boko Haram has the potential to explode any day, like ISIS. They have killed hundreds, including elected officials.

We shall tweet every day #bringbackourgirls to raise alarm over the kidnapped Nigerian schoolgirls. We must not forget these girls, and we must stop Boko Haram.

Tweet, tweet, tweet: #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet: #followrepwilson.

HONORING OFFICER SCOTT PATRICK

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the Mendota Heights police officer Scott Patrick, who tragically lost his life in the line of duty recently. Officer Patrick was a 19-year veteran of the Mendota Heights police force. He loved his community, and he served it with honor.

Whether he was checking in with accident victims at the hospital or stopping by local businesses for a chat, Officer Patrick will be remembered as somebody who was friendly, who was helpful, and always looking to serve others.

A dedicated family man with two teenage daughters, Officer Patrick would constantly remind his fellow officers to enjoy their days off and make sure that they spent time with their loved ones.

Madam Speaker, Officer Patrick's tragic death reminds us of all the dangers that members of the Thin Blue Line face each and every day in order to help keep our communities safe. His sacrifice will not be forgotten.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Michelle, his daughters, and the Mendota Heights police officers.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to give voice to the 63,000 unaccompanied minors who have sought refuge at our borders since last fall. These vulnerable children have fled terrible violence and poverty in their home countries.

In August, I traveled to McAllen, Texas, where I visited the border with CBP agents, I toured processing centers, and I met with Mexican officials to discuss the issue.

There is no easy or quick solution to this very complex problem, but there are some steps we can take to relieve the crisis: provide resources for shelter and other social services for these children in U.S. custody; encourage economic investments in Central America; assess the effectiveness of U.S. funding for antigang programs in Central America; and increase the number of immigration judges to ensure children move quickly and fairly through the process.

But in the end, this crisis simply underlies the necessity for us to enact comprehensive immigration reform. So I urge the House Republican leadership to listen to the American people and bring this reform to the floor for a vote.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, with the anniversary of 9/11 just a few days away, we are reminded not only of the enormous loss of innocent life and physical destruction that terrorism can bring, but also the long-term, economic harm that follows an attack.

As we have seen with the rise of ISIS, the American people and our interests are always a target and remain under constant threat. With our economy remaining stagnant over the past several years, Congress must make sure we are doing everything we can to protect our citizens and safeguard our fiscal health.

One of the steps we can and must take before the end of this year is to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. This will provide much-needed certainty in the marketplace by making sure that terrorism risk insurance coverage is readily available. This insurance is absolutely key to maintaining our economic security.

Without this reauthorization, we will leave the American people vulnerable to danger that could have been prevented. The Senate has passed a TRIA reauthorization, and I applaud Chairman HENSARLING for passing a TRIA bill through the committee in June. While reasonable people can disagree on how this gets done, we should all agree that it must happen.

THE NEED TO BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

(Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today with pain in my heart and soul. There is not any room in a civilized society for the abuse of anyone, but especially women and girls. I have seen and known women who are victims and survivors. Mother, sisters, and daughters must know that their pain is our pain.

The thought of another human being living in constant fear breaks my heart. Imagine life day in and day out afraid to come home at night and with no safe place in the day. It hurts my soul.

Throughout my life, I have taken a stand against violence in thoughts, in words, and in action. Violence is not in keeping with the human spirit. We do not come into this world beating and abusing our fellow human beings. We learn it from our environment and from our experiences.

Together, we have a moral obligation to teach our children—especially our young men—the way of peace, the way of love, and the way of nonviolence. There can be no place for abuse in our society. Madam Speaker, we must

break this cycle, and we must do it now.

IN DEFENSE OF CHRISTIANS INAUGURAL SUMMIT

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to welcome all those who have traveled to Washington, D.C., this week for the In Defense of Christians Inaugural Summit.

This summit unites human rights groups and religious leaders concerned about the plight of ancient Christian minorities of the Middle East. Many of these ancient churches have survived centuries of hardship, foreign invasion, and domestic despotism.

As we have seen recently in Iraq and Syria, millions are now caught up in the middle of sectarian violence and conflict and end up paying the ultimate price for it.

The bedrock of our Nation's establishment was freedom of religion. But what many experience today, even here in the United States, is the subjugation of religious beliefs by a government or military decree. A people cannot be free without religious liberty.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I welcome all those who are here for the summit, and I commend them for their enduring fight for religious freedom.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5078, WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 644, DISAPPROVAL OF THE ADMINIS- TRATION'S FAILURE TO NOTIFY CONGRESS BEFORE RELEASING INDIVIDUALS FROM GUANTA- NAMO BAY

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 715 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 715

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 644) condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act

of 2014, and makes in order three amendments, all from Democrats, for floor consideration.

It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In addition, this resolution provides for a closed rule for consideration of House Resolution 644, which condemns the administration's clear failure to follow the law requiring 30 days' advance congressional notification if any terrorist detainees at Guantanamo are to be released and condemning this administration's policy of selectively negotiating with terrorists to secure the release of an Army staff sergeant.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

While these are separate issues, the two separate pieces of legislation covered under this rule, unfortunately, share one common theme: the practice of this administration to stretch the law.

As Bill Veeck used to say when he was running his baseball team, he doesn't break the rules, he just tests their elasticity. This administration has tested the elasticity from some of these rules and laws to the point where they have broken, and it is an overreach of the authority under the law.

Madam Speaker, let me talk for just a second about H.R. 5078 that deals with the Clean Water Act. This is a bipartisan bill. It was passed in the committee by a voice vote supported by many State and local governments and has largely been ignored by this administration as the administration seeks to go around Congress and attempt to revise administrative rules asserting a Federal stranglehold on private enterprise and job creation.

One may want to know why the U.S. economy is still in a Jimmy Carter-like malaise situation after 6 years with this administration. Just taking a look at the underlying issue of this bill finds an answer: the administration wants more rulemaking authority, more regulations, and a stronger Federal stranglehold on what you and I can and can't do, what business owners can and can't do, and what farmers can or can't do with their own property.

Clearly, when the Clean Water Act was passed, it specified that the primary responsibility for water issues were to lay with the States. It is very clear when they came up with the concept of navigable waters of the United States, the Federal Government had a jurisdictional interest in interstate water regulations, but not intrastate.

Twice the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled against the agencies that have been managing the Clean Water Act and saying simply that they overstretched their authority, they stretched their limits, and

they stretched what is the power given to them under this particular act.

Now, unfortunately, we see an administration that is trying to move around that. Two Congresses—the 110th and the 111th—had legislation that was introduced to try and change these provisions of the Clean Water Act. Both times they were met with strong bipartisan opposition which didn't go anywhere.

Now, the administration, with much of their work done in closed-door session without local input, are trying to draft a proposed administrative rule that takes the Supreme Court decisions—it misconstrues their decisions and manipulates their decisions, so that, in effect, it turns the cases that we are attempting to put limitations on what the Clean Water Act authorized the government to do and use that as a justification for the Agency to broaden its jurisdiction and increase the controls it has over waters of the United States and individuals. In so doing, it actually harms people.

Overregulation seems to be one of this administration's hallmark. This bill, in a bipartisan manner, will address the proper way to go about modifying the Clean Water Act and its relation to Federal power, such that it will not further stifle jobs, economic growth, or hurt people, while it still protects the environment.

The rule before us is still a good bill. It deals with two vitally important pieces of legislation. I urge their adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

We are back here, and this is our first legislation after a lengthy recess, and the fact of the matter is that, after next week, we will be on yet another lengthy recess headed into the November 4 election.

When we began this session, the 113th Congress, the Speaker of the House commented—and I won't bother to quote him, I will just summarize briefly what he said—that this would be the most open legislative period that we have seen.

Ironically, today, dealing with these two pieces of legislation in this particular rule, we are seeing one portion of it structured, and for the 74th time—count them, 74 times—we are dealing with a closed rule.

What that means, America, is that your Representatives here in the House of Representatives, on the subject of legislation dealing with House Resolution 644, having released Taliban prisoners in exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl, your Representatives will not be able to amend that legislation,

and the general debate period will be the only time that a limited number of Members, in 1 hour, will have an opportunity to speak to the issue.

I think that is wrong, as I think that most of the closed rules previous to this 74th have been wrong. Let me hasten to add, when Democrats were in the majority—and I remember being here in 1993 and hearing on the radio that Democrats were doing closed rules, I had not come to Congress, I didn't understand that dynamic, and Democrats did closed rules as well.

I don't think that is right. I think this body should operate openly. Even if it takes time for us to have Members who choose to come down and debate legislation, I think they should have that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, there is a lot that we could be doing this September. Americans need good-paying jobs. The working poor who are making the minimum wage deserve to make a living wage. We have recently seen demonstrations in 100 cities where people working at \$7.35 or \$8 an hour are demonstrating, saying, "Give me a chance."

While the economy may be, as my good friend from Utah says, in a Carter-like malaise, Wall Street is in a mushroom boom, and somehow or other, the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class is slipping into the lower class.

Something is wrong with that picture, and we can do better as a society. I defy anybody to tell me that if you are a mother or father and you have one child and you work 8 hours a week at \$7.35 an hour anywhere in the United States of America, how do you provide adequate child care, how do you provide the necessary food for your child, and how do you provide the necessary medical services?

I don't believe that anybody believes that that can be done with such a limited amount of resources for a family.

Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own—companies moving all over the world to avoid paying taxes in the United States of America—I believe that those people need help keeping food on the table.

We find students in our country, young people that work here on Capitol Hill, and their brothers and sisters who are graduating from elite institutions, online institutions, for-profit institutions, and State universities throughout this country are faced with crushing debt that keeps them from entering the housing market, keeps them from starting a family, or opening a small business.

I know everybody agrees that women deserve equal pay for equal work, but are we doing any of those things here? No. We are discussing a waterways issue that isn't going to go anywhere fast, and everybody here knows that.

We are discussing the condemnation of the President's administration about a measure that I believe most of us would have done pretty much the same thing, about whether or not there was going to be a 30-day notice to the House of Representatives.

No, we are not dealing with the family situations that exist in this country as it pertains to poverty, we are not dealing at all with equal pay for equal work for women, while the resolution, I repeat, condemns President Obama's administration for action to ensure the safe return of an American soldier, Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl; yet I know my friends on the other side of the aisle celebrate Sergeant Bergdahl's return because this resolution even says it right there in the text.

Here is the quote:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the House of Representatives expresses relief that Sergeant Bergdahl has returned safely to the United States.

I have been taught and all of us here believe, when our military is in harm's way, we have had for years—and more recently, we have made ourselves gender perfect, but for years, we say we leave no man behind, we leave no soldier behind.

I have been on missions with Republicans and Democrats in this particular body in places far away from here, in Korea, where we were looking for the remains of American soldiers to bring them home.

Now, I don't know Bowe Bergdahl, and I certainly don't know his family, but as a citizen of this country, I do know this: five old men in Guantanamo that were exchanged—and yes, indeed, they were former members of organizations that would do us harm, but they are not likely to return to the battlefield at their age.

If so, then old people like me need to be in the war, and probably, we wouldn't have so many in the first place. Are their minds going to be utilized? That may very well be the case, but I don't think all five of them put together were worth as much as one American soldier, Bowe Bergdahl.

Toward that end, I defy anybody to tell me that the Bergdahl family and those of us who believe that we should leave no soldier behind are not pleased. We send our soldiers into harm's way under the American flag, we assure them that they will not be left behind, and President Obama and Defense Secretary Hagel made good on that promise.

Now, I am sorry that you object to how we secured the safe return of one of our soldiers, but you don't get to have it both ways. Instead of bringing bills to the floor that would help our students, that would help those struggling to find jobs, that would help women get the pay they deserve, or help small business owners, we get this resolution which allows that you can

have it both ways. We are glad he is home, but we are not glad about how you brought him here.

Let me say, hurriedly, too that I think President Obama should have given the 30 days' notice. I for one know that this matter in the intelligence community was debated previously, but I don't think anybody believes that we should have left young Mr. Bergdahl behind, and what would we be doing if we were standing here talking about he died in captivity and we had that slight window of opportunity to bring him home.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, the plan for the next 2 weeks is to stoke up the base. These are message measures. That is all they are. It is just saying something so you can go home to your base and argue: Look what we did. We condemned the Obama administration. We repealed health care 52 times.

You aren't passing laws and you aren't doing anything in a cooperative way, institutionally, to allow both sides to have input to measures that are needed in this country in order for us to go forward.

Thursday we will pass a continuing resolution and then we will hear a whole lot of sound and fury signifying exactly nothing but nonsense.

Welcome back, my friends, to Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend from Florida that significant issues need to be addressed on this floor. Nothing is more significant than the future of our water rights, which does impact the economy, especially for areas of interest where that is significant, like agriculture. Because of that, I am glad to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

This rule will expand the regulatory jurisdiction of the EPA and Corps and, in turn, place more restrictions on landowners who will fall under this new umbrella of jurisdiction.

It has been said many times from others that our side is, at best, uncaring about the environment and, at worst, we actually want to make the environment terrible. I think what we have got to deal with here is the Clean Water Act has provided a good parameter and needs to be continued to work because it has a clear direction and a clear parameter of how you bring in bodies of water and what is under that jurisdiction.

I think what has happened here and what is a concern that I have heard from my constituents especially in north Georgia, and all over the country as I have traveled in the past few weeks talking in different parts of the

country, is about what is the actual role in dealing with this waters of the USA and what are we taking jurisdiction from.

This is not just an agricultural issue, Madam Speaker. This is also an internal issue for the rural and urban areas, because what is being talked about here is taking under consideration navigable waterways that have never been thought of in my part of the world, many times, as any more than a dry ditch, and they will simply say: We are not dealing with dry ditches. In fact, a dry ditch will not be uncovered. However, there is a caveat that basically says that when water from that dry ditch flows into another waterway, then it could be considered navigable. And I don't know about anybody else, Madam Speaker, but in my part of the world, I have never seen a ditch run uphill and stop. A ditch is running to somewhere.

This is simply a landgrab that takes land away from owners who could use this land in very productive and very carefully thought-out ways in their own localities and States, and actually takes it away. This is nothing more, frankly, than a landgrab that is based on a desire to put political agendas ahead of property owners. That is why I support the rule and I will support the underlying bill dealing with the Waters of the USA Act.

I rise also in support of our underlying bill, as well. And we have got to understand that the law clearly states the President shall notify Congress of any release of Guantanamo Bay detainees. It clearly states this. And if changing or breaking that law isn't enough, the President released five of the most dangerous detainees held at Guantanamo Bay. These Taliban leaders have orchestrated plans to engage in hostilities against Americans and in association with al Qaeda. By his own admission, there is the possibility that these detainees would return to the fight.

As someone who has been in that fight over the past 10 years and has been over there, they do not need any help. They do not need their poster heroes coming back to them and giving them support, even though they have been off the battlefield. This was wrong.

My friend from Florida says they are message bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, let's be sort of open and transparent, which is what the American people want here. There is not a bill that hits the floor of this House that is not a message bill. It sends a message of the priorities of the Congress. It sends a message of the priorities

of the people that we represent. Yes, they are messaging bills. They are messaging bills for Florida. They are messaging bills for Georgia. They are messaging bills for the American people. What happened in this instance is the message was loud and clear from the executive office, saying: I don't care what the law says, I am going to do it anyway.

That is a bad message, Mr. President, and we need to stop it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would request that Members refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am glad to know that I am personality enough to be recognized.

I understand the passion of my young friend. I also understand an awful lot about the waterways in Georgia and Florida and other areas of the United States of America, and I appreciate his concern.

The message bill that I get from these measures allows that, when we know something is not going to pass the United States Senate and reach a President's desk, then what we are doing in the final analysis is just addressing measures so that we can go to the electorate and claim that we did something when, in fact, we did not. And it is just that simple.

Many of the measures that we have dealt with over the course of the 113th Congress have been just that—measures that were designed to reach the base of the party. And that is a prerogative, but it is not good legislating, and I will stand by that throughout the remainder of this debate and any others that I participate in.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments that were made by the gentleman from Florida just recently, except that I would take exception to the idea that anything that we should bring to this floor has to be generated and has to be passed by the Senate.

I reject the idea that we have to get permission from that body to discuss things here on the floor, and if they allow it to go forward, then, and only then, would we bring something to the floor, because this rule will bring a significant piece of legislation that has to be addressed dealing with a potential rule and regulation that deals with the waters of the United States that could have enormous consequences—enormous consequences not only for the economy of this country, but also for individuals who use the water and live with that water.

We have the potential of actually doing something positive by stopping a bad rule from going into effect by

changing its direction and saying that only Congress should be the one that would change those concepts. Unfortunately, if we don't do that, we end up hurting people. And that is why I want this rule to go forward and I want the underlying bill to go forward on water, because we have to stop hurting people.

Let me give you a story of an old farmer in northern Utah I met when I was first elected. He was a very kindly gentleman because, in his entire ordeal with the Federal Government, I never heard him say an unkind word. I, on the other hand, will spend quite a few years in purgatory about what I was saying about this situation not only verbally but inside my head.

This gentleman had a problem because he was renting a farm that had been a family farm since the 1800s. He was a sugar beet farmer, which, parenthetically, I have to note for the record, is a root crop that cannot be grown in a wetlands.

Nonetheless, his farm was watered by irrigation that came from a valid right that came from a creek that was diverted by a ditch. Around 1905, the creek was diverted to a higher level on the farm so that it would run there, and the old waterbed became vacant. It became part of his sugar beet farm. The water then went through a ditch that irrigated that particular area.

Well, as the farmer for over 80 years, his family was growing sugar beets on this creekbed. As the gentleman's siblings left the farm and his kids didn't want to take it over, this land became his inheritance that would provide for his retirement and an inheritance for his kids to pass on.

It came to the point where it was rezoned by the local community for commercial property, and the company gave him a very decent offer to try and buy his old farm. This was back in 1993. But what it would require is to actually fill up the old riverbed and run a pipe underneath the property so the water would go from the original point over to the neighbors.

Everything was great until the Army Corps of Engineers came by and one Army regulator saw them irrigating the land, which was now used to grow hay and not sugar beets, and declared that, since water was now pooled in this land, it was a wetland. His recognition was that it was a wetland. Now, the fact that no water reached that land if the ditch was shut off didn't stop him from saying: This now is a wetland, and I get to regulate it under the Clean Water Act as waters of the United States.

So the soil and conservation service came in and conducted tests. They drilled 22 holes 8 feet or longer to find out that under the topsoil is a level of clay, so no water would ever percolate up onto this land. The only way you got water there is if you opened the ditch to let water come back. Nonethe-

less, the Army Corps regulator still said: I declare this to be a wetland, and I have jurisdiction over it under the Clean Water Act regulations that we have.

The guy tried to prove his point by putting in a pipe that shows that if you actually ran the water past this area, nothing actually pooled on this land, to which he was threatened with jail time if he did not take the pipe that he owned off the land that he owned from the water right that he owned, actually take that away.

We said: Look, no water actually appears there normally. You go out there and you can break a shovel trying to dig up this wetland. How long will it take before you recognize the fact that this is not a generating wetland?

The regulator said: Well, you know, we are in a drought cycle. So maybe in 7 to 15 years, if no water appears on that land, we will actually not declare this a wetland and allow the owner of the land to actually sell his property for his retirement and his inheritance.

My predecessor started this case. I met the man as I was early elected. Finally, after 10 years of haggling with the regulators of the United States over what is or is not waters of the United States, he simply got tired of doing it. He sold his land at one-quarter of the value that a neighboring piece of property got for the same size but had not been declared as wetlands by a single regulator in the United States.

Now, why is this bill so significant? Because this bill, if not put in some kind of parameters and checks, allows the Federal Government to hurt people. It gives them the power and authority to hurt people. Indeed, the direction that this proposed rule is going would not limit the control the agencies have over people's lives. It would significantly expand it. That is why it is so significant.

It is important for Congress to simply say: No, we will no longer make rules in this country simply by agencies deciding to expand their own control where they have a terrible track record and they actually hurt people. We will say: If you are going to expand it, it has got to be done by Congress—specifically by Congress—and not by rulemaking authority of some agency of the Federal Government.

That is the significance of this piece of legislation. That is why this legislation has to come to the floor. That is why we are not wasting time.

This is not a message issue. This is something where people are being harmed by the agencies of the Federal Government, and Congress must exert its rightful role in trying to rein in these agencies and trying to write the laws so these agencies will not simply abuse people because they have the power to abuse people.

I am sorry, Madam Speaker, but I consider that to be significant. I con-

sider that to be our responsibility. If the Senate doesn't want to take up that responsibility, if the Senate wants to still abuse people, then that can be their prerogative, but it should not limit what we do here in the House in speaking out for our constituents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my good friend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my good friend from Florida.

I listened to my friend from Utah and I heard him make reference to fact that he thought he might be spending some time in purgatory. I just want him to know that I rise in support of him. I want to help him expiate whatever transgressions he has committed and lessen that time in purgatory by opposing this rule. I think that is how we ought to begin.

Madam Speaker, here we go again. Should it surprise any of us that the most antienvironmental House majority is once again engaging in science suppression and denial simply because they don't like the findings and where they take us?

□ 1300

Apparently, the narrative is environmental regulations and rulemaking can only be abuse. My friend from Utah used that word. That is the choice: "Do you like being abused or not?" And I find that not only something I have to reject, but I don't think that is, in fact, the choice we face at all.

I think environmental regulation, since we adopted rigorous standards in 1970 under the Richard Nixon administration, a Republican President, actually has served the American public, by and large, very well, the story my friend from Utah tells about the farmer, the sugar beet farmer, notwithstanding.

There may be anecdotes that are compelling and where, indeed, Federal regulators abuse their authority. That does not characterize rulemaking, and it can't serve as a substitute for protecting, not abusing, the American public and its environmental safety.

We have all grown accustomed to repeated efforts here on the floor to gut important environmental safeguards that protect public health.

All told, my friends on the other side of the aisle have had something like 200 votes to block action to address climate change, to halt efforts to reduce air and water pollution, to undermine protections for public lands, coastal areas, and the ecology. The bill that will be before us if this rule passes is more of the same.

What really should alarm the American public is the House majority's effort to suppress and openly reject science. They have done it in denying climate change. They have done it in

opposing commonsense protections against mercury, lead, and arsenic. And today they want to throw out the scientific findings of the proposed clean waterways rule and prohibit them from being used moving forward.

Where does that end?

This know-nothing kind of approach fails the public we are sworn to protect and serve and again abandons the model of environmental leadership going back to the Republican days of Teddy Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

We, as elected officials, have to recognize the valuable role science must play in making good public policy—not anecdotes, science. I think Neil deGrasse Tyson said it best when he said: “The good thing about science is that it’s true whether you believe in it or not.”

Let’s have science inform our public policymaking and our legislation. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying repeat legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate my friend from Virginia’s effort to try and save my mortal soul. You failed.

Whether it is one person or multiple people being abused, abuse is wrong and, unfortunately, we have two Supreme Court decisions that have said the same thing: the agencies abuse their authority. It is time for Congress to step in.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the two bills that this rule brings before the House today are critical. I have a resolution here adopted by the County Commissioners’ Court and Judge of San Augustine County, and they state the obvious:

Be it resolved that San Augustine County strongly opposes the proposed new rule to define waters of the United States in that it increases the need for burdensome and costly permitting requirements, infringes on private property rights, and circumvents the legislative process, thus, the will of the people.

Be it further resolved that Congress, not Federal agencies, make the laws, and therefore any such change in jurisdictional power of the Federal Government should only occur as a result of the passage of Federal legislation.

We have a power grab in this administration. It goes on and on. That is why it is so critical to take up this bill, to rein in the EPA in this effort at an oligarchy, or actually, a monarchy, where we just have rules spoken into law, or breathed into law in bureaucratic back rooms, taking private property rights away.

This needs to be dealt with on the floor, and that is what this House Republican majority is trying to do.

Now, when it comes to the Taliban Five, it was very clear from the GAO conclusion that “when DOD failed to notify specified congressional committees at least 30 days in advance of its transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to Qatar, DOD used appropriated funds in violation of section 8111 of the law.”

The law goes on, in part, and says that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in the act may be used to transfer any individuals detained at the United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay.

We also find out here, I have seen, today, that the Taliban brothers over in Afghanistan and Pakistan, one with the Taliban Five that have been released, are saying they support and are brothers with the Islamic State that is cutting off the heads of American citizens.

There is no question that the five murdering and complicit murderers that were released back to the Taliban will kill Americans again. They will be complicit in killing Americans again even if their hands don’t actually do that.

So the question I have, and I will yield to anybody that wants to answer it: What do you call somebody who breaks the law to let lawbreaking complicit murderers go free? What do you call somebody that breaks the law to release murderers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am glad to yield to anybody that has an answer.

Madam Speaker, hearing none, the listener, those who have ears to hear, should take note. This is a serious violation. It is not merely an administrative mistake. This has and will cost American lives in violation of United States law. It is time we reined in the lawbreakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would advise my colleague from Utah that I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) to talk about this significant issue.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time from my colleague from Utah, and thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

I was at the Kansas State Fair this past weekend, and the number one issue at the fair was this particular rule coming out of the EPA. I stopped by the booth of the Kansas Farm Bureau, I heard it as I walked through the streets of the state fair: “Ditch the rule.” And that is what we are trying to do here, to make certain that EPA regulators can’t go in the backyards, the farm ponds, the road ditches, every place there might be a drop of water.

This is a radical redefinition from the EPA, unelected, of course, trying to redefine the current language of the Clean Water Act. It is so radical, Madam Speaker, that a Congress controlled by the other side of the aisle even refused to authorize these changes, so the EPA is trying to do an end run, as they have done on numerous other accounts, trying, again, to rewrite clear law in reference to navigable waters.

In western Kansas, where I farm, and where I have most of my constituents, they are worried. What kind of place have we come to in this country in which average ordinary Americans, whom we work for, whom the EPA claims to work for, are worried about those regulators?

The State of Kansas will continue to regulate these issues. The EPA does not need additional authority. They have stepped well beyond the bounds of the authority we have given them as a Congress.

I would encourage my colleagues to allow us to proceed, to move forward on this rule, and then get to the underlying bill, which is to ditch the rule from the EPA.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah for his leadership on this and many other natural resource issues.

All across Oregon, farmers and ranchers and other property owners are walking around their land wondering what the EPA will regulate under the proposed rule to expand its Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

Ranchers in eastern Oregon wonder about their stock ponds. Wheat growers in Columbia Basin worry about an intermittent stream adjacent to a field. Fruit growers in Hood River and onion growers in Ontario are concerned about their irrigation ditches.

This proposed rule is based on faulty science. It underestimates the tremendous harm it poses to our rural economies, so it is no wonder people are concerned.

At a town hall meeting I had in Grants Pass Saturday morning, three of them, 30 people there, this was their number one issue. They are involved in real estate. They are very, very upset, very concerned about what this could do.

Further, this regulatory overreach by the EPA blatantly ignores Congress’ repeated rejection of similar legislative efforts to expand jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act.

Of course, we shouldn’t be that surprised. The EPA has tried this before. They have been rebuked by the Supreme Court, twice in fact, in 2001 and 2006.

The EPA says this new rule was meant to “clarify” the scope of the Clean Water Act, but I have heard across my district how the vague language in this proposal actually creates more uncertainty, not less, more red tape, not less. And for our farmers and ranchers, property owners, and other Oregonians and others that utilize our water and resources, it is a huge threat.

I have long opposed expansion of this authority, whether through legislation or administrative rulemaking. Detrimental action of this size and scope should not be pushed by anyone, much less by unelected bureaucrats.

The economies of rural Oregon and other communities around the country face enough obstacles already. The broken Federal forest policies have strangled our communities, often leaving only agriculture to grow jobs and combat unemployment rates that now are still in double digits.

We don’t need agencies in Washington erecting more hurdles and creating more uncertainty as our farmers and ranchers work to feed the world and create jobs in rural communities. It is time to ditch this rule.

So I applaud Mr. SOUTHERLAND from Florida for writing this bill, and I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER for helping to bring it to the floor. I urge its passage to stop yet another regulatory overreach by a Federal agency out of control, threatening jobs, threatening private property rights, threatening rural communities and our way of life.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) because if anyone can be considered an expert on water issues in the United States, it is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, as well as a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, there is a clear sense in my district, and I believe around the country, that the constant expansion of the Federal Government and its bureaucratic red tape is holding back our economy.

One the worst offenders of government is the overreach of the EPA. The proposed rule they jointly released with the Army Corps attempts to regulate waters that were never intended to be covered under the Clean Water Act, and would grant them authority over streams on land even when the water beds have been dry, in some cases, for hundreds of years. This is a serious threat to both private property rights and our economy.

As the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I have worked along with our subcommittee members to try to rein in EPA’s regulatory overreach.

The fiscal year 2015 bill prohibits the EPA from changing the definition of navigable waters. It is absolutely critical that we uphold the Federal-State partnership and prevent the administration from finalizing a rule that results in the biggest land grab in the history of our country.

So we need to support this rule to bring this important legislation to the floor. And I certainly hope that all the Members will support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

□ 1315

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and passage of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014.

This legislation would stop another unlawful regulatory overreach by the EPA which, in this case, would expand the definition of the waters of the United States. We have all seen that this administration believes it can bypass Congress to create laws through executive rulemaking, and it is flatout wrong.

The administration’s proposed rule could have damaging effects on American property rights, particularly those in Alabama’s largest economic sector, agriculture. Expanding the role of the EPA, as this proposed rule does, to enforce almost all bodies of water, including puddles, small ponds, and ditches, will have a profound and, I fear, a very negative impact on those who produce our Nation’s food and fiber.

As we approach the 227th anniversary of the ratification of the U.S. Constitution, I want to remind my colleagues that the Constitution created three separate but equal branches of government. The Congress writes the laws, not the executive branch.

This is an issue the Congress of elected officials must address, not unelected bureaucrats in Washington. I urge my colleagues to stand for common sense and support H.R. 5078.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, does my friend have additional speakers?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The only one to hear from now is I.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. With that, I am prepared to close, and the only one he has to hear from is I, so we will speak to each other right about now.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would have thought—and I was at home over the past month—that when we came back

here that we would be most immediately discussing matters pertaining to Iraq and the threat from ISIL and Ukraine and the ongoing matters.

I guess I could twist myself into understanding how the particular measure in dealing with the release of prisoners from Guantanamo in exchange for the life of Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl could have some relationship to terrorism at large, but this morning, while I normally do not look at television in the early hours, as I am not a fan of listening to the talking heads, I have to come here and listen to their heads talk.

Toward that end, I did hear this morning the Speaker of the House of Representatives in his daily briefing on the subject of ISIL. All of us anticipate tomorrow that President Obama will speak to the issue and will give us greater clarity as needed, with reference to the administration’s approach to dealing with this particular subject.

I raise it for the reason that I may not get an opportunity to speak further on the floor today or the subject may not be at hand in the continuing resolution, although it may be, since funding is going to be an issue.

I was distressed to hear when the Speaker was asked—you could not hear the queries from four media representatives, but in each instance, his statement was that they were waiting for a strategy from the administration. I don’t think we need to wait for a strategy from the administration.

What I get a little bit tired of is hearing people say that the administration needs a strategy—and they do—without having a strategy of their own. It would be similar to health care. We went through all of that business in trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and we didn’t have a measure come forward from my friends in the majority offering what their plan is.

It is easy enough for us here on the House of Representatives’ floor and in our respective offices in air-conditioned conditions to talk about very complicated matters around the world and then talk about somebody else’s needing a strategy when, in fact, we don’t have one. The Speaker said it—and I heard it eight times—that the President needed to have a strategy, but he refused to say that he has a strategy.

We have a responsibility. Senator KAINE, I, and several others did request that we be called back into session, so that we could discuss this particular matter and give forth the necessary dialogue for authorization to be followed.

Madam Speaker, we are here for 2 weeks, essentially, to finish a continuing resolution. The rest of the time, we will spend dealing with—and I repeat—messaging bills that won’t go anywhere. That is what I mean when I

say a messaging bill: you know it isn't going to pass, and when you know it isn't going to pass, all you are doing, whether you consider it significant or not, is offering up a message for your base. You are entitled, but let's not kid anybody about what we are doing.

We need to stop calling this Congress the least productive ever because that implies that the Congress did something, in some kind of way or another, but not enough.

In reality, this Congress—and this House specifically—far from being unproductive, has actively been destructive and obstructive and detrimental to the interests of hardworking Americans, repeatedly trying to undo the fixes to our broken health care system, quite frankly, and offering none; defunding programs that help Americans who have fallen on hard times, not even passing measures to extend unemployment insurance; refusing to move on immigration reform and then casting aspersions when all of us know that our immigration system is broken.

Yet we here in the House of Representatives in this instance—not in the Senate, which did pass a bipartisan measure—will not even put an immigration measure on the floor. No matter who said that they would do something when, I am saying that all you have to do is put it on the floor, and I promise you that we could pass immigration reform.

Yet we refuse to address climate change, and all of the naysayers—I spoke to a group that produced energy, along with one of my Republican colleagues and one of my Democratic colleagues, during the break. During that period of time, I said, “Do you know something? Something is happening here. You can call it science, or you can call it anything you want, but something is happening here.”

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman was not here earlier, and I am in closing, but I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), if there is something she wishes to add.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, for his time, and for his very eloquent words.

Very quickly, Madam Speaker, as I indicated in the Rules Committee, what poor timing for a resolution, in the midst of a crisis with ISIS, to be able to criticize the President for using his constitutional powers, and now, in a debate on ISIS, why he isn't doing something. The American people are confused. This is the wrong time for the wrong resolution. It has no purpose.

I am grateful that Sergeant Bergdahl is home. We don't leave our soldiers behind. We looked at the heinous killing of our two precious journalists. Now, we are asking for the great leadership of this administration, which it has

been doing, but this resolution is wrong.

It is misdirected in law, and it is conflicting with law, and we have already addressed the question. I am not condemning the administration. I believe that this resolution should be pulled off the floor.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H. Res. 644, and the underlying resolution.

I oppose the resolution because at bottom it is nothing more than another partisan attack on the President and will make it difficult for this body and the Administration to find the common ground and goodwill needed to devise and support policies needed to address the real threats and challenges facing our country, particularly the threat posed by ISIS.

H. Res. 644, a resolution disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to provide Congress with 30 days advance notice before making the transfer of certain Guantanamo detainees that secured the release of an American soldier, U.S. Army Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl.

Sgt. Bergdahl's health was poor and rapidly deteriorating at the time his release from captivity was secured by his Commander-in-Chief, President Obama, who speaking for the nation, said on June 3, 2014 in response to critics of his decision:

The United States has always had a pretty sacred rule, and that is: we don't leave our men or women in uniform behind. Regardless of the circumstances, we still get an American soldier back if he's held in captivity. Period. Full stop.

Madam Speaker, the resolution condemns the Obama Administration for failing to comply with the 30-day advance notice requirement imposed by Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) and section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76).

I disagree for several reasons. First, as Defense Secretary Hagel testified before the House Armed Services Committee on June 11, 2014, “this was not simply a detainee transfer, but a military operation with very high risk and a very short window of opportunity that we didn't want to jeopardize—both for the sake of Sergeant Bergdahl, and our operators in the field who put themselves at great risk to secure his return.”

As a military operation, rather than a routine transfer of detainees, the President had the constitutional authority as Commander-in-Chief to authorize this sensitive military operation for which time was of the essence.

The resolution put forward by the House majority assumes that the provisions of Section 1034 of National Defense Authorization Act trump the President's constitutional authority under Article II if the two are in conflict. This clearly is an erroneous assumption since Article VI of the Constitution makes clear that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and prevails in the event of a conflict with federal or state law. See, e.g., *INS v. CHADHA*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) (federal law conferring “legislative veto” power to be exercised by only House of Congress held unconstitutional).

But even if it were less clear whether a conflict existed between a federal law and the

President's authority as Commander-in-Chief, as Justice Robert Jackson pointed out 62 years ago in the famous “Steel Seizure Case,” *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 640 (1952), it does not automatically follow that the President has “broken the law” if he relies upon his claimed constitutional authority:

[B]ecause the President does not enjoy unmentioned powers does not mean that the mentioned ones should be narrowed by a nigardly construction. Some clauses could be made almost unworkable, as well as immutable, by refusal to indulge some latitude of interpretation for changing times. I have heretofore, and do now, give to the enumerated powers the scope and elasticity afforded by what seem to be reasonable, practical implications instead of the rigidity dictated by a doctrinaire textualism.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, it should be pointed out that the constitutionality of Section 1035, the statutory provision which the resolution asserts the President has violated, has never been upheld by any court, and certainly not upheld against a challenge that it impermissibly infringes upon the President's duty as Commander in Chief to protect the lives of Americans abroad and to protect U.S. servicemembers.

The Administration strongly objected to the inclusion of Section 1035 in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2014, on the ground that it unwisely and inappropriately interferes with the Executive Branch's ability to manage detainees in a time of armed conflict.

Indeed, the President has informed Congress of his objection to the inclusion of these and similar provisions in prior versions of the Defense Authorization and Defense Appropriations Act in law, and it is interesting to note that they only began to be inserted after President Obama assumed the office.

Madam Speaker, not only is the resolution before us ill-conceived and unwise, its timing could not be worse.

There are only a few days left before the Congress adjourns. We need to devote all our time on addressing the real problems facing the American people, like raising the minimum wage, making college more affordable, passing immigration reform, and responding to the threat to the security of the nation and the homeland by ISIS.

Madam Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is serious and real and the President has reached out to Congress to work with him to develop a unified and international response to meet the threat.

And tomorrow evening, the President will address the nation on the nature of the ISIS threat and the actions the United States will take to protect the security of the nation and the homeland.

In the midst of this international crisis, it does not help or strengthen our country for the House to be debating a partisan resolution condemning the President and Commander-in-Chief.

In concluding, let me quote again Defense Secretary Hagel:

The options available to us to recover Sergeant Bergdahl were few, and far from perfect. But they often are in wartime, and especially in a complicated war like we have been fighting in Afghanistan for 13 years. Wars are messy and full of imperfect choices.

In the decision to rescue Sergeant Bergdahl, we complied with the law, and we did what we believed was in the best interests of our country, our military, and Sergeant Bergdahl.

The President has constitutional responsibilities and authorities to protect American citizens and members of our armed forces. That's what he did. America does not leave its soldiers behind.

We made the right decision, and we did it for the right reasons—to bring home one of our people.

I hold to the beliefs of the role of Congress in any declaration of war and the value and purpose of the Administration adhering to the rules of consultation with Congress. In this instance the administration explained its reasoning and Congress already through committee hearings expressed its disagreement. This resolution is nothing but political and wholly without purpose and just simply wrong.

Madam Speaker, we should not waste this precious time remaining on matters intended to score political points or to hold the current President to standards we never applied to his predecessors.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Continuing, Madam Speaker, my friends in the majority shut the government down. I didn't think that was helpful. The matter of not dealing with immigration reform and climate change, I don't think, makes our country better. Their attempts to mold a conservative utopia can never work outside the pages of novels.

This is a House whose leadership judges success not by how it has improved the lives of families in this country, but how successful it was to thwart the President of the United States. This is a body that would rather be trapped in gridlock than to go about the business of the country.

So we will live through these next 2 weeks, and then we will return to our districts. What will we tell our constituents that we accomplished in the House of Representatives in the 113th Congress? We will tell them that we condemned the President for refusing to leave an American prisoner of war behind.

How far are we going to follow an extreme fringe minority down this path into poverty? We have got 2 weeks. Once again, House Republicans are proving that they would rather put partisan politics and petty intrigue first and discredit the President than to govern responsibly and address the many challenges facing our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, in closing, historically, the wise use of water has made the desert bloom, but much of my time and some of the most egregious problems that I face deal with the overreach of executive agencies when it comes to water. To claim that their tactics are arbitrary

and capricious would be overly generous.

The bottom line is the Supreme Court has twice said that the executive branch agencies have overreached their authority. Twice there was legislation to try to expand that authority, which failed miserably, and now what the Supreme Court said they could not do and what Congress would not grant them to do, the agencies are trying to accomplish by creating a rule to give them powers that they ought not to have.

That—I am sorry, Madam Speaker—is simply wrong. The reason it is wrong is that it hurts people. People trying to live their lives find themselves frustrated by executive agency overreach.

That is why Congress must indeed pass not only this resolution and rule, but also the underlying bill, and it must move forward to make sure that Congress controls these issues in the future, not an executive branch agency. I have to reiterate that this rule is fair, and the underlying legislation is appropriate.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 179, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert

Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)

Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty

Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Sherman	Titus	Wasserman
Sires	Tonko	Schultz
Slaughter	Tsongas	Waters
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Waxman
Speier	Vargas	Welch
Swalwell (CA)	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Vela	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bucshon	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Jones	Nadler
Cicilline	King (IA)	Nunnelee
Clark (MA)	Lee (CA)	Poe (TX)
Clarke (NY)	Lynch	Rush
Davis, Rodney	Maloney	Sewell (AL)
DesJarlais	Carolyn	Tierney
Dingell	Meng	Velázquez

□ 1352

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Messrs. MORAN, BARROW, and COHEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 484 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 484, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 484, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5078.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 715 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5078.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1356

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the Congressman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), who is the original sponsor of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

I think it is a thoughtful piece of legislation.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the efforts of you and Ranking Member RAHALL, and those efforts, how they have advanced this bipartisan piece of legislation. I would also like to thank Subcommittee Chairman GIBBS for giving this issue the urgent attention that it deserves.

For more than 40 years, America's waters have been made cleaner and safer by a balanced regulatory partnership between the States and the Federal Government. The basis for this partnership was a commonsense understanding that not all waters are subject to Federal jurisdiction and that the States must have the primary responsibility for regulating waters within their own boundaries.

But, now, decades of success have been put at risk under the guise of clarifying the scope of the Federal jurisdiction.

Under its proposed rules, Federal agencies like the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers would see their regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act drastically expanded, to the point of covering almost any body of water throughout America, from ditches to culverts to pipes to watersheds to farmland ponds.

This would have devastating consequences on virtually every major section of our economy, including farming, construction, manufacturing, transportation, and energy development.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014. Our bipartisan bill draws a line in the sand that preserves the critical Federal-State partnership in place today.

By preventing the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from finalizing or implementing the proposed rule, we are providing a safeguard against the Federal Government's overreach into regulatory decisions best made by officials at the State and local levels.

We are also requiring the EPA and the Corps to consult with the State and local officials to form a consensus proposal on the scope of the future water regulations under the Clean Water Act.

This bill is not anti-environment. It is not anti-clean water. Our bill preserves the partnership we have had in place for years to strengthen the

health of our waterways and manage our water quality, and it does so in a way that maintains certainty for our job creators.

□1400

For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5078.

In proposing its latest version of regulations defining “waters of the United States,” the EPA claims to be attempting to provide clarity. It claims to be attempting to provide certainty for multitudes of Americans who have been left perplexed by Clean Water Act jurisdiction for many years.

Without a doubt, confusing and conflicting Supreme Court decisions have helped to create a regulatory jumble. But the EPA's proposed new regulations are doing little, if anything, to clear and calm those murky and roiling regulatory waters.

These proposed regulations have only stirred up more worry, aggravation, and, frankly, anger. In truth, the only certainty that these regulations provide is the sure knowledge that, under them, anyone undertaking nearly any activity involving so much as a ditch in the United States will have to deal with the bureaucracy known as the EPA.

I stand here today voicing the sheer dread and utter frustration of enterprises and individuals across southern West Virginia—from coal miners and coal mining families to farmers and farming families to builders and businesses, large and small. We have seen firsthand how this EPA uses its limited legal authorities to drive a broad and growing ideological agenda. We have seen this EPA use permits to threaten our coal industry, browbeat our State, and elbow out other federal agencies. And we have witnessed this EPA's cold and callous disregard for how its politically driven agenda is affecting the lives of hardworking West Virginia families.

The proposed regulations concerning “waters of the United States” certainly amount to an expansion of EPA's reach into waters never before envisioned by the Congress to be subject to the Clean Water Act. They would stake out Federal Government oversight of areas long reserved to the States. If implemented, they would entail more than a power grab; they would result in a land grab, enabling EPA to dictate to more and more citizens just how they can use their own property.

I stand with our coal miners, our farmers, our builders, and our manufacturers. Our citizens need—and certainly they are owed—clarity and certainty. For the EPA to claim that

these proposed regulations answer that need, well, one has to wonder just what is in the water over at the EPA headquarters.

I support the pending measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1-1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), the chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014.

Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns about the administration's proposal to redefine the scope of jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and the unilateral approach the agencies took developing this rule. The agencies' attempt to expand their jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act will have serious consequences for the Nation's economy, threaten jobs, and restrict landowners from making decisions about their property.

In my subcommittee hearing earlier this year, we discovered that the EPA could not identify a single State that supports this rule. Under the Clean Water Act, the States are supposed to act as coregulators with the Federal Government, and this partnership has enjoyed much success over the years. It is unfortunate that the agencies have chosen to take a closed-door approach to this rulemaking instead of engaging in a proper and transparent process working with their State counterparts.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5078 will put an end to the EPA's overreach and will ensure that any new rule is adopted openly and responsibly, and takes into consideration the concerns of the State, local governments, and other stakeholders. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all Members to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very honored at this time to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), the distinguished ranking member of our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment on our Transportation Committee, although we are not in full agreement on this measure.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and our ranking member from West Virginia for yielding and for his leadership on the T&I Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5078. Last session, the Republican majority pushed through a rider to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to block this administration from using Agency guidance to clarify how they would interpret two confusing decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court that called into question the protections of the Clean Water Act over our Nation's waters.

At that time, the Republican majority claimed that this use of administra-

tion guidance was unprecedented and in violation of the law, notwithstanding the fact that the previous administration followed the exact same process in issuing two guidance documents which, coincidentally, remain in force today. In fact, it is these two Bush-era guidance documents that have compounded the confusion, uncertainty, and increased compliance costs faced by our constituents today.

But don't take my word on this. Let me quote from some of the comments made in opposition to the Bush-era guidance. According to the American Farm Bureau Federation and others:

With no clear regulatory definitions to guide their determinations, what has emerged is a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories.

Again, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation and others:

The Bush administration guidance is causing confusion and added delays in an already burdened and strained permit decision-making process, which ultimately will result, and is resulting, in increased delays and costs to the public at large.

Finally, according to the Waters Advocacy Coalition:

Until a comprehensive set of rules regarding which water bodies the agencies will regulate is promulgated, the public and Agency field staff will be beleaguered by partial answers, confusing standards, and ad hoc, overbroad, and arbitrary decisions pertaining to the scope of Federal jurisdiction.

In April of 2011, over 150 Members of this House wrote to the Environmental Protection Agency and to the Corps requesting that a proposed guidance document of the Obama administration be reconsidered. In that letter, these Members suggested:

If the administration seeks to make regulatory changes to the Clean Water Act, a notice-and-comment rulemaking is required.

In the intervening months, this is exactly what the administration has done. In 2012, the administration chose to withdraw the proposed 2011 guidance document and instead pursued a notice-and-comment rulemaking to address much of the confusion, uncertainty, and increased costs surrounding the scope of the Clean Water Act protections.

However, many of these same Members who asked for a formal rulemaking are now vehemently opposed to this rulemaking going forward. I have to ask why? Are these Members opposed to providing greater clarity on the scope of Federal Clean Water Act protections? Are they opposed to trying to reduce the confusion and uncertainty facing our regulated communities while at the same time trying to ensure that our network of waters and wetlands are protected from pollution or destruction?

Opponents of this rulemaking are trying to portray this as a Federal attempt to regulate birdbaths, puddles, and driveways, but both common sense and the testimony of representatives of

the EPA and the Corps before our committee would confirm that these were never subject to Clean Water Act jurisdiction, nor would they be subject to the act under the administration's proposed rule.

In short, this is not a debate about the Federal Government trying to regulate someone's backyard birdbath, but it is about ensuring that those waters and wetlands that provide hundreds of millions of Americans with their drinking water, provide vital protection to our towns and communities, and provide valuable habitat to our native fish and wildlife are protected.

Mr. Chairman, to be fair, several of my own constituents have expressed concern with the substance of the proposed rule. I have listened to their concerns, and I have pressed the Agency witnesses who have appeared before our subcommittee on several critical areas. I have questioned the agencies to ensure that the scope of the proposed rule lives solely within the confines of the two Supreme Court decisions on this matter; otherwise, such changes would require an act of Congress.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for Agency assurance that this proposed rule does not expand the scope of the Clean Water Act jurisdiction over what was covered by prior rulings of the Supreme Court. Again, I have been assured that this is the case.

I have asked the Agency staff to clarify that these proposed rules do not eliminate any existing statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, including activities on prior converted cropland. Again, we have been assured by the Agency that all of the existing exemptions for farming, silviculture, and ranching in the current Clean Water Act and regulations remain in place.

In my view, this is not a perfect proposed rule—few are—but it does establish a reasonable process for providing additional clarity on Clean Water Act protections that we desire. To suggest that the solution is to simply throw out this proposed rule and to forever leave the regulated community with the current regulatory morass simply makes no sense.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 5078. I thank the ranking member for his indulgence.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, recently, I met with about 600 farmers at an annual gathering in my district which we call Dinner on the Farm, where local farmers express

their concerns over the negative impact EPA's proposed regulations would have on their businesses.

The Michigan Farm Bureau actually showed me this map of my district which shows what could be subject to Federal regulation if the proposed EPA rule is actually adopted. And highlighted are the water sources that would be impacted. It actually excludes wetlands because then it would cover my entire district, including just about anything that includes moisture.

Mr. Chairman, this is another shocking example of this administration trying to do an end run around the Congress and the legislative process with more overreaching regulations that will drive up food prices for American families.

By stopping the EPA from expanding their scope and requiring the Agency to coordinate with States, this legislation will help to protect this Nation's agricultural community from Federal overreach that threatens their livelihood and ultimately this Nation's economic success.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a very valued member of our committee. He is also the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. It is unfortunate that we are here today. We have departed from reality, which would be the districts we represent, where I just spent 5 weeks, and now we are back inside the Beltway. And we are doing things in this case that we know will never become law, but we do have an opportunity actually to do something real and allay the concerns—legitimate concerns—of farmers, ranchers, and others who feel that the EPA is either overreaching or has written a somewhat garbled rule. I would agree with that.

But instead of approaching it in a measured way and saying we want to be certain that you are not doing this, and we want to be certain that you are doing this, this would say that anything and everything that they have considered over the last 2 years in developing this rule is now ineligible for future consideration. Well, what does that mean? Well, it means that the determination that certain things are exempt, well, we probably can't revisit those. Can we use the Court's decision or any of those documents? Seems not.

So where do we end up if this cockamammy thing passes the House and becomes law—which it won't? Well, where we end up is back in the earlier era of the 2003 and 2008 guidances. And many of the groups that are here today supporting this unbelievably broad overreach are actually groups who had objected strenuously to what the Bush administration did in the 2003 guidance and the 2008 guidance.

Here is a quote from the American Farm Bureau, 2003:

No clear regulatory definitions to guide their determinations. What has emerged is a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories.

2008, American Farm Bureau:

Guidance is causing confusion, added delays in an already burdened and strained permit decisionmaking process which ultimately will result and is resulting in increased delays and costs to the public at large.

Then, on the other side, groups such as the National Wildlife Federation and Ducks Unlimited also found the objections of the 2003 and 2008 guidances to be totally inadequate, and, of course, the Supreme Court itself split 4-1-4 on one of the guiding documents behind this.

□ 1415

So instead of wading in, rolling up your sleeves, and acting like legislators, you are acting like idiot ideologues here today. You are saying nothing that was considered in developing this rule can ever be used again to develop a future rule. What does that mean? That means you are stuck with a 2003-2008 guidance, which all these groups found to be disturbingly inconsistent, expensive, causing unnecessary delays, and we need new guidance. We do need new guidance. We do need new definition.

There are some who have the agenda of wanting to repeal the Clean Water Act altogether. Let's go back to the good old days, when you could light a match and watch the Cuyahoga River burn or when the Willamette River in Oregon was an open sewer. Let's go back to those good old days before the Clean Water Act.

No, I don't think the American people want to go there, and I don't think a majority in this House want to go there, but instead of fixing and limiting the problems and the potential defects of this incompetent rulemaking that is ongoing and is, at this point, only proposed, perhaps the Agency itself will wake up and withdraw and revise the rule.

That is what public comment periods are all about; but no, we are going to preempt it before then and say nothing that went into developing this rule can ever be considered again in developing another rule. You are stuck with something that doesn't work, which these same groups object to.

It is just very sad that we aren't a legislative body anymore. You take someone who has got a tough race, you give them a bill, they go out and rah-rah-rah, they pretend they did something, and they go home and get re-elected, instead of really doing something.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the gentleman from Oregon to go back and read the second part of the bill—the last half of the bill. He may find a little different perspective on it.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member as well.

I stand in strong support of H.R. 5078 because it represents another administration overreach that will impact our entire economy. Under the vague regulation proposed by the EPA and the Corps, Federal power will grow and tie up our agriculture, construction, and energy industries in even more red tape.

Expanding the scope of Federal jurisdiction will require many more Clean Air permits, which will mean more permitting delays, and more permitting delays mean fewer jobs.

During the August recess, I traveled all across the State of West Virginia and met with farmers who were particularly concerned, construction workers, miners, and many others, who are very, very upset about the EPA's regulatory assault that is costing us West Virginia jobs.

We should support this bill today, reject this proposed rule, and send Federal officials back to the drawing board to work with State and local leaders on a jurisdictional water rule that makes sense for our economy and our environment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), a strong supporter, the cosponsor of this legislation, original cosponsor of it, and the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

As others have said, H.R. 5078 would prohibit the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers from redefining waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act.

The bill would also prohibit implementation of the interpretive rule for agriculture which, while it probably was meant to provide some clarity to farmers and ranchers, only creates more confusion and is bad for agriculture.

This legislation is necessary because, in my view, the EPA does not seem to understand the real world effects that these regulations will have on farmers across the country.

We still don't have any clear definition of a wetland in agriculture, an issue that is dating back to the eighties and nineties. Maps used by the USDA were unclear then and often mislabeled wetlands. This rule would not clarify it. It would only add more to the uncertainty that we are facing in that regard.

In my State, the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service has done

a great job working with farmers to encourage voluntary conservation efforts. This rule would severely disrupt those positive efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 24½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

For 4 decades, the Clean Water Act has worked as a strong partnership between the Federal Government and the States. This bill protects that partnership against the proposed rule from the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers.

I have heard from many of my constituents that this rule would force them to prove that large mud puddles and ditches on their property are not federally regulated waters.

However, the new definition of Federal waters is so vague that it is impossible to know what standards you will need to prove. This rule will cost my constituents time, money, and jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill because sometimes a mud puddle is just a mud puddle.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a very powerful lady on the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking member on Energy and Water Development.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, for his great leadership and consider it a privilege to speak today.

Let me inform this House why it should vote down this death bill—yes, death bill.

This is a jar of algae, toxic to humans and animals. It was just drawn from Lake Erie, one of our great freshwater lakes, a drinking source for some 11 million people.

On August 2, this green muck filled with toxic microcystin surrounded the Toledo drinking water intake, leaving over half a million people with no safe drinking water for 3 days. It almost seemed surreal. One of America's biggest cities and regions with no fresh drinking water.

Now, the region that our watershed drains is 85 percent agricultural. How fortunate we are. In fact, it is the largest watershed in the entire Great Lakes, but allowing farm field runoff of manures and fertilizers, applied at four times the rate of 20 years ago, with excessive phosphorous and nitrogen that feed the growth of this green muck, is simply no longer acceptable.

The number of people who live in our tristate watershed totals 2 million, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and of course, with Canada even more; but the number of animals in the watershed is 10 to 15 times the human population. The manure load of those animals—compared to 20 years ago—spread on the land, even in the wintertime, contributes, with increasing rainfall, to the pollution that then drains to places like Toledo.

Utility rates are going up—what are they going to do? How are they going to afford the bills to pay to clean up the pollution from a massive tristate and, indeed, international watershed?

Instead of helping clean up our water for future generations, this Republican bill takes America backwards. Do you know what I say? Shame on you. Shame on you.

Today, the United States Environmental Protection Agency recognizes that harmful algal blooms are a major environmental problem in all 50 States, with severe impacts on human health.

The Toledo water plant and what happened to us is a severe warning for our country, and we better pay attention. Communities are incurring massive costs for water treatment as a result of pollution and toxic algae because our water plants have to somehow clean this mess up and then send fresh drinking water to our citizens. These costs are being paid not by the polluters, but by the ratepayers downstream at the receiving end of the muck—how unfair.

I am back here in Washington, fighting for our lake. Our citizens must turn this green muck back into blue water to sustain life itself. One of the ways we start is by defeating this bill. It is an embarrassment to the country at this point in our history.

I can tell you, to the people who still don't know what their future holds in places like Toledo and along Lake Erie, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Reject the dead water direction in which it leads America because it isn't just this generation, but it is those that follow that we should be voting for here in this House. I urge defeat of this measure.

I want to thank Congressman RAHALL and those who understand what it takes to build a great nation. Let us do something worthy in our time and generation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5078.

As you have heard from many Members today, the EPA's proposed rule is a clear overstep of authority. Back in my home State of Oklahoma, ranchers and farmers have been very clear that this rule would significantly limit their operations.

As a rancher myself, I understand and agree with their concerns. The def-

inition of "navigable waters," as stated and written by the EPA, would put all farmers and ranchers on notice that they are no longer in charge of their own land. From now on, they will have to ask permission to get a permit or to operate their own land the same way they have for many years.

In summary, this would be an unprecedented land grab by our government through the EPA and the bureaucrats of Washington, D.C. The EPA is simply out of touch with rural America.

I stand with our farmers and our ranchers when I say it is time to stop the EPA's overreach and their redefinition of navigable waters.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who is leaving this august body, but certainly, we will continue to rely upon his wisdom and friendship, wisdom that is except on this particular bill, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Interior and Environment on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend from West Virginia, and I understand where we sit is where we stand. The gentleman has always been in the forefront of protecting his citizens in West Virginia and his workforce, including the mine workers of West Virginia, and I fully understand that, but nevertheless, I rise in opposition to this regressive legislation.

With very few days remaining before this Chamber adjourns, we are wasting what limited floor time remains debating a legislative proposal that this Chamber has already passed and the Senate has rejected.

Today, we will be voting for the 218th time—the 218th time this session—to weaken existing laws that protect our health and the environment that we depend upon.

Later this week, we will vote for the 53rd time to weaken the Affordable Care Act, which the American people are beginning to realize is actually working on their behalf.

None of these measures that have passed this session or will pass the House this week will become law. The President has already said if it passes, he will veto it, and my friend knows that. In fact, he reminded me. We know he is going to veto that if it were to pass, so you would think this is kind of a misguided and wasteful use of this institution.

We are planning on only 6 full legislative days before the election, and we are using one of those days on such a fruitless exercise. How about addressing the problems at our border or passing an extension of unemployment benefits or even passing a budget, which is one of our most basic responsibilities?

Instead of doing something useful and productive that might become law,

we will again vote on a measure to prevent the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing their joint proposed rule clarifying the limits of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act.

□ 1430

This is what the Supreme Court instructed us to do. This rule is necessary. It is our responsibility. EPA and the Corps of Engineers need to clarify their authority because there is a lot of confusion on what falls under the protection of the Clean Water Act following two Supreme Court rulings.

Clarity will also help the States that use the Federal definition to operate their State water protection programs. Ninety percent of what the EPA does is in fact carried out by the States.

The proposed rule clarifies that most seasonal and rain-dependent streams are not affected. Wetlands near rivers and streams are not included. Other types of waters that may have more uncertain connections with downstream water will be evaluated through a case-specific analysis of whether the connection is or is not significant. EPA and the Corps have encouraged recommendations from the public for how best to determine whether a water body has a significant connection to downstream waters.

My colleagues, an estimated 59 percent of all stream miles in the lower 48 States fall into the category of intermittent or ephemeral—they don't exist for part of the year—yet they receive 40 percent of all individual wastewater discharges. That is what the problem is. More than 117 million Americans get some of their drinking water from these very streams that don't flow year-round. Shouldn't their drinking water be safe from toxic elements?

If this measure were to be enacted, it would only ensure that the confusion continues and that these sources of drinking water remain a serious risk to the public's health. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today against an unlawful expansion of Federal power. The EPA's attempt at an unprecedented power grab will ultimately saddle hardworking Americans, small businesses, and farmers with new, onerous regulatory burdens.

Under this proposed new rule, the EPA will be able to claim jurisdiction over almost all bodies of water in the U.S. So, along with the bays and rivers, EPA's hand will extend over streams, ponds, ditches, and even storm water runoff. Beyond sounding ridiculous, this rule will impact farmers, energy producers, and any private citizens

that use their land for economic or recreational purposes. It is harmful and unnecessary.

I live in the West. The West is burdened right now with the drought. Some of that drought is based upon excess regulations that choose fish over people, and that water will run out to the ocean because of a regulation and a lawsuit.

I have seen where regulatory effects and burdens have gone before. I have a town in my community called Taft. It is a hardworking town like many of you have. The EPA has been a part of it before. It is a town that could be anywhere in America.

Taft had a waterway, the EPA said, called Sandy Creek. The only challenge, though, in Sandy Creek is it was a dry ditch. It had been dry for 30 years. So when they came to me and they wanted to be able to move forward, they found that the Federal Government was trying to impose a permitting regulation of excess regulation on this private land. I had to personally call them, and they said: No, you cannot do it because of the creek. I had to drive an individual all the way out to the dry dirt and sit them in the dry creekbed until finally they said "yes."

Under the new bill, Sandy Creek will not be dry anymore because that burdensome regulation can possibly be back on them. It could be redesignated, and we will not be able to grow again.

Mr. Chairman, we are struggling with job creation in America. We are struggling with small businesses trying to make ends meet. Milk prices are at an alltime high. Why would we burden America with more regulation? Why would we not unshackle what holds us back and let us be able to grow and let people keep their private land and protect our water, but do it in a sense that has common sense?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART), who is on the Agriculture Committee and an original sponsor of the legislation. He has been of tremendous help in moving this forward.

Mr. ENYART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of this legislation and to share my concern about overreaching jurisdiction in the proposed rulemaking expanding the reach of the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers.

I have spent the last 5 weeks talking to constituents in my district, meeting with landowners, and discussing legislation with my agriculture advisory committing, talking to leaders from small communities and large cities alike.

Again and again, I hear the same thing: southern Illinoisans believe the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA went too far rewriting the Federal Government's jurisdiction over waters of

the United States. The Federal Government is claiming to have jurisdiction over small private property waterways.

The biggest concerns voiced by constituents were over the new areas that would become waters of the U.S. Under the proposed rule, many ditches, small ponds, and low spots in fields could be considered within the purview of the Federal Government.

Farmers and growers already protect their waters. They need it for livestock, orchards, soybean fields, and cornfields. Our Nation's farmers are the first conservationists of our time.

Additionally, I am further concerned about the lack of scientific analysis and economic outlook used to determine the scope of jurisdiction. Our farmers, land owners, communities, and our country's waterways deserve better planning than this. They deserve detailed studies and thoughtful execution. Our constituents sent us to Washington to keep their best interests in mind, not to pile on more red tape in a blanket fashion.

I urge you to join me and take into consideration those who will be affected by the proposed expansion of the EPA and the Corps' power.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the EPA is at it again, this time with an overly burdensome rule that would expand their reach and power to regulate under the Clean Water Act.

I have heard from roadbuilders, homebuilders, and small businesses who are concerned about this overreach. In particular, farmers in my district are very concerned that this rule could add new permitting requirements for farming activities like irrigation ponds and drainage ditches.

That is right. The EPA, which is the same Agency that inexplicably released the personal information of livestock producers, is now telling farmers "just trust us" when it comes to this new rule. There is a trust gap between the EPA and the agricultural community. One of my priorities is trying to bridge that gap.

Instead of this proposed rule, the EPA and the Corps of Engineers should engage with States and local governments to produce a more commonsense approach to regulating our waterways.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, the WOTUS Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and in opposition to the EPA's Waters of the U.S. Act.

I represent Pinellas County, Florida, a district that lies between the Gulf of Mexico and Tampa Bay, surrounded by water and prone to flooding and storm runoff. So, like many coastal communities, this is an important issue to us.

EPA issues can be divisive—we know that—but they need not be. My message today is not one of anger. It is simple common sense. We can do better. The EPA can do better and the Corps can do better.

This is not a debate over clean water. Everybody in this body supports clean water. But this is a debate over the expanded jurisdiction of a Federal Agency and the current overreach of that Agency. In this case, this legislation is opposed by a variety of interests, from agriculture, shopping centers, chambers, homebuilders, manufacturers, transportation interests, but very importantly, by counties and mayors like many in my district who spoke to me in August.

We are called as Members of this body to represent our communities. Let's do that today. Let's represent the interests of our communities. This is not a moment for "Washington knows best," because Washington does not know best in this case.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better. In this case, let's send it back and insist on a better rule.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

The Environmental Protection Agency is once again seeking to overstep its authority, and we are here to remind them of the balance of powers.

This year, EPA proposed a rule to redefine the waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act. This rule expands Federal control of land and water resources across the Nation. This rule would trigger an onslaught of additional permitting and regulatory requirements to protect not our great natural resources but, rather, our backyard ponds and agricultural ditches.

These requirements would extend to every landowner, farmer, and rancher. What this means for farmers and ranchers is that their normal business activities for the production of food would be subject to even more permitting requirements or faced with penalties. Traditional conservation guidelines which were once voluntary will become mandatory or the farmer will be subject to fines and vulnerable to lawsuits.

In this rulemaking, EPA assumes discretion never intended or granted by Congress through which Federal agencies would be empowered to make deci-

sions, and those decisions could be made in an arbitrary fashion.

H.R. 5078 blocks the Agency from finalizing, implementing, and enforcing this rule. It preserves States' rights, ensures the Obama administration consults States and local officials on any future proposal to regulate and protect our Nation's waters under the Clean Water Act.

Protecting our natural resources is a noble cause and one that the agricultural community stands solidly behind, but this proposal is an underhanded way to harm American agriculture and threaten America's food security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this bill and against the EPA's ditch rule.

If this rule were to go forward, two things would assuredly occur: less clarity of what waters are jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act for our farmers and ranchers, and more overreach of jurisdiction by the EPA.

This rule joins a long list of initiatives undertaken by the Agency which would increase the regulatory burden on Nebraska's farmers, ranchers, businesses, and everyday citizens.

In my State, multiple organizations banded together to fight this rule. The group calls itself Common Sense Nebraska Coalition. It includes folks that you would expect, such as farmers and ranchers, but what is interesting is that so many others have heard about this and joined in the fight, including the Nebraska Chamber of Commerce, Nebraska Bankers Association, county officials, resource districts, the Water Resources Association, homebuilders, general contractors, and the Rural Electric Association. They have all joined in this cause because of its uncertainty and massive jurisdiction under the EPA.

My State supports this bill, and I stand proudly with them.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and now a member of the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. First of all, let me thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, Science Committee investigations revealed that the EPA prepared State maps that show the widespread impact of their proposed regulations. As you can see by the colored areas on this map, the EPA plans to regulate nearly every square inch on the map. More detailed maps of every State can be found on our Science Committee's Web site, science.house.gov.

The EPA's rewriting of the law is an unprecedented expansion of Federal control over Americans' private property, and these maps make that clear. The Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Acts stops the EPA and protects Americans from the President's drive to regulate private property.

□ 1445

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for taking the initiative on this bill, and I thank the chairman again for yielding me time. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, expanding the scope of "waters of the United States" is a dangerous expansion of authority strongly opposed by the farmers in my western New York district.

In May, I led a bipartisan letter with Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon, supported by a majority of this House, asking the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to withdraw this overreaching rule.

EPA officials have testified that they realize this rule, as drafted, is confusing and needs modification, but they have refused to withdraw the rule and start over.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5078, the bipartisan legislation that will address this problem.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend and colleague, STEVE SOUTHERLAND, for crafting the Waters of the United States bill, this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard from farmers, ranchers, contractors and even homeowners across my district and across this country. They have had enough of regulatory overreach by the administration and the EPA.

As many of my colleagues have already stated, this bill will stop this administration from using a pen and a phone to unfairly target those who are our greatest stewards of our land, the farming and ranching families of this country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. Government should facilitate businesses, not hinder them.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank Chairman SHUSTER for bringing the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach and Protection Act to this body.

Mr. Chairman, this administration has continually tried to expand the role of the Federal Government in the everyday lives of American families, and now the EPA wants to regulate almost all bodies of water throughout the country, including ditches, pipes, and even farmland ponds.

After meeting with many of my constituents back home throughout the month of August, I know that my fellow farmers, whom I sat with in Indiana, and those of any other State don't want or need more regulatory overreach from Washington, D.C.

From irrigation for crops to water for livestock, farmers feed us and the world with this precious resource. This legislation is an opportunity to maintain the relationship between local and Federal officials already established in the Clean Water Act.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member RAHALL, and the rest of Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill for rural America.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate the chairman yielding me time here today on this very important measure.

We have seen the EPA now trying to claim jurisdiction over virtually every body of water in the United States, puddle or not, navigable or not, man-made or natural, year-round or just even seasonal. In order to protect these waters, the EPA claims it needs to control vast amounts of land surrounding these waters.

Now, the residents of my district in northern California are already familiar with this type of regulatory act. In California, the EPA is already ignoring clear exemptions for farming activities that have been going on for years and years and are even in the law as exempt; this, in order to pursue massive fines against family farmers simply for changing crops or maintaining their already manmade irrigation systems, thus, in the process paralyzing farmers who are waiting months and months or even years for EPA or their cohorts in the Army Corps to decide these legal activities can continue to go on, otherwise they will be subject to huge fines.

This is form of tyranny that is a gigantic overreach and needs to be stopped. That is why I support H.R. 5078 as a way to limit EPA back to the proper role of actually watching out for clean waters, not regulating to the last drop every water drop in the United States.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of this regulatory overreach protection act. I believe that it is safe to say that no one has a greater interest in protecting our water resources than our Nation's farmers, farmers who depend on clean water for their livelihood.

Just last month, I met with many farmers across Virginia's Fifth District who expressed their grave concern about the Federal Government's unilateral expansion of the Clean Water Act far beyond that intended by Congress. This overreach will add huge costs for our farmers and the millions of American families that depend upon them.

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting this commonsense, bipartisan bill to stop this administration's sweeping overreach on American farms.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first commend the chairman of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. SHUSTER, for bringing this legislation forward and commend the staff on both sides of the aisle for the work in producing this bill. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) as well.

This legislation is truly about giving the American people and giving our States a say in what is theirs and in the direction that they wish for the people within their borders.

Much has been said about the homebuilders' support for this bill, the contractors' support for this bill, and many, many, many other organizations. But I have two quotes here from the National Association of Home Builders and the Associated General Contractors.

These individuals are on the ground. They know what the effect is, the day-to-day effect of policy that emanates or regulations that are promulgated from our Nation's Capital.

These are the individuals that provide jobs for our people. As I said, they are on the ground, on the front lines every day trying to provide those jobs for our people, and in an environmentally sound way, I might add, as well.

Mr. James Tobin has written Members of Congress on behalf of the National Association of Home Builders, and he says, and I quote:

For home builders, this proposed rule adds confusion and increases the cost and time needed to obtain a Federal wetlands permit prior to home construction. The costs of this rule will increase the price of a home at a time when home construction is beginning to recover from the devastating effects of the economic downturn. Many American families will be priced out of the housing market if this rule is finalized in its current form.

That hits home. That hits home to the young people of this Nation seeking to buy their first-time home. It

speaks to those seeking to refinance their homes. It speaks to a key sector of our economy that provides jobs and provides a future for this country that many of our young people are looking to improve.

The Associated General Contractors has written Members of Congress. Their senior executive director, Mr. Jeff Shoaf, has said that we must find "a more predictable definition to clearly differentiate those waters that are regulated by the Federal Government from those that fall under the jurisdiction of State and local governments."

In my opinion, it is time that this EPA recognize that our States do have a say in the future of regulations that affect people within their borders.

Unfortunately, we have seen too many instances, as I said in my opening comments, where this EPA has overreached. It has reached beyond what its legal authority is in trying to promote an ideological agenda that is not good for the heartland of America, the true areas that have built this country and provided jobs for our people in the past, and can provide jobs to a very talented and available workforce that is available, if only given a chance to work without further intrusion from the EPA.

So I conclude, and, again, commend my chairman for bringing this bill forward, and urge all Members to support the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude and yield myself the balance of my time, first, by thanking Mr. RAHALL for working with us to come forward with a commonsense approach to stopping another grab by the executive branch.

I also want to thank Congressman STEVE SOUTHERLAND from Florida, who introduced H.R. 5078. Mr. SOUTHERLAND has been a leader on the water issue since he arrived in Congress.

As we have been talking about here, and as Mr. RAHALL agrees, this proposed rule would significantly increase the geographic scope of the Federal Government's authority under the act and is outside the bounds of what can legitimately be done by the rule-making.

It also is going to create great uncertainty within the many industries in this country. The rulemaking proposed by the administration is yet another example of the disturbing pattern as this Presidency seeks to use brute force to expand executive action while ignoring Congress and the Supreme Court.

I would urge all the Members, all 435 Members of this body, to look seriously at this piece of legislation and what this administration is trying to do. The President tries to grab Congress' legitimate constitutional authority. And if you have any doubts on that, the Supreme Court, twice, rejected a rule-making by the EPA.

I think all 435 of us ought to be looking closely, whether it is a Republican or a Democrat administration, at these power grabs by the executive branch. It has gone on for far too long, and Congress needs to stand up and maintain its constitutional authority.

This is a massive Federal jurisdiction grab. In the 110th and the 111th Congresses, there were attempts through various committees and through various amendments which were rejected on a bipartisan basis to stop this.

H.R. 5078, introduced by our colleague, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, simply prevents the EPA and the Corps from finalizing the ill-conceived proposed rule, and directs the agencies to consult with the States and local officials. That is the way forward, going back to our States and our local governments.

They care as much or more about the waters in Pennsylvania and West Virginia and California and Oregon than the EPA does. This notion in Washington that Washington has the greater concern, that Washington has the better idea, the one-size-fits-all, just doesn't work, and it has been proven time and time again.

So again, this stops the administration proceeding. It has a path forward. I would urge my colleagues to read all nine pages of this bill. If you get to the end, you will see there is a way forward, and that is to consult with the States and the locals to come up with a consensus rule that can result in reasonable regulatory process that protects our waters.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 5078, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and the members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their work on this important legislation.

For over forty years, the quality of our nation's waters has been managed through a partnership between individual States and the Federal Government. This relationship, established by the Clean Water Act (CWA), recognizes that some waters are more effectively regulated by local stakeholders and state officials than the Federal Government in Washington, DC. This partnership has led to less pollution and cleaner water for Eastern Washington and our nation. Despite decades of success, the Obama Administration has recently proposed a rule that would significantly alter this partnership by increasing Federal oversight of our nation's waters.

The Administration's proposal would dramatically expand the definition of "waters of the United States" under the CWA, potentially placing ditches, drainages, creeks, and even seasonally wet areas under Federal jurisdiction. Additionally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued an interpretative

rule that would increase regulation of our nation's farms by narrowing an exemption under the CWA for certain agricultural practices. As such, this proposed interpretative rule will negatively impact farmers and growers in Eastern Washington and throughout the nation.

I support the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014 because it seeks to rein in the Administration's overreach into our nation's waters. First, this bill prohibits finalization and implementation of the proposed rule expanding Federal regulatory authority over bodies of water currently managed by or jointly with the States. Additionally, this bill prohibits the interpretative rule which expands Federal regulation of our nation's agricultural communities. The legislation also requires the EPA and the Corps to engage in a "federalism consultation" with State and local governments to help identify which bodies of water should be federally regulated and which should be left to the states. In short, H.R. 5078 restores the Federal-State partnership envisioned by Congress when it passed the CWA.

I believe regulation of our nation's waters must be done in a manner that balances the need to responsibly protect the environment with the economic needs of our communities. To that end, I support H.R. 5078 because it ensures that we can continue to protect our waters without unreasonable and burdensome regulation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5078, a bill that would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency from clarifying protections for drinking water under the Clean Water Act.

Today's legislation would prohibit the Army Corps and EPA from continuing proposed action to ensure that the streams and wetlands that feed our waterways and provide drinking water for millions of Americans are protected from pollution. In 2001 and 2006, Supreme Court decisions created confusion about precisely which upstream tributaries were covered by the law. Subsequent policy guidance only increased legal uncertainty and undermined efforts to protect drinking water for more than 117 million Americans, including more than 26 million residents in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

In response to this confusion, the Army Corps and EPA have proposed a rule that would clarify which waters must be protected in order to safeguard public health and resources, and are currently seeking comments from stakeholders. Their proposal protects waters that have historically been covered by the Clean Water Act while continuing exemptions for agriculture. The bill on the floor today would not only shortcut the public comment process and withdraw the proposed rule, but would also prohibit the Army Corps and EPA from clarifying the regulation in the future.

For too long, legal uncertainty around the Clean Water Act jurisdiction has jeopardized the health of drinking water and created confusing delays for industry as they struggle to determine their responsibility under the law. Congress should allow this rulemaking to go forward to develop a clear, practical standard

that restores protections to our communities. I urge a no vote on the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act. In Virginia and the larger Chesapeake Bay watershed we have already seen the Environmental Protection Agency micromanaging state and local water decisions. The EPA's Waters of the U.S. rule expands the regulatory overreach we have seen in the Bay watershed to the entire United States while imposing even more harmful regulations on even more small streams, creeks, manmade ponds, and nearby wetlands under the agency's control.

Congress intended the states and federal government to implement the Clean Water Act as a federal-state partnership where the states and federal government act as co-regulators. This rule is just another example of EPA forgetting the Clean Water Act's goal of cooperative federalism. The EPA cannot re-write the Clean Water Act and expand their jurisdiction at a whim. Only Congress can grant that authority. Today's vote is an important step to rein in the EPA and protect the farmers, landowners, and local economies that stand to be harmed by this rule.

I urge passage of this important legislation. Protecting America's waterways is critical, but what we need are commonsense policies that will protect water quality without limiting economic growth and unfairly over-regulating local agricultural producers and economies—not more power grabs by the EPA.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I rise today in favor of H.R. 5078, the Waters of the U.S. Regulatory Overreach Protection Act.

Over the last five years, we have seen attempt after attempt to add layers of environmental red tape to any economic development that our states, counties, and cities may undertake. The new "Waters of the United States" proposal is no different. With this, the EPA seeks to gain jurisdiction over most of the country by claiming authority to regulate dry beds, ditches, pipes, farmland ponds and anywhere water could conceivably run. They would require local communities, businesses and individuals to navigate the costly and time-consuming process of obtaining additional permits for activities around these waters, making it harder to mine coal, to construct roads and shopping centers, and even to build homes. This is one of the largest federal power grabs we have ever witnessed in this country, and there is no question that the economic impact would be profound.

In my home state of Kentucky, mining permits have ground to a halt and onerous regulations are shuttering power plants, threatening the fossil energy industries that have been the backbone of our energy security for decades. I am dismayed at efforts that this Administration has undertaken with the express purpose of eliminating coal from our nation's energy supply, despite the fact that this fuel provides a cheap, abundant source of energy that keeps energy costs down and productivity up. With this bill, we stand firm against the latest attempt by the EPA to put up road blocks for those working to create jobs. These efforts are fruitless attempts to legislate through regulation, and the Congress

must exercise its prerogative to prevent this kind of bureaucratic overreach that would be crippling for the U.S. economy. H.R. 5078 will uphold the federal-state partnership to regulate the Nation's waters, allowing states to continue regulating certain waters within their individual boundaries, and providing farmers, construction companies, energy suppliers, and manufacturers with much needed certainty as they work to create jobs and grow the economy.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 5078.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5078

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. RULES AND GUIDANCE.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from—

(A) developing, finalizing, adopting, implementing, applying, administering, or enforcing—

(i) the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled "Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act" (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)); or

(ii) the proposed guidance submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget for regulatory review under Executive Order 12866, entitled "Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected By the Clean Water Act" and dated February 17, 2012 (referred to as "Clean Water Protection Guidance", Regulatory Identifier Number (RIN) 2040-ZA11, received February 21, 2012); or

(B) using the proposed rule or proposed guidance described in subparagraph (A), any successor document, or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(2) USE OF RULES AND GUIDANCE.—The use of the proposed rule or proposed guidance described in paragraph (1)(A), any successor document, or any substantially similar proposed rule or guidance, as the basis for any rulemaking or decision regarding the scope or enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act shall be grounds for vacating the final rule, decision, or enforcement action.

(b) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from developing, finalizing, adopting, implementing, applying, administering, or enforcing the interpretive rule described in the notice of availability published in the Federal Register entitled "Notice of Availability Regarding the Exemption from Permitting Under Section 404(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Water Act to Certain Agricultural Conservation Practices" (79 Fed. Reg. 22276 (April 21, 2014)).

(2) WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall withdraw the interpretive rule described in paragraph (1), and such interpretive rule shall have no force or effect.

(3) APPLICATION.—Section 404(f)(1)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) shall be applied without regard to the interpretive rule described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. FEDERALISM CONSULTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly consult with relevant State and local officials to develop recommendations for a regulatory proposal that would, consistent with applicable rulings of the United States Supreme Court, identify—

(1) the scope of waters covered under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(2) the scope of waters not covered under such Act.

(b) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the recommendations under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) provide relevant State and local officials with notice and an opportunity to participate in the consultation process under subsection (a);

(2) seek to consult State and local officials that represent a broad cross-section of regional, economic, and geographic perspectives in the United States;

(3) emphasize the importance of collaboration with and among the relevant State and local officials;

(4) allow for meaningful and timely input by State and local officials;

(5) be respectful of maintaining the Federal-State partnership in implementing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;

(6) take into consideration the input of State and local officials regarding matters involving differences in State and local geography, hydrology, climate, legal frameworks, economies, priorities, and needs;

(7) promote transparency in the consultation process under subsection (a); and

(8) explore with State and local officials whether Federal objectives under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act can be attained by means other than through a new regulatory proposal.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a draft report describing the recommendations developed under subsection (a).

(2) CONSENSUS REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary and the Administrator may include a recommendation in the draft report only if consensus has been reached with regard to the recommendation among the Secretary, the Administrator, and the State and local officials consulted under subsection (a).

(3) FAILURE TO REACH CONSENSUS.—If the Secretary, the Administrator, and the State and local officials consulted under subsection (a) fail to reach consensus on a regulatory proposal, the draft report shall identify that consensus was not reached and describe—

(A) the areas and issues where consensus was reached;

(B) the areas and issues of continuing disagreement that resulted in the failure to reach consensus; and

(C) the reasons for the continuing disagreements.

(4) DURATION OF REVIEW.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall provide not

fewer than 180 days for the public review and comment of the draft report.

(5) FINAL REPORT.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall, in consultation with the relevant State and local officials, address any comments received under paragraph (4) and prepare a final report describing the final results of the consultation process under subsection (a).

(d) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and make publicly available the final report prepared under subsection (c)(5).

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Army.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—The term "State and local officials" means elected or professional State and local government officials or their representative regional or national organizations.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 113-581. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-581.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 4, line 20, and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from implementing any final rule that is based on the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled "Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act" (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)) if such final rule—

(1) expands the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) beyond those waterbodies covered prior to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers* (531 U.S. 159 (2001)) and *Rapanos v. United States* (547 U.S. 715 (2006));

(2) is inconsistent with the judicial opinions of Justice Scalia or Justice Kennedy in the *Rapanos* decision;

(3) increases the regulation of ditches when compared to existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulations or guidance;

(4) eliminates historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture;

(5) increases the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to groundwater;

(6) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of erosional features;

(7) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act permits for land-use activities;

(8) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of farm ponds, puddles, water on driveways, birdbaths, or playgrounds;

(9) is inconsistent with the latest peer-reviewed studies; or

(10) was promulgated without public notice or comment.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 715, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment gets to the heart of the debate on this proposed rule.

For months, opponents of the proposed rule have made numerous claims about its impacts. Yet, despite numerous efforts by representatives of the administration's to answer these claims and to point out how many of these claims are simply false, we seem to go around and around, again and again, on these allegations. My amendment simply addresses these concerns and claims, saying that, if any of them prove to be true, then the Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from issuing any final rule that would bring about these occurrences.

For example, opponents of the proposed rule have claimed that this rule expands the scope of the Clean Water Act authority. When asked this direct question during our subcommittee hearing, the administration's witness stated clearly that the proposed rule "would not assert jurisdiction over any type of waters not previously protected over the past 40 years." Under my amendment, if the administration is proven incorrect, the final rule could not be implemented.

Similarly, opponents have suggested that the rule is inconsistent with the rulings and jurisdictional tests outlined by the Supreme Court. The administration's witness has testified that this rule is consistent with the tests outlined by the U.S. Supreme Court. If my amendment is adopted and if the administration is wrong about this assertion, then the final rule could not be implemented.

Opponents of the proposed rule have claimed that the proposed rule increases the regulation of ditches. The administration has testified that, in fact, it would reduce the scope of jurisdictional ditches that are covered by the Bush administration guidance. If my amendment is adopted and if the administration is incorrect in this as-

sertion, the rule cannot be implemented.

Opponents contend that, under this rule, individuals would be required to have Federal Clean Water Act permits for draining farm ponds or for activities in the water on your driveways or your birdbaths or puddles in your backyard. The administration has asserted, obviously, that these types of waters have never been subject to the Clean Water Act, nor would they be under this rulemaking. If somehow the administration is wrong about this, under my amendment, the final rule could not be implemented.

Lastly, opponents contend that the rule would eliminate existing statutory and regulatory exemptions for agriculture or increase the regulation of groundwater or require Federal Clean Water Act permits for land-use activities. Yet the administration has time and time again testified that these assertions are simply inaccurate. Again, if my amendment is adopted and if the administration is incorrect, the final rule cannot go forward.

In my view, this administration has put forward a good faith effort to provide additional clarity on the scope of Clean Water Act protections for our Nation's waters that are consistent with current scientific information as well as the precedent of the Supreme Court. While it is not perfect, this rule is far better than the current regulatory process that has led to numerous delays, significant increases in compliance costs, and greater difficulty in protecting our Nation's water resources.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I must strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment because it seeks to gut this legislation.

This amendment would allow the administration to go forward and finalize its flawed rule, expanding Federal jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act if they determine entirely of their own discretion that the rule is consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and other factors listed in this amendment. Basically, the EPA can self-certify that they are ready to move forward.

This amendment is misleading. The administration has already stated that they believe the proposed rule is consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and with other factors listed in this amendment. The effect of this amendment is to allow the agencies to finalize their flawed rule that many believe is not consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and other listed factors.

This amendment would put the U.S. EPA solely in charge of America's waters, and it would take away the Federal-State partnership that H.R. 5078 seeks to preserve. It would allow the EPA to finalize and implement the rule without consulting with the States. Let me repeat that. It would allow the U.S. EPA to move forward without consulting with their counterpart State EPAs.

In contrast, H.R. 5078 preserves the Federal-State partnership that was set up under the Clean Water Act in 1972. This important legislation recognizes that the proposed administration rule has created controversy, confusion, and discord in the clean water regulatory programs. H.R. 5078 calls for a timeout to stop the final development of this ill-conceived rule. In addition, it requires that the agencies consult with State and local governments to develop a consensus rule that will work and protect our water resources.

As I said during the general debate in our subcommittee, they were not able to identify any State regulatory agency that supports this proposed rule. That ought to be a red flag to all American people and to all of the stakeholders involved.

As my friend on the other side talked about expansion and jurisdiction, I would argue of the proposed rule, if it is not necessary, why does the Secretary of Agriculture have to put together an interpretive rule when it has been said that agriculture is exempt from these practices? Why move forward?

We don't need this rule. I urge the Members to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, remember, should this bill pass and become law, which it never will, it will tie us to the 2003-2008 guidance, which the Farm Bureau has described as a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories, and will result in and is resulting in increased delays and costs to the public at large. That is why we are here today.

Everybody agrees that we need clarification, but you are excluding them from using the judicial decisions and any document that was used in coming up with this problematic rule, and you are saying you can't use any of that. So, basically, we are stuck with the 2003-2008 guidance, which, prior to this grandstanding over here, everybody agreed needed to be fixed. Now we are going to be stuck with it forever.

Instead of using a legislative scalpel, you pulled out the giant sledgehammer

here. Sometimes it is harder to be a legislator and to actually get into the guts of something and figure out what is wrong and what isn't wrong, and Mr. BISHOP has done that.

They cannot expand the scope beyond those water bodies covered prior to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in those two cases, and it cannot be inconsistent with the judicial opinions of Scalia's and Kennedy's in *Rapanos*. This is not judgmental stuff. These are clear legislative restrictions. This would be taking and putting walls around their rulemaking and saying, no, you're staying inside those rules. In addition to that, they can't increase the regulation of ditches. They can't eliminate any historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, which do not exist under the 2003–2008 rules. There are questions about ditches under the 2003–2008 rules, and they are interpreted differently in all parts of the country.

You are going to bind us to something that doesn't work because you want to grandstand and pretend you are doing something for people who have legitimate concerns. Sometimes it is harder to say to them that this is a difficult and complicated question, because Americans want to preserve the clean waters of the United States. We don't want to go back in time, but we also want you people to farm and to ranch and to do other productive activities. That is hard to do, and that isn't what this bill before us today will do. It will bind us to the problems of the past.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–581.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.

None of the provisions in this Act shall apply if the Administrator determines that the implementation of such provisions is likely—

(1) to increase the interstate movement of pollutants through surface waters;

(2) to increase the costs to be incurred by a State to maintain or achieve approved water quality standards for the State; or

(3) to cause or contribute to the impairment of surface or coastal waters of a State.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 715, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would address one of the fundamental flaws I see in this legislation. The enactment of H.R. 5078 would almost certainly block current and future efforts to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act.

Unfortunately, this would lock in place the interpretive guidance of the Bush administration, which took the narrowest and most cumbersome and confusing interpretation of the two recent Supreme Court decisions, and it has been uniformly criticized by the stakeholder community as well as by the conservation and environmental community.

I think it is important to remember that, under the current Bush administration's guidance, traditional Clean Water Act protections over a significant percentage of waters has been called into question or have simply been lost. These are Clean Water Act protections that existed for over 30 years prior to the issuance of the first Bush-era guidance in 2003 and are now all but lost, making it harder and more costly for individual States to protect their own waters should their upstream neighbors be unwilling or unable to fill in the gap in protecting water quality.

As we all know, if pollution is allowed to increase due to the competing financial and political interests of States, that pollution needs to go somewhere, and since pollution does not respect State boundaries when it travels downstream, it will have an adverse impact on the quality of life and the quality of the environment of those downstream States. As highlighted in my amendment, the end result of this will be that downstream States will become responsible for treating the pollution of their upstream neighbors, which, at a minimum, will increase the compliance costs of downstream States and, at a maximum, may destroy the ecological or economic health of these States.

As I have noted before, my district in New York is separated from Connecticut by the Long Island Sound. Over time, the number of polluters in the area has increased exponentially, killing fish, lobsters, and imperiling the \$5 billion of economic output that the region depends upon. Fortunately, the State has decided that the Sound was impaired, and it proposed a more restrictive water quality standard for nitrogen. A \$5 billion crisis has been averted. However, under the current Bush-era guidance, questions have arisen as to whether the Clean Water Act protection continues to apply to the

upper reaches of watersheds, streams, and wetlands which feed the rivers that eventually flow into the Sound.

Under H.R. 5078, the EPA would be prohibited from ensuring that polluters in Connecticut continue to reduce excessive amounts of nitrogen in the Sound, leaving my constituents in the State of New York without any recourse under the Clean Water Act to stop them.

If this bill were to pass, individual States would decide that collective efforts to address the water quality impairments of the Chesapeake Bay, the Puget Sound, the Great Lakes, or the Gulf of Mexico were unnecessarily restrictive or burdensome, and they would refuse to participate in a meaningful way towards the restoration of these regional water bodies. This go-it-alone approach flies in the face of science, of common sense, and of decades of experience in implementing the Clean Water Act.

My amendment would limit the impact of this legislation if the administration determines that this bill were likely to, one, increase the interstate movement of pollutants through surface waters; two, increase the costs incurred by a downstream State to maintain or achieve approved water quality standards for that State; or three, to cause or contribute to the impairment of the surface or coastal waters of another State.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure created the Clean Water Act over 40 years ago as a response to burning rivers, to Great Lakes that were pronounced dead, and to an understanding that a State-by-State approach to protecting water simply didn't work.

Let's not repeat the sins of the past but commit to moving forward in our efforts to protect the Nation's waters. Support my amendment, and allow the Agency to put back in place reasonable, comprehensive protections of our Nation's waters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I most strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment because it seeks to undermine the intent of this legislation.

There is a great deal of controversy over what the EPA's proposed rule would do or would not do. Added to that, they have a subsequent proposal of the interpretive rule from the Department of Agriculture.

What H.R. 5078 says is, "Stop. Time out." The bill says, "Stop this rule process. Go back to the States and back to the stakeholders and local governments and work together," which was the intent of the Clean Water Act.

Let's have these agencies work together to develop a consensus rule that will actually provide clarity and allow the Federal and State governments to work as partners in protecting America's waters. This amendment would give the EPA unfettered discretion in making determinations regarding State water quality standards, taking away the Federal-State partnership that this legislation is seeking to preserve.

I need to remind everybody what this bill does. This bill says, "Time out. EPA and Army Corps of Engineers, go back to the drawing board. Go back to the States. Work with the States. Work with your counterparts in the States, and develop a consensus to the rule that you need. Go back to the partnership."

Let's have a cooperative relationship between the States and the Federal U.S. EPA.

□ 1515

Let's have commonsense proposals to protect our Nation's waters and not a one-size-fits-all policy coming out of Washington, D.C. Because when it comes to water bodies, streams, and so on, one-size-fits-all policies don't always work. We need to be working with those local governments and the States to develop the policies to protect and enhance our environment at the local level.

So let's send it back, support H.R. 5078, and make sure that our U.S. EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers will work with their counterparts to seek commonsense policies that protect and enhance our water quality and our safe drinking water here in the United States. I urge all Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States,

and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISAPPROVAL OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO NOTIFY CONGRESS BEFORE RELEASING INDIVIDUALS FROM GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 715, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 644) condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 715, the amendments to the text and preamble printed in the resolution are adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

Whereas section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) requires the Secretary of Defense to notify the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days before the transfer or release of any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (hereinafter referred to as "GTMO");

Whereas on May 31, 2014, the Department of Defense transferred five Taliban detainees held at GTMO to the State of Qatar;

Whereas according to declassified United States government documents, the five detainees were all senior Taliban leaders: Abdul Haq Wasiq was the Taliban Deputy Minister of Intelligence, Mullah Norullah Noori was the Taliban military commander at Mazar-e-Sharif, Mullah Mohammad Fazl was the Taliban Deputy Minister of Defense, Khairullah Said Wai Khairkwa was the Taliban Minister of Interior, and Mohammad Nabi Omari was the Taliban communications chief and border chief;

Whereas these five senior Taliban leaders have had associations with al-Qaeda or have engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners;

Whereas these five senior Taliban detainees held leadership positions within the Taliban in Afghanistan when it provided safe haven for al-Qaeda to conduct planning, training, and operations for the September 11, 2001, attacks;

Whereas in 2010, after an extensive evaluation meant to identify detainees who could be transferred out of the detention facility at GTMO, the Obama administration determined that these five should remain in United States detention because they were "too dangerous to transfer" because each "poses a high level of threat that cannot be mitigated sufficiently except through continued detention";

Whereas the President has stated that there is "absolutely" the "possibility of some" of these former Taliban detainees

"trying to return to activities that are detrimental to" the United States;

Whereas other former GTMO detainees that were transferred have become leaders of al-Qaeda affiliates actively plotting against the United States and are "involved in terrorist or insurgent activities";

Whereas Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that, pursuant to an agreement with Qatar, the five former detainees transferred in May would not be allowed to leave Qatar for one year, but after that date there would be no restrictions on the movement of the former detainees;

Whereas notwithstanding the fact that Qatar is an important regional ally, after another GTMO detainee was transferred to Qatar in 2008, Qatar apparently had difficulty implementing the assurances Qatar gave the United States in connection with that detainee's transfer;

Whereas senior officials in the Obama administration negotiated, through intermediaries in the government of Qatar, with the Taliban, and with the Haqqani Network, which the Department of State has designated as a foreign terrorist organization, and which held Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl captive;

Whereas Secretary Hagel testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that negotiations for the transfer of the five Taliban detainees in exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl began in January 2014;

Whereas the General Counsel of the Department of Defense signed a memorandum of understanding with the Attorney General of the State of Qatar on May 12, 2014, regarding the security conditions for transfer of these five Taliban detainees;

Whereas in addition to an unknown number of officials of Qatar, senior Obama administration officials acknowledge that approximately 80 or 90 individuals within the Obama administration were knowledgeable of the planned transfer of the five Taliban detainees prior to their transfer;

Whereas Congress was not notified of the transfer until June 2, 2014, three days after such individuals were transferred, and 33 days after the date on which such notification was required by section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) and section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76);

Whereas the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the President and other senior Obama administration officials, did not comply with the 30-day notification requirement;

Whereas article II, section 3 of the Constitution stipulates that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed";

Whereas on January 15, 2009, the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice acknowledged that, under article I of the Constitution, Congress possesses legislative authority concerning the detention and release of enemy combatants;

Whereas the Obama administration has complied with the law in all other detainee transfers from GTMO since the date of the enactment of prevailing law; and

Whereas in 2011, after leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives expressed their bipartisan opposition to the prospective transfer of these Taliban detainees from GTMO, senior Obama administration officials assured these Senators and Members of

Congress that there would be no exchange of Taliban detainees for Sergeant Bergdahl, and that any transfer of Taliban detainees that might otherwise occur would be part of a reconciliation effort with the Taliban and the Government of Afghanistan and that such a transfer would only take place in consultation with Congress pursuant to law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns and disapproves of the failure of the Obama administration to comply with the lawful 30-day statutory reporting requirement in executing the transfer of five senior members of the Taliban from detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba;

(2) expresses grave concern about the national security risks associated with the transfer of five senior Taliban leaders, including the national security threat to the American people and the Armed Forces of the United States;

(3) expresses grave concern over the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists, even when conducted through intermediaries, and the risk that such negotiations with terrorists may further encourage hostilities and the abduction of Americans;

(4) stipulates that further violations of the law set forth in section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) and section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76) are unacceptable;

(5) expresses that these actions have burdened unnecessarily the trust and confidence in the commitment and ability of the Obama administration to constructively engage and work with Congress; and

(6) expresses relief that Sergeant Bergdahl has returned safely to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 644.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 644, a resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), condemning the Obama administration's failure to comply with the requirement to notify Congress before transferring individual detainees from Guantanamo Bay.

I would like to thank Mr. RIGELL for his leadership on this deeply troubling issue. He worked across the aisle to author a bipartisan resolution, sponsored by 94 Members of the House, including myself, focused on the Obama administration's clear violation of statute passed by the legislative branch and enacted into law by the President.

I would also like to thank Ranking Member SMITH. Though he did not support this resolution in its entirety, I appreciate his candor and his commitment to fostering a thoughtful debate within our committee.

The administration violated the law, and House Resolution 644 articulates this simple message. It passed out of the Armed Services Committee with a bipartisan vote.

Section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 requires the Secretary of Defense to notify the appropriate committees of Congress at least 30 days before the transfer or release of any individual detained at GTMO. There are no waivers to this clause—no exceptions, period; yet, on May 31, at the request of the Taliban and in exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl, who was held by the Haqqani Network, the administration sent five senior Taliban leaders from GTMO to Qatar.

The administration took this action without notifying Congress. This is an obvious violation of the law. There can be no confusion on this point. In fact, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office recently determined that the administration violated the law by failing to notify Congress, but also by expending funds to carry out the transfers without an appropriation for that purpose.

The statutory provision of the NDAA was written and approved by a bipartisan majority in Congress because of genuine concerns that dangerous terrorists were leaving GTMO and returning to fight against the U.S. or its allies.

By requiring the Secretary of Defense to convey detailed information to Congress, the provision is intended to allow Members to have a complete understanding of the risks of sending GTMO detainees elsewhere and how those risks might be mitigated.

In transferring the Taliban Five without lawfully notifying Congress, the administration deprived Congress of the opportunity to consider the national security risks that such a transfer could pose or the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists.

If Congress does not speak strongly now to condemn such blatant disregard for the law, any future administration may come to believe that obedience to statute is not a requirement for the executive branch. This is intolerable, and for this reason, I support this resolution and will ask my colleagues in the House to adopt it.

Again, I thank Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BARROW, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. RIBBLE for introducing this important bipartisan resolution, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are two issues important to this piece of legislation. The first that the chairman mentioned is the legality of this. However, he is wrong in the idea in saying that this is clear on its face and there is no debate. There is actually considerable debate as to whether or not the President's actions were legal.

The President and the Secretary of Defense have stated unequivocally that they believe they acted within the law, and this is actually an issue that comes up repeatedly between the legislative and the executive branch. It has been coming up for a couple hundred years now.

The administration's position is that they acted in accordance with their article II Commander in Chief authority in the interest of national security and in bringing one of our soldiers home, and it is their position that article II of the Constitution, which is a law, supersedes the piece of legislation that was referenced about 30 days' notice that was passed, and therefore, their actions were legal.

The first thing to really understand about this is that this is in no way unprecedented. I am sure if we went back and examined the history, just about every President at one time or another did something contrary to a piece of legislation or a law because they felt article II required them to do so. They felt article II—the Constitution, which is a law—superseded the legislation in question.

In fact, we don't have to go back very far. President George W. Bush repeatedly took actions that were in violation of the clear law post-9/11. He basically authorized warrantless wiretapping. He authorized indefinite detention.

Both of those issues were clearly contrary to statutory law, but President Bush asserted his article II authority and said that, therefore, it was legal to do that.

Go back to Abraham Lincoln, who suspended habeas corpus in the same way. This is a long-running debate between the legislative and the executive branch, and never before has the legislative branch stepped out with legislation like this to censure the President.

So, number one, the President did not violate the law. He followed what he felt was article II of the Constitution, perfectly consistent with what George W. Bush and a whole lot of other folks did, so I think it is wrong to call him out and say that he violated the law when this is simply part of a long-running debate between the legislative and the executive branch.

Now, let me say I feel that the President should have given us 30 days' notice. I do believe that. Now, the reason that they didn't is because they were concerned that the information would be leaked.

This was a very sensitive negotiation, and they were told that if the information was leaked, it would kill the deal, and they were deeply concerned about Sergeant Bergdahl's health and that if any further delay happened, that he might not survive his current incarceration with the Taliban, so that was their reason for doing it.

While I have said and will continue to say that I think he should have given us that 30 days' notice, that I think Congress has proven repeatedly that we can, in fact, keep a secret—we have been told about a number of very sensitive things and have not revealed that information.

I think it is worth noting that the President isn't completely without reason for that. In fact, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS, after this was revealed, was asked, "Well, if you had known about this, what would you have done?"

He initially said, "Well, I would have let people know, absolutely, because I didn't think it was a good idea, and I would have done everything I could to stop it."

Now, after having been explained that that is exactly why the President was reluctant to tell Congress, the Senator walked himself back from those remarks and said that he wouldn't, but his initial reaction sort of shows that the President and the administration were not completely out of bounds in thinking that their ability to bring Sergeant Bergdahl home might have been jeopardized by allowing Congress to know that.

Be that as it may, I think they should have. I think we have proven ourselves capable of keeping secrets, and they should have given us 30 days' notice, but on the legality question, this is perfectly consistent with what a large number of Presidents have done in the past.

So to call this President out specifically, I think, is wrong, which brings us to the second issue, and that is the partisan nature of this body. Now, it is not unique to this body. Regrettably, if you go back and you look at instances where the President is of one party and the Congress is of another, that is when investigations are off the charts.

Somehow, when both the President and the Congress are in the same party, we don't have anywhere near the condemnation, anywhere near the investigation for actions, on and on and on; and that regrettably reflects the deepening partisan rift in Washington, D.C.

That ultimately is what I think this legislation reflects. It is simply an opportunity for a Republican Congress to take a shot at a Democratic President. If it was more than that, then back 10 years ago, when President George W. Bush was violating all manner of different statutory law under his articulated article II powers, then we would have had something out of this Con-

gress that said, "Hey, don't do that." We didn't. All we had was silence.

Now, unfortunately, what that leads the public to believe is that this is a partisan exercise, and we need fewer partisan exercises, not more. I think it is perfectly appropriate for many Members, as I did and others, to say the President should have given us notice. He should have given us 30 days.

For this to be the first—or I guess the second issue, since we had the water bill just before this—that we take up when we come back from recess, when you think of all the economic and national security challenges and everything that is going on out there, I think once again makes the public just shake their head and say, "Here we go again, another partisan exercise."

Unfortunately, I think this piece of legislation is unnecessary, and I think it further poisons the well between Congress and the President. Again, I do not feel that the President violated the law. He had a different interpretation of it, as many Presidents before him have.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I must respond to just a couple of points made by my good friend from Washington.

We agree on more than we disagree on. This item we disagree on, but it seems to me that his main argument is that because other Presidents have done it, it is okay for this President to do it. In other words, two wrongs make a right. I don't think that is the point. I think at some point, you have to draw the line, and that is what we are doing right now.

Secondly, he said that the President said that he really believed he wasn't breaking the law. You know, prisons are full of people that say they don't think they broke the law, but some judge thinks they did, and in this instance, until you take the matter to the court, it is the law. Even though he is the President of the United States, he did break the law.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL), my friend and colleague who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, is the lead cosponsor, and is the one who has from day one provided the leadership on this issue.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCKEON for his leadership and bringing this resolution to the floor. I thank the original cosponsors, Congressmen RIBBLE, BARROW, and RAHALL for standing with me on this.

I respect my colleague from Washington, Ranking Member SMITH, and my respect for him is not diminished by the fact that we have strong but different views on this matter. I don't share the ease with which he has accepted the President's, I believe, re-

fusal to follow the law, and I reject outright—and I must do so in this Chamber—the assertion that this is partisan.

□ 1530

It is not partisan. It is in my service to Virginia's Second Congressional District.

An increasing number of men and women from a very diverse audience in my district are deeply troubled by the President's continued pattern of going outside of the law and executive overreach. This is an example that hits home in our district, which is home to more men and women in uniform, Active Duty and retired, than any other of the 435 congressional districts. They increasingly are asking me this question: What is Congress doing about this?

This resolution today is a direct manifestation of my duty and, I believe, our collective duty to hold the President accountable for breaking the law.

Now, again, the ease with which some have said that he hasn't broken the law, well, that is not shared by the GAO, the Government Accountability Office. It is an independent nonpartisan agency, and this summer it found that in releasing the Taliban senior commander, in fact, the administration did break the law. That is really not in dispute.

If we don't hold the administration accountable for this, who will? That is what we do: making sure that the balance of powers is adhered to.

I think it is important that we look at who was released. Among those released is Mullah Mohammad Fazl, the Taliban's deputy defense minister. The President himself acknowledged that there is absolutely the possibility of these senior Taliban commanders returning to the battlefield. They can be released by the Government of Qatar in less than 9 months. The President has more confidence in the Government of Qatar than I do and I think the American people do.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite the administration's lawful duty to engage Congress, despite Congress's clear objection in 2011 on these very same detainees, a bipartisan message was sent clearly to the administration: Don't release these prisoners; it is not in the national interests and security interests of the United States. And yet the administration did so.

Despite the damage that it has done to our policy of not negotiating with terrorists and, finally, despite the increased risk that this brings to Americans, I believe, on the battlefield in Afghanistan, the administration plowed ahead. And it was far more than unwise; it was unlawful, and it merits condemnation.

I will close with this. I really didn't want to bring this to the floor. I know

we have plenty of partisan bickering around here, but I looked for someone else and maybe another Member that was bringing something to the floor. I couldn't find it. I thought, well, I guess it falls to us. And I appreciate the ranking member meeting with me and the conversation we had about this matter. We hold different views on this. But I believe this is best for our Nation and, indeed, best for our President and our country and certainly for our men and women in uniform that this is passed today, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes just to respond quickly.

First of all, the GAO study specifically said they didn't address the constitutional issue; they didn't address article II. They simply said on the plain reading of the statute, 30 days' notice was required and 30 days' notice wasn't given, which, by the way, didn't take a GAO study to figure out. That is very plain.

The statute itself is really not in question nor that the President didn't give the notice required. The question is one that we have had repeatedly as to when the President has the authority under his article II authority to go in a different direction of the statute. As was mentioned, that happened many times, most recently with George W. Bush, a warrant with wire tapping and indefinite detention and a number of other issues. That's number 1. The GAO did not comment on that specific issue.

The second thing I would say is we are not really arguing that two wrongs make a right. We are arguing about whether or not it was wrong in the first place. All right? I still haven't heard anyone stand up on the other side who supports this issue and say: Gosh, we missed an opportunity. President George W. Bush was absolutely wrong to have taken those actions that he did and contrary to statute and did something that was illegal, and we are very mad about that. As long as we are talking about it, we should mention the fact that—so I haven't heard anyone say that, because I think the implication is, on that side, they didn't think it was wrong.

And that is the issue: Is it wrong for the President to do something that he believes is in the national security interest of the country under his article II authority? I think most people would say: Sometimes yes, sometimes no. It is a debatable issue. It is not a matter of saying two wrongs make a right. It is a matter of arguing whether or not it was wrong in the first place. And consistency is the hobgoblin of

small minds, as the saying goes, but there certainly is enough inconsistency on this issue to make people believe this is more partisan motivated than it is purely policy and conscience motivated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the gentleman recently that neither of us were in these jobs when President Bush was in office, so we don't know what we would have done at that time. I would hope that, if he went against the law, we would take similar action. I think that we would have done that.

I yield at this time 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and as chairman the Readiness Subcommittee to voice my support for H. Res. 644.

I would like to thank the chairman for his leadership in bringing this to the floor. I respect deeply the ranking member, but adamantly disagree with him on the points that he makes about this piece of legislation.

Very simply stated, the prisoner swap authorized by the President to exchange five Taliban captives for Sergeant Bergdahl was illegal. That part of the law was not followed. It is pretty plain and simple. By failing to notify the Congress in accordance with the 30-day reporting requirement, our President acted outside of the law. Clearly, it wasn't authorized and the law was ignored.

You can make arguments about what other prerogatives he had, but you can't say, well, article II we'll put in place and that trumps other areas of the law. I think you have to say that this law was disregarded.

Our Constitution clearly outlines those separations of powers. This principle is the cornerstone of our democracy. Our Framers carefully incorporated the division of the government and the responsibilities there in order to protect citizens by preventing any one branch of government from overreach and abuse of power. That is why we are here is to have these type of debates and say the President clearly acted outside of the law.

I will make this even clearer. Congress makes the laws; the President, on the other hand, has a constitutional charge of ensuring the laws are faithfully executed—not just part of them, but all of them. In this case, the President knowingly and wilfully disregarded his constitutional duties, and Americans deserve better.

Americans expect that their President will uphold his end of the constitutional bargain. Americans expect that the laws of the land apply to everyone and that they are applied prop-

erly in accordance with the direction from Congress. Americans also expect that their congressional leaders are simply not going to shrug their shoulders and look the other way. Congress has an obligation to the people to ensure that its laws are enforced. That is why we are elected.

Our Nation remains, today, at a tipping point in this world's history in a war against terrorism. The unlawful release of five Taliban prisoners, some of whom will certainly return to the battlefield, deeply concerns me. An investigation I led in 2012 indicated at the time that 27 percent return to the battlefield. That is why I remain skeptical of the administration's assessment that the released prisoners will not pose a threat to our national security.

We have no idea how much more terror those men now might unleash and what impacts they will have on the lives of others. By ignoring the law, the President has decided that he's going to shoulder this responsibility. I argue he had an obligation under the law to consult Congress in doing this. That is why it was put into the National Defense Authorization Act.

We live in a nation where people expect their elected leaders to carry out their duties as the Constitution directs them, and every day each of us is entrusted by the public to uphold the Constitution, and we must live up to that obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support H. Res. 644 and urge my colleagues to support this institution and our Constitution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are here to consider a technical violation of section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act. A fair reading of that section would indicate that it is drafted and focused on gratuitous prisoner releases, the many occasions prior to the adoption of that section when the prior administration or this administration chose to release a prisoner. When applied to the situation for which it was drafted, it is a practical and fully constitutional provision.

It is practical because it involves a 30-day delay in release of a prisoner where there is no particular hurry to release the prisoner. We release the prisoner 30 days after the notice; we make the decision to release the prisoner; the prisoner is released; and it gives Congress 30 days to perhaps pass a law prohibiting such release.

I believe it is constitutional because it doesn't interfere with the Commander in Chief's ability to safeguard and protect the soldiers under his command.

Now there is an attempt to criticize the President for not following this statute when it is applied to a situation for which it was not drafted and

when it is applied in such a way where it becomes incredibly impractical, perhaps impossible, and constitutionally questionable.

We have had prisoner exchanges in every war we have fought, and they have been implemented by the executive branch. Even in World War II, we had prisoner exchanges before the end of the war.

Now, as a practical matter, if you have a 30-day delay in effectuating a prisoner exchange, it is not just the U.S. Government that has 30 days to think about whether to go through with the decision. You also give the enemy 30 days to think about it. And the hard-liners within the enemy's council can eliminate the deal. So it is impractical, especially if it was a good deal.

Now, this may not have been a good deal, but there may come a time when we have negotiated a very good, favorable-to-America prisoner exchange. And this provision would say it is prevented not by decisions of the Congress or the President, but by decisions made by our enemy in their council.

But, second, a prisoner exchange returns to the United States a soldier under the command and protection of the Commander in Chief. He has a constitutional duty to protect and hopefully return home safely our soldiers.

When you create a circumstance that makes it practically impossible to have a prisoner exchange because in order to have one you have to give the hard-liners within the enemy's council an ability to upset it, then you have, I believe, unconstitutionally interfered with the role of the Commander in Chief.

We tell our Commander in Chief to bring as many as possible of our men and women home safely. We cannot at the same time, in effect, prohibit any prisoner exchange with which the enemy hard-liners may disagree.

Now, I am not here to praise the Bergdahl decision. I think I disagree with it; I know I disagree with it. But I am here to say that this was a code section not designed to apply to the situation, cannot practically be applied to this situation, and is constitutionally questionable as applied to this situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Given that, how can it be said that it is a good use of Congress' time to pass some formal resolution attacking the President for not applying to this situation a code section so infirm?

I think that what we are doing today is dodging the real responsibility of Congress. We are engaged now in bombing ISIS. The Constitution says that Congress should play a role in making that decision. Many of our colleagues

would prefer to dodge the issue. It is safer to attack the President for what he did in the past than to participate in the decisions of the future.

We should be dealing with an authorization to utilize military force against ISIS. We should be debating the term that that applies. We should be debating whether it applies to airpower alone or whether, under some circumstances, we should have boots on the ground.

But, no, we are not dealing with that. That is too tough a vote. That is a vote on which members of both parties might disagree. Instead, we are playing around with this resolution.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, just a little reality check here. I offered the points that went into the National Defense Authorization Act. One of the reasons I did it was because we specifically did not want any detainees to be taken from Guantanamo without alerting the Congress, because they had tried it before and it had pushback from the Congress and we felt like we should have a part in that protection of our people.

□ 1545

There are 80 people, detainees, in Guantanamo that have been vetted and that are approved for possible transfer to a suitable location. None of these five were on that list. All were considered too dangerous to be on that list. There were several months of negotiations. There was plenty of time to give us the 30 days' notice. They talked to 80 to 90 people in four different executive branches: the State Department, the Defense Department, the White House, and Homeland Security, but not one Member of Congress, in compliance with the law. They didn't talk to Senator REID, they didn't talk to Senator FEINSTEIN, and they didn't talk to the Speaker. Nobody. And that was not accidental. That was a firm decision to avoid the law and to avoid going to the Congress, which was required.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), my friend and colleague, a member of the Budget Committee, and cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Article I, section 1 of the United States Constitution says: "The Congress shall have the power"—I want to repeat—"the Congress shall have the power to make rules concerning the capture on land and water."

December 26, 2013, the President of the United States signed into law the Congress' action on article I, section 8, regarding making rules.

The President had options on December 26, 2013. He could have signed it, as he did, accepted language that was in there, knowing it was in there—I am assuming someone over there read it. So he had an option to sign it. He had

an option to send it back, and at that point the Congress could have done whatever they wanted to do. They could override it, they could rewrite it, they could revoke on it and send it back again.

What the President didn't have the right to do was to change it. And, in fact, I have heard a couple of times today quoting of article II of the Constitution. I have read it probably a dozen times just sitting here today. It is relatively short. I am having a hard time finding the authority here, but I did find some interesting thing. Article II: "Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation, 'I do solemnly swear or affirm that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.'"

Later it says that the President, he shall take care that the laws be faithfully—faithfully—executed.

The idea that the President can take the very law that he signed into existence by putting his name on it—the very law—as a suggestion—whether or not any President before him did it—is tantamount to someone being pulled over for speeding and saying, I can speed because the guy in front of me did it.

Then there is no law at all. The laws that this Congress sends over there and the President signs are not recommendations. They are not suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States broke the law. No matter what another Congress does, or another Congress did, or what another President ever did is irrelevant to this today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I would again note that it is not a matter of speeding. It would be as if someone were stopped for speeding and said that there is no posted speed limit, how are you saying that I was speeding? That is the argument. It is the argument a number of Presidents have made, that their article II authority for national security purposes gives them the legal right to do this.

I would also note that in a couple hundred years of history, no court has ever said otherwise, has ever reversed one of these decisions by the President.

So this notion that the President knew he was breaking the law and just did it, and comparing it to two wrongs don't make a right or people speeding, it is the President's opinion—and, by the way, not just this President, but every President that I am aware of, including, again, George W. Bush, that this is not a violation of the law, this

is not speeding, because of his article II authority. So it is not a matter of simply saying, well, he broke the law but if someone else did it, it is okay. It is arguing that none of those people actually broke the law. That is the argument in the debate.

As far as the bill itself, yes, the President was very much aware of it, that it was in that bill when he signed the bill, and it was part of a much larger bill. It was part of the National Defense Authorization Act.

When he signed that bill, he noted: "I disagree with this portion. I think it has the potential to violate my article II authority." So he absolutely noticed that it was in there and gave us notice that he did not feel that it would legally bind him in certain circumstances.

Again, it is a debatable point. All I know is that in a couple hundred years of history, the Presidents, all of them, have won that debate. And now here we stand today saying that this one President somehow uniquely should be condemned for doing what all before him have done and what all courts have said is perfectly okay.

So, again, I find this to be more partisan than substantive.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, the President is meeting with congressional leaders to discuss our strategy moving forward in Iraq and Syria to protect Americans, our homeland, and our national interests.

It is hard for me to understand why we are debating this partisan resolution that would condemn the President and our government for having saved the life of an American soldier, Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl.

In the past month, we have seen with horror the sight of two Americans killed at the hands of some of these deranged insurgents, not unlike the situation many of our American soldiers have faced in Afghanistan where Mr. Bergdahl was captured.

So here we have 2 weeks to go in this congressional session because we are just back from an August recess where there were no votes, and we have already been told by the Republican leadership in the House that they don't intend to be in session more than 2 weeks now, this week and next week, possibly a few days in the following week, and we are going to be gone.

In that time, we have to finish a budget, we have to deal with all sorts of other pressing matters, and we have to work with the President to come up with a strategy to make sure that it is clear where America stands on these issues that impact the lives and security of Americans abroad and at home, and here we are debating a resolution

that has no impact. It doesn't change the circumstance. Bowe Bergdahl is now alive and back home. It doesn't change the fact that James Foley is still dead and so is Steven Sotloff. They are both still gone. But what we do know is that the military kept its commitment to our men and women in uniform when they say we never leave one of our own in military uniform behind.

Now, you can have this semantic discussion about whether a statute supersedes the Constitution or whether this statute required the President to act a certain way. All I know is what General Dempsey has said before. General Dempsey being the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey, General Dempsey said this with regard to the rescue of Bowe Bergdahl:

This was likely the last best opportunity to free him.

Now, anyone in this Chamber has the right to argue whatever they want. But no one was in the shoes of Bowe Bergdahl, quite honestly, no one was in the shoes of General Dempsey, and at the end of the day, not one of us is in the shoes of President Barack Obama. And if that window is closing, he has got to make a decision because there is an American life on the line. And if we don't believe that, just ask the families of Mr. Foley and Mr. Sotloff.

Bowe Bergdahl is alive today. Thank the Lord, thank you, President Obama, and thank you to our men and women in uniform who risked their own lives to make sure that men and women like that could come back home.

We have 2 weeks to go before we are gone and out campaigning for election. You would think that we would work on the things that people in America are concerned about most. They want us to not shut down this government again, they want us to make sure that we continue the success of the last 55 months of creating 10 million jobs—because remember, don't forget, it wasn't too long ago, January 2009, when George Bush handed the keys over to Barack Obama at the White House, we bled 800,000 jobs in just 1 month. We have got more work to do to get people to work. There are a whole bunch of families, including mine, who are sending their kids to college.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. We have more student loan debt in America held by our young men and women trying to get their college degrees and, of course, their parents, as well, who are paying for them, than we hold in all the credit card debt in America today.

Does this bill do anything to help young Americans and their parents help their kids get through college? Not a thing. Does this help an American today who works full-time and

still lives in poverty because he is working at a minimum-wage job? Not a thing.

Does this help a woman who is out there working just as hard as a man and doing the same exact thing but earning less money than he is? Not a thing.

We have got work to do.

Bowe Bergdahl is alive. Let's praise that. Let's make sure every American can come back home and say the same thing, and then let's get to work doing the real business of this country rather than passing partisan resolutions that have nothing to do with the business at hand.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I respect my friend. We came to Congress together, and I appreciate his remarks on a lot of things. But we should get back to the subject at hand. This has nothing to do with Sergeant Bergdahl. This has to do with the action that the President took. We are all happy that Sergeant Bergdahl is home, and we are glad that he is here, and his case will be taken care of separately.

Mr. Speaker, there is a call to do something for the President. The President hasn't asked us to do anything yet. He is not even speaking until tomorrow. Then we will see what he has to say, and then we will see how we move forward.

I am not an attorney. My good friend from Washington is a great attorney. And I recall when we had Secretary Hagel, and Secretary Hagel made the comment that he thought what they did was within the law. And my good friend responded that here is the way it works: The President signed the bill and said that he disagreed with it, but that does not change it. It is still the law until it is challenged in the courts. That is our system.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW), my good friend from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a supporter and a sponsor of this resolution, and I appreciate my friend from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for working with me on this bipartisan effort to hold the administration accountable. Under current law, the President is required to notify Congress prior to releasing any prisoners from Guantanamo Bay. Unfortunately, he failed to do that this summer when he transferred five high-priority detainees in exchange for Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl.

Although I am grateful that Sergeant Bergdahl has been reunited with his family, I strongly disagree with the President's decision to negotiate with terrorists, and I certainly don't agree with the President's decision to make this prisoner exchange without first consulting with Congress in the manner required by federal law.

The freeing of terrorists poses a national security threat to Americans and our Armed Forces, and it complicates our current efforts to combat terrorism worldwide. Negotiating with terrorists will only weaken this Nation in the future and encourage other terrorists to kidnap Americans in an attempt to extort future prisoner exchanges.

□ 1600

Checks and balances aren't negotiable. It is unacceptable for this or any other administration to treat Congress as an afterthought or adversary, particularly with decisions impacting our national security and especially since, in this case, Congress could have helped the President get this decision right.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee and having the honor to serve under Mr. McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, I would like to just share a couple of thoughts, having sat through the hearing with Secretary Hagel where he was held accountable that day, he was asked very probing, difficult questions about a very difficult decision, which was happening at Mach speed, when an opportunity—a small window of opportunity opened up to recover an American soldier held in captivity by the enemy.

When the President signed the National Defense Authorization Act, including the 30-day notice, the administration put up a big red warning flag saying that article II of the U.S. Constitution, which empowers the President to be the Commander in Chief, conflicted with that section, and they reserved their rights to continue to act pursuant to the Constitution.

Now, any first-year law student—frankly, almost any high school student who takes American history—knows that a constitutional provision trumps a statute, that when there is a conflict of law between a constitutional provision and a statute, the Constitution prevails.

The President, as Secretary Hagel laid out in excruciating detail when he was asked about the sequence of events which led up to the decision that was made, again reviewed through the Justice Department their authority.

Realizing that again there was no plan B, there was no plan C to get Sergeant Bergdahl out of captivity, there was no Special Forces sort of ready to rev up and go in and free him, the fact of the matter is that it was this or there was nothing and that, exercising his rights under the Constitution, they

moved forward and freed Sergeant Bergdahl, which apparently everybody agrees with the outcome, they are just upset with the fact that the President's interpretation of the law is different than the committee.

So where are we with this resolution? Is there a remedy? Is anybody proposing to do anything other than just sort of issue what I think is just a political polemic criticizing the President for his actions?

This resolution is a nullity in terms of any effect or impact that it actually has in terms of the President's actions. He is not being held to account by impeachment, which probably there is a lot of talk on the Internet when this was all taking place, but that is not happening.

So it is just really we are filling up space here on the floor of the House when we have so many other pressing issues. At the end of the day, it is not going to change the events. It is not going to change the two sides in terms of their interpretation of what happened here one iota.

Mr. Speaker, again, I understand that people had an honest disagreement about the way the statute was interpreted and implemented, but what I will just say to you is that that is an honest disagreement that happens and has happened in American history over and over again.

We should move on. We should let the military do whatever disciplinary proceedings they are going to do with Sergeant Bergdahl.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. COURTNEY. We should let the military act as they deem appropriate in terms of Sergeant Bergdahl's actions in the Middle East, but the fact of the matter is it is Secretary Hagel who came before this committee as a wounded warrior from the war in Vietnam, an impeccable military history—in my opinion, one of the most outstanding individuals I have had the privilege to meet in Washington, D.C.—testified honestly and sincerely. He took his hits before the committee.

Let's move on. Let's accept his explanation. Disagree with it if we honestly feel that he acted improperly, but the fact of the matter is he acted pursuant to the Constitution. It is time for this Congress to focus on real issues that have a real effect on the American people.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague, and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 644. The President's actions in

unilaterally swapping five Taliban members for an American prisoner swept away a decades-old policy of not negotiating with terrorists. This policy prevents the United States from being extorted by evil people who hold no regard for human life.

The President's actions lead to an open season on Americans all over the world. Are we now in the business of negotiating with terrorists? Is ISIL up next at the bargaining table with this administration? These are senior Taliban detainees, not low-level foot soldiers. Will the administration stop at five next time? Why not 50 or 100? This is unacceptable.

The President's actions were also troublesome because he did not inform Congress prior to making the swap. Even the independent Government Accountability Office explicitly said that this exchange broke the law. Some will try to say that this is just partisan rhetoric, but what did they say to the findings of the nonpartisan GAO?

While it is a relief to have an American home, the way this was done further erodes the working relationship between the President and Congress. The President asked the Congress to act and pass bills, but how can we trust him with new legislation when time and time again he has abused that trust? How do we know he is not just going to ignore the next law that we send him?

Congress must stand up against the way this prisoner exchange took place. We are a nation that believes in the rule of law. We have a Congress that makes law and a President who is supposed to enforce them. In this case, the law was broken, and Congress cannot remain silent.

I urge every one of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Washington has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The issue here of negotiating with terrorists misses the fact that this happened on the battlefield. The five Taliban commanders were captured on the battlefield, as was Bowe Bergdahl. This was a prisoner exchange, as has happened in every war that we have fought.

Now, it is a slightly different situation because it is the Taliban who are now out of power. We are not actually fighting a government at this point. We are fighting a group of insurgents, but nonetheless, Bowe Bergdahl was captured on the field of battle, as were the five Taliban commanders, and this was a prisoner exchange.

To equate this with negotiating with terrorists I think totally misses the

point of that aspect of it, that we were exchanging prisoners, not dealing with a straight terrorist situation. I don't think it sets that precedent at all, and I think we need to be aware that that was what the President was facing.

Was the exchange a good deal? That is highly debatable. I am glad I wasn't the Commander in Chief having to make that call, facing the deteriorating health of Bowe Bergdahl and wondering if five Taliban prisoners were worth saving his life, but these sorts of decisions are made all the time.

I would remind you that Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel, no shrinking violet when it comes to terrorism, once exchanged over 1,000 Palestinian prisoners for two Israel soldiers because that was a prisoner exchange. That was bringing home the people that Israel wanted brought home, and it was not easy.

So this is not simply a matter of negotiating with terrorists or giving away prisoners. It is the difficult choice of what you do to bring your own soldier home, a difficult choice that every President or Prime Minister whose country is engaged in warfare has to face. I don't think we should diminish the difficulty or the importance of that decision.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H. Res. 644, for which I am a proud cosponsor.

This bipartisan bill condemns and disapproves the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay and expresses national security concerns over the effects of releasing five Taliban leaders and negotiating with terrorists.

Our constitutional system of checks and balances maintains a separation of powers that ensures Congress is involved in major decisions that affect our country's national security.

I have serious concerns when the President deliberately ignores Congress, negotiates with terrorists, and violates the law which requires that he consult with Congress before releasing detainees.

Those five Taliban leaders that were released are already responsible for the deaths of many Americans. In 2010, they were determined "too dangerous to transfer" by President Obama's own task force. One of the five had ties to Bin Laden himself. Another is wanted by the United Nations for war crimes.

Unfortunately, there is a good chance these five terrorists will return to their radical jihadist fight against America and against our Western allies. Nearly

30 percent of detainees reengage in terrorist activity after being released.

In any major decision of war and peace, Congress must have a say because the American people must have a voice. As we continue to face many tough decisions over how to best protect Americans at home and abroad, Congress should be an active participant in decisionmaking. I will continue to work hard to ensure our homeland remains safe from terrorist attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), my friend and colleague and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me you have two issues here: one, Congress, which we have an enumerated power to make rules for detainees captured on land and water; then you also have, as the GAO report pointed out, a funding prohibition that withheld funds contingent on the President providing that notification.

As Madison said in the Federalist Papers, the power of the purse is the most effectual weapon that we have in terms of vindicating the interests of our constituents. So whatever the President's article II power is, clearly, if we remove the funding, then he is not able to do that through the executive branch.

So the question is: Knowing that, why go ahead and do it? Why not comply with both the statute and the funding restriction? I think the reason is because they knew this would not be popular with the American people. One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, "Well, this statute really shouldn't apply in this situation because hard-liners in the enemy camp can nix the deal."

I have got news for you, Mr. Speaker, the hard-liners were the subject of the deal. I served in Guantanamo for a time. The Bush administration released detainees who they thought may not have been a danger anymore. Nobody would have even suggested that this Taliban Five did not represent a danger to our national security.

So here we have an instance where Congress clearly exercised its authority in order to check the President on an issue with, in terms of the terrorist detainees, that his views are, quite frankly, not representative of the American people as a whole. We did that legitimately, and this President decided to flagrantly violate the lawful actions that we took.

I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The release of the Taliban Five, in violation of a law that President Obama himself signed, is among the greatest examples of this administration's disregard of the Constitution. It reflects contempt for this Congress and for the people who are represented here. Worst of all, his actions have emboldened Islamic militants and endangered American service personnel and civilians around the world.

Five years ago, when I first came to Congress, the President announced his intentions to close the terrorist detention facility at Guantanamo Bay. The Justice Department went shopping for a prison back in my State of Illinois to relocate those most dangerous and hardened enemy combatants from the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Back then, Democrats had a majority in this House and a supermajority in the United States Senate. Even then, the President could not get authority from this Congress, controlled by his party in both chambers, to empty Guantanamo and move terrorists even detained back here to United States soil.

It is one thing for the President to defy any old law. It is another thing for the President to defy the very laws that he, himself, signed into law, but President Obama has gone even further.

By refusing to notify Congress of his intention to open the gates at GTMO and thus avoiding the anticipated political pressure that his carelessness would invite, the President has done the unthinkable. He has negotiated with terrorists, plain and simple.

I would say that he has abused the office and the power which comes with it, except in this case he has done something that he doesn't even have the power to do.

□ 1615

Tomorrow night the President will address the Nation about his latest strategy to deal with Islamic jihadists, but I would suggest that the world has seen enough about how this administration deals with terrorists and nothing he says tomorrow night can hide the growing sense among jihadists around the world that they finally have an American President who will negotiate with them.

It is important for Congress to tell the world where we stand. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on today's resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have to ask: What is personalities toward the President, just for a point of clarification? Personal attacks, perhaps?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are allowed to engage in debate on policy. They are not allowed to engage in personally offensive remarks regarding the President.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to take note of the importance of this debate and, as well, the respect that we as Members of Congress owe each other and this institution.

I have long said that our longevity comes not only because of the democratic principles of our Constitution, but because there is the groundwork of the Founding Fathers and those who took to the floor to debate such raging issues as the question of slavery in the 1800s. Each time we are given the microphone, I think that we should adhere to that respect, and each time we put our pen to paper to create legislation, it should equally be based on the grounds of respect and understanding of the constitutional divisions of the three branches of government.

Today I think we have failed. This is, as I said, a personal attack against the President. If we would read the resolution, we would see five items that completely dictate the failure of the Obama administration.

Let me say that all of us concede the point that section 1035 that was added under the Obama administration in 2012—or, more recently—does ask the President to give a 30-day notice to Congress. No other President has been asked to do that.

The President has been very clear on his intent to close Guantanamo. Many of us have been to Guantanamo. But the issue before us was not an effort to close Guantanamo. And so to suggest that there was malicious intent of this President is, from my perspective, showing disrespect and dishonor to us, the institution, and the three branches of government.

Let me be very clear. There is a debate on the powers that the President has under the war powers. Some say there is a statute that says he had to notify us. But there was an explanation. This very strong committee, the Armed Services Committee, with the chairman, whom I respect, and the ranking member, had a very thorough hearing that many of us were able to read some of the transcript where the Secretary of Defense came and explained.

I think one of the key elements for me as a member of Homeland Security is that the Secretary made it very clear that this was a military operation with very high risk, as spoken by Secretary Hagel on June 11, 2014, and a very short window of opportunity that we didn't want to jeopardize, both for

the sake of Sergeant Bergdahl—there is a sentence that congratulates us for not leaving our precious treasure behind—and our operators in the field who put themselves at great risk to secure this return. There are those of us who remember that brief glimpse that we had of the rescue. Our men and women swooped down and picked up Sergeant Bergdahl. It was a military action.

This is an unnecessary resolution, Mr. Speaker. It is wrongly condemning. The President had authority and he explained what the action was.

Vote against this resolution. It is untimely and wrong. Vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H. Res. 644, and the underlying resolution.

I oppose the resolution because at bottom it is nothing more than another partisan attack on the President and will make it difficult for this body and the Administration to find the common ground and goodwill needed to devise and support policies needed to address the real threats and challenges facing our country, particularly the threat posed by ISIS.

H. Res. 644, a resolution disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to provide Congress with 30 days advance notice before making the transfer of certain Guantanamo detainees that secured the release of an American soldier, U.S. Army Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl.

Sgt. Bergdahl's health was poor and rapidly deteriorating at the time his release from captivity was secured by his Commander-in-Chief, President Obama, who speaking for the nation, said on June 3, 2014 in response to critics of his decision:

The United States has always had a pretty sacred rule, and that is: we don't leave our men or women in uniform behind. Regardless of the circumstances, we still get an American soldier back if he's held in captivity. Period. Full stop.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution condemns the Obama Administration for failing to comply with the 30-day advance notice requirement imposed by Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) and section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76).

I disagree for several reasons. First, as Defense Secretary Hagel testified before the House Armed Services Committee on June 11, 2014, "this was not simply a detainee transfer, but a military operation with very high risk and a very short window of opportunity that we didn't want to jeopardize—both for the sake of Sergeant Bergdahl, and our operators in the field who put themselves at great risk to secure his return."

As a military operation, rather than a routine transfer of detainees, the President had the constitutional authority as Commander-in-Chief to authorize this sensitive military operation for which time was of the essence.

The resolution put forward by the House majority assumes that the provisions of Section 1034 of National Defense Authorization Act trump the President's constitutional authority under Article II if the two are in conflict.

This clearly is an erroneous assumption since Article VI of the Constitution makes clear that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and prevails in the event of a conflict with federal or state law. See, e.g., *INS v. CHADHA*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) (federal law conferring "legislative veto" power to be exercised by only House of Congress held unconstitutional).

But even if it were less clear whether a conflict existed between a federal law and the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief, as Justice Robert Jackson pointed out 62 years ago in the famous "Steel Seizure Case," *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 640 (1952), it does not automatically follow that the president has "broken the law" if he relies upon his claimed constitutional authority:

[B]ecause the President does not enjoy unmentioned powers does not mean that the mentioned ones should be narrowed by a niggardly construction. Some clauses could be made almost unworkable, as well as immutable, by refusal to indulge some latitude of interpretation for changing times. I have heretofore, and do now, give to the enumerated powers the scope and elasticity afforded by what seem to be reasonable, practical implications, instead of the rigidity dictated by a doctrinaire textualism.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the constitutionality of Section 1035, the statutory provision which the resolution asserts the President has violated, has never upheld by any court, and certainly not upheld against a challenge that it impermissibly infringes upon the President's duty as Commander in Chief to protect the lives of Americans abroad and to protect U.S. service members.

The Administration strongly objected to the inclusion of Section 1035 in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2014, on the ground that it unwisely and inappropriately interferes with the Executive Branch's ability to manage detainees in a time of armed conflict.

Indeed, the President has informed Congress of his objection to the inclusion of these and similar provisions in prior versions of the Defense Authorization and Defense Appropriations Act is law, and it is interesting to note that they only began to be inserted after President Obama assumed the office.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the resolution before us ill-conceived and unwise, its timing could not be worse.

There are only a few days left before the Congress adjourns. We need to devote all our time on addressing the real problems facing the American people, like raising the minimum wage, making college more affordable, passing immigration reform, and responding to the threat to the security of the nation and the homeland by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is serious and real and the President has reached out to Congress to work with him to develop a unified and international response to meet the threat.

And tomorrow evening, the President will address the nation on the nature of the ISIS threat and the actions the United States will take to protect the security of the nation and the homeland.

In the midst of this international crisis, it does not help or strengthen our country for the

House to be debating a partisan resolution condemning the President and Commander-in-Chief.

In concluding, let me quote again Defense Secretary Hagel:

The options available to us to recover Sergeant Bergdahl were few, and far from perfect. But they often are in wartime, and especially in a complicated war like we have been fighting in Afghanistan for 13 years. Wars are messy and full of imperfect choices.

In the decision to rescue Sergeant Bergdahl, we complied with the law, and we did what we believed was in the best interests of our country, our military, and Sergeant Bergdahl.

The President has constitutional responsibilities and authorities to protect American citizens and members of our armed forces. That's what he did. America does not leave its soldiers behind.

We made the right decision, and we did it for the right reasons—to bring home one of our people.

Mr. Speaker, we should not waste this precious remaining on matters intended to score political points or to hold the current president to standards we never applied to his predecessors.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McKEON. We have just one more speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the inference has been that this happened on the spur of the moment and they didn't have time to tell Congress. These negotiations on this transfer went on for months. They have admitted they told 80 to 90 people in four of the departments of the executive branch but not one Member of Congress, in compliance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On the last point about the people who were noticed how long this was going on for, yes, the negotiations were going on for around 3 years, but the timeliness came in when they actually had a deal. The President's concern was once they got to the point where they had the deal, if the details of it had been leaked, it would have nixed the deal. And they were deeply concerned about Sergeant Bergdahl's health.

As I have said, this is an extraordinarily difficult call. I don't know if I would have done this deal or not. It is hard. The Commander in Chief has that responsibility. As I have mentioned, other leaders through the world have done it, including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who gave up over a thousand prisoners in exchange for two Israeli soldiers. Those choices are difficult, and I am certain that those thousand Palestinians that were re-

leased posed some risk to Israel, but that is the decision they made. And that is the decision the President made.

This resolution is not primarily about whether or not the deal should have been done; it is about whether or not we should condemn the President for a clear violation of the law. And I will simply come back to the fact that this President has only done what every other President before him did in exercising his article II authority—under his interpretation and every previous Executive's—that this was legal.

It has been implied throughout this resolution that the President looked at the law and said: I'm just not going to follow it. That is not what he did. He did what every President before him has done. He said that he believed it was within his legal authority to make this decision.

So to put forward a resolution that said he intentionally broke the law, I think, is wrong on its face. This President made a determination about his article II authorities and went forward with it. He did not knowingly violate the law. Secretary Hagel has explained that repeatedly.

Again, I said it a little while ago that President Bush did the exact same thing. He violated any number of different laws and said that article II is the reason. We have been told: Well, that was years ago. I don't know what we would have done then.

I have offered up the opportunity for anybody on the other side to as roundly criticize and condemn President Bush for those actions now that we are here. I haven't heard it. It hasn't been said. All of which leads us to the inescapable conclusion that this is more partisan than principled. This President is the one who is being condemned by a Republican Congress. All the other Presidents have done it and it is just: Oh, we are just not going to do anything about that. That leads to the belief that this is a partisan action.

I think Congress should comment on this. We had great hearings on this. We should have had a hearing on this. We brought in Secretary Hagel. He explained himself. We criticized some of those decisions. That is appropriate.

This resolution is unprecedented and I think once again shows that this body has become more partisan than principled.

I urge everyone to reject the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am leaving Congress at the end of this year, but I am sure at home I will still be able to hear blame on President Bush for at least the next 2 years.

One thing we can't escape is the fact that this went on for months. Even though they had to make a critical

last-minute decision, they still had time to notify 80 to 90 people in the executive branch and not one Member of the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate, in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) to give the concluding remarks on this debate. He is the vice chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for introducing this measure and shepherding it through the committee and onto the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important for us to vote on this measure for two reasons. One is that it is important for Congress to speak clearly and directly when a President violates the law, and that is exactly what GAO said the administration did. They violated section 811.

Now, it is true that throughout the country's history there have been differences of opinion about the constitutionality of various provisions of law. I think it is fairly rare, however, that a President has chosen to violate a provision that is as clear as this one. There was no waiver authority. There was no ambiguity. There was no matter of interpretation. The law was clear. It says, if you are going to transfer somebody from Guantanamo Bay, you have got to give at least 30 days' notice. And they did have meetings within the administration that discussed whether to follow that 30-day requirement, and they decided not to do it. So it was a clear-cut decision not to follow the law.

In addition to that, the point was made by the gentleman from Florida that they also violated the Antideficiency Act. There has never been a dispute about the ability of Congress to put conditions on funding. And yet, by carrying out this action, they spent funds for which they were not authorized to spend, which also violated a separate law.

They didn't have to tell everybody. They could have just told the Speaker and majority leader. I think they are pretty safe at keeping secrets. Yet the President chose not to. The rule of law is important. It is fundamental to our system. And so it is important to speak clearly on that.

But here is the second reason. The Constitution gives Congress a variety of powers related to national security; but in carrying out those powers, whether it is oversight of the money

we spend, oversight of the operations, making decisions to authorize the use of military force, all of that depends upon Congress having accurate, timely information. This decision not to follow the law undercuts the trust that is required between the military and the intelligence community and the Congress in carrying out our responsibilities.

Tomorrow night we are all going to listen to the President as he, hopefully, gives us his goals and strategy for achieving the goals to diminish and destroy ISIL, but all of that is possible only if there is an exchange of information so that we can carry out the responsibilities that the Constitution puts upon us.

When we don't have trust that the President and the military or the intelligence community following his orders are giving us that information, then we can't have trust that we have the ability to carry out our duties under the Constitution.

On a bipartisan basis, over the last several years, we have set up oversight structures on cyber, on terrorism, on sensitive military operations that allow the military to operate in a complicated world but give us the ability to get the information to carry out the oversight that we have to have.

That is the other reason this is important. This undermines that trust that is necessary for an executive and legislative branch to defend the country in a complex world. For that reason, I think it is important for us to speak clearly about it because there are going to be more instances in the days ahead.

We need—we deserve—to have full information.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the United States should not negotiate with terrorists. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle agree, which is why we have passed laws requiring the President notify us if he wishes to change effective foreign policy. Sadly, when the President unilaterally organized a prisoner swap with the Taliban for the release of Army Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl, he broke the law, disregarded the Constitution, and placed all American families at risk.

A recent GAO report details the extent of which the President ignored current law and disregarded Congress in his decision-making. In addition to violating the thirty-day rule, funding was used that was not available to complete the transfer, which violates the Antideficiency Act.

The five members of the Taliban whom the President released and effectively pardoned from Guantanamo Bay are "high risk" and dangerous with extensive ties to al Qaeda. These terrorists have the blood of innocent civilians by the 9/11 attacks and American soldiers on their hands and are fixated on destroying our freedoms. Immediately upon their release, members of the Taliban praised this "big victory" as the first time the "enemy offi-

cially recognized our status." One Taliban leader went as far to say that the return of one prisoner was "like pouring 10,000 Taliban fighters into the battle on the side of jihad. Now the Taliban have the right lion to lead them in the final moment before victory in Afghanistan." These detainees are sure to relocate to Afghanistan and resume launching attacks against the United States and our Allies. At a time when our brave men and women are still fighting the Global War on Terrorism in Afghanistan, this decision further places our heroes in harms way.

This administration has a history of ignoring our laws in order to achieve its own agenda. According to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, these negotiations did not happen overnight, but were in the works for months. The reason why the President did not notify Congress thirty days before giving the go-ahead to release and pardon five jihadists as required by law is because he did not feel it was necessary. It's time to put a stop to this irresponsible behavior and hold the President accountable. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution that condemns and disapproves of the President's unlawful actions, which have placed American families at risk here at home and abroad.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong concern regarding President Obama's failure to notify Congress at least 30 days in advance of exchanging five Taliban prisoners held at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, for U.S. Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, who was held by the Taliban as a Prisoner of War (POW).

However, this resolution is a clear example of partisan overreach by the House Majority and does not appropriately address these issues. Nor does it advance this debate in a constructive way. In the words of the Dissenting Views of the House Armed Services Committee members, this resolution is "an overstated and unnecessary product of a rhetorical exercise fueled by over partisanship."

We, as a nation, have an obligation to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces to do everything in our power as a nation to bring them home. Americans do not leave our soldiers behind.

Section 8111, of the Department of Defense (DOD) Appropriations Act of 2014, prohibits the President from using any Congressionally appropriated funds to transfer any individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay, unless Congress is notified 30 days in advance. This is the law, and the President is required to comply with the law.

The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded that "DOD violated section 8111 because it did not notify the relevant congressional committees at least 30 days in advance of the transfer." Additionally, GAO concluded that DOD violated the Antideficiency Act "because DOD used appropriated funds to carry out the transfer when no money was available for that purpose."

While I agree with the GAO findings, I cannot vote for a purely partisan measure written under the pretense of addressing a violation of the law.

This is a serious matter that requires deliberative debate in Congress. The President should have followed the law, as laid out in

section 8111, and notified Congress 30 days in advance of this release. However, the American people deserve better than this highly politicized resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 715, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble, as amended.

The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 163, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—249

Aderholt	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Amash	Fleming	Long
Amodel	Flores	Lucas
Bachmann	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Bachus	Fortenberry	Lummis
Barletta	Fox	Marchant
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Barrow (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Barton	Gabbard	Matheson
Benishek	Gallagher	McAllister
Bentivolio	Garcia	McCarthy (CA)
Bera (CA)	Gardner	McCauley
Bilirakis	Garrett	McClintock
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	McHenry
Black	Gibbs	McKeon
Blackburn	Gibson	McKinley
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Rodgers
Braley (IA)	Goodlatte	Meadows
Bridenstine	Gosar	Meehan
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	Messer
Brooks (IN)	Granger	Mica
Brown (GA)	Graves (GA)	Michaud
Brownley (CA)	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Buchanan	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Bucshon	Griffith (VA)	Mullin
Burgess	Grimm	Mulvaney
Bustos	Guthrie	Murphy (FL)
Byrne	Hall	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hanna	Neugebauer
Camp	Harper	Noem
Campbell	Harris	Nugent
Capito	Hartzer	Nunes
Carter	Hastings (WA)	O'Rourke
Cassidy	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Chabot	Hensarling	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Clawson (FL)	Holding	Perry
Coble	Hudson	Peters (MI)
Coffman	Huelskamp	Peterson
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Petri
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Pittenger
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pitts
Conaway	Hurt	Poe (TX)
Cook	Issa	Pompeo
Costa	Jenkins	Posey
Cotton	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Crawford	Jolly	Reed
Crenshaw	Jones	Reichert
Cuellar	Jordan	Renacci
Culberson	Joyce	Ribble
Daines	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rigell
Denham	Kingston	Roby
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
DeSantis	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rokita
Ellmers	Lankford	Rooney
Farenthold	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher	Latta	Roskam
Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Ross

Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—163

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutt er
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
DesJarlais
Dingell
Engel
King (IA)

Lee (CA)
Maloney,
Carolyn
McIntyre
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee

Olson
Pelosi
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tierney
Velázquez

□ 1655

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FARENTHOLD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Resolution condemning and disapproving of the failure of the Obama administration to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before transferring individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing concern about the national security risks over the transfer of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 485 on September 9, 2014, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES REGULATORY OVERREACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 715 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5078.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1656

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–581 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–581 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 248, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

AYES—163

Barber	Hahn	Negrete McLeod
Bass	Hanabusa	Nolan
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	O'Rourke
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Higgins	Pascarell
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Payne
Bonamici	Holt	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Israel	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carney	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kilmer	T.
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kuster	Schakowsky
Connolly	Langevin	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Levin	Serrano
Crowley	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sinema
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sires
DeGette	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Delaney	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Doggett	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Lynch	Titus
Duckworth	Maffei	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Eshoo	Matsui	Van Hollen
Esty	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Farr	McCollum	Veasey
Fattah	McDermott	Visclosky
Foster	McGovern	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Wasserman
Fudge	Michaud	Schultz
Gabbard	Miller, George	Waters
Garamendi	Moore	Waxman
Garcia	Moran	Welch
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Nadler	Woodall
Grijalva	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gutiérrez	Neal	

NOES—248

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Bachmann	Black	Byrne
Bachus	Blackburn	Calvert
Barletta	Boustany	Camp
Barr	Brady (TX)	Campbell
Barrow (GA)	Bridenstine	Capito
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cárdenas
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Carter
Bentivolio	Broun (GA)	Cassidy

Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Jolly
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallo
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter

Hurt
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Davis, Danny
DesJarlais
Dingell
Ellison

Engel
Enyart
Gingrey (GA)
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Maloney,
Carolyn

McIntyre
Meeks
Nunnelee
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tierney
Velázquez

□ 1702

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 486 on September 9, 2014, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 240, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

AYES—170

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García
Grayson
Green, Al

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—240

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann

Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)

Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallo
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall

Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts

Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Engel

Honda
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Maloney,
Carolyn
McIntyre
Meeks
Nunnelee

Peters (CA)
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tierney
Tsongas
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1707

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 487 on September 9, 2014, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 715, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Huffman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5078 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING THE QUALITY OF WATER FOR PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES AND AGRICULTURAL USES AND TO MITIGATE AGAINST DROUGHT.

Nothing in this Act affects the authority of the Secretary or Administrator to protect the quality of surface water that is available—

(1) for public water supplies, which are a significance source of drinking water for municipalities;

(2) for agricultural uses, including irrigation; or

(3) to mitigate against the harmful impact of drought.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill before us today will make it harder for the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA to clarify the jurisdictional cov-

erage of the Clean Water Act, leaving watersheds across the country in continued legal limbo.

Now, I have visited with ranchers, landowners, and folks from around my district. I understand the anxieties that have been expressed about what the Waters of the United States rule-making means, but the solution to this situation is to seek tighter definitions and clearer rules, not to prohibit agencies from further developing an important proposal.

In particular, I am concerned that H.R. 5078 could have unintended consequences for those who rely on healthy watersheds. We need clarity in the law, so that we can protect water quality for drinking water supplies and for agricultural uses.

We are suffering from a historic drought in California, and the current legal mess—the ambiguity of what qualifies as waters of the U.S. under the Clean Water Act—actually makes it harder to know which water bodies are covered by the law.

It makes it harder to protect upstream wetlands that reach our groundwater supplies. The importance of these intermittent streams and wetlands is most notable during extreme weather events like torrential rains or droughts because wetlands and streams can absorb and then release water gradually to surrounding streams and aquifers.

This underlying bill would keep regulatory uncertainty in place, and it could leave upstream water sources subject to expensive and long-lasting litigation. That situation is not good for the communities in my district who need clean drinking water and clean water for their businesses. It is not good for my downstream ranchers who are already facing water shortages and are hurting from rising feed prices.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, that the current proposal from the EPA and the Army Corps is actually very narrowly targeted.

Under President Reagan, the Clean Water Act covered any body of water that could serve as habitat for migratory birds, a much more far-reaching standard than the one the Obama administration is considering.

The GAO determined in 2004 that the Reagan rule would have allowed the Army Corps to regulate almost any body of water or wetland. Let's remember that when we hear the characterizations of the Obama administration's proposal as some vast overreach, it is far more narrowly tailored than what existed under President Reagan.

Right now, the Federal agencies have a proposal—again, much less expansive than President Reagan's—that they are reviewing with ranchers, with water utilities, and with States. It should be, it can be, and I believe it will be a workable proposal. We should let that process play out.

Let's not make the current situation worse. Let's ensure that this bill doesn't harm drinking water or water supplies for irrigation needs. Let's ensure that we aren't making it harder to respond to an extreme drought. I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose this motion to recommit because it basically aims to gut the underlying bill. The purpose of H.R. 5078 is to uphold the Federal-State partnership in regulating the Nation's waters by maintaining a balance between the States and the Federal Government in carrying out the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 5078 restricts the administration's current administrative efforts to expand Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, and requires the agencies to engage in a federalism consultation with the State and local government partners in implementing the Clean Water Act. However, this motion is designed to undermine the legislation by giving the EPA unfettered discretion in making State water quality determinations in order to allow the administration to continue implementing its flawed rule. In effect, the amendment says that the underlying bill will not apply virtually anywhere the EPA decides that the bill should not apply. This amendment would further erode the Federal and State partnership that H.R. 5078 seeks to preserve.

I would urge all 435 Members of this body to take notice. This is another attempt by the executive branch to take Congress' constitutional authority away from us. We should all take this as a serious challenge to us. For too long, this body has allowed the executive branch to take our authority granted to us by the Constitution. I say whether it is a Republican or a Democrat administration, we have to stop that. This bill, H.R. 5078, is a step in the right direction.

H.R. 5078 is a good bill that maintains the balance of our Nation's water. We must preserve the State and Federal partnership that has existed under the Clean Water Act until this administration chose to impose an overbearing EPA on our States.

I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 235, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

AYES—177

Barber	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bass	Hahn	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hanabusa	Owens
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Payne
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Holt	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Bustos	Huffman	Pocan
Butterfield	Israel	Polis
Capps	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Keating	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kilmer	T.
Cleaver	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kuster	Schakowsky
Connolly	Langevin	Schiff
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Costa	Levin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lewis	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Loebach	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Sires
DeFazio	Lowe	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Delaney	(NM)	Speier
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takano
Deutch	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Duckworth	Matsui	Tonko
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McDermott	Vargas
Esty	McGovern	Veasey
Farr	McIntyre	Vela
Fattah	McNerney	Visclosky
Foster	Meng	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Wasserman
Fudge	Miller, George	Schultz
Gabbard	Moore	Waters
Garamendi	Moran	Waxman
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Grayson	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Neal	
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—235

Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)
Amash	Benishek	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bentivolio	Brooks (AL)
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brown (GA)
Barletta	Black	Buchanan
Barr	Blackburn	Bucshon
Barrow (GA)	Boustany	Burgess

Byrne	Hudson	Rahall
Calvert	Huelskamp	Reed
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Campbell	Hultgren	Renacci
Capito	Hunter	Ribble
Carter	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Cassidy	Issa	Rigell
Chabot	Jenkins	Roby
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Coffman	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Cole	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rokita
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney
Conaway	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kingston	Roskam
Cotton	Kinzing (IL)	Ross
Cramer	Kline	Rothfus
Crawford	Labrador	Royce
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Runyan
Cuellar	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Lance	Salmon
Daines	Lankford	Sanford
Denham	Latham	Scalise
Dent	Latta	Schock
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Schrader
Diaz-Balart	Long	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Elmers	Lummis	Sessions
Enyart	Marchant	Shimkus
Farenthold	Marino	Shuster
Fincher	Massie	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	Matheson	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	McAllister	Smith (NE)
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Flores	McCaul	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McClintock	Southerland
Fortenberry	McHenry	Stewart
Fox	McKeon	Stivers
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Stockman
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Stutzman
Gallego	Rodgers	Terry
Gardner	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Garrett	Meehan	Burgess
Gerlach	Messer	Thornberry
Gibbs	Mica	Tiberi
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Upton
Goodlatte	Mullin	Valadao
Gosar	Mulvaney	Wagner
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Granger	Neugebauer	Walden
Graves (GA)	Noem	Walorski
Graves (MO)	Nugent	Weber (TX)
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Webster (FL)
Griffith (VA)	Olson	Wenstrup
Grimm	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Guthrie	Paulsen	Whitfield
Hall	Pearce	Williams
Hanna	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Harper	Peterson	Wittman
Harris	Petri	Wolf
Hartzer	Pittenger	Womack
Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Woodall
Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)	Yoder
Hensarling	Pompeo	Yoho
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Young (AK)
Holding	Price (GA)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Braley (IA)	Duffy	Nunnelee
Cicilline	Engel	Rush
Clark (MA)	King (IA)	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney,	Tierney
DesJarlais	Carolyn	Velázquez
Dingell	Meeks	

□ 1724

Mr. GALLEGO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 488, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 152, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

YEAS—262

Aderholt	Gallego	McIntyre
Amash	Garamendi	McKeon
Amodei	Garcia	McKinley
Bachmann	Gardner	McMorris
Bachus	Garrett	Rodgers
Barber	Gerlach	Meadows
Barletta	Gibbs	Meehan
Barr	Gibson	Messer
Barrow (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Mica
Barton	Gohmert	Miller (FL)
Benishek	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Bentivolio	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Mullin
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Mulvaney
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Black	Graves (MO)	Negrete McLeod
Blackburn	Green, Gene	Neugebauer
Boustany	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Brady (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Bridenstine	Grimm	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hall	Owens
Brown (GA)	Hanna	Palazzo
Buchanan	Harper	Paulsen
Bucshon	Harris	Pearce
Burgess	Hartzler	Perry
Bustos	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Byrne	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Camp	Hensarling	Pitts
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Capito	Holding	Pompeo
Carter	Horsford	Posey
Cassidy	Hudson	Price (GA)
Chabot	Huelskamp	Rahall
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Clawson (FL)	Hultgren	Reichert
Cleaver	Hunter	Renacci
Clyburn	Hurt	Ribble
Coble	Issa	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Jenkins	Richmond
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Collins (NY)	Jolly	Roe (TN)
Conaway	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Costa	Joyce	Rogers (MI)
Cotton	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Crawford	King (NY)	Rooney
Crenshaw	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Cuellar	Kinzing (IL)	Roskam
Culberson	Kirkpatrick	Ross
Daines	Kline	Rothfus
Denham	Labrador	Royce
Dent	LaMalfa	Ruiz
DeSantis	Lamborn	Runyan
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Duffy	Lankford	Salmon
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Scalise
Ellmers	LoBiondo	Schock
Enyart	Loebach	Schrader
Farenthold	Long	Schweikert
Farr	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	Marchant	Sessions
Fleming	Marino	Shimkus
Flores	Massie	Shuster
Forbes	Matheson	Simpson
Fortenberry	McAllister	Sinema
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Fudge	McHenry	Southerland

Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton

Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—152

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dogggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn

Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swallow (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais

Dingell
Engel
King (IA)
Lee (CA)
Maloney,
Carolyn

Meeks
Nunnelee
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Tierney
Velázquez

□ 1731

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 489, I placed voting card in machine and it did not register. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BURGESS from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-584) on the resolution (H. Res. 717) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS THROUGH 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4067) to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4067

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS THROUGH 2014.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall continue to apply through calendar year 2014 the enforcement instruction described in the notice of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services entitled "Enforcement Instruction on Supervision Requirements for Outpatient Therapeutic Services in Critical Access and Small Rural Hospitals for CY 2013", dated November 1, 2012 (providing for an exception to the restatement and clarification under the final rulemaking changes to the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system and calendar year 2009 payment rates (published in the Federal Register on November 18, 2008, 73 Fed. Reg. 68702 through 68704) with respect to requirements for direct supervision by physicians for therapeutic hospital outpatient services).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Pursuant to the rule, the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4067, which provides for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014. This was a bill introduced by Congresswoman JENKINS of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense solution to a problem that has the potential to limit or delay access to health care for America's seniors in rural communities.

The bill would delay until the end of the year enforcement of supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access hospitals. This delay would give the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services and provider groups time to identify which services will eventually fall under the requirement.

I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4067 would suspend current enforcement of Medicare rules relating to physician supervision of staff in rural and critical access hospitals for certain outpatient therapeutic services. Enforcement of these rules was delayed from 2009 through 2013, but began again in January of this year. My understanding is that there has not been any issue with enforcement to date and that the Medicare program has not taken any action against a facility for failure to meet physician supervision standards since January. But as this bill did not follow regular order through the committee process, we have not had an opportunity to hear from interested parties about the issue and bring to light what the implications might be of an additional delay. Frankly, the likely result of such a bill would be confusion for hospitals.

Medicare's physician supervision requirement places a premium on patient safety, and I understand that rural facilities sometimes face difficulty in securing staffing. However, it seems reasonable to me that outpatient clinics

that provide services to Medicare beneficiaries should meet some basic standards for having supervisory physicians available if an emergency arises—for example, when patients are receiving potentially lethal doses of chemotherapy medication.

Meanwhile, there are countless public health issues that the committee could productively devote its time to, such as looking into the recent outbreak of Ebola, the effects of e-cigarettes, or perhaps the decline of routine vaccinations that has led to an explosion of preventable illnesses like measles. Rather, the bill before us seems to be only responsive to the fears of certain health care providers that someone could file a complaint that a facility was allowing staff to practice medicine on Medicare patients without any supervision. But isn't that the kind of thing that we might be concerned about—and want a whistleblower to report? Yet, that is just what this bill would prevent.

It remains unclear to me why an additional delay of this Medicare policy is needed. Simply saying that the Senate passed this bill by unanimous consent in February is not sufficient justification—and makes even less sense now that the calendar year is nearly over.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should be finding time to address the real and pressing public issues facing our Nation rather than those that merely cause an inconvenience or anxiety for certain health care providers.

I reserve the balance of my time at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas, Congresswoman JENKINS, the author of the bill.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4067, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

I was proud to introduce this legislation in February, and I am pleased that Chairman UPTON and the Energy and Commerce Committee reported it favorably and brought it to the House floor today.

The 83 critical access hospitals in Kansas are the lifeblood of our rural communities, and one of the many challenges these communities face is access to health care. The presence of a facility such as a critical access hospital in a community could be the deciding factor in whether or not the next generation of children decide to raise their family in their hometown, or perhaps whether or not a business decides to locate there.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services made a decision on Jan-

uary 1 of this year that will make it more difficult for these rural hospitals to serve their communities. CMS informed these hospitals that physicians are now required to directly supervise outpatient services, such as drawing blood and activity therapy. This is a change in policy that will put a strain on providers while providing no quality improvements for the patients they serve.

This bill will correct that problem by reinstating the moratorium on enforcement of these unnecessary regulations. It has broad bipartisan support in Congress and the support of key stakeholders.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 4067 from the American Hospital Association, the National Rural Health Association, the Kansas Hospital Association, and Anderson County Hospital, which is a critical access hospital in Garnett, Kansas, one of 1,300 nationwide.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2014.

Hon. LYNN JENKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: On behalf of our nearly 5,000 member hospitals, health systems and other health care organizations, and our 43,000 individual members, the American Hospital Association is pleased to support H.R. 4067 to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

Approximately 46 million Americans live in rural areas and depend on these hospitals as an important, and often the only, source of care. Critical access and small rural hospitals face unique challenges because of their remote geographic location, scarce workforce, physician shortages and constrained financial resources with limited access to capital.

Your bill attempts to address one of these unique challenges—the issue of direct supervision for outpatient therapeutic services. In the 2009 outpatient prospective payment system (PPS) final rule, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) mandated a new policy for “direct supervision” of outpatient therapeutic services that hospitals and physicians recognized as a burdensome and unnecessary policy change. CMS’s policy required that a supervising physician be physically present in the department at all times when Medicare beneficiaries receive outpatient therapeutic services. Hospital outpatient therapeutic services have always been provided by licensed, skilled professionals under the overall direction of a physician and with the assurance of rapid assistance from a team of caregivers, including a physician, should an unforeseen event occur. While hospitals recognize the need for direct supervision for certain outpatient services that pose high risk or are very complex, CMS’s policy generally applies to even the lowest risk services. Your bill would provide a needed delay in enforcement of the direct supervision policy through 2014 for critical access and small rural hospitals with fewer than 100 beds.

Again, we are pleased to support this bill and applaud your commitment to America’s rural hospitals and health care providers.

Sincerely,
RICK POLLACK,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2014.

Hon. LYNN JENKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: The National Rural Health Association applauds your leadership in introducing H.R. 4067. This bill will provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

NRHA is a national nonprofit membership organization with more than 21,000 members. Our mission is to provide leadership on rural health issues. NRHA membership is made up of a diverse collection of individuals and organizations, all of whom share the common bond of ensuring all rural communities have access to quality, affordable health care.

NRHA supports your efforts to put a moratorium on the physician supervision of outpatient services requirement at CAHs and small rural hospitals until the end of 2014. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to call Erin Mahn on my government affairs staff at 202-639-0550 or by e-mail emahn@nrharural.org.

We thank you for sponsoring this important legislation. You are truly a stalwart champion for rural America.

Sincerely,
ALAN MORGAN, CEO,
National Rural Health Association.

KANSAS HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
July 30, 2014.

Hon. LYNN JENKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: On behalf of our 128 member hospitals, the Kansas Hospital Association is pleased to support H.R. 4067. This important legislation provides a one-year extension on the non-enforcement of the direct supervision policy for therapeutic services provided in critical access hospitals and rural hospitals with 100 or few beds.

Effective January 1, 2014, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services’ decided to not extend its policy to not enforce the direct supervision policy for therapeutic services provided in CAHs and rural hospitals with less than 100 beds. This new policy of enforcement on CAHs and small rural hospitals may limit the hospital’s ability to provide their outpatients with basic therapeutic services. These are services that have been provided safely in rural communities throughout the years. H.R. 4067 would provide a much needed delay in enforcement of the direct supervision policy for therapeutic services through 2014.

We are pleased to support your legislation and appreciate your commitment to Kansas hospitals.

Sincerely,
TOM BELL,
President and CEO.

ANDERSON COUNTY HOSPITAL,
Garnett, KS, May 18, 2014.

Hon. LYNN JENKINS,
Longworth HOB,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: As you know, I have communicated with you in the

past about the consequences of the physician supervision requirements that were included in the Outpatient Prospective Payment Final Rule (OPPS) for 2014, as published in the Federal Register on December 10, 2013. These rules will have an unintended impact on the provision of outpatient therapeutic services in Critical Access Hospitals and to patient care in rural settings.

Anderson County Hospital (ACH) is a Critical Access Hospital (CAH) located in Anderson County, Kansas. Since 1994, we have operated a hospital-based rural health clinical staff by employed physicians and mid-levels, the only primary care clinic currently operating in our county. Additionally, our emergency room is staffed with physicians and mid-level practitioners 24/7. For the past two years, ACH has continued to struggle with how to meet the supervision requirements. Initially, it was that we would use a combination of ER and primary care providers to provide the direct supervision; if one of them was not immediately available, we would provide the service and not bill for it. Please keep in mind that while direct supervision does not require the provider to be in the room with the patient, they do need to be immediately available. The location of both our clinic and ER providers meet this requirement.

In a clarification received from CMS in January, they further instructed us that hospital employed practitioners in hospital-based rural health clinics, even those that are located on the same campus and adjacent to the hospital, cannot meet the direct supervision requirement for outpatient therapeutic services. This makes it nearly impossible for us to meet the supervision requirements. Although we have a full complement of staff that could provide direct supervision, the ability to use them to provide services is not in question.

These requirements present a significant hardship and expense to rural hospitals and is in direct conflict to the Conditions of Participation for CAHs. It will limit the ability to provide our outpatients with basic therapeutic services such as IV infusions, initial antibiotic therapy, emergency cardiac drugs and blood transfusions. These are services that have been provided in rural communities safely throughout the years, and will ultimately impact access to important services for the patients and communities we serve.

For those CAHs who have emergency room coverage provided by their own employed physicians, the requirements are even more difficult to meet. Since CAH conditions of participation say that the physician does not need to be in the ER, must respond to the emergency room within 30 minutes, most hospitals have protocols that allow a registered nurse to begin life saving IV therapy on a verbal order from the provider. The physician supervision requirements seem to contradict this.

The strangest part of the interpretation of these rules is that they only impact payment, not the actual provision of the services, so this is not really an issue of quality or patient safety. We are told that we are able to provide the services when needed, but unless there is documented direct supervision, we are not able to bill or be paid for the services provided.

Because of the implications of these rules and their interpretation on the provision of outpatient therapeutic services at our hospital and many others in rural settings, I ask for your support of H.R. 4067, which would put a hold on enforcement of the supervision

requirements through 2014. This additional time would hopefully allow the opportunity to re-visit the many issues raised by these rules and would go a long way in alleviating the consequences of the policy that I've outlined in this letter. We must keep in mind that the intent of the CAH program was to provide access to quality patient care in rural communities. A delay in enforcement would help us refocus on that goal.

Sincerely,

DENNIS A. HACHENBERG, FACHE,
Chief Executive Officer,
Anderson County Hospital.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in a small town in Kansas, and I feel strongly that folks in rural communities deserve access to quality health care.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I am hopeful that the Senate will soon act on it so that it may become law.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4067, reinstates a four month delay in the enforcement of the current Medicare rules relating to physician supervision of staff who administer certain therapeutic services in rural and critical access hospitals.

The Medicare physician supervision requirement protects patients by ensuring that Medicare beneficiaries have access to someone capable of dealing with unforeseen emergencies. While I understand that rural healthcare providers often have difficulty acquiring adequate staffing, we should not place greater value on their convenience than on the safety of Medicare beneficiaries.

Reinstating a delay of these requirements until the end of the year only potentially confuses healthcare providers and lowers the bar on patient safety that Medicare has put in place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4067.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUDDEN UNEXPECTED DEATH DATA ENHANCEMENT AND AWARENESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 669) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 669

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sudden Unexpected Death Data Enhancement and Awareness Act".

SEC. 2. STILLBIRTH AND SUDDEN DEATHS IN THE YOUNG.

The Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 317L of such Act (42 U.S.C. 247b-13) the following:

"SEC. 317L-1. STILLBIRTH AND SUDDEN DEATHS IN THE YOUNG.

"(a) STILLBIRTH ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall continue to carry out activities of the Centers relating to stillbirth, including the following:

"(1) SURVEILLANCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for surveillance efforts to collect thorough, complete, and high-quality epidemiologic information on stillbirths, including through the utilization of existing surveillance systems (including the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) and other appropriately equipped birth defects surveillance programs).

"(B) STANDARD PROTOCOL FOR SURVEILLANCE.—The Secretary, in consultation with qualified individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, to include representatives of health and advocacy organizations, State and local governments, public health officials, and health researchers, shall—

"(i) provide for the continued development and dissemination of a standard protocol for stillbirth data collection and surveillance; and

"(ii) not less than every 5 years, review and, as appropriate, update such protocol.

"(2) POSTMORTEM DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with qualified individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, to include representatives of health professional organizations, shall—

"(A) upon the enactment of this section, and not less than every 5 years thereafter, review existing guidelines for increasing and improving the quality and completeness of postmortem stillbirth evaluation and related data collection, including conducting and reimbursing autopsies, placental histopathology, and cytogenetic testing; and

"(B) develop strategies for implementing such guidelines and addressing any barriers to implementation of such guidelines.

"(b) SUDDEN UNEXPECTED INFANT DEATH ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall continue to carry out activities of the Centers relating to sudden unexpected infant death (SUID), including the following:

"(1) SURVEILLANCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for surveillance efforts to gather sociodemographic, death scene investigation, clinical history, and autopsy information on SUID cases through the review of existing records on SUID, including through the utilization of existing surveillance systems (including the national child death review case reporting system and SUID case registries).

"(B) STANDARD PROTOCOL FOR SURVEILLANCE.—The Secretary, in consultation with qualified individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, to

include representatives of health and advocacy organizations, State and local governments, and public health officials, shall—

“(i) provide for the continued development and dissemination of a standard protocol for SUID data reporting and surveillance; and

“(ii) not less than every 5 years, review and, as appropriate, update such protocol.

“(C) GOALS FOR ENHANCING SURVEILLANCE.—In carrying out activities under this subsection, the Secretary shall seek to accomplish the following goals:

“(i) Collecting thorough, complete, and high-quality death scene investigation data, clinical history, and autopsy findings.

“(ii) Collecting standardized information about the environmental and medical circumstances of death (including the sleep environment and quality of the death scene investigation).

“(iii) Supporting multidisciplinary infant death reviews, such as those performed by child death review committees, to collect and review the information and classify and characterize SUID using a standardized classification system.

“(iv) Facilitating the sharing of information to improve the public reporting of surveillance and vital statistics describing the epidemiology of SUID.

“(2) STANDARD PROTOCOL FOR DEATH SCENE INVESTIGATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with forensic pathologists, medical examiners, coroners, medicolegal death scene investigators, law enforcement personnel, emergency medical technicians and paramedics, public health agencies, and other individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, shall—

“(i) provide for the continued dissemination of a standard death scene investigation protocol; and

“(ii) not less than every 5 years, review and, as appropriate, update such protocol.

“(B) CONTENT OF DEATH SCENE PROTOCOL.—The protocol disseminated under subparagraph (A) shall include information on—

“(i) the current and past medical history of the infant;

“(ii) family medical history;

“(iii) the circumstances surrounding the death, including any suspicious circumstances;

“(iv) the sleep position and sleep environment of the infant; and

“(v) any accidental or environmental factors associated with death.

“(3) GUIDELINES FOR A STANDARD AUTOPSY PROTOCOL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General of the United States, forensic pathologists, medical examiners, coroners, pediatric pathologists, pediatric cardiologists, pediatric neuropathologists, geneticists, infectious disease specialists, and other individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, shall—

“(A) develop guidelines for a standard autopsy protocol for SUID; and

“(C) not less than every 5 years, review and, as appropriate, update such guidelines.

“(4) TRAINING.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General of the United States, may—

“(A) conduct or support—

“(i) training activities for medical examiners, coroners, medicolegal death scene investigators, law enforcement personnel, and emergency medical technicians or paramedics concerning death scene investigations for SUID, including the use of standard death scene investigation protocols disseminated under paragraph (2); and

“(ii) training activities for medical examiners, coroners, and forensic pathologists concerning standard autopsy protocols for SUID developed under paragraph (3); and

“(B) make recommendations to health professional organizations regarding the integration of protocols disseminated or developed under this subsection, and training conducted or supported under this paragraph, into existing training and continuing education programs.

“(c) SUDDEN UNEXPLAINED DEATH IN CHILDHOOD ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall continue to carry out activities of the Centers relating to sudden unexpected death in childhood (SUDC), including the following:

“(1) SURVEILLANCE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall provide for surveillance efforts to gather sociodemographic, death scene investigation, clinical history, and autopsy information on SUDC cases through the review of existing records on SUDC, including through the utilization of existing surveillance systems (including the Sudden Death in the Young Registry).

“(2) GUIDELINES FOR A STANDARD AUTOPSY PROTOCOL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General of the United States, forensic pathologists, medical examiners, coroners, pediatric pathologists, pediatric cardiologists, pediatric neuropathologists, geneticists, infectious disease specialists, and other individuals and organizations determined appropriate by the Secretary, may—

“(A) develop guidelines for a standard autopsy protocol for SUDC; and

“(B) not less than every 5 years, review and, as appropriate, update such guidelines.

“(3) REVIEW OF APPLICABILITY OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall complete an evaluation of the possibility of carrying out or intensifying, with respect to SUDC, the types of programs and activities that are authorized to be carried out under subsection (b) with respect to SUID.

“(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Such report shall include—

“(1) the results of the evaluation under subsection (c)(3); and

“(2) a description of any activities that—

“(A) are being carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in consultation with the National Institutes of Health relating to stillbirth, SUID, or SUDC; and

“(B) are in addition to the activities being carried out pursuant to this section.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘stillbirth’ means a spontaneous fetal death that—

“(A) occurs at 20 or more weeks gestation; or

“(B) if the age of the fetus is not known, involves a fetus weighing 350 grams or more.

“(2) The terms ‘sudden unexpected infant death’ and ‘SUID’ mean the death of an infant less than 1 year of age—

“(A) which occurs suddenly and unexpectedly; and

“(B) whose cause—

“(i) is not immediately obvious prior to investigation; and

“(ii) is either explained upon investigation or remains unexplained.

“(3) The terms ‘sudden unexplained death in childhood’ and ‘SUDC’ mean the sudden death of a child 1 year of age or older which remains unexplained after a thorough case investigation that includes—

“(A) a review of the clinical history and circumstances of death; and

“(B) performance of a complete autopsy with appropriate ancillary testing.

“(f) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section, and this section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1745

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 669, the Sudden Unexpected Death Data Enhancement and Awareness Act, introduced by my colleague, Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Prevention of stillbirth, sudden unexpected infant death, and sudden unexplained death in children depends upon the collection of data related to the biological, social, and environmental factors associated with these outcomes.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention collects data through existing surveillance systems in order to identify the extent of the problem and risk factors.

Sudden unexpected infant death rates decreased in the 1990s during the Back to Sleep campaign, but have remained unchanged since then. It is time for us to address this problem.

H.R. 669 authorizes activities at the Centers for Disease Control to help improve the understanding of stillbirth, sudden unexpected infant death, and sudden unexplained death in children by improving data collection, increasing surveillance strategies, and setting guidelines and protocols for death scene investigations.

I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise with great pride to be speaking in support of H.R. 669, the Sudden Unexpected Death Data Enhancement and Awareness Act.

This has been an issue that I have worked on for many years in Congress. In particular, it is one of the many bills that I partnered with my late friend, Senator Frank Lautenberg. I also want to thank Congressman PETER KING as well, since he worked with me on this.

Stillbirth and unexpected infant death affect tens of thousands of families every year, according to data from CDC, and sudden infant death syndrome is the leading cause of death for infants up to 12 months old. Unfortunately, too many families in this country suffer these tragic events, but what makes matters even worse is their struggle with the process to help find answers.

Currently, there is a lack of comprehensive, high-quality data to best understand why these events occur in the first place. The intent of the bill has always been to better utilize the Federal Government's activities in this area.

Specifically, it would expand and standardize surveillance and data collection for stillbirth and sudden unexpected infant death and sudden unexplained death in childhood at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

In addition, it would improve the development of standard protocols for use in death scene investigations and autopsies surrounding these deaths and also allow the Secretary of HHS to conduct training activities regarding these protocols.

The bill also requires CDC, in consultation with NIH, to submit a report to Congress on current activities related to stillbirth, SUID, and SUDC and evaluate the possibility of expanding programs related to SUDC specifically.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by personally thanking Laura Crandall, co-founder and codirector of the CJ Foundation's SUDC program. This issue hits close to home for Laura, but in the face of tragedy, she decided to work to help others who also suffered.

She has been a great advocate for this bill and has spread awareness of SUDC in communities all across the country. I thank her for her strength, determination, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't everything I think the CDC can be doing to address the needs of families across the country, but it represents a critical step on a very tragic issue that deserves our attention.

I urge my colleagues to support its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 669, the Sudden Unexpected Death Data Enhancement and Awareness Act.

Stillbirths—the loss of a pregnancy after 20 weeks of gestation—occur for approximately 26,000 women in the United States each year. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimate there are 4,000 sudden unexplained infant deaths (SUID) in children under age one each year as well. Sudden Unexplained Deaths in Childhood (SUDC) occur in children over the age of 12 months, with an estimated incidence of 1.2 deaths per 100,000 children.

CDC currently oversees a number of initiatives to collect data on these tragic deaths. H.R. 669 would help to improve surveillance on SUID, SUDC, and stillbirths. Improving data on the number and root causes of these unexplained deaths will be a critical step in advancing our efforts to reduce them.

I want to commend the sponsors of this legislation, Ranking Member PALLONE and Congressman KING, for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, and all of our staff for helping to bring this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and to the floor today.

I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 669, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAKEFIELD ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4290) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4290

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wakefield Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w-9(d)) is amended by striking "fiscal year 2014" and inserting "each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4290, the Wakefield Act of 2014, introduced by Mr. MATHESON of Utah and Mr. KING of New York.

Children have special health needs, especially in the field of emergency medical services. The emergency and trauma care system has been slow to develop an adequate response to these unique needs.

Some problems are endemic in emergency services, such as fragmentation and poor coordination among pre-hospital services, hospitals, and public health. The problem is worse for children when hospitals lack the appropriate medical personnel, pediatric supplies, or transfer agreements that lead to better care within the golden hour, when chances of survival of an accident are higher.

In 1984, Congress passed the Emergency Medical Services for Children as part of the Preventive Health Amendments of 1984. Last reauthorized in 2010, the program aims to reduce child and youth mortality and morbidity caused by severe illness and trauma.

H.R. 4290 reauthorizes the Emergency Medical Services for Children program through 2019. The program supports education and training of EMS providers and identifies models that can increase pediatric care in rural and tribal communities.

The bill also supports the Pediatric Emergency Care Applied Research Network that facilitates collaborative research on pediatric emergency services.

I ask my colleagues to support emergency medical services for children by voting for this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4290, the Wakefield Act of 2014, a bill to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children program was established 30 years ago. The program includes a number of grant programs to help States to assess and improve pediatric emergency care; improve emergency services for children in rural, tribal, and other communities; and support research in pediatric emergency medicine.

The legislation before us today will reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program for another 5 years, so that this critical program can continue its lifesaving work.

I want to offer my thanks to Congressman MATHESON and Congressman KING for sponsoring the bill and to Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and our staffs for working on this bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding me the time.

H.R. 4290, the Wakefield Act, will reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program. For the past 30 years, the Emergency Medical Services for Children program has been the only Federal program focused solely on improving emergency medical care for children and adolescents.

In that time, emergency care has gone from treating critically injured children simply as “little adults,” to providing more appropriate and specialized care as children.

The program is focused on ensuring that proper emergency medical care is given to sick or injured children no matter where they live, attend school, or travel.

All States and the territories receive grant funding to educate and train medical professionals in trauma care for children. This funding and training has dramatically increased the quality of care at our Nation’s emergency rooms and the quality that first providers provide, and in doing so, it has saved lives.

Allied to this, the program supports the coordination, collaboration, and data analysis of pediatric researchers across the country for the continued advancement of emergency pediatric care, a critical component of the program.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children program has long held bipartisan support in Congress throughout its 30-year history and is certainly worthy of being reauthorized because this is a Federal program that truly works, and it has data to back that up. It has dramatically helped improve the quality of emergency medical care for our children, and this bill will ensure that it continues to do so.

In closing, I want to thank both the minority and majority staffs on the Energy and Commerce Committee for working with my office on this legislation. I particularly want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman PETER KING, for introducing the bill with me.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical program by voting “yes” on H.R. 4290.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time.

I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4290, the Wakefield Act of 2014.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children (EMSC) program aims to reduce the number of deaths of children and adolescents due to severe illness or trauma. This program has funded grants to all fifty states, as well as to institutions of higher learning, to advance pediatric emergency care. It is the only federal program that specifically focuses on improving emergency care for children and adolescents.

The EMSC program was first established in 1984 and last reauthorized in 2010. Today’s legislation will once again reauthorize the EMSC program through 2019.

I want to commend the sponsors of this legislation, Congressman MATHESON and Congressman KING, for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, and all of our staff for their work in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

I support H.R. 4290 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4290, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TICK-BORNE DISEASE RESEARCH ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4701) to provide for scientific frameworks with respect to vector-borne diseases, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4701

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. LYME DISEASE AND OTHER TICK-BORNE DISEASES.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART W—LYME DISEASE AND OTHER TICK-BORNE DISEASES

“SEC. 3990O. RESEARCH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct or support epidemiological, basic,

translational, and clinical research regarding Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases.

“(b) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that each biennial report under section 403 includes information on actions undertaken by the National Institutes of Health to carry out subsection (a) with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including an assessment of the progress made in improving the outcomes of Lyme disease and such other tick-borne diseases.

“SEC. 3990O-1. WORKING GROUP.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a permanent working group, to be known as the Interagency Lyme and Tick-Borne Disease Working Group (in this section and section 3990O-2 referred to as the ‘Working Group’), to review all efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services concerning Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases to ensure interagency coordination, minimize overlap, and examine research priorities.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Working Group shall—

“(1) not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this part, and every 24 months thereafter, develop or update a summary of—

“(A) ongoing Lyme disease and other tick-borne disease research related to causes, prevention, treatment, surveillance, diagnosis, diagnostics, duration of illness, intervention, and access to services and supports for individuals with Lyme disease or other tick-borne diseases;

“(B) advances made pursuant to such research;

“(C) the engagement of the Department of Health and Human Services with persons that participate at the public meetings required by paragraph (5); and

“(D) the comments received by the Working Group at such public meetings and the Secretary’s response to such comments;

“(2) ensure that a broad spectrum of scientific viewpoints is represented in each such summary;

“(3) monitor Federal activities with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases;

“(4) make recommendations to the Secretary regarding any appropriate changes to such activities; and

“(5) ensure public input by holding annual public meetings that address scientific advances, research questions, surveillance activities, and emerging strains in species of pathogenic organisms.

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Working Group shall be composed of a total of 14 members as follows:

“(A) FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Seven Federal members, consisting of one or more representatives of each of—

“(i) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health;

“(ii) the Food and Drug Administration;

“(iii) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

“(iv) the National Institutes of Health; and

“(v) such other agencies and offices of the Department of Health and Human Services as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC MEMBERS.—Seven non-Federal public members, consisting of representatives of the following categories:

“(i) Physicians and other medical providers with experience in diagnosing and treating Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases.

“(ii) Scientists or researchers with expertise.

“(iii) Patients and their family members.

“(iv) Nonprofit organizations that advocate for patients with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases.

“(v) Other individuals whose expertise is determined by the Secretary to be beneficial to the functioning of the Working Group.

“(2) APPOINTMENT.—The members of the Working Group shall be appointed by the Secretary, except that of the non-Federal public members under paragraph (1)(B)—

“(A) one shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) one shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

“(3) DIVERSITY OF SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES.—In making appointments under paragraph (2), the Secretary, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Majority Leader of the Senate shall ensure that the non-Federal public members of the Working Group represent a diversity of scientific perspectives.

“(4) TERMS.—The non-Federal public members of the Working Group shall each be appointed to serve a 4-year term and may be reappointed at the end of such term.

“(d) MEETINGS.—The Working Group shall meet as often as necessary, as determined by the Secretary, but not less than twice each year.

“(e) APPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Working Group shall be treated as an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

“(f) REPORTING.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this part, and every 24 months thereafter, the Working Group—

“(1) shall submit a report on its activities, including an up-to-date summary under subsection (b)(1) and any recommendations under subsection (b)(4), to the Secretary, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate;

“(2) shall make each such report publicly available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

“(3) shall allow any member of the Working Group to include in any such report minority views.

“SEC. 3990O-2. STRATEGIC PLAN.

“Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a strategic plan, informed by the most recent summary under section 3990O-1(b)(1), for the conduct and support of Lyme disease and tick-borne disease research, including—

“(1) proposed budgetary requirements;

“(2) a plan for improving outcomes of Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including progress related to chronic or persistent symptoms and chronic or persistent infection and co-infections;

“(3) a plan for improving diagnosis, treatment, and prevention;

“(4) appropriate benchmarks to measure progress on achieving the improvements described in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

“(5) a plan to disseminate each summary under section 3990O-1(b)(1) and other relevant information developed by the Working Group to the public, including health care providers, public health departments, and other relevant medical groups.”

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the

amendment made by this Act, and this Act and such amendment shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4701, the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, introduced by CHRIS GIBSON of New York.

Lyme disease is the most commonly reported vector-borne illness in the United States. Prior to 2012, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported about 30,000 new cases each year in the United States, with 95 percent of those cases in 13 States concentrated in the Northeast and upper Midwest.

The Centers for Disease Control now estimates that around 300,000 people in the United States are diagnosed each year with Lyme disease, making it a substantial public health problem.

H.R. 4701 is an important bill that addresses the growing threat of Lyme disease in the United States, it prioritizes Federal research online, and related diseases, and gives patients a seat at the table. The bill would establish a working group at the Department of Health and Human Services that would prepare a report summarizing Federal activities related to Lyme disease, identifying the latest scientific advances and making recommendations to the Secretary and to Congress.

It also ensures that the Federal Government consults with patients and physicians in their work on the disease.

I would like to thank Mr. GIBSON for his hard work and dedication on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4701, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that Lyme disease is a concerning public health issue. The CDC estimates there are approximately 300,000 Lyme disease cases each year in the United States.

H.R. 4701, the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Trans-

parency Act of 2014, creates a new working group to develop a summary of research in advances related to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, monitor Federal activities, and make recommendations to the Secretary of HHS and hold annual public meetings.

I support ensuring that research in the area of Lyme disease is productive and significant. However, there are still a number of other changes that need to be made to this bill, particularly regarding appointments to and responsibilities of the working group.

□ 1800

Additionally, we do not want the resources needed to maintain this working group to take away from the already strained budgets of current Federal research and surveillance efforts related to Lyme disease.

At the full committee markup of H.R. 4701 in July, Chairman UPTON committed to continue to work with myself and other Members to address these concerns before bringing the bill to the floor, and I am disappointed to say that that commitment wasn't honored. While I have reservations about H.R. 4701 in its current form, I would not object to considering it on suspension and advancing the bill here today, but I will continue to advocate for resolving these issues in the bill as it moves forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of thousands of Americans who have been impacted by Lyme disease and tick-borne illnesses each year, including in my district in upstate New York, where this is a public health scourge.

This legislation is truly constituent-driven and represents a significant step forward in what has been an extensive process. For the past few years, I have worked with physicians, patient advocates, professional researchers, and patients and their families throughout New York and the United States on a bill that focuses on solutions.

I am proud to be joined by two of my colleagues who have been national leaders on this issue: CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey is our leader, who has, for several decades, been a tireless advocate for our sufferers, and FRANK WOLF of Virginia, who has added his significant voice to this issue and has also made incredibly meaningful contributions to this bill and the cause. I thank them both.

Likewise, I thank Dr. Richard Horowitz, Pat Smith, David Roth, Jill and Ira Auerbach, Holly Ahern, Chris Fiske, and other Lyme advocate leaders from Pennsylvania and from across the Nation for their significant and persuasive engagement and unyielding

commitment to change the direction of U.S. policy to bring solutions and relief for our chronic Lyme sufferers.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, their ranking members, and their dedicated committee staffs. Thank you all for your great work.

In August of 2013, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that the number of Americans diagnosed with Lyme disease each year is now over 300,000, while other researchers, such as Holly Ahern, have shown that we are significantly underestimating the cases in the U.S. It is clear that the increase of Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases is rapidly becoming a public health crisis in the United States. While the CDC, NIH, and other Federal agencies have recognized this threat to public health, regrettably, we have made far too little progress in improving prevention, diagnosis, and treatment.

This legislation before us seeks to make a positive difference, prioritizing and coordinating Federal tick-borne disease research through an interagency working group made up of relevant Federal agencies as well as non-Federal partners, such as experienced physicians, researchers, patient advocates, and chronic Lyme disease patients themselves.

The working group is tasked with ensuring interagency coordination, accountability, and transparency, minimizing overlap, examining research priorities, and ultimately making policy recommendations. The working group is required to reflect a broad spectrum of scientific viewpoints and ensure patients and their advocates have a seat at the table.

The bill increases oversight and accountability over tick-borne research throughout the relevant Federal agencies, ensuring all stakeholders are situationally aware of all existing research before making policy recommendations.

Importantly, this bill also requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services, informed by the working group report, to submit a strategic plan to Congress to improve patient outcomes to cure our chronic Lyme sufferers. This plan will include benchmarks to measure progress, ultimately ensuring we spend the taxpayer dollars wisely and find solutions and cures that are long overdue.

Finally, this bill is dedicated to those chronic Lyme sufferers out there who have been ill for years, at times seemingly without hope, wondering if anyone in Washington was listening or cared. We hear you. We do care. Today we pass this legislation to help you get better.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), one of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the sponsors of this bill. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I want to thank my colleague, CHRIS GIBSON from New York. Here we are again. Just a month ago, my colleague Mr. GIBSON and I were working across the aisle to lower energy prices in the Hudson Valley, and here we are working again on an issue of tremendous importance to our region. I support the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act, along with so many others, and I want to acknowledge Mr. GIBSON's leadership on this issue.

I am proud we are working across the aisle, because Lyme disease is an epidemic in the Hudson Valley, and it is hurting our kids, our friends, and our families. It is happening everywhere—on our playgrounds, in our backyards, at parks, picnics, and on trails in the woods. It is the invisible, silent disease that so many find themselves developing—and far too many find out too late. It is now one of the most common and fastest growing infectious diseases in our country. Every year, there are hundreds of thousands of cases nationwide, with 96 percent of those cases in only 13 States.

In New York, thousands of my neighbors in the Hudson Valley are suffering from Lyme disease every day. Four counties in the Hudson Valley, including Dutchess and Putnam Counties, have reported the highest rates of Lyme disease in the entire country. I hear about it everywhere I go.

A man named Alex from Washingtonville told me he has been suffering from Lyme disease for over 35 years. I spoke with a man who has a tree-cutting business in Garrison, New York. He said he has got about 12 guys working for him. I said, How many have got Lyme disease? He said, Every single one. All of my guys have Lyme disease, he said.

A member of my own staff spent a month this summer injecting himself with heavy-duty antibiotics through a catheter that was put into his heart. A member of my own staff had to sit on a couch every day and inject antibiotics into his heart because of this disease. Thank God he caught it in time and will make a full recovery.

I met a woman at an event in Poughkeepsie who came up to me with a cane. She couldn't be more than 30 years old. She was with her husband. She said:

Our whole lives have been ruined by this disease. My husband and I were just starting our life together. We were going to have a family. We had big plans, and now all we do is deal with this chronic Lyme disease that I have, and I can't get better.

There is a woman named Valerie from Westchester County who wrote to me and says:

No one listens. I hope you will listen.

Well, we are listening today, Valerie, and I urge my colleagues to listen and pass this critical bill.

This bipartisan legislation makes a landmark investment in Lyme disease and other tick-borne illnesses so that our friends and families in the Hudson Valley no longer have to suffer in silence. When folks are suffering, I guarantee you they aren't thinking, Mr. Speaker, about partisan politics.

There is no Republican or Democratic Lyme disease, and Americans expect us to work together. That is why I am proud we are doing so today. We can stand up. We can stand shoulder-to-shoulder and say the health of our communities is too important to wait. For neighbors like Alex, Valerie, the others I mentioned, and for so many others I have never met, I want you to know we are listening.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4701 because our constituents deserve a government that is working for them and that steps up to the plate when they need it most.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who will provide our closing.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas, the distinguished subcommittee leader, chair, and doctor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support today of the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, an historic bill offered by my good friend and distinguished colleague, CHRIS GIBSON.

From all those who suffer from this hideous disease, thank you, CHRIS.

I would also like to extend my very special thanks to Chairmen FRED UPTON and JOE PITTS, as well as their staff, for their tireless efforts to ensure the final bill brought before the floor today establishes a means to address huge gaps that exist and the great unmet need in the Lyme community.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992 I met with the two top medical officials at the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control working on Lyme and an extraordinary woman named Pat Smith. We laid out a case. She did most of the talking. They listened. They were responsive. However, 22 years later, far too little has been accomplished.

I raised, as did she, the apparent ineffectiveness of a month-long antibiotic treatment for a sizable percentage of people. The CDC says between 15 to 20 percent of the people suffering from this disease don't seem to get better. We call it chronic Lyme.

Dr. Richard Horowitz notes in his bestselling book, "Why Can't I Get Better?":

A patient's journey typically begins with a primary care physician or a family doctor. A maximum of 30 days of antibiotics is the accepted standard of care for Lyme disease. If patients report back that they are not getting better, they are likely diagnosed as having "post-Lyme syndrome," chronic fatigue syndrome, or fibromyalgia.

He then described how children are treated for other diseases or disorders, and continues:

This may help some of the symptoms yet fail to address the root problem.

Unfortunately, without better information on chronic Lyme and how to treat it, we will continue to "fail to address the root of the problem" and, in so doing, fail to assist patients in need.

Mr. Speaker, I fully understand that there are concerns about the prolonged use of antibiotics. I chair the Global Health Committee and have chaired numerous hearings on multidrug-resistant tuberculosis and many other diseases that increasingly are being treated with antibiotics with less effectiveness. Yet the ISDA, in their final report of the Lyme Disease Review Panel, found:

There has yet to be a study that demonstrates comparable benefits to prolonged antibiotic therapy beyond 1 month.

There have been far too few studies. There is an engraved invitation. I say to my colleagues, there needs to be those studies. You can fit on half a page the number of studies that have been done over these many years.

However, in that same report, they went on to say:

This conclusion was reached despite the large volumes of case reports, case series, anecdotes, and patient testimonials reviewed that attest to perceived clinical improvement during antibiotic therapy.

Large volumes are just dismissed and laid aside as if they were trivial. It was dismissed and didn't make it into the final report, except for that sentence.

Dr. Horowitz has said that:

In fact, increasing the dose of antibiotics and/or extending the length of treatment clearly did help a certain percentage of my patients. Their fatigue, headaches, joint and muscle pain, and cognitive symptoms improved.

Among clinicians—and I have met with dozens of them—Dr. Horowitz is not alone at all in those findings.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need scientifically-based answers and a comprehensive probe that goes wherever the data suggests. And this is especially important for my own constituents. In New Jersey, over the last 15 years, about 55,000 people have had cases of Lyme.

This bill before us accelerates the process of helping Lyme patients by establishing an interagency working group on Lyme disease with diverse opinions—which is very important—in a transparent and open manner and creates a strategic plan to guide existing Federal Lyme disease research and treatment programs.

Of particular significance, the House bill that we will vote on today for the

first time identifies and seeks to address chronic Lyme disease.

Mr. Speaker, the CDC says:

Approximately 10 to 20 percent of patients treated for Lyme disease with a recommended 2-4 week course of antibiotics will have lingering symptoms of fatigue, pain, or joint and muscle aches.

I would respectfully submit that they are symptoms of something that has a root cause.

The CDC refers to chronic Lyme as "Post-treatment Lyme Disease Syndrome," and many people have been dismissed and told, Oh, you are a hypochondriac. And yet there are so many cases, it can't be dismissed.

This bill is a great step forward for chronic Lyme patients, especially those who have suffered for decades with this debilitating disease, again, only to be told that their illness does not exist.

Again, I want to thank my good friend, CHRIS GIBSON, for his leadership and for the leadership of our House Republicans and our friends on the other side of the aisle. This is a bipartisan bill, and I do hope Members will support it robustly.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my thoughts on H.R. 4701, the Tick-Borne Disease Research Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014.

H.R. 4701 would create a new working group to review efforts on Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases within the Department of Health and Human Services. I support efforts to advance research and public input in this area, but I remain concerned that today's legislation is not the best way to advance these goals. Specifically, I have concerns that H.R. 4701 could unnecessarily politicize federal activities on Lyme disease and potentially result in recommendations that are not supported by a strong, scientific evidence base.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take a careful look at H.R. 4701 and make changes to address these concerns before considering it further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4701, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

ANTI-SPOOFING ACT OF 2014

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 3670) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Anti-Spoofing Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON INACCURATE CALLER ID INFORMATION.

(a) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE UNITED STATES.—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by inserting "or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States," after "United States,".

(b) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(including a text message sent using a text messaging service)" before the period at the end;

(2) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by inserting "(including a text message sent using a text messaging service)" before the period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) TEXT MESSAGE.—The term 'text message' means a real-time or near real-time message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted from or received by a device that is identified as the transmitting or receiving device by means of a telephone number. Such term—

"(i) includes a short message service (SMS) message, an enhanced message service (EMS) message, and a multimedia message service (MMS) message; and

"(ii) does not include a real-time, two-way voice or video communication.

"(E) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—The term 'text messaging service' means a service that permits the transmission or receipt of a text message, including a service provided as part of or in connection with a telecommunications service or an IP-enabled voice service."

(c) COVERAGE OF OUTGOING-CALL-ONLY IP-ENABLED VOICE SERVICE.—Section 227(e)(8)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)(C)) is amended by striking "has the meaning" and all that follows and inserting "means the provision of real-time voice communications offered to the public, or such class of users as to be effectively available to the public, transmitted using Internet protocol, or a successor protocol, (whether part of a bundle of services or separately) with interconnection capability such that the service can originate traffic to, or terminate traffic from, the public switched telephone network, or a successor network."

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(e)(3)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(3)(A)) is amended by striking "Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009, the Commission" and inserting "The Commission".

(2) DEADLINE.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this section not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that

is 6 months after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission prescribes regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Chairman Emeritus BARTON for his leadership on this issue.

Caller ID spoofing is growing at an alarming rate in this country. This new technology allows criminals to falsify deliberately the telephone number and the name relayed on caller ID information to make it appear as though those criminals are calling from our bank or our credit card company, or even from a governmental agency.

Imagine that. I get a telephone call on my cell telephone, and under caller ID, I think it comes from my bank or my credit card company, or even worse, I suppose, from a local governmental agency.

A recent case in New Jersey resulted in a resident's reportedly being scammed out of more than \$5,500 by a caller, a criminal, falsely claiming to be a Federal tax agent attempting to collect back taxes.

What a frightening experience for the innocent receiver of that telephone call. According to investigators, the victim's caller ID showed the number of the local police department. This has got to stop.

Today's bipartisan legislation will strengthen and improve the Truth in Caller ID law to help protect consumers in a greater way from scammers, spammers, and unscrupulous telemarketers.

I commend Chairman Emeritus BARTON, of Ennis, Texas, Republican, and Congresswoman GRACE MENG, Democrat, of Queens, New York, for their hard work and leadership on this issue.

I want the American people to know that on the Energy and Commerce Committee, where Chairman BARTON and I serve, more bipartisan legislation is passed out of that committee and reaches the floor of the House, and then goes over to the United States Senate and is passed in the United

States Senate and goes to the President of the United States for his signature, than legislation from any other committee of Congress.

Now, much of what we do on the Energy and Commerce Committee does not make the headlines because much of what we do is eminently bipartisan in nature. And that is the history of the committee, the oldest standing committee in the House of Representatives, having first been established in 1795.

That is the tradition of bipartisanship, when the chairman, Mr. BARTON was the chairman of that committee. It continues under the chairmanship of Mr. UPTON of Michigan, and this includes the ranking member, Mr. WAXMAN, and the ranking member of the subcommittee. On both sides of the aisle we have a tradition on Energy and Commerce to make sure that our legislation is bipartisan in nature.

I came to this issue as the result of the nefarious situation in New Jersey. I also came to this issue at the request of Congresswoman MENG of New York City, and I want to thank the Congresswoman for coming to me.

I certainly believe that this legislation is in the interest of the American people. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this consumer protection legislation.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act. This is a bipartisan, pro-consumer bill that addresses the increasing problem of scam artists faking caller ID information to defraud consumers.

These bad actors scramble or spoof caller identification information for the purpose of impersonating legitimate individuals or institutions such as law enforcement officials or a bank. They then use these fraudulent identities to obtain sensitive personal information from unsuspecting consumers.

Vulnerable populations such as seniors, veterans, and recent immigrants have been especially targeted by these attacks.

The bill makes three important changes to strengthen existing law and protect consumers. First, it broadens current law to address spoofing in the context of international calls.

Second, it changes the definition of Internet Protocol-enabled voice services to cover new forms of technology criminals have employed making Internet-based calls.

Finally, the bill broadens the scope of the existing law to cover text message spoofing.

These changes will make the 2009 enacted Truth in Caller ID Act a more effective tool to combat caller ID spoofing and protect consumers.

Before reserving my time, I do want to commend Congresswoman MENG for

her work on this issue. I want to commend Mr. LANCE, and I want to also congratulate Congressman BARTON for working together on this commonsense bill.

Not only does the legislation enjoy bipartisan support in the House, but the sponsors have also worked very closely with Federal agencies and industry stakeholders and consumer groups to develop true consensus around this proposed legislation. This is the way this institution ought to work.

I urge my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 3670, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I am the only other speaker left on my side, and I reserve the right to close. So I would yield to the gentleman from Utah or the gentlelady from New York if they wish to speak.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, and I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act, which I authored along with Congressman BARTON and Congressman LANCE.

The bill addresses the problem of caller ID spoofing, which is the scrambling of caller identification numbers. It is a tool often used to defraud unwitting recipients of phone calls and text messages.

It is often stated that a measure of a society is how it treats its most vulnerable. Almost every day, I receive new reports of caller ID spoofing that harms the most vulnerable in our society. Immigrants, seniors, veterans, and those in need of help from law enforcement are all primary victims here. That is why this bill is endorsed by senior citizen groups, law enforcement groups, and consumer protection groups.

Shortly after entering Congress, I pursued this issue because of complaints from a local civic organization and seniors in my district. But I quickly realized it is affecting Americans in all corners of our country, in all of our districts.

I think the fact that this is plaguing so many of our communities is a big reason why we have so much bipartisan support here for this bill.

H.R. 3670 is an update to the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009. That legislation first criminalized malicious caller ID spoofing. But since the passage of that law, scammers have used legal loopholes and new technologies to circumvent it, thus, malicious caller ID spoofing is on the rapid rise again.

So it is time to strengthen and tighten existing law and shut down the routes by which it is being circumvented, and that is what our bill does. H.R. 3670 sets forth three important changes to current law.

Number one, the bill broadens current law to prohibit caller ID spoofing from foreigners. This is crucial because U.S.-based companies now spoof calls to U.S. residents with intent to do harm, but originate such calls from outside of the United States.

Number two, the bill broadens current law to include new Internet-based Voice Over IP services that enable callers to make outgoing only calls from computers and tablets to mobile and landline phones. This is a technology that was undeveloped in 2009 when the Truth in Caller ID Act was adopted and, therefore, unaccounted for in the law. But it has now grown and has contributed significantly to the caller ID spoofing problem.

Number three, finally, our bill broadens current law to include text messaging.

In closing, I would like to thank Mr. BARTON and Mr. LANCE for working with me to write this bill, Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN and Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO for all their guidance and leadership, the Communications and Technology Subcommittee members, most of whom gave this bill great time and support, and all the other cosponsors.

I would also like to thank the committee and personal staffs for all of their hard work.

I urge a "yes" vote for H.R. 3670.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is not spoofing when we say we are going to do something about those individuals that do try to spoof the American public.

As has been pointed out, we passed a law back in, actually, it was the 2009 act, but we passed it in 2010, the Truth in Caller ID Act, to mitigate the effects of caller spoofing.

As you well know, you look on your caller ID and you see that an innocent or innocuous individual or company is calling you, as has been pointed out. It could be the police department, could be the Pizza Hut, could be almost anything, so you take the call and that is not what it is. In many cases they are trying to defraud our elderly in some scam or something like this. So we passed a law that we thought would handle it. But it needs to be updated, and that is what this bill does.

As has been pointed out, it makes it illegal to initiate these calls from outside the United States. It makes it illegal to do it over the Internet with a Voice Over Internet Protocol-based system. And it also broadens the jurisdiction to include text messaging.

As we well know, Mr. Speaker, text messaging is ubiquitous now on our Blackberrys and our iPads and iPhones and all of our personal telecommunication devices.

This bill has bipartisan support. The subcommittee chairman, Mr. WALDEN,

is an original cosponsor. The subcommittee ranking member, Ms. ESHOO of California, is a cosponsor. Chairman Emeritus on the Democratic side JOHN DINGELL is a cosponsor. I am an original sponsor.

So this is one of these instances, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans and Democrats are united. Chairman UPTON, the full committee chairman, and Mr. WAXMAN, the full committee ranking member, are totally supportive.

□ 1830

There is every indication that, if this body passes this bill this evening, it will go to the other body, the United States Senate, and we fully expect it to pass it. This is one of those rare birds in this Congress that might actually be signed by the President of the United States.

There is no known opposition to the bill. Our stakeholders, as Mr. MATHESON has pointed out, support it. Google supports it. The FCC supports it. AT&T, CTIA, Microsoft, USTelecom, Vonage, Verizon, and AARP are just some of the more popularly known stakeholders that support the bill.

So I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, that we unanimously pass H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act of 2013, and send it to the Senate for its consideration.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3670, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5161) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014" or the "E-LABEL Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Communications Commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") first standardized physical labels

for licensed products such as computers, phones, and other electronic devices in 1973, and the Commission has continually refined physical label requirements over time.

(2) As devices become smaller, compliance with physical label requirements can become more difficult and costly.

(3) Many manufacturers and consumers of licensed devices in the United States would prefer to have the option to provide or receive important Commission labeling information digitally on the screen of the device, at the discretion of the user.

(4) An electronic labeling option would give flexibility to manufacturers in meeting labeling requirements.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC LABELING.

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 720. OPTIONAL ELECTRONIC LABELING OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'electronic labeling' means displaying required labeling and regulatory information electronically; and

"(2) the term 'radiofrequency device with display' means any equipment or device that—

"(A) is required under regulations of the Commission to be authorized by the Commission before the equipment or device may be marketed or sold within the United States; and

"(B) has the capability to digitally display required labeling and regulatory information.

"(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROMULGATE REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014, the Commission shall promulgate regulations or take other appropriate action, as necessary, to allow manufacturers of radiofrequency devices with display the option to use electronic labeling for the equipment in place of affixing physical labels to the equipment."

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) to provide for electronic labeling of devices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act. This legislation

that I introduced is a bipartisan and bicameral measure that marks an important step forward in modernizing our laws to reflect today's information and communications technology marketplace.

Over the past 20 years, there has been tremendous growth and innovation in both the communications and manufacturing industries. Smartphones, tablets, and other revolutionary devices come equipped with functionalities we could only imagine just a short time ago. In the midst of this innovation era, it is critical that our laws recognize these advancements and are updated to foster continued investment and opportunities for future development. The E-LABEL Act will facilitate this effort.

The E-LABEL Act establishes a timeline for the FCC to move forward with a rulemaking to permit the use of electronic labels instead of physical labels to certify that devices with screens have been approved for commercial use. Not only will this give manufacturers greater flexibility to design innovative products that consumers demand, but by some estimates, e-labeling will save manufacturers over \$80 million a year. Consumers will also benefit from efficiencies created by e-labeling. E-labeling can expand consumer access to relevant device information and enhance the overall quality and availability of equipment identification records through supporting software. The E-LABEL Act represents good policy for both manufacturers and consumers and should be advanced without delay.

I thank Ranking Member ESHOO, Congressman WELCH, and Congresswoman BLACKBURN for their support on this measure. I also thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN for their continued support and leadership in modernizing our communication laws for the digital age. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

This bipartisan bill will modernize the Federal Communications Commission's device certification rules by eliminating the requirement for device manufacturers to include etched labels on the outside body of each electronic device. Instead, device manufacturers will have the flexibility to display FCC certification information through software on device screens.

There are numerous potential benefits to e-labeling. For example, e-labels can provide more information to consumers than is conveyed today, such as details regarding the device warranties, recycling, and trade-in opportunities. E-labeling will also lower production costs for device manufacturers

since affixing labels to a device can require significant design time and expensive equipment.

I would also note that we should commend FCC Chairman Wheeler and his staff in the Office of Engineering and Technology for recently taking steps to update the Commission's e-labeling policies.

By working together with the FCC, we can provide innovators with more flexibility and speed the delivery of new devices in the marketplace.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LATTA, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5161.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ISLAMIC JIHAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am so profoundly grateful to be able to stand in the well of the United States House of Representatives. There is no greater bastion for free speech than here in this House. What a wonderful gift this is, not only just for people here in the United States, but also for people around the world.

There is one thing that we have learned from Tiananmen Square, and I had the privilege in August of being able to travel to China and visit and stand in the midst of Tiananmen Square, where people from around China had come to take a stand for speech. If we remember from that infamous photo that was taken, one very brave student held up a copy of a little pamphlet in front of a tank when a tank was going to run this student over. The document that the student held up was a copy of the United States Declaration of Independence, as he spoke about freedom and what freedom meant to him.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we have always been in this country—this is a standard-bearer for liberty, a standard-bearer for freedom and a standard-bearer for the expression of free speech rights. That is why we take this opportunity so seriously to be able to keep safe this ability, to be able to speak out on the issues of the day.

If there is anything that has captured America's attention with horror, I believe, especially over these summer months as the United States Congress had taken a recess—the Members of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate had gone back into their districts, and they had met with people on the ground who allowed them to come and serve here in this Congress—it is, when they went home, they also saw on their televisions at night a fairly horrific sight, something that we thank God with everything within our beings that we don't see frequently here in the United States. It was terrorism—and terrorism on a level that we were unfamiliar with and hadn't seen before.

We heard of a group named ISIS, and we saw they had continued to make wild gains both in Iraq and in Syria, so much so that they were robbing banks to fill their own pockets. Then they began to steal oilfields and take those oilfields over. Then they took over oil refineries. Then they began to take over electric grids. Then, with just seemingly very few men, they took over entire cities. In fact, we were shocked when the city of Mosul, which is the ancient city of Nineveh—the prophet Jonah was sent to the city of Nineveh, where he preached to the city, and the Holy Bible records that the entire city repented and turned to God. That ancient city is the modern day city of Mosul in northern Iraq. That was the city that the leader of the Islamic State—the jihadists that we have seen every night on our national news programs—chose to come against. That particular city had a population of well over a million people, and some estimate there were 1.7 million people.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would be more than delighted to yield to the wonderful gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX.

RECOGNIZING CHILDRESS INSTITUTE FOR PEDIATRIC TRAUMA

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding. I know she has an important message to bring tonight, and I appreciate her sharing a little of her time with me.

Mr. Speaker, at a recent event, I had the privilege of learning more about a remarkable organization in Winston-Salem, North Carolina—the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma at Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center. The institute was established due to the leadership and generous financial support of Richard and Judy Childress,

who saw that, while trauma was taking the lives of thousands of children every year, pediatric trauma was not a focus of medical research.

In 2010, according to the Centers for Disease Control, pediatric trauma took the lives of 9,523 children, making it the largest cause of childhood death by a significant margin. As a comparison, cancer, heart disease, and birth defects combined take the lives of about 3,300 children every year. Tragically, 3,300 is a very similar number of children who were killed in 2010 due to traumatic injury from child abuse. An additional 6,190 children died that year from unintentional traumatic injuries. A full 52 percent of those injuries were caused by vehicle accidents, followed by drowning, poisoning, fire, guns, and falls. In addition to the nearly 10,000 fatalities, another 175,000 children were hospitalized due to injuries.

Dr. C. Everett Koop, who served as U.S. Surgeon General under President Reagan, once said: "If a disease were killing our children in the proportions that injuries are, people would be outraged and demand that this killer be stopped."

Despite trauma being the overwhelming cause of childhood death, the Federal Government spends only about 1 cent on pediatric trauma research for every dollar spent to study pediatric cancer.

The Childress Institute has been working to pick up where Federal dollars have dropped off. The institute uses its resources for research, education, and awareness about pediatric trauma and to improve the treatment for critically injured children in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Childress is a lifelong resident of the Winston-Salem area, and is a NASCAR pioneer. Richard and his wife, Judy, are civic and philanthropic leaders in the community. Through their determination to fight the number one cause of pediatric death, children worldwide are benefiting from the generosity that those of us in North Carolina have long witnessed.

□ 1845

The remarkable people of the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma work tirelessly to discover and share the best ways to prevent injuries and treat severely injured children, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that all "injured kids get the best care when they need it the most."

Today, I thank Richard and Judy Childress for their foresight and generosity, and I thank the Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center in Winston-Salem for its expertise and dedication to this mission.

Finally, I want to recognize the dedicated men and women of the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma for working every day to keep our children

safe and to help them recover when they get hurt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for so graciously yielding to me this evening.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to give words of praise for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX. She is a stalwart on almost every topic and every subject that there is in this Chamber.

She is one of the few women that you will regularly see here almost on a daily basis, taking the debate to the American people, so that they can understand that our society can be in conformity with what the creators of this society wanted, a place that was, first of all, peaceful, a place that would be welcoming, and a nation that would allow everyone who comes here to realize their dreams in a way that would even stretch their own imaginations. She has been a stalwart, and that is Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX, and I am grateful that she was able to come and speak here this evening.

I would like to be able to continue, Mr. Speaker, with this important topic because, again, these are extraordinary times and extraordinary days that we live in. As we all know from the news reports, the President of the United States, tomorrow night, will be addressing the Nation on the topic of Islamic jihad, particularly the Islamic State, as they call themselves today.

Some people may know them as ISIS or ISIL. They call themselves the Islamic State. The President will be talking about this threat, and I think that the country is anxious to hear what the President of the United States will say.

I serve on the Intelligence Committee. It is a privilege to serve on the Intelligence Committee. It is a fairly small committee. We deal with the classified secrets of our Nation. We also deal primarily with terrorism and how to keep the Nation safe, and as a member of that committee, we have watched this group called the Islamic State form.

We have watched it for well over 2 years because what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is nothing new. It is a continuation of the concept known as Islamic jihad.

While maybe this is a new name and this is a new format, the Islamic State, it is merely a continuation of a phenomenon that began in 700 A.D. under the prophet Muhammad who took the sword and violently attempted to convert people to his religion to various villages, whether it was Mecca or Medina, he used the sword to violently force individuals to convert to Islam.

That attempted conversion has continued from 700 A.D. forward, and so what we are seeing today is the Islamic jihad, the continuation, and it is also at its root a religious war.

While sitting on the Intelligence Committee, watching the rise of the Islamic jihad, we learned and studied about who this leader of the Islamic jihad is. His name is Baghdadi. He is about 43 years old. He is very well-educated. He has a doctorate degree.

He has been involved in al Qaeda as a senior member for decades. So, again, this is not a new individual. This is not a brandnew thought or a brandnew concept. This is an individual who has dedicated his life to jihad. His name, again, is Baghdadi.

As we watched Baghdadi and his rise, something stunned me, and I hope that everyone in the United States understands this one concept: we, in the United States, had intercepted Baghdadi, the current head of the Islamic State. We had Baghdadi in United States custody. We had him in custody in Iraq, the country where he was born, and he was in a United States detention center.

The reason why he was in detention is because he was a terrorist committing terrorist acts, and he was committed to pursuing terrorist goals. We had him in detention, and President Obama chose in 2009 to release Baghdadi from detention in Iraq. He was set free.

Now, was Baghdadi rehabilitated? Had we confirmed that he had renounced Islamic jihad, that he had renounced acts of terror, that he was no longer going to pick up the sword and force people at the threat of their life or beheadings to convert to Islam?

That wasn't it at all. As a matter of fact, at the moment when the United States released Baghdadi from the United States prison, Camp Bucca in Iraq, at that moment, Baghdadi said to his jailer, "I will see you in New York."

That should have been a tipoff right there and then that we should have nabbed him and held him and retained him in detention. This was not a good candidate for release.

Today, Baghdadi is the head of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and the self-appointed caliph of the new caliphate. He reconstituted al Qaeda in Iraq. As a matter of fact, the very first franchise or affiliate of al Qaeda was located in Iraq. Baghdadi himself was the number three in the organization.

We in the United States took out and killed the number one and the number two in al Qaeda of Iraq. Baghdadi was number three. He was ready to move up, obviously, to be the number one of al Qaeda in Iraq, but he didn't have the opportunity.

He didn't have the opportunity when he was in detention in 2009. He had to look for his opportunity and reconstitute himself and his organization and build an organization, which he did. He began in 2009, and he began with what he called "break the walls"—that was his name, a "break the walls" strategy.

It was a campaign whereby he opened prison doors all across northern Iraq, and he released terrorists from prisons, so these are prisoners that we captured—the United States—or that the Iraqi forces working with the United States had captured.

So terrorists who are behind bars in jail in Iraq in pursuit of the Islamic jihad were behind bars, and the one man that President Obama released from jail in Iraq went to the other prisons and opened the prison doors and began forming his army, and his army was formed with convicted Islamic jihadist terrorists.

He broke open so many jails, and he again then recruited other terrorists from the region that today Baghdadi has an army—a brutal, savage, animalistic army of 12,000 individuals who are so brutal.

We heard the reports that they literally buried alive innocent women and children in northern Iraq. They chased families up a mountain, Mount Sinjar, the Yazidis. The Yazidis were a peace-loving people, but they were considered devil worshippers by Baghdadi and his band of the Islamic State. They couldn't have that, so they chased these people.

One and two and then 10 and then 100 and then thousands of Yazidis were killed by these barbarians and the Islamic State. They died of thirst. They died of hunger. They died of beheadings.

Men were separated from women. Women were raped. Women were carried away and kidnapped. They were forced into sexual slavery to serve the animals who had beheaded their husbands and their sons. Literally, hundreds of men were taken away and beheaded by the Islamic State, led by Baghdadi, the man who had been released from prison by President Obama.

I wonder if President Obama will have something to say about his decision to release Baghdadi when he addresses the Nation tomorrow night. Clearly, this was a mistake that never should have happened.

Well, once Baghdadi had his terrorists released from prison, they began a wave of car bombings across Iraq. As Baghdadi reconstituted his Army in 2010 and 2011, he began his strategy. His outward strategy was a series of nationwide car bombings in 2011 and 2013 all across Iraq.

He destabilized Iraq and destabilized the Government of Iraq and destabilized the Army of Iraq to the point where they were more and more fearful of the Islamic State and what they were intending to do.

So bold did Baghdadi become that his aim was not simply on Iraq and on Syria or just on Gaza or just on Israel or on Jordan or on Turkey or on Lebanon. He gave a speech in January of this year, 2014.

In this speech, Baghdadi spoke to America. This is what he had to say to America—the leader of ISIS—“Soon we'll be in direct confrontation, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching.”

I repeat, “Soon we'll be in direct confrontation, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching.”

They posted a picture of the al Qaeda flag—the black flag—flying over the White House. They have intentions, all right. Their intentions are not just in the Middle East. Their intentions are terrorist activity also in Western Europe and also in the United States of America.

Why? They tell us what their goal is. Their goal is to force the peoples of Western Europe and to force the peoples of the United States of America to convert to Islam at the tip of a sword, whatever it takes.

You see, we are in the shadow of the 13th anniversary of the horrific tragedy of 9/11, when we saw what 19 committed Islamic jihadists can achieve with an airline ticket in one hand and a box cutter in another.

They drove the planes on that morning of September 11 directly into tower number one and tower number two in New York City. They felled the towers, and 3,000 innocents died.

They also took off in a jet here in this city, from the airport in this city. That airplane went directly into the Pentagon, and more hundreds of innocents died, and that wasn't alone. Another jet took off.

No one knows if that jet was intended to come into this building, if they were targeting this very well, 13 years ago. Were they targeting this well, this rotunda, the Capitol? Were they targeting the White House?

We will never know. We will never know because the brave Americans on Flight 93 infamously said, “Let's roll.” They were the first resistance that day, the first American resistance to push back and say, “Not in my Nation, you don't.”

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to those Americans who said, who realized through phone calls with their loved ones, when they tragically picked up the phone and found out the horrifying news of what had happened in New York City to the World Trade towers, of what had happened to the Pentagon, and they knew very likely that the plane that they were on could be carrying them also on a nefarious mission, and to the point of losing their own lives, they stood up and said, “This is our last chance, but we're not going to sit here, we're going to fight back,” and they did. They fought back. They lost their lives that day.

□ 1900

They lost their lives that day, but they saved that jet from being used as a missile on another target.

You see, Americans and America didn't wait. We didn't wait to be defeated by this evil philosophy and this evil enemy. Brave Americans stood up that day and said, “No more.” And the question we have is: Do we hear their voices? Do we still hear their voices? Is there bravery yet among us today to heed their call? Because, you see, the Islamic jihadists haven't changed. They haven't deviated in their intent. They haven't deviated in their ultimate goal, which is to spread their caliphate across the entire world, not just in Iraq, not just in Syria, but across the entire world, including the United States of America.

We saw what they did in Benghazi 2 years ago, almost to the day, again on September 11, when Islamic jihadists targeted the American consulate. They not only burned it down, but they also took the life—for the first time in 30 years, we lost an American Ambassador, Chris Stevens. What is so shameful is that 2 years later Libya is in absolute chaos today. Just in the last month, we saw Islamic jihadists take over the airfield in Tripoli.

I was in Tripoli earlier this year. I had visited the American Embassy earlier this year. I went outside and observed a moment of silence in front of the memorial recognizing our Ambassador, Chris Stevens. It is right outside, between the Embassy and the swimming pool at the Embassy. And shamefully, about a week, 2 weeks ago, we saw Islamic jihadists had so pressurized our Embassy that the people in our Embassy wisely abandoned the Embassy and took off for Tunisia and escaped out of Libya with their lives, thank God.

The Islamic jihadists, the terrorists, came into the United States Embassy and took over and had a party in our Embassy and made a video that they posted on YouTube that had them standing on the second-floor balcony at the Embassy, jumping joyfully into the swimming pool, splashing in the swimming pool, mere yards from the memorial to our killed Ambassador, Chris Stevens.

You see, we are not winning the war against Islamic jihad. Our President infamously told us in the runup to his reelection in 2012 that al Qaeda was defeated. Core al Qaeda was nearly gone; it was defeated. Al Qaeda was on the run, our President assured us. I only wish our President would have been right.

Sitting on the Intelligence Committee, I knew without a shadow of a doubt what our President was saying in 2012 was absolutely wrong. It wasn't true. I knew al Qaeda wasn't defeated. I knew that al Qaeda across the world was continuing to gain traction. We knew that. And yet we were told that, with the death of bin Laden, all had been solved. Thank you very much. Tragically, nothing could be further from the truth.

Tragically, James Foley, the United States photojournalist who was beheaded by ISIS, knew that that wasn't true, as well as Steven Sotloff, the other United States journalist who also was beheaded by the Islamic State.

You see, actions have consequences; ideas have consequences. And when the decision was made by President Obama of releasing Baghdadi from the United States detention center for whatever reason, that has had profound consequences. Ask the thousands of Iraqis who are now dead. Ask the thousands of Yazidis who are dead and displaced. Ask the hundreds and maybe thousands of women who have been raped and violated, and young girls, those in Syria who have had to deal with the same. The tragic consequences are being felt even here in the United States.

Then we watched, with startling speed, the bank robberies that occurred when Baghdadi had to find a source of income and revenue to run the Islamic State. He did that by robbing banks. There are various reports. Some reports say that he stole over \$400 million, some say over \$100 million, others say various amounts. The fact is now we had an Islamic jihadist who could support himself through bank robberies. But he didn't stop there. He knew that that wouldn't be enough to accomplish the dreams that he had to establish a global Islamic State.

And so, besides robbing banks, besides reconstituting an army, he decided that he would also take over oilfields in the Kurdistan area of northern Iraq. He took over the oilfield. Some reports say that he sells on the black market oil that comes in at potentially \$1 million a day; other open-source documents say other amounts. But the fact is we have the Islamic State supporting itself by selling oil on the black market, and that oil goes to fund terrorism.

He also didn't stop there. Baghdadi also was strategic and he took over an oil refinery, the oil refinery which supplies the energy to the Islamic State to run their vehicles, their airplanes, whatever it is that they need energy for.

They also took over an electric grid so that they could have electricity. They didn't take over every village; they didn't need to. They could cause them to fall through intimidation, just as they did in Mosul, and that is what was stunning.

Imagine you have got an army estimated to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000 to 12,000, and you can take over a city of 1.7 million, just one. You see, that is what terrorism does. It so intimidates people that live in the community that they decide, We can't win; we aren't even going to try.

That is why the United States can't stay silent. That is why we must stand and act and recognize. We are at war. We are at war because the Islamic

State has declared war against the United States, Western Europe. They declared war on anyone who isn't them. But they have been very clear about declaring war against the United States.

The Islamic State also made another strategic capture. They captured air bases, Iraqi air bases. And when they did that, they captured United States equipment. So the Islamic jihad is fighting with the latest United States equipment.

They reportedly have United States helicopters, United States planes. They reportedly have United States weaponry and United States ammunition. They also have uniforms that they captured from the Iraqi forces. They captured Humvees, armaments, the oilfields. They also captured natural gasfields in central Syria.

Well, this spring as I was watching this occur, I am from the State of Minnesota, and unfortunately Minnesota has a very long connection to terrorism. I went to the FBI earlier this summer, and I asked the FBI for a private classified meeting. I asked the FBI if there were any Minnesotans that had joined the Islamic State and had traveled to the Middle East to fight on their behalf. They told me at that time the information was classified. It no longer is. The FBI told me that there were two Minnesotans who had traveled and joined the Islamic State.

So I had asked the obvious question, which was: If they are not killed in that battle, and if they choose to come back to the United States—we know who they are; we know what they have done—will they be allowed to come back into the United States? And I was told, Yes, they will. They are American citizens. They have passports. We can't stop them from coming into the United States.

I was floored. Here we are trying to track down and murder terrorists in Afghanistan. We have American citizens who have left the United States and who have joined with the Islamic State—and, by the way, the creed of the Islamic State says, when you join the Islamic State, you have renounced every other form of government and you are now submitting to the government of the Islamic State. How is it that that individual then would be able to come in?

The FBI said, Well, we put those individuals on a watch list and we give them further screening at the airport. I asked, What you do mean, further screening? They said, Well, we ask them questions.

And then they are allowed to get on a plane and then they are allowed to come into the United States and travel freely?

Yes, they are.

That floored me. I thought that couldn't possibly be. And then we saw the events transpire this summer. And

tragically, we saw the very first American who was killed fighting for the Islamists, the Islamic State, was a Minnesotan. His name was Doug McCain, from Minnesota, from the Twin Cities suburban area. He was an African American youth from Chicago. He had come with his family to Minnesota, where he had been converted to Islam and radicalized in the Twin Cities and became a fighter for the Islamic State. He was the first American.

Very shortly thereafter, a second American was reported to have been killed fighting for the Islamic State—in the same battle. That was also a Minnesotan, another young man, who was a Somali American. Minnesota has the largest Somali population in the world outside of Somalia. And that Somali man traveled over as well.

And so had these two individuals, had they been in the war with the Islamic State and, rather than getting killed decided to come back, they would not have been impeded by the United States Government from coming back.

Now, think of this. Here you have individuals who have given their allegiance to the Islamic State—oh, and by the way, one of their friends from high school was killed in 2009. He also was fighting in the Middle East in Islamic jihad. His name was Troy Kastigar. And Troy Kastigar was featured in a video, a recruitment video, inviting more Americans to come and join Islamic jihad.

Troy Kastigar said that he was glad—I am paraphrasing—he was glad to be a traitor to America. And yet, under our current law, Troy Kastigar can be a killer and fight against the interests of the United States and travel to the Middle East, be a terrorist, and then freely come back to the United States with battlefield experience, maybe a plan for terrorism in the United States, and he can roam freely in this country?

There is something seriously wrong here, Mr. Speaker, something very seriously wrong. Have we completely lost our minds that we wouldn't even prevent a terrorist, a known, avowed terrorist from returning to the United States where he could carry out terrorist activity here in the United States?

You see, we think that things have been fairly peaceful, but at a minimum, there have been 53 different terrorist plots that our government has stopped. We have foiled 53 plots, at minimum, since 2001, since the terrorist activity.

We didn't foil all of them. We didn't foil the Islamic jihadists in Arkansas who killed a United States soldier. And this individual also had been converted to Islam and killed the soldier who was at a recruiting station, I believe an Army recruiting station. We didn't stop the two refugees who were in Boston, the Tsarnaev brothers, at the Boston Marathon bombing.

Despite the fact that our FBI was given a cable from the Russian FSB—that is their intelligence service. They gave a cable to our FBI that it appeared that the Tsarnaev brothers had—there was a question of terrorist involvement and terrorist activity. The Tsarnaev brothers weren't stopped, and people, tragically, were hurt during the Boston Marathon bombing.

So we have seen those attempts, as we also saw another attempt of the infamous Christmas Day underwear bomber, who had left London, headed to Minneapolis, Minnesota, with the express intention of blowing himself up as a suicide bomber with a concoction that someone had put together for him, and he attempted to blow up the plane. At that time, it was Northwest Airlines, the precursor to today's Delta Air Lines. He tried to blow himself up over the city of Detroit, but thank God he was unsuccessful. Again, it was yet one more plot here in the United States.

And there were more. There were attempts on one of our former President's life, George W. Bush, at his home. There have been other plots as well. Thank God we have foiled so many of them. But what that should speak to us, Mr. Speaker, is that the problem isn't just in the Middle East.

□ 1915

The problem is here in the United States, and that is why we have to act now. We have to act forward thinking so we don't allow them to reach their goals. Well, I went to the FBI, and I asked them this question. Again, I was shocked at the answer.

Earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the United States Congress. It is gaining a fair amount of traction with both Democrats and Republicans. It essentially says this: If you are an American citizen, and if you have gone to join ISIS, a foreign terrorist organization, and you want to return to the United States, your passport will be taken from you, and you will begin the process of denaturalization. In other words, we will do everything within our power to prevent you from coming back into this United States. You can try to come in—and, unfortunately, too many try to come in through our southern border—but we are going to try and make sure that you are not successful. My bill is called the Terrorist Denaturalization and Passport Revocation Act to amend section 349(a) of the United States Code.

Well, not only that, from Minnesota, the FBI estimates we have at least 20 Somali Americans from Minnesota that have left our State and have traveled to the Middle East to join the Islamic jihad. Just last week, a 19-year-old Somali American woman left St. Paul to join the Islamic jihad. What I am told is that all three of the women

that have gone to join from the United States are from the State of Minnesota. They are continuing to recruit.

Our southern border remains, for all practical purposes, wide open so foreign nationals can cross into the United States. Again, it is not the fault of the Border Patrol. I actually naively thought on my visit about 6 weeks ago to our southern border that the Border Patrol actually stops foreign nationals from coming in. I thought they did. I was shocked to find out that the Border Patrol doesn't stop anyone. Nearly 100 percent of foreign nationals who want to come into the United States through our southern border come in. They come in. The Border Patrol is a people processing pipeline. So they come in. They may not all get to stay, but they certainly all do come in. Again, that is not the fault of the Border Patrol. That is the fault of politicians who haven't made the decision to actually secure America's southern border and to set up the police, to set up the law enforcement to make that happen, and also to instantaneously deport foreign nationals back across the border. I was told, as a matter of fact, if I didn't mention it before, that foreign nationals from over 140 countries have already made their way into the United States just so far this year.

We have a lot on our plate right now, Mr. Speaker, a lot that we have to pay attention to. The United States could have stopped them in the cradle, and they weren't. They could have been stopped before they were reconstituted. The President could have retained Baghdadi in the United States detention system. We wouldn't have had the beheadings that we saw of James Foley or of Steve Sotloff, and hundreds of thousands of innocent people wouldn't be dead today had the President made that decision, but he didn't.

It is also important for us to realize Iraq pled with the United States to do drone strikes against the Islamic State dating back to August of 2013. Wouldn't it have been important to listen to Iraq? They were the ones dealing with the Islamic State in 2013. They begged us to do drone strikes and take out the leadership in Iraq. What was the answer of President Obama? No. He took a pass. He didn't listen to the calls of Iraq, and we didn't take out the leadership when we had the chance.

The Iraq foreign minister came to the United States, and he begged for the United States to help against the Islamic State. He also went home empty-handed. There were multiple knocks on the President's door to do something about the Islamic State even back in 2013 by our partners who we were trying to help be successful in Iraq. Unfortunately, our President did not answer that call.

On May 11, the President of Iraq, al-Maliki, asked CENTCOM to strike the Islamic State with drones. That was on

May 11, this spring. I was on the Intelligence Committee. I was seeing the up tempo, and all of us were seeing the up tempo of the Islamic State and the rise of the Islamic jihad. Again, the president of Iraq asked our CENTCOM to do drone strikes and take out the Islamic State. Al Maliki said, "I will approve the airstrikes. I will get behind you." He was told "no."

The problem, you see, wasn't al-Maliki in the spring. The problem is that the President and his team decided not to help when we had ample opportunities. A meeting was held very early on on how to defeat al Qaeda both in Pakistan and Afghanistan. It was written about by a weekly news magazine author who had the ability to be in that meeting. And in that early meeting of the Obama administration, a meeting both with Pakistan and Afghanistan on how to defeat al Qaeda, they didn't discuss in that meeting—and it was very telling—they didn't discuss a strategy to actually defeat al Qaeda. What they did is take along our agriculture secretary, Tom Vilsack, and the conversation rather than being about actually defeating al Qaeda was about planting seeds in Pakistan and planting seeds for the agriculture community and growing the agriculture community in both countries. Now, I am not saying that that is not a worthwhile meeting, but if your point in having the meeting is to defeat al Qaeda, that is the subject that you should be covering, and you should come up with a plan. That was, again, at this point, over 4 years ago, and we are here tomorrow night about to hear from the President. Does he finally have a plan? Once the crisis got to the point of American citizens being beheaded on TV before our eyes in the most cruel, barbaric way possible, now we are only starting to reengage.

The Islamic State crisis, unfortunately, is one that will be very difficult because we have seen United States forces prematurely moved out of that region. So were we forewarned? We absolutely were forewarned. And it isn't just the administration. We also knew during George W. Bush's tenure as President of the United States that the foreign policy establishment, the military establishment, also knew. There is a clip that has gone on YouTube recently of President George W. Bush in 2007, and I will read exactly verbatim what the President said July 12, 2007. George W. Bush warned the Nation then:

It would mean surrendering the future of Iraq to al Qaeda if the United States completely removed ourselves from Iraq. It would mean that we would be risking mass killings on a horrific scale.

It would mean that we would allow the terrorists to establish a safe haven in Iraq to replace the one they lost in Afghanistan.

It would mean increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous.

It is beyond belief the statement that was made by George W. Bush back in July 12 of 2007. It is as though the President has most accurately described exactly what President Obama will address tomorrow night by his ill-made decision in 2011 not to leave American residual forces to maintain the peace.

I want to give credit tonight, Mr. Speaker, to the American heroes, the American soldiers who won the peace and defeated the enemy in Iraq—yes, they did—and in Afghanistan. In order to maintain the peace, we needed to maintain a strong American presence, just like today we have in South Korea. I was in South Korea in August. We maintain an American presence. Why? Because there is an aggressor in North Korea. We have our force on location so that we can let the aggressor know, if you try something, we are here, and you won't succeed. And that has worked very well in South Korea. That has worked very well in Western Europe.

Unfortunately, President Obama didn't learn the lessons of history, and he made the ill-timed decision to pull American residual forces out of Iraq. That decision has led to the consequences that we have today, and it is why, again, I would plead with the President of the United States to not pull American forces out of Afghanistan, either. Because I heard over and over and over when I was in Kabul, Afghanistan, over the Memorial Day weekend, May 30, that if the United States leaves Afghanistan, everyone on the ground knows the Taliban will be back. It will be bloody, and it won't be pretty, and it will be back to square one after \$1 trillion worth of treasure. But, more importantly, after the sacrifice of thousands of brave American lives. That is not how we should honor their memory nor their sacrifice. And the same with the brave American men and women in our Armed Forces, and contractors, et cetera, who lost their life also to win the peace in Iraq. Again, President George Bush had it right in July of 2007. We needed those residual forces.

Yes, this is a continuation of Islamic jihad. Yes, this is, at its basis, a religious war—not America saying it. That is the terrorists themselves telling us that they are at war with us because they intend to force conversions to their religion of Islam.

Well, what is very unusual about the Islamic State is this: they have a land, and they have a territory. We have a philosophy, we have been fighting, now we have a land and a territory, a new caliphate. It is at least half of Syria and at least half of Iraq. It has a head, Baghdadi, who has declared himself the caliph of this new caliphate. He has a committed army of 12,000 terrorist soldiers, many of whom he released from terrorist prisons. They have a form of

government, Islamic sharia law, and they follow that to the tee.

They have money from banks that they have robbed, from oilfields, and from the revenue that they take from gasfields. They also have a self-sustaining infrastructure with their energy production. They are seeking to obtain weapons of mass destruction. They obtained 90 pounds of low-enriched uranium. There is now a fear that materials that could be used to form a nuclear bomb are items on the wish list and the shopping list of the Islamic State. We need to do everything that we can to prevent them from achieving their goal of putting together the elements for a nuclear weapon.

We also need to be aware that Pakistan is also in a vulnerable position. There are reports that Pakistan may have upwards of 200 nuclear weapons. Pakistan is a Sunni state. The Islamic State led by Baghdadi is also a Sunni Islamic jihadist enterprise. If they choose to make a deal with Pakistan for nuclear material or a nuclear weapon, that would change the dynamic overnight. And that is why it is imperative that another Islamic state, Iran, a Shia Islamic state, never, ever, ever obtain a nuclear weapon. Because if Iran obtains a nuclear weapon, they have stated unequivocally they will use that nuclear weapon to wipe Israel off the map. They will also use that weapon, they have stated, against the United States to defeat the United States of America.

You see, nuclear weapons matter, Mr. Speaker, and they must never, ever go into the hands in any way of committed Islamic jihadist terrorists. Iran is a terror State. It is a United States-designated terror state. There are only four in the world. Iran is one of them.

Now we have the Islamic State. The Islamic State headed by Baghdadi also seeks destruction, and they mean it. We have seen it, and we have to take it seriously. That is why we must engage them and not allow them to succeed because the Islamic State now has weapons from the United States equal to weapons that we have in our Army. They have weapons from the Russian Government, and they also have Iranian weapons, as well—sophisticated weapons and individuals with the knowledge and ability to be able to use those weapons.

They also control borders that weren't in the control of jihadists before. Just recently, they gained control of a border at the Golan Heights on Israel's border. This is approximately 200 yards from Israel in a demilitarization area. Nonetheless, they took United Nations workers hostage just as the Islamic State took 49 Turks hostage out of the Turkish Embassy in northern Iraq.

□ 1930

They have taken checkpoints on the Jordan border with Iraq. The Islamic

State has taken over. They have virtually erased the border with Syria. They have taken over checkpoints in Lebanon, also in Turkey and also in the Kurdistan region, so they control territory in a way that they never have before.

They have some of the most sophisticated recruitment materials in the world today through Facebook, through Twitter. They know exactly what the message is and who they need to target to join them in the Islamic jihad.

Unfortunately, in my home State of Minnesota, we know all too well how successful the Islamic State has been in drawing in literally thousands from Western Europe to join them in jihad, but also Americans as well. They are the cool kid on the block, if you will. That is where young people want to go, and that is who they are attracted to.

As I said earlier, the leader of the Islamic State is a man named Baghdadi, a man who was released from American detention by President Obama in 2009, who went on to reconstitute this horrific Islamic jihad called the Islamic State. He is in his early forties. He is in the prime of life. He believes this is his moment. He has declared himself the head, the caliph, of the new state, the caliphate.

He was involved in al Qaeda leadership for decades. He was literally number three in al Qaeda of Iraq, the first franchise. He was an associate of Bin Laden. He has a doctorate degree. He was born in Samarra, Iraq. He understands Iraq. He understands that it is his destiny, from his opinion, to fulfill the reestablishment of the caliphate, and he has no interest in waiting. He is on the march.

He made a statement in January of this year that I read previously, but it is one that bears repeating, and he said this to the United States. He said, "Soon we will be in direct confrontation with you, United States, so watch out for us, for we are with you, watching."

That is why we need to understand that we very likely have Islamic jihad terrorists here in the United States today. We know that there are those who went to join ISIS who have returned to the United States. They are terrorists.

We need to call them for who they are. They aren't engaged in workplace violence, as our former head of Homeland Security erroneously said. They are terrorists. They are murderers. They live to kill innocent human beings.

They do it because they believe that they are pleasing their God when they do. According to their belief, not mine, not what I am saying, what they say, they believe that if they are a martyr, if they die in the way of jihad, that is their only one sure way to go to heaven. That is what they say in their belief.

We need to understand who the enemy is. We need to understand the enemy's motivation, not what we wish the enemy thinks, not what we hope the enemy thinks. We need to understand what the enemy—the terrorists—actually say about themselves and say about their beliefs and say about what their goals are because, you see, Sun Tzu wrote in his book "The Art of War," there are two rules to win in a conflict.

One is you need to know yourself, you need to know who you are, you need to know what your attributes are, what your strengths, what your weaknesses are as an army, as a nation, as an individual, but you also need to know who your enemy is.

That is why it was so concerning when the FBI decided—not only the FBI, but other agencies of our government, the CIA included, but in particular, I am familiar with the FBI—when the FBI agreed that they would purge the training manuals of FBI agents, and they purged the manuals of materials on Islam, and the materials that they purged were quotes from the Koran—why did they do that? Why in the world would our FBI not want its agents to understand the motivation of terrorists?

This isn't about being mean to Muslims, this isn't about being mean to anybody's religion or being insensitive to anyone's religion—because in the United States you have freedom of religion, you can believe what you want to believe, but you can't take, as your basis and your justification, religious belief to go and kill other people or hurt other people—that, you can't do.

It is important again that our FBI, our law enforcement mechanism, understands the motivation of who the enemies are and why they are doing what they are doing. That is why it is so dangerous for the FBI not to train our agents in what the motivation is of Islamic jihad.

Well, you see, we witnessed the Islamic jihad, we witnessed them also taking hostages. I mentioned 49 Turkish hostages have been taken. They have taken hostages of the British, the French, Germans, United States hostages, including the two journalists that we had mentioned that they tragically took.

This is age-old. This has been a part of what has happened in Islamic jihad through the millennia with ransoms and piracy and taking hostages for money.

The demand was made of the United States that we would pay \$132 million for the release of James Foley. It is curious that that demand was made almost immediately after President Obama illegally and unfortunately negotiated with terrorists to release the alleged deserter Bergdahl in exchange for five Taliban.

The five top leaders of the Taliban, the five top strategists, the five top

leaders of the Taliban, the enemy that we are fighting in Afghanistan, the President of the United States negotiated with terrorists so that we would release from detention in Guantanamo Bay the five top strategists of the terrorists that we are fighting in Afghanistan. He released those five top terrorists in exchange for the alleged deserter Bergdahl.

Now, that was a first. The United States hadn't done that before. We have had a policy of we don't negotiate for hostages, and that has served us very well because the world understood—the thugs and the animals and the savages and barbarians of the world understood you are not going to get anywhere with the United States, they are not going to pay for hostages, they are not going to give up prisoners in exchange. It is not going to happen.

It is a way of life with other countries, not with the United States of America, not until May of 2014 when President Obama, in my opinion, tragically made the decision that he would negotiate with terrorists in order to regain the alleged deserter Bowe Bergdahl.

Almost immediately, we saw the demand by the terrorists for money for James Foley. We did not comply, and he was beheaded. Then the demand came for the United States to release Lady al Qaeda in exchange for Steve Sotloff, and we didn't comply. That is why we are looking forward to what the President of the United States has to say tomorrow. We have to defeat this enemy, the Islamic State.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REDUCING THE RISK OF FIRES IN OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I think we just heard a 1-hour audition for FOX News, but we did not hear a solution to what is a very real problem. We didn't hear a call for a vote, which we are going to have to take if we are to carry out our constitutional obligations, and that is going to be before us.

I don't want to carry on the discussion about the very serious problem of ISIL or ISIS. We have heard a lot of that already. We will have to come to grips with that by October 6 or 7, when the 60-day clock on the War Powers Act runs out and our constitutional obligation takes place.

There are many, many problems facing this Nation, and certainly, the international scene is one of them, but there is also a problem in our communities. I represent a large portion of California, the national forests on the

Sierra side and the national forests on the coastal side of the Sacramento Valley. A lot of that is in the U.S. Forest Service, as well as in the Bureau of Land Management.

Over the last several years, those two agencies have been struggling to put out the fires that have raged in the Western United States and, indeed, in the Southeast of the United States. The way in which we have set up the budgeting and the appropriation for fighting fires has created an ongoing cycle of increasing the likelihood of new fires.

We need to change that. We need to get ahead of the century of fire repression and put in place policies and programs that will reduce the risks of fires. We need to manage our forests in such a way that the fire risk is reduced, the forests are thinned, trees appropriately harvested, the undergrowth reduced and eliminated, firebreaks put in place, and protect our communities by the proper management of the forest, reducing the fuel, reducing the load of fuel that these forests have.

We have been unable to do that, principally because we have seen an enormous increase in the number of fires, and the Federal budget to fight these fires is a 10-year rolling average that has not been able to keep up with the increase each year in the megafires, California most recently facing the rim fire in the Yosemite area.

That fire gobbled up not only the forest, but gobbled up the money that was set aside to prevent fires to manage the forest. Instead of having that fund available to do that kind of work, the money was transferred from those programs into the firefighting.

Now, this is an ongoing problem. My colleague from California, SCOTT PETERS, has addressed this problem with a motion to bring to the floor legislation that would set up a new mechanism for appropriating funds for fighting fires. I will let him discuss that and why he has this before us.

Mr. PETERS, if you would join us.

Mr. PETERS of California. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for helping to raise awareness about the pressing need to change the way the Federal Government deals with funding wildfire response and prevention.

As you well know, the devastating effect of wildfires in 2003 and 2007—we had massive, massive loss of property and displacements in Scripps Ranch, Tierrasanta, Rancho Bernardo, and Poway.

Right now, as I am speaking—and you mentioned this as well—firefighters in Yosemite National Park continue to battle a wildfire that has burned more than 2,600 acres and required 120 firefighters and 11 aircraft to combat.

It is no secret, in addition, that California is facing a prolonged drought that places us at increased risk for

wildfires. So we are in the midst of what is expected to be one of the longest and hardest wildfire seasons in recent memory, certainly in any of our memories.

Wildfires are extremely expensive for States and localities to fight. There is an urgent need for Congress to pass a solution that funds firefighting without stealing from prevention, which is a crazy thing to do. I think we all acknowledge that.

Earlier this summer, as you mentioned, I led the discharge petition with 196 signers to demand a vote on the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014. That bill has real bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate—71 Democrats and 60 Republicans have cosponsored in the House—and that is very unusual around here. It was also included by the President in his budget request.

So you have both parties in the House and the President of the United States all on the same page on this issue. It seems like an area where we ought be able to make some progress, and we ought to have a vote.

The bill allows firefighting agencies to access funds from the natural disaster contingency fund while fighting catastrophic fires, not take money from prevention because, of course, what that does is it makes the following year's fires even more severe and even more costly and dangerous.

□ 1945

So it is fiscally responsible to treat wildfires like the natural disasters that they are, like an earthquake, flood, or hurricane. Instead of stealing funds from prevention efforts to pay for immediate responses, we should be adequately funding both.

I join my colleagues here tonight to call on the Speaker to bring this truly bipartisan bill to a vote immediately so that fire-prone regions like the two we are dealing with in California—mine in San Diego—don't suffer from Washington's dysfunction.

Ladies and gentlemen, we started this fire season this year in May. We are used to having fire seasons. It is natural to have fire seasons in September or October, but the fact that we started in May just underscores what we are up against. We do not want to leave for our October election activities without having dealt with that and exposing these communities to risk.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI, for helping to raise awareness about this. Thank you for your continued commitment and leadership on the issue. We look forward to bringing it home.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. PETERS, for your leadership in bringing to the attention of the entire Nation, and certainly to the 435 Members of this House, that there is a way to manage our forests and to deal with the

fires that have plagued us so extensively over these many years.

I think all of us have seen this before. It is Smokey the Bear. "Only you can prevent forest fires." We need to add to it, "But Congress can help." And Smokey turns to us and says: How can you help? Well, we can help by changing the way in which we budget for the fighting of fires. Instead of a rolling 10-year average and putting that money up every year and in 9 of the last 12 years blowing through that budget and then reaching back and taking the forest management funds that would allow us to reduce the risk of fires in our forests and in your public lands, instead of doing that, we would have a different system, as Mr. PETERS just described. It is H.R. 3992.

H.R. 3992 is a bipartisan bill, Democrats and Republicans. Democrat Mr. SCHRADER from Oregon and Republican Mr. SIMPSON from Idaho, the authors of the bill, say there is a better way of doing it. Set aside a special reserve, just like we do for tornadoes, earthquakes, hurricanes, floods; a special reserve that could be tapped when we exceed the average and blow through that 10-year average with a megafire or a series of fires.

We expect more than 38,000 fires this year in the United States. We are going to blow through that budget. Just this last month in August, the chief forester of the U.S. Forest Service sent a letter out to every part of the U.S. Forest Service saying: Hold on. No more contracts. Save the money. We are going to need to transfer some of your maintenance money. Your fire prevention money, the money that you are using to thin the forests to reduce the fuel load, the money that you are using to carry out logging practices, hold that. We are going to need to hold that because we anticipate once again blowing through that fire budget and having to reach back for the prevention budget.

So Smokey is right. We can prevent forest fires if Congress acts on H.R. 3992. A discharge petition that Mr. PETERS has brought to the floor is before us. It has 196 Members of Congress that have signed on. When we get to 218, that bill will automatically be brought to the floor for a vote.

Democrats and Republicans already support it, so bring it to the floor for a vote. Let us put in place a sensible, commonsense way of appropriating money to fight fires and to manage our forests. Let's get ahead of next year's fire. Let's get to prevention not just by not throwing out cigarettes and leaving campfires unattended, but by making sure that our forests are healthy so that they are able to sustain small fires that burn slowly along the floor of the forest, which is the natural ecological way in which forests have for a millennium been able to deal with fire. We are in a different situation now. We

have allowed the forests to grow and to be in a position where a fire becomes huge. It is no longer along the floor but gets up into the crown of the trees and destroys the forests.

So we can get back to where we were by properly managing the forests, but we can't do it without money. The Forest Service needs to have that money. The Bureau of Land Management and the National Parks all need to have a different way of appropriating and budgeting. And that is what this bill does.

By the way, it doesn't cost any more. It simply rearranges how that money is going to be spent. That reserve fund would only be available when you have the megafires and you blow through the 10-year rolling average of how much we spend on fighting fires.

It is sensible. It makes a lot of sense. The administration wants it, and, therefore, I suppose my Republican colleagues are opposed to it simply because the administration has proposed a better way of dealing with this budgeting for fires.

So our plea tonight is simple. Just for a few moments, like 12½ minutes thus far, it is to allow us to take up H.R. 3992 and help Smokey prevent forest fires. We only need a few more Members of this House to sign on. More than 50 members of the Republican Party are already coauthors, but none have yet signed the discharge petition. So let's do it. Let's get on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2014, FY 2015, AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2015 THROUGH FY 2024

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2014, 2015, and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2024. The report is current through September 8, 2014. The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues for fiscal years 2014, 2015, and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2015 through 2024 to the overall limits filed in the Congressional Record on January 27, 2014 for fiscal year 2014 and on April 29, 2014 for fiscal years 2015 and 2015–2024 as required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the

budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2015 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations filed on January 27, 2014 for fiscal year 2014 and the allocations filed on April 29, 2014 for fiscal years 2015 and the 10-year period 2015 through 2024 as required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. For fiscal year 2014, "action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth on January 27, 2014. For fiscal years 2015 and the 10-year period 2015–2024, "action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the levels set forth on April 29, 2014.

This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would

breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Tables 3 and 4 compare the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2014 and 2015 with the "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Tables 5 and 6 give the current level for fiscal year 2015 and 2016, respectively, of ac-

counts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation that occurred after adoption of the budget resolution against the budget resolution aggregates in force.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia at (202) 226-7270.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

TABLE 1—REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND 2015 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 8, 2014

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year 2014 ¹	Fiscal Year 2015 ²	Fiscal Years 2015–2024
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	2,924,837	3,031,744	n.a.
Outlays	2,937,044	3,026,384	n.a.
Revenues	2,311,026	2,533,388	31,202,135
Current Level:			
Budget Authority	2,943,953	2,014,209	n.a.
Outlays	2,955,423	2,430,133	n.a.
Revenues	2,311,761	2,535,984	31,206,435
Current Level over (+) / under (–)			
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority	+19,116	–1,017,535	*n.a.
Outlays	+18,379	–596,251	n.a.
Revenues	+735	+2,596	+4,300

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

¹Section 111(b) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 required the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the House of Representatives to file aggregate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2014 for purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The spending and revenue aggregates for fiscal year 2014 were subsequently filed on January 27, 2014. The current level for this report begins with the budgetary levels filed on January 27, 2014 and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

²Section 115(b) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 required the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in the House of Representatives to file aggregate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2015–2024 for purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The spending and revenue aggregates for fiscal year 2015 were subsequently filed on April 29, 2014. The current level for this report begins with the budgetary levels filed on April 28, 2014 and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 8, 2014

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2014		2015		2015–2024	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+3,243	+2,124	+1	+1	+11	+11
Difference	+3,243	+2,124	+1	+1	+11	+11
Armed Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+4	+4	0	0	0	0
Difference	+4	+4	0	0	0	0
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Commerce:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+6,159	+6,157	+2	+2	+24	+24
Difference	+6,159	+6,157	+2	+2	+24	+24
Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foreign Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–34	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	–34	0	0	0	0	0
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Resources:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–1	–1	0	–2	0	0
Difference	–1	–1	0	–2	0	0
Oversight and Government Reform:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 8, 2014—Continued

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2014		2015		2015–2024	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Science, Space and Technology:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and infrastructure:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ways and Means						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	+9,745	+9,745	+2	–13	–3,511	–4,746
Difference	+9,745	+9,745	+2	–13	–3,511	–4,746

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPT 8, 2014

[Figures in Millions]¹

	302(b) Allocations ¹		302(b) for GWOT ¹		Current Status General Purpose		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20,880	22,092	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Commerce, Justice, Science	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	51,600	60,756	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	486,851	528,707	85,191	43,140	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	34,060	39,652	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services and General Government	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21,851	23,054	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	39,270	46,045	227	182	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Interior, Environment	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	30,058	32,154	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	156,773	159,953	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4,258	4,192	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	73,299	76,278	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
State, Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	42,481	45,818	6,520	1,885	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation, HUD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	50,856	116,465	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Full Committee Allowance	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1,012,237	1,155,166	91,938	45,207	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) allocation²

	General Purpose		GWOT	
	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	1,012,237	1,154,816	91,938	45,207
Total Appropriations	1,012,237	1,155,166	91,938	45,207
Total Appropriations vs. 302(a) Allocation	0	+350	0	0

Memorandum					Amounts Assumed in 302(b) ¹		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories					BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense					n.a.	n.a.	225	150	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	5,626	281	0	0
Interior, Environment					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	924	832
Legislative Branch					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD					n.a.	n.a.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals					n.a.	n.a.	225	150	5,626	281	924	832

¹ The original 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations contained in H.Rpt. 113–17 for the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget-Fiscal Year 2014 (H.Con.Res. 25) was revised on January 14, 2014, consistent with section 101 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. The House Committee on Appropriations did not file revised 302(b) allocations after the final 302(a) allocation was provided—hence there are no valid 302(b)'s in force for fiscal year 2014.

² Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPT. 8, 2014

[Figures in Millions]¹

	302(b) Allocations		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose ¹		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	20,880	21,716	0	0	20,880	21,716	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,200	61,518	0	0	51,200	61,518	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	490,944	522,774	79,445	36,839	490,908	522,751	79,445	36,839	–36	–23	0	0
Energy and Water Development	34,010	37,831	0	0	33,991	37,811	0	0	–19	–20	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,285	22,750	0	0	20,133	21,593	0	0	–1,152	–1,157	0	0
Homeland Security	45,658	44,712	0	0	45,658	44,712	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior, Environment	30,220	30,191	0	0	30,220	32,740	0	0	0	–F2549	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	155,702	159,922	0	0	24,691	115,210	0	0	–131,011	–44,712	0	0

TABLE 4—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPT. 8, 2014—Continued

[Figures In Millions]¹

	302(b) Allocations		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose ¹		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Legislative Branch	4,258	4,219	0	0	3,323	3,491	0	0	-935	-728	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	71,499	76,100	0	0	71,499	76,100	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	42,381	42,319	5,912	3,142	42,381	43,897	5,912	1,275	0	+1,578	0	-1,867
Transportation, HUD	52,029	118,732	0	0	52,029	118,678	0	0	0	-54	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	1,020,066	1,142,784	85,357	39,981	886,913	1,100,217	85,357	38,114	-133,153	-42,567	0	-1,867
Comparison of Total Appropriations and 302(a) allocation									General Purpose		GWOT	
									BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation									1,020,066	1,142,784	85,357	39,981
Total Appropriations									886,913	1,100,217	85,357	38,114
Total Appropriations vs. 302(a) Allocation									-133,153	-42,567	0	-1,867
Memorandum					Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories					BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense					0	0	0	75	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security					6,438	322	0	0	6,438	322	0	0
Interior, Environment					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislative Branch					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals					6,438	322	0	75	6,438	322	0	0

¹ Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown in this table.

TABLE 5—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

[Budget Authority in Millions]

Section 601(d)(1) Limits	2,015
Appropriate Level	55,634
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs:	
Medical Services	45,016
Medical Support and Compliance	5,880
Medical Facilities	4,739
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	55,635
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit	+1
Section 601(d)(2) Limits	2015
Appropriate Level	28,852
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Payment to Postal Service	71
Employment and Training Administration	1,772
Education for the Disadvantaged	10,841
School Improvement Programs	1,681
Special Education	9,283
Career, Technical and Adult Education	791
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	4,000
Project-based Rental Assistance	400
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	28,839
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit	-13
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations ²	2,015
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445
Total, enacted advances ¹	84,919

¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding.² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113-6.

TABLE 6—CURRENT LEVEL OF 2016 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 115(c) OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

[Budget Authority]

Section 601(d)(1) Limits	2,016
Appropriate Level	58,662,202,000
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs:	
Medical Services	0
Medical Support and Compliance	0
Medical Facilities	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(1) Limit	-58,662,202,000
Section 601(d)(2) Limits	2016
Appropriate Level	28,781,000,000
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement Programs	0
Special Education	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	0
Project-based Rental Assistance	0
Subtotal, enacted advances ¹	0
Enacted Advances vs. Section 601(d)(2) Limit	-28,781,000,000
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations ²	2,016
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	445,000,000
Total, enacted advances ¹	445,000,000

¹ Line items may not add to total due to rounding.² Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113-76.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2014.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current through September 8, 2014. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated June 17, 2014, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2014:

An act to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes. (Public Law 113-129);

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (Public Law 113-145);

Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146); and

Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-159).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,

Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,310,972
Permanents and other spending legislation ^b	1,849,079	1,778,854	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,662	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-707,692	-707,792	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,141,387	1,575,724	2,310,972
Enacted Legislation: ^c			
Authorizing Legislation:			
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-28)	14,400	12,670	0
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-37)	-1	-1	0
Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-40)	-16	-58	0
An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (P.L. 113-42)	2	2	5
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113-66)	66	68	0
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013/Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-67)	-3,207	985	49
Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79)	3,243	2,124	5
Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-93)	6,143	6,141	0
Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113-94)	-34	0	0
Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113-97)	0	0	5
An act to amend . . . the Provo River Project Transfer Act., and for other purposes (P.L. 113-129)	-1	-1	0
Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-159)	9,765	9,765	725
Total, Authorizing Legislation	30,360	31,695	789
Appropriations Legislation:			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) ^d	635	635	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-76)	1,869,637	1,421,565	0
Support for Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-95)	0	350	0
Total, Appropriations Legislation	1,870,272	1,422,550	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,900,632	1,454,245	789
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-98,066	-74,546	0
Total Current Level ^e	2,943,953	2,955,423	2,311,761
Total House Resolution ^f	2,924,837	2,937,044	2,311,026
Current Level Over House Resolution	19,116	18,379	735
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2014-2023:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,104,656
House Resolution ^g	n.a.	n.a.	31,095,742
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,914
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during last session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1), the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9).

^b Relative to the House Current Level Report dated October 24, 2013, House Current Level has increased by \$361 million in 2014 because of assumptions related to the interest on the public debt that were revised pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-67).

^c Pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2014, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Sec. 155)	0	50	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (P.L. 113-145)	225	150	0
Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-146)	15,000	450	0
Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements	15,225	650	0

^d Sections 135 and 136 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) provide \$636 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended. Section 146 of the Act freezes the pay of Members of Congress, which is estimated to result in a reduction in spending of \$1 million in 2014.

^e For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^f Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution	2,769,406	2,815,079	2,270,932
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25	-14,089	-4,100	40,040
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	6,079	230	0
Adjustment for Technical Correction to the Budget Control Act Spending Caps	549	308	0
Pursuant to section III of the Bipartisan Budget Act	162,892	125,527	54
Revised House Resolution	2,924,837	2,937,044	2,311,026

^g Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2014-2023 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total shown in the table reflects those revisions.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2014.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2015 budget and is current through September 8, 2014. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67).

Since my last letter dated June 17, 2014, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2015:

Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 113-141);

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (Public Law 113-145);

Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146);

Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-159); and

Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-160).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,

Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,533,388
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,882,631	1,805,294	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	508,261	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	- 735,195	- 734,481	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,147,436	1,579,074	2,533,388
Enacted Legislation: ^b			
Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act (P.L. 113-141)	0	- 2	0
Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-159)	0	- 15	2,590
Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-160)	5	5	6
Total, Enacted Legislation	5	- 12	2,596
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	866,768	851,071	0
Total Current Level ^c	2,014,209	2,430,133	2,535,984
Total House Resolution	3,031,744	3,026,384	2,533,388
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	2,596
Current Level Under House Resolution	1,017,535	596,251	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2015-2024:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,206,465
House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	31,202,135
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	4,330
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.
^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before publication in the Congressional Record of the statement of the allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-67): the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79), the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-89), the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113-94), the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113-97), and the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (FL. 113-145).
^b Pursuant to section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2014, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014	0	75	0
Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-146)	1,331	6,619	- 42
Total, amounts designated as emergency requirements	- 1,331	6,694	- 42

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^d Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on April, 29, 2014 pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67):

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution	3,025,306	3,025,032	2,533,388
Revisions:			
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	6,438	322	0
Pursuant to section 115(e) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013	0	1,030	0
Revised House Resolution	3,031,744	3,026,384	2,533,388

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 210(e) of the Congressional Accountability Act ("CAA"), 2 U.S.C. 1331(e), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") to issue regulations implementing Section 210 of the CAA relating to provisions of Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183 and 12198, made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §§1331(b)(1).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting "such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publica-

tion in the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached notice of proposed rulemaking to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I request that this notice be published in the House section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period of 30 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

All inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540; (202) 724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Compliance.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING ("NPRM"), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

REGULATIONS EXTENDING RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ("ADA") RELATING TO PUBLIC SERVICES AND ACCOMMODATIONS, NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING, AS REQUIRED BY 2 U.S.C. §1331, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED ("CAA").

Background:

The purpose of this Notice is to propose substantive regulations that will implement

Section 210 of the CAA, which provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodation under Titles II and III of the ADA shall apply to entities covered by the CAA.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations?

Section 210(b) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to the following entities:

- (1) each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee;
- (2) each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee;
- (3) each joint committee of the Congress;
- (4) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;
- (5) the Capitol Police;
- (6) the Congressional Budget Office;
- (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden);
- (8) the Office of the Attending Physician; and
- (9) the Office of Compliance.

2 U.S.C. 1331(b).

Title II of the ADA generally prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of services, programs, or activities by any "public entity". Section 210(b)(2) of

the CAA defines the term "public entity" for Title II purposes as any entity listed above that provides public services, programs, or activities. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(2).

Title III of the ADA generally prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with accessibility standards. Section 225(f) of the CAA provides that, "[e]xcept where inconsistent with definitions and exemptions provided in this Act, the definitions and exemptions of the [ADA] shall apply under this Act." 2 U.S.C. §1361(f)(1).

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, conduct periodic inspections of all covered facilities and report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under section 210. 2 U.S.C. §1331(f).

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") established under the CAA to issue regulations implementing the section. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e). Section 210(e) further states that such regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." *Id.* Section 210(e) further provides that the regulations shall include a method of identifying, for purposes of this section and for different categories of violations of subsection (b), the entity responsible for correction of a particular violation. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e).

Additional authority for proposing these regulations is found in CAA Section 304, which sets forth the procedure to be followed for the rulemaking process in general, including notice and comment; Board consideration of comments and adoption of regulations; transmittal to the Speaker and President Pro Tempore for publication in the Congressional Record; and approval by the Congress.

Are there ADA public access regulations already in force under the CAA?

Yes. The CAA was enacted on January 23, 1995. It applied to the legislative branch of the federal government the protections of 12 (now 13) statutes that previously had applied to the executive branch and/or the private sector, including laws providing for family and medical leave, prohibiting discrimination against eligible veterans, and affording labor-management rights and responsibilities, among others. The CAA established the Office of Compliance as an independent agency to administer and enforce the CAA. The OOC administers an administrative dispute resolution system to resolve certain disputes arising under the Act. The General Counsel of the OOC has independent investigatory and enforcement authority for other violations of the Act, including certain portions of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§12131–12150, 12182, 12183, & 12189.

As set forth in the previous answer, the CAA requires the Board to issue regulations implementing the statutory protections provided by the CAA. *See, e.g.,* CAA Sections 202(d) (Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993), 206(c) (Veterans' Employment and Reemployment), 212 (d) (Federal Service Labor

Management Relations Act). 2 U.S.C. sections 1312(d), 1316(c), 1351(d). The Board's regulations "shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and Secretary of Transportation . . . except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2).

The CAA does not simply apply to the legislative branch the substantive protections of these laws, and direct that the implementing regulations essentially mirror those of the executive branch. The statute further provides that, while the CAA rulemaking procedure is underway, the corresponding executive branch regulations are to be applied. Section 411 of the Act provides:

"Effect of failure to issue regulations."

In any proceeding under section 1405, 1406, 1407, or 1408 of this title . . . if the Board has not issued a regulation on a matter for which this chapter requires a regulation to be issued, the hearing officer, Board, or court, as the case may be, shall apply, to the extent necessary and appropriate, the most relevant substantive executive agency regulation promulgated to implement the statutory provision at issue in the proceeding."

This statutory scheme makes plain that ADA public access regulations are presently in force. First, regulations virtually identical to these were adopted by the Board, presented to the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 19, 1996, and published on January 7, 1997. 142 Cong. Rec. S10984–11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30–66. No action was taken and thus the regulations were not issued. As set forth above, in these circumstances the CAA applies "the most relevant substantive executive agency regulations," i.e., the Departments of Justice ("DOJ") and Department of Transportation ("DOT") ADA public access regulations. 2 U.S.C. §1411.

A contrary interpretation would render meaningless several sections of the CAA. For example, Congress directed the AOC and other employing offices to conduct an initial study of legislative branch facilities from January 23, 1995 through December 31, 1996, "to identify any violations of subsection (b) of [section 210], to determine the costs of compliance, and to take any necessary corrective action to abate any violations." 2 U.S.C. section 1331(f)(3). Congress instructed the OOC to assist the employing offices by "arranging for inspections and other technical assistance at their request." *Id.* The CAA was enacted on January 23, 1995. No implementing regulations could have taken effect as of that date. Plainly, Congress intended the employing offices and the OOC to look to the DOJ and DOT ADA public access regulations, with which the CAA explicitly required employing offices to comply, when conducting the initial study and abatement actions.

Other sections of the CAA support this reading. For example, the CAA requires the Board to exclude from labor relations regulations employees of Member offices, Senate and House Legislative Counsel, the Congressional Budget Office and several other employing offices if the Board finds a conflict of interest or appearance thereof. 2 U.S.C. §1351(e)(1)(B). Where, as here, a statute explicitly provides for certain regulatory exemptions, it would be illogical to interpret language that expressly provides for regulatory compliance to mean anything else. When Congress intended to exempt employ-

ing offices from regulations, the CAA did so explicitly.

Why are these regulations being proposed at this time?

As set forth in the previous answer, the CAA requires employing offices to comply with ADA public access regulations issued by the DOJ and DOT pursuant to the ADA. The CAA also requires the Board to issue its own regulations implementing the ADA public access provisions of the CAA. The statute obligates the Board's regulations to be the same as the DOJ and DOT regulations except to the extent that the Board may determine that a modification would be more effective in implementing ADA public access protections. CAA section 210(e)(2). These proposed regulations will clarify that covered entities must comply with the ADA public access provisions applied to public entities and accommodations to implement Titles II and III of the ADA. Congressional approval and Board issuance of ADA public access under the CAA will also eliminate any question as to the ADA public access protections that are applicable in the legislative branch.

The Board adopted proposed regulations and presented them to the House of Representatives and the Senate in 1996. The regulations were published on January 7, 1997, during the 105th Congress. 142 Cong. Rec. S10984–11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30–66. No Congressional action was taken and therefore the regulations were not issued. The Board adopted the present proposal, with updated proposed regulations, to facilitate Congressional consideration of the ADA regulations.

Which ADA public access regulations are applied to covered entities in 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)?

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the Board to issue regulations that are "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions . . . except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." 2 U.S.C. §1331(e).

Consistent with its prior decisions on this issue, the Board has determined that all regulations promulgated after a notice and comment by the DOJ and/or the DOT to implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA are "substantive regulations" within the meaning of section 210(e). *See, e.g.,* 142 Cong. Rec. S5070, S5071–72 (daily ed. May 15, 1996) (NPRM implementing section 220(d) regulations); 141 Cong. Rec. S17605 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations).

See also *Reves v. Ernst & Young*, 494 U.S. 56, 64 (1993) (where same phrase or term is used in two different places in the same statute, it is reasonable for court to give each use a similar construction); *Sorenson v. Secretary of the Treasury*, 475 U.S. 851, 860 (1986) (normal rule of statutory construction assumes that identical words in different parts of the same act are intended to have the same meaning).

In this regard, the Board has reviewed the provisions of section 210 of the CAA, the sections of the ADA applied by that section, and the regulations of the DOJ and DOT, to determine whether and to what extent those regulations are substantive regulations which implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA. As explained more fully

below, the Board proposes to adopt the following otherwise applicable regulations of the DOJ published at Parts 35 and 36 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations (“CFR”) and those of the DOT published at Parts 37 and 38 of Title 49 of the CFR:

1. DOJ’s regulations at Part 35 of Title 28 of the CFR: The DOJ’s regulations at Part 35 implement subtitle A of Title II of the ADA (sections 201 through 205), the rights and protections of which are applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. See 28 CFR §35.101 (Purpose). Therefore, the Board determines that these regulations will be adopted in the proposed regulations under section 210(e).

2. DOJ’s regulations at Part 36 of Title 28 of the CFR: The DOJ’s regulations at Part 36 implement Title III of the ADA (sections 301 through 309). See 28 CFR §36.101 (Purpose). Section 210(b) only applies the rights and protections of three sections of Title III with respect to public accommodations: prohibitions against discrimination (section 302), provisions regarding new construction and alterations (section 303), and provisions regarding examinations and courses (section 309). Therefore, only those regulations in Part 36 that are reasonably necessary to implement the statutory provisions of sections 302, 303, and 309 will be adopted by the Board under section 210(e) of the CAA.

3. DOT’s regulations at Parts 37 and 38 of Title 49 of the CFR: The DOT’s regulations at Parts 37 and 38 implement the transportation provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA. See 49 CFR §§37.101 (Purpose) and 38.1 (Purpose). The provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA relating to transportation and applied to covered entities by section 210(b) of the CAA are subtitle B of Title II (sections 221 through 230) and certain portions of section 302 of Title III. Thus, those regulations of the Secretary that are reasonably necessary to implement the statutory provisions of sections 221 through 230, 302, and 303 of the ADA will be adopted by the Board under section 210(e) of the CAA.

The Board proposes not to adopt those regulatory provisions of the regulations of the DOJ or DOT that have no conceivable applicability to operations of entities within the Legislative Branch or are unlikely to be invoked. See 141 Cong. Rec. at S17604 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations). Unless public comments demonstrate otherwise, the Board intends to include in the adopted regulations a provision stating that the Board has issued substantive regulations on all matters for which section 210(e) requires a regulation. See section 411 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1411.

In addition, the Board has proposed to make technical changes in definitions and nomenclature so that the regulations comport with the CAA and the organizational structure of the Office of Compliance. In the Board’s judgment, making such changes satisfies the CAA’s “good cause” requirement. With the exception of these technical and nomenclature changes and additional proposed regulations relating to the investigation and inspection authority granted to the General Counsel under the CAA, the Board does not propose substantial departure from otherwise applicable regulations.

The Board notes that the General Counsel applied the above-referenced standards of Parts 35 and 36 of the DOJ’s regulations and Parts 37 and 38 of the DOT’s regulations during the past inspections of Legislative Branch facilities pursuant to section 210(f) of the CAA. In contrast to other sections of the CAA, which generally give the Office of Com-

pliance only adjudicatory and regulatory responsibilities, the General Counsel has the authority to investigate and prosecute alleged violations of disability standards under section 210, as well as the responsibility for inspecting covered facilities to ensure compliance. According to the General Counsel’s final inspection reports, the Title II and Title III regulations encompass the following requirements:

1. Program accessibility: This standard is applied to ensure physical access to public programs, services, or activities. Under this standard, covered entities must modify policies, practices, and procedures to ensure an equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities. If policy and procedural modifications are ineffective, then structural modifications may be required.

2. Effective communication: This standard requires covered entities to make sure that their communications with individuals with disabilities (such as in the context of constituent meetings and committee hearings) are as effective as their communications with others. Covered entities are required to make information available in alternate formats such as large print, Braille, or audio tape, or use methods that provide individuals with disabilities the opportunity to effectively communicate, such as sign language interpreters or the use of pen and paper. Primary consideration must be given to the method preferred by the individual.

3. ADA Standards for Accessible Design: These standards are applied to architectural barriers, including structural barriers to communication, such as telephone booths, to ensure that existing facilities, new construction, and new alterations, are accessible to individuals with disabilities.

The Board recognizes that, as with other obligations under the CAA, covered entities will need information and guidance regarding compliance with these ADA standards as adopted in these proposed regulations, which the Office will provide as part of its education and information activities.

How do these regulations differ from those proposed by the Board on January 7, 1997?

These regulations are very similar to those proposed by the Board in 1997; however, there are three significant differences:

1. These regulations have been updated to incorporate the changes made in the DOJ and DOT regulations since 1997. One of the most significant changes made by the DOJ occurred on September 15, 2010 when the DOJ published regulations adopting the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design (“2010 Standards”). The 2010 Standards became fully effective on March 15, 2012 and replaced the 1991 Standards for Accessible Design (“1991 Standards”) that were referenced in the regulations proposed by the Board in 1997. These regulations incorporate by reference the pertinent DOJ and DOT regulations that are in effect as of the date of the publication of this notice, which means that the 2010 Standards will be applied. The Board has also changed the format of the incorporated regulations. Rather than reprinting each of the regulations with minor changes to reflect different nomenclature used in the CAA (i.e., changing references to “Assistant Attorney General,” “Department of Justice,” “FTA Administrator,” “FTA regional office,” “Administrator,” and “Secretary” to “General Counsel”), these regulations contain a definitional section in §1.105(a) which make these changes and incorporates the DOJ and DOT regulations by reference.

2. Unlike the Board in 1997, the current Board has decided not to propose adoption of

the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. §35.140. The Board notes that since 1997 most courts considering this issue have decided that employees of public entities must use the procedures in Title I of the ADA to pursue employment discrimination claims and that these claims cannot be pursued under Title II. See, e.g., *Brumfield v. City of Chicago*, 735 F.3d 619 (7th Cir. 2013); *Elwell v. Okla. ex rel. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.*, 693 F.3d 1303 (10th Cir. 2012); *Zimmerman v. Or. Dep’t of Justice*, 170 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 1999). The prohibition against employment discrimination because of disability in Title I of the ADA is incorporated into section 201(a)(3) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1311(a)(3). Under section 210(c) of the CAA, “with respect to any claim of employment discrimination asserted by any covered employee, the exclusive remedy shall be under section 1311 of this title.” 2 U.S.C. §1311(c). Similarly, under section 225(e) of the CAA, “[o]nly a covered entity who has undertaken and completed the procedures in sections 1402 and 1403 of this title may be granted a remedy under part A of this subchapter.” 2 U.S.C. §1361(e). When taken together, these sections of the CAA make it clear that the exclusive method for obtaining relief for employment discrimination because of disability is under section 201, which involves using the counseling and mediation procedures contained in sections 402 and 403 of the CAA. For these reasons, the Board has found good cause not to incorporate the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. §35.140, into these regulations.

3. In Parts 2 and 3 of these regulations, the Board has proposed regulations relating to the two unique statutory duties imposed by the CAA upon the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance that are not imposed upon the DOJ and DOT: (1) the investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination using the Office’s mediation and hearing processes (section 210(d) of the CAA) and (2) the biennial inspection and reporting obligations (section 210(f) of the CAA). Parts 2 and 3 of these regulations were not contained in the regulations proposed in 1997; however, the Board has determined that there is good cause to propose these regulations to fully implement section 210 of the CAA. See, 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(1). In formulating the substance of these regulations, the Board has directed the Office’s statutory employees to consult with stakeholders and has considered their comments and suggestions.

The Board has also reviewed the biennial ADA reports from the General Counsel and considered what the General Counsel has learned since 1995 while investigating charges of discrimination and conducting and reporting upon ADA inspections. Of particular note is the regulation proposed as §3.103(d) which addresses concerns raised by oversight and appropriations staff over finding a cost-efficient process that would allow better identification and elimination of potential ADA compliance issues during the pre-construction phases of new construction and alteration projects.

Procedural Summary:

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA?

Pursuant to Section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384, the procedure for proposing and approving such substantive regulations provides that:

(1) the Board of Directors propose substantive regulations and publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the Congressional Record;

(2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking;

(3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, the Board adopt regulations and transmit notice of such action (together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations) to the Speaker of the House and President [P]ro [T]empore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record;

(4) there be committee referral and action on the proposed regulations by resolution in each House, concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution; and

(5) final publication of the approved regulations in the Congressional Record, with an effective date prescribed in the final publication.

For more detail, please reference the text of 2 U.S.C. §1384. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is step (1) of the outline set forth above.

Are these proposed regulations also recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives?

As required by Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), the substance of these regulations is also recommended by the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

Has the Board of Directors previously proposed substantive regulations implementing the ADA public access provisions pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §1331?

Yes. Proposed regulations were previously adopted by the Board and presented to the House of Representatives and the Senate on September 19, 1996. The regulations were published on January 7, 1997, 142 Cong. Rec. S10984-11018 and 143 Cong. Rec. S30-66. No Congressional action was taken on these regulations.

What is the approach taken by these proposed substantive regulations?

The Board will follow the procedure as enumerated above and as required by statute. The Board will review any comments received under step (2) of the outline above, and respond to the comments and make any changes necessary to ensure that the regulations fully implement section 210 of the CAA and reflect the practices and policies particular to the legislative branch.

What responsibilities would covered entities have in effectively implementing these regulations?

The CAA charges covered entities with the responsibility to comply with these regulations. CAA §210, 2 U.S.C. §1331.

Are there substantive differences in the proposed regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the other employing offices?

No. The Board of Directors has identified no "good cause" for proposing different regulations for these entities and accordingly has not done so. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2).

Are these proposed substantive regulations available to persons with disabilities in an alternate format?

This Notice of Proposed Regulations is available on the OOC's web site, www.compliance.gov, which is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, 29 U.S.C. §794d. This Notice can also be made available in large print or Braille. Requests for this Notice in an alternative format should be made to: Annie

Leftwood, Executive Assistant, Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540; 202-724-9250; TDD: 202-426-1912; FAX: 202-426-1913.

30 Day Comment Period Regarding the Proposed Regulations

How long do I have to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations?

Comments regarding the proposed regulations of the OOC set forth in this Notice are invited for a period of thirty (30) days following the date of the appearance of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

How do I submit comments?

Comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided either on an accompanying computer disk or e-mailed to the OOC via its web site. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non-toll-free number).

Am I allowed to view copies of comments submitted by others?

Yes. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review on the Office's web site at www.compliance.gov, and at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-Federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Summary:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of thirteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 210 of the CAA applies that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by of Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to Legislative Branch entities covered by the CAA. The above provisions of section 210 became effective on January 1, 1997, 2 U.S.C. §1331(h).

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is now publishing proposed regulations to implement Section 210 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 ("CAA"), 2 U.S.C. §1301-1438, as applied to covered entities of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and certain Congressional instrumentalities listed below.

In addition to inviting comment in this Notice, the Board, through the statutory appointees of the Office, sought consultation with the stakeholders regarding the development of these regulations. The Board also notes that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance has completed inspections of covered facilities for compliance with disability access standards under section 210 of the CAA during each Congress since the CAA was enacted and has submitted reports to Congress after each of these inspections. Based on information gleaned from these consultations and the experience gained from the General Counsel's inspections, the Board is publishing these proposed regulations, pursuant to section 210(e) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1331(e).

The purpose of these regulations is to implement section 210 of the CAA. In this No-

tice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM" or "Notice") the Board proposes that virtually identical regulations be adopted for the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the seven Congressional instrumentalities. Accordingly:

(1) Senate. It is proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the Senate, and this proposal regarding the Senate entities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Deputy Executive Director for the Senate.

(2) House of Representatives. It is further proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the House of Representatives, and this proposal regarding the House of Representatives entities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

(3) Certain Congressional instrumentalities. It is further proposed that regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; and this proposal regarding these six Congressional instrumentalities is recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director.

Dates: Comments are due within 30 days after the date of publication of this Notice in the Congressional Record.

Supplementary Information:

The regulations set forth below (Parts 1, 2, and 3) are the substantive regulations that the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance are proposing pursuant to section 210(e) of the CAA. Part 1 contains the general provisions applicable to all regulations under section 210, the method of identifying entities responsible for correcting a violation of section 210, and the list of executive branch regulations incorporated by reference which define and clarify the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations. Part 2 contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. Part 3 contains the provisions regarding the periodic inspections and reports to Congress on compliance with the disability access standards. These three parts correspond to the three general duties imposed upon the Office of Compliance by section 210 which are as follows:

1. Under section 210(e) of the CAA, the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance must promulgate substantive regulations which implement the rights and protections provided by section 210, 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(1).

2. Under Section 210(d) of the CAA, the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance must receive and investigate charges of discrimination alleging violations of the rights and protections provided by Titles II and III of the ADA, may request mediation of such charges upon believing that a violation may have occurred, and, if mediation has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, may file a complaint and prosecute the complaint through the Office of Compliance's hearing and review process 2 U.S.C. §1331(d).

3. Under section 210(f) of the CAA, the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, must conduct periodic inspections of

all covered facilities and report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under section 210. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f).

Regulations proposed in Part 1.

§ 1.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and cites the sections of Title II and III of the ADA incorporated by reference into the CAA, follows the statutory language of the CAA to identify the covered entities and the statutory duties of the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance and describes how the regulations are organized.

§ 1.102 Definitions. This section describes the abbreviations that are used throughout the regulations.

§ 1.103 Authority of the Board. This section describes the authority of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to issue regulations under section 210 of the CAA and the intended effect of the technical and nomenclature changes made to the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and Secretary of Transportation.

§ 1.104 Method for identifying the entity responsible for correcting violations of section 210.

The regulation in this section is required by section 210(e)(3) of the CAA. This regulation hues very closely to the DOJ Title III regulation set forth in 28 C.F.R. § 36.201 which in turn is based on the statutory language in 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) (one of the ADA statutory sections incorporated by reference in section 210(b) of the CAA). Under section 302 of the ADA, owners, operators, lessors and lessees are all jointly and severally liable for ADA violations. *See, e.g., Botosan v. McNally Realty*, 216 F.3d 827, 832 (9th Cir. 2000). The proposed regulation allows consideration of relevant statutes, contracts, orders, and other enforceable arrangements or relationships to allocate responsibility. The term “enforceable arrangement” is used intentionally since certain indemnification and contribution contracts allocating liability under the ADA have been found to be unenforceable. *See, e.g., Equal Rights Center v. Archstone-Smith Trust*, 602 F.3d 597 (4th Cir. 2010, *cert denied*, 131 S. Ct. 504 (2010)). Although the concepts of “ownership” or “leasing” do not appear to apply to Legislative Branch facilities on Capitol Hill, the Architect of the Capitol does have statutory superintendence responsibility for certain legislative branch buildings and facilities, including the Capitol Building, which includes duties and responsibilities analogous to those of a “landlord”. *See* 40 U.S.C. §§ 163–166 (Capitol Building), 167–175 and 185a (House and Senate office buildings), 193a (Capitol grounds), 216b (Botanical Garden) and 2 U.S.C. § 141(a)(1) (Library of Congress buildings). The Board believes that, where two or more entities may have compliance obligations under section 210(b) as “responsible entities” under the proposed regulations, those entities should have the ability to allocate responsibility by agreement similar to the case of landlords and tenants with respect to public accommodations under Title III of the ADA. Thus, the proposed regulations adopt such provisions modeled after section 36.201(b) of the DOJ regulations. However, by promulgating this provision, the Board does not intend any substantive change in the statutory responsibility of entities under section 210(b) or the applicable substantive rights and protections of the ADA applied thereunder. *See* 142 Cong. Rec. at S270 (final rule under section 205 of the CAA substitutes the term “privatization” for “sale of business” in the Secretary of Labor’s regulations under the Worker Adjustment Retraining and Notification Act).

§ 1.105 Regulations incorporated by reference. As explained above, consistent with

its prior decisions on this issue, the Board has determined that all regulations promulgated after a notice and comment by the DOJ and/or the DOT to implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA are “substantive regulations” within the meaning of section 210(e). *See, e.g.*, 142 Cong. Rec. S5070, S5071–72 (daily ed. May 15, 1996) (NPRM implementing section 220(d) regulations); 141 Cong. Rec. S17605 (daily ed. Nov. 28, 1995) (NPRM implementing section 203 regulations). In this regard, the Board has reviewed the provisions of section 210 of the CAA, the sections of the ADA applied by that section, and the regulations of the DOJ and DOT, to determine whether and to what extent those regulations are substantive regulations which implement the provisions of Title II and Title III of the ADA applied by section 210(b) of the CAA.

In section 1.105(a)(1), the Board has modified the nomenclature used in the incorporated regulations to comport with the CAA and the organizational structure of the Office of Compliance. In the Board’s judgment, making such changes satisfies the CAA’s “good cause” requirement. With the exception of these technical and nomenclature changes and additional proposed regulations relating to the investigation and inspection authority granted to the General Counsel under the CAA, the Board does not propose substantial departure from otherwise applicable regulations. The dates referenced in section 1.105(a)(2) reflect that the ADA public access provisions of the CAA became effective on January 1, 1997 rather than effective date of the ADA which was January 26, 1992. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(h). The three year provision in section 1.105(a)(3) was developed after consultation with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol regarding what would be a reasonable time frame for implementing these provisions of the regulations. In several portions of DOJ and DOT regulations, references are made to dates such as the effective date of the regulations or effective dates derived from the statutory provisions of the ADA. The Board proposes to substitute dates which correspond to analogous periods for the purposes of the CAA. In this way covered entities under section 210 may have the same time to come into compliance relative to the effective date of section 210 of the CAA afforded public entities subject to Title II of the ADA. In the Board’s judgment, such changes satisfy the CAA’s “good cause” requirement. In section 1.105(a)(4), which was also developed based upon consultations with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (“AOC”), the Board modified the exception for “historic” property to include properties, buildings, or facilities designated as an historic or heritage assets by the AOC. This was necessary because the DOJ regulations limit the definition of historic properties to those “listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or properties designated as historic under State or local law” 28 C.F.R. § 35.104. While there are certainly properties on Capitol Hill which have historically significant features that are worthy of preservation, these properties are not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or considered historic under State or local law. *See, Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, 16 U.S.C. 470g (exempting the White House and its grounds, the Supreme Court building and its grounds, and the United States Capitol and its related buildings and grounds from the provisions of the Historic Preservation Act).

In section 1.105(b), the Board has adopted a rule of interpretation to cover the few in-

stances where there are differences between regulations implementing Title II and Title III of the ADA. The CAA is unique in that it applies both Title II and Title III provisions to covered public entities. The public accommodation provisions of Title III of the ADA are otherwise only applicable to private entities. *See*, 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7). This section of the regulation reflects the Board’s determination that Congress applied provisions of both Title II and Title III of the ADA to legislative branch entities to ensure that individuals with disabilities are provided the most access to public services, programs, activities and accommodations provided by law.

In section 1.105(c), the Board has listed the specific DOJ regulations incorporated into the regulations being issued under section 210 of the CAA. As noted earlier, the Board has adopted all of the DOJ regulations implementing Titles II and III of the ADA with the following exceptions:

1. The Board is not incorporating the DOJ regulations regarding retaliation or coercion (28 C.F.R. §§ 35.134 & 36.206). Sections 35.134 and 36.206 of the DOJ’s regulations implement section 503 of the ADA, which prohibits retaliation against any individual who exercises his or her rights under the ADA. 28 CFR pt. 35, App. A at 464 & pt. 36, App. B at 598 (section-by-section analysis). Sections 35.134 and 36.206 are not provisions which implement a right or protection applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and, therefore, they will not be included within the adopted regulations. The Board notes, however, that section 207 of the CAA provides a comprehensive retaliation protection for employees (including applicants and former employees) who may invoke their rights under section 210, although section 207 does not apply to nonemployees who may enjoy rights and protections against discrimination under section 210.

2. As noted above, unlike the Board in 1997, the current Board has decided not to propose adoption of the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. § 35.140. The Board notes that since 1997 most courts considering this issue have decided that employees of public entities must use the procedures in Title I of the ADA to pursue employment discrimination claims and that these claims cannot be pursued under Title II. *See, e.g., Brumfield v. City of Chicago*, 735 F.3d 619 (7th Cir. 2013); *Elwell v. Okla. ex rel. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.*, 693 F.3d 1303 (10th Cir. 2012); *Zimmerman v. Or. Dep’t of Justice*, 170 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 1999). The prohibition against employment discrimination because of disability in Title I of the ADA is incorporated into section 201(a)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1311(a)(3). Under section 210(c) of the CAA, “with respect to any claim of employment discrimination asserted by any covered employee, the exclusive remedy shall be under section 1311 of this title.” 2 U.S.C. § 1331(c). Similarly, under section 225(e) of the CAA, “[o]nly a covered entity who has undertaken and completed the procedures in sections 1402 and 1403 of this title may be granted a remedy under part A of this subchapter.” 2 U.S.C. § 1361(e). When taken together, these sections of the CAA make it clear that the exclusive method for obtaining relief for employment discrimination because of disability is under section 201, which involves using the counseling and mediation procedures contained in sections 402 and 403 of the CAA. For these reasons, the Board has found good cause not to incorporate the DOJ Title II regulation relating to employment discrimination, 28 C.F.R. § 35.140, into these regulations.

3. The Board has not incorporated Subpart F of the DOJ's regulations (28 C.F.R. §§35.170-35.189), which set forth administrative enforcement procedures under Title II. Subpart F implements the provisions of section 203 of the ADA, which is applied to covered entities under section 210 of the CAA. Although procedural in nature, such provisions address the remedies, procedures, and rights under section 203 of the ADA, and thus the otherwise applicable provisions of these regulations are "substantive regulations" for section 210(e) purposes. See 142 Cong. Rec. at S5071-72 (similar analysis under section 220(d) of the CAA). However, since section 303 of the CAA reserves to the Executive Director the authority to promulgate regulations that "govern the procedures of the Office," and since the Board believes that the benefit of having one set of procedural rules provides the "good cause" for modifying the DOJ's regulations, the Board proposes to incorporate the provisions of Subpart F into the Office's procedural rules, to omit provisions that set forth procedures which conflict with express provisions of section 210 of the CAA or are already provided for under comparable provisions of the Office's rules, and to omit rules with no applicability to the Legislative Branch (such as provisions covering entities subject to section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, provisions regarding State immunity, and provisions regarding referral of complaints to the Justice Department). See 142 Cong. Rec. at S5071-72 (similar analysis and conclusion under section 220(d) of the CAA).

4. The Board has not incorporated Subpart G of the DOJ's regulations, which designates the Federal agencies responsible for investigating complaints under Title II of the ADA. Given the structure of the CAA, such provisions are not applicable to covered Legislative Branch entities and, therefore, will not be adopted under section 210(e).

5. The Board has not incorporated the insurance provisions contained in 28 C.F.R. §36.212. Section 36.212 of the DOJ's regulations restates section 501(c) of the ADA, which provides that the ADA shall not be construed to restrict certain insurance practices on the part of insurance companies and employers, so long as such practices are not used to evade the purposes of the ADA. Section 501(c) of the ADA is not incorporated by reference into section 210 of the CAA. Because section 36.212 implements a section of the ADA which is not incorporated into the CAA and appears intended primarily to cover insurance companies which are not covered entities under the CAA, the Board finds good cause not to incorporate this regulation.

6. The Board has not incorporated Subpart E of the DOJ's regulations (sections 36.501 through 36.599) setting forth the enforcement procedures under Title III of the ADA. As the Justice Department noted in its NPRM regarding subpart E, the Department of Justice does not have the authority to establish procedures for judicial review and enforcement and, therefore, "Subpart E generally restates the statutory procedures for enforcement". 28 CFR pt. 36, App. B at 638 (section-by-section analysis). Additionally, the regulations derive from the provisions of section 308 of the ADA, which is not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. Thus, the regulations in subpart E are not promulgated by the Attorney General as substantive regulations to implement the statutory provisions of the ADA referred to in section 210(b), within the meaning of section 210(e).

7. The Board has not incorporated Subpart F of the DOJ's regulations which establishes

procedures to implement section 308(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the ADA regarding compliance with State laws or building codes as evidence of compliance with accessibility standards under the ADA. 28 CFR pt. 36, App. B at 640 (section-by-section analysis). Section 308 is not one of the laws applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and, therefore, these regulations will not be adopted under section 210(e).

In section 1.105(d), the Board has listed the specific DOT regulations incorporated into the regulations being issued under section 210 of the CAA. As noted earlier, the Board has adopted all of the DOT regulations implementing Titles II and III of the ADA with the following exceptions:

1. Although the Board has adopted the definitions in section 37.3 of the DOT's regulations, relating to implementation of Part II of Title II of the ADA (sections 241 through 246), those definitions dealing with public transportation by intercity and commuter rail are not adopted because sections 241 through 246 of the ADA were not within the rights and protections applied to covered entities under section 210(b) and, therefore, the regulations implementing such sections are not substantive regulations of the DOT required to be adopted by the Board within the meaning of section 210(e). Accordingly, the Board will give no effect to the definitions of terms such as "commerce," "commuter authority," "commuter rail car," "commuter rail transportation," "intercity rail passenger car," and "intercity rail transportation," which relate to sections 241 through 246 of the ADA.

2. Although the Board has adopted the Nondiscrimination regulation set forth in section 37.5 of the DOT's regulations, subsection (f) of section 37.5 of the this regulation relates to private entities primarily engaged in the business of transporting people and whose operations affect commerce. This subsection implements section 304 of the ADA, which is not a right or protection applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA. See 56 Fed. Reg. 13856, 13858 (April 4, 1991) (preamble to NPRM regarding Part 37). Therefore, it is not a regulation of the DOT included within the scope of rule-making under section 210(e) of the CAA and will not be considered by the Board to be included in these regulations.

3. Several portions of the DOT's regulations refer to obligations of entities regulated by state agencies administering federal transportation funds. See, e.g., sections 37.77(d) (requires filing of equivalent service certificates with state administering agency), 37.135(f) (submission of paratransit development plan to state administering agency) and 37.145 (State comments on paratransit plans). Any references to obligations not imposed on covered entities, such as state law requirements and laws regulating entities that receive Federal financial assistance, will be considered excluded from these proposed regulations.

4. The Board has not adopted section 37.11 of the DOT's regulations relating to administrative enforcement because it does not implement any provision of the ADA applied to covered entities under section 210 of the CAA. Moreover, the enforcement procedures of section 210 are explicitly provided for in section 210(d) ("Available Procedures"). Accordingly, this section will not be included within the incorporated regulations. The subject matter of enforcement procedures is addressed in the Office's procedural rules and in Part 2 of these regulations.

5. Certain sections of Subparts B (Applicability) and C (Transportation Facilities) of

the Secretary's regulations were promulgated to implement sections 242 and 304 of the ADA, provisions that are not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA or are otherwise inapplicable to Legislative Branch entities. Therefore, the Board will exclude the following sections from its substantive regulations on that basis: 37.21(a)(2) and (b) (relating to private entities under section 304 of the ADA and private entities receiving Federal assistance from the Transportation Department), 37.25 (university transportation systems), 37.29 (private taxi services), 37.33 (airport transportation systems), 37.37(a) and 37.37(e)-(g) (relating to coverage of private entities and other entities under section 304 of the ADA), and 37.49-37.57 (relating to intercity and commuter rail systems). Similarly, the Board proposes modifying sections 37.21(c), 37.37(d), and 37.37(h) and other sections where references are made to requirements or circumstances strictly encompassed by the provisions of section 304 of the ADA and, therefore, not applicable to covered entities under the CAA. See, e.g., sections 37.25-37.27 (transportation for elementary and secondary education systems).

6. Subpart D (sections 37.71 through 37.95) of the DOT's regulations relate to acquisition of accessible vehicles by public entities. Certain sections of subpart D were promulgated to implement sections 242 and 304 of the ADA, which were not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA, or are otherwise inapplicable to Legislative Branch entities. Therefore, the Board will exclude the following sections from its substantive regulations on that basis: 37.87-37.91 and 37.93(b) (relating to intercity and commuter rail service).

7. Subpart E (sections 37.101 through 37.109) of the DOT's regulations relates to acquisition of accessible vehicles by private entities. Section 37.101, relating to acquisition of vehicles by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people, implements section 302 of the ADA, which is applied to covered entities under section 210(b). Therefore, the Board will adopt section 37.101 as part of its section 210(e) regulations. Sections 37.103, 37.107, and 37.109 of the regulations implement section 304 of the ADA, which is inapplicable to covered entities under the ADA. Therefore, the Board proposes not to include them within its substantive regulations under section 210(e) of the CAA.

8. Part 37 of the DOT's regulations includes several appendices, only two of which the Board proposes to adopt as part of these regulations. The Board proposes to adopt as an appendix to these regulations Appendix A (Modifications to Standards for Accessible Transportation Facilities, ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities), which provides guidance regarding the design, construction, and alteration of buildings and facilities covered by Titles II and III of the ADA. 49 CFR pt. 37, App. A. Such guidelines, where not inconsistent with express provisions of the CAA or of the regulations adopted by the Board, may be relied upon by covered entities and other in proceedings under section 210 of the CAA to the same extent as similarly situated persons may rely upon them in actions brought under Title II and Title III of the ADA. See 142 Cong. Rec. at S222 and 141 Cong. Rec. at S17606 (similar resolution regarding Secretary of Labor's interpretative bulletins under the Fair Labor Standards Act for section 203 purposes). The Board proposes not to adopt Appendix B, which gives the addresses

of FTA regional offices. Such information is not relevant to covered entities under the CAA. The Board also proposes not to adopt Appendix C, which contain forms for certification of equivalent service. These forms appear to be irrelevant to entities covered by the CAA and therefore will not be adopted by the Board. Finally, the Board will adopt Appendix D to Part 37, the section-by-section analysis of Part 37. The Board notes that the section-by-section analysis may have some relevance in interpreting the sections of Part 37 that the Board has adopted.

9. The Board proposes to adopt, with minimal technical and nomenclature changes, the regulations contained in Part 38 and accompanying appendix, with the exception of the following subparts which the Board has determined implement portions of the ADA not applied to covered entities under section 210(b) of the CAA and/or the Board believe have no conceivable applicability to legislative branch operations: Subpart E, Commuter Rail Cars and Systems; and Subpart F, Intercity Rail Cars and Systems.

In section 1.105(d), the Board has proposed the adoption of one regulation promulgated by the Access Board, 36 C.F.R. §1190.34, relating to the accessibility of leased buildings and facilities. While the DOJ does not have a regulation pertaining to leased buildings and facilities, the Access Board has promulgated this regulation that sets minimal accessibility standards whenever the federal government leases a building or facility (or a portion thereof). Generally, this regulation requires that fully accessible space be leased when available, but also sets some minimal accessibility requirements when fully accessible spaces are not available. These minimum requirements include at least one accessible entrance, an accessible route to major function areas, an accessible toilet, and accessible parking (if that is included in the rent). If there is no space available that meets even these minimal requirements, the regulation does contain an exception that would permit the short term leasing of spaces that do not even meet these minimal standards. The most common ADA public access complaint received by the General Counsel from members of the public relates to the lack of ADA access to spaces being leased by legislative branch offices. The Board therefore finds good cause to clarify the ADA access obligations regarding leased spaces by adopting 36 C.F.R. §1190.34.

Regulations proposed in Part 2.

§2.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and notes that Part 2 of these regulations implements section 210(d) of the CAA which requires that the General Counsel accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. It also notes that by procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by section 210(d) of the CAA. The Board notes that the Executive Director is proposing amendments to the Office's Procedural Rules that do include provisions relating to section 210(d) of the CAA.

§2.102 Definitions. This section provides definitions for the undefined terms used in section 210(d) of the CAA. In §2.102(a), the term "charge" is defined in a manner consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Fed. Express Corp. v. Holowecki*, 552 U.S. 389, 402 (2008). In §2.102(b), the definition of the term "file a charge" clarifies how charges can be presented to the General Counsel by

listing the methods by which the General Counsel has accepted charges in the past. In §2.102(c), the term "occurrence of the alleged violation" is defined in a manner that includes both isolated acts of discrimination and continuing violations. *See, e.g., Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 380 (1982). In §2.102(d), the term "the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations" is defined by referencing the specific sections of Titles II and III that are incorporated into the CAA in section 210(b)(1). 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(1).

§2.103 Investigatory Authority. This section explains the investigatory methods that the General Counsel will use when investigating charges of discrimination and clarifies the duty of cooperation owed by all parties. The language used to describe the investigatory methods listed in §2.103(a) is derived from the Supreme Court's decision in *Dow Chemical Co. v. United States*, 476 U.S. 227, 233 (1986) which describes what is intended when an agency is granted investigatory authority that is not otherwise defined in the statute. The duty to cooperate with investigations described in §2.103(b) is implicit in the CAA. By empowering the General Counsel to investigate potential violations of the ADA, Congress expressed its expectation that legislative branch employees and offices would cooperate fully with investigations conducted by the General Counsel pursuant to this authority. This regulation is consistent with prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

§2.104 Mediation. This section explains when the General Counsel will request mediation of a charge of discrimination. The language in §2.104(a) is derived from section 210(d)(2) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(2). The explanation of what happens when mediation results in a settlement is contained in §2.104(b) and is consistent with the language in section 210(d)(3) and with the General Counsel's past practice of closing cases that are resolved during mediation. The language in §2.104(c) is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.105 Complaint. The language in this section is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.106 Intervention by charging individual. The language in this section is derived from section 210(d)(3) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3).

§2.107 Remedies and Compliance. This section describes the remedies available and the compliance dates when a violation of section 210 is found. The remedy language in §2.107(a) is based upon the statutory language in section 210(c) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(3). The allowance of attorney's fees and costs described in §2.107(a)(1) is based upon the language in 28 C.F.R. §§35.175 & 36.505 which recognize that attorney's fees may be awarded under both Titles II and III of the ADA. The availability of compensatory damages described in §2.107(a)(2) derives from sections 210(c) and of the CAA which incorporates by reference the remedies contained sections 203 and 308(a) of the ADA. Section 203 of the ADA provides that the remedies set forth in the Rehabilitation Act (at 29 U.S.C. §794a) shall be the remedies for violations of Title II of the ADA. The Supreme Court has made clear that the remedies available under Title II of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act are "coextensive with the remedies available in a private cause of action brought under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" which includes compen-

satory, but not punitive, damages. *Barnes v. Gorman*, 536 U.S. 181, 185 (2002). The language in §2.107(a)(1) & (a)(2) requiring that payment be made by the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation is from section 415(c) of the CAA which requires that funds to correct ADA violations "may be paid only from funds appropriated to the employing office or entity responsible for correcting such violations." 2 U.S.C. §1415(c). The compliance date set forth in §2.107(b) is from section 210(d)(5) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(5).

§2.108 Judicial Review. This section is from section 210(d)(4) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(d)(4).

Regulations proposed in Part 3.

§3.101 Purpose and scope. This section references and notes that Part 3 of these regulations implements section 210(f) of the CAA which requires that the General Counsel, on a regular basis, at least once each Congress, inspect the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA and to prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections, describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement. It also notes that by procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by section 210(d) of the CAA. The Board notes that the Executive Director is proposing amendments to the Office's Procedural Rules that do include provisions relating to section 210(f) of the CAA.

§3.102 Definitions. This section defines terms used in section 210(f) of the CAA which are not defined in the statute. In §3.102(a), the term "facilities of covered entities" is defined. The term "facility" is defined in 28 C.F.R. §35.104, which is incorporated by reference into these regulations. *See* §1.105(c). "Facilities of covered entities" is defined to include all facilities where covered entities provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations, including those facilities designed, maintained, altered or constructed by a covered entity. Because the General Counsel's inspections under section 210(f) of the CAA are focused upon finding barriers to access in facilities, the term "violation" is defined in §3.102(b) as any barrier to access caused by noncompliance with the applicable standards. The definition of "estimated cost and time needed for abatement" was developed in consultation with Office of the Architect of the Capitol which proposed that reporting regarding estimated abatement cost and time be provided using a range of dollar amounts and dates due to the difficulty in precisely estimating such costs and dates.

§3.103 Inspection authority. This section describes the general scope of the General Counsel's inspection authority [§3.103(a)] and recognizes that the General Counsel has the right to review information and documents [§3.103(b)], receive cooperation from covered entities [§3.103(c)], and become involved in pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects [§3.103(d)].

The general scope of authority in §3.103(a) is derived from the language in section 210(f)(1) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1331(f)(1). This subsection also describes the discretion that the General Counsel has exercised when conducting these inspections since the enactment of the CAA.

The document and information review described in §3.103(b) recognizes that a thorough inspection of facilities can require the

review of documents and other information to ascertain whether a covered entity is in compliance with the ADA. The language in this subsection is based upon prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

The duty to cooperate with inspections described in § 3.103(c), like the duty to cooperate with investigations described in § 2.103(b), is implicit in the CAA. By empowering the General Counsel to inspect all facilities for potential violations of the ADA, Congress expressed its expectation that legislative branch employees and offices would cooperate fully with such inspections conducted by the General Counsel pursuant to this authority. This regulation is consistent with prior policy guidance the General Counsel has provided to covered entities.

The pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects described in § 3.103(d) was developed after consultation with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and addresses concerns raised by oversight and appropriations staff over finding a cost efficient process that would allow better identification and elimination of potential ADA compliance issues during the pre-construction phases of new construction and alteration projects.

§ 3.104 Reporting, estimating cost & time and compliance date. This section describes the reporting obligations of the General Counsel set forth in section 210(f)(2) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f)(2). The language in § 3.104(a) is directly from section 210(f)(2) of the CAA. Subsection 3.104(b) merely recognizes that the General Counsel needs the cooperation of covered entities to provide the cost and time estimates for abatement required by section 210(f)(2). The compliance date set forth in § 3.104(c) is from section 210(d)(5) of the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(d)(5).

Proposed Regulations:

PART 1—MATTERS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY TO ALL REGULATIONS PROMULGATED UNDER SECTION 210 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

§ 1.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

§ 1.102 DEFINITIONS

§ 1.103 AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD

§ 1.104 METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRECTING VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 210

§ 1.105 REGULATIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

§ 1.101 Purpose and scope.

(a) **CAA.** Enacted into law on January 23, 1995, the Congressional Accountability Act (“CAA”) in Section 210(b) provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Title II and III (Sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 (“ADA”) shall apply to the following entities:

- (1) each office of the Senate, including each office of a Senator and each committee;
- (2) each office of the House of Representatives, including each office of a Member of the House of Representatives and each committee;
- (3) each joint committee of the Congress;
- (4) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;
- (5) the United States Capitol Police;
- (6) the Congressional Budget Office;
- (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden);
- (8) the Office of the Attending Physician; and

(9) the Office of Compliance;

Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services, programs, activities by any “public entity.” Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA provides that for the purpose of applying Title II of the ADA the term “public entity” means any entity listed above that provides public services, programs, or activities. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with accessibility standards. Section 225(f) of the CAA provides that, “[e]xcept where inconsistent with definitions and exemptions provided in this Act, the definitions and exemptions of the [ADA] shall apply under this Act.” 2 U.S.C. § 1361(f)(1).

Section 210(d) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. If the General Counsel believes that a violation may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation. 2 U.S.C. § 1361(d).

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance on a regular basis, and at least once each Congress, conduct periodic inspections of all covered facilities and to report to Congress on compliance with disability access standards under Section 210. 2 U.S.C. § 1331(f).

(b) **Purpose and scope of regulations.** The regulations set forth herein (Parts 1, 2, and 3) are the substantive regulations that the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance has promulgated pursuant to Section 210(e) of the CAA. Part 1 contains the general provisions applicable to all regulations under Section 210, the method of identifying entities responsible for correcting a violation of Section 210, and the list of executive branch regulations incorporated by reference which define and clarify the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations. Part 2 contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. Part 3 contains the provisions regarding the periodic inspections and reports to Congress on compliance with the disability access standards.

§ 1.102 Definitions.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in these regulations, as used in these regulations:

(a) **Act** or **CAA** means the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–1, 109 Stat. 3, 2 U.S.C. §§ 1301–1438).

(b) **ADA** means the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131–12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189) as applied to covered entities by Section 210 of the CAA.

(c) **Covered entity and public entity** include any of the entities listed in § 1.101(a) that provide public services, programs, or activities, or operates a place of public accommodation within the meaning of Section 210 of the CAA. In the regulations implementing Title III, **private entity** includes **covered entities**.

(d) **Board** means the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

(e) **Office** means the Office of Compliance.

(f) **General Counsel** means the General Counsel of the Office of Compliance.

§ 1.103 Authority of the Board.

Pursuant to Sections 210 and 304 of the CAA, the Board is authorized to issue regulations to implement the rights and protections against discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of public services and accommodations under the ADA. Section 210(e) of the CAA directs the Board to promulgate regulations implementing Section 210 that are “the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.” 2 U.S.C. § 1331(e). Specifically, it is the Board’s considered judgment, based on the information available to it at the time of promulgation of these regulations, that, with the exception of the regulations adopted and set forth herein, there are no other “substantive regulations promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (b) [of Section 210 of the CAA]” that need be adopted.

In promulgating these regulations, the Board has made certain technical and nomenclature changes to the regulations as promulgated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation. Such changes are intended to make the provisions adopted accord more naturally to situations in the Legislative Branch. However, by making these changes, the Board does not intend a substantive difference between these regulations and those of the Attorney General and/or the Secretary from which they are derived. Moreover, such changes, in and of themselves, are not intended to constitute an interpretation of the regulations or of the statutory provisions of the CAA upon which they are based.

§ 1.104 Method for identifying the entity responsible for correction of violations of section 210.

(a) **Purpose and scope.** Section 210(e)(3) of the CAA provides that regulations under Section 210(e) include a method of identifying, for purposes of this section and for categories of violations of Section 210(b), the entity responsible for correcting a particular violation. This section sets forth the method for identifying responsible entities for the purpose of allocating responsibility for correcting violations of Section 210(b).

(b) **Violations.** A covered entity may violate Section 210(b) if it discriminates against a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of Title II or Title III of the ADA.

(c) **Entities Responsible for Correcting Violations.** Correction of a violation of the rights and protections against discrimination is the responsibility of the entities listed in subsection (a) of Section 210 of the CAA that provide the specific public service, program, activity, or accommodation that forms the basis for the particular violation of Title II or Title III rights and protections and, when the violation involves a physical access barrier, the entities responsible for designing, maintaining, managing, altering or constructing the facility in which the specific public service program, activity or accommodation is conducted or provided.

(d) **Allocation of Responsibility for Correction of Title II and/or Title III Violations.** Where more than one entity is found to be an entity responsible for correction of a violation of Title II and/or Title III rights and

protections under the method set forth in this section, as between those parties, allocation of responsibility for correcting the violations of Title II or Title III of the ADA may be determined by statute, contract, order, or other enforceable arrangement or relationship.

§1.105 Regulations incorporated by reference.

(a) **Technical and Nomenclature Changes to Regulations Incorporated by Reference.** The definitions in the regulations incorporated by reference (“incorporated regulations”) shall be used to interpret these regulations except when they differ from the definitions in §1.102 or the modifications listed below, in which case the definition in §1.102 or the modification listed below shall be used. The incorporated regulations are hereby modified as follows:

(1) When the incorporated regulations refer to “Assistant Attorney General,” “Department of Justice,” “FTA Administrator,” “FTA regional office,” “Administrator,” “Secretary,” or any other executive branch office or officer, “General Counsel” is hereby substituted.

(2) When the incorporated regulations refer to the date “January 26, 1992,” the date “January 1, 1997” is hereby substituted.

(3) When the incorporated regulations otherwise specify a date by which some action must be completed, the date that is three years from the effective date of these regulations is hereby substituted.

(4) When the incorporated regulations contain an exception for an “historic” property, building, or facility that exception shall apply to properties, buildings, or facilities designated as an **historic or heritage asset** by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with its preservation policy and standards and where, in accordance with its preservation policy and standards, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol determines that compliance with the requirements for accessible routes, entrances, or toilet facilities would threaten or destroy the historic significance of the building or facility, the exceptions for alterations to qualified historic buildings or facilities for that element shall be permitted to apply.

(b) **Rule of Interpretation.** When a covered entity is subject to conflicting regulations implementing both Title II and Title III of the ADA, the regulation providing the most access shall apply.

(c) **Incorporated Regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36.** The following regulations from 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 and 36 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

§35.101 Purpose.

- §35.102 Application.
- §35.103 Relationship to other laws.
- §35.104 Definitions.
- §35.105 Self-evaluation
- §35.106 Notice.
- §35.107 Designation of responsible employee and adoption of grievance procedures.
- §35.130 General prohibitions against discrimination.
- §35.131 Illegal use of drugs.
- §35.132 Smoking.
- §35.133 Maintenance of accessible features.
- §35.135 Personal devices and services.
- §35.136 Service animals
- §35.137 Mobility devices.
- §35.138 Ticketing
- §35.139 Direct threat.
- §35.149 Discrimination prohibited.
- §35.150 Existing facilities.

§35.151 New Construction and alterations.
§35.152 Jails, detention and correctional facilities.

- §35.160 General.
- §35.161 Telecommunications.
- §35.162 Telephone emergency services.
- §35.163 Information and signage.
- §35.164 Duties.
- §36.101 Purpose.
- §36.102 Application.
- §36.103 Relationship to other laws.
- §36.104 Definitions.
- §36.201 General.
- §36.202 Activities.
- §36.203 Integrated settings.
- §36.204 Administrative methods.
- §36.205 Association.
- §36.207 Places of public accommodations located in private residences.
- §36.208 Direct threat.
- §36.209 Illegal use of drugs.
- §36.210 Smoking.
- §36.211 Maintenance of accessible features.
- §36.213 Relationship of subpart B to subparts C and D of this part.
- §36.301 Eligibility criteria.
- §36.302 Modifications in policies, practices, or procedures.
- §36.303 Auxiliary aids and services.
- §36.304 Removal of barriers.
- §36.305 Alternatives to barrier removal.
- §36.306 Personal devices and services.
- §36.307 Accessible or special goods.
- §36.308 Seating in assembly areas.
- §36.309 Examinations and courses.
- §36.310 Transportation provided by public accommodations.
- §36.402 Alterations.
- §36.403 Alterations: Path of travel.
- §36.404 Alterations: Elevator exemption.
- §36.405 Alterations: Historic preservation.
- §36.406 Standards for new construction and alterations.

Appendix A to Part 36—Standards for Accessible Design.

Appendix B to Part 36—Preamble to Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations (Published July 26, 1991).

(d) **Incorporated Regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38.** The following regulations from 49 C.F.R. Parts 37 and 38 that are published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations are hereby incorporated by reference as though stated in detail herein:

- §37.1 Purpose.
- §37.3 Definitions.
- §37.5 Nondiscrimination.
- §37.7 Standards for accessible vehicles.
- §37.9 Standards for accessible transportation facilities.
- §37.13 Effective date for certain vehicle specifications.
- §37.21 Applicability: General.
- §37.23 Service under contract.
- §37.27 Transportation for elementary and secondary education systems.
- §37.31 Vanpools.
- §37.37 Other applications.
- §37.41 Construction of transportation facilities by public entities.
- §37.43 Alteration of transportation facilities by public entities.
- §37.45 Construction and alteration of transportation facilities by private entities.
- §37.47 Key stations in light and rapid rail systems.
- §37.61 Public transportation programs and activities in existing facilities.
- §37.71 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.
- §37.73 Purchase or lease of used non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.

§37.75 Remanufacture of non-rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured non-rail vehicles by public entities operating fixed route systems.

§37.77 Purchase or lease of new non-rail vehicles by public entities operating a demand responsive system for the general public.

§37.79 Purchase or lease of new rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§37.81 Purchase or lease of used rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§37.83 Remanufacture of rail vehicles and purchase or lease of remanufactured rail vehicles by public entities operating rapid or light rail systems.

§37.101 Purchase or lease of vehicles by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.

§37.105 Equivalent service standard.

§37.121 Requirement for comparable complementary paratransit service.

§37.123 ADA paratransit eligibility: Standards.

§37.125 ADA paratransit eligibility: Process.

§37.127 Complementary paratransit service for visitors.

§37.129 Types of service.

§37.131 Service criteria for complementary paratransit.

§37.133 Subscription service.

§37.135 Submission of paratransit plan.

§37.137 Paratransit plan development.

§37.139 Plan contents.

§37.141 Requirements for a joint paratransit plan.

§37.143 Paratransit plan implementation.

§37.147 Considerations during FTA review.

§37.149 Disapproved plans.

§37.151 Waiver for undue financial burden.

§37.153 FTA waiver determination.

§37.155 Factors in decision to grant an undue financial burden waiver.

§37.161 Maintenance of accessible features: General.

§37.163 Keeping vehicle lifts in operative condition: Public entities.

§37.165 Lift and securement use.

§37.167 Other service requirements.

§37.171 Equivalency requirement for demand responsive service operated by private entities not primarily engaged in the business of transporting people.

§37.173 Training requirements.

Appendix A to Part 37—Modifications to Standards for Accessible Transportation Facilities.

Appendix D to Part 37—Construction and Interpretation of Provisions of 49 CFR Part 37.

- §38.1 Purpose.
- §38.2 Equivalent facilitation.
- §38.3 Definitions.
- §38.4 Miscellaneous instructions.
- §38.21 General.
- §38.23 Mobility aid accessibility.
- §38.25 Doors, steps and thresholds.
- §38.27 Priority seating signs.
- §38.29 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.
- §38.31 Lighting.
- §38.33 Fare box.
- §38.35 Public information system.
- §38.37 Stop request.
- §38.39 Destination and route signs.
- §38.51 General.
- §38.53 Doorways.
- §38.55 Priority seating signs.
- §38.57 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.

- § 38.59 Floor surfaces.
- § 38.61 Public information system.
- § 38.63 Between-car barriers.
- § 38.71 General.
- § 38.73 Doorways.
- § 38.75 Priority seating signs.
- § 38.77 Interior circulation, handrails and stanchions.
- § 38.79 Floors, steps and thresholds.
- § 38.81 Lighting.
- § 38.83 Mobility aid accessibility.
- § 38.85 Between-car barriers.
- § 38.87 Public information system.
- § 38.171 General.
- § 38.173 Automated guideway transit vehicles and systems.
- § 38.179 Trams, and similar vehicles, and systems.

Figures to Part 38.

Appendix to Part 38—Guidance Material.

(e) **Incorporated Regulation from 36 C.F.R. Part 1190.** The following regulation from 36 C.F.R. Part 1190 that is published in the Code of Federal Regulations on the effective date of these regulations is hereby incorporated by reference as though detail herein:

§ 1190.3—Accessible buildings and facilities: Leased.

PART 2—MATTERS PERTAINING TO INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF CHARGES OF DISCRIMINATION.

- § 2.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
- § 2.102 DEFINITIONS
- § 2.103 INVESTIGATORY AUTHORITY
- § 2.104 MEDIATION
- § 2.105 COMPLAINT
- § 2.106 INTERVENTION BY CHARGING INDIVIDUAL
- § 2.107 REMEDIES AND COMPLIANCE
- § 2.108 JUDICIAL REVIEW

§ 2.101 Purpose and Scope.

Section 210(d) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel accept and investigate charges of discrimination filed by qualified individuals with disabilities who allege a violation of Title II or Title III of the ADA by a covered entity. Part 2 of these regulations contains the provisions pertaining to investigation and prosecution of charges of discrimination. By procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise the statutory authority provided by Section 210.

§ 2.102 Definitions.

(a) **Charge** means any written document from a qualified individual with a disability or that individual's designated representative which suggests or alleges that a covered entity denied that individual the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations provided in Section 210(b)(1) of the CAA.

(b) **File a charge** means providing a charge to the General Counsel in person, by mail, by electronic transmission, or by any other means used by the General Counsel to receive documents. Charges shall be filed within 180 days of the occurrence of the alleged violation.

(c) **The occurrence of the alleged violation** means the later of (1) the date on which the charging individual was allegedly discriminated against; or (2) the last date on which the service, activity, program or public accommodation described by the charging party was operated in a way that denied access in the manner alleged by the charging party.

(d) **The rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations** means all of the rights

and protections provided by Section 210(b)(1) of the CAA through incorporation of Sections 201 through 230, 203, 303, and 309 of the ADA and by the regulations issued by the Board to implement Section 210 of the CAA.

§ 2.103 Investigatory Authority.

(a) **Investigatory Methods.** When investigating charges of discrimination and conducting inspections, the General Counsel is authorized to use all the modes of inquiry and investigation traditionally employed or useful to execute this investigatory authority. The authorized methods of investigation include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) requiring the parties to provide or produce ready access to: all physical areas subject to an inspection or investigation, individuals with relevant knowledge concerning the inspection or investigation who can be interviewed or questioned, and documents pertinent to the investigation; and (2) requiring the parties to provide written answers to questions, statements of position, and any other information relating to a potential violation or demonstrating compliance.

(b) **Duty to Cooperate with Investigations.** Charging individuals and covered entities shall cooperate with investigations conducted by the General Counsel. Cooperation includes providing timely responses to reasonable requests for information and documents (including the making and retention of copies of records and documents), allowing the General Counsel to review documents and interview relevant witnesses confidentially and without managerial interference or influence, and granting the General Counsel ready access to all facilities where covered services, programs and activities are being provided and all places of public accommodation.

§ 2.104 Mediation.

(a) **Belief that violation may have occurred.** If, after investigation, the General Counsel believes that a violation of the ADA may have occurred and that mediation may be helpful in resolving the dispute, prior to filing a complaint, the General Counsel may request, but not participate in, mediation under subsections (b) through (d) of Section 403 of the CAA between the charging individual and any entity responsible for correcting the alleged violation.

(b) **Settlement.** If, prior to the filing of a complaint, the charging individual and the entity responsible for correcting the violation reach a settlement agreement that fully resolves the dispute, the General Counsel shall close the investigation of the charge without taking further action.

(c) **Mediation Unsuccessful.** If mediation under (a) has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, and if the General Counsel believes that a violation of the ADA may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation.

§ 2.105 Complaint.

The complaint filed by the General Counsel shall be submitted to a hearing officer for decision pursuant to subsections (b) through (h) of Section 405 of the CAA. The decision of the hearing officer shall be subject to review by the Board pursuant to Section 406 of the CAA.

§ 2.106 Intervention by Charging Individual.

Any person who has filed a charge may intervene as of right, with the full rights of a party, whenever a complaint is filed by the General Counsel.

§ 2.107 Remedies and Compliance.

(a) **Remedy.** The remedy for a violation of Section 210 of the CAA shall be such remedy

as would be appropriate if awarded under Section 203 or 308(a) of the ADA.

(1) **Attorney Fees and Costs.** In any action commenced pursuant to Section 210 of the CAA by the General Counsel, when a charging individual has intervened, the hearing officer and the Board, in their discretion, may allow the prevailing charging individual a reasonable attorney's fee, including litigation expenses, and costs, and the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation shall pay such fees, expenses and costs from its appropriated funds as part of the funds to correct violations of Section 210 under Section 415(c) of the CAA.

(2) **Compensatory Damages.** In any action commenced pursuant to Section 210 of the CAA by the General Counsel, when a charging individual has intervened, the hearing officer and the Board, in their discretion, may award compensatory damages to the prevailing charging individual, and the covered entity responsible for correcting the violation shall pay such compensatory damages from its appropriated funds as part of the funds to correct violations of Section 210 under Section 415(c) of the CAA.

(b) **Compliance Date.** Compliance shall take place as soon as possible, but no later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the order requiring correction becomes final and not subject to further review.

§ 2.108 Judicial Review.

A charging individual who has intervened or any respondent to the complaint, if aggrieved by a final decision of the Board, may file a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, pursuant to Section 407 of the CAA.

PART 3—MATTERS PERTAINING TO PERIODIC INSPECTIONS AND REPORTING.

- § 3.101 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
- § 3.102 DEFINITIONS
- § 3.103 INSPECTION AUTHORITY
- § 3.104 REPORTING, ESTIMATED COST & TIME AND COMPLIANCE

§ 3.101 Purpose and scope.

Section 210(f) of the CAA requires that the General Counsel, on a regular basis, at least once each Congress, inspect the facilities of covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA and to prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections, describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement. Part 3 of these regulations contains the provisions pertaining to these inspection and reporting duties. By procedural rule or policy, the General Counsel or the Office may further describe how the General Counsel will exercise this statutory authority provided by Section 210.

§ 3.102 Definitions.

(a) **The facilities of covered entities** means all facilities used to provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations that are designed, maintained, altered or constructed by a covered entity and all facilities where covered entities provide public programs, activities, services or accommodations.

(b) **Violation** means any barrier to access caused by noncompliance with the applicable standards.

(c) **Estimated cost and time needed for abatement** means cost and time estimates that can be reported as falling within a range of dollar amounts and dates.

§ 3.103 Inspection authority.

(a) **General scope of authority.** On a regular basis, at least once each Congress, the General Counsel shall inspect the facilities of

covered entities to ensure compliance with the Titles II and III of the ADA. When conducting these inspections, the General Counsel has the discretion to decide which facilities will be inspected and how inspections will be conducted. The General Counsel may receive requests for ADA inspections, including anonymous requests, and conduct inspections for compliance with Titles II and III of the ADA in the same manner that the General Counsel receives and investigates requests for inspections under Section 215(c)(1) of the CAA.

(b) **Review of information and documents.** When conducting inspections under Section 210(f) of the CAA, the General Counsel may request, obtain, and review any and all information or documents deemed by the General Counsel to be relevant to a determination of whether the covered entity is in compliance with Section 210 of the CAA.

(c) **Duty to cooperate.** Covered entities shall cooperate with any inspection conducted by the General Counsel in the manner provided by § 2.103(b).

(d) **Pre-construction review of alteration and construction projects.** Any project involving alteration or new construction of facilities of covered entities are subject to inspection by the General Counsel for compliance with Titles II and III of the ADA during the design, pre-construction, construction, and post construction phases of the project. The Office of the Architect of the Capitol shall, within one year from the effective date of these regulations, develop a process with the General Counsel to identify potential barriers to access prior to the completion of alteration and construction projects that may include the following provisions:

- (1) Design review or approval;
- (2) Inspections of ongoing alteration and construction projects;
- (3) Training on the applicable ADA standards;
- (4) Final inspections of completed projects for compliance; and
- (5) Any other provision that would likely reduce the number of ADA barriers in alterations and new construction and the costs associated with correcting them.

§ 3.104 Reporting, estimating cost & time and compliance date.

(a) **Reporting duty.** On a regular basis, at least once each Congress, the General Counsel shall prepare and submit a report to Congress containing the results of the periodic inspections conducted under § 3.103(a), describing any violations, assessing any limitations in accessibility, and providing the estimated cost and time needed for abatement.

(b) **Estimated cost & time.** Covered entities shall cooperate with the General Counsel by providing information needed to provide the estimated cost and time needed for abatement in the manner provided by § 2.103(b).

(c) **Compliance date.** All barriers to access identified by the General Counsel in its periodic reports shall be removed or otherwise corrected as soon as possible, but no later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the report describing the barrier to access was issued by the General Counsel.

Recommended Method of Approval:

The Board recommends that (1) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply to the Senate and entities and facilities of the Senate be approved by the Senate by resolution; (2) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply to the House of Representatives and entities and facilities of the House of Representatives be approved by the

House of Representatives by resolution; and (3) the version of the proposed regulations that shall apply to other covered entities and facilities be approved by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on this 9th day of September, 2014.

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
Chair of the Board, Office of Compliance.

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 303(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1383(a), requires that, with regard to the proposal of procedural rules under the CAA, the Executive Director "shall, subject to the approval of the Board [of Directors], adopt rules governing the procedures of the Office . . . publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking" and "shall transmit such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

Having obtained the approval of the Board as required by Section 303(b) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1383(b), I am transmitting the attached notice of proposed procedural rulemaking to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I request that this notice be published in the House section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following the receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 303(b) of the CAA, a comment period of 30 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540; 202-724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA J. SAPIN,
*Executive Director,
Office of Compliance.*

Attachment.

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING ("NPRM"), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE, NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING, AS REQUIRED BY 2 U.S.C. § 1383, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED ("CAA").

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Shortly after the creation of the Office of Compliance (Office) in 1995, Procedural Rules were adopted to govern the processing of cases and controversies under the administrative procedures established in subchapter IV of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) 2 U.S.C. 1401-1407. The Rules of Procedure were amended in 1998 and again in 2004. The existing Rules of Procedure are available in their entirety on the Office of Compliance's web site: www.compliance.gov. The web site is fully compliant with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d).

Pursuant to section 303(a) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1383(a)), the Executive Director of the Office has obtained approval of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance regard-

ing certain amendments to the Rules of Procedure.

After obtaining the Board's approval, the Executive Director must then "publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking . . . for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal." (Section 303(b) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1383(b)).

NOTICE

Comments regarding the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Office of Compliance set forth in this NOTICE are invited for a **period of thirty (30) days** following the date of the appearance of this NOTICE in the Congressional Record. In addition to being posted on the Office of Compliance's section 508 compliant web site (www.compliance.gov), this NOTICE is also available in the following alternative formats: Large Print, Braille. Requests for this NOTICE in an alternative format should be made to Annie Leftwood, Office of Compliance, at 202/724-9272 (voice). Submission of comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided via e-mail to: Annie Leftwood: annie.leftwood@compliance.gov. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non toll-free number). Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-Federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA applies the rights and protections of 13 federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the Legislative Branch of Government. Section 301 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1381) establishes the Office of Compliance as an independent office within that Branch. Section 303 (2 U.S.C. 1383) directs that the Executive Director, as the Chief Operating Officer of the agency, adopt rules of procedure governing the Office of Compliance, subject to approval by the Board of Directors of the Office.

The rules of procedure establish the process by which alleged violations of the 13 laws made applicable to the Legislative Branch under the CAA will be considered and resolved. Subpart A covers general provisions pertaining to scope and policy, definitions, and information on various filings and computation of time. Proposed Amendments to Subpart A provide for electronic filing and clarify requirements and procedures concerning confidentiality. Subpart B provides procedures for counseling, mediation, and election between filing an administrative complaint with the Office of Compliance or filing a civil action in U.S. District Court. A new Subpart C of the Procedural Rules sets forth the proposed rules and procedures for enforcement of the inspection, investigation and complaint sections 210(d) and (f) of the CAA relating to Public Services and Accommodations under Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Subpart C has been reserved for these rules since 1995. Because the Office of the General Counsel conducts ADA inspections and investigates ADA charges using procedures that

are similar to what are used in its Occupational, Safety and Health (OSH) inspections and investigations conducted under section 215 of the CAA, the procedural rules are similar to what are contained in Subpart D of the Procedural Rules relating to OSH inspections and investigations. The proposed Amendments to Subpart D clarify potential ambiguities in the rules and procedures and make modifications in terminology to better comport with the statutory language used in Section 215 of the CAA. Subparts E, F, and G include the process for the conduct of administrative hearings held as the result of the filing of an administrative complaint. Subpart H sets forth the procedures for appeals of decisions by hearing officers to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance and for appeals of decisions by the Board of Directors to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Proposed Amendments to Subpart H also reference procedures for other proceedings before the Board. Subpart I of the Rules contain other matters of general applicability to the dispute resolution process and to the operation of the Office of Compliance, including proposed Amendments concerning attorney's fees and violations of formal settlement agreements.

These proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure are the result of the experience of the Office in processing disputes under the CAA since the original adoption of these Rules in 1995. The proposed Amendments to Subpart D of the Procedural Rules reflect the experience of the Office of General Counsel in conducting OSH inspections and investigations since 1995.

EXPLANATION REGARDING THE TEXT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Material from the 2004 version of the Rules is printed in roman type. The text of the proposed amendments shows *deletions in italicized type within bold italics brackets* and **added text in bold**. Only subsections of the Rules that include proposed amendments are reproduced in this NOTICE. The insertion of a series of small dots (. . .) indicates additional, unamended text within a section has not been reproduced in this document. The insertion of a series of asterisks (* * * *) indicates that the unamended text of entire sections of the Rules have not been reproduced in this document. For the text of other portions of the Rules which are not proposed to be amended, please access the Office of Compliance web site at www.compliance.gov.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Subpart A—General Provisions

§ 1.01 Scope and Policy

§ 1.02 Definitions

§ 1.03 Filing and Computation of Time

§ 1.04 Availability of Official Information

§ 1.05 Designation of Representative

§ 1.06 Maintenance of Confidentiality

§ 1.07 Breach of Confidentiality Provisions

§ 1.01 Scope and Policy.

These rules of the Office of Compliance govern the procedures for consideration and resolution of alleged violations of the laws made applicable under Parts A, B, C, and D of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995. The rules include **definitions**, procedures for counseling, mediation, and for electing between filing a complaint with the Office of Compliance and filing a civil action in a district court of the United States **under Part A of title II**. The rules also address the procedures for **compliance, investigation and enforcement under Part B of title II**, **[variances]** and for compliance, investigation, **[and]** enforcement, and **variance**

under Part C of title II. **The rules include [and]** procedures for the conduct of hearings held as a result of the filing of a complaint and for appeals to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance from Hearing Officer decisions, as well as other matters of general applicability to the dispute resolution process and to the operations of the Office of Compliance. It is the policy of the Office that these rules shall be applied with due regard to the rights of all parties and in a manner that expedites the resolution of disputes.

§ 1.02 Definitions.

Except as otherwise specifically provided in these rules, for purposes of this Part:

(b) *Covered Employee*. The term “covered employee” means any employee of

(3) the **[Capitol Guide Service] Office of Congressional Accessibility Services;**
(4) the **United States Capitol Police;**

(9) for the purposes stated in paragraph (q) of this section, the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** or the Library of Congress.

(d) *Employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol*. The term “employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol” includes any employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, **or** the Botanic Garden **[or the Senate Restaurants]**.

(e) *Employee of the Capitol Police*. The term “employee of the Capitol Police” includes civilian employees and any member or officer of the Capitol Police.

(f) *Employee of the House of Representatives*. The term “employee of the House of Representatives” includes an individual occupying a position the pay for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or another official designated by the House of Representatives, or any employment position in an entity that is paid with funds derived from the clerk-hire allowance of the House of Representatives, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) of paragraph (b) above.

(g) *Employee of the Senate*. The term “employee of the Senate” includes any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) of paragraph (b) above.

(h) *Employing Office*. The term “employing office” means:

(4) the **[Capitol Guide Service] Office of Congressional Accessibility Services**, the **United States Capitol Police**, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; or

(5) for the purposes stated in paragraph **[(q)] (r)** of this section, the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** and the Library of Congress

(j) *Designated Representative*. The term “designated representative” means an individual, firm, or other entity designated in writing by a party to represent the interests of that party in a matter filed with the Office.

—Re-letter subsequent paragraphs—

[(o)](p) General Counsel. The term “General Counsel” means the General Counsel of

the Office of Compliance **and any authorized representative or designee of the General Counsel**.

[(p)](q) Hearing Officer. The term “Hearing Officer” means any individual **[designated]** **appointed** by the Executive Director to preside over a hearing conducted on matters within the Office's jurisdiction.

[(q)](r) Coverage of the [General Accounting] Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress and their Employees. The term “employing office” shall include the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** and the Library of Congress, and the term “covered employee” shall include employees of the **[General Accounting] Government Accountability Office** and the Library of Congress, for purposes of the proceedings and rulemakings described in subparagraphs (1) and (2):

§ 1.03 Filing and Computation of Time

(a) *Method of Filing*. Documents may be filed in person, **electronically, by facsimile (FAX)**, or by mail, including express, overnight and other expedited delivery. **[When specifically requested by the Executive Director, or by a Hearing Officer in the case of a matter pending before the Hearing Officer, or by the Board of Directors in the case of an appeal to the Board, any document may also be filed by electronic transmittal in a designated format, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format. Requests for counseling under section 2.03, requests for mediation under section 2.04 and complaints under section 5.01 of these rules may also be filed by facsimile (FAX) transmission. In addition, the Board or a Hearing Officer may order other documents to be filed by FAX. The original copies of documents filed by FAX must also be mailed to the Office no later than the day following FAX transmission.]** The filing of all documents is subject to the limitations set forth below. **The Board, Hearing Officer, the Executive Director, or the General Counsel may, in their discretion, determine the method by which documents may be filed in a particular proceeding, including ordering one or more parties to use mail, FAX, electronic filing, or personal delivery. Parties and their representatives are responsible for ensuring that the Office always has their current postal mailing and e-mail addresses and FAX numbers.**

(2) **[Mailing] By Mail.**

(i) **Requests for Mediation**. If mailed, including express, overnight and other expedited delivery, a request for mediation **[or a complaint]** is deemed filed on the date of its receipt in the Office.

(ii) **Other Documents**. **[A document,] Documents**, other than a request for mediation, **[or a complaint, is]** are deemed filed on the date of **[its]** their postmark or proof of mailing to the Office. Parties, including those using franked mail, are responsible for ensuring that any mailed document bears a postmark date or other proof of the actual date of mailing. In the absence of a legible postmark a document will be deemed timely filed if it is received by the Office at Adams Building, Room LA 200, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, by mail within five (5) days of the expiration of the applicable filing period.

(3) **[Filing Documents] By FAX**. Documents transmitted by FAX machine will be deemed filed on the date received at the Office at 202-426-1913, or **[, in the case of any document to be filed or submitted to the General Counsel,]** on the date received at the Office of the General Counsel at 202-426-1663 **if received by**

11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. Faxed documents received after 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time will be deemed filed the following business day. A FAX filing will be timely only if the document is received no later than **[5:00 PM]** **11:59 p.m. Eastern Time** on the last day of the applicable filing period. Any party using a FAX machine to file a document bears the responsibility for ensuring both that the document is timely and accurately transmitted and confirming that the Office has received a facsimile of the document. **[The party or individual filing the document may rely on its FAX status report sheet to show that it filed the document in a timely manner, provided that the status report indicates the date of the FAX, the receiver's FAX number, the number of pages included in the FAX, and that transmission was completed.]** The time displayed as received by the Office on its FAX status report will be used to show the time that the document was filed. When the Office serves a document by FAX, the time displayed as sent by the Office on its FAX status report will be used to show the time that the document was served. A FAX filing cannot exceed 75 pages, inclusive of table of contents, table of authorities, and attachments. Attachments exceeding 75 pages must be submitted to the Office in person or by electronic delivery. The date of filing will be determined by the date the brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum is received in the Office, rather than the date the attachments were received in the Office.

(4) **By Electronic Mail.** Documents transmitted electronically will be deemed filed on the date received at the Office at oceffile@compliance.gov, or on the date received at the Office of the General Counsel at OSH@compliance.gov if received by **11:59 p.m. Eastern Time**. Documents received electronically after **11:59 p.m. Eastern Time** will be deemed filed the following business day. An electronic filing will be timely only if the document is received no later than **11:59 p.m. Eastern Time** on the last day of the applicable filing period. Any party filing a document electronically bears the responsibility for ensuring both that the document is timely and accurately transmitted and for confirming that the Office has received the document. The time displayed as received by the Office will be used to show the time that the document has been filed. When the Office serves a document electronically, the time displayed as sent by the Office will be used to show the time that the document was served.

(b) **Service by the Office.** At its discretion, the Office may serve documents by mail, FAX, electronic transmission, or personal or commercial delivery.

[(b)](c) Computation of Time. All time periods in these rules that are stated in terms of days are calendar days unless otherwise noted. However, when the period of time prescribed is five (5) days or less, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, federal government holidays, and other full days that the Office is officially closed for business shall be excluded in the computation. To compute the number of days for taking any action required or permitted under these rules, the first day shall be the day after the event from which the time period begins to run and the last day for filing or service shall be included in the computation. When the last day falls on a Saturday, Sunday, **[or]** federal government holiday, **or a day the Office is officially closed**, the last day for taking the action shall be the next regular federal government workday.

[(c)](d) Time Allowances for Mailing, Fax, or Electronic Delivery of Official Notices. Whenever a person or party has the right or is re-

quired to do some act within a prescribed period after the service of a notice or other document upon him or her and the notice or document is served by **[regular, first-class]** mail, five (5) days shall be added to the prescribed period. **[Only two (2) days shall be added if a document is served by express mail or other form of expedited delivery.]** When documents are served by certified mail, return receipt requested, the prescribed period shall be calculated from the date of receipt as evidenced by the return receipt. **When documents are served electronically or by FAX, the prescribed period shall be calculated from the date of transmission by the Office.**

[(d) Service or filing of documents by certified mail, return receipt requested. Whenever these rules permit or require service or filing of documents by certified mail, return receipt requested, such documents may also be served or filed by express mail or other forms of expedited delivery in which proof of date of receipt by the addressee is provided.]

[\$9.01] §1.04 Filing, Service, and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and Other Documents.

(a) **Filing with the Office; Number and Format.** One copy of requests for counseling and mediation, requests for inspection under OSH, unfair labor practice charges, charges under titles II and III of the ADA, **[one original and three copies of]** all motions, briefs, responses, and other documents must be filed **[whenever required,]** with the Office **[or Hearing Officer]**. **[However, when a party aggrieved by the decision of a Hearing Officer or a party to any other matter or determination reviewable by the Board files an appeal or other submission with the Board, one original and seven copies of any submission and any responses must be filed with the Office. The Office, Hearing Officer, or Board may also request a]** **[A party [to submit] may file an electronic version of any submission in a [designated] format designated by the Executive Director, General Counsel, Hearing Officer, or Board, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format.**

(b) **Service.** The parties shall serve on each other one copy of all motions, briefs, responses and other documents filed with the Office, other than the request for counseling, the request for mediation and complaint. Service shall be made by mailing, **by fax or e-mailing**, or by hand delivering a copy of the motion, brief, response or other document to each party, or if represented, the party's representative, on the service list previously provided by the Office. Each of these documents must be accompanied by a certificate of service specifying how, when and on whom service was made. It shall be the duty of each party to notify the Office and all other parties in writing of any changes in the names or addresses on the service list.

(d) **Size Limitations.** Except as otherwise specified **[by the Hearing Officer, or these rules,]** no brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum filed with the Office shall exceed **35 double-spaced pages, [or 8,750 words,]** exclusive of the table of contents, table of authorities and attachments. The Board, the **Executive Director**, or Hearing Officer may **[waive, raise or reduce]** modify this limitation **upon motion and for good cause shown; or on [its] their own initiative.** Briefs, motions, responses, and supporting memoranda shall be on standard letter-size paper (8-1/2" x 11"). **To the extent that such a filing exceeds 35 double-spaced pages, the Hearing Officer, Board, or Executive Director may, in their discretion, reject the filing in**

whole or in part, and may provide the parties an opportunity to refile.

[\$9.02] §1.05 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violation of Rules; Sanctions.

(a) **Signing.** Every pleading, motion, and other filing of a party represented by an attorney or other designated representative shall be signed by the attorney or representative. A party who is not represented shall sign the pleading, motion or other filing. **In the case of an electronic filing, an electronic signature is acceptable.** The signature of a representative or party constitutes a certificate by the signer that the signer has read the pleading, motion, or other filing; that to the best of the signer's knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.

(b) **Sanctions.** If a pleading, motion, or other filing is not signed, it shall be stricken unless it is signed promptly after the omission is called to the attention of the person who is required to sign. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is signed in violation of this rule, a Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or upon **[its] their own initiative, [shall] may impose [upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both,]** an appropriate sanction, which may include **[an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of the filing of the pleading, motion, or other filing, including a reasonable attorney's fee. A Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or its own initiative may also impose an appropriate sanction, which may include]** the sanctions specified in section 7.02 **[, for any other violation of these rules that does not result from reasonable error].**

[\$1.04] §1.06 Availability of Official Information.

(a) **Policy.** It is the policy of the Board, the **[Office] Executive Director**, and the General Counsel, except as otherwise ordered by the Board, to make available for public inspection and copying final decisions and orders of the Board and the Office, as specified and described in paragraph (d) below.

(c) **Copies of Forms.** Copies of blank forms prescribed by the Office for the filing of complaints and other actions or requests may be obtained from the Office **or on line at www.compliance.gov.**

(f) **Access by Committees of Congress.** **[At the discretion of the Executive Director, the] The Executive Director, at his or her discretion,** may provide to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives (**House Committee on Ethics**) and the Select Committee on Ethics of the Senate (**Senate Select Committee on Ethics**) access to the records of the hearings and decisions of the Hearing Officers and the Board, including all written and oral testimony in the possession of the Office. The identifying information in these records may be redacted at the discretion of the Executive Director. The Executive Director shall not provide such access until the Executive Director has consulted with the individual filing the complaint at issue, and until a final decision has been entered under section 405(g) or 406(e) of the Act.

§ 1.05 § 1.07 Designation of Representative.

(a) *[An employee, other charging individual or] A party [a witness, a labor organization, an employing office, or an entity alleged to be responsible for correcting a violation] wishing to be represented [by another individual,] must file with the Office a written notice of designation of representative. No more than one representative, [or] firm, or other entity may be designated as representative for a party, unless approved in writing by the Hearing Officer or Executive Director. The representative may be, but is not required to be, an attorney. If the representative is an attorney, he or she may sign the designation of representative on behalf of the party.*

(b) *Service Where There is a Representative. [All service] Service of documents shall be [directed to] on the representative unless and until such time as the represented [individual, labor organization, or employing office] party or representative, with notice to the party, [specifies otherwise and until such time as that individual, labor organization, or employing office] notifies the Executive Director, in writing, of [an amendment] a modification or revocation of the designation of representative. Where a designation of representative is in effect, all time limitations for receipt of materials [by the represented individual or entity] shall be computed in the same manner as for those who are unrepresented [individuals or entities], with service of the documents, however, directed to the representative[, as provided].*

(c) *Revocation of a Designation of Representative.* A revocation of a designation of representative, whether made by the party or by the representative with notice to the party, must be made in writing and filed with the Office. The revocation will be deemed effective the date of receipt by the Office. At the discretion of the Executive Director, General Counsel, mediator, hearing officer, or Board, additional time may be provided to allow the party to designate a new representative as consistent with the Act.

§ 1.06 § 1.08 [Maintenance of] Confidentiality.

(a) *Policy.* *[In accord with section 416 of the Act, it is the policy of] Except as provided in sections 416(d), (e), and (f) of the Act, the Office [to] shall maintain [, to the fullest extent possible, the] confidentiality in counseling, mediation, and [of] the proceedings and deliberations of hearing officers and the Board in accordance with sections 416(a), (b), and (c) of the Act. [of the participants in proceedings conducted under sections 402, 403, 405 and 406 of the Act and these rules.]*

(b) *[At the time that any individual, employing office or party, including a designated representative, becomes a participant in counseling under section 402, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding, the Office will advise the participant of the confidentiality requirements of section 416 of the Act and these rules and that sanctions may be imposed for a violation of those requirements.] Participant.* For the purposes of this rule, participant means an individual or entity who takes part as either a party, witness, or designated representative in counseling under Section 402 of the Act, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under Section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding which is expressly or by necessity deemed confidential under the Act or these rules.

(c) *Prohibition.* Unless specifically authorized by the provisions of the Act or by these rules, no participant in counseling, mediation

or other proceedings made confidential under Section 416 of the Act (“confidential proceedings”) may disclose a written or oral communication that is prepared for the purpose of or that occurs during counseling, mediation, and the proceedings and deliberations of hearing officers and the Board.

(d) *Exceptions.* Nothing in these rules prohibits a party or its representative from disclosing information obtained in confidential proceedings when reasonably necessary to investigate claims, ensure compliance with the Act or prepare its prosecution or defense. However, the party making the disclosure shall take all reasonably appropriate steps to ensure that persons to whom the information is disclosed maintain the confidentiality of such information. These rules do not preclude a mediator from consulting with the Office, except that when the covered employee is an employee of the Office a mediator shall not consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness. These rules do not preclude the Office from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives.

(e) *Waiver.* Participants may agree to waive confidentiality. Such a waiver must be in writing and provided to the Office.

(f) *Sanctions.* The Office will advise the participants of the confidentiality requirements of Section 416 of the Act and that sanctions may be imposed by the Hearing Officer for a violation of those requirements. No sanctions may be imposed except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.

§ 1.07 Breach of Confidentiality Provisions.

(a) *In General.* Section 416(a) of the CAA provides that counseling under section 402 shall be strictly confidential, except that the Office and a covered employee may agree to notify the employing office of the allegations. Section 416(b) provides that all mediation shall be strictly confidential. Section 416(c) provides that all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including any related records shall be confidential, except for release of records necessary for judicial actions, access by certain committees of Congress, and, in accordance with section 416(f), publication of certain final decisions. Section 416(c) does not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but does apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under section 215. See also sections 1.06, 5.04, and 7.12 of these rules.

(b) *Prohibition.* Unless specifically authorized by the provisions of the CAA or by order of the Board, the Hearing Officer or a court, or by the procedural rules of the Office, no participant in counseling, mediation or other proceedings made confidential under section 416 of the CAA (“confidential proceedings”) may disclose the contents or records of those proceedings to any person or entity. Nothing in these rules prohibits a bona fide representative of a party under section 1.05 from engaging in communications with that party for the purpose of participation in the proceedings, provided that such disclosure is not made in the presence of individuals not reasonably necessary to the representative’s representation of that party. Moreover, nothing in these rules prohibits a party or its representative from disclosing information obtained in confidential proceedings for the limited purposes of investigating claims, ensuring compliance with the Act or preparing its prosecution or defense, to the extent that such disclosure is reasonably necessary to accomplish the aforementioned purposes and provided that the party making the disclosure takes all reasonably appropriate steps to ensure that persons to whom the information is disclosed maintain the confidentiality of such information.

(c) *Participant.* For the purposes of this rule, participant means any individual or party, including a designated representative, that becomes a participant in counseling under section 402, mediation under section 403, the complaint and hearing process under section 405, or an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the Act, or any related proceeding which is expressly or by necessity deemed confidential under the Act or these rules.

(d) *Contents or Records of Confidential Proceedings.* For the purpose of this rule, the contents or records of counseling, mediation or other proceeding includes information disclosed by participants to the proceedings, and records disclosed by either the opposing party, witnesses or the Office. A participant is free to disclose facts and other information obtained from any source outside of the confidential proceedings. For example, an employing office or its representatives may disclose information about its employment practices and personnel actions, provided that the information was not obtained in a confidential proceeding. However, an employee who obtains that information in mediation or other confidential proceeding may not disclose such information. Similarly, information forming the basis for the allegation of a complaining employee may be disclosed by that employee, provided that the information contained in those allegations was not obtained in a confidential proceeding. However, the employing office or its representatives may not disclose that information if it was obtained in a confidential proceeding.

(e) *Violation of Confidentiality.* Any complaint regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions must be made to the Executive Director no later than 30 days after the date of the alleged violation. Such complaints may be referred by the Executive Director to a Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer is also authorized to initiate proceedings on his or her own initiative, or at the direction of the Board, if the alleged violation occurred in the context of Board proceedings. Upon a finding of a violation of the confidentiality provisions, the Hearing Officer, after notice and hearing, may impose an appropriate sanction, which may include any of the sanctions listed in section 7.02 of these rules, as well as any of the following:

(1) an order that the matters regarding which the violation occurred or any other designated facts shall be taken to be established against the violating party for the purposes of the action in accordance with the claim of the other party;

(2) an order refusing to allow the violating party to support or oppose designated claims or defenses, or prohibiting him from introducing designated matters in evidence;

(3) an order striking out pleadings or parts thereof, or staying further proceedings until the order is obeyed, or dismissing with or without prejudice the action or proceedings or any part thereof, or rendering a judgment by default against the violating party;

(4) in lieu of any of the foregoing orders or in addition thereto, the Hearing Officer shall require the party violating the confidentiality provisions or the representative advising him, or both, to pay, at such time as ordered by the Hearing Officer, the reasonable expenses, including attorney fees, caused by the violation, unless the Hearing Officer finds that the failure was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust. Such an order shall be subject to review on appeal of the final decision of the Hearing Officer under section 406 of the Act. No sanctions may be imposed under this section except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.]

Subpart B—Pre-Complaint Procedures Applicable to Consideration of Alleged Violations of Part A of Title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995

§ 2.01 Matters Covered by Subpart B

§ 2.02 Requests for Advice and Information

§ 2.03 Counseling

§ 2.04 Mediation

§ 2.05 Election of Proceedings

§ 2.06 Filing of Civil Action

§ 2.01 Matters Covered by Subpart B.

(a) These rules govern the processing of any allegation that sections 201 through 206 of the Act have been violated and any allegation of intimidation or reprisal prohibited under section 207 of the Act. Sections 201 through 206 of the Act apply to covered employees and employing offices certain rights and protections of the following laws:

(10) Chapter 35 (relating to veteran's preference) of title 5, United States Code

(11) Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008.

(b) This subpart applies to the covered employees and employing offices as defined in section 1.02(b) and (h) of these rules and any activities within the coverage of sections 201 through 206(a) and 207 of the Act and referenced above in section 2.01(a) of these rules.

§ 2.03 Counseling.

(a) *Initiating a Proceeding; Formal Request for Counseling.* **[In order]** To initiate a proceeding under these rules **regarding an alleged violation of the Act, as referred to in section 2.01(a), above**, an employee shall file a written request for counseling with the Office **[.]** **[regarding an alleged violation of the Act, as referred to in section 2.01(a), above.]** **The written formal request for counseling should be on an official form provided by the Office and can be found on the Office's website at www.compliance.gov.** **[All requests for counseling shall be confidential, unless the employee agrees to waive his or her right to confidentiality under section 2.03(e)(2), below.]**

(b) *Who May Request Counseling.* A covered employee **who, in good faith**, believes that he or she has been or is the subject of a violation of the Act as referred to in section 2.01(a) may formally request counseling.

(d) **[Purpose] Overview of the Counseling Period.** **The Office will maintain strict confidentiality throughout the counseling period. The [purpose of the] counseling period [shall] should be used:** to discuss the employee's concerns and elicit information regarding the matter(s) which the employee believes constitute a violation(s) of the Act; to advise the employee of his or her rights and responsibilities under the Act and the procedures of the Office under these rules; to evaluate the matter; and to assist the employee in achieving an early resolution of the matter, if possible.

(e) *Confidentiality and Waiver.*

(1) Absent a waiver under paragraph 2, below, all counseling shall be **kept** strictly confidential and **shall not be subject to discovery. All participants in counseling shall be advised of the requirement for confidentiality and that disclosure of information deemed confidential could result in sanctions later in the proceedings.** Nothing in these rules shall prevent a counselor from consulting with personnel within the Office concerning a matter in counseling, except that, when the person being counseled is an employee of the Office, the counselor shall not

consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness without the consent of the person requesting counseling. Nothing contained in these rules shall prevent the Executive Director from **compiling and publishing statistical information such as that required by Section 301(h)(3) of the Act.** **[so long as that statistical information does not reveal the identity of the employees involved or of employing offices that are the subject of a request for counseling.]**

(2) The employee and the Office may agree to waive confidentiality **[of]** during the counseling process for the limited purpose of **allowing the Office [contacting the employing office] to [obtain information] notify the employing office of the allegations.** **[to be used in counseling the employee or to attempt a resolution of any disputed matter(s).]** Such a limited waiver must be written on the form supplied by the Office and signed by both the counselor and the employee.

(g) *Role of Counselor [in Defining Concerns].* The counselor **[may]** shall:

(1) obtain the name, home and office mailing and e-mail addresses, and home and office telephone numbers of the person being counseled;

(2) obtain the name and title of the person(s) whom the employee claims has engaged in a violation of the Act, **e-mail address, if known**, and the employing office in which this person(s) works;

(5) obtain the name, **business and e-mail** addresses, and telephone number of the employee's representative, if any, and whether the representative is an attorney.

[(i)](h) Counselor Not a Representative. The counselor shall inform the person being counseled that the counselor does not represent either the employing office or the employee. The counselor provides information regarding the Act and the Office and may act as a third-party intermediary with the goals of increasing the individual's understanding of his or her rights and responsibilities under the Act and of promoting the early resolution of the matter.

[(j)] (i) Duration of Counseling Period. The period for counseling shall be 30 days, beginning on the date that the request for counseling is **[received by the Office]** filed by the employee in accordance with section 1.03(a) of these rules, unless the employee requests in writing on a form provided by the Office to reduce the period and the **[Office] Executive Director** agrees **[to reduce the period].**

[(h)] (j) Role of Counselor in Attempting Informal Resolution. In order to attempt to resolve the matter brought to the attention of the counselor, the counselor must obtain a waiver of confidentiality pursuant to section 2.03(e)(2) of these rules. If the employee executes such a waiver, the counselor may:

(1) conduct a limited inquiry for the purpose of obtaining any information necessary to attempt an informal resolution or formal settlement;

(2) reduce to writing any formal settlement achieved and secure the signatures of the employee, his or her representative, if any, and a member of the employing office who is authorized to enter into a settlement on the employing office's behalf; and, pursuant to section 414 of the Act and section 9.05 of these rules, seek the approval of the Executive Director. Nothing in this subsection, however, precludes the employee, the employing office or their representatives from reducing to writing any formal settlement.

(k) *Duty to Proceed.* An employee who initiates a proceeding under this part shall be re-

sponsible at all times for proceeding, regardless of whether he or she has designated a representative, and **shall notify the Office in writing of any change in pertinent contact information, such as address, e-mail, fax number, etc.** An employee, however, may withdraw from counseling once without prejudice to the employee's right to reinstate counseling regarding the same matter, provided that the request to reinstate counseling **must be in writing and is [received in] filed with the Office not later than 180 days after the date of the alleged violation of the Act and that counseling on a single matter will not last longer than a total of 30 days.**

(1) *Conclusion of the Counseling Period and Notice.* The Executive Director shall notify the employee in writing of the end of the counseling period **[.]** by **[certified mail, return receipt requested,] first class mail, [or by] personal delivery evidenced by a written receipt, or electronic transmission.** The Executive Director, as part of the notification of the end of the counseling period, shall inform the employee of the right and obligation, should the employee choose to pursue his or her claim, to file with the Office a request for mediation within 15 days after receipt by the employee of the notice of the end of the counseling period.

(m) *Employees of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and Capitol Police.*

(1) Where an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police requests counseling under the Act and these rules, the Executive Director, **in his or her sole discretion**, may recommend that the employee use the **[grievance] internal** procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Architect of the Capitol and the Office or the Capitol Police and the Office addressing certain procedural and notification requirements. The term **“[grievance] internal procedure(s)”** refers to any internal procedure of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police, including grievance procedures referred to in section 401 of the Act, that can provide a resolution of the matter(s) about which counseling was requested. Pursuant to section 401 of the Act when the Executive Director makes such a recommendation, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) The Executive Director shall recommend in writing to the employee that the employee use an **[grievance] internal** procedure of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police, as appropriate, for a period generally up to 90 days, unless the Executive Director determines, **in writing**, that a longer period is appropriate **[for resolution of the employee's complaint through the grievance procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police].** Once the employee notifies the Office that he or she is using the internal procedure, the employee shall provide a waiver of confidentiality to allow the Executive Director to notify the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police that the employee will be using the internal procedure.

(ii) The period during which the matter is pending in the internal procedure shall not count against the time available for counseling or mediation under the Act.

(iii) If the dispute is resolved to the employee's satisfaction, the employee shall so notify the Office within 20 days after the employee has been served with a final decision.

[(ii)] (iv) After **[having contacted the Office and having utilized] using the [grievance] internal** procedures **[of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police]**, the employee may notify the Office that he or she wishes

to return to the procedures under these rules:

(A) within 60 days after the expiration of the period recommended by the Executive Director, or longer if the Executive Director has extended the time period, if the matter has not resulted in a final decision or a decision not to proceed; or

(B) within 20 days after service of a final decision or a decision not to proceed, resulting from the [grievance] internal procedures [of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police Board.]

[(iii) The period during which the matter is pending in the internal grievance procedure shall not count against the time available for counseling or mediation under the Act. If the grievance is resolved to the employee's satisfaction, the employee shall so notify the Office within 20 days after the employee has received service of the final decision resulting from the grievance procedure. If no request to return to the procedures under these rules is received within 60 days after the expiration of the period recommended by the Executive Director the Office will issue a Notice of End of Counseling, as specified in section 2.04(i) of these Rules.]

(v) If a request to return to counseling is not made by the employee within the time periods outlined above, the Office will issue a Notice of the End of Counseling.

(2) Notice to Employees who Have Not Initiated Counseling with the Office. When an employee of the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police raises in the internal procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police [Board] an allegation which may also be raised under the procedures set forth in this subpart, the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police [Board should] shall, in accordance with the MOU with the Office, advise the employee in writing that a request for counseling about the allegation must be initiated with the Office within 180 days after the alleged violation of law occurred if the employee intends to use the procedures of the Office.

(3) Notice in Final Decisions when Employees Have Not Initiated Counseling with the Office. When an employee raises in the internal procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police [Board] an allegation which may also be raised under the procedures set forth in this subpart, any [final] decision issued [pursuant to the procedures of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Capitol Police Board should] under such procedure, shall, pursuant to the MOU with the Office, include notice to the employee of his or her right to initiate the procedures under these rules within 180 days after the alleged violation occurred.

(4) Notice in Final Decisions when There Has Been a Recommendation by the Executive Director. When the Executive Director has made a recommendation under paragraph 1 above, the Architect of the Capitol or the Capitol Police [Board should] shall, pursuant to the MOU with the Office, include with the final decision notice to the employee of his or her right to resume the procedures under these rules within 20 days after service on the employee of the final decision and shall transmit a copy of the final decision, settlement agreement, or other final disposition of the case to the Executive Director.

§ 2.04 Mediation.

(a) [Explanation] Overview. Mediation is a process in which employees, employing offices and their representatives, if any, meet separately and/or jointly with a [neutral] mediator trained to assist them in resolving disputes. As [parties to] participants in the

mediation, employees, employing offices, and their representatives discuss alternatives to continuing their dispute, including the possibility of reaching a voluntary, mutually satisfactory resolution. The [neutral] mediator has no power to impose a specific resolution, and the mediation process, whether or not a resolution is reached, is strictly confidential, pursuant to section 416 of the Act.

(b) Initiation. Not more than 15 days after receipt by the employee of the notice of the conclusion of the counseling period under section 2.03(l), the employee may file with the Office a written request for mediation. Except to provide for the services of a mediator and notice to the employing office, the invocation of mediation shall be kept confidential by the Office. The request for mediation shall contain the employee's name, home and e-mail addresses, [and] telephone number, and the name of the employing office that is the subject of the request. Failure to request mediation within the prescribed period [will] may preclude the employee's further pursuit of his or her claim. If a request for mediation is not filed within 15 days of receipt of a Notice of the End of Counseling, without good cause shown, the case will be closed and the employee will be so notified.

(d) Selection of [Neutrals] Mediators; Disqualification. Upon receipt of the request for mediation, the Executive Director shall assign one or more [neutrals] mediators to commence the mediation process. In the event that a [neutral] mediator considers him or herself unable to perform in a neutral role in a given situation, he or she shall withdraw from the matter and immediately shall notify the Office of the withdrawal. Any party may ask the Office to disqualify a [neutral] mediator by filing a written request, including the reasons for such request, with the Executive Director. This request shall be filed as soon as the party has reason to believe there is a basis for disqualification. The Executive Director's decision on this request shall be final and unreviewable.

(e) Duration and Extension.

(2) The [Office] Executive Director may extend the mediation period upon the joint written request of the parties, or of the appointed mediator on behalf of the parties[, to the attention of the Executive Director]. The request shall be written and filed with the [Office] Executive Director no later than the last day of the mediation period. The request shall set forth the joint nature of the request and the reasons therefore, and specify when the parties expect to conclude their discussions. Requests for additional extensions may be made in the same manner. Approval of any extensions shall be within the sole discretion of the [Office] Executive Director.

(f) Procedures.

(1) The [Neutral's] Mediator's Role. After assignment of the case, the [neutral] mediator will promptly contact the parties. The [neutral] mediator has the responsibility to conduct the mediation, including deciding how many meetings are necessary and who may participate in each meeting. The [neutral] mediator may accept and may ask the parties to provide written submissions.

(2) The Agreement to Mediate. At the commencement of the mediation, the [neutral] mediator will ask the [parties] participants and/or their representatives to sign an agreement prepared by the Office ("the Agreement to Mediate"). The Agreement to Medi-

ate will define what is to be kept confidential during mediation and set out the conditions under which mediation will occur, including the requirement that the participants adhere to the confidentiality of the process and a notice that a breach of the mediation agreement could result in sanctions later in the proceedings. The Agreement to Mediate will also provide that the parties to the mediation will not seek to have the counselor or the [neutral] mediator participate, testify or otherwise present evidence in any subsequent administrative action under section 405 or any civil action under section 408 of the Act or any other proceeding.

(g) Who May Participate. The covered employee[, and the employing office], their respective representatives, and the Office may meet, jointly or separately, with the neutral. A representative of the employee and a representative of the employing who has actual authority to agree to a settlement agreement on behalf of the employee or the employing office, as the case may be, must be present at the mediation or must be immediately accessible by telephone during the mediation. [may elect to participate in mediation proceedings through a designated representative, provided, that the representative has actual authority to agree to a settlement agreement or has immediate access by telephone to someone with actual settlement authority, and provided further, that should the mediator deem it appropriate at any time, the physical presence in mediation of any party may be required. The Office may participate in the mediation process through a representative and/or observer. The mediator will determine, as best serves the interests of mediation, whether the participants may meet jointly or separately with the mediator.

(h) Informal Resolutions and Settlement Agreements. At any time during mediation the parties may resolve or settle a dispute in accordance with section [9.05] 9.03 of these rules.

(i) Conclusion of the Mediation Period and Notice. If, at the end of the mediation period, the parties have not resolved the matter that forms the basis of the request for mediation, the Office shall provide the employee, and the employing office, and their representatives, with written notice that the mediation period has concluded. The written notice [to the employee] will be [sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, or will be] personally delivered evidenced by a written receipt, or sent by first class mail, e-mail, or fax. [, and it] The notice will specify the mode of delivery and also [notify] provide information about the employee's [of his or her] right to elect to file a complaint with the Office in accordance with section 405 of the Act and section 5.01 of these rules or to file a civil action pursuant to section 408 of the Act and section [2.06] 2.07 of these rules.

(j) Independence of the Mediation Process and the [Neutral] Mediator. The Office will maintain the independence of the mediation process and the [neutral] mediator. No individual, who is appointed by the Executive Director to mediate, may conduct or aid in a hearing conducted under section 405 of the Act with respect to the same matter or shall be subject to subpoena or any other compulsory process with respect to the same matter.

[(k) Confidentiality. Except as necessary to consult with the parties, the parties' their counsel or other designated representatives, the parties to, the mediation, the neutral and the Office shall not disclose, in whole or in part, any information or records obtained through, or prepared specifically for, the mediation process.

This rule shall not preclude a neutral from consulting with the Office, except that when the covered employee is an employee of the Office a neutral shall not consult with any individual within the Office who might be a party or witness. This rule shall also not preclude the Office from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives that does not reveal the identity of the employees or employing offices involved in the mediation. All parties to the action and their representatives will be advised of the confidentiality requirements of this process and of the sanctions that might be imposed for violating these requirements.]

(k) **Violation of Confidentiality in Mediation.** An allegation regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions may be made by a party in a mediation to the mediator during the mediation period and, if not resolved by agreement in mediation, to a Hearing Officer during proceedings brought under Section 405 of the Act.

§ 2.05 Election of Proceeding.

(a) Pursuant to section 404 of the Act, not later than 90 days after a covered employee receives notice of the end of mediation under section 2.04(i) of these rules but no sooner than 30 days after that date, the covered employee may either:

(2) file a civil action in accordance with section 408 of the Act and section 2.06 2.07, below in the United States [District Court] district court for the district in which the employee is employed or for the District of Columbia.

(b) A covered employee who files a civil action pursuant to section [2.06] 408 of the Act and section 2.07 below, may not thereafter file a complaint under section 405 of the Act and section 5.01 below on the same matter.

§ 2.06 Certification of the Official Record

(a) Certification of the Official Record shall contain the date the Request for Counseling was made; the date and method of delivery the Notification of End of Counseling Period was sent to the complainant; the date the Notice was deemed by the Office to have been received by the complainant; the date the Request for Mediation was filed; the date and method of delivery the Notification of End of Mediation Period was sent to the complainant; and the date the Notice was deemed by the Office to have been received by the complainant.

(b) At any time after a complaint has been filed with the Office in accordance with section 405 of the Act and the procedure set out in section 5.01, below; or a civil action filed in accordance with section 408 of the Act and section 2.07 below in the United States district court, a party may request and receive from the Office Certification of the Official Record.

(c) Certification of the Official Record will not be provided until after a complaint has been filed with the Office or the Office has been notified that a civil action has been filed in district court.

§ [2.06] 2.07 Filing of Civil Action.

(c) **Communication Regarding Civil Actions Filed with District Court.** The party filing any civil action with the United States District Court pursuant to sections 404(2) and 408 of the Act shall provide a written notice to the Office that the party has filed a civil action, specifying the district court in which the civil action was filed and the case number. Failure to notify the Office that such action

has been filed may result in delay in the preparation and receipt of the Certification of the Official Record.

Subpart C—Compliance, Investigation, and Enforcement under Section 210 of the CAA (ADA Public Services)—Inspections and Complaints

§ 3.01 Purpose and Scope

§ 3.02 Authority for Inspection

§ 3.03 Request for Inspections by Members of the Public

§ 3.04 Objection to Inspection

§ 3.05 Entry Not a Waiver

§ 3.06 Advance Notice of Inspection

§ 3.07 Conduct of Inspections

§ 3.08 Representatives of Covered Entities

§ 3.09 Consultation with Individuals with Disabilities

§ 3.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review

§ 3.11 Charge filed with the General Counsel

§ 3.12 Service of charge or notice of charge

§ 3.13 Investigations by the General Counsel

§ 3.14 Mediation

§ 3.15 Dismissal of charge

§ 3.16 Complaint by the General Counsel

§ 3.17 Settlement

§ 3.18 Compliance date

§ 3.01 Purpose and Scope.

The purpose of sections 3.01 through 3.18 of this subpart is to prescribe rules and procedures for enforcement of the inspection and complaint provisions of sections 210(d) and (f) of the CAA. For the purpose of sections 3.01 through 3.18, references to the "General Counsel" include any authorized representative of the General Counsel. In situations where sections 3.01 through 3.18 set forth general enforcement policies rather than substantive or procedural rules, such policies may be modified in specific circumstances where the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee determines that an alternative course of action would better serve the objectives of section 210 of the CAA.

§ 3.02 Authority for Inspection.

(a) Under section 210(f)(1) of the CAA, the General Counsel is authorized to enter without delay and at reasonable times any facility of any entity listed in section 210(a) ("covered entities"), to inspect and investigate during regular working hours and at other reasonable times, and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, any facility, and all pertinent conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment and materials therein; to question privately any covered entity, employee, operator, or agent; and to review records maintained by or under the control of the covered entity.

(b) Prior to inspecting areas containing information which is classified by an agency of the United States Government (and/or by any congressional committee or other authorized entity within the Legislative Branch) in the interest of national security, and for which security clearance is required as a condition for access to the area(s) to be inspected, the individual(s) conducting the inspection shall have obtained the appropriate security clearance.

§ 3.03 Requests for Inspections by Members of the Public and Covered Entities.

(a) By Members of the Public.

(1) Any person who believes that a violation of section 210 of the CAA exists in any facility of a covered entity may request an inspection of such facility by giving notice of the alleged violation to the General Counsel. Any such notice shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the

grounds for the notice, and shall be signed by the person or the representative of the person. A copy shall be provided to the covered entity or its agent by the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee no later than at the time of inspection, except that, upon the written request of the person giving such notice, his or her name and the names of individual employees referred to therein shall not appear in such copy or on any record published, released, or made available by the General Counsel. If the person making the request is a qualified individual with a disability, as defined by section 201(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (42 U.S.C. 12131(2)), the request for inspection shall be considered a charge of discrimination within the meaning of section 210(d)(1) of the CAA.

(2) If upon receipt of such notification the General Counsel's designee determines that the notice meets the requirements set forth in subparagraph (1) of this section, and that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the alleged violation exists, he or she shall cause an inspection to be made as soon as practicable, to determine if such alleged violation exists. Inspections under this section shall not be limited to matters referred to in the notice.

(3) Prior to or during any inspection of a facility, any person may notify the General Counsel's designee, in writing, of any violation of section 210 of the CAA which he or she has reason to believe exists in such facility. Any such notice shall comply with the requirements of subparagraph (1) of this section.

(b) **By Covered Entities.** Upon written request of any covered entity, the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee shall inspect and investigate facilities of covered entities under section 210(d) of the CAA. Any such requests shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office.

§ 3.04 Objection to Inspection.

Upon a refusal to permit the General Counsel's designee, in exercise of his or her official duties, to enter without delay and at reasonable times any place of employment or any place therein, to inspect, to review records, or to question any covered entity, operator, agent, or employee, in accordance with section 3.02 or to permit a representative of employees to accompany the General Counsel's designee during the physical inspection of any facility in accordance with section 3.07, the General Counsel's designee shall terminate the inspection or confine the inspection to other areas, conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment, materials, records, or interviews concerning which no objection is raised. The General Counsel's designee shall endeavor to ascertain the reason for such refusal, and shall immediately report the refusal and the reason therefor to the General Counsel, who shall take appropriate action.

§ 3.05 Entry Not a Waiver.

Any permission to enter, inspect, review records, or question any person, shall not imply or be conditioned upon a waiver of any cause of action under section 210 of the CAA.

§ 3.06 Advance Notice of Inspections.

(a) Advance notice of inspections may not be given, except in the following situations:

(1) in circumstances where the inspection can most effectively be conducted after regular business hours or where special preparations are necessary for an inspection;

(2) where necessary to assure the presence of representatives of the covered entity and employees or the appropriate personnel needed to aid in the inspection; and

(3) in other circumstances where the General Counsel determines that the giving of advance notice would enhance the probability of an effective and thorough inspection.

(b) In the situations described in paragraph (a) of this section, advance notice of inspections may be given only if authorized by the General Counsel or by the General Counsel's designee.

§ 3.07 Conduct of Inspections.

(a) Subject to the provisions of section 3.02, inspections shall take place at such times and in such places of employment as the General Counsel may direct. At the beginning of an inspection, the General Counsel's designee shall present his or her credentials to the operator of the facility or the management employee in charge at the facility to be inspected; explain the nature and purpose of the inspection; and indicate generally the scope of the inspection and the records specified in section 3.02 which he or she wishes to review. However, such designation of records shall not preclude access to additional records specified in section 3.02.

(b) The General Counsel's designee shall have authority to take or obtain photographs related to the purpose of the inspection, employ other reasonable investigative techniques, and question privately, any covered entity, operator, agent or employee of a covered facility. As used herein, the term "employ other reasonable investigative techniques" includes, but is not limited to, the use of measuring devices, testing equipment, or other equipment used to assess accessibility or compliance with the ADA Standards.

(c) In taking photographs and samples, the General Counsel's designees shall take reasonable precautions to ensure that such actions with flash, spark-producing, or other equipment would not be hazardous. The General Counsel's designees shall comply with all employing office safety and health rules and practices at the workplace or location being inspected, and they shall wear and use appropriate protective clothing and equipment.

(d) The conduct of inspections shall be such as to preclude unreasonable disruption of the operations of the covered entity.

(e) At the conclusion of an inspection, the General Counsel's designee shall confer with the covered entity or its representative and informally advise it of any apparent ADA violations disclosed by the inspection. During such conference, the employing office shall be afforded an opportunity to bring to the attention of the General Counsel's designee any pertinent information regarding accessibility in the facility.

(f) Inspections shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of this subpart.

§ 3.08 Representatives of Covered Entities.

(a) The General Counsel's designee shall be in charge of inspections and questioning of persons. A representative of the covered entity shall be given an opportunity to accompany the General Counsel's designee during the physical inspection of any facility for the purpose of aiding such inspection. The General Counsel's designee may permit additional representatives from the covered entity to accompany the designee where he or she determines that such additional representatives will further aid the inspection. A different covered entity representative may accompany the General Counsel's designee during each different phase of an inspection if this will not interfere with the conduct of the inspection.

(b) The General Counsel's designee shall have authority to resolve all disputes as to

whom is the representative authorized by the covered entity for the purpose of this section.

(c) If in the judgment of the General Counsel's designee, good cause has been shown why accompaniment by a third party who is not the requestor or an employee of the covered entity (such as a sign language interpreter, braille reader, architect or accessibility expert) is reasonably necessary to the conduct of an effective and thorough physical inspection of the workplace, such third party may accompany the General Counsel's designee during the inspection.

(d) The General Counsel's designee may deny the right of accompaniment under this section to any person whose conduct interferes with a fair and orderly inspection. With regard to information classified by an agency of the U.S. Government (and/or by any congressional committee or other authorized entity within the Legislative Branch) in the interest of national security, only persons authorized to have access to such information may accompany the General Counsel's designee in areas containing such information.

§ 3.09 Consultation with Individuals with Disabilities

The General Counsel's designee may consult with individuals with disabilities concerning matters of accessibility to the extent he or she deems necessary for the conduct of an effective and thorough inspection. During the course of an inspection, any person shall be afforded an opportunity to bring any violation of section 210 of the CAA which he or she has reason to believe exists in the facility to the attention of the General Counsel's designee.

§ 3.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review.

(a) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a violation exists under section 210 of the CAA, he or she shall notify the party making the request of such determination. The complaining party may obtain review of such determination by submitting a written statement of position with the General Counsel and, at the same time, providing the covered entity with a copy of such statement. The covered entity may submit an opposing written statement of position with the General Counsel and, at the same time, provide the complaining party with a copy of such statement. Upon the request of the complaining party or the covered entity, the General Counsel, at his or her discretion, may hold an informal conference in which the complaining party and the covered entity may orally present their views. After considering all written and oral views presented, the General Counsel shall affirm, modify, or reverse the designee's determination and furnish the complaining party and the covered entity with written notification of this decision and the reasons therefor. The decision of the General Counsel shall be final and not reviewable.

(b) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because the requirements of section 3.03(a)(1) have not been met, he or she shall notify the complaining party in writing of such determination. Such determination shall be without prejudice to the filing of a new notice of alleged violation meeting the requirements of section 3.03(a)(1).

§ 3.11 Charge filed with the General Counsel.

(a) Who may file.

(1) Any qualified individual with a disability, as defined in section 201(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42

U.S.C. 12131(2)), as applied by section 210 of the CAA, who believes that he or she has been subjected to discrimination on the basis of a disability in violation of section 210 of the CAA by a covered entity, may file a charge against any entity responsible for correcting the violation with the General Counsel. A charge may not be filed under section 210 of the CAA by a covered employee alleging employment discrimination on the basis of disability; the exclusive remedy for such discrimination are the procedures under section 201 of the CAA and subpart B of the Office's procedural rules.

(b) When to file. A charge under this section must be filed with the General Counsel not later than 180 days from the date of the alleged discrimination.

(c) Form and Contents. A charge shall be written or typed on a charge form available from the Office. All charges shall be signed and verified by the qualified individual with a disability (hereinafter referred to as the "charging party"), or his or her representative, and shall contain the following information:

(i) the full name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number(s) of the charging party;

(ii) the name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the covered entity(ies) against which the charge is brought, if known (hereinafter referred to as the "respondent");

(iii) the name(s) and title(s) of the individual(s), if known, involved in the conduct that the charging party claims is a violation of section 210 and/or the location and description of the places or conditions within covered facilities that the charging party claims is a violation of section 210;

(iv) a description of the conduct, locations, or conditions that form the basis of the charge, and a brief description of why the charging party believes the conduct, locations, or conditions is a violation of section 210; and (v) the name, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the representative, if any, who will act on behalf of the charging party.

§ 3.12 Service of charge or notice of charge.

Within ten (10) days after the filing of a charge with the General Counsel's Office (excluding weekends or holidays), the General Counsel shall serve the respondent with a copy of the charge, except when it is determined that providing a copy of the charge would impede the law enforcement functions of the General Counsel. Where a copy of the charge is not provided, the respondent will be served with a notice of the charge within ten (10) days after the filing of the charge. The notice shall include the date, place and circumstances of the alleged violation of section 210. The notice may not include the identity of the person filing the charge if that person has requested anonymity.

§ 3.13 Investigations by the General Counsel.

The General Counsel or the General Counsel's designated representative shall promptly investigate each charge alleging violations of section 210 of the CAA. As part of the investigation, the General Counsel will accept any statement of position or evidence with respect to the charge which the charging party or the respondent wishes to submit. The General Counsel will use other methods to investigate the charge, as appropriate.

§ 3.14 Mediation.

If, upon investigation, the General Counsel believes that a violation of section 210 may have occurred and that mediation may be helpful in resolving the dispute, the General

Counsel may request, but not participate in, mediation under subsections (b) through (d) of section 403 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder, between the charging party and any entity responsible for correcting the alleged violation.

§ 3.15 Dismissal of charge.

Where the General Counsel determines that a complaint will not be filed, the General Counsel shall dismiss the charge.

§ 3.16 Complaint by the General Counsel.

(a) After completing the investigation, and where mediation under section 3.14, if any, has not succeeded in resolving the dispute, and where the General Counsel has not settled or dismissed the charge, and if the General Counsel believes that a violation of section 210 may have occurred, the General Counsel may file with the Office a complaint against any entity responsible for correcting the violation.

(b) The complaint filed by the General Counsel under subsection (a) shall be submitted to a hearing officer for decision pursuant to subsections (b) through (h) of section 405 of the CAA. Any person who has filed a charge under section 3.11 of these rules may intervene as of right with the full rights of a party. The procedures of sections 405 through 407 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder shall apply to hearings and related proceedings under this subpart.

§ 3.17 Settlement.

Any settlement entered into by the parties to any process described in section 210 of the CAA shall be in writing and not become effective unless it is approved by the Executive Director under section 414 of the CAA and the Office's procedural rules thereunder.

§ 3.18 Compliance Date.

In any proceedings under this section, compliance shall take place as soon as possible, but not later than the fiscal year following the end of the fiscal year in which the order requiring correction becomes final and not subject to further review.

Subpart D—Compliance, Investigation, Enforcement and Variance Process under Section 215 of the CAA (Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970)—Inspections, Citations, and Complaints

§ 4.01 Purpose and Scope

§ 4.02 Authority for Inspection

§ 4.03 Request for Inspections by Employees and Covered Employing Offices

§ 4.04 Objection to Inspection

§ 4.05 Entry Not a Waiver

§ 4.06 Advance Notice of Inspection

§ 4.07 Conduct of Inspections

§ 4.08 Representatives of Employing Offices and Employees

§ 4.09 Consultation with Employees

§ 4.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review

§ 4.11 Citations

§ 4.12 Imminent Danger

§ 4.13 Posting of Citations

§ 4.14 Failure to Correct a Violation for Which a Citation Has Been Issued; Notice of Failure to Correct Violation; Complaint

§ 4.15 Informal Conferences

Rules of Practice for Variances, Limitations, Variations, Tolerances, and Exemptions

§ 4.20 Purpose and Scope

§ 4.21 Definitions

§ 4.22 Effect of Variances

§ 4.23 Public Notice of a Granted Variance, Limitation, Variation, Tolerance, or Exemption

§ 4.24 Form of Documents

§ 4.25 Applications for Temporary Variances and other Relief

§ 4.26 Applications for Permanent Variances and other Relief

§ 4.27 Modification or Revocation of Orders

§ 4.28 Action on Applications

§ 4.29 Consolidation of Proceedings

§ 4.30 Consent Findings and Rules or Orders

§ 4.31 Order of Proceedings and Burden of Proof

Inspections, Citations and Complaints

* * * * *

§ 4.02 Authority for Inspection.

(a) Under section 215(c)(1) of the CAA, upon written request of any employing office or covered employee, the General Counsel is authorized to enter without delay and at reasonable times any place **where covered employees work ("place of employment")** [of employment under the jurisdiction of an employing office]; to inspect and investigate during regular working hours and at other reasonable times, and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, any such place of employment, and all pertinent conditions, structures, machines, apparatus, devices, equipment and materials therein; to question privately any employing office, operator, agent or employee; and to review records **maintained by or under the control of the covered entity.** [required by the CAA and regulations promulgated thereunder, and other records which are directly related to the purpose of the inspection.]

§ 4.03 Requests for Inspections by Employees and Covered Employing Offices.

(a) *By Covered Employees and Representatives.*

(1) Any covered employee or representative of covered employees who believes that a violation of section 215 of the CAA exists in any place of employment [under the jurisdiction of employing offices] may request an inspection of such place of employment by giving notice of the alleged violation to the General Counsel. Any such notice shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office, shall set forth with reasonable particularity the grounds for the notice, and shall be signed by the employee or the representative of the employees. A copy shall be provided to the employing office or its agent by the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee no later than at the time of inspection, except that, upon the written request of the person giving such notice, his or her name and the names of individual employees referred to therein shall not appear in such copy or on any record published, released, or made available by the General Counsel.

* * * * *

(b) *By Employing Offices.* Upon written request of any employing office, the General Counsel or the General Counsel's designee shall inspect and investigate places of employment [under the jurisdiction of employing offices] under section 215(c)(1) of the CAA. Any such requests shall be reduced to writing on a form available from the Office.

* * * * *

§ 4.10 Inspection Not Warranted; Informal Review.

(a) If the General Counsel's designee determines that an inspection is not warranted because there are no reasonable grounds to believe that a violation or danger exists with respect to a notice of violation under section 4.03(a), he or she shall notify the party giving the notice [in writing] of such determination in writing. The complaining party

may obtain review of such determination by submitting **and serving** a written statement of position with the General Counsel[,] and [, at the same time, providing] the employing office [with a copy of such statement by certified mail]. The employing office may submit **and serve** an opposing written statement of position with the General Counsel[,] and [, at the same time, provide] the complaining party [with a copy of such statement by certified mail].

Upon the request of the complaining party or the employing office, the General Counsel, at his or her discretion, may hold an informal conference in which the complaining party and the employing office may orally present their views. After considering all written and oral views presented, the General Counsel shall affirm, modify, or reverse the designee's determination and furnish the complaining party and the employing office with written notification of this decision and the reasons therefor. The decision of the General Counsel shall be final and not reviewable.

* * * * *

§ 4.11 Citations.

(a) If, on the basis of the inspection, the General Counsel believes that a violation of any requirement of section 215 of the CAA, [or of] including any occupational safety or health standard promulgated by the Secretary of Labor under Title 29 of the U.S. Code, section 655, or of any other regulation [standard], rule or order promulgated pursuant to section 215 of the CAA, has occurred, he or she shall issue to the employing office responsible for correction of the violation [, as determined under section 1.106 of the Board's regulations implementing section 215 of the CAA.] either a citation or a notice of de minimis violations that [have] has no direct or immediate relationship to safety or health. An appropriate citation or notice of de minimis violations shall be issued even though, after being informed of an alleged violation by the General Counsel, the employing office immediately abates, or initiates steps to abate, such alleged violation. Any citation shall be issued with reasonable promptness after termination of the inspection. No citation may be issued under this section after the expiration of 6 months following the occurrence of any alleged violation **unless the violation is continuing or the employing office has agreed to toll the deadline for filing the citation.**

* * * * *

§ 4.13 Posting of Citations.

(a) Upon receipt of any citation under section 215 of the CAA, the employing office shall immediately post such citation, or a copy thereof, unedited, at or near each place an alleged violation referred to in the citation occurred, except as provided below. Where, because of the nature of the employing office's operations, it is not practicable to post the citation at or near each place of alleged violation, such citation shall be posted, unedited, in a prominent place where it will be readily observable by all affected employees. For example, where employing offices are engaged in activities which are physically dispersed, the citation may be posted at the location to which employees report each day. Where employees do not primarily work at or report to a single location, the citation may be posted at the location from which the employees operate to carry out their activities. **When a citation contains security information as defined in Title 2 of the U.S. Code, section 1979, the General Counsel may edit or redact the security information from the copy of the citation used**

for posting or may provide to the employing office a notice for posting that describes the alleged violation without referencing the security information. The employing office shall take steps to ensure that the citation or notice is not altered, defaced, or covered by other material. Notices of de minimis violations need not be posted.

(b) Each citation, notice, or a copy thereof, shall remain posted until the violation has been abated, or for 3 working days, whichever is later. The pendency of any proceedings regarding the citation shall not affect its posting responsibility under this section unless and until the Board issues a final order vacating the citation.

§ 4.15 Informal Conferences.

At the request of an affected employing office, employee, or representative of employees, the General Counsel may hold an informal conference for the purpose of discussing any issues raised by an inspection, citation, or notice issued by the General Counsel. Any settlement entered into by the parties at such conference shall be subject to the approval of the Executive Director under section 414 of the CAA and section **[9.05] 9.03** of these rules. If the conference is requested by the employing office, an affected employee or the employee's representative shall be afforded an opportunity to participate, at the discretion of the General Counsel. If the conference is requested by an employee or representative of employees, the employing office shall be afforded an opportunity to participate, at the discretion of the General Counsel. Any party may be represented by counsel at such conference.

Subpart E—Complaints

§ 5.01 Complaints

§ 5.02 Appointment of the Hearing Officer

§ 5.03 Dismissal, Summary Judgment, and Withdrawal of Complaint

§ 5.04 Confidentiality

§ 5.01 Complaints.

(a) Who May File.

(1) An employee who has completed the mediation period under section 2.04 may timely file a complaint with the Office alleging any violation of sections 201 through 207 of the Act^[.], under the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, or any other statute made applicable under the Act.

(2) The General Counsel may timely file a complaint alleging a violation of section 210, 215 or 220 of the Act.

(b) When to File.

(1) A complaint may be filed by an employee no sooner than 30 days after the date of receipt of the notice under section 2.04(i), but no later than 90 days after receipt of that notice. In cases where a complaint is filed with the Office sooner than 30 days after the date of receipt of the notice under section 2.04(i), the Executive Director, at his or her discretion, may return the complaint to the employee for filing during the prescribed period without prejudice and with an explanation of the prescribed period of filing.

(c) Form and Contents.

(1) *Complaints Filed by Covered Employees.* A complaint shall be in writing and may be written or typed on a complaint form available from the Office. All complaints shall be signed by the covered employee, or his or her representative, and shall contain the following information:

(i) the name, mailing and e-mail addresses, and telephone number(s) of the complainant;

(v) a brief description of why the complainant believes the challenged conduct is a violation of the Act or the relevant sections of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act and the section(s) of the Act involved;

(vii) the name, mailing and e-mail addresses, and telephone number of the representative, if any, who will act on behalf of the complainant.

(2) *Complaints Filed by the General Counsel.* A complaint filed by the General Counsel shall be in writing, signed by the General Counsel or his designee and shall contain the following information:

(i) the name, mail and e-mail addresses, if available, and telephone number of, as applicable, (A) each entity responsible for correction of an alleged violation of section 210(b), (B) each employing office alleged to have violated section 215, or (C) each employing office and/or labor organization alleged to have violated section 220, against which complaint is brought;

(e) *Service of Complaint.* Upon receipt of a complaint or an amended complaint, the Office shall serve the respondent, or its designated representative, by hand delivery *[or certified mail]* or first class mail, e-mail, or facsimile with a copy of the complaint or amended complaint and *[a copy of these rules]* written notice of the availability of these rules at www.compliance.gov. A copy of these rules may also be provided if requested by either party. The Office shall include a service list containing the names and addresses of the parties and their designated representatives.

(f) *Answer.* Within 15 days after receipt of a copy of a complaint or an amended complaint, the respondent shall file an answer with the Office and serve one copy on the complainant. *[The answer shall contain a statement of the position of the respondent on each of the issues raised in the complaint or amended complaint, including admissions, denials, or explanations of each allegation made in the complaint and any affirmative defenses or other defenses to the complaint.]* In answering a complaint, a party must state in short and plain terms its defenses to each claim asserted against it and admit or deny the allegations asserted against it by an opposing party. Failure to *[file an answer]* deny an allegation, other than one relating to the amount of damages, or to raise a claim or defense as to any allegation(s) shall constitute an admission of such allegation(s). Affirmative defenses not raised in an answer that could have reasonably been anticipated based on the facts alleged in the complaint shall be deemed waived. A respondent's motion for leave to amend an answer to interpose a denial or affirmative defense will ordinarily be granted unless to do so would unduly prejudice the rights of the other party or unduly delay or otherwise interfere with or impede the proceedings.

(g) *Motion to Dismiss.* In addition to an answer, a respondent may file a motion to dismiss, or other responsive pleading with the Office and serve one copy on the complainant. Responses to any motions shall be in compliance with section 1.04(c) of these rules.

(h) *Confidentiality.* The fact that a complaint has been filed with the Office by a covered employee shall be kept confidential by the Office, except as allowed by these rules. **§ 5.02 Appointment of the Hearing Officer.**

Upon the filing of a complaint, the Executive Director will appoint an independent

Hearing Officer, who shall have the authority specified in sections 5.03 and 7.01(b) below. The Hearing Officer shall not be the counselor involved in or the *[neutral]* mediator who mediated the matter under sections 2.03 and 2.04 of these rules.

§ 5.03 Dismissal, Summary Judgment and Withdrawal of Complaints.

(f) *Withdrawal of Complaint by Complainant.* At any time a complainant may withdraw his or her own complaint by filing a notice with the Office for transmittal to the Hearing Officer and by serving a copy on the employing office or representative. Any such withdrawal must be approved by the Hearing Officer and may be with or without prejudice to refile at the Hearing Officer's discretion.

(g) *Withdrawal of Complaint by the General Counsel.* At any time prior to the opening of the hearing the General Counsel may withdraw his complaint by filing a notice with the Executive Director and the Hearing Officer and by serving a copy on the respondent. After opening of the hearing, any such withdrawal must be approved by the Hearing Officer and may be with or without prejudice to refile at the Hearing Officer's discretion.

(h) *Withdrawal From a Case by a Representative.* A representative must provide sufficient notice to the Hearing Officer and the parties of record of his or her withdrawal. Until the party designates another representative in writing, the party will be regarded as pro se.

§ 5.04 Confidentiality.

Pursuant to section 416(c) of the Act, except as provided in sub-sections 416(d), (e) and (f), all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including any related records, shall be confidential. Section 416(c) does not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but does apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under section 215. A violation of the confidentiality requirements of the Act and these rules *[could]* may result in the imposition of procedural or evidentiary sanctions. *[Nothing in these rules shall prevent the Executive Director from reporting statistical information to the Senate and House of Representatives, so long as that statistical information does not reveal the identity of the employees involved or of employing offices that are the subject of a matter.]* See also sections *[1.06] [1.07] 1.08* and 7.12 of these rules.

Subpart F—Discovery and Subpoenas

§ 6.01 Discovery

§ 6.02 Requests for Subpoenas

§ 6.03 Service

§ 6.04 Proof of Service

§ 6.05 Motion to Quash

§ 6.06 Enforcement

§ 6.01 Discovery.

(a) *[Explanation] Description.* Discovery is the process by which a party may obtain from another person, including a party, information, not privileged, reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, for the purpose of assisting that party in developing, preparing and presenting its case at the hearing. No discovery, oral or written, by any party shall *[This provision shall not be construed to permit any discovery, oral or written, to]* be taken of, or from, an employee of the Office of Compliance, *[or the]* counselor^(s), or mediator *[the neutral(s) involved in counseling and mediation.]*, including files, records, or notes produced during counseling and mediation and maintained by the Office.

(b) *Initial Disclosure.* *[Office Policy Regarding Discovery. It is the policy of the Office to*

encourage the early and voluntary exchange of relevant and material nonprivileged information between the parties, including the names and addresses of witnesses and copies of relevant and material documents, and to encourage Hearing Officers to develop procedures which allow for the greatest exchange of relevant and material information and which minimizes the need for parties to formally request such information.] Within 14 days after the pre-hearing conference and except as otherwise stipulated or ordered by the Hearing Officer, a party must, without awaiting a discovery request, provide to the other parties: the name and, if known, mail and e-mail addresses and telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information that the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses; and a copy or a description by category and location of all documents, electronically stored information, and tangible things that the disclosing party has in its possession, custody, or control and may use to support its claims or defenses.

(c) *Discovery Availability.* Pursuant to section 405(e) of the Act, [the Hearing Officer in his or her discretion may permit] the parties may engage in reasonable prehearing discovery. [In exercising that discretion, the Hearing Officer may be guided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.]

(1) The [Hearing Officer may authorize] parties may take discovery by one or more of the following methods: depositions upon oral examination or written questions; written interrogatories; production of documents or things or permission to enter upon land or other property for inspection or other purposes; physical and mental examinations; and requests for admission.

(2) The Hearing Officer may adopt standing orders or make any order setting forth the forms and extent of discovery, including orders limiting the number of depositions, interrogatories, and requests for production of documents, and may also limit the length of depositions.

(d) *Claims of Privilege.*

(1) *Information Withheld.* Whenever a party withholds information otherwise discoverable under these rules by claiming that it is privileged or confidential or subject to protection as hearing or trial preparation materials, the party shall make the claim expressly in writing and shall describe the nature of the documents, communications or things not produced or disclosed in a manner that, without revealing the information itself privileged or protected, will enable other parties to assess the applicability of the privilege or protection. A party must make a claim for privilege no later than the due date for the production of the information.

(2) *Information Produced As Inadvertent Disclosure.* If information produced in discovery is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as hearing preparation material, the party making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information to the Hearing Officer or the Board under seal for a determination of the claim. The producing party must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.

§ 6.02 Request for Subpoena.

(a) *Authority to Issue Subpoenas.* At the request of a party, a Hearing Officer may issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and for the production of correspondence, books, papers, documents, or other records. The attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required from any place within the United States. However, no subpoena by any party may be issued for the attendance or testimony of an employee [with] of the Office of Compliance, a counselor, or a mediator, including files, records, or notes produced during counseling and mediation and maintained by the Office. Employing offices shall make their employees available for discovery and hearing without requiring a subpoena.

(d) *Rulings.* The Hearing Officer shall promptly rule on the request for the subpoena.

* * * * *

Subpart G—Hearings

§ 7.01 The Hearing Officer

§ 7.02 Sanctions

§ 7.03 Disqualification of the Hearing Officer

§ 7.04 Motions and Prehearing Conference

§ 7.05 Scheduling the Hearing

§ 7.06 Consolidation and Joinder of Cases

§ 7.07 Conduct of Hearing; Disqualification of Representatives

§ 7.08 Transcript

§ 7.09 Admissibility of Evidence

§ 7.10 Stipulations

§ 7.11 Official Notice

§ 7.12 Confidentiality

§ 7.13 Immediate Board Review of a Ruling by a Hearing Officer

§ 7.14 Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; Posthearing Briefs

§ 7.15 Closing the record

§ 7.16 Hearing Officer Decisions; Entry in Records of the Office; Corrections to the Record; Motions to Alter, Amend or Vacate the Decision.

§ 7.01 The Hearing Officer.

(b) *Authority.* Hearing Officers shall conduct fair and impartial hearings and take all necessary action to avoid undue delay in the disposition of all proceedings. They shall have all powers necessary to that end unless otherwise limited by law, including, but not limited to, the authority to:

(14) maintain and enforce the confidentiality of proceedings; and

§ 7.02 Sanctions.

(b) The Hearing Officer may impose sanctions upon the parties under, but not limited to, the circumstances set forth in this section.

(1) *Failure to Comply with an Order.* When a party fails to comply with an order (including an order for the taking of a deposition, for the production of evidence within the party's control, or for production of witnesses), the Hearing Officer may:

[(a)](A) draw an inference in favor of the requesting party on the issue related to the information sought;

[(b)](B) stay further proceedings until the order is obeyed;

[(c)](C) prohibit the party failing to comply with such order from introducing evidence concerning, or otherwise relying upon, evidence relating to the information sought;

[(d)](D) permit the requesting party to introduce secondary evidence concerning the information sought;

[(e)](E) strike, in whole or in part, [any part of] the complaint, briefs, answer, or other submissions of the party failing to comply with the order, as appropriate;

[(f)](F) direct judgment against the non-complying party in whole or in part; or

[(g)](G) order that the non-complying party, or the representative advising that party, pay all or part of the attorney's fees and reasonable expenses of the other party or parties or of the Office, caused by such non-compliance, unless the Hearing Officer or the Board finds that the failure was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of attorney's fees and/or expenses unjust.

(2) *Failure to Prosecute or Defend.* If a party fails to prosecute or defend a position, the Hearing Officer may dismiss the action with prejudice or [rule for the complainant] decide the matter, where appropriate.

* * * * *

(4) *Filing of frivolous claims.* If a party files a frivolous claim, the Hearing Officer may dismiss the claim, in whole or in part, with prejudice or decide the matter for the party alleging the filing of the frivolous claim.

(5) *Failure to maintain confidentiality.* An allegation regarding a violation of the confidentiality provisions may be made to a Hearing Officer in proceedings under Section 405 of the CAA. If, after notice and hearing, the Hearing Officer determines that a party has violated the confidentiality provisions, the Hearing Officer may:

(A) direct that the matters related to the breach of confidentiality or other designated facts be taken as established for purposes of the action, as the prevailing party claims;

(B) prohibit the party breaching confidentiality from supporting or opposing designated claims or defenses, or from introducing designated matters in evidence;

(C) strike the pleadings in whole or in part;

(D) stay further proceedings until the breach of confidentiality is resolved to the extent possible;

(E) dismiss the action or proceeding in whole or in part; or

(F) render a default judgment against the party breaching confidentiality.

(c) No sanctions may be imposed under this section except for good cause and the particulars of which must be stated in the sanction order.

§ 7.04 Motions and Prehearing Conference.

(b) *Scheduling of the Prehearing Conference.* Within 7 days after assignment, the Hearing Officer shall serve on the parties and their designated representatives written notice setting forth the time, date, and place of the prehearing conference, except that the Executive Director may, for good cause, extend up to an additional 7 days the time for serving notice of the prehearing conference.

(c) *Prehearing Conference Memoranda.* The Hearing Officer may order each party to prepare a prehearing conference memorandum. At his or her discretion, the Hearing Officer may direct the filing of the memorandum after discovery by the parties has concluded. [That] The memorandum may include:

(3) the specific relief, including, where known, a calculation of [the amount of] any monetary relief [.] or damages that is being or will be requested;

(4) the names of potential witnesses for the party's case, except for potential impeachment or rebuttal witnesses, and the purpose

for which they will be called and a list of documents that the party is seeking from the opposing party, and, if discovery was permitted, the status of any pending request for discovery. (It is not necessary to list each document requested. Instead, the party may refer to the request for discovery.); and

(d) At the prehearing conference, the Hearing Officer may discuss the subjects specified in paragraph (c) above and the manner in which the hearing will be conducted **[and proceed]**. In addition, the Hearing Officer may explore settlement possibilities and consider how the factual and legal issues might be simplified and any other issues that might expedite the resolution of the dispute. The Hearing Officer shall issue an order, which recites the action taken at the conference and the agreements made by the parties as to any of the matters considered and which limits the issues to those not disposed of by admissions, **stipulations**, or agreements of the parties. Such order, when entered, shall control the course of the proceeding, subject to later modification by the Hearing Officer by his or her own motion or upon proper request of a party for good cause shown.

§ 7.05 Scheduling the Hearing.

(b) *Motions for Postponement or a Continuance.* Motions for postponement or for a continuance by either party shall be made in writing to the **[Office] Hearing Officer**, shall set forth the reasons for the request, and shall state whether the opposing party consents to such postponement. Such a motion may be granted **by the Hearing Officer** upon a showing of good cause. In no event will a hearing commence later than 90 days after the filing of the complaint.

§ 7.06 Consolidation and Joinder of Cases.

(b) *Authority.* The Executive Director prior to the assignment of a complaint to a **Hearing Officer**; a **Hearing Officer** during the hearing; or the Board **[, the Office, or a Hearing Officer]** during an appeal may consolidate or join cases on their own initiative or on the motion of a party if to do so would expedite processing of the cases and not adversely affect the interests of the parties, taking into account the confidentiality requirements of section 416 of the Act.

§ 7.07 Conduct of Hearing; Disqualification of Representatives.

(c) No later than the opening of the hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Hearing Officer, each party shall submit to the Hearing Officer and to the opposing party typed lists of the hearing exhibits and the witnesses **expected to be called to testify**, excluding **impeachment** or rebuttal witnesses **[, expected to be called to testify]**.

(f) Failure of either party to appear, present witnesses, or respond to an evidentiary order may result in an adverse finding or ruling by the Hearing Officer. At the discretion of the Hearing Officer, the hearing may also be held in absence of the complaining party if the representative for that party is present.

[(f)](g) If the Hearing Officer concludes that a representative of an employee, a witness, a charging party, a labor organization, an employing office, or an entity alleged to be responsible for correcting a violation has a conflict of interest, he or she may, after

giving the representative an opportunity to respond, disqualify the representative. In that event, within the time limits for hearing and decision established by the Act, the affected party shall be afforded reasonable time to retain other representation.

§ 7.08 Transcript.

(b) *Corrections.* Corrections to the official transcript will be permitted. Motions for correction must be submitted within 10 days of service of the transcript upon the **[party] parties**. Corrections of the official transcript will be permitted only upon approval of the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer may make corrections at any time with notice to the parties.

§ 7.12 Confidentiality.

(a) Pursuant to section 416 of the Act and section 1.08 of these Rules, all proceedings and deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board, including the transcripts of hearings and any related records, shall be confidential, except as specified in sections 416(d), (e), and (f) of the Act and section 1.08(d) of these Rules. All parties to the proceeding and their representatives, and witnesses who appear at the hearing, will be advised of the importance of confidentiality in this process and of their obligations, subject to sanctions, to maintain it. This provision shall not apply to proceedings under section 215 of the Act, but shall apply to the deliberations of Hearing Officers and the Board under that section.

(b) *Violation of Confidentiality.* An allegation regarding a violation of confidentiality occurring during a hearing may be resolved by a **Hearing Officer** in proceedings under Section 405 of the CAA. After providing notice and an opportunity to the parties to be heard, the **Hearing Officer**, in accordance with section 1.08(f) of these Rules, may make a finding of a violation of confidentiality and impose appropriate procedural or evidentiary sanctions, which may include any of the sanctions listed in section 7.02 of these Rules.

§ 7.13 Immediate Board Review of a Ruling by a Hearing Officer.

(b) *Time for Filing.* A motion by a party for interlocutory review of a ruling of the **Hearing Officer** shall be filed with the **Hearing Officer** within 5 days after service of the ruling upon the parties. The motion shall include arguments in support of both interlocutory review and the determination requested to be made by the Board upon review. Responses, if any, shall be filed with the **Hearing Officer** within 3 days after service of the motion.

[(b)](c) *Standards for Review.* In determining whether to **certify** and forward a request for interlocutory review to the Board, the **Hearing Officer** shall consider **all** of the following:

[(c)] *Time for Filing.* A motion by a party for interlocutory review of a ruling of the **Hearing Officer** shall be filed with the **Hearing Officer** within 5 days after service of the ruling upon the parties. The motion shall include arguments in support of both interlocutory review and the determination requested to be made by the Board upon review. Responses, if any, shall be filed with the **Hearing Officer** within 3 days after service of the motion.

(d) *Hearing Officer Action.* If **all** the conditions set forth in paragraph **[(b)](c)** above are met, the **Hearing Officer** shall **certify** and

forward a request for interlocutory review to the Board for its immediate consideration. Any such submission shall explain the basis on which the Hearing Officer concluded that the standards in paragraph **[(b)](c)** have been met. **The decision of the Hearing Office to forward or decline to forward a request for review is not appealable.**

(e) *Grant of Interlocutory Review Within Board's Sole Discretion.* **Upon the Hearing Officer's certification and decision to forward a request for review, [(b)]** the Board, in its sole discretion, may grant interlocutory review. **The Board's decision to grant or deny interlocutory review is not appealable.**

[(g)] *Denial of Motion not Appealable; Mandamus.* The grant or denial of a motion for a request for interlocutory review shall not be appealable. The **Hearing Officer** shall promptly bring a denial of such a motion, and the reasons therefor, to the attention of the Board. If, upon consideration of the motion and the reason for denial, the Board believes that interlocutory review is warranted, it may grant the review *sua sponte*. In addition, the Board may in its discretion, in extraordinary circumstances, entertain directly from a party a writ of mandamus to review a ruling of a **Hearing Officer**.

[(h)](g) *Procedures before Board.* Upon its [acceptance of a ruling of the **Hearing Officer** for] decision to grant interlocutory review, the Board shall issue an order setting forth the procedures that will be followed in the conduct of that review.

[(i)](h) *Review of a Final Decision.* Denial of interlocutory review will not affect a party's right to challenge rulings, which are otherwise appealable, as part of an appeal to the Board under section 8.01 from the **Hearing Officer's** decision issued under section 7.16 of these rules.

§ 7.14 Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law; Posthearing Briefs.

[(a)] *May be [Filed] Required.* The **Hearing Officer** may **[permit]** require the parties to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and/or posthearing briefs on the factual and the legal issues presented in the case.

[(b)] *Length.* No principal brief shall exceed 50 pages, or 12,500 words, and no reply brief shall exceed 25 pages, or 6,250 words, exclusive of tables and pages limited only to quotations of statutes, rules, and the like. Motions to file extended briefs shall be granted only for good cause shown; the **Hearing Officer** may in his or her discretion also reduce the page limits. Briefs in excess of 10 pages shall include an index and a table of authorities.

(c) *Format.* Every brief must be easily readable. Briefs must have double spacing between each line of text, except for quoted texts and footnotes, which may be single-spaced.

§ 7.15 Closing the Record of the Hearing.

(a) Except as provided in section 7.14, the record shall be closed at the conclusion of the hearing. However, when the **Hearing Officer** allows the parties to submit argument, briefs, documents or additional evidence previously identified for introduction, the record will remain open for as much time as the judge grants for that purpose [additional evidence previously identified for introduction, the **Hearing Officer** may allow an additional period before the conclusion of the hearing as is necessary for that purpose].

(b) Once the record is closed, no additional evidence or argument shall be accepted into the hearing record except upon a showing that new and material evidence has become available that was not available despite due diligence prior to the closing of the record or

it is in rebuttal to new evidence or argument submitted by the other party just before the record closed. *[However, the]* The Hearing Officer shall also make part of the record any *[motions for attorney fees, supporting documentation, and determinations thereon, and]* approved correction to the transcript.

§ 7.16 Hearing Officer Decisions; Entry in Records of the Office; Corrections to the Record; Motions to Alter, Amend or Vacate the Decision.

(b) The Hearing Officer's written decision shall:

(1) state the issues raised in the complaint; (2) describe the evidence in record; (3) contain findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the reasons or basis therefore, on all the material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record;

(4) contain a determination of whether a violation has occurred; and (5) order such remedies as are appropriate under the CAA.

[(b)](c) Upon issuance, the decision and order of the Hearing Officer shall be entered into the records of the Office.

[(c)](d) The Office shall promptly provide a copy of the decision and order of the Hearing Officer to the parties.

[(d)](e) If there is no appeal of a decision and order of a Hearing Officer, that decision becomes a final decision of the Office, which is subject to enforcement under section 8.03 of these rules.

(f) **Corrections to the Record.** After a decision of the Hearing Officer has been issued, but before an appeal is made to the Board, or in the absence of an appeal, before the decision becomes final, the Hearing Officer may issue an erratum notice to correct simple errors or easily correctible mistakes. The Hearing Officer may do so on motion of the parties or on his or her own motion with or without advance notice.

(g) After a decision of the Hearing Officer has been issued, but before an appeal is made to the Board, or in the absence of an appeal, before the decision becomes final, a party to the proceeding before the Hearing Officer may move to alter, amend or vacate the decision. The moving party must establish that relief from the decision is warranted because: (1) of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) there is newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new hearing; (3) there has been fraud (misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the decision is void; or (5) the decision has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier decision that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable. The motion shall be filed within 15 days after service of the Hearing Officer's decision. No response shall be filed unless the Hearing Officer so orders. The filing and pendency of a motion under this provision shall not relieve a party of the obligation to file a timely appeal or operate to stay the action of the Hearing Officer unless so ordered by the Hearing Officer.

Subpart H—Proceedings before the Board

§ 8.01 Appeal to the Board

§ 8.02 Reconsideration

§ 8.03 Compliance with Final Decisions, Requests for Enforcement

§ 8.04 Judicial Review

§ 8.05 Application for Review of an Executive Director Action

§ 8.06 Exceptions to Arbitration Awards

§ 8.07 Expedited Review of Negotiability

§ 8.08 Procedures of the Board in Impasse Proceedings

§ 8.01 Appeal to the Board.

(a) No later than 30 days after the entry of the final decision and order of the Hearing Officer in the records of the Office, an aggrieved party may seek review of that decision and order by the Board by filing with the Office a petition for review by the Board. The appeal must be served on the opposing party or its representative.

(3) *[(Upon written delegation by the Board,)]* In any case in which the Board has not rendered a determination on the merits, the Executive Director is authorized to: determine any request for extensions of time to file any post-petition for review document or submission with the Board *[(in any case in which the Executive Director has not rendered a determination on the merits,)]*; determine any request for enlargement of page limitation of any post-petition for review document or submission with the Board; or require proof of service where there are questions of proper service. *[(Such delegation shall continue until revoked by the Board.)]*

(d) Upon appeal, the Board shall issue a written decision setting forth the reasons for its decision. The Board may dismiss the appeal or affirm, reverse, modify or remand the decision and order of the Hearing Officer in whole or in part. Where there is no remand the decision of the Board shall be entered in the records of the Office as the final decision of the Board and shall be subject to judicial review.

(e) The Board may remand the matter to *[(the)]* a Hearing Officer for further action or proceedings, including the reopening of the record for the taking of additional evidence. The decision by the Board to remand a case is not subject to judicial review under Section 407 of the Act. The procedures for a remanded hearing shall be governed by subparts F, G, and H of these Rules. The Hearing Officer shall render a decision or report to the Board, as ordered, at the conclusion of proceedings on the remanded matters. *[(Upon receipt of the decision or report, the Board shall determine whether the views of the parties on the content of the decision or report should be obtained in writing and, where necessary, shall fix by order the time for the submission of those views.)]* A decision of the Board following completion of the remand shall be entered in the records of the Office as the final decision of the Board and shall be subject to judicial review under Section 407 of the Act.

(h) *Record.* The docket sheet, complaint and any amendments, notice of hearing, answer and any amendments, motions, rulings, orders, stipulations, exhibits, documentary evidence, any portions of depositions admitted into evidence, docketed Memoranda for the Record, or correspondence between the Office and the parties, and the transcript of the hearing (together with any electronic recording of the hearing if the original reporting was performed electronically) together with the Hearing Officer's decision and the petition for review, any response thereto, any reply to the response and any other pleadings shall constitute the record in the case.

(j) An appellant may move to withdraw a petition for review at any time before the Board renders a decision. The motion must be in writing and submitted to the Board. The Board, at its discretion, may grant such a motion and take whatever action is required.

§ 8.02 Reconsideration.

After a final decision or order of the Board has been issued, a party to the proceeding before the Board, who can establish in its moving papers that reconsideration is necessary because the Board has overlooked or misapprehended points of law or fact, may move for reconsideration of such final decision or order. The motion shall be filed within 15 days after service of the Board's decision or order. No response shall be filed unless the Board so orders. The filing and pendency of a motion under this provision shall not relieve a party of the obligation to file a timely appeal or operate to stay the action of the Board unless so ordered by the Board. The decision to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration is within the sole discretion of the Board and is not appealable.

§ 8.03 Compliance with Final Decisions, Requests for Enforcement.

(a) Unless the Board has, in its discretion, stayed the final decision of the Office during the pendency of an appeal pursuant to section 407 of the Act, and except as provided in sections 210(d)(5) and 215(c)(6) of the Act, a party required to take any action under the terms of a final decision of the Office shall carry out its terms promptly, and shall within 30 days after the decision or order becomes final and goes into effect by its terms, provide the Office and all other parties to the proceedings with a compliance report specifying the manner in which compliance with the provisions of the decision or order has been accomplished. If complete compliance has not been accomplished within 30 days, the party required to take any such action shall submit a compliance report specifying why compliance with any provision of the decision or order has not yet been fully accomplished, the steps being taken to assure full compliance, and the anticipated date by which full compliance will be achieved. A party may also file a petition for attorneys fees and/or damages unless the Board has, in its discretion, stayed the final decision of the Office during the pendency of the appeal pursuant to Section 407 of the Act.

(d) To the extent provided in Section 407(a) of the Act and Section 8.04 of this section, the appropriate *[(Any)]* party may petition the Board for enforcement of a final decision of the Office or the Board. The petition shall specifically set forth the reasons why the petitioner believes enforcement is necessary.

§ 8.05 Application for Review of an Executive Director Action.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's review of an Executive Director action in Representation proceedings, refer to Parts 2422.30—31 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.06 Expedited Review of Negotiability Issues.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's expedited review of negotiability issues, refer to Part 2424 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.07 Review of Arbitration Awards.

For additional rules on the procedures pertaining to the Board's review of arbitration awards, refer to Part 2425 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

§ 8.08 Procedures of the Board in Impasse Proceedings.

For additional rules on the procedures of the Board in impasse proceedings, refer to Part 2471 of the Substantive Regulations of the Board, available at www.compliance.gov.

Subpart I—Other Matters of General Applicability

§ 9.01 Filing, Service and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and other Documents.

§ 9.02 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violations of Rules; Sanctions]

§ 9.03] § 9.01 Attorney's Fees and Costs

§ 9.04] § 9.02 Ex parte Communications

§ 9.05] § 9.03 Settlement Agreements

§ 9.06] § 9.04 Revocation, Amendment or Waiver of Rules

§ 9.01 Filing, Service, and Size Limitations of Motions, Briefs, Responses and Other Documents.

(a) *Filing with the Office; Number.* One original and three copies of all motions, briefs, responses, and other documents, must be filed, whenever required, with the Office or Hearing Officer. However, when a party aggrieved by the decision of a Hearing Officer or a party to any other matter or determination reviewable by the Board files an appeal or other submission with the Board, one original and seven copies of any submission and any responses must be filed with the Office. The Office, Hearing Officer, or Board may also request a party to submit an electronic version of any submission in a designated format, with receipt confirmed by electronic transmittal in the same format.

(b) *Service.* The parties shall serve on each other one copy of all motions, briefs, responses and other documents filed with the Office, other than the request for counseling, the request for mediation and complaint. Service shall be made by mailing or by hand delivering a copy of the motion, brief, response or other document to each party, or if represented, the party's representative, on the service list previously provided by the Office. Each of these documents, must be accompanied by a certificate of service specifying how, when and on whom service was made. It shall be the duty of each party to notify the Office and all other parties in writing of any changes in the names or addresses on the service list.

(c) *Time Limitations for Response to Motions or Briefs and Reply.* Unless otherwise specified by the Hearing Officer or these rules, a party shall file a response to a motion or brief within 15 days of the service of the motion or brief upon the party. Any reply to such response shall be filed and served within 5 days of the service of the response. Only with the Hearing Officer's advance approval may either party file additional responses or replies.

(d) *Size Limitations.* Except as otherwise specified by the Hearing Officer or these rules, no brief, motion, response, or supporting memorandum filed with the Office shall exceed 35 pages, or 8,750 words, exclusive of the table of contents, table of authorities and attachments. The Board, the Office, Executive Director, or Hearing Officer may waive, raise or reduce this limitation for good cause shown or on its own initiative. Briefs, motions, responses, and supporting memoranda shall be on standard letter-size paper (8½" x 11").

§ 9.02 Signing of Pleadings, Motions and Other Filings; Violation of Rules; Sanctions.

Every pleading, motion, and other filing of a party represented by an attorney or other designated representative shall be signed by the attorney or representative. A party who is not represented shall sign the pleading, motion or other filing. The signature of a representative or party

constitutes a certificate by the signer that the signer has read the pleading, motion, or other filing; that to the best of the signer's knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is not signed, it shall be stricken unless it is signed promptly after the omission is called to the attention of the person who is required to sign. If a pleading, motion, or other filing is signed in violation of this rule, a Hearing Officer or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or upon its own initiative, shall impose upon the person who signed it, a represented party, or both, an appropriate sanction, which may include an order to pay to the other party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred because of the filing of the pleading, motion, or other filing, including a reasonable attorney's fee. A Hearing Officer, the Executive Director, or the Board, as appropriate, upon motion or its own initiative may also impose an appropriate sanction, which may include the sanctions specified in section 7.02, for any other violation of these rules that does not result from reasonable error.]

§ 9.03] § 9.01 Attorney's Fees and Costs.

(a) *Request.* No later than [20] 30 days after the entry of a final [Hearing Officer's] decision of the Office, [under section 7.16, or after service of a Board decision by the Office the complainant, if he or she is a] the prevailing party[.] may submit to the Hearing Officer or Arbitrator who [heard] decided the case [initially] a motion for the award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs, following the form specified in paragraph (b) below. [All motions for attorney's fees and costs shall be submitted to the Hearing Officer.] The Hearing Officer or Arbitrator, after giving the respondent an opportunity to reply, shall rule on the motion. Decisions regarding attorney's fees and costs are collateral and do not affect the finality or appealability of a final decision issued by the [Hearing Officer] Office. [A ruling on a motion for attorney's fees and costs may be appealed together with the final decision of the Hearing Officer. If the motion for attorney's fees is ruled on after the final decision has been issued by the Hearing Officer, the ruling may be appealed in the same manner as a final decision, pursuant to section 8.01 of these Rules.]

(b) *Form of Motion.* In addition to setting forth the legal and factual bases upon which the attorney's fees and/or costs are sought, a motion for an award of attorney's fees and/or costs shall be accompanied by:

(3) the attorney's customary billing rate for similar work with evidence that the rate is consistent with the prevailing community rate for similar services in the community in which the attorney ordinarily practices; [and]

(4) an itemization of costs related to the matter in question[.] ; and

(5) evidence of an established attorney-client relationship.

§ 9.04] § 9.02 Ex parte Communications.

(a) *Definitions.*

(3) For purposes of section [9.04] 9.02, the term *proceeding* means the complaint and hearing proceeding under section 405 of the CAA, an appeal to the Board under section 406 of the CAA, a pre-election investigatory hearing under section 220 of the CAA, and

any other proceeding of the Office established pursuant to regulations issued by the Board under the CAA.

.....

(b) *Prohibited Ex Parte Communications and Exceptions.*

(2) The Hearing Officer or the Office may initiate attempts to settle a matter informally at any time. The parties may agree to waive the prohibitions against *ex parte* communications during settlement discussions, and they may agree to any limits on the waiver.

—Remember subsequent paragraphs in subsection—

§ 9.05] § 9.03 Informal Resolutions and Settlement Agreements.

(b) *Formal Settlement Agreement.* The parties may agree formally to settle all or part of a disputed matter in accordance with section 414 of the Act. In that event, the agreement shall be in writing and submitted to the Executive Director for review and approval. The settlement is not effective until it has been approved by the Executive Director. If the Executive Director does not approve the settlement, such disapproval shall be in writing, shall set forth the grounds therefor, and shall render the settlement ineffective.

(c) *Requirements for a Formal Settlement Agreement.* A formal settlement agreement requires the signature of all parties or their designated representatives on the agreement document before the agreement can be submitted to the Executive Director for signature. A formal settlement agreement cannot be submitted to the Executive Director for signature until the appropriate revocation periods have expired. A formal settlement agreement cannot be rescinded after the signatures of all parties have been affixed to the agreement, unless by written revocation of the agreement voluntarily signed by all parties, or as otherwise permitted by law.

(d) *Violation of a Formal Settlement Agreement.* If a party should allege that a formal settlement agreement has been violated, the issue shall be determined by reference to the formal dispute resolution procedures of the agreement. Parties are encouraged to include in their settlements specific dispute resolution procedures. If the [particular] formal settlement agreement does not have a stipulated method for dispute resolution of an alleged violation [of the agreement], the Office may provide assistance in resolving the dispute, including the services of a mediator as determined by the Executive Director. [The following dispute resolution procedure shall be deemed to be a part of each formal settlement agreement approved by the Executive Director pursuant to section 414 of the Act:] Where the settlement agreement does not have a stipulated method for resolving violation allegations, [Any complaint] an allegation [regarding] of a violation [of a formal settlement agreement may] must be filed with the Executive Director no later than 60 days after the party to the agreement becomes aware of the alleged violation. Such [complaints may be referred by the Executive Director to a Hearing Officer for a final decision. The procedures for hearing and determining such complaints shall be governed by subparts F, G, and H of these Rule.] allegations will be reviewed, investigated or mediated, as appropriate, by the Executive Director or designee.

§ 9.06] § 9.04 Payments required pursuant to Decisions, Awards, or Settlements under section 415(a) of the Act.

Whenever a final decision or award pursuant to sections 405(g), 406(e), 407, or 408 of the Act, or an approved settlement pursuant to

section 414 of the Act, require the payment of funds pursuant to section 415(a) of the Act, the decision, award, or settlement shall be submitted to the Executive Director to be processed by the Office for requisition from the account of the Office of Compliance in the Department of the Treasury, and payment. **No payment shall be made from such account until the time for appeal of a decision has expired.**

[§9.07] §9.05 Revocation, Amendment or Waiver of Rules.

(a) The Executive Director, subject to the approval of the Board, may revoke or amend these rules by publishing proposed changes in the Congressional Record and providing for a comment period of not less than 30 days. Following the comment period, any changes to the rules are final once they are published in the Congressional Record.

(b) The Board or a Hearing Officer may waive a procedural rule contained in this Part in an individual case for good cause shown if application of the rule is not required by law.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6923. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Kevin J. Kovacich, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6924. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Rockingham County, VA, et al.) [Docket ID FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8341] received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6925. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Houston County, AL, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-8343] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8343] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6926. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Multifamily Mortgage Insurance; Capturing Excess Bond Proceeds [Docket No.: FR-5583-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ16) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6927. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Refinancing an Existing Cooperative Under Section 207 Pursuant to Section 223(f) of the National Housing Act [Docket No.: FR 5395-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI92) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6928. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions

to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0012] (RIN: 1557-AD83) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6929. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Ethiopian Airlines SC (Ethiopian Airlines) of Ababa, Ethiopia, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6930. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Avianca Holdings S.A. (Avianca Holdings) of Panama City, Panama pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6931. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Air China Limited (Air China), Beijing, China pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6932. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6933. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Kingdom pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6934. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Transferred OTS Regulations and FDIC Regulations Regarding Disclosure and Reporting of CRA-Related Agreements (RIN: 3064-AE09) received August 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6935. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2013 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6936. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

6937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "2014 Smart Grid System Report"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6938. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications To Accommodate People With Disabilities; Ejection Mitigation; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment [Docket No.: NHTSA-2014-0069] (RIN: 2127-AL17) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6939. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation Program Analyst, transmitting the Department's final rule — Registered Importers of Vehicles Not Originally Manufactured to Conform to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards [Docket No.: NHTSA-2013-0041; Notice 2]

(RIN: 2127-AL43) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6940. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 1; Correction [EPA-R08-OAR-2009-0790; FRL-9914-08-Region 8] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6941. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Certain Coals to Be Washed [EPA-R075-OAR-20140-0582; FRL-9915-30-Region 7] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6942. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Nitrogen Oxides and Volatile Organic Compounds [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0848; A-1-FRL-9913-00-Region 1] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6943. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the implementation of the Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6944. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri: Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0290; FRL-9915-28-Region 7] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6945. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Kent, Seattle, and Tacoma Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0713; FRL-9915-40-Region 10] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6946. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Hawaii; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone and the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0317; FRL-9915-38-Region 9] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6947. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Negative Declarations [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0439; FRL-9914-75-Region 9] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6948. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sweet Orange Peel Tincture; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0444; FRL-9909-83] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6949. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6950. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6951. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-073, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6952. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-072, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-065, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6954. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-087, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-086, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6956. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-055, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6957. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Designation of Countries of Particular Concern, Imposition of Presidential Actions, and Exercise of Waiver Authority Under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6958. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6959. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting in accordance with Pub. L. 105-270, the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Board's inventory of commercial activities for 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6960. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Contractor Selection and Quality Assurance for Select DDOT Road Projects"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6961. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, St. Petersburg Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0437] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6962. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, James River; Newport News, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0376] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6963. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Elizabeth River; Norfolk, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0619] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6964. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0446] (RIN: 1625-AA08; 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6965. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Offshore Supply Vessels of at Least 6,000 GT ITC [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0208] (RIN: 1625-AB62) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6966. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA) for 2014; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6967. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): Use of Sufficiently Sensitive Test Methods for Permit Applications and Reporting [EPA-HQ-OW-2009-1019; FRL-9915-18-OW] (RIN: 2040-AC84) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6968. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a letter regarding the state of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6969. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Manton Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0001; T.D. TTB-122; Ref. Notice No. 141] (RIN: 1513-AC03) received August 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6970. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest

Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-48] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6971. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clarification and Modification of Notice 2013-29 and Notice 2013-60 [Notice 2014-46] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6972. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Awards for Information Relating to Detecting Underpayments of Tax or Violations of the Internal Revenue Laws [TD 9687] (RIN: 1545-BL08) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6973. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2012"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6974. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting a notice of proposed rulemaking and request for comments from interested parties regarding proposed amendments to the rules of procedure, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1383; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

6975. A letter from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting a notice of proposed rule making and request for comments from interested parties regarding extending rights and protections under the Americans with Disabilities Act, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1331; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4067. A bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014 (Rept. 113-582, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4321. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; with an amendment (Rept. 113-583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 717. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-584). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5417. A bill to prohibit certain nutrition rules with respect to foods sold at schools as a fundraiser; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5418. A bill to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5420. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5421. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of an insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5422. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to require the EEOC to approve commencing or intervening in certain litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 5423. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to exclude the application of such title to employment practices that are in compliance with Federal regulations, and State laws, in certain areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5424. A bill to create the Made-in-America Bank; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5425. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5426. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 5427. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish small business savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5428. A bill to provide for the implementation of the negotiated property division regarding Former Fort Wingate Depot

Activity in McKinley County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5429. A bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to restore the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to adopt certain rules relating to preserving the open Internet and to direct the Commission to take all actions necessary to restore to effect vacated portions of such rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 5430. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to establish processes for certain aliens located in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Turkey, or Syria to apply for admission to the United States as refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 124. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Res. 718. A resolution calling on the Department of Defense to expedite the delivery of all necessary military equipment, weapons, ammunition, and other needed materials to the Kurdish Peshmerga forces to successfully combat and defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, located at section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 5421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation

exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes;" Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to establish ... uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;" Article I, Section 8, clause 9 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;" Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and, Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 5423. 1 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I. Section 8, Clauses 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 5429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 5430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 274: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 292: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 440: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 498: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 508: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 543: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 572: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 628: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 800: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 831: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 855: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 920: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1015: Ms. MENG, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1020: Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 1027: Mr. SIRE.
H.R. 1070: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1213: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1249: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1252: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1286: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1309: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1318: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1389: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1563: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1573: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1652: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. Pierluisi.
H.R. 1692: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1695: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 1750: Mr. COBLE and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1761: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 1795: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1941: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1975: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2194: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2224: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2366: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2414: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2477: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2479: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2529: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2673: Mr. KLINE, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2707: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2725: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2780: Mr. NADLER and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2831: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2847: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2856: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2869: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 2917: Mr. LOESBACH.
H.R. 2994: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2996: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3040: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3115: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3116: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3279: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 3330: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3367: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3403: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3426: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3489: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3543: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 3680: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3708: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3712: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 3717: Mr. HOLT, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 3742: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 3749: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3862: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3902: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3991: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4042: Mr. KLINE and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4109: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4148: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4158: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 4172: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4188: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4190: Mr. JOYCE and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 4208: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 4260: Mr. MORAN and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4319: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4351: Mr. LATTI, Mr. POSEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4399: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4421: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4437: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4440: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4510: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4515: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4525: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of

California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4574: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4577: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4578: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4592: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 4616: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4679: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4682: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4717: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4740: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4746: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4785: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4826: Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4833: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4857: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4865: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4895: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4906: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4920: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4930: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4957: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. HANNA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POSTER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 4966: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4969: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 4971: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4986: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4988: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4989: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 5012: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5020: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 5063: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. NOEM and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 5082: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5083: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5084: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5085: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5098: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5159: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5169: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 5179: Ms. BASS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5185: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5193: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5212: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 5213: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 5226: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5227: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5228: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 5231: Mr. WALZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JONES, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 5233: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 5242: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 5260: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5277: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 5285: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5294: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5320: Mr. JONES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 5354: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5370: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5392: Mr. JONES, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 5402: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 5403: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 5408: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 5415: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. CARNEY.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. LONG, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Con. Res. 27: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H. Res. 109: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H. Res. 147: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 190: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H. Res. 231: Mr. YODER and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 281: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 611: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 614: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 620: Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 668: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 688: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 690: Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 707: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BERA of California, Mr.

SIRE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CHU, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 711: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 124, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING FORT BRAGG'S PAUL BUNYAN DAYS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Paul Bunyan Days in Fort Bragg, California, on the event of its 75th Anniversary August 29, Sunday, through September 1, 2014.

For seventy-five years, the citizens of Fort Bragg have celebrated and honored the history of the community and its foundation in logging. The first celebration of Paul Bunyan, a giant lumberjack in American Folklore, was held in the year 1939. As the economy and culture of the coast continue to change, this three-day celebration will continue to honor the town's roots, history, and traditions.

With the dedication of its residents, Fort Bragg's Paul Bunyan Days will surely continue to be a wonderful celebration for the entire family. Please join me in expressing hearty congratulations to Fort Bragg's Paul Bunyan Days on the occasion of the festival's 75th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION'S CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an important occasion, National Constitution Week. The important designation was made official by President Dwight Eisenhower on August 2, 1956 at the urging of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR).

Constitution Week is celebrated every year during the week of September 17–23. The week-long celebration commemorates America's most important and oldest living document. It has grown and evolved slightly over the years, but the Constitution has always been a symbol of freedom for the United States, as well as people around the world.

I am especially proud of the work done by the Ecor Rouge Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Baldwin County, Alabama, to bring attention to our nation's most important governing document during Constitution Week.

Constitution Week not only celebrates this iconic document, but also encourages citizens to take the time to read and learn about the document and reflect on what values it em-

bodies as a primary symbol of freedom and patriotism. This week encourages reflection and celebrates our founding document which means so much to the history of the United States.

As the Daughters of the American Revolution have stated, the purpose of this celebration is to emphasize citizens' responsibilities for protecting and defending the Constitution, inform people that the Constitution is the basis for America's great heritage, and encourage the study of the historical events which led to the framing of the Constitution in September 1787.

Mr. Speaker, we are, and have been from our birth, a nation that guarantees our citizens' very basic rights. And our government, as its very core function, is supposed to keep these rights secure. Our government does not create its own powers. Our government only gets its powers from the citizens' consent. That is why our Constitution is so important.

So on this Constitution Week, I encourage all Americans to take time to read our nation's Constitution and refresh our minds to the legacy of the document on which our nation's government is rooted.

HONORING DR. JASON TAYLOR SNODGRASS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievement of Dr. Jason Taylor Snodgrass of Independence, Missouri. Dr. Snodgrass is the principal of Fort Osage High School in Independence, Missouri, and has been selected by the Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals as the 2014 Missouri High School Principal of the Year. This prestigious award recognizes Dr. Snodgrass's ability to excel in the ever-demanding role of principal in all aspects of education.

Dr. Snodgrass is a major contributing factor to the increasing success students are finding at Fort Osage High School. His results-driven leadership has seen an increase in the average ACT score and a 10% increase in ACT participation. His mantra, "Here at Fort Osage, we do things a little bit better!" has built up school spirit and pride while empowering the students of Fort Osage High School into believing in themselves and their own future. Dr. Snodgrass is a true asset to the Fort Osage School District with his commitment to students, relationship building and long-range goals for students, teachers and Fort Osage High School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in applauding Dr. Jason Taylor Snodgrass's outstanding professionalism and commitment to

educating the American youth. I join with Dr. Snodgrass's colleagues, family, friends, and students in congratulating him on his outstanding achievement, and wish him good luck in his future endeavors.

TEXAS TOWNS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the best things about Texas is the fact that Texas towns each have their own unique history. There are hundreds of stories about towns and their colorful past and the settlers who founded them. However, the most interesting part of their unique history is how each town received its name.

A notable example is Gun Barrel City that picked up its name in the 1920s prohibition era. The secluded area in North Texas was also one of the hideouts for Bonnie and Clyde. Apparently, a moonshiner living on the main road to the remote area sat in his front room with a shotgun barrel sticking out of the window, watching for Federal Revenuers and Texas lawmen. Thus, came the name Gun Barrel City.

Dime Box was first called Brown's Mill in the 1860s. Since there was no Postal Service, settlers would leave mail in a wooden box at the mill with a dime. Old Man Brown would then take the letters (and dimes) then go 15 miles away to the official post office in Giddings and pick up mail for the community. When the Post Office eventually appeared, it made the community change its name. The concern was that Brown's Mill sounded too much like Brownsville; naturally they could not have that. So, they decided on Dime Box. Not to be outdone, by the "10 cent town," there is a Nickel, Texas.

Notrees, which you can guess by its literal name, is obviously in barren west Texas. It received the name when the only tree in the area was cut down for an oil and gas drilling boom in the 1940s.

There are many more such places in Texas with odd names, such as Hoop and Holler in nearby Liberty County. The list goes on, including towns like: Salty, Oatmeal, Earth, Moscow, Turkey, Tarzan, Ding Dong, Happy, Paris, Bigfoot, Muleshoe, and Hogeye.

My all-time favorite is Cut and Shoot, Texas, close to Conroe. There are several versions of how it got its name, but the one that seems the most credible comes from The History of Montgomery County, by William Harley Gandy, whose family members witnessed this story firsthand. According to Gandy, the following happened 112 years ago:

The homesteaders in this area were a God-fearing community of a couple hundred. They

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

erected a community church/school for almost all denominations to use, including the Methodists, Missionary Baptists, and Hard Shell Baptists. However, they prohibited the Mormons and Apostolics from using the building.

All went well with the different religious groups until an out-of-towner of the Apostolic faith showed up ready to preach to the local sinners at the church house. Pastor Stamps was welcomed by some, but not by others. Soon the community was divided into two groups: the "Let him Preach" group and the "He Aint Preaching" group. The two groups agreed to vote on it and set a meeting for Sunday morning, July 21, 1912. Someone locked the door of the meeting house, likely to keep the Preacher from preaching. Word got around that the door to the church was locked. Those who sided with Stamps vowed to break the doors down. So, both sides sent "Paul Revere riders" throughout the town, telling them to bring their firearms to the scheduled Sunday church meeting.

On Sunday morning, both sides showed up at the locked church building. Many had not only packed a lunch, but they also put their knives and pistols in their wagons just in case there was trouble. The obvious argument between the two sides erupted, and guns and knives were brandished. Unkind words may have been uttered as well.

Eventually, the "Let him preach" (in the building) crowd backed off. So preacher Stamps had to preach under a nearby tree. Later, a makeshift structure was erected for Stamps to preach all summer long under some shade—but he could not enter the church building.

However, the churchgoers headed off to court the next day. Both sides filed assault and disorderly conduct charges on the other with a nearby local Justice of the Peace (JP). Obscene language charges were alleged as well. (I guess unkind words were actually spoken at the church house by the church goers.)

When the JP inquired of a witness where the altercation took place in the County, a witness not knowing the actual location replied that it happened at the place of the cutting and shooting fight. The name Cut and Shoot stuck, and the rest is Texas history.

Let it be known that the names of Texas towns are not random, but a living symbol of what once was. They give us Texans a peak into how life used to be. The names of these towns represent vivid stories about culture and community with just a couple of words, all adding to the rich history of our great state.

And that's just the way it is.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO BRUCE WAYNE PHILPOTT

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Bruce Wayne Philpott of Pasadena, California, former Pasadena Police Chief, who passed away on Tuesday, July 29, 2014, after courageously battling a prolonged illness.

Born in Portland, Oregon on January 8, 1944, to Vernon and Zoe Philpott, Bruce grew up in Portland and later, in Sunland, California. A natural athlete, Bruce enjoyed sports, especially baseball, hiking and camping, and fishing trips with his father and his two brothers, Kent and Gary. He earned his Bachelor of Science Degree from California State University Los Angeles and completed graduate studies at the University of Southern California School of Public Administration.

As a young man, Bruce became a law enforcement officer with the Pasadena Police Department. He served the police department with honor and distinction for 28 years, successfully moving through the ranks to the position of Chief of Police. In addition to his work with the police department, Chief Philpott served his community as a Special Assistant to the Pasadena City Manager and Director of Northwest Development, commander of the Pasadena Fire Department's Support Services Division, as well as teaching classes at Pasadena High School and Pasadena City College. He received several awards including the Community Ethics Award from the Glendale Character and Ethics Project, the Brotherhood Citation from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Pasadena Police Department's Silver Award of Merit.

After his retirement, in 1991, Chief Philpott continued to ardently serve his community through political activism and volunteering with numerous organizations. He was known for being outspoken and tenacious, with a passion for social justice and advocating for youth, especially related to inequity and poverty. Bruce helped revitalize the northwest Pasadena community and played a significant role in the Villa Parke youth boxing program. He was the co-founder and served on the board of the Community Non-Violence Resource Center, co-founder and Board President of Day One, a nonprofit organization focused on addressing issues of drug, alcohol and tobacco abuse in Pasadena area youth, and he developed and facilitated the Partnership Workshop, Healing the Heart of America, A National Cities Conference, in Richmond, Virginia. In addition, he served on the board of directors for the Jackie Robinson Foundation, Pasadena Boys and Girls Club, Pasadena Planned Parenthood, Child Health Foundation and the Western Justice Center Foundation.

Bruce is survived by his three children, Kris Strong, Kelly Sturgeon and Greg Philpott, his brother, Kent Philpott, and his five grandchildren, Dustin, Samantha, Carson, Nicole and Mark.

Chief Philpott was an irreplaceable part of our community, and he will be greatly missed. A model public servant and a man of impeccable character, I ask all members to join me in remembering Bruce Wayne Philpott.

RECOGNIZING VALERIE RASCHKE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Valerie (Val) Raschke who is

transitioning from her position as Congressional Representative after serving the district for nearly two years.

Val served as District Scheduler and Marin County Field Representative for California's 6th District State Assembly Office for five years prior to joining California's 2nd Congressional District Office staff at the beginning of the 113th Congress. Val's steadfast devotion to the constituents of Marin County and Sonoma County performing a myriad of assignments helped countless individuals throughout the region tackle challenging issues. With a special attention to veterans' services, Val worked tirelessly to improve conditions for others. Her work with the military academy nominations helped many students navigate the applications process in hopes of serving the country.

Val served as my trusted representative in many community events where she was always regarded for her professional and thoughtful manner. Her expertise and personal flair in the creation of hundreds of certificates of recognition over the years, and more recently, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements, were greatly valued by the many recipients of these honors. Revered for her strong work ethic, command of the written language, competence for managing sophisticated database systems, and wonderful sense of humor, Val has been an invaluable member of my staff in the State Assembly and the Second Congressional District and will be missed.

The residents of our congressional districts are better off today thanks to the work of Val Raschke. Her commitment to advocating for individuals in need of federal assistance is appreciated and we wish her continued success in the future. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Val for her many years of invaluable service to the people of Marin and Sonoma counties.

IN MEMORY OF JONATHAN FRENCH

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Jonathan French of Glendale, KY. Only 25 years old, Jonathan was killed in a tragic accident while doing his job as a volunteer firefighter.

Jonathan's death represents the first on-duty firefighter to be killed in the line of duty there since July 1970. The entire Hardin County community is grieving the loss—a young man who was a son, a brother, a mentor and a fiancé.

His interests included hunting and rooting for the University of Kentucky's basketball team, but his passion was firefighting. A fellow Glendale volunteer firefighter reiterated that in an interview with the local paper, The News-Enterprise. "He loved keeping the fire trucks clean. He took his firefighting seriously. He was one heck of a good man."

A dedicated public servant, Jonathan was taken too soon. But his legacy and strong desire to serve his community will surely continue. I join with Kentucky's Second District in

sending prayers to Jonathan's family. We will miss him and are thankful for his service.

HONORING DR. EDWARD
GETTEMEIER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the outstanding achievement of Dr. Edward Gettemeier. Dr. Gettemeier is the principal of Hardin Middle School in St. Charles, Missouri, and has been selected by the Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals as the 2014 Missouri Middle School Principal of the Year. This prestigious award recognizes Dr. Gettemeier's ability to excel in the ever-demanding role of principal in all aspects of education.

Dr. Gettemeier is a major contributing factor to the increasing success students are finding at Hardin Middle School. He has modeled a high-rate work ethic that has permeated throughout the school. Through his work, Hardin has seen a significant increase in access to technology and developed programs to meet the needs of Hardin Middle School's diverse student population. Dr. Gettemeier has been a leader on implementing the St. Charles School District's Standards-Based Grading and worked with the St. Charles Juvenile Justice Center to develop a Teen Court system for Hardin students. His plan to improve the ABC's—Academics, Behavior, and Climate—have transformed Hardin Middle School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in applauding Dr. Edward Gettemeier's outstanding professionalism and commitment to educating the American youth. I join with Dr. Gettemeier's colleagues, family, friends, and students in congratulating him on his outstanding achievement, and wish him good luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HERB
STOTTLER

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and remember the life of Herb Stottler, 79, who passed away on August 30, 2014, surrounded by those he loved dearly.

The citizens of Northeast Ohio are hardworking, honest Americans, and Herb was no exception. Herb was a dedicated labor leader, as well as a strong advocate for the Democratic Party. Herb served his nation proudly in the United States Marine Corps, where he was honorably discharged. Herb also faithfully devoted himself to his community, where he served as Ward 7 Council for the City of Akron, before becoming the International Staff Representative for the United Steel Workers of America.

Herb was preceded in death by his mother, Mona; brother, Bob; dear daughter, Debra

Leigh; and nephew by marriage, Dave Fritz. He leaves behind his loving wife of 30 years, Jan; daughters, Pam and Tonia; granddaughters, Misty, Rachel (Matt), and Chelcie; great-grandsons, Dylan and Sam; brother, John (Suzie); nephews, Brian (Jan) and Bob (Kathy); nieces, Christine (David), Kim (Terry), and Jackie; and many great-nieces and nephews.

I am deeply saddened and extend my condolences to his entire family. Herb was a strong and dedicated man, who will be missed by those whose lives he impacted, because of his dedication and unwavering service. Northeast Ohio is a better place.

BILL SCHWERI

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri, upon his retirement as the Director of Federal Relations at the University of Kentucky.

During his 42 years at the University of Kentucky, Bill has been a champion for progress in education, healthcare, and energy research across the state. Behind the scenes of Kentucky's highly esteemed flagship university, Bill has been a driving force, seeking out partnerships, programs and funding to help the most distressed region of the Commonwealth. I'm certain there is not a single resource that Bill hasn't researched for the benefit of southern and eastern Kentucky.

No one knows the value and power of creating and sustaining long-time partnerships quite like Bill. If the University of Kentucky needed a partner to improve education or access to healthcare, Bill ensured the connection was secured with his genuine, kind and humble approach. Most leaders seek recognition or credit for their efforts, but that has never been the case with Bill.

His work has led to exponential growth of UK's research enterprise and jumpstarted new research initiatives that have enabled the university to be successful in competing for federal grants and contracts. This riveting scientific research on cancer, fossil energy, transportation and agriculture is blazing new trails in every aspect of our everyday life, and our country—to say nothing of our state—is better off for it. He has fought for legislation that is important to UK and student financial aid. Bill has also been a leader in The Science Coalition, and actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs, and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Over the years, he has deservedly gained the utmost respect of his peers in federal relations.

As he departs his post at the University of Kentucky, it is my intention to ensure Bill Schweri receives the recognition that is due him, for his tireless efforts on behalf of students and families across Kentucky, and specifically people living in Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District. We hope he knows he always has the thanks of a grateful Big Blue Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring my friend Bill Schweri as we bid him a joy-filled retirement.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO LOUIS
ANDREW BEATTIE, JR.

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Louis Andrew Beattie, Jr. of La Cañada Flintridge, California, an outstanding community leader, who passed away on Sunday, July 27, 2014.

Louis Beattie, better known as "Andy," was born on February 3, 1953 in Brownsville, Pennsylvania to Louis Andrew Beattie, Sr. and Marilyn Beattie. The Beattie family moved to Ventura, California in 1956, where Andy attended El Camino Elementary School, Anacapa Junior High School, and Buena High School where he was ASB President, Sophomore Class President, and a member of the Buena High School Hall of Fame. Andy graduated from Occidental College in 1975, earning a B.A. in Political Science. He was a devoted alumnus of Occidental College, serving as President of the Alumni Association Board of Governors and as a member of the Occidental College Board of Trustees. Andy had a long and successful career in the fashion and clothing industry, holding the position of Senior Vice President of Strategic Partners, Inc., a uniform and apparel company. Because of his interest and experience in the clothing industry, he and his wife, Kim, formed a line of pajamas called Liz & Lauren, named after their eldest daughter, Lauren Elizabeth, an enterprise of which he was very proud.

Andy was dedicated in both his professional pursuits and his commitment to serving his community and our country. On the local level, Mr. Beattie was a Public Safety Commissioner for La Cañada Flintridge for six years, playing a significant role in initiating La Cañada Flintridge's new "Alert LCF" emergency notification system and the city's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. He served as president of the La Cañada Unified School Board, working to improve the educational programs and buildings in the La Cañada Flintridge schools, and president of the La Cañada High School Spartan Boosters. Andy's public service extended beyond his local community as he spent many years volunteering for the White House's Office of Advance, a department responsible for coordinating the travel schedules of the President and press corps. Mr. Beattie travelled with President Clinton and President Obama often, and he visited several nations including Iraq, Poland, South Korea, Chile, and India during his service for the White House.

Andy Beattie is remembered in his community as a fair, honest, smart, and thoughtful person, who "put family first." He is survived by his wife, Kim Beattie, their three daughters, Sarah, Katherine, and Lauren, his mother, Marilyn, and his brothers, Neil and John.

Andy was an exceptional community leader, admired by all as a man of impeccable character and he will be greatly missed. I ask all

members to join me in remembering Louis Andrew Beattie, Jr.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FEAST
OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, the largest Portuguese feast in the world and one of the largest festivals in New England.

Founded in 1915, the Feast recreates the traditional religious festivals of Portugal and celebrates the safe passage onto American shores. The Feast is often referred to as "the Madeira Feast" because its roots lie in the tiny mountain and shoreline villages of the island of Madeira, the "Pearl of the Atlantic." For the last 100 years, New Bedford has hosted the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament, featuring authentic Portuguese food, wine, and music, along with lessons on Portuguese history and folklore.

Today, this historic feast continues to maintain its cultural significance to those who wish to honor the Madeira customs. Additionally, it is known to provide endless entertainment to the entire New Bedford community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the town of New Bedford and the Club Madeirense S.S. Sacramento, Inc., who sponsor the feast, for the celebration of the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament's 100th anniversary. May this magnificent cultural event continue to flourish for many years to come.

COMMEMORATING AVANCE'S 40TH
ANNIVERSARY OF EMPOWERING
FAMILIES

HON. LLOYD DOGGETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor AVANCE, Inc. and to recognize its 40th anniversary of service to families and children in Texas. This outstanding organization was founded in 1973 to provide family support services and education to parents. AVANCE began in one room of the Mirasol Housing Project on the West Side of San Antonio with a handful of families and has grown into a national organization with sites across the country.

Every day, AVANCE's staff works tirelessly to "Unlock America's Potential" by strengthening families in at-risk communities through effective parent education and support programs. This effort has changed the lives of thousands of Texas families, leading the way for stronger, healthier communities; a sharper workforce; and increased educational attainment.

AVANCE has successfully capitalized on parents' inner strength and innate love for their children to help them become the best

teachers and stewards of their children's growth and success. AVANCE works on the principle that parental education alone is sometimes not enough; an effective intervention must build parents' resilience, interpersonal connections, networks, and access to education, jobs and other opportunities. True parental engagement empowers parents to become advocates for their children and families.

Studies have shown the effectiveness of AVANCE's two-generation approach. In an external study designed to assess whether participation led to changes in education and socio-economic status, results showed that the AVANCE program has positive effects on families long after they graduate—especially for the most disadvantaged families. Parents had dramatic increases in educational attainment, better jobs and home ownership.

Congratulations to AVANCE President and CEO Richard J. Noriega and the AVANCE Board of Directors. Today, AVANCE has active sites in the Texas cities of San Antonio, Austin, Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth, El Paso, Waco, Del Rio, San Juan and in the Rio Grande Valley as well as in several other states.

Mr. Speaker, I join with our community in expressing congratulations and deep gratitude to AVANCE for its more than four decades of exemplary service and dedication to the families of Texas. We wish you many more years of success toward fulfilling your mission of Unlocking America's potential.

H.R. 5078 AND H. RES. 644

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act of 2014, and had I been present would have voted against the legislation offered by Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

I am concerned that this legislation would prevent both the current and future Administrations from undergoing a rulemaking process to clarify enforcement of Clean Water Act protections of streams and tributaries around the country. This rulemaking process is necessary to clarify what is now an unclear and confusing set of guidelines as to which waterways fall under jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act.

The small streams, wetlands, headwaters, and tributaries that are affected by this ruling flow into the drinking water of over 117 million Americans, support businesses and recreation, and are crucial habitats for wildlife, including in my home state of Rhode Island. The Administration has undergone an open and transparent process, including a lengthy public commentary period that is still underway, to come up with a rule that more clearly defines which waterways are under jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act, in order to protect our country's drinking water supply and waterways from pollution, actions that benefit every American. Preventing the Executive Branch from clarifying this issue jeopardizes the safety of waterways across the country.

Additionally, I strongly oppose H. Res. 644, condemning the President for the prisoner exchange of five Guantanamo Bay prisoners for Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, and had I been present I would have voted against it. As Commander in Chief of the U.S. Military, the President has a constitutional responsibility to protect the lives of U.S. servicemembers, as well as the lives of U.S. citizens abroad. While Members of Congress may not agree with the President's decision, a resolution calling his actions illegal is hardly helpful or useful at this time. And the fact remains, an American soldier is home safely because the President took seriously his constitutional responsibilities to protect American lives.

The decision made by the President was made in close consultation with Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey. Sergeant Bergdahl had been held prisoner by Taliban forces since 2009. It was determined that there was a very narrow window of opportunity to ensure his safe return. General Dempsey has said that the opportunity to make a prisoner exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl represented the best and last chance to ensure his freedom. When confronted with the decision to either ensure Sergeant Bergdahl's safety, or allow him to die in enemy captivity, the President decided to act in order to save his life.

When we send our brave men and women in the Armed Services onto the field of battle, we send them with the assurance that we will never forget their sacrifice, and that we will leave no man behind. The President has demonstrated true leadership by honoring this pledge. I do not believe it is appropriate for Congress to undermine that leadership, or that pledge.

TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING
FOR HEALTH CARE ACT OF
2014

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2014. This bill will improve the health care system's ability to recognize and respond to victims of trafficking by providing health care professionals with the knowledge and training they need to deal with this modern day form of slavery.

We know that the victims of sex and labor trafficking in the United States suffer from wide-ranging physical and mental health problems. In one study, over 87% of these victims have sought care from an emergency ward in a hospital, a neighborhood clinic, or a family physician. Because of this, these health care professionals are in a unique position to identify trafficking victims and help them recover.

At the same time, we are also discovering that healthcare providers and professionals remain unaware of sex trafficking and the role that they can play to help them. In fact, even when medical personnel think they have identified a victim, which is only about half the

time, they don't know how to help or are not even aware that there are protocols in place to refer them to others for help. This is even more distressing because the medical professional is probably the one expert most likely to encounter a victim at some point during their enslavement.

Although trafficking is demonstrably expensive to our society—and a debilitating public health issue—current federal law does not require medical care professionals to receive training regarding the nature and scope of sex trafficking in this country. Nor does current law require health care professionals to be trained to identify possible trafficking victims, nor how to respond to victims if they are able to identify them. My bill would take the first necessary steps to make this training available.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act mandates that HHS take steps to develop evidence-based protocols to recognize and respond to victims of trafficking. It also sets up a comprehensive pilot program to test these protocols and determine whether or not the protocols will actually result in victim identification and rescue. Those protocols that are shown to be evidence-based can then be taught to health care professionals as part of their medical and nursing school curriculum. They can also be included in continuing-education modules.

The U.S. government estimates that more slaves exist today than ever before. Currently, there are more than 20 million victims of human trafficking worldwide. Yet most Americans don't realize that trafficking is also a huge problem here in the United States. Some estimate that as many as 300,000 U.S. children are at risk of sex trafficking each year.

We must take action to stop this horrendous danger to our people. The bill I am introducing today instructs the Department of Health and Human Services to work with medical and nursing schools to evaluate existing protocols, and develop new ones to identify and respond to victims of trafficking. It is an appropriate concern for healthcare workers and it is my hope that, once health care professionals are convinced that the protocols are tested and evidence-based, they will welcome the opportunity to incorporate them into their medical training so that they can assist the victims and help them heal.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation:

Whereas: It is the privilege and duty of the American people to commemorate the two hundred twenty-sixth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas: Public Law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week; now, therefore I, TOM RICE by

virtue of the authority vested in me as Representative of the 7th Congressional District of the State of South Carolina do hereby recognize the week of September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week and urge all citizens to study the Constitution and reflect on the privilege of being an American with all the rights and responsibilities which that privilege involves.

HONORING A LIFETIME OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF DR. GLENN POSHARD

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the careers of a true champion of Southern Illinois, Dr. Glenn Poshard. I say the "careers" in the plural form because Glenn wore many hats—soldier, educator, legislator, administrator and advocate, in his service to his community, his state and his nation.

Born and raised in Southern Illinois, Glenn Poshard served in the U.S. Army, deployed to Korea. On returning home, Glenn used the GI Bill to begin a relationship with Southern Illinois University that would span over 40 years and include roles as a student (Glenn earned bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees from SIU Carbondale), adjunct professor, administrator and University President.

Glenn began a career in education as a high school teacher and coach, and served as the director of the Southern Illinois Educational Service Center. He began his legislative career when he was appointed to fill a seat in the Illinois Senate in 1984. He would represent Southern Illinois in that body until 1988 when he was elected to the U.S. Congress. Glenn would serve in Congress until 1999 and there are still a number of members who served with Glenn in this chamber who continue to count on him as a trusted friend and colleague.

Throughout his tenure in Congress, Glenn was well known as a champion of working men and women who stood up for the needs of his constituents in Southern Illinois. Glenn worked tirelessly to secure job creation, educational opportunities, health care facilities and fair wages. He also led by example on campaign finance reform and worked to limit the influence of money in politics. Throughout his political career, Glenn was known as a fiery orator who brought crowds to their feet. By word and deed, Glenn always inspired his constituents and instilled optimism and hope.

After retiring from Congress, Glenn returned to education and his beloved Southern Illinois University where he was named vice chancellor of administration at SIU Carbondale. He served on the Board of Trustees until 2005, when he resigned to seek the position of University President, a post he held until retiring from that position this past Spring. Glenn Poshard's tenure as SIU President was the second longest in the university's history.

Fifteen years ago, Glenn and his wife, Jo (also an educator), cofounded the Poshard Foundation for Abused Children. This charitable organization has provided invaluable as-

sistance to children who have suffered abuse and also serves as an advocacy tool in the fight to permanently eradicate the scourge of abuse that impacts far too many children and families in Southern Illinois and throughout our nation.

Throughout many roles, Glenn Poshard has always worked for the betterment of Southern Illinois and its people. He has done so as a model of integrity and inspiration. I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Glenn Poshard and expressing our appreciation for his lifetime of public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF LOREN AND ELOUISE SUTTON

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Loren Sutton who have been married 58 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Loren and Elouise met at Southeastern Bible College in 1953. They were married in Birmingham, Alabama, on June 8, 1957.

Loren and Elouise accepted their call to ministry on April 6, 1958 and served as pastors in Townley and Jasper, both in Alabama, before they arrived in Opelika, Alabama, to start a new church in March of 1965.

The Suttons have four children and three grandchildren including: Loren Sutton Roberts, wife of Dr. Don Roberts; Elizabeth Sutton; Timothy Sutton; Dr. John Sutton.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Loren and Elouise Sutton for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL BEN P. BINGCANG

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to celebrate the life and share the passing of a dear friend of mine and a devoted servicemember, physician, husband and father, U.S. Army Colonel Ben P. Bingcang.

Colonel Bingcang passed away at his home in Nicholasville, Kentucky on July 31, 2014 at the age of 67 and is survived by his wife, Cornelia C. Bingcang of Nicholasville, Kentucky; his three sons, Oliver, Alexander, Christopher; and a host of family and friends.

We grieve the loss of this great American, but we also celebrate and honor his life and his service to our country. Since receiving his commission in the U.S. Army Reserves with a rank of Captain on January 3, 1983, Colonel Bingcang spent the rest of his career providing medical care and comfort to service members and civilians alike. When Colonel Bingcang was not treating patients at St. Joseph Hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, he was tending to

the wounded on the battlefields and commanding hospitals during Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm and, in more recent years, Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

Colonel Bingcang embodied the best of America's ideals, values, and commitment to service, constantly living by the motto of his home reserve unit in Kentucky in both his civilian and military life: "Say it, Mean it, Do it!"

Due to Colonel Bingcang answering the call to serve his country, many lives were saved and comforted by his medical care and countless staff and patients' spirits have been raised by his loving personality. I am forever grateful for his friendship and service to our local community and our country. He was truly an outstanding American and an inspiration to us all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 8, 2014 I was not present for 3 votes. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 481, I would have voted "yea."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 482, I would have voted "yea."

Had I been present for rollcall No. 483, I would have voted "yea."

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,756,856,045,819.45. We've added \$7,129,978,996,906.37 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING GLEN R. BORTELL'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. RICHARD B. NUGENT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Glen R. Bortell's one hundredth birthday.

It is with great pride that I stand to honor Mr. Bortell, not only for his long life but his great contributions to the health and well-being of his fellow citizens. Mr. Bortell has not

let life pass him by without many accomplishments for the good of his community and those around him. The dedication and effort of people like Mr. Bortell allow our communities to thrive and reach their utmost potential.

For nearly 10 years, Mr. Bortell has volunteered at Citrus Memorial Hospital in the diagnostic imaging department. At an age when most hope for a quiet and restful retirement, he has dedicated an amazing 5,000-plus hours of his time to the hospital and its patients. Still having so much to give, to this day Mr. Bortell continues transporting patients in wheelchairs and beds to various departments throughout the hospital.

The selflessness Mr. Bortell has demonstrated throughout his life as well as his constant "can do" attitude have inspired many members of his community, especially his fellow volunteers and hospital employees. I am extremely proud to be Mr. Bortell's congressman and I invite everyone to join me in wishing Mr. Bortell a Happy 100th Birthday, and congratulating him on his long, rich, and active life.

IN RECOGNITION OF MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR (RET.) BENNIE G. ADKINS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Command Sergeant Major (Ret.) Bennie G. Adkins, of Opelika, Alabama, for being awarded the Medal of Honor from President Barack Obama on September 15, 2014. In his honor, I am submitting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following summary of his service and heroism as written and prepared by the United States Army:

"Command Sgt. Maj. Bennie G. Adkins was drafted into the Army Dec. 5, 1956, at the age of 22, from Waurika, Oklahoma. Upon completion of initial training at Fort Bliss, Texas, he was assigned as an Administrative Clerk-Typist to a garrison unit in Giessen, Germany, with a follow-on assignment to the 2nd Infantry Division, at Fort Benning, Georgia. After attending Airborne School, he volunteered for Special Forces, in 1961. He served with the Special Forces for more than 13 years with the 7th, 3rd, 6th and 5th Special Forces Groups (Airborne).

While in the Special Forces, he deployed to the Republic of Vietnam for three non-consecutive tours. His first tour in the Republic of Vietnam lasted from February 1963 to August 1963. His second tour of duty in Vietnam lasted from September 1965 to September 1966. His final Vietnam tour lasted from January 1971 through December 1971.

Command Sergeant Major Bennie G. Adkins distinguished himself during 38 hours of close-combat fighting against enemy forces, March 9-12, 1966. At that time, then-Sergeant First Class Adkins was serving as an Intelligence Sergeant with Detachment A-102, 5th Special Forces Group, 1st Special Forces at Camp A Shau, in the Republic of Vietnam.

When Camp A Shau was attacked by a large North Vietnamese and Viet Cong force in the early morning hours of March 9, then-Sergeant First Class Adkins rushed through intense enemy fire and manned a mortar position defending the camp. He continued to mount a defense even while incurring wounds from several direct hits from enemy mortars. Upon learning that several Soldiers were wounded near the center of camp, he temporarily turned the mortar over to another Soldier, ran through exploding mortar rounds and dragged several comrades to safety. As the hostile fire subsided, Adkins repeatedly exposed himself to sniper and mortar fire, while moving casualties to the camp dispensary.

Adkins exposed himself to enemy fire transporting a casualty to an airstrip for evacuation. He and his group then came under heavy small-arms fire from members of the Civilian Irregular Defense Group, which had defected to fight with the North Vietnamese. Despite this overwhelming force, Adkins maneuvered outside the camp to evacuate a seriously wounded American and draw fire away from the aircraft, all the while successfully covering the rescue. Later, when a resupply air drop landed outside of the camp perimeter, Adkins again moved outside of the camp walls to retrieve the much-needed supplies.

During the early morning hours of March 10, enemy forces launched their main assault. Within two hours, Adkins was the only defender firing a mortar. When all mortar rounds were expended, Adkins began placing effective recoilless rifle fire upon the enemy, as they infiltrated the camp perimeter and assaulted his position. Despite receiving additional wounds from enemy rounds exploding on his position, Adkins fought off relentless waves of attacking Viet Cong.

Adkins then withdrew to regroup with a smaller element of Soldiers at the communications bunker. While there, he single-handedly eliminated numerous insurgents with small-arms fire, almost completely exhausting his supply of ammunition. Braving intense enemy fire, he returned to the mortar pit, gathered vital ammunition and evaded fire while returning to the bunker. After the order was given to evacuate the camp, Adkins and a small group of Soldiers destroyed all signal equipment and classified documents, dug their way out of the rear of the bunker, and fought their way out of the camp.

Because of his efforts to carry a wounded Soldier to an extraction point and leave no one behind, Adkins and his group were unable to reach the last evacuation helicopter. Adkins then rallied the remaining survivors and led the group into the jungle, where they evaded the enemy for 48 hours, until they were rescued by helicopter, March 12. During the 38-hour battle and 48 hours of escape and evasion, Adkins fought with mortars, machine guns, recoilless rifles, small arms, and hand grenades, killing an estimated 135-175 of the enemy and sustaining 18 different wounds. Adkins' extraordinary heroism and selflessness, above and beyond the call of duty, are in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service, and reflect great credit upon himself, Detachment A-102, 5th Special Forces Group, 1st Special Forces and the United States Army.

After Vietnam, Adkins served as First Sergeant for the Army Garrison Communications Command in Fort Huachuca, Arizona. He then joined Class #3 of the Army Sergeants Major Academy in El Paso, Texas. After graduation, Adkins served with the Special Forces at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and then led training at Fort Sherman's Jungle School in the Panama Canal Zone. He retired from the Army in 1978.

Adkins earned his bachelor's degree from Troy State University, in 1979. He earned his Master's Degree in Education, in 1982, and then, a second Master's Degree in Management, in 1988, all from Troy State University. Simultaneous to pursuing his degree programs, he established the Adkins Accounting Service, Inc., in Auburn, Alabama, serving as its CEO for 22 years. He also taught night classes at Alabama's Southern Union Junior College, for 10 years, and at Auburn University, for six years. Adkins has been married to his wife, Mary, for 59 years, and together they have raised five children.

Adkins' previous awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Bronze Star Medal with one Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster and "V" Device, the Purple Heart with two Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal with Bronze Clasp and Five Loops, the National Defense Service Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with one Silver Service Star and one Bronze Service Star, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Meritorious Unit Citation, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal with "60" Device, the Republic of Vietnam Bravery Medal with Brass Star, the Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Bronze Star, the Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross Unit Citation with Palm Device, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Special Forces Tab, the U.S. Army Master Parachutist Badge, the Vietnamese Parachutist Badge—Two Awards, the Expert Badge with Rifle and Pistol Bars, the Sharpshooter Badge with Carbine Bar, and the Marksman Badge with Machinegun Bar."

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Command Sgt. Maj. Adkins for his service and congratulating him on receiving such a well-deserved honor. He is a true American hero.

H.R. 5272, H.R. 5230, AND

H.J. RES. 76

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong opposition to two pieces of legislation that were brought before the House on August 1st, 2014. H.R. 5272 and H.R. 5230 are partisan bills that do nothing to fix our broken immigration system. Rather than effectively addressing the situation at the border or the larger failures of our immigration system, the House majority has chosen to penalize children by removing trafficking protections for child refugees from Central America, and preventing the administration from deferring the deportation of DREAMers.

Deporting hardworking, law-abiding people who were brought here as children will not

make our country safer or more prosperous. Our resources are limited, and the administration must have the ability to prioritize the deportation of those who are a threat to our country. Furthermore, we will not solve the crisis at our border without seriously investing in our immigration courts and addressing the violence and poverty in Central America that are causing these children to flee. H.R. 5272 and H.R. 5230 are not sincere attempts to address these issues, and although I was not able to vote on these bills, had I been present I would have voted "no" on both.

I would also like to express my strong support for H.J. Res. 76 to provide \$225 million in emergency funding for Israel's Iron Dome missile defense system. The Obama Administration requested the additional funds to help Israel replenish the scores of missiles it is using to defend its civilian population from Hamas rocket attacks. As the author of the Iron Dome Support Act, which authorizes further assistance to Israel for Iron Dome, I support emergency spending to provide additional resources for the missile defense system, which has saved countless civilian lives. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H.J. Res. 76.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF WARREN P. ROGERS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lexington, Kentucky native and businessman Warren P. Rogers for his efforts to find creative solutions to public infrastructure financing as a champion of "P3" public-private partnerships in Kentucky.

As the federal budget faces continued challenges with autopilot spending programs and a massive federal debt crowding out other spending priorities, we must continue to look for creative solutions to fund public projects. In Kentucky, Warren Rogers has worked with the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, the Associated General Contractors of Kentucky, the League of Cities and several other organizations to champion H.B. 407, a bill that would clarify the rules to allow for private-public partnerships—often referred to as P3s—by the state and local governments in Kentucky.

These partnerships are already a tool used by 30 other states, creating greater private-sector involvement and investment in public works, leading to better predictability, less risk and less cost for taxpayers.

Mr. Rogers helped organize and co-chaired the Kentucky Chamber's P3 coalition and testified on behalf of the legislation before committees to encourage its passage. Ultimately, the legislation passed both houses of the Kentucky General Assembly with large bipartisan majorities—27–9 in the Senate and 86–9 in the House. While the Governor found cause to veto this legislation, the broad bipartisan support it enjoys will no doubt lead to its passage once again in 2015.

On behalf of Kentucky's Sixth Congressional District, I would like to thank Warren Rogers

for his work to protect and improve Kentucky's public infrastructure.

IN RECOGNITION OF REV. AND
MRS. WILLIE FRANK SMITH, SR.

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Rev. and Mrs. Willie Frank Smith, Sr. who have been married 50 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Rev. and Mrs. Smith met in Selma, Alabama and were married on July 28, 1964 at New Canaan Baptist Church in Camp Hill, Alabama.

Rev. Smith has served as the pastor at churches in Camp Hill, Valley and Notasulga.

The Smiths have three children including: Willie F. Smith Jr., a minister, medical transcriptionist and Christian education consultant; Monique Smith Gadson, a professional counselor and mother of two daughters Nia and Imani; and Patrick T. Smith, Assistant Professor of Theology and Philosophy at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary and father of Gabrielle and Caleb.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Rev. and Mrs. Smith for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

HONORING DENNIS C. BLESS,
CRNA, MS, PRESIDENT OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
NURSE ANESTHETISTS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Dennis C. Bless, CRNA, MS, of Minneapolis, Minnesota. Mr. Bless will soon complete his year as national president of the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA) whose headquarters are located in my Congressional district. I am proud that Mr. Bless was elected as the 2013–2014 president of this prestigious national organization.

Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) are advanced practice registered nurses who administer approximately 34 million anesthetics to patients each year. They work in every setting in which anesthesia is delivered, including hospital surgical suites, obstetrical delivery rooms, ambulatory surgical centers, and the offices of dentists, podiatrists, and specialty surgeons. They also provide acute and chronic pain management services to patients in need of such care. CRNAs provide anesthesia for all types of surgical cases and are the sole anesthesia providers in many rural hospitals.

As a CRNA for nearly 20 years, Mr. Bless has contributed greatly to the health care community in Minnesota and nationwide, serving as a clinical nurse anesthetist at Fairview Southdale Hospital in Edina, Minnesota. Mr.

Bless also serves as an adjunct instructor for St. Mary's University of Minnesota and clinical/didactic instructor for the Minneapolis School of Anesthesia. He has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to his professional education and development. Mr. Bless was awarded his Master of Science degree in nurse anesthesia from St. Mary's University of Minnesota, a certificate in nurse anesthesia from the Minneapolis School of Anesthesia, a Bachelor of Science degree in nursing from the University of Minnesota and his Bachelor of Science degree in agricultural business from Iowa State University.

In addition to his service as AANA President, Mr. Bless has held various leadership positions in the AANA, including President-elect, Treasurer, Director Region 4, and as a member of numerous AANA committees. Mr. Bless also serves on the Board of Directors for the AANA Associations Management Services and is a distinguished speaker on anesthesia topics, lecturing nationwide on the safety, value and cost-effectiveness of CRNA care.

During his AANA Presidency, Mr. Bless has been a prominent advocate for patients and for the practice of nurse anesthetists before federal agencies and members of Congress. He has worked tirelessly to promote anesthesia patient safety and the value of CRNAs to our healthcare system: recognition of CRNAs as Full Practice Providers in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), proper implementation of provider non-discrimination requirements, and appropriate recognition of the full scope of CRNA practice, including pain management and related services in the Medicare system.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Bless today on a job well done. His service to the AANA, his patients and his commitment to high quality health care nationwide are truly commendable. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his notable career and outstanding achievements.

HONORING DR. ROBERT C. KEEN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary accomplishments of Bobby C. Keen, Ph.D., President and Chief Executive Officer of Hancock Regional Hospital, in my congressional district.

Dr. Keen began his career at Hancock Regional Hospital in 1994 as its Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer. Five months later Dr. Keen was promoted to President and Chief Executive Officer, the position he held for the next twenty years.

Dr. Keen's professional awards and achievements are many and noteworthy. They include the Hancock County Mental Health Association's Time, Talents and Treasures Award, and the Indiana Hospital Association's Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Keen was also appointed by three former Governors to serve on the Executive Committee of the Indiana Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Board, as well as severing under two Gov-

ernors on the Hospital Council of the Indiana State Department of Health.

Hancock Regional Hospital has been an outstanding example of premier health care success in Indiana by delivering top notch medical care and providing expertise to the community. Dr. Keen's steadfast dedication and continued leadership within the hospital has been vital to its success.

Dr. Keen retired from his duties heading this exemplary institution this past June. I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking him for his long career and service to his hospital and community.

HONORING THE NEW YORK HALL OF SCIENCE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the New York Hall of Science on the 50th anniversary of its dedication. The Hall of Science is a true jewel that Queens and all New Yorkers are so proud to have in our city.

This year, Flushing Meadows Corona Park in Queens celebrates the 75th anniversary of the 1939-40 World's Fair and the 50th anniversary of the 1964-65 World's Fair.

The fairs brought the world together in Queens to share experiences and see the newest technologies and products that would one day change our world.

What began as a fair pavilion showcasing exhibits about atomic energy, space exploration and satellite communication has evolved over five decades into one of the world's pre-eminent centers for science education and teacher professional development.

The legacy of the Fair is present not just in the vintage NASA rockets still in the museum's front yard, but in the spirit of innovation, discovery and a quest for knowledge that still permeates the Hall of Science's more than 400 exhibits, which include the country's largest Science Playground and a miniature golf-course where each hole teaches a lesson in space physics.

In celebration of its 50th anniversary, the Hall of Science has just completed a \$50 million fundraising campaign. Two new exhibitions are coming on line this year. Design Lab will introduce visitors to the creative design process and Connected Worlds will present an immersive digital environment where visitors can explore sustainability and learn how their personal actions have a global impact. The campaign has also enabled a \$25 million restoration of the Great Hall, the original World's Fair pavilion. Wallace Harrison's iconic space-age "Cathedral to Science" with its soaring stained glass walls rising 100 feet in the air once again stands as a majestic, inspirational destination for hundreds of thousands of people to get excited about science, technology, engineering and math.

The New York Hall of Science is also preparing to host its fifth annual World Maker Faire on September 20-21. At the great World's Fairs, governments and industry pre-

sented exhibitions on what they thought the future would hold. At World Maker Faire, it is the makers themselves who are offering a preview of the future. More than 600 projects will be on display, giving people a glimpse at the best of creativity in all its forms. The Hall's President, Dr. Margaret Honey, was among the distinguished guests invited by the President to celebrate the first ever White House Maker Faire earlier this year, and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy has been a major supporter of the maker movement as it has grown and evolved worldwide. The movement is tapping into our innate sense of curiosity, creativity and collaboration, with staggering results. More than 100 maker faires took place around the globe last year.

The National Science Foundation, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Office of Naval Research, NASA and the U.S. Department of Education have all been major supporters of the Hall of Science. Recognizing this important institution's impact on education for students, teachers and families, these agencies, not to mention my office and the entire New York delegation, have all supported investments in new educational resources, exhibits and programs that each year serve a half-million museum visitors (many of them children on school field trips), help more than 3,000 teachers enhance their capacity as educators, and inspire countless young people to pursue careers in the STEM fields.

Today, I salute the Hall of Science, a respected leading institution among science education centers worldwide. I wish that all Americans have the chance to visit the Hall at some point in their lives. For the New Yorkers that haven't visited yet, I hope you have a chance to visit this Queens treasure as soon as you can.

HONORING PATTI GILMORE

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patti Gilmore of Hutto, TX. A pillar of this quiet town nestled in the heart of my congressional district, Patti is retiring after years of exemplary service to her beloved community.

Daily life in a city like Hutto rests upon the shoulders of dedicated public servants like Patti Gilmore. Throughout her career, she was the indispensable woman, juggling a multitude of responsibilities, performing great work whenever needed, and making it look easy. As if managing the administrative support and operations of the City Manager's office wasn't enough work, Patti coordinated meetings, press releases, and distributed the informative Hutto Highlights newsletter. She also managed the legislative initiatives for the City while maintaining effective relations with other governmental entities.

Patti's dedication to making Hutto a great place to live is second to none. She pioneered countless programs such as Hutto Day at the Capitol, Youth in Government, Hutto Citizen's University, and Hutto Matters. She led and

served on numerous civic committees including Hutto Has Heart, Friday Night Live, Youth Advisory Task Force, and Marketing Task Force. Patti is also very active in several community organizations including the Hutto Lions Club, Hutto Discovery Methodist Church, and Al-Anon.

Yet Patti's commitment to service doesn't end at the Hutto city limits. Working with the Adopt-A-Unit program, she has been instrumental in obtaining donations, organizing events and providing support to deployed troops and their families. Her acts are a sign of true patriotism to our great nation and to the men and women who serve our country.

Patti Gilmore's extraordinary commitment to service reflects the best values of Central Texas. She has positively impacted the lives of thousands and there's no doubt that Hutto is a better place because of her. I join all the people of Hutto in saluting her service.

IN RECOGNITION OF LARRY AND
DONNA PRESLEY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Larry Presley who have been married 56 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Larry and Donna met while attending Phillips University in Enid, Oklahoma. They were married on August 30, 1958 in Overland Park, Kansas. They moved to Lee County, Alabama, in 1987.

Larry has been in the ministry 57 years and still serves as full-time minister in Opelika, Alabama. The Presleys have two sons, Lynn and Jamey.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Larry and Donna Presley for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF ST. NICHOLAS BYZ-
ANTINE CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a significant milestone in the life of St. Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Parish of Lorain, Ohio in my District. The parish will celebrate its 100th anniversary on Sunday, September 14, 2014.

The parish history recounts that on September 14, 1914, the first Byzantine Catholic bishop, Bishop Soter Ortinsky, dedicated St. Nicholas Church. The pastor at that time was Father Basil Beretz. The people who were members of the parish had actually initiated plans for a church of the Byzantine Rite Catholics a number of years before that time. St. Nicholas' founders emigrated from a region of the Austro-Hungarian Empire which is today

the easternmost part of Czechoslovakia and arrived in Lorain, Ohio in the last part of the 19th century and the beginning of the twentieth century. They attended St. Michael Hungarian Byzantine Rite Catholic Church and for a brief time services were held in Kohlmyer's Hall in Lorain.

The church history characterizes the years from 1900 to 1914 as the formative years of St. Nicholas Parish: "In 1905 a committee of Byzantine Rite Catholics of Rusyn origin sought the advice and counsel of the late Bishop Joseph Schrembs, Bishop of Cleveland. In 1907 the faithful of the future St. Nicholas Parish solicited funds for the purchase of lots on Toledo Avenue, Lorain, the former site of the church and rectory. The parish would then relocate in 1982 to 2711 W. 40th Street, the present site of the St. Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Church complex. An historical mural retained in the old church for many years contained the list of the following contributors for the lots: Andrew Kakos, Andrew Ksenich, Andrew Karahuts, George Ksenich, Michael Lascisky, Michael Rusinko, George Demchik, John Danko, George Vajda, Vasil Pavelvach, Peter Yureck, John Kocak, Joseph Kokinda, Peter Kekel, John Taraka, Stephen Lascisky, Elek Ksenich, John Kvasnak, Nicholas Ksenich, Vasil Teleha, Peter Hazlak, Mike Rericky, Peter Hrinda, George Maczik, Mike Kizak, Jacob Andraska, John Jeresko. Stephen Ksenich, Joseph Suster, John Moroznak, George Tomcso, Frank Kablinka, John Szalag, Daniel Demjanovich, Mike Koscs, Mike Koczak, Joseph Szasz, Joseph Gluvna, John Naaymik and John Maylik. The purchase of the aforementioned lots was consummated through the Cleveland Chancery in the name of Bishop Schrembs and held by him in trust for the St. Nicholas Parish. In this manner St. Nicholas Parish was constituted as a Catholic parish under a Catholic bishop."

The church continued to grow and expand, both physically and in membership. A rectory was added in 1919 and a second story of the original church was dedicated on July 16, 1928, by Bishop Basil Takach, the first bishop of the Byzantine Rite Catholic Exarchate of Pittsburgh. Renovations continued and in 1946 the mortgage was paid off.

Under the stewardship of Father Andrew Pataki who later became the bishop of Parma, a parochial school was built. On Sunday, June 12, 1960, a festival was held and Bishop Nicholas T. Elko blessed a newly renovated St. Nicholas Church and the new St. Nicholas School. Sisters under the Order of St. Basil the Great came to Lorain to begin teaching at the school in 1962. A small house was purchased nearby and remodeled by parishioners as a convent.

On Dec. 14, 1964, St. Nicholas' celebrated its golden jubilee with bishop Nicholas T. Elko officiating at the pontifical Divine Liturgy assisted by the former pastors Fathers Andrew Pataki and George Simchak.

By the late 1970s it was apparent the church had outgrown its original buildings and, in "a beautiful testimonial to the generosity and the love that our parishioners have for their church" according to the history, the substantial funds needed to build a new building were raised. A ground-breaking ceremony was held on Sunday, Jan. 25, 1981. During the

ceremony, the history notes, "the sound of axes could be heard ringing from the nearby woods. The St. Nicholas wood-chopping crew had a lot of land to clear and they did not have time to attend the ceremony. Additionally, a "hearty band of volunteers worked throughout the year of 1981 and painted the entire interior of the complex, laid all the floor tiles (estimated at over 10,000 tiles), sanded and stained all the woodwork and contributed thousands of cost-free hours of labor. As a result of their physical contribution, the interior of the convent was finished as well as many other items that were not in the original contract. By early spring, the new complex was nearing completion and an appeal was made for volunteers to purchase the pews, certain kitchen items and the appointments in the church. The response was overwhelming. The parishioners of St. Nicholas, the Greek Catholic Union Lodge, the Russo-Slav Club and other fraternal organizations associated with the church had come through once again.

The church history records that "the last service to be held at the old St. Nicholas Church was on Palm Sunday, April 4, 1982, and many a tear was shed as the last song was sung. Finally, on Holy Thursday evening, April 8, 1982, Father Felock blessed the new altar and church and the first service was held." The life of the parish continued in its new location through the 1980s, 1990s and into the new century. The school was closed in 2007 and the parish embarked on a mission of renewal as the new century dawned.

Today, the members of St. Nicholas Church's focus is on its future even as they honor its past. Standing on the shoulders of its founders and the families who established the parish as a cornerstone of its community, the parishioners of today's St. Nicholas Byzantine Catholic Church are proud of its rich history. Yet, as they celebrate a century of parish life, the congregation of St. Nicholas' looks toward the next century with hope and faith. Onward!

OPPOSITION TO THE BAY DELTA
CONSERVATION PLAN

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to express my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, or BDCP. The BDCPs comment period closed at the end of July and California state officials reviewed comments from stakeholders throughout California as it determines the best route going forward. The result: the state has delayed implementation of the BDCP.

Since being elected to Congress in 2006, I've expressed concerns with this proposal. Building two tunnels that make it easier to ship Delta water south does nothing to address California's larger water issues. We need to focus our investments on recycling, desalinization, conservation, and storage—both above and below ground. Becoming better managers of our water resources will help prepare our state for wet and dry years.

As evident by the BDCPs delay, this flawed plan is based on unreasonable assumptions

instead of sound science and has raised red flags from various federal agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. That is why I offered an amendment to the FY15 Energy and Water Appropriations Act to ban the government from funding tunnels taking our water. We must focus our finite federal resources on initiatives that will result in increased water supply and storage capacity, not waste it on projects that take from one region of the state and send it to another.

The BDCP is not a plan that reflects the interests of all Californians; I along with my Delta colleagues remain willing to work with all parties on a statewide solution that considers all stakeholders interests.

HONORING ALAN AND SALLY
MERTEN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Mason University President Emeritus Dr. Alan Merten and his wife, Sally. In June, I had the pleasure of attending a dedication naming the university's new senior administration building "Alan and Sally Merten Hall."

Dr. Merten served as George Mason University's president for 16 years, stepping down in 2012. This dedication is a fitting tribute to the Mertens, a pair who worked tirelessly for the better part of two decades promoting, growing and improving George Mason University. As a result of Alan and Sally's efforts, the university has become one of Virginia's greatest schools, as well as a nationally and internationally recognized center of academic and research excellence.

Current George Mason President Angel Cabrera honored the Mertens' service to the George Mason community at the June 23 ceremony. President Cabrera and former Board of Visitors rector, Edwin Meese III, lauded the Mertens' contributions to the school and to the community, and I was allowed to offer a few words as well. I always enjoyed working with Dr. Merten and was grateful for the opportunity to speak on my relationship with Alan and Sally, as well as my appreciation for their commitment to the school and leadership in the community.

As stated in the resolution used to enact the dedication, the Mertens' legacy includes four endowed scholarships and numerous gifts to university building and program funds. There is no doubt that George Mason is a better institution for the Mertens' efforts. I hope they will remain active in the George Mason community for many years to come.

I respectfully submit George Mason University's "Resolution to Rename University Hall" and the following news article from George Mason University on the ceremony.

RESOLUTION TO RENAME UNIVERSITY HALL IN
HONOR OF ALAN AND SALLY MERTEN

Whereas, George Mason University President Emeritus Dr. Alan G. Merten led the university with distinction for 16 years, dur-

ing which time he launched an ambitious and successful program to build the school into a major teaching and research university; and

Whereas, under Alan Merten's leadership, George Mason University became the largest research university in the Commonwealth of Virginia, with increasingly nationally and internationally highly ranked programs; and

Whereas, Mrs. Sally Merten, the former first lady of George Mason University, was instrumental in bringing the community and the university closer together, serving on several community nonprofit boards during her husband's tenure as president, including Fall for the Book, as well as several university advisory boards; and

Whereas, Sally Merten actively participated in university life, especially employee recognition events; and

Whereas, together Alan and Sally Merten have been generous donors to the university, establishing four endowed scholarships: the G. Louise and Anthony J. Otto Endowed Scholarship in Creative Writing; the Eric G. and Melissa H. Merten Endowed Scholarship; the Ruth A. and Gilbert E. Merten Endowed Scholarship; and the Kathleen A. Lieder and Lloyd C. Fell Student Scholarship Endowment in Music Performance/Vocal Studies; and

Whereas, the Mertens have made significant gifts to a number of other university funds, including the Patriot Club, the Long and Kimmy Nguyen Engineering Building, and Mason arts programs; and

Whereas, the Mertens remain active and engaged members of the surrounding community, thus continuing to serve as "ambassadors" of the university; Now, be it therefore

Resolved that the building on the Fairfax Campus now known as University Hall be named Alan and Sally Merten Hall in recognition of the Mertens' many contributions to George Mason University; be it further

Resolved that this resolution be entered into the minutes of the George Mason University Board of Visitors this day, May 7, 2014.

(SEAL)

C. DANIEL CLEMENTE,
Rector, George Mason University
Board of Visitors.

GEORGE MASON UNVEILS ALAN AND SALLY
MERTEN HALL

(By Preston Williams)

On Monday, George Mason University dedicated Alan and Sally Merten Hall in a building renaming ceremony attended by hundreds of members of the Mason community and several integral figures from the university's history.

Alan Merten was Mason's fifth president, serving from 1996 to 2012. Merten Hall is the new name for what formerly was called University Hall, one of many structures erected during the Mertens' dynamic 16-year tenure.

"When I travel around the region, the country or the world and people ask me what I'm most proud of with respect to what's happened at George Mason," Alan Merten told the attendees, "the answer is always I'm proud of the pride that people have in this institution as a result of what we've all done."

"What kept me going—what keeps us all going—is stamina, passion and a caring attitude. That's what got George Mason going. That's what will keep George Mason going," Merten added before exiting to a standing ovation at the outdoor ceremony on the grounds outside Merten Hall.

Merten's successor as Mason president, Ángel Cabrera, hailed the Mertens' leadership of making "one smart decision at a time" and said that renaming the building in their honor was symbolic of their many contributions to the university.

"It is a reminder of how much these two individuals gave of their time tirelessly and how they helped George Mason be what it is today," said Cabrera, whose office has been relocated to Merten Hall, on the north end of the Fairfax Campus.

Two guests in particular added historical insight to the Mertens' tenure. Virginia Congressman Frank Wolf, who taught at the university in the late 1970s, and the former Board of Visitors rector, Edwin Meese III, cited the joint efforts of the Mertens as crucial to the university's growth, not only in size and enrollment but in stature as the largest public research university in the state.

"It's become one of the great universities in the commonwealth and one of the great universities in our country and it's all because of the great work—and they work as a team—Alan and Sally have done," Wolf said.

Meese's first year on the Board of Visitors coincided with the Mertens' first year in office. They built a strong partnership.

"It is said that a great institution is the length and shadow of its leadership," said Meese, the former attorney general under Ronald Reagan. "And that's certainly true in this case. . . . The beneficial shadow of your leadership is now permanently inscribed in the form of this building. You've made [the university] the knowledge and cultural centerpiece of Northern Virginia."

The current Board of Visitors rector, C. Daniel Clemente, read aloud the board resolution that formally proposed renaming the building Alan and Sally Merten Hall.

The Mertens remain active on campus and serve in a variety of roles for the university. They have endowed four scholarships.

HONORING DORIS KRASICK GOLDBERG QUEEN ON THE OCCASION
OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Doris Krasick Goldberg Queen, on the occasion of her 100th birthday, which will be celebrated on September 28, 2014. She is a long-time constituent whose family I have known for more than 20 years.

Doris was born on September 28, 1914 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1939, she married Lewis Goldberg and together they were the proprietors of a longstanding Philadelphia neighborhood grocery store and butcher shop called "Lew's Thrifty Market." They had two children, Arlene Sockel (spouse Richard) and Robert Goldberg (spouse Hedy), four grandchildren, Bonnie Sockel-Stone (spouse Elliot, son of former United States Senator Richard Stone), Iris Sockel Mitrakos (spouse Steve), Lewis Goldberg (spouse Morgan) and Ellen Goldberg, and six great-grandchildren (Lily, Elizabeth, Jason, Stella, Ivy and Oliver).

Following the passing of her husband Lewis in 1971, Doris married widower Jesse Queen in 1973. Together they retired to Lauderdale

Lakes, Florida, where they shared many vibrant years together, enjoying the company of family and friends. Jesse passed away in 1992, but Doris remains active and engaged in her current home of Tamarac, Florida.

It gives me great pride to honor Doris on the occasion of her 100th birthday. I wish her all the very best for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING
ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CA-
REER OF DR. CLIFFORD
DEBAPTISTE

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Clifford DeBaptiste of Chester County, Pennsylvania on his 90th birthday, 60 years as owner and proprietor of the DeBaptiste Funeral Home, and for his incomparable record of community engagement.

Clifford DeBaptiste first came to West Chester, Pennsylvania on a visit in the 1940's. After serving in the U.S. Army, he graduated from mortuary school and married his lovely wife, Inez Manning. They then opened the DeBaptiste Funeral Home in 1954 and, in 1965, moved the business from its original location to 25 South Worthington Street where it may be found today.

In addition to running a successful business for 60 years, Dr. DeBaptiste has made numerous other invaluable contributions to the Greater West Chester community and beyond, including serving as West Chester's first African-American Mayor from 1994–2002. Additionally, he has been honored by the NAACP for his business leadership and by the National Purple Heart Association for his service in the U.S. Army. In 2014, Dr. DeBaptiste was also coronated a Sovereign Grand Inspector General, the Thirty-Third and last degree in the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry. Further, Dr. DeBaptiste chaired the Pennsylvania State Board of Funeral Directors for 13 years, received its President's Medallion for Service in 1991, and an honorary Doctor of Public Service Degree from West Chester University in 1999.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the 60 years of his incredible business record and service to the community, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Dr. Clifford DeBaptiste, one of Chester County, Pennsylvania's most valued and respected citizens.

IN RECOGNITION OF JERRELL AND
VERA McNUTT

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Jerrell McNutt who have been married 59 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Jerrell and Vera McNutt married on September 2, 1955, at Needham Presbyterian Church in Elizabethtown, Kentucky. Mr. McNutt, a World War II veteran, earned three degrees and for the past 48 years has taught graduate-level Theology using the experimental method Clinica Pastoral Education (CPE). He has also served as CPE Supervisor for over 27 years at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Tuskegee, Alabama. Mrs. McNutt has served as chief nurse in a Psychiatric Facility, Labor and Delivery and Geriatric Care.

The McNutts have three children, six grandchildren and one great-grandson including: Linda Joy Jones, a teacher and mother of two sons and grandmother to one grandson; Barbara Vickery, an RN and mother of one son and one daughter; and Jerry Lester McNutt, an audio engineer, and father of two sons.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Jerrell and Vera McNutt for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

HONORING DIANE COWAN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary work of Diane Cowan of Temple, TX. Diane is the latest recipient of the Cy Carpenter Award from Experience Works for her leadership, advocacy on behalf of older workers, and never-ending passion to help others succeed.

Diane retired in 2012 after a 36-year career with Experience Works, where she held progressively responsible positions including Texas state director and national customer service center director. Through her tireless efforts, she has helped Experience Works fulfill its noble mission to assist thousands of mature workers over age 55 with job placement, job training, and job counseling. Her leadership and advocacy, especially for older Americans in rural areas, makes her the ideal recipient of the prestigious Cy Carpenter Award.

Diane Cowan brings to life Gandhi's words that "The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others." Her commitment to advocacy and helping others reflects the best values of Central Texas. I applaud her work and wish her success as she continues to be a champion for older Americans.

HONORING THE PHILADELPHIA
OFFICE OF FORENSIC SCIENCE

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Philadelphia Office of Forensic Science. Forensic science is the application of a broad spectrum of sciences and technologies to investigate and establish facts of interest in relation to criminal or civil law. The word forensic comes from the Latin foren-

sic, meaning "before the forum." In modern usage, the word defines a category of legal evidence that may be presented in a legal courtroom setting. Forensic science is a vital public service and access to quality forensic analysis dramatically improves the investigation of criminal activity leading to the exoneration of the innocent and the prosecution of the guilty. Forensic science plays a critical role in public outreach and crime prevention and that role is evolving within the criminal justice community. Crime scene investigators, forensic examiners and forensic scientists provide unbiased, accurate and reliable analyses of evidence recovered from scenes across the nation. In the United States there are more than 12,000 forensic scientists active in the field.

The dedicated and hardworking individuals that comprise the forensic science organizations are worthy of recognition for their commitment to proper scientific investigations to support the cause of justice. Through quality forensic services, accredited programs, validated scientific techniques and a commitment to scientific integrity, forensic scientists make a significant impact in our communities.

From August 10–16, 2014, professional organizations across the country acknowledged the value of modern forensic science and the role of forensic examiners by hosting events to observe National Forensic Science Week. Activities were presented to encourage a better understanding of forensic science and educate local, state and federal policy makers to the current capabilities and future challenges facing this field.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in expressing appreciation for the people, facilities, and technologies that make reliable forensic science possible for the betterment of our communities.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE WILDERNESS ACT

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, located in Harding Township, County of Morris, New Jersey, as it celebrates the 50th Anniversary of the Wilderness Act.

On September 3, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed one of the most important and successful pieces of conservation legislation: The Wilderness Act. Over the past half-century, the Wilderness Act has led to the preservation of environmentally sensitive land in more than 750 Wilderness Areas in 44 states across America, encompassing 109 million acres.

Almost 7,800 acres of that total is found in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in Morris County, New Jersey. One of the most beautiful, peaceful, ecologically diverse and environmentally important areas of the Garden State, the Great Swamp is true wilderness, formed by the retreat of the Wisconsin Glacier. The Refuge remains today much as it has for millennia. But what took nature thousands of

years to create was once almost destroyed in the blink of an eye.

In 1961, the Port of New York Authority (as it was then known) wanted to build another airport—the fourth—for the metropolitan area. The new airport would have been enormous: twice the size of Kennedy International Airport. If the Port Authority had its way, it would have paved over New Jersey's Great Swamp, which the PA maintained was the only practical site it could find.

Then, as now, the Port Authority was a powerful player in the region's politics. The Port Authority was used to getting what it wanted. Stopping it would not be easy. But in what would become one of the nation's first modern major environmental battles pitting progress against preservation, preservation and citizen action would win.

Among those who fought to save the Great Swamp was the area's representative in Congress, my father, Peter H.B. Frelinghuysen.

Described by the New York Times as "a leader of the opposition," my father headed the steering committee formed to oppose the Port Authority's plan. He helped mobilize the New Jersey Congressional delegation—both Republicans and Democrats—against the idea. He was joined by literally thousands of citizens in marshalling support and raising money to save what one writer described as "a natural masterpiece."

At countless hearings and public meetings, the public came out against the proposal. One of the most effective citizen leaders was Helen Fenske. Her efforts were recently recognized by naming the visitor's center at the Great Swamp in her honor. At one meeting called by the Department of Interior, more than 900 people crowded the room. Only one person spoke in favor of the proposed airport. He was not well received.

Yet despite the enormous outpouring of support for saving the Great Swamp, the Port Authority continued to press forward. But its efforts would never come to fruition. On May 29, 1964, 2,600 acres of the Great Swamp were designated a National Wildlife Refuge, the first such protected wilderness in the country. In recognition of the leadership and generosity of M. Hartley Dodge, who donated a considerable portion of the land for the new refuge, it carried his name.

Had the PA succeeded, the residents of New Jersey and New York would have been the primary losers. The Great Swamp helps regenerate and improves air quality for millions of people in New York City and northern New Jersey, protects water supplies, and provides homes to a wide variety of wildlife, including more than 200 species of birds—among them, our national emblem, the American Bald Eagle. But the nation would also have lost forever this unique natural treasure.

My father considered his effort to help preserve the Great Swamp as the proudest legacy of his service in the House of Representatives. During my own tenure in Congress, I have followed his lead. Over the years I have secured Federal funds to expand the Refuge.

Today, the tens of millions of people who visit the Great Swamp and the hundreds of other Wilderness Areas across the country can learn about and appreciate some of the most beautiful parts of America's precious natural heritage.

President Johnson called the Wilderness Act one of the "most far-reaching conservation measures that a farsighted nation" had ever enacted. As we mark its 50th Anniversary, my hope is that we will continue to build on its legacy for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Wilderness Act.

HONORING ARNOLD HARVEY

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I pay special tribute to an outstanding citizen from the State of Maryland, Arnold Harvey.

One of the great strengths of this country is how the American people look out for one another. When our neighbor is suffering, we lend a hand.

Arnold Harvey personifies that virtue. A Waste Management commercial driver for over 20 years, Mr. Harvey saw individuals and families in need along his route and worked to do something about it. In cooperation with his employer, Mr. Harvey organized food and clothing drives. He also founded a non-profit, God's Connection Transition to help those in his community in Gaithersburg, Maryland. Today, in partnership with grocery stores, retailers, churches and shelters, his non-profit donates food to 5,000 families a month.

Arnold Harvey is a shining light helping others during dark times. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should reflect the good work he has done as a permanent testament to his generosity and the generosity of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Arnold Harvey for his outstanding service to his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF WAYNE AND JEAN IVEY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Ivey who have been married 50 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Jean of Manchester, Georgia and Wayne of Columbus, Georgia met while attending a surprise birthday party. They were married in Manchester on August 23, 1964.

In 1966, Wayne joined the Air Force and he and Jean joined a Baptist church in Tampa, Florida. Soon after, Wayne began to feel the call of God to full-time ministry. Since he had a problem with stuttering, he did not see how God could use him as a pastor, but Wayne soon found when he spoke on subjects related to God he did not stutter.

After completing his education, Wayne served as pastor in two full-time churches,

Pleasant Grove in Abbeville and Midway in Smiths Station, both in Alabama. For almost a decade, he has served as part-time pastor of Northside Baptist Church in Opelika, Alabama. Jean currently works part-time as administrative assistant for the Tuskegee Lee Baptist Association.

They have two children, four grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Wayne and Jean Ivey for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

CONGRATULATING STEFFES REGISTERED HOLSTEINS FOR RECEIVING THE ILLINOIS MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dennis, Jane, and Darcy Steffes of Steffes Registered Holsteins of Elizabeth, Illinois, whose farm was recently awarded the Illinois Milk Producers' Association Environmental Stewardship Award.

Dennis and Jane have continued to build upon their family's five-generation tradition of dairy farming. Along with their daughter Darcy and three employees, Dennis and Jane strive to consistently produce high quality milk, all while staying conscious of the farm's impact on the environment.

It was with these goals in mind that the Steffes built a concrete tank on their property for the storage of manure, water, and yard run-off, with the contents being applied to the ground twice a year as part of the farm's comprehensive nutrient management plan. This plan has helped the Steffes to maintain an effective crop rotation program, ensuring that the land will continue to produce for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to know that businesses such as Steffes Registered Holsteins exist, and I want to once again congratulate the Steffes family and their employees on having been recognized by their peers for their dedication to environmentally friendly and sustainable farming practices.

HAPPY 125TH BIRTHDAY TO LAFAYETTE, COLORADO

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 125th birthday of the city of Lafayette Colorado, one of the historical gems of the Rocky Mountain Front Range. Lafayette is set in a dramatic location at the area that the plains meet the Rocky Mountains. Before the land was settled, the Cheyenne and Arapahoe nations roamed the plains. After migrating from the east coast, frontier woman Mary Miller raised her six children on the land and cultivated one of the most successful farms in

Colorado. In 1888 Mary platted a 150 acre two site and named it Lafayette, after her late husband. The town had agricultural and ranching success which continues to shape its landscape and culture. In 1889 the town was officially incorporated into Colorado.

After the first mine shaft was dug in 1887, Lafayette grew to a thriving mining town. The community survived on the coal mining industry for the century to come. The last mine in Lafayette closed in 1956 and the town became a successful commercial and small industrial community nestled between Denver and Boulder.

Lafayette is known for their commitment to local art, respect of the environment, and historical preservation in their city. I congratulate the people of Lafayette for 125 years of community and prosperity and look eagerly forward to the future of this beautiful city.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRS FOR
MUSIC ON 100 YEARS OF PRO-
TECTING SONGWRITERS AND
COMPOSERS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize PRS for Music—the United Kingdom's Performing Rights Society—representing that nation's composers, lyricists and music publishers—on its milestone 100th anniversary.

Founded in 1914, the same year as ASCAP, its sister American performing rights organization, PRS for Music has, for a century, championed and protected the rights of music writers and publishers by licensing the public performance of their music. Significantly, via reciprocal agreements with America's performing rights organizations, our friends at PRS for Music have protected our country's music creators by making it possible for American songwriters and composers to receive royalties when their works are performed in the United Kingdom.

British music creators who joined the PRS in its early years include Ivor Novello, the writer of "Keep the Home Fires Burning," Noël Coward, writer of "Mad Dogs and Englishmen," Ray Noble, composer of "The Very Thought of You," Jimmy Kennedy, lyricist of "South of the Border," Gustav Holst, composer of The Planets, Benjamin Britten, composer of The Young Person's Guide to the Orchestra, and pioneering music publishers William Boosey and Oliver Hawkes, who founded the PRS.

As time went on, the musical cross-pollination between the United States and the United Kingdom grew more and more intense and PRS songwriters who have made their mark on the USA and the world include the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, Elton John, Rod Stewart, Andrew Lloyd Webber, Phil Collins, and Adele.

PRS for Music has played a leading role in the global music industry for 100 years and has weathered every new development in music delivery and musical style. I hope that

my colleagues will join me in applauding the significant contributions of PRS for Music and wishing them many more years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. A.L.
WILSON AND NANCY MAE BROWN

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Dr. and Mrs. A.L. Wilson who have been married 66 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

A.L. Wilson and his wife, Nancy Mae, were both born in Elmore County, Alabama and married on August 8, 1948. The Wilsons moved to Lee County in 1954 so Dr. Wilson could be pastor of Thompson Chapel AME Zion. Dr. Wilson served as pastor there for 50 years.

A.L. and Nancy Mae raised six children and have eight grandchildren. They include: Vandy Wilson, a retired Air Force veteran and father of three; Dr. Linda Wilson, who has a Ph.D in nursing and has one child; Carolyn Wilson-Dandridge, an Air Force veteran and mother of two; Barbara Wilson-Frazier, a graduate of Tennessee State University; Michael Wilson, a graduate of Livingstone College in Salisbury, NC; and Authurine Wilson-Sims, deceased after a short, but successful life as a teacher of special education. She leaves behind two children.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Dr. and Mrs. A.L. Wilson for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

RECOGNIZING SOUTHWEST MISSOURI
REGIONAL COMMUNITY
EMERGENCY RESPONSE TEAM

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Southwest Missouri Regional Community Emergency Response Team (MOCERT1) on being awarded one of the 2014 Community Preparedness Awards by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Each year FEMA announces the winners of its Individual and Community Preparedness Awards. These awards are intended to recognize the outstanding emergency preparedness efforts of individuals, programs, and organizations throughout the country.

Out of more than 230 applications FEMA received for the 2014 Individual and Community Preparedness Awards only 11 were chosen to be awarded with the honor.

MOCERT1 is the first regional Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) within the State of Missouri. MOCERT1 incorporates the region's city and county CERT personnel, equipment, and assets into one regionally based team. MOCERT1 has enabled larger

and stronger response efforts that would not otherwise be possible. MOCERT1 has not only deployed relief efforts locally, but their help has been requested in surrounding states and communities. The many response efforts of MOCERT1 have included helping the communities of Moore, Oklahoma, and Baxter Springs, Kansas, with tornado relief and response efforts.

I am honored to recognize the members of MOCERT1 for their outstanding and commendable efforts in providing assistance to local and regional communities.

HONORING BERRY GORDY, JR.

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize "Berry Gordy Day" in Oakland, California, honoring Mr. Berry Gordy Jr.'s many contributions to the music and film industry. Known as the founder of Motown Records, Mr. Gordy has paved the way for many artists and played an inspiring role in breaking racial barriers.

Born on November 28, 1929, Mr. Berry Gordy Jr. was raised in Detroit, Michigan as the seventh of eight children. Before working in the entertainment industry, Mr. Gordy pursued a career in boxing and was later drafted into the United States Army to serve in the Korean War.

In 1959, Mr. Berry Gordy Jr. founded Motown Records, making his record company the first African American owned music company in the United States. His record company was the epicenter of one of the most popular and influential musical movements of the 20th century, the Motown Sound, which combines African American gospel singing with rock and roll.

The Motown Sound helped to desegregate America's music industry and the social climate of the nation. Mr. Gordy's vision introduced the world to the soul of the streets of Black America, which included recording artists such as Stevie Wonder, Smokey Robinson, Diana Ross, Michael Jackson, the Temptations, and many more.

Motown Records later expanded to incorporate other sectors of the entertainment industry. Motown's Black Forum label gave voice to the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements through recording the speeches and works of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Amiri Baraka, Elaine Brown and many other influential leaders. In addition, Motown Records began producing films to share the stories of African American life and the deplorable inequality of racial segregation, including Lady Sings the Blues and The Bingo Long Traveling All Star.

Throughout his prolific career, Mr. Gordy has been the recipient of numerous awards. In 1988, he was inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame. Mr. Gordy has also been honored with a Star on Hollywood's Walk of Fame and received the Songwriter's Hall of Fame Pioneer Award in 2013.

I grew up listening to the music of Motown, and my fondest memories of my teen years

are learning to dance to the beat of Motown, day dreaming about love and life, and discussing the genius of African American artists and musicians. Berry Gordy captured my imagination and, to this day, Motown lifts my spirit and brings joy into my life.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, Mr. Berry Gordy, I salute you. As we join together on August 18 to celebrate "Berry Gordy Day" in the East Bay, I thank you for a lifetime of service and congratulate you on your many achievements. I wish you all the best as your musical contributions and work continue to inspire future generations in our country and around the world.

HONORING CHEF DURIO

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the ninth anniversary of Hurricane Katrina, I rise to recognize the resilience demonstrated by many Louisianans in the years following that tragic event. While we are all familiar with the tragedy of this horrific event, I am reminded of the triumph of the people of New Orleans, who worked side by side to overcome the devastation and rebuild our great city. I remember all of us working to help our fellow New Orleanians, to feed the displaced and support our first responders.

Today, I would like to recognize the contributions of Chef Durio. Chef Durio is a true hero. Not only did he not abandon New Orleans in her time of need, but doubled down on his efforts to help her get through this difficult time. At one point during the aftermath of the hurricane, he would spend days traveling from New Orleans to Biloxi, Houston, and Lafayette to prepare meals for first responders and those in need. There are not enough words to truly thank him for playing his part in this story.

Louisiana Chef of the year for 2007, and a lifelong New Orleanian, Chef Durio started out as a barber. I am pleased and honored to know him and glad to introduce everyone in America to a true American hero.

IN RECOGNITION OF JERRY AND JUNE HUNT

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Hunt who have been married 66 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Jerry and June Hunt were married in Atlanta, Georgia on October 24, 1948. Mr. and Mrs. Hunt both grew up with a father who served as a pastor. Pastor Hunt served as the associate pastor with his grandson of the church where his father and his wife's father

served as pastors. This church was Fellowship Primitive Baptist Church in McDonough, Georgia founded in 1829 in Tucker, Georgia.

Pastor Hunt owned a business and was pastor of a church in Atlanta before moving to Hopewell Primitive Baptist Church in Lee County, Alabama in 2008.

Jerry and June have three children including: Frances June Hunt, mother of seven; Jerry M. Hunt, Jr., father of three; and Virginia Ann Hunt Corley, mother of three. The Hunts have 13 grandchildren and 40 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Jerry and June Hunt for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

IN HONOR OF TOM VIDMAR

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of the late Tom Vidmar.

Tom took on major responsibilities at an early age, becoming the primary caretaker for himself and his two younger brothers when he was fourteen. He quit high school to work jobs at a corner grocery store and at a gas station. At the age of seventeen he joined the U.S. Navy, working as a jet mechanic and later patrolling the coast of Vietnam. After completing his military service, he worked various jobs while simultaneously earning a high school diploma, a degree from Fresno City College, and eventually a Bachelor of Science Degree in Industrial Technology and a minor in Business from California State University, Fresno.

After working as a representative of Ford Motor Co., Mr. Vidmar established Anlin Window Systems in Fresno, moving the company to Clovis in 1999. The company grew to encompass 350 employees and earned many accolades, including its designation by this very House as an "Industrial Business of the Year." It is well known not only for being a successful company, but also for the icons of Americana and the U.S. flags that adorn its building, as well as its Fourth of July military tributes and Christmas displays.

These characteristics reflected the qualities of the company's founder. Mr. Vidmar was a deeply religious man and an altruistic member of the community who supported a wide array of local charitable activities. He was a great patriot and proud family man whose sons, both of whom were among Anlin's very first employees, now help run the family business. He leaves behind his wife Linda, two sons, eight grandchildren, and a community that is grateful for all his contributions.

SAN BRUNO 4TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, four years ago today, a massive explosion killed eight of my

constituents, injured 66, and destroyed 38 homes, and scarred a San Bruno neighborhood.

The fire roared for 90 minutes until PG&E finally located the gas line's manual shut-off valve. Last week the California Public Utilities Commission recommended a \$1.4 billion fine. Their punishment must send a message to all utilities across the country: putting profits before safety has serious consequences.

We're good at passing legislation that doesn't solve problems and patting ourselves on the back. The fact that there have been ten more explosions since then shows we must do more. That's why I'll be introducing legislation that will adopt recommendations from the National Transportation Safety Board including requiring auto and remote shut off valves and hydrostatic testing.

Please join me in honoring the families of the Crestmoor neighborhood and the first responders. I also ask you to join me in remembering the lives of Jacqueline Greig [Greg], Janessa Greig [Greg], Jessica Morales, Elizabeth Torres, Lavonne Bullis, Greg Bullis, Will Bullis, and James Emil Franco.

RECOGNIZING THE 2014 GREEN RIBBON SCHOOLS

HON. JIM MATHESON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Chairman of the Green Schools Caucus to highlight the important contributions of the Department of Education's Green Ribbon Schools Program and to congratulate all the schools recognized as 2014 Green Ribbon Schools. This program began in 2011, and seeks to encourage schools, school districts, and institutions of higher education to adopt practices focused on sustainability, health, and environmental education.

The Green Ribbon Schools Program offers awards for outstanding performance based on three categories of achievement. Schools and districts are first evaluated on the basis of success in reducing their overall environmental impact. The award also evaluates school and district strategies to improve the health and wellness of students and staff. Lastly, the Green Ribbon Schools Program examines the extent to which environmental education is offered, and whether those programs incorporate STEM subjects, civics, and green career counseling. All those recognized this year have made exceptional strides in each of these areas.

Those recognized are invited to Washington, DC each year to share their experiences and discuss best practices with other leaders in the field. This process of sharing information and highlighting the achievements of individual schools and districts offers an incentive for others to work toward a common goal of a more sustainable future. It also offers the chance for school officials to compare and contrast strategies for improving curriculums, engage on ways to implement these strategies, and share their successes with others.

At a time when we seek to reduce our carbon footprint, initiatives such as the Green

Ribbon Schools Program are a valuable step toward lessening our impact on the environment and educating others as how best to maintain a healthy and sustainable environment. Our schools are well positioned to be leaders in the effort to combat climate change and I commend those schools and districts who have chosen to participate.

Congratulations again to those who have been recognized as 2014 Green Ribbon Schools.

HONORING THE EAST BAY
REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the East Bay Regional Park District upon its 80th anniversary. Since its founding in 1934, the District has provided Alameda County and Contra Costa County residents with healthy recreation and environmental education. Encompassing over 65 parks and 114,000 acres of land, the East Bay Regional Park District is the largest regional park district in the United States.

The East Bay Regional Park District emerged from a popular movement during the Great Depression that sought to provide residents with recreational opportunities and employment. The District began by developing parks within the region, including Temescal, Tilden and Sibley Regional Parks. By 1939, it started the process of acquiring land for Redwood Regional Park.

Today, over 25 million people visit East Bay parks annually to walk, hike, bicycle and jog on the parks' 1,200 miles of trails. In addition, visitors have the opportunity to swim, boat and fish at the District's nine park lakes and twelve beaches. The District also hosts nine interpretive centers that educate visitors about the region's cultural history, wildlife and natural features.

The East Bay Regional Park District has received numerous accolades for its dedication to natural preservation and East Bay recreation. It has received the California Parks and Recreation Society's Award for Excellence for Creating Community for its exceptional community-building efforts through park-related events, one of five awards it has received from the Society in the past six years.

I personally appreciate the impact that the East Bay Regional Park District has on our youth. When I was a girl growing up in El Paso, Texas, my sister and I broke barriers by being the only African Americans in our Girl Scout troop. We were fortunate to have access to nature through the Girl Scouts, and it impressed upon me at an early age the need to preserve outdoor open spaces where young children can learn about nature, the importance of our ecosystem and environment, and to have a natural environment in which to play. For the youth who grow up in highly urbanized East Bay cities, East Bay parks represent an environment that can broaden a child's perspectives of space and coexistence with nature.

I commend the East Bay Regional Park District for providing our community with a wellspring of recreational and educational opportunity for the past 80 years. The District's continual efforts to foster community and learning benefit all Bay Area residents and visitors.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I extend my congratulations on this important milestone and thank all of the people who have contributed to the success of the East Bay Regional Park District throughout the years. I wish the District continued success in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEONARD
AND MARY BRYANT

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Bryant who have been married 57 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Leonard and Mary Bryant met in Sunday School at Green Chapel Missionary Baptist Church. They attended Southern Union and Selma University graduating with a degree in Theology. They were married on October 6, 1957.

The Bryants have lived in Opelika their entire lives and have been pastor at three churches in Waverly, Dadeville and Fort Davis, all in Alabama.

Leonard and Mary raised four daughters including: Lindie Bryant-Payne, Carmella Bryant-McGhee, Dale Bryant-Williams and Janyce Bryant. They have seven grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Leonard and Mary Bryant for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SCHOOL
SPIRIT DAY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 12, 2014 as National School Spirit Day, which was created to recognize the great efforts of cheerleaders on behalf of their schools and communities. On this day, cheer teams nationwide will galvanize their schools to perform community service projects.

Varsity Brands began National School Spirit Day in 2009 in order to highlight all of the ways our nation's cheerleaders and dancers make a difference in their schools and communities as mentors, community service leaders, and positive role models. As part of National School Spirit Day, cheerleaders and dancers will hold pep rallies, and invite all students to volunteer with local charities and perform at least four hours of community service.

Students have volunteered in a number of ways including by visiting community nursing homes, cleaning school facilities and grounds, fundraising for charities, getting involved with the Make-A-Wish Foundation, and holding car washes for charity. Since 2009, cheerleaders and dancers have pledged more than 500,000 community service hours as a result of National School Spirit Day efforts. National School Spirit Day is an opportunity for America's future leaders to stand out and have a positive impact in their communities.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing September 12, 2014 as National School Spirit Day.

COMMEMORATING THE CEN-
TENARY OF THE PASSENGER PI-
GEON'S EXTINCTION AND THE
PASSENGER PIGEON PROJECT

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

Whereas; the Passenger Pigeon, *Ectopistes migratorius*, was once the most abundant bird in North America with a population exceeding 3 billion; and

Whereas; due to unregulated market hunting in the 19th century, the population plummeted towards extinction; and

Whereas; the death of Martha, the last Passenger Pigeon, on September 1, 1914, and the extinction of the Passenger Pigeon helped assemble the American conservation movement of the early 20th century; and

Whereas; the story of the Passenger Pigeon can serve as a cautionary tale and raise awareness of current issues related to human-caused extinction, explore connections between humans and nature, and inspire the building of sustainable relationships with other species; and

Whereas; the history of the Passenger Pigeon is relevant today due to the fact more than 30 percent of amphibians are threatened with extinction, many species of birds, bats and honeybees are in rapid decline and when it is projected that 25 percent of the U.S.'s native plant species may go extinct by mid-century; and

Whereas; Project Passenger Pigeon, a consortium of over 150 institutions, scientists, conservationists, educators, artists, musicians, filmmakers and others throughout the nation is using the centenary of the species extinction to tell the story of the Passenger Pigeon; and

Whereas; the story of the Passenger Pigeon, once an example of nature's abundance, and its subsequent extinction is unique to American history;

Now Therefore, be it known that the undersigned Member of the United States Congress, the Honorable L. TAMMY DUCKWORTH of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois, hereby recognizes the anniversary of the Passenger Pigeon's extinction and its importance in remembering our natural heritage and nation's wildlife and the role we can play in conserving them.

HONORING GARY LESSER

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Gary Lesser, who has received the 2014 American Jewish Committee Judge Learned Hand award for his outstanding accomplishments in the legal profession and exemplary service to the community. Gary is an individual dedicated to maintaining the highest ethical legal standards and has displayed a level of commitment to his clients and profession that can be admired by all.

Gary Lesser is the Managing Partner of Lesser, Lesser, Landy, & Smith, PLLC, and concentrates in general personal injury matters. As a member of the Florida Bar Board of Governors and past chair of the Florida Bar Professional Ethics Committee, Gary has demonstrated an incredible commitment to the ethical practice of law. Highly regarded in the legal community, he is frequently called upon to lecture on personal injury law and various ethics issues and has been interviewed by local and national media regarding cases, important ethical and legal issues, and his service to the community. Aside from his successes in the legal profession, Gary is also a devoted member of the Jewish community. He has served as Chair of the Jewish Federation Business & Professions Cabinet and as Legal and Fundraising Vice President of the Arthur Meyer Jewish Academy, where he has been a member of the Board of Directors for over twenty years.

It is a privilege to represent a district with citizens who not only work tirelessly to help those in need but strive to achieve a higher professional standard. His passion and dedication is an inspiration to the Jewish community, and I have no doubt that we will continue to see great things from Gary in the future.

HONORING DEREK JETER

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of history's most distinguished

New York Yankees, Derek Jeter. Derek has spent the last 20 years thrilling Bronx residents and Yankees fans across the nation with his unparalleled performances on the field. He has been one of the greatest shortstops in the modern game, and as his final season comes to a close, he has received many accolades and messages of thanks for his dedication to this illustrious franchise.

Derek Jeter has spent his entire career with the Yankees organization, from the time he was drafted as an 18-year-old out of Kalamazoo, Michigan. He has excelled at whatever he was asked to do for the organization, and has led the Yankees during one of their most successful eras. During his time as a Yankee, the organization has won 5 World Series, and Derek played an important part in those victories. His incredible baseball skills are only surpassed by the maturity and leadership he has shown on the field. In almost every aspect, he has earned the nickname bestowed upon him: The Captain.

His statistics show what an influence he has had on the field, and his hard work and success has been recognized by baseball fans, writers, and peers. He won the Rookie of the Year award in his first full season in the American League, and went on to become a 14-time All-Star and a 5-time Golden Glove winner. He has a lifetime average of .310, and has amassed an astounding 3,448 hits as of Friday, September 5th, a total surpassed by only 5 other players in baseball history. He has been even more vital when the Yankees have needed it most—during his seven World Series appearances, he batted .321, and was named MVP of the 2000 World Series.

Derek has also led in his actions off the field. Through the Turn 2 Foundation, a charity he founded in 1996, Derek has helped children in Western Michigan, New York City, and the Tampa-St. Petersburg area to live healthier lives and to turn away from drugs and alcohol. In New York City, the foundation has partnered with the New York City Parks and Recreation Department to create four free after-school programs that serve more than 300 children.

Derek Jeter will be retiring at the end of this season, ending an illustrious, Hall of Fame-worthy career. He has become a part of the fabric of the Yankees and of the Bronx. Although we will get used to seeing him suc-

ceed in other endeavors, for Yankees fans it will be difficult to imagine the shortstop position without number 2 there. I congratulate Derek on an outstanding career, thank him for his contributions to the Yankees and to the Bronx, and wish him well in whatever the future brings.

IN RECOGNITION OF GERALD AND MARY SYKES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Gerald and Mary Sykes who have been married 59 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Gerald and Mary Sykes met in Lanett, Alabama, while attending a birthday party in August of 1952. They dated for three years and married June 3, 1955.

Gerald entered the ministry in 1968 in Atlanta, Georgia and has served five churches as the full-time pastor. He retired in 2012 and served three churches as interim pastor and is currently serving as full-time pastor at Waverly Baptist Church in Waverly, Alabama.

The Sykes raised two daughters and have two grandsons and four great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Gerald and Mary Sykes for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 481, 482, and 483 I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes," "yes," and "yes."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 10, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have stepped away from a Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health to come to the floor. The purpose of that hearing is once again to attack the Affordable Care Act, criticisms of CMS, and to lay the foundation for the Republican goal of repealing the Act entirely.

I have frankly lost track of the number of attempts to repeal the bill. Fifty? Sixty? You know, it really doesn't matter. The Affordable Care Act is here to stay and will be throughout the tenure of President Obama.

Despite some difficulties in its implementation, the President is justly proud of the health care reform as a signal accomplishment of his administration. Many of the problems that we are facing in the implementation of the act have been as a result of Republican intransigence.

Remember, despite the fact that the legislation embodies most of what had been bipartisan principles—indeed,

those strongly advocated by Republicans over the last 20 years or more—there was unrelenting opposition.

Republicans in the Senate refused to cooperate and refused to legislate, denying the 60-vote threshold necessary to move the bill forward. As a result, the bill was adopted through a process called reconciliation, where you just melded the two bills together.

The result was not a bill that anybody would have designed, but it easily could have been made better, should our Republican friends have chosen. Instead, they have continued this unyielding assault.

Even without their assistance, the results are pretty remarkable. We have the lowest rate of medical inflation in years. The Congressional Budget Office has consistently now been lowering the long-term cost estimates for Medicare.

This is probably the most powerful evidence yet that we are getting runaway health care costs under control, which was and remains the greatest single threat to the fiscal stability of our country.

We have been doing much more than merely controlling costs. There are more than 8 million people with marketplace insurance, and about three-quarters of them receive tax credits to help reduce the cost. Six million low-income people have been enrolled in Medicaid. Another 6 million children have been able to stay on their parents' health plans.

129 million Americans—I daresay that includes most of us in Congress—can no longer be denied care because of preexisting medical conditions.

As I said, there is lots that can be done to improve the system. Today, I had a chance to address the Case Management Society of America about one of them. Congressman PETRI of Wisconsin and I have introduced a transitional care benefit that would greatly reduce the chance of hospital readmissions that are not just costly, but they represent a failure to deliver health care to our citizens and reduce the stress and strain on families with loved ones who have left the hospital. This could save billions of dollars and frankly doesn't remotely depend on whether or not you support ObamaCare.

Another great example is legislation that Dr. PHIL ROE of Tennessee and I have introduced, dealing with the Federal Government finally placing a value on the conversation with patients and their families for conditions surrounding the end of life.

There is value-based insurance, which I am cosponsoring with Rep-

resentative BLACK of Tennessee. Representative ROSKAM of Illinois has the PRIME Act to deal with Medicare fraud. Representative GERLACH of Pennsylvania for several years has had legislation for a secure access card.

The list of opportunities is long and represents an extraordinary chance to build on reform, not just a futile effort at undermining it.

Someday, the American public is going to insist that we grow up and do our jobs, and there would be no better place to start than in building on the promise of health care reform not just to save money, but to improve the lives of Americans of all ages.

The hypocrisy here is breathtaking: refuse to legislate and then attack it for its faults; starve the IRS and CMS of resources to properly administer the law and then complain that the IRS and CMS are not properly administering it.

The American public has a right to expect better from the people's House. Someday, they will get it.

INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, although criminal forfeiture laws have been an important tool and a useful tool for law enforcement, civil asset forfeiture has been used too many times to seize, forfeit, and indeed profit off the property of Americans without even charging them with crimes—innocent until proven guilty.

The activity can be a boon for police budgets, as the Federal asset forfeiture fund exceeded \$2 billion in 2013 and equitable sharing agreements between the Department of Justice and local police departments accounted for over \$600 million.

While policing certainly is a vital element of an effective society, let's also be mindful of the fact that our Constitution emphasizes individual rights above all. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 5212, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act, to limit the scope, the power, and the reach of the government to abuse their forfeiture powers in violation of individual rights guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

I urge all my colleagues to support this needed reform effort and to again assure our citizens of their civil liberties and the opportunity to defend innocence or prove guilt.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my press secretary has kept me pretty busy the last few days, talking about the President's decision to delay executive action on immigration, in two languages. I made it clear that from a political standpoint, in the short run and the long run, I think the President should have taken action before election day in order to be more transparent with the American people about the policy we all know is coming.

It makes the job harder for me to generate enthusiasm among Americans to vote at all, let alone enthusiasm for voting for Democrats when there are members of my own party asking the President to hold his pen and his phone in abeyance until after the voters vote.

From a policy standpoint, every week we delay is bad for our country. From a humanitarian perspective, deporting the parents of U.S. citizens is not in our national interest. Making it impossible for spouses of legal immigrants and citizens of the United States to pick up the visas that have already been issued to them is not in our national interest.

Keeping the fear of deportation hovering over immigrant communities, like Pilsen and Little Village in my district in Chicago, has a damaging impact on the fabric of our community. It dampens the economy along commercial thoroughfares, like 26th Street, a key engine of the Chicago economy and tax base.

Perhaps more important to those living outside of immigrant communities is to know that when the President acts, he will announce a tough but fair solution for millions of immigrants who do not have visas or any way of getting visas, but who have lived and worked here peacefully for years, even decades.

It would work something like this: if they come forward, if they submit their fingerprints at their own expense to the FBI, and if they pass a rigorous criminal background check and meet other requirements, we will issue them a biometric identification card that says that they are not a priority for deportation.

Not only do we get them in the system and on the books, but now they are in a program that needs to be renewed periodically with strict rules. This creates a huge incentive not to violate the rules of the program or the rules of our society.

I know the President has heard all of these arguments, and I don't think I will convince him to change his mind again and move forward with key improvements to our deportation policies before November 4, but let us be clear, I think he has already made two important decisions.

Number one, there is no longer any question that the President of the United States has the legal authority to act on immigration and deportations under current law. Even Republicans who have hired the best lawyers at taxpayers' expense to prepare their lawsuits against the President agreed and didn't include immigration in their farfetched list of Presidential "overreaches."

This is settled law, and despite the shouts of talk radio and a few on the Republican side, there is no real serious debate about the rock-solid legal ground from which the President can act and has already acted.

Secondly, I know the President has decided going big, going broad, going generous, and going quickly after the election is the right decision because he and Secretary Jeh Johnson have to set enforcement priorities about which people they will deport first and which people they will deport last based on national security and economic interests of this country.

He will act up to the limits of current law, and believe me, I can hear the cries from the other side, "He can't act because we, Republicans, may try to do something on immigration in the lame-duck. The President can't act because we, Republicans, are going to put the bipartisan coalition back together again in the new 114th Congress, and we will get reform passed in both Houses; or, you know, we were just kidding when we said all that stuff about immigration after our defeat on election day in 2012."

They will say, "This time, we really mean it because 2016 and the electoral college are staring us in the face"—but no, I know the President and the Democrats will not fall for that again.

I don't see the President saying he will act if you don't act, as we have been saying for 2 years. This time, I see the President acting first, acting broadly, and acting generously, laying out a broad array of executive actions to mitigate the damage that is being done to our country by congressional inaction on immigration reform.

If the Republicans are so inclined, they can take legislative action. It is what we have been begging them to do for two decades on this issue. We may even work with you if you are serious about it, but it will no longer be accepted as a delaying tactic for action by the executive branch of government. It will be a response to Presidential action.

I think the President will have the courage to act, and then it is Congress' chance to act.

THE RETIREMENT OF BILL SCHWERI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend of southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri, upon his retirement as the director of Federal Relations at the University of Kentucky.

During his 42 years at the university, Bill has been a champion for progress in education, health care, and energy research across the State. Behind the scenes of Kentucky's highly esteemed flagship university, Bill has been a driving force, seeking out partnerships, programs, and funding to help the most distressed region of the Commonwealth. I am certain there is not a single resource that Bill hasn't researched for the benefit of southern and eastern Kentucky.

No one knows the value and power of creating and sustaining longtime partnerships like Bill. If the University of Kentucky needed a partner to improve education or access to health care, Bill ensured the connection was secured with his genuine, kind, and humble approach.

Most leaders seek recognition or credit for their own efforts, but that has never been the case with Bill Schweri. His work has led to exponential growth of UK's research enterprise and jump-started new research initiatives that have enabled the university to be successful in competing for Federal grants and contracts.

This riveting scientific research on cancer, fossil energy, transportation, and agriculture is blazing new trails in every aspect of our everyday life in our country, to say nothing of how our State is better off for it.

□ 1015

He has fought for legislation that is important to UK and student financial aid. Bill has been a leader in the Science Coalition and actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. Over the years, he has deservedly gained the utmost respect of his peers in Federal relations.

As he departs his post, Mr. Speaker, at the University of Kentucky, it is my intention to ensure Bill Schweri receives the recognition that is due him for his tireless efforts on behalf of students and families all across Kentucky, and specifically living in Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District. We hope he knows he always has the thanks of a grateful Big Blue Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me as we honor my friend Bill Schweri as we bid him a joy-filled retirement.

POTABLE WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, just last month, hundreds of thousands of residents in Toledo, Ohio, were left without access to potable water and faced an extended drinking water ban, after unsafe toxin levels, likely caused by a Lake Erie algal bloom, were found at a city water treatment plant. In January, Charleston, West Virginia, residents faced a similar ban on their drinking water after a chemical spill.

George Bernard Shaw once said:

Success does not consist in never making mistakes, but in never making the same one a second time.

One would think, after two new incidents that left hundreds of thousands of Americans without access to clean drinking water, this body would jump into action to prevent this from ever happening again. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the House hasn't only refused to act, yesterday we actually voted to prevent the administration from acting.

Again and again my colleagues continue to introduce bills and riders that would endanger our drinking water while ignoring basic scientific principles in the process. Today more than 117 million Americans get their drinking water from systems that rely on rivers, streams, and wetlands which, at this very moment, are not clearly protected under the Clean Water Act. Let me say that again: 117 million Americans are getting their drinking water from bodies of water that may not be protected from pollution or destruction.

American families deserve clarity, and that is exactly what the administration is trying to provide with their proposed Clean Water Act rule; and, unbelievably enough, that is exactly what the House voted to prevent yesterday.

For years we relied on the Clean Water Act to protect the Nation's waters. For my constituents back home in Chicago, that meant everything from the wetlands on the shores of Lake Michigan to the inland streams that flow across the Great Lakes region. But two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 changed all that, leaving us with a confusing, time-consuming, and frustrating process for determining which of the Nation's waters are now protected under Federal law and which are not.

It is imperative that we close what has become a harmful loophole, and that is what the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers are trying to do with their proposed rule clarifying the scope of the Clean Water Act.

Let's be clear: The EPA and the Corps of Engineers are acting within the authority granted them by Congress under the Clean Water Act to legally clarify the statute's jurisdiction. This clarity is desperately needed, especially in the Great Lakes Basin. Half the streams in the Great Lakes States lack clear water protection simply because they do not all flow all year.

This lack of protection has taken its toll, slowing permitting decisions for responsible development and reducing protections for drinking water supplies and critical habitats. The EPA and Army Corps' proposed rule would restore Clean Water Act protections to wetlands and tributary streams because the science clearly shows that these water bodies are connected.

Before proposing its rule, the EPA analyzed more than 1,000 peer-reviewed scientific articles, and the findings are irrefutable. Tributary streams and wetlands are clearly connected to downstream waters. Pollution is carried down the river, polluting bigger and bigger waterways.

Healthy wetlands improve water quality by filtering polluted runoff from farm fields and city streets that otherwise would flow into rivers, streams, and great water bodies across the country. Wetlands and tributaries provide vital habitat to wildlife, waterfowl and fish, reduce flooding, and replenish groundwater supplies.

We cannot protect and restore the Great Lakes and our drinking water supplies without first protecting and restoring the wetlands and upstream waters that feed into them. Congress passed the Clean Water Act with the intention of protecting our waterways, and that is what it did for almost 30 years. Now this administration is trying to bring back these protections this House has undermined.

Let's not make the same mistake twice. Let's let the experts do their job.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ON 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to pay special tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also known as the VFW, on the 100th anniversary of its organization in September 1914. The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was also organized in 1914.

Over the past century, members of the VFW have worked tirelessly to ensure that veterans receive the respect, honor, and support they deserve. The VFW was formed when the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the National Society of the Army of the Philippines merged during a conference at the former Schenley Hotel, which is now the William Pitt Union at the University of Pittsburgh.

A Pennsylvania Historic Society marker that sits between the Soldiers and Sailors Hall and the William Pitt Union commemorating the occasion reads:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars organized September 14-17, 1914, at the former Schen-

ley Hotel near here. Veterans who had served in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and China were among its founders.

Since its founding, the VFW has done tremendous work to serve veterans and family members. The organization played a central role in the creation of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the GI Bill. In addition, the VFW helped spearhead the creation of the Vietnam War, Korean War, World War II, and Women in Military Service Memorials.

It continues this legacy of service by helping veterans and their family members secure VA benefits, including disability claims and pensions. The VFW continues to play an important role as Iraq and Afghanistan veterans return home and adjust to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join us in recognizing and expressing sincere gratitude for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the important work they have done and continue to do to stand with those who have stood for us.

SOCORRO, TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGOS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, today, as we continue our journey through the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to highlight the historic city of Socorro, in El Paso County. It is located in the center of El Paso's Mission Valley, a valley named for three historic missions founded by Spanish priests, soldiers, and colonists.

Socorro is also home to the Socorro High School Bulldogs. They are known for many things, but particularly they are known for their prowess in baseball. Socorro High is a former State champion in baseball. In a State as big as Texas, that is a pretty impressive feat.

The roots of Socorro began to take shape in 1680 when Governor Antonio de Otermin and Father Francisco de Ayeta led the Spanish and Piro Indian refugees who were fleeing the New Mexico Pueblo Indian revolt to the El Paso area. Two years later, they built a mission, Nuestra Senora de la Limpia Concepcion del Socorro, the second-oldest mission in Texas. Unfortunately, this first mission was swept away by a flood on the Rio Grande in 1744 and a second mission was built.

Today it may be hard to imagine, but the Rio Grande in those days was a wild river, much different from the dry riverbed or placid stream of today. And a powerful flood also washed away the second mission in 1829.

In 1843, the main part of the present Socorro mission was completed, and at that time, Socorro had a population of about 100 people. The city of Socorro is one of those cities in Texas that has seen several flags flown over it. Founded by the Spanish, it became a part of

Mexico from 1821 to 1848, and as a result of the U.S.-Mexican war, Socorro became part of Texas.

The area around El Paso can be arid and harsh, but the secret to Socorro's longevity has been its acequias, a well-designed system of irrigation canals still in existence today. These acequias provided water for crops and vineyards.

The development of Socorro suffered a setback in 1881 when the railroads laid their track all the way to El Paso but they bypassed Socorro. This shifted the development and the political power into the city of El Paso itself. And yet the determined city of Socorro continued to grow, and it diversified and developed various industries. Its resolute citizens were determined to stay in the area.

Later on, unscrupulous developers started to build homes and residential subdivisions there that didn't have paved streets or water or sewer, but Socorro residents again rose up against these builders of these colonias to make sure that their city survived and prospered. And today, the city of Socorro is home to some 32,000 people, making it the 95th largest city in Texas.

The city of Socorro is El Paso County's second largest municipality, and there is a lot of history in Socorro, a lot of places to go and see. If you have got a young kid, a young child, you will want to hang out where the community gathers, and that is at Bulldog Championship Park, which includes a splash park, an amphitheater, walking trails, and a pond.

There is also the Socorro Entertainment Center, known as Speaking Rock, operated by the Tiguas, a Pueblo tribe located in the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo. The Entertainment Center welcomes recording artists like B.B. King and the Gipsy Kings, Everclear and Korn, just to name a few.

Socorro is served by the Socorro Independent School District, with one high school, three middle schools, and five elementaries.

I invite people visiting the 23rd to stop by Socorro, enjoy Texas culture. It is an infusion of Southwest history and Southwest traditions.

SUPPORT THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider the Employee Health Care Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

As I traveled West Virginia during the August recess, I heard from small business owners and workers across the State that their health insurance premiums are increasing. I also heard that

their deductibles are increasing quite rapidly.

Given that the Obama administration's own Centers for Medicare & Medicaid studies found that 11 million small business employees will see their premiums increase due to ObamaCare, it was sad, but not surprising, that businesses in West Virginia and around the country are feeling the pinch of this law's misguided policies.

Yesterday a report issued by the American Action Forum found that the Affordable Care Act regulations are reducing small businesses' pay by \$22.6 billion annually, and the rising premiums spurred by the law have cost our Nation's economy more than 350,000 jobs.

In my State of West Virginia, more than half of our private sector workers are employed by small businesses. Making sure that health insurance on the small group market is affordable is important to both the family budgets and to make sure those small businesses can continue to grow and provide jobs.

We saw last fall the tremendous problems and uncertainty that occurred when roughly 5 million Americans who purchased insurance on the individual market received cancellation notices, but recent testimony at the House Energy and Commerce Committee has indicated that millions more workers who have employer-sponsored plans could get similar notices starting as early as this year.

If a worker is forced to change health insurance policies, their new plan might not include their doctor or their community hospital. This is another example of overreaching government that is taking away the freedom of individuals and businesses to make the health care decisions that best fit their unique circumstances.

The bill the House will consider today is very simple. If a plan was offered on the group health insurance market in 2013, that plan can continue to be offered for the next 5 years. Any worker covered by one of these plans will not be fined under the individual mandate. The Employer Health Care Protection Act keeps the President's promise that people who like their insurance, health insurance, can keep it.

□ 1030

It also provides more affordable alternatives for small businesses whose health care costs are soaring. This bill is a commonsense step forward.

There is still much more work that needs to be done. We need to go back to the drawing board and enact true health care reform. We should build on the good ideas, like helping those with preexisting conditions and allowing children to remain on parents' benefits until the age of 26. These are good things.

We should get rid of bad ideas like the job-killing employer mandate, the

individual mandate, and regulations that have cost many Americans the insurance plan and the doctor that they choose. We should enact meaningful medical liability reform, we should help spur association health plans, and allow insurance to be sold across State lines to broaden competition in the individual insurance market.

We need to come together to fix our broken health care system. But today, the least we can do is keep the promise that the President made to the American people and allow current plans to continue to be available. I ask my colleagues to support the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

THE WISDOM OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the effective action and wise caution shown by the President of the United States with regard to ISIS. We were all disgusted by the beheading of American journalists and alarmed by ISIS' early military successes.

Those who oversimplify the Middle East focus exclusively on the evils of ISIS and demand its immediate destruction without sufficient examination of the costs and the effects. The President recognizes that the situation calls for action but that its complexity also calls for caution. He has ordered over 150 airstrikes, which have punished ISIS, killing hundreds of its fighters and securing military victories at Mosul Dam, protecting the Yazidi minority, protecting our Kurdish allies, and protecting the Shiite Turkmen, four important military victories. And, just as importantly, we have pushed back ISIS and prevented its further expansion in Iraq.

Yet, the simpleminded argue that all of our problems in the Middle East would disappear if only we had a President with a different personality. Or they assume that ISIS can be destroyed immediately without any American boots on the ground. The ground forces necessary to destroy ISIS immediately, that deployment would involve hundreds, if not thousands, of American casualties. Even if we had a victory over ISIS that was swift, our forces would be the ones on the ground. We would then be viewed as responsible for providing security, which would require a prolonged presence.

Now, some fantasize that Turkey or Saudi Arabia or somebody else—just not us—will be willing to deploy ground forces and suffer major casualties. Well, keep in mind that Turkey and Saudi Arabia weren't willing to suffer any casualties to destroy Saddam Hussein in our final war against

him, and that these two Sunni nations hate some of the enemies of ISIS as much they hate ISIS. If there are going to be troops on the ground, they will not just magically appear from others in the region.

The greatest flaw in the simple thinking is to focus exclusively on whom we want to destroy without asking who will be empowered by such destruction. Who are the enemies of ISIS that ISIS is fighting today? Who would step into the vacuum if ISIS were rapidly destroyed? Four entities: the al-Nusra front, ISIS' chief rival in Syria. The al-Nusra front, of course, is part of al Qaeda. Second, Assad, who has killed over 191,000 of his own people. Third, the extremist Shiite militias and perhaps former Prime Minister Maliki. These are forces that killed hundreds of Americans last decade. And fourth, Hezbollah and its patron Iran, who killed hundreds of Americans in Lebanon in 1983 and also killed hundreds of Americans in Iraq last decade.

Now, there is constant discussion that ISIS might have the ability to conduct operations outside the Middle East, perhaps against us. Hezbollah and Iran have killed hundreds of people in actions in Asia, South America, Africa, and Europe. So let us be clear: those who will take power if ISIS is swept aside are nearly as evil as ISIS. Let us applaud a President who has taken decisive action, acted with caution, achieved significant military victories, and done it all without a single American casualty.

Finally, there is the issue of Congress. What is our role? Some think that our role is to dodge tough votes, leave town next week, and stay away until Veterans Day, all without voting on what America is doing in the Middle East. Unfortunately, we ought to do our job. The War Powers Act allows the President to act for 60 or 90 days. After that, if Congress refuses to act, the President either has to violate the Constitution or summon Congress back and hope that we do our job. We ought to pass a resolution authorizing air operations for a significant period of time while not expanding the President's limited rights to deploy ground forces.

We ask our pilots to do their job. We in Congress should do ours. Let's consider a War Powers Act resolution. Let's take the tough vote.

THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

Our Nation has certainly come a long way in advancing the rights of women. In fact, just a few weeks ago, our coun-

try celebrated Women's Equality Day, a day commemorating the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, granting women the right to vote. Women, united together against incredible odds, have fought for the right to participate in our democratic process. And, now, 94 years later, our fight for our dignity continues in our own homes—the war being waged against domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act embodies that fight against women being brutalized by those who claim to love us. The Violence Against Women Act provides the resources for women to access police protection, legal services, and social services.

The passage and reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act was a victory for our entire country—a victory for Native American women who had been raped and brutalized on tribal lands with impunity, a victory for LGBTQ victims whose agony was ignored because of their gender identity, a victory for young women in college whose institutions were derelict in their response to “boys just being boys,” and a victory for children whose emotional wounds had scabbed over with no healing balm.

We can take comfort knowing that the Violence Against Women Act is making a true difference in the lives of countless women across the country. It has helped reduce domestic violence by shifting the way our culture responds to it. For instance, our Services-Training-Officers-Prosecutors, or STOP, grant program provides vital funding to local communities, giving them the tools they need to strengthen the States' criminal justice system response for victims.

And the Violence Against Women Act isn't just socially responsible, it is fiscally responsible, as well. In its first 6 years alone, the Violence Against Women Act saved taxpayers at least \$12.6 billion in net averted social costs. A recent study found that civil protection orders saved one State, Kentucky, on average \$85 million in a single year.

The road to this victory wasn't traveled alone. As I look around, I see many of those who stood with me in the face of partisan opposition and obstruction. I see the faces of friends and champions like Representative DONNA EDWARDS, Representative TOM COLE, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, Representative JOHN CONYERS, and Leader NANCY PELOSI. But I don't want to just talk about Members of this body but talk about those who walk outside these Halls, champions like President Obama, Vice President JOE BIDEN, President and Secretary Clinton, Kim Gandy from the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and all those Native American tribes who showed up to stand for the reauthorization.

As I stand here remembering those who have walked with us, I am re-

minded of my very own home district of Milwaukee. Our community will, once again, host the annual Brides Walk sponsored by the UMOS Latina Resource Center. This walk commemorates a Dominican American woman who was brutally murdered by her jealous ex-boyfriend in New Jersey on her wedding day. This beautiful bride was shot dead in her wedding dress. This event, the Brides Walk, was inspired by a staunch advocate for women's rights, Josie Ashton, who raised awareness about domestic violence by walking from New Jersey to Florida wearing her own wedding dress and spending the night sleeping at shelters from New Jersey to Florida to elucidate the problems and challenges of domestic violence, and remind us that sometimes so-called love can turn to abuse.

This event, the Brides Walk in Milwaukee, will be celebrated by women donning wedding gowns and walking through the streets of Milwaukee speaking against domestic violence. They will be accompanied by brave men who walk by their sides. And so I urge people in Milwaukee to join the March Against Domestic Violence in Milwaukee and to use social media to bring attention to this pressing issue.

THE DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we only have 24 legislative days left in the 113th Congress, yet the Republican majority has failed to pass any meaningful legislation. The last 2 years have been wasted with partisan rhetoric and legislative initiatives that amount to nothing more than talking points. House Republicans have made this the least productive Congress in recent memory.

They have waged a sustained war against low-income citizens by blocking commonsense legislation that would raise the minimum wage and restore emergency unemployment insurance. They continue to oppose efforts to ensure women receive equal pay for equal work. For the first time in the history of our Nation, they are pursuing a frivolous lawsuit against the President at taxpayer expense, and I continue to fume about that lawsuit. Republicans seem proud that this prestigious body has been labeled the Do-Nothing Congress.

For the past 2 years, Democrats have repeatedly called on the Republicans to tackle a pro-jobs, pro-middle class agenda. Democrats have consistently put forth proposals that would grow jobs, provide workers with a living wage, and fix our broken immigration system. Instead of working with Democrats to bring about the change supported by the majority of Americans, Republicans have refused to act.

Instead, the Republican majority has spent the 113th Congress appealing to the fringes of the Republican Party. They wasted hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars trying to defend the Defense of Marriage Act. They held hearing after hearing after hearing to pursue conspiracy theories about Benghazi at the expense of our Nation's delicate work in a volatile region. And for the first time in the history of our Republic, the Republicans voted to sue the President of the United States for delaying a health care mandate that they themselves have long opposed.

□ 1045

My Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, routinely walk away from key discussions and negotiations, failing to lead, but worse, failing the American people. They have, however, succeeded in making this Republican-controlled House one of the least productive and most divided in our Nation's history.

In the Senate where 60 votes are needed to pass any bill, Republicans have also been successful in blocking important proposals that have the overwhelming support of the American people. As a result, Americans' confidence in Congress has fallen to less than 10 percent.

The American people desperately need their elected representatives to come together to advance policies that benefit our citizens. The American people don't care about Republicans or Democrats. They care about us working to improve their lives, but Republicans insist on driving us further apart.

Instead of doing the work we were elected to do, House Republicans have scheduled another 5-week break beginning in October. I guess obstruction must really be exhausting to all of them.

There is so much work that remains to be done. I pray my Republican colleagues hear me. Now is the time to work the will of the American people. That is what we were sent here to do.

I urge the majority to end this Congress on a high note. Cancel the 5-week break. I am serious. Cancel the 5-week break. I can handle it if you can handle it.

Let's raise the minimum wage, reform our immigration system, and ensure equal pay for equal work. It is what the American people expect and deserve.

MEDICAID EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the urgent need for 24 States to expand Medicaid for the 5.7 million Americans who fall into the Medicaid gap.

Among those excluded are 435,000 cashiers, 341,000 cooks, and 253,000 nurses' aides. These hardworking Americans should not have to choose between groceries and medicine or between rent and a doctor's visit.

On behalf of all Alabamians, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my colleagues, Representatives BUTTERFIELD and JOHNSON, for heading up the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus, of which I am a proud member.

It is painfully unsettling that the 24 States not expanding Medicaid are the very States where the concentration of those living in poverty and without health care is the most acute. The 24 States that have rejected Medicaid expansion are home to over half of the Nation's population, but 68 percent of the poor, uninsured, Blacks, and single mothers. These constituents have the highest burden of illness and costs to our entire health care system.

The 235,000 Alabamians and 5.7 million Americans who fall in the coverage gap are our most vulnerable citizens. About 60 percent of the Nation's uninsured working poor live in these 24 States.

These individuals pay their taxes, they work hard, and they contribute to our community. Our government should support them in return. To not expand Medicaid for these hardworking Americans is reckless disregard for their dramatic needs and their important work that they do in our community.

Expanding Medicaid is not only a moral imperative, but an economic imperative as well. There is not a State in the country that will benefit from its refusal to accept Federal dollars provided to them to expand their Medicaid program.

Alabamians need jobs, and they need health care. Without raising a cent in taxes, my Governor and State leaders can achieve both job creation and health care coverage by expanding Medicaid.

The facts are clear. There is not an economic development investment in Alabama's history that would provide the State with 35,000 new jobs like Medicaid expansion would. Our State leaders cannot be honest with their constituents in arguing that they are interested in economic development while turning down \$375 million a quarter.

In the State of Alabama, the income ceiling for Medicaid in its current form for a family of three is \$3,560 annually. That is less than \$10 a day for a family of three. This is the lowest Medicaid income ceiling in the country. So families that earn a mere \$15 a day are left behind when it comes to being able to afford access to affordable health care.

While I understand the political realities in which we operate and in which my Governor operates, I do not understand the shameful neglect of our

most vulnerable constituents, our rural hospitals, and our fragile economy that is presented in our State's refusal to accept Medicaid expansion.

Our most sacred responsibility to serve our constituents shall not be examined and instituted through such a dangerous partisan lens. With each day that my State of Alabama delays expansion, more of our constituents are unable to work due to unrelated health conditions.

Americans who are both impoverished and sick should not have to wait one more day while our State leaders play political football with this urgent issue.

This is why I am so proud to stand with my colleagues in the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus today in sending a clear message to our State leaders that enough is enough. We need to expand Medicaid now for every State in the Union.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Cliff Lea, First Baptist Church of Leesburg, Leesburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Living Lord, it is an honor to come and open our hearts before You today. We acknowledge Your greatness and power over us and all things. Thank You for salvation.

It is with our deepest gratitude that we thank You for the privilege of being called Americans. With humility, let us realize the responsibility this privilege entails. Let Your presence in us be the light that causes this Nation to shine bright in the world.

Grant Your favor, wisdom, and protection to our troops here and abroad. Place within our leaders and Representatives, here in the House and the Senate, a desire to make God-honoring decisions. May our President be guided by Your truth. In our differences, let us see You first.

Please give each of us in this place and every citizen of this Nation a contrite heart and willingness to follow Your way.

In Christ's name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S SPEECH ON ISIS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS, has been doing what terrorists have done for millennia: decimating villages, persecuting religious minorities, and massacring the innocent, including the brutal public beheadings of two American journalists.

For the past month, as lawmakers and leaders around the country have called for President Obama to outline a plan to respond to this enemy, the President has been vacationing, golfing, and fundraising for partisan allies.

The President initially admitted that he doesn't have a strategy for dealing with ISIS, a brutal group he once compared to a jayvee team. He then indicated his goal was reducing ISIS to a manageable problem.

This won't do.

Tonight, the President addresses the Nation. I hope he uses the opportunity to make a change. I hope he uses his speech to provide a clear strategy. I hope he provides long overdue leadership on this issue. The American people and the world are waiting.

PASSING OF TOM MCCORMICK

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mourn the passing and recognize the life of Tom McCormick: loving husband, father, marine,

man of great faith, and dedicated public servant to the city of Dublin, California.

Following graduation from high school, he joined the U.S. Marines and served honorably in the Korean war, where he received a Purple Heart.

Tom loved Dublin deeply, serving 17 years as an elected representative for the Dublin-San Ramon Services District, where he pushed, and was one of the first in the State to push, for water recycling systems. We can also thank Tom for his role in helping to create and establish the Dublin Heritage Park.

Tom also had a big heart. In 1975, he and his wife, Claudia, took in some of the last South Vietnamese refugees.

Tom will be missed.

I send my condolences to his wife, Claudia, of 42 years, who also served as a Dublin City Council member; his sons, Marshall and Thomas; and stepchildren, Melinda, Desiree, and Kathy.

HARVEST HOPE ADDRESSES PRESIDENT'S JOB POLICIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last month's jobs report revealed the worst numbers of the year. Millions of Americans are continuing to drop out of the workforce, destroying opportunity. A clear symbol of the President's failure is that 14 million more people are forced to depend on food stamps than when the President took office.

The State's recent article explains families are hurting as a result of the President's failed job policies.

Harvest Hope Food Bank is serving an unexpected increase of needy families. CEO Denise Holland says: "Every morning when we open up, the lines are waiting for us all the way to the road. The people who are suffering from hunger have not seen an improvement in their financial condition yet."

House Republicans have passed over 40 job-creation solutions which are blocked in the Senate. The President should change course so we can, together, work for job opportunities.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President's actions should be based on remembering September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

My sympathy to Mayor Rita Crapps and the families of Batesburg-Leesville.

HONORING JOE SCHNEIDER

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to tell the story of a con-

stituent of mine whose life has exemplified the American Dream.

Joe Schneider was born in Kernei, Yugoslavia, in 1929. While his father was off fighting in World War II, Joe led his displaced family on a journey throughout Eastern Europe. As refugees, the war years were extremely challenging, and he eventually lost a leg at the age of 15.

His family was given the opportunity to leave Austria and arrived in the U.S. as immigrants in 1951. Without speaking a word of English, he set out to start working as a tailor. He finally lived his dream when he founded Joe's Tailor Shop at 50. For more than 25 years, his small family business created employment and provided for more than 20 families. As a resident of Hanover Park, Illinois, Joe was known for his commitment to his community.

In 1953, Joe met Katharina Schaeffer, who was also an immigrant from Kernei. They had three children and three grandchildren together. The family was blessed to be able to celebrate Joe and Katharina's 60th wedding anniversary in February.

Unfortunately, Joe passed away recently, but his American Dream and love for his country and his family will live on forever. I send my condolences to his family and especially to Herman, his son, who continues that tradition of the American Dream and is leading manufacturing in our district, adding to the strength of this Nation.

RUSSIA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin lives in an alternate reality, one where the state is still all-powerful and can control reality for its citizens.

In the 1930s, Stalin could make people disappear by sending them to the gulags and then erasing any mention of them in state archives. By controlling all information, he could pretend that black was white and up was down.

Today, in Russia, Putin wants to pretend that the Ukrainian insurgency is homegrown, that Russian soldiers on the other side of the border are lost or just volunteers. He wants to pretend that Kiev is controlled by Nazis. His state-owned media dutifully reports these fictions as fact.

The Soviet Union hasn't existed in more than 20 years. It collapsed out of weakness, and Russia remains weak and wholly dependent on energy exports today. Putin can pretend all he wants, but the reality is that he does not have the power of the secretary general or the czars. Let's not let him turn his dreams into reality by abandoning our friends and NATO allies. We must stand up for their freedom and support them more vigorously.

BOKO HARAM

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I stand today with my colleagues in remembering the more than 200 girls who were abducted from their school on April 14, 2014. It is hard to imagine the fear, pain and the anguish they have suffered at the hands of the monsters who kidnapped them.

As a father, I understand what these girls' families are feeling. I have not forgotten these girls, and I will continue to work with my colleagues for their safe return and for the elimination of the terrorist group Boko Haram.

The world and mainstream media have mostly moved on from the events in Nigeria, but amid all the horrors that regularly compete for the world's attention, this one should not be forgotten. Among these missing girls are future lawyers, doctors, and teachers, women who could someday lead their country.

I call for my colleagues not to forget these girls and come together to combat Boko Haram, al Qaeda, and ISIL.

COLORADO FLOODS

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of the 1-year anniversary of the horrific floods that hit the State of Colorado 1 year ago.

Starting on September 11, floods ravaged communities and wiped away homes, schools, and businesses. The widespread damage was unlike anything I have seen in my lifetime in Colorado.

As the flooding was happening and in the immediate aftermath, I joined neighbors and leaders to survey many of the damaged areas. We worked together to make sure that we provided the much-needed relief.

In west Longmont, I saw railroad tracks ripped and tangled. I saw vehicles lying upside down and garages filled with mud. I also saw people working in the spirit of community, striving to recover, helping each other.

I couldn't possibly name all of the heroes involved in the flood response and recovery, but I would like to recognize a few:

St. Vrain and Left Hand Water Conservancy District Director Sean Cronin has provided invaluable resources to water districts and ditch companies to help them provide water to communities for agriculture;

John Zadel and Stan Linker of the Central Weld County Water District worked to get water systems for small communities like Frederick and Firestone back in operation;

Local fire districts like Mountain View, Hygiene, Johnstown, and others were on the front lines of flood response.

In the year since the disaster, we have made tremendous progress, but there is a lot more work to be done. Communities in Weld, Morgan, and Logan continue their work today.

With the great resilience of the people of this State, I have no doubt we will come back stronger than ever and continue working together for the good of our great State.

SECOND DISTRICT
MANUFACTURING TOUR

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this August work period, I had the pleasure of meeting with businesses and workers across my district as part of my Second District Manufacturing Tour. I was fortunate to witness firsthand the creation of products made in Illinois and had the privilege of hearing from workers about what Congress could be doing to support America's workforce.

The Second District and our Nation is made better by the presence of manufacturers like Smedberg Machine Corporation. They build the parts used in locks and bridges, products we rely on every day.

The future of our economy is made brighter by members of the Kankakee County Chamber of Commerce, whom I met with to discuss economic development, jump-starting the middle class, and the future of American business.

Speaking of America's future, I must acknowledge our national champion, Jackie Robinson West Little League team from the great State of Illinois. They are a shining example of how far hard work and teamwork can get you and what happens when you have the opportunity to pick up a ball, a pen, a book, or a skill.

As we return to business, I urge my colleagues to follow the example of these Little League and business heroes because hard work, teamwork, and innovation make us all better.

Lastly, I salute the heroes of 9/11.

STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this summer America has witnessed the horrific actions of ISIS as it marched into Iraq as part of its mission to create an Islamic state.

As a 29-year Air Force veteran, I know trouble when I see it, and so do the American people. ISIS is a direct threat to America and our democratic

way of life. Congress and the American people want, need, and deserve a clearly defined strategy from our President to defeat ISIS—not a strategy to degrade or contain or manage, but a strategy to defeat ISIS.

Tomorrow Americans remember the 13th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. As we remember all those we lost that day, let us also remember the hard lessons those attacks taught us: that we must always be vigilant in protecting the American way of life and all that we hold dear.

□ 1215

THE FCC AND THE NFL

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in my western New York community, there is no shortage of pride for our Buffalo Bills. This was apparent yesterday when it was announced Terry and Kim Pegula will be the new team owners. The Pegulas have time and again shown their commitment to western New York through their ownership of the Buffalo Sabres, financing of the new HarborCenter development on Buffalo's Inner Harbor, and now as owners of the Bills, keeping the team in western New York where it belongs.

This is excellent news for the team's future. Still more good news came for football fans yesterday when FCC Chairman Wheeler announced plans to consider repeal of the sports blackout rules at their next meeting.

Commissioner Ajit Pai was recently in Buffalo advocating for the same, and it appears now that momentum is building to return the game to the fans who support their teams and end blackouts once and for all.

The Federal Government certainly should not support such outdated and unfair practices, and I am hopeful that the FCC will end the backing of NFL blackout rules on September 30.

OVERREGULATION

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, over the last few decades, the Federal Government has regulated activities of the American people in increasingly minute detail. It was the Founders' desire to protect our individual liberty by having a government, which was energetic in its ability to perform the duties entrusted in it but limited in its scope, a concept incompatible with the current degree of overregulation.

The result is diminished job opportunities and higher costs for the average American. When jobs are lost, when new businesses never open, it is the

low-skilled, the young, new workers and those already suffering from chronic unemployment who are harmed the most.

The story of America is the story of someone starting out with nothing and achieving the American Dream. The secret to our success has always been our free and dynamic society that enables everyone to fulfill their unique human potential. It is time for Congress to decide whether it values paperwork or people. Don't regulate the American Dream out of existence.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, about 5 months ago, we were shocked and disturbed by the news that 200 schoolgirls were kidnapped from their beds in Nigeria by the militant terrorist group Boko Haram. The #bringbackourgirls raised awareness around the world of the plight of these innocent victims.

Boko Haram continues to terrorize families across Nigeria, attacking villages, gunning down civilians, and burning churches. Kidnappings and beheadings have become commonplace. Boko Haram has been responsible for the deaths of more than 900 men, women, and children in the last 3 months. The people of Nigeria are living in a state of fear, and I can't imagine what the kidnapped girls are facing in the months of captivity.

We will not rest until every girl is home and safe.

HONORING LYNNE MOFENSON, M.D.

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Lynne Mofenson, M.D., who is retiring after 26 years of service to the Federal Government and is currently the chief of the Maternal and Pediatric Infectious Disease Branch at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

Now, I have a full list of Dr. Mofenson's accomplishments and her prestigious and wonderful resume for the RECORD, but just a couple of points:

Dr. Mofenson received the 2012 Federal Employee of the Year Award from the Partnership for Public Service. The award is one of nine Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals bestowed on public servants who make high-impact contributions to the health, safety, and well-being of Americans. She was recognized for playing a pivotal role in preventing the AIDS epidemic among U.S. children through an effective

means of preventing pregnant women from passing HIV on to their infants, and for dedicating her career to conducting research on HIV, which has influenced and informed national HIV policy.

Dr. Mofenson has continued to work with her colleagues in this country and around the globe to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission and to improve the treatments for children with HIV infection. Please join me in honoring the lifelong work of this extraordinary scientist.

BOKO HARAM MUST BE STOPPED

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in June, I joined colleagues on a trip to Nigeria. The focus of the journey was the kidnapping of 270 innocent young girls at the hands of Boko Haram terrorists. It has now been 5 months since they were taken from school and from their families off to unimaginable circumstances.

Since then, Boko Haram has only become more brutal and more vicious, continuing its rampage in Nigerian villages killing, torturing, kidnapping, raping, burning, and announcing the creation of an Islamic state in north-east Nigeria.

Their reign of terror has been overshadowed on the world stage by events elsewhere. Overshadowed but not forgotten, Boko Haram must be stopped, and the girls must be brought home.

RECOGNIZING ARNOLD PALMER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a true American treasure and one of my constituents who still spends his summer months in his native Youngstown, Pennsylvania, Arnold Palmer.

Today, Arnold celebrates his 85th birthday, and he continues to serve as an inspiration to me and the millions who make up "Arnie's Army."

Arnold rose from humble beginnings and has achieved remarkable things in his life. Taught the game of golf at the age of 3 by his father, Deacon, who was the golf pro at Latrobe Country Club, Arnold made a name for himself in the amateur ranks. His promising collegiate career was cut short when he enlisted in the Coast Guard in honor of a friend who died. After he fulfilled his military service, Arnold returned to Wake Forest and won the U.S. Amateur Championship in 1954.

Arnold's achievements on the golf course are nothing short of legendary:

seven-time major champion, 1960 and 1962 PGA Player of the Year, and 92 overall professional victories.

Perhaps Arnold's most enduring legacy, however, lies in his decades of philanthropic work. Over the years, he has raised millions of dollars for the Latrobe-area hospital for charitable care. He helped to build a 30,000-square-foot cancer center and sponsored construction of a nature preserve for all of Westmoreland County to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call Arnold Palmer a son of western Pennsylvania, as well as my friend, and I ask that all Members wish him a very happy birthday.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the world and mainstream media focuses on other world events, the Boko Haram terrorists continue to bomb, pillage, rape, and behead innocent men, women, and even children in Nigeria. Yesterday, I met with some of the girls who bravely escaped from their captors.

As the girls relived their nightmare, the trauma of this experience was visible on their faces. I reassured them that Congress has not forgotten them and that I will be reintroducing legislation to help safely return their friends and family members and to eradicate Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited Nigeria, a young woman, Abuja, told me that Boko Haram beheaded her husband and put his head on the bed next to her as they raped her.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is using kidnapped girls as suicide bombers. Boko Haram is beheading men, women, and children—let me repeat—and children. They must be stopped.

Tweet today: #bringbackourgirls and #joinrepwilson.

Tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet. Tweet all day, tweet all night, tweet all week, and tweet all month. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, when the President was trying to sell ObamaCare to the people of Montana, we were promised that if we like our health insurance, we can keep it. But millions of Americans, including 38,000 Montanans, were forced out of their health care plans, and President Obama's promise was named the Lie of the Year by PolitiFact.

The promise he made to Montanans should be honored.

The Employee Health Care Protection Act, H.R. 3522, will protect the health care plans of 50 million Americans who get coverage through their employer and provide relief for workers who could see their out-of-pocket costs increase due to ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3522 and help ensure that no more Montanans see their health care costs rise or are forced out of plans that they like and that they chose.

EXPAND MEDICAID NOW

(Ms. PINGREE of Maine asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are finally increasing access to health coverage for millions of Americans, those who need it the most are left without.

Nearly every day, I hear from constituents in my State of Maine who are suffering because they are caught in a political battle over the expansion of Medicaid. These people are our friends and neighbors, and many of them have chronic conditions, injuries, or mental illnesses that prevent them from working. But because they live in States that have chosen not to expand the program, they have been left without any affordable options.

Instead, people are putting off getting health care until their needs are critical. Hospitals and health centers end up picking up the tab, and our economy continues to be strained.

In Maine, almost 70,000 people are struggling without health care because Medicaid hasn't been expanded. I call on Governors across the country, including my own, to think about these people rather than politics when they make decisions about health care in their States and expand Medicaid now.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD LISTEN TO THE VOTERS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President should listen to the voters and not grant amnesty to illegal immigrants by executive order. A recent survey by the polling company found that three-quarters of voters want the President to work with Congress to change immigration policies, not act on his own.

This overwhelming opposition to unilateral executive action is bipartisan—93 percent of Republicans, 81 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Democrats want the President to follow the legislative process.

Voters also support immigration policies that put American workers first. Supermajorities from all demo-

graphic groups say that Americans who need work should have the opportunity to do the jobs now held by illegal immigrants. They believe that government has a responsibility to protect American workers from competition with illegal workers.

The President should listen to the voters and put the interests of Americans first.

SAFE CLIMATE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to urge this Do-Nothing Congress to acknowledge the dangers and the reality of climate change.

This week we got startling news that once again is falling on deaf ears here in the House of Representatives. The World Meteorological Organization announced that atmospheric carbon levels reached a record high in 2013. And the Audubon Society found that nearly half of all bird species in North America—but, unfortunately, not including the ostrich—are at risk of severe population decline due to climate change. But despite the clear and present danger to the species, the ostrich-like Members of this body have their heads buried in the sand of denial.

We can no longer ignore the science. The time to act is now. I support the President's decision to reduce carbon emissions, and I urge my Republican colleagues to take their heads out of the sand so that together we can address this global threat.

□ 1230

TAYLORVILLE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the honor to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to wish my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois, in my home county of Christian County, a happy 175th anniversary.

I was only 7 years old when my parents moved our family to Taylorville, where my mom and dad were opening their very first restaurant. While my family has called Taylorville home for 37 years, I can say what made Taylorville and Christian County a great place to live when we first moved there still makes it a great place to live now.

My parents wouldn't have been able to achieve the American Dream without the support of friends and neighbors in Taylorville and Christian Coun-

ty, and without a doubt, I would not be standing here today if it weren't for the help and friendship of so many people throughout my years in Taylorville and Christian County.

As Taylorville and Christian County prepare to celebrate their 175th anniversary, it is an honor for me to be able to stand here today and offer my congratulations and best wishes.

GETTING BACK TO WORK

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Congress is back in Washington, and it is time to get to work on the priorities of the American people, but I rise today with serious concerns about the Republican agenda, which has failed to tackle important issues that would grow the economy and strengthen the middle class, such as raising the minimum wage, making education more affordable, and guaranteeing women equal pay for equal work.

Instead of ignoring the challenges facing hardworking Americans, we should be investing in their future and, in so doing, in the future of our great country.

We have a plan that will get the middle class back to work called the Middle Class Jumpstart. This legislative action plan will raise the minimum wage, guarantee women equal pay for equal work, make education more affordable, and invest in rebuilding our country and reinvigorating American manufacturing.

In order to move our country forward and build ladders of opportunity, we have to invest in our greatest asset, hardworking middle class families, and we have to take action now.

HONORING BEAVER COUNTY'S VIETNAM VETERANS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America.

I join Beaver County residents and all western Pennsylvanians in thanking them for their service to our Nation, as well as their efforts to bring The Wall that Heals, a traveling Vietnam Memorial, to Beaver County for the second time.

The Wall that Heals is a half-scale replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C. It travels across the country and provides greater access to the memorial for those who may not be able to visit it in our Nation's capital.

At more than 600 members strong, the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America is the largest chapter in

Pennsylvania and the third largest chapter in the Nation. Thanks to their efforts, The Wall that Heals will be in Quay Square in Darlington from September 24 through September 28.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of all Vietnam veterans and thanking the members of the Beaver County Vietnam Veterans of America, Chapter 862, for their hard work in once again bringing The Wall that Heals to Beaver County.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The Ex-Im Bank provides small and large U.S. businesses more job-creating opportunities to sell their products internationally. By providing loans and financing, the Ex-Im Bank has helped U.S. businesses compete in international markets that has generated over \$266 billion in export value.

Since 2007, businesses in California's 16th District in the San Joaquin Valley, which I represent, has helped finance tens of millions of dollars of loans' worth of exports that have created jobs in the Valley. The Export-Import Bank supports American jobs and helps level a playing field in the face of fierce competition that we experience from countries in Asia and around the world.

Rather than kick this can down the road, we must pass a long-term reauthorization for the Export-Import Bank. This issue has never been a partisan issue and nor should it be so today. We ought to be doing our jobs and working together.

TAX EXTENDERS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for the last month, I have traveled up and down the 25th District of Texas talking with my constituents about their biggest concerns.

They are fed up with Washington's out-of-touch economic policies that are hurting their families and their businesses. Business owners and individuals need certainty when it comes to their money and their taxes. That is why we need to quickly pass a tax extenders bill so business owners can stop playing defense and focus on what they do best, creating jobs.

Since Texas doesn't have a State income tax, Texans need to know if they

can continue deducting their sales tax from their Federal income taxes. Business owners need to know if they can continue taking risks and innovating with the R&D credit. Companies need to know that they are not the target of tax bias by extending the bonus depreciation credit permanently.

Ensuring these incentives is just the first step for true comprehensive tax reform, but these are good, sound policies that my constituents want and that our economy needs. Let's give America the certainty they deserve and pass the tax extenders.

And remember the 9/11 victims. In God we trust.

LET'S ADDRESS THE ONGOING CRISIS IN IRAQ

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support my colleague and good friend, FREDERICA WILSON, in her effort that she has undertaken to #bringbackourgirls, addressing the horror of Boko Haram having extracted these girls from their lives, but we also, in addition to that responsibility, have an exacting responsibility with reference to ongoing circumstances that the President will address tonight.

On August 14, nearly a month ago, I wrote to the President asking him to be mindful of a letter that I include in my remarks to Speaker BOEHNER. What I wrote to Speaker BOEHNER was:

I respectfully call upon you to bring Congress back into session, so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility to address the ongoing crisis in Iraq. As you know, the situation there is becoming increasingly more complex and continues to defy easy resolution.

There is no doubt that the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, ISIS, will continue to terrorize the people of Iraq, leading to an increase in tens of thousands of Iraqi Christian, Yazidi, and other refugees who have been driven from their homes.

We must ask Congress: exercise our constitutional responsibility.

SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Suicide Prevention Day, which is recognized on September 10. Suicide is a tragedy that touches more of us than most might realize. It is also a great challenge for our military.

In addition to an alarming suicide rate, half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting, according to recent Army studies, and a large percentage had never been deployed in a combat role.

Today, as we draw attention to the issues and prevention strategies that might save just one life or more, I am proud to say the House in May passed bipartisan legislation that would improve the military's approach to suicide detection and prevention.

While currently the Department of Defense does a thorough physical assessment for military recruits, no similar mental health evaluation is performed.

H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, will bring mental health to parity with physical health through the enforcement of a mental health assessment for incoming military recruits.

On Suicide Prevention Day, I am calling on the Senate to pass this important legislation. Our servicemembers deserve as much.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today in Emancipation Hall, the United States Congress and the United States Government honored the fallen heroes of 9/11 with a Congressional Gold Medal ceremony—three gold medals: one to the individuals who died in Shanksville, Pennsylvania; one to the folks who died at the Pentagon; and another to those who died at the World Trade Center. Their names are all in this memorial book, nearly 3,000 innocent victims of radical Islam.

Radical Islam and al Qaeda continues to stay in ISIS. The President will address the Nation tonight about the dangers ISIS presents to the world, to democracy, and to the United States.

I plan to support the President in his request for us to join him militarily, economically, and in other measures to see that ISIS does not hit our homeland, attack democracy, and create a caliphate that will be dangerous to freedom-loving people all over the world.

I attended the National 9/11 Memorial Museum 2 weeks ago. It is stirring. It made me think of the heroes, the firemen, the policemen, the first responders, and the people on that airplane, but it also made me think of the hate of al Qaeda and ISIS.

We must respond. We are America. God bless America.

WE MUST BE EVER VIGILANT IN DEFENDING OUR NATION

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, recent insecurity throughout the world is a reminder that we must be ever vigilant

in defending our Nation against those who wish to attack us and destroy our American values.

Tomorrow is the 13th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and once again, we pause to remember the innocent lives lost at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the heroes on Flight 93 in Pennsylvania.

We also pay tribute to the brave men and women who answered the call of duty and have courageously joined the Armed Forces to serve our Nation and fight the global war on terror.

September 11, 2001, changed our great Nation. It awakened us to the ever-present threat by those who wish to attack our country and our citizens, but it also stiffened our resolve and unified our Nation. Immediately after the horrific attacks, we came together as a nation, American spirit running high, and we emerged determined and stronger than ever before.

As we combat today's threats, our American spirit is enduring, and our leadership in the world is the strongest tool we have against terror.

God bless America.

DON'T DENY LGBT VETERANS FEDERAL VA BENEFITS THEY HAVE EARNED

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Republican members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, with one notable exception, voted to deny LGBT veterans the Federal VA benefits they have earned if they happen to live in a State that does not recognize marriage equality.

The Defense Department provides for LGBT soldiers and their families, regardless of where they live, but not the VA. While they are wearing a uniform, they and their families are covered, but once they take it off and become a veteran, too bad. If they live in Florida or Texas or Nevada, too bad.

It doesn't matter that they fought to defend this country, not a particular State. It doesn't matter that the VA and the VSOs support giving them benefits. It doesn't matter how brave they were, how much they sacrificed, or how long and honorably they served, too bad. They get nothing, according to the Republicans.

This is unfair and unjust, and they should be ashamed for lacking the courage to do the right thing by our Nation's heroes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 10, 2014 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1934.

That the Senate passed S. 898.

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 539.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 717 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 717

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-56, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 717 provides for consider-

ation of H.R. 3522, the Employer Health Care Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, equally divided between the majority and minority. One clarifying amendment has been included to clarify that group health plans for the upcoming year can be covered under 2013 plans. The minority is afforded the customary opportunity to offer one motion to recommit, should they so choose. This is a fair rule to allow us to give some relief to Americans who want to keep their health insurance plan but are being told that, because of the Affordable Care Act, they may not.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the President has quickly forgotten some of the promises he made to the American people about this law. In a June 2009 speech before the American Medical Association, President Obama, addressing the house of delegates, said:

We will keep this promise to the American people. If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what.

In March of 2010, the President said:

Your employer, it's estimated, will see premiums fall by as much as 3,000 percent, which means they could give you a raise.

It is obvious that both statements were not only nonoperational, they were completely false. Individuals and businesses have experienced or will face in the future the loss of current health insurance if it does not comply with Affordable Care Act coverage requirements. The Affordable Care Act is, quite simply, a job killer. Employers are reducing hours and limiting pay increases just to keep up with the demands of the law.

Just a few weeks ago, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York reported that over half of employers are changing insurance in response to the Affordable Care Act. These changes aren't being done for the benefit of the employees. All across the country, employees have lost doctors, seen premiums rise, seen hours cut, or had their coverage dropped. This will continue as long as the Affordable Care Act continues with the benefit mandates, burdensome taxes, and unreasonable regulation. In fact, employees are paying more in out-of-pocket costs than ever before. Premiums have skyrocketed under the Affordable Care Act, but access to doctors has narrowed.

Today, H.R. 3522 offers a solution to this problem. This bill would allow employer-sponsored plans that were available at any point in 2013 to continue to be offered. This bill would also help protect both employers offering these plans and their employees enrolled in them from the Affordable Care Act's costly taxes and penalties.

The President recognizes that there are serious flaws in his signature

health care law, a law that he championed and, in fact, was written at the White House. Since the law was passed, the President has signed seven bills into law that repealed parts of the Affordable Care Act, bills that passed both the House and the Senate, went to the President for his signature, and he signed them.

In addition to these statutory changes, there have been attempts to fix this broken law through a series of unilateral executive orders and regulations. Can we really expect the same administration that wrote this disastrous law to now fix it?

Last year, the President unilaterally decided to delay the employer mandate. Even the administration doesn't believe that businesses and their employees can handle the burdens imposed by the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 3522 is offering the American people a legal solution to get out from under the crushing demands of the health care law. The law would grandfather in employer plans that existed before the law went into effect. With the passage of this bill before us today, no employee would have to lose their coverage or have their out-of-pocket costs soar because of the Affordable Care Act.

It is clear that H.R. 3522 offers the only feasible lifeline to millions of employees who want to keep their health care plan. It is Congress' job to protect the American people. I urge men and women on both sides of the dais to pass this law so that Americans will have the opportunity to keep their plans and their doctors and reduce their out-of-pocket costs.

To be clear, this bill before us today, if signed into law, will not fix the Affordable Care Act. No piece of legislation, short of a full-fledged repeal, could ever achieve that. The bill we are voting on today serves to stop the hemorrhaging that is occurring as a consequence of this ill-conceived government takeover of the American health care industry. As a physician, I know that sometimes it is important to just stop the hemorrhage if you are going to save the patient. That is what the House of Representatives will do today. I hope all colleagues from both sides of the dais will support this.

I encourage everyone to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill and stand with millions of Americans who are losing their employer health care coverage and access to their doctors, despite what has been promised to them repeatedly by this disastrous law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I am hearing quotes given about what people promised when and what is happening now, and yet under this very

rule that we are considering, I fail to see how it is consistent with promises that our current Speaker has made.

On January 5, 2011, our current Speaker, promised:

You will always have the right to a robust debate and open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives, and to be heard. Furthermore, to my friends in the minority, I offer a commitment: openness.

And yet how ironic is it that this very rule is the 75th closed rule of the 113th Congress?

Now, what does a closed rule mean? A closed rule means that even if Democrats or Republicans have great ideas about how to improve or amend a bill, they are not even allowed to be discussed or voted upon on the floor of the House.

A closed rule means the only say that I or my friends get as Members of Congress is to say "yes" or "no." We don't get to improve upon the idea. We don't get to make it work better for our country. We don't get to offer changes that will reduce costs to taxpayers or improve the efficiency of the bill.

We had a commitment from this current Speaker to have an open process, and yet here we have before us the 75th closed rule. This is the diamond jubilee of closed rules that we are celebrating here on the floor of the House today with this 75th closed rule that doesn't allow my Democratic or Republican colleagues to bring forth simple, commonsense ideas to improve the bill before us and make it work for our country.

In addition to the diamond jubilee of closed rules, we also have the 53rd attempted repeal of ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act. Now, we get that. Our friends on the other side want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We have heard that. This is the 53rd time we have heard that.

Whenever our colleagues on the other side are serious about rolling up their sleeves and working in a bipartisan way to improve the Affordable Care Act, to make it work better for our country, to increase competition, to reduce costs, we are happy to have that discussion.

I myself am the sponsor of several bills to change the Affordable Care Act, as are many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but instead of having that discussion, we are having the 53rd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act under the 75th closed rule of the current Congress. I think the American people are learning no longer to be surprised by these kinds of maneuvers. We wonder why the approval of rating Congress is at a record low of 12 percent.

There was a commitment from our Speaker to allow us to represent our constituents, to allow us to make our case, to allow us to offer alternatives. We are going to do that under the pre-

vious question. We are going to do that under the motion to recommit. But in terms of actually being able to amend this bill, the process has been closed, not only from my fellow Democrats, but from the many fine Republicans who have ideas to make this bill better and make health care more affordable.

This Congress deserves better, and I know that we can do better.

I know that under this rule, my colleague, Mr. BURGESS, managed to have his amendment included. They use a self-executed amendment in the rule. That means that by passing this rule there is a special amendment that actually becomes part of the bill. We don't even have the opportunity to debate the merits of that amendment, whatever they are, but any other ideas from Democrats or Republicans are closed down for the 75th time. They are not even able to bring them forward.

My colleagues have a lot of ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act. I am the sponsor of a number of bills. Rather than bringing forth the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act, let's move forward. The country is ready to go. Let's make sure that Americans that have used the health care marketplace to enroll in affordable, high-quality health care are able to continue doing so. Let's make sure we improve the Affordable Care Act rather than end it.

Instead of rolling back protections that benefit millions of Americans, let's get back to work on the issues that matter, like reducing costs in health care, like fixing our broken immigration, like raising the minimum wage and making sure that we can get our economy going with an infrastructure investment.

For instance, on immigration reform alone, this body's failure to act continues to cost taxpayers money every day. There is a bill that passed the Senate with more than a two-thirds majority. That is not easy to do over there. If that bill were simply allowed to come to a vote in the open process that the Speaker promised and allow us to vote for our constituents, I think it would pass.

We have a bipartisan bill in the House called H.R. 15. It is a version of the Senate bill. We can bring that bill forward under a rule. Let's do it. It will pass tomorrow and address our broken immigration system and save taxpayers over \$200 billion over 10 years, create hundreds of thousands of jobs for Americans, secure our borders, and make sure that the rule of law in our country is restored. The longer we put that off, the worse that issue becomes and the harder it will be to address.

Again, while this bill is an anniversary of sorts—the diamond jubilee of closed bills and the 53rd attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it doesn't offer anything new to the American people, and it doesn't allow

Democrats or Republicans who have thoughtful ideas for improving the Affordable Care Act to bring them forward at all to be discussed on their merits or voted on here in this body.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Again, Mr. POLIS, I think, very powerfully stated how this majority once again is denying a free and open amendment process, or even a limited amendment process, with this totalitarian version of debate.

I also want to speak in opposition to the underlying bill. We heard a lot about skyrocketing premiums. I come from a State where a Governor actually embraced the Affordable Care Act. What we saw just a few days ago, with the new premiums that are released for 2015, was reported on by Kaiser Family Foundation, which is the gold standard for health care reporting in this country, is that the State of Connecticut is actually going to see a 4 percent reduction in the plans sold through the Affordable Care Act exchange. My friend from Colorado is one of the real lucky States. They are looking at a 15 percent reduction in terms of their silver plans that are sold through the exchange.

Again, this chart which we have prepared for today shows that, rather than skyrocketing premiums, what we are seeing in State after State after State in terms of premiums for next year is that there are either reductions or very modest increases.

The bill that we are going to be voting on later today would actually damage the progress that is being made in a lot of these States because it basically expands plans that protect discriminating against people with pre-existing conditions, which was, sadly, what the insurance market looked like before the Affordable Care Act was passed. It, again, allows cherry-picking plans that picked healthier populations as opposed to what we are seeing with the plans that have been implemented and now are high-functioning.

□ 1300

256,000 people enrolled through the exchange in the State of Connecticut last year, far shattering all the projections that HHS had set forth, because we had a high-functioning Web site—kudos to Governor Malloy—but also because people voted with their feet; that when they actually got the facts and had a chance to look at the coverage that was being offered and the price that it was going to cost, they, again, shattered all the projections. And we are poised to move forward again next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to yield an additional 45 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. In the small group market, what we are seeing is that since the enrollment ended for the individual market, the shop exchange, as the small market is called, tripled in terms of small businesses in the State of Connecticut that enrolled, with protections so that people with pre-existing conditions, who are born with diabetes, or arthritis, are not going to be shut out of the market, which these old plans that the Cassidy bill seeks to enshrine and enlarge did under the provisions of that legislation.

We, as Mr. POLIS said, need to roll up our sleeves and talk about ways that we can improve the law. This is a huge, terrible step backwards, which, for all these States which are seeing rate reductions for 2015, would be lost.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting recitation.

I wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to Bloomberg View and an article by Megan McArdle from September 9 of 2014, just a couple of paragraphs in the article that prices—talking about reissue rates—that prices are not being based on claims data. She points out, and I am quoting here: "Companies began setting these rates just a few months ago after open enrollment closed, and because so many people bought in the last few weeks, they had no meaningful idea of what their expenses would be, that is, the insurance companies."

And, further quoting: "The companies that are coming in are looking to gain market share, not make a profit."

Continuing to quote: "The other reason we cannot learn much from these data right now is that for the next year, insurers are operating under the expectation of large subsidies from the Obama administration via the various reinsurance provisions in ObamaCare. These provisions expire in 2016."

Continuing to quote: "Right now, it is just not very risky to write a policy that loses money because your losses are capped. Starting in 2017, all that changes. Insurers are going to need to price policies with the expectation of making money and the fear of losing it."

Mr. Speaker, what Megan McArdle is saying is, right now you don't really know much about the renewal rates on insurance policies because there is distortion in the market because of the reinsurance provisions in the Affordable Care Act.

But I will share this with you. I bought insurance in the Texas Federal fallback exchange. I bought a bronze plan on Blue Cross/Blue Shield. It is the most expensive insurance I have

ever had in my life. Trying to plan and trying to budget for next year, I can't because here we sit, September 10, and I do not know what the renewal rates are going to be. And in all likelihood I will not know until around election day, with very little time to plan.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up two pieces of legislation. The first is the Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2014, and the second is a constitutional amendment to address the issues surrounding Citizens United.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

I rise to urge the defeat of the motion on ordering the previous question on this rule.

Most Americans would be outraged to see the 113th Congress, on track to be the most unproductive Congress in this Nation's history, return from a 5-week recess, only to waste more time. Yet, that is what is happening today with the GOP's 53rd attack on the Affordable Care Act.

We could be doing so much more. We could stand up against special interests and advance the American people's priorities.

We could raise the minimum wage to prevent big corporations from paying workers starvation wages.

We could stand up to the gun lobby and pass background checks to stop criminals from buying guns online.

We could stand up to companies that use fancy corporate inversions to skirt their responsibility to pay taxes towards American infrastructure, American schools, and American research.

Yet, these priorities will just as surely go ignored this 113th Congress as they did in the 112th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that we are not dealing with the people's business today. Since the 2010 Supreme Court decision in Citizens United, Congress has become mired in dysfunction. The people's House is now paralyzed by the threat of attacks from corporations and a handful of billionaires with their Super PACs and their secret front groups.

When Members spend more time fundraising and dodging Super PAC attack ads than working on bipartisan solutions and championing their constituents' priorities, our democracy is dysfunctional. And that dysfunction is a form of corruption. It is money from the left and the right, and it is only getting worse.

This year, the Supreme Court ruled 5-4 in *McCutcheon* that the wealthy have a right to hold more influence over elected officials than actual voters. This idea threatens our entire system of elected self-government, and we

have an opportunity to take action today.

I urge my colleagues to do the courageous thing, to do the right thing. Join me to support the Democracy for All Amendment, H.J. Res. 119, to amend our Constitution and overturn these destructive Supreme Court rulings.

In the Senate this week, our colleagues are considering Senator UDALL's companion to my constitutional amendment. And while the Senate has this important debate about money and politics, this House is rehashing tired old attacks on ObamaCare that everyone is sick of.

The Democracy for All Amendment is simple. It says that the American people have a right to pass laws protecting the integrity of our elections by limiting money and politics.

It is time to get money out and voters in and end this "pay-to-play" democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion ordering the previous question, to allow consideration of the Democracy for All Amendment to overturn Citizens United, and allow the American people, and not the special interests, to once again set the agenda in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, our Bill of Rights guarantees free speech, but free speech is not free if only the wealthy can afford it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) certainly convinced me. I hope he convinced you as well that, rather than repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time, let's take this body back from the special interests and return it to the people of this country. And his motion will do that if we defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss the other proposal if we defeat the previous question, I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge we defeat the previous question for two reasons, and I want to speak to one of them.

Right now, corporations can move their tax address overseas and avoid or lower their U.S. taxes. Middle class and other typical families cannot do that at all. They can't simply change their address and lower or eliminate their taxes.

Since the beginning of this year, more than a dozen large corporations have announced their plans for inversion. And yet, they will continue to benefit from being headquartered in our country, taking advantage of everything this country has to offer, whether it is our wealth of educated workers, government funding of basic research, tax credits like R&D, or our robust financial markets.

They will pay less in U.S. taxes, so much that the American tax base is ex-

pected to lose \$20 billion over the next 10 years if we do nothing to address the issue.

And who will make up this difference? Basically, middle class taxpayers.

The Republican answer? To do nothing, leave town next week, or, some say, to wait for tax reform at some undetermined time.

Republicans are taking the President to court for use of executive authority, his executive authority. At the same time, Republicans in this House fail to use their own authority, failing to do their job.

Addressing this issue cannot wait. This is an immediate problem that requires an immediate legislative solution. Voting "no" on the previous question provides all of us an opportunity to do just that and will allow us to bring up legislation to address this problem.

If you vote to move the previous question, essentially you are saying, I rubberstamp this inversion process where corporations essentially move their address and lower or eliminate their taxes. No one should be doing that.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote "no" on the previous question as well so we can allow consideration of the Democracy for All constitutional amendment, which would allow us to put some reasonable limits on this outside spending, these huge expenditures of funds by Super PACs and outside groups that are crowding out the voices of everyday citizens.

When I go around my district, when I talk to people, the average person feels like their voice can't be heard. When they go into the political town square to try to make their views known, there is a megaphone being held by these Super PACs and these outside groups that is drowning out the voice of everyday citizens, so that their opinions, their perspective can't be heard.

If you go to a town meeting, usually, the way they organize it is you sign up and everybody gets a chance to talk for 5 minutes. The way the system is headed with these Super PACs, because there are no limits on the amount of speech they can buy, if you go down to the town hall meeting now, in a sense, you get there and you find out that some Super PAC has reserved 59 minutes out of the hour of time for talking on the issues, and everyday citizens only have 1 minute left.

That is why we need some reasonable limits, because the big money is taking over the microphone, and they are not letting anybody else have their opinions heard.

A constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All constitutional amendment—I want to salute my colleague, TED DEUTCH of Florida for leading the effort on this—would put reasonable limits in place so that everybody can have a voice, so that everybody can participate in a pluralistic democratic society where all voices are heard.

I urge that we vote "no" on ordering the previous question to allow consideration of this important constitutional amendment to give a voice back to everyday citizens out there in our country.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question and to urge support of the Democracy for All Amendment that we intend to offer if the question is defeated.

The last thing Congress needs is more special interest candidates who don't answer to the American people. The Supreme Court decisions in Citizens United and McCutcheon have opened the floodgates of unlimited spending on campaigns.

Protections against special-interest influence on our elections have steadily eroded, along with public confidence in government. The result is campaigns dominated not by ideas, thoughtful debates, or visions for the future, but by television ads, mostly negative and mostly funded by unaccountable outside groups.

In my State of Kentucky, MITCH MCCONNELL and his special interest allies have spent more than \$8 million, running nearly 26,000 TV ads in our Commonwealth. The vast majority are from outside groups attacking Mr. MCCONNELL's opponents. Many bend the truth and intentionally mislead Kentuckians, which is a lot easier to get away with if the attacker isn't accountable to voters.

Under our current political system, these groups are allowed massive influence over our campaigns, much more than any average citizen or group of citizens could ever exert.

It is system riddled with loopholes, lacking meaningful disclosure, and more awash in corporate influence than ever.

□ 1315

In Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL's race is expected to cost \$100 million. That would pay the annual salaries of about 2,000 public schoolteachers in our Commonwealth. While Senator MCCONNELL and other supporters of the Citizens United decision call this "freedom of speech," it is actually the freedom to deceive. To be fair, dishonest ads are coming from both sides by both parties. These are ads made possible by

Citizens United, and if The Washington Post Fact Checker actually had to present real Pinocchios for all of the dishonest ads made possible by Citizens United, Geppetto would be the busiest man in America.

That is why we need to pass the Democracy for All amendment—to put a stop to this runaway special interest spending on campaigns and to return Congress to the people it was meant to serve.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of defeating the motion on ordering the previous question.

The GOP has put forward H.R. 3522, which would undermine the Affordable Care Act by putting insurance companies back in charge of health care for everyday Americans. That is right. I mean, it is not a surprise, putting corporate special interests ahead of the interests of the American people. Instead, they are now taking the 53rd vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We could be enacting a commonsense constitutional amendment, as my colleagues have said, that would better serve the people's interests. The Democracy for All constitutional amendment seeks to address the failure of our current political system, where the megaphones of moneyed interests are now drowning out the voices of ordinary Americans.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in 2010 of Citizens United, which struck down the limits on independent campaign spending by corporations, we have actually seen those with deep pockets threaten our democracy, spending unlimited, hidden amounts on our elections, and it gets worse with each passing election.

Two years ago, outside groups, including more than 1,200 so-called Super PACs, spent \$970 million on our elections. That is nearly \$1 billion in secret, dark money. It is not fair, and the American people know it. \$123 million of anonymous cash was also spent. Overall, spending totaled nearly \$7 billion.

Earlier this year, another Supreme Court decision struck down decades-old caps on the total amount that any one individual can contribute to Federal candidates in a 2-year cycle. Now those individuals—and there are only a handful of them across the United States—can contribute unlimited amounts from their own pockets into elections. The result has only increased the role that money plays in American politics.

Recent reports show that undisclosed political spending, better known as

“dark money,” will, once again, reach record levels in this November's election.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Recently, the Center for Responsive Politics announced that dark money has already exceeded \$50 million—seven times the amount that was accrued at this time in the last midterm election.

Justice Breyer wrote in this last Supreme Court decision: “Where enough money calls the tune, the general public will not be heard.”

We are not being heard, and that is exactly the position that we find ourselves in today because, as the Republican House votes to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act for the 53rd time since its enactment, they have given us a choice. The Republicans want us to choose corporate insurance special interests, or we can choose the interests of the American people by passing a constitutional amendment that would restore democracy, government, and our elections back to the people of the United States.

It is time that we pass this constitutional amendment, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to let us begin to address the interests of the American people.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I just want to address the issue of the insurance companies.

They have never enjoyed the type of unprecedented power that they have today until the passage of the Affordable Care Act. The insurance companies—executives from the insurance companies—meet regularly down at the White House with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. We are not privy to those discussions. We have no earthly idea what goes on in those meetings, but we do know that insurance companies are enjoying unprecedented profits right now since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Their profits have increased. Their stock prices have increased.

Why is that? It is because of the individual mandate that was included in the Affordable Care Act.

No longer do insurance companies need to be interested in the longitudinal relationships with their insureds. You have got to buy what they are selling. Don't even get me started on their own narrow networks, which can restrict patients' abilities to see a doctor or to go to a hospital, to see who they want, to buy the medications that they need or to be reimbursed for the medications that they need. A lot of that has gone out the window. Talk about people with preexisting conditions. Most of us buy on price. Since we buy

the lowest-cost price on the Bronze plan, we find ourselves now confined by narrow networks.

Who is really now prejudiced against a person with a preexisting condition under the current arrangement?

This bill today does not undo the Affordable Care Act, but it provides one more little measure of sanity for patients who wanted to keep their insurance policies before this regime took over.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously important topic because this Congress, unfortunately, and our government are affected so much by political contributions. Because of *Baker v. Carr*, “one man, one vote” exists, but that one vote is not equal to the voice of corporations or individuals with unlimited amounts of money. The fact is those people, those corporations, have gotten more of a voice than any one person's vote.

Most Members of Congress spend a great deal of time raising money when they should be studying issues, listening to debate, participating in debate, listening to constituents. The amount of money that is in this system and determines who comes into this body is beyond anything the Framers of the Constitution ever imagined. The amendment that we offer would allow the Congress to put limits on the amount of money that can come into the system. It promotes the idea of everybody being equal, of “one man, one vote” and our representing people equally. It simply gives Congress the power to set limits.

I don't know why anybody in this Congress would object to giving Congress the power to set limits on corporate spending involving campaigns, which takes away the fundamental aspect of democracy that each person is considered to have a voice and one's perspectives presented on this floor in equal opportunity with those who are the most wealthy. There is nothing that affects this House in a more adverse way than money. This amendment can help this House be more representative of the great democracy that we represent and intend to represent and make it the democracy that it is supposed to be. It simply gives Congress that power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. I would urge this amendment to be considered and to be voted on in order to uphold the idea that each individual and his position is sacred and equal, that money is taken out of the system in the best possible

ways, and that corporations don't continue to have the extraordinary influence they have had on this body.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3522.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

While the title of this legislation and those supporting it claim that it will protect employees, in fact, it will prevent millions of Americans from accessing the consumer protections and important reforms included in the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

H.R. 3522 would permit any health insurance issuer offering coverage in the group market in 2013 to continue to offer that coverage through 2018. These insurance policies would not have to comply with the consumer protections that went into effect in 2014.

This bill is different—and much worse—than the Administration's grandfathering policy. It means that insurance companies would be able to cherry pick, offering low rates for inadequate bare-bones policies for some groups but discriminate against, charge higher prices, or offer weaker coverage for others.

The bill would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat. If this became law, insurers will be able to continue to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children has pre-existing health conditions. And small businesses will face higher premiums and continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee has an accident, develops a chronic health condition, or has a complicated pregnancy.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, businesses have added nearly 10 million jobs and in just the past few months, more than 10 million people who were previously uninsured have gained health insurance coverage. Premiums have risen at historically low levels, and the life of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 13 years.

We have come far in the effort to stop the worst abuses of the insurance industry and provide Americans with true coverage that protects them from bankruptcy, annual and life-time limits, discrimination, and from being dropped from their plans when they need them the most. Rolling back critical reforms and returning to a broken system is not the answer. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and work together to improve the law for all Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers. We are prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. No, I have no additional speakers. I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Instead of focusing on rolling back protections for the benefits of millions

of Americans for the 53rd time, this House should get back to the work of focusing on real problems, like the need to overhaul our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works for our country. Instead of solving immigration problems that are facing our Nation, the House continues to vote on bills that take our country backwards.

Before we left for recess 5 weeks ago, the House voted to deny DREAMers the ability to stay here, and they subjected them to deportation proceedings. This body's continued failure to act on comprehensive immigration reform means that the President must act instead. For more than a year, I have come to the House floor to decry the fact that the House Republicans have failed to move any immigration reform bills to the floor this entire Congress—or any bills to secure our border, any bills to provide provisional work permits, any bills to require workplace authentication. Not a single one has been brought to the floor of the House.

I am deeply disappointed that the President has put off taking action on this bill until after the November elections, but the President will have no alternative if this Congress continues to fail to act. Sadly, over the next 2 months, the current administration will continue to deport tens of thousands of hardworking mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers because of the lack of courage of this body to act and because the President continues to refuse to act with the authority that is already granted to him by the nature of his office.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to act right now means he will go big and bold tomorrow, but the truth is the President can't do it all alone. He needs Congress. If we are serious about securing the border, it will take an appropriation—it will take resources—from this body to secure the border. I am confident the President will do whatever he can with the money and resources he has to do it, but if this body is serious, we need to require the President to secure the border and make sure the President has the resources to do that. I am hopeful the President will use his powers to reform our antiquated visa program, which restricts an employer's ability to hire key talent and only provides an additional incentive for companies to move overseas so that they can hire the people they need.

These are issues that the President can and should address now, not just when it is politically convenient. Unite families, make America more competitive, and challenge Congress to get immigration reform done.

Of course, any relief the President provides would be just a temporary fix. Only this body can find a permanent solution by rewriting our immigration laws to restore the rule of law with re-

gard to the 11 million people who are here illegally, to reform our visa and green card systems going forward, to secure our borders, to ensure workplace enforcement, and to make sure that we can facilitate legal commerce between Mexico and the United States.

But once again, rather than addressing the issue that came up the most of any issue in my 10 town halls—immigration reform—we are faced with the 53rd repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the 75th closed rule—the diamond jubilee of closed rules—that doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans to offer a single amendment to this bill. Amendments that are germane, that improve the Affordable Care Act, that have bipartisan consensus support are not even allowed to be brought forward and are not even discussed for 10 minutes on the floor of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with the extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In 2006, the Democrat manifesto, "A New Direction for America," states:

Bills should come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

The fact remains that, when the Democrats took control of the House, they did precisely the opposite.

Throughout the 111th Congress, which was the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI's time as Speaker and which was the first 2 years of the Obama administration, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process. Under Republican control, the House has returned to the consideration of appropriations bills under an open process with 22 open rules.

□ 1330

This year, the House has considered 404 amendments, 189 of which were offered by the Democrats. When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis will show that the Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives.

One word on the previous question: defeat of the previous question would not allow any of these proposals that

we have heard about today to be considered because they would not be germane to the rule, so I do urge my colleagues to support the previous question.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to protect millions of Americans who are facing the loss of their employer-sponsored health insurance and that they were promised—a promise is a promise—they were promised they could keep.

I certainly thank my colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his thoughtful piece of legislation and his work in this effort.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 717 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H. J. Res. 119, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4679) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have

been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 119 or H.R. 4679.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon re-

jection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 276) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR.

Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbered 12423, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice and in accordance with the procedures of the Commission under that section, reinstate the license and extend the

time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of project works to the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 276 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license and extend for 3 years the deadline for commencement of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir. Hydropower is a critical component of our all-of-the-above energy strategy, and this bill will help facilitate the construction of an affordable and reliable source of domestic electricity.

As many people around the country understand, many Members of the House and Senate have very strong differing views with the President and his administration over the direction that we are going on energy in America, particularly the impact that regulations are having on the electric generation system in America.

It looks like it is going to be creating a lot of chaos, but when we have projects like this hydro project at American Falls Reservoir, I think there is unanimous agreement that we need to move forward expeditiously on these types of projects.

This bill has passed the U.S. Senate, and I would urge all Members of the House to support it.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support the American Falls Reservoir hydropower legislation, introduced by Senators RISCH and CRAPO of Idaho. The bill would authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reinstate the license for a hydroelectric project involving Idaho's American Falls Reservoir, and it gives the project 3 additional years by which to begin construction.

This bill allows FERC to get this project licensed expeditiously while ensuring that the appropriate environmental analyses are completed and considered.

The noncontroversial legislation before us today has passed the Senate by unanimous consent in two consecutive Congresses.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I also urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 276.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EPS SERVICE PARTS ACT OF 2014

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5057) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5057

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "EPS Service Parts Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. EXEMPT SUPPLIES.

Section 325(u) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(u)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) EXEMPT SUPPLIES.—

"(A) FEBRUARY 10, 2014, RULE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—An external power supply shall not be subject to the final rule entitled 'Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for External Power Supplies', published at 79 Fed. Reg. 7845 (February 10, 2014), if the external power supply—

"(I) is manufactured during the period beginning on February 10, 2016, and ending on February 10, 2020;

"(II) is marked in accordance with the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016;

"(III) meets, where applicable, the standards under paragraph (3)(A), and has been certified to the Secretary as meeting International Efficiency Level IV or higher of the External Power Supply International Efficiency Marking Protocol, as in effect on February 10, 2016; and

"(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

"(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

"(bb) was manufactured before February 10, 2016.

"(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of products exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that fall below International Efficiency Level VI.

"(iii) LIMITATION OF EXEMPTION.—The Secretary may issue a rule, after providing public notice and opportunity for public comment, to limit the applicability of the exemption established under clause (i) if the Secretary determines that the exemption is resulting in a significant reduction of the energy savings that would otherwise result from the final rule described in such clause.

"(B) AMENDED STANDARDS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may exempt an external power supply from any amended standard under this subsection if the external power supply—

"(I) is manufactured within four years of the compliance date of the amended standard;

"(II) complies with applicable marking requirements adopted by the Secretary prior to the amendment;

"(III) meets the standards that were in effect prior to the amendment; and

"(IV) is made available by the manufacturer as a service part or a spare part for an end-use product that—

"(aa) constitutes the primary load; and

"(bb) was manufactured before the compliance date of the amended standard.

"(ii) REPORTING.—The Secretary may require manufacturers of a product exempted pursuant to clause (i) to report annual total units shipped as service and spare parts that do not meet the amended standard."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), who is an important member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman WHITFIELD for his leadership on the Energy and Power Subcommittee, and I certainly appreciate the work you have done on energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the EPS Service Parts Act of 2014. This bill simply seeks to achieve congressional intent of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 regarding exemptions for certain service parts.

I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congressman TONKO,

for working with me on this legislation, and I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for bringing this bill to the floor.

In the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, Congress recognized the need for manufacturers to continue to produce and distribute service and spare parts to be used with older out-of-production products that didn't comply with the new energy efficiency regulations produced by the 2007 bill.

The most common forms of EPS products are laptops, desktops, tablets, printers, and network products—products we use every day. Congress anticipated issues surrounding older service parts. The 2007 bill provided that from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2015, the energy standards would not apply to EPS made available as service or spare parts for end use products manufactured before July 1, 2008.

The reason for this legislation is to make a technical correction to provide explicit authority to the Department of Energy to create a similar exemption when the Department of Energy updated their EPS efficiency standards.

The existing language in the 2007 bill, according to DOE, has the opposite effect. It actually prevents DOE from extending this needed exemption in its February 2014 rulemaking on EPS efficiency standards.

The EPS Service Parts Act is in line with the original intent of the 2007 energy bill. It allows for continued production and distribution of replacement EPS for use with equipment manufactured before February 10, 2016, the effective date of the new DOE efficiency standards.

By passing this legislation, the bill will benefit both U.S. consumers and manufacturers. It will allow manufacturers such as Dell or Hewlett-Packard to maintain and distribute supplies of replacement parts for older equipment. It will also allow for warranty and contract compliance by these manufacturers.

Without this legislation, manufacturers would be required to redesign and qualify service on spare EPS parts at significant expense solely to support products that are no longer in production.

Manufacturers would also be forced to destroy existing inventories. Again, they would have to be destroyed—existing inventories—that were intended to support service and spare parts.

Also, in addition to meeting energy efficiency standards, the redesigned EPS parts would also need to be recertified to all the applicable safety, efficiency, and other environmental specifications.

Because of the low volume of services and spare parts, this would be a very costly and job-costing undertaking for manufacturers. Companies have esti-

mated increased costs in the millions of dollars with no corresponding benefit to energy savings or the consumer.

This bill has the support of the Information Technology Industry Council, the Alliance to Save Energy, the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, the Consumer Electronics Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The bill saves money and avoids a regulatory overreach not intended by, but accidentally instigated by a previous Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the bill.

Again, thank you to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5057, the External Power Supply Service Parts Act of 2014.

I thank my colleague Representative GARDNER and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their cooperation and support in bringing this measure to the floor.

External power supplies have become regular fixtures in homes and workplaces around the world as we have expanded our use of rechargeable batteries to power the many electronic products we use every day. Because these products are so common, lowering their power consumption translates into substantial energy savings for consumers and savings for businesses.

Earlier this year, the Department of Energy finalized a rule to strengthen the energy efficiency standards for these products. I support that rule.

H.R. 5057 is not intended to undermine the new standard. H.R. 5057 simply creates a short-term targeted exemption to enable a smooth and orderly transition to the new standard for both manufacturers and for the current owners of equipment purchased prior to the adoption of the new standard.

This narrow exemption enables manufacturers to continue to provide service and replacement parts for existing equipment. It allows owners of equipment to keep it functioning for the full intended life of that given product.

The bill ensures the exemption included in this legislation will not result in a significant delay in reaching the new energy efficiency targets for EPS equipment.

The bill provides DOE with the authority to establish a reporting requirement to track the number of parts that are shipped and of those that do not meet the efficiency standard.

If the Department finds that this exemption is undermining the energy savings that are projected under the new efficiency regulations, the Secretary can issue a rule to limit or rescind the exemption.

H.R. 5057 strikes an appropriate balance, I believe, that keeps us moving forward on efficiency goals for external power supplies while providing manufacturers and owners of current products the assurance that service and spare parts will be available.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Representative GARDNER, for working with me and working with our colleagues on this bill.

I urge all Members to support the legislation, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER for being the cosponsors of this legislation and thank Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. UPTON for working with all of us to bring it to the floor, as well as the staffs on both sides of the aisle.

As both Mr. TONKO and Mr. GARDNER stated, this bill is a technical correction to existing law that will allow external power supply manufacturers to continue to sell service parts compatible with older technology to the benefit of consumers and manufacturers. It is a good piece of legislation.

I would urge all the Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5057, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1504

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 717;

Adoption of House Resolution 717, if ordered;

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2678, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4751, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3522, EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 717) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Amash	Chabot	Fleming
Amodei	Chaffetz	Flores
Bachmann	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Bachus	Coble	Fortenberry
Barletta	Coffman	Fox
Barr	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Barton	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Benishek	Collins (NY)	Gardner
Bentivolio	Conaway	Garrett
Bilirakis	Cook	Gerlach
Bishop (UT)	Cotton	Gibbs
Black	Cramer	Gibson
Blackburn	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Bridenstine	Daines	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Granger
Broun (GA)	Dent	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Burgess	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Grimm
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie
Camp	Ellmers	Hall
Campbell	Farenthold	Hanna
Capito	Fincher	Harper
Carter	Fitzpatrick	Harris

Hartzler	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Salmon
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Sanford
Hensarling	Meehan	Scalise
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Schrock
Holding	Mica	Schweikert
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Hultgren	Mullin	Shimkus
Hunter	Mulvaney	Shuster
Hurt	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Issa	Neugebauer	Smith (MO)
Jenkins	Noem	Smith (NE)
Johnson (OH)	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Jolly	Olson	Southerland
Jones	Palazzo	Stewart
Jordan	Paulsen	Stivers
Joyce	Pearce	Stockman
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Stutzman
King (IA)	Petri	Terry
King (NY)	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Kingston	Pitts	Thornberry
Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Kline	Pompeo	Tipton
Labrador	Posey	Turner
LaMalfa	Price (GA)	Upton
Lamborn	Reed	Valadao
Lance	Reichert	Wagner
Lankford	Renacci	Walberg
Latta	Ribble	Walden
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Walorski
Long	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Roby	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
Marino	Rogers (MI)	Williams
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
McAllister	Rokita	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wolf
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McHenry	Ross	Woodall
McKeon	Rothfus	Yoder
McKinley	Royce	Young (AK)
	Runyan	Young (IN)

NAYS—196

Barber	DelBene	Kildee
Barrow (GA)	Deutch	Kilmer
Bass	Doggett	Kind
Beatty	Doyle	Kirkpatrick
Becerra	Duckworth	Kuster
Bera (CA)	Edwards	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Enyart	Lee (CA)
Bonamici	Eshoo	Levin
Brady (PA)	Esty	Lewis
Braley (IA)	Farr	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Loeb
Brownley (CA)	Poster	Loeb
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Butterfield	Fudge	Lowenthal
Capps	Gabbard	Lowey
Capuano	Gallego	Lujan Grisham
Cardenas	Garamendi	(NM)
Carney	Garcia	Lujan, Ben Ray
Carson (IN)	Grayson	(NM)
Cartwright	Green, Al	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	Maffei
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	Maloney,
Chu	Gutiérrez	Carolyn
Cicilline	Hahn	Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	Matheson
Clarke (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Clay	Heck (WA)	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Higgins	McCollum
Clyburn	Himes	McDermott
Cohen	Hinojosa	McGovern
Connolly	Holt	McIntyre
Conyers	Honda	McNerney
Cooper	Horsford	Meeks
Costa	Hoyer	Meng
Courtney	Huffman	Michaud
Crowley	Israel	Miller, George
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Moore
Cummings	Jeffries	Moran
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
DeFazio	Kaptur	Napolitano
DeGette	Keating	Neal
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Negrete McLeod
DeLauro	Kennedy	Nolan

Owens	Ryan (OH)	Swalwell (CA)
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Takano
Pascarella	T.	Thompson (CA)
Pastor (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Sarbanes	Titus
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schiff	Tsongas
Peters (CA)	Schneider	Van Hollen
Peters (MI)	Schrader	Vargas
Peterson	Schwartz	Veasey
Pingree (ME)	Scott (VA)	Vela
Pocan	Scott, David	Velázquez
Polis	Serrano	Visclosky
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Walz
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Wasserman
Rahall	Sherman	Schultz
Rangel	Sinema	Waters
Richmond	Sires	Waxman
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Welch
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Ruppersberger	Speler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

DesJarlais	Nunnelee	Tierney
Dingell	Roskam	Yoho
Latham	Rush	

□ 1534

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Messrs. OWENS and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HALL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—233

Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Amash	Coble	Gardner
Amodei	Coffman	Garrett
Bachmann	Cole	Gerlach
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Barber	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Barletta	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Barr	Cook	Gohmert
Barton	Cotton	Goodlatte
Benishek	Cramer	Gosar
Bentivolio	Crawford	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Daines	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Griffin (AR)
Boustany	Denham	Griffith (VA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Grimm
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hall
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hanna
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Harris
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hartzler
Burgess	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Byrne	Fincher	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hensarling
Camp	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Fleming	Holding
Capito	Flores	Hudson
Carter	Forbes	Huelskamp
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Huizenga (MI)
Chabot	Fox	Hultgren
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Hunter

Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford

Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle

Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Bass
DesJarlais
Dingell
Latham

Nunnelee
Rush
Schneider
Tierney

Walz
Waxman
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1542

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes Nos. 490 and 491. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 490—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted “yea.”

On rollcall No. 491—Adoption of H. Res. 717, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3522—I would have voted “yea.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, I, along with other leaders, committee chairs, and ranking members, received a classified briefing from the administration regarding a significant piece of the President's strategy to confront the international terrorist organization known as ISIL.

This piece involves a request for additional authority to be included in the continuing resolution. Tonight the country will hear from the President of the United States as he addresses the Nation on this situation.

Additionally, all Members of the House will receive a classified briefing from the administration tomorrow morning on both the threat and the strategy to confront it.

I think I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that we stand ready to listen and work with the President to confront this growing threat.

Now, given the severity of the situation and the need for all Members to

properly evaluate the President's request, the House will postpone consideration of the continuing resolution which was originally scheduled for tomorrow.

However, votes on other measures will still take place tomorrow after the classified briefing, and all Members are encouraged to be in attendance.

LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2678) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the “Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—422

Aderholt	Bucshon	Conaway
Amash	Burgess	Connolly
Amodei	Bustos	Conyers
Bachmann	Butterfield	Cook
Bachus	Byrne	Cooper
Barber	Calvert	Costa
Barletta	Camp	Cotton
Barr	Campbell	Courtney
Barrow (GA)	Capito	Cramer
Barton	Capps	Crawford
Bass	Capuano	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Carney	Cuellar
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bentivolio	Carter	Cummings
Bera (CA)	Cartwright	Daines
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DeFazio
Black	Chaffetz	DeGette
Blackburn	Chu	Delaney
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Boustany	Clarke (NY)	Denham
Brady (PA)	Clawson (FL)	Dent
Brady (TX)	Clay	DeSantis
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Bridenstine	Clyburn	Diaz-Balart
Brooks (AL)	Coble	Doggett
Brooks (IN)	Coffman	Doyle
Brown (GA)	Cohen	Duckworth
Brown (FL)	Cole	Duffy
Brownley (CA)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Buchanan	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)

Edwards	Kilmer	Perlmutter	Turner	Walorski	Wilson (FL)	Capuano	Granger	Maloney,
Ellison	Kind	Perry	Upton	Walz	Wilson (SC)	Cárdenas	Graves (GA)	Carolyn
Ellmers	King (IA)	Peters (CA)	Valadao	Wasserman	Wittman	Carney	Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean
Engel	King (NY)	Peters (MI)	Van Hollen	Schultz	Wolf	Carson (IN)	Grayson	Marchant
Enyart	Kingston	Peterson	Vargas	Waters	Womack	Carter	Green, Al	Marino
Eshoo	Kinzinger (IL)	Petri	Veasey	Weber (TX)	Woodall	Cartwright	Green, Gene	Massie
Esty	Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)	Vela	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth	Cassidy	Griffin (AR)	Matheson
Farenthold	Kline	Pittenger	Velázquez	Welch	Yoder	Castor (FL)	Griffith (VA)	Matsui
Farr	Kuster	Pitts	Visclosky	Wenstrup	Yoho	Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McAllister
Fattah	Labrador	Pocan	Wagner	Westmoreland	Yoder	Chabot	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Fincher	LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Walberg	Whitfield	Young (AK)	Chaffetz	Guthrie	McCarthy (NY)
Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Polis	Walden	Williams	Young (IN)	Chu	Gutiérrez	McCaul
Fleischmann	Lance	Pompeo				Ciulline	Hahn	McClintock
Fleming	Langevin	Posey		NAYS—2		Clark (MA)	Hall	McCollum
Flores	Lankford	Price (GA)	Massie	Rigell		Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	McDermott
Forbes	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)		NOT VOTING—7		Clawson (FL)	Hanna	McGovern
Fortenberry	Larson (CT)	Quigley				Clay	Harper	McHenry
Foster	Latta	Rahall	DesJarlais	Nunnelee	Waxman	Cleaver	Harris	McIntyre
Fox	Lee (CA)	Rangel	Dingell	Rush		Clyburn	Hartzler	McKeon
Frankel (FL)	Levin	Reed	Latham	Tierney		Coble	Hastings (FL)	McKinley
Franks (AZ)	Lewis	Reichert				Coffman	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Renacci		ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE		Cohen	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Fudge	LoBiondo	Ribble		The SPEAKER pro tempore (during		Cole	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Gabbard	Loeb sack	Rice (SC)		the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-		Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meadows
Galego	Lofgren	Richmond		ing.		Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Garamendi	Long	Roby				Conaway	Higgins	Meeks
Garcia	Lowenthal	Roe (TN)				Connolly	Himes	Meng
Gardner	Lowey	Rogers (AL)				Conyers	Hinojosa	Messer
Garrett	Lucas	Rogers (KY)				Cook	Holding	Mica
Gerlach	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)				Cooper	Holt	Michaud
Gibbs	Lujan Grisham	Rohrabacher				Costa	Honda	Miller (FL)
Gibson	(NM)	Rokita				Cotton	Horsford	Miller (MI)
Gingrey (GA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Rooney				Courtney	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Gohmert	(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen				Cramer	Hudson	Miller, George
Goodlatte	Lummis	Roskam				Crawford	Huelskamp	Moore
Gosar	Lynch	Ross				Crenshaw	Huffman	Moran
Gowdy	Maffei	Rothfus				Crowley	Huizenga (MI)	Mullin
Granger	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard				Cuellar	Hultgren	Mulvaney
Graves (GA)	Carolyn	Royce				Culberson	Hunter	Murphy (FL)
Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz				Cummings	Hurt	Murphy (PA)
Grayson	Marchant	Runyan				Daines	Israel	Nadler
Green, Al	Marino	Ruppersberger				Davis (CA)	Issa	Napolitano
Green, Gene	Matheson	Ryan (OH)				Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Neal
Griffin (AR)	Matsui	Ryan (WI)				Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod
Griffith (VA)	McAllister	Salmon				DeFazio	Jenkins	Neugebauer
Grijalva	McCarthy (CA)	Sánchez, Linda				DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Noem
Grimm	McCarthy (NY)	T.				Delaney	Johnson (OH)	Nolan
Guthrie	McCaul	Sanchez, Loretta				DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Nugent
Gutiérrez	McClintock	Sanford				DelBene	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Hahn	McCollum	Sarbanes				Denham	Jolly	O'Rourke
Hall	McDermott	Scalise				Dent	Jones	Olson
Hanabusa	McGovern	Schakowsky				DeSantis	Jordan	Owens
Hanna	McHenry	Schiff				Deutch	Joyce	Palazzo
Harper	McIntyre	Schneider				Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pallone
Harris	McKeon	Schock				Doggett	Keating	Pascarell
Hartzler	McKinley	Schrader				Doyle	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
Hastings (FL)	McMorris	Schwartz				Duckworth	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Schweikert				Duffy	Kennedy	Payne
Heck (NV)	McNerney	Scott (VA)				Duncan (SC)	Kildee	Pearce
Heck (WA)	Meadows	Scott, Austin				Duncan (TN)	Kilmer	Pelosi
Hensarling	Meehan	Scott, David				Edwards	Kind	Perlmutter
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Sensenbrenner				Ellison	King (IA)	Peters (CA)
Higgins	Meng	Serrano				Ellmers	King (NY)	Peters (MI)
Himes	Messer	Sessions				Engel	Kingston	Peterson
Hinojosa	Mica	Sewell (AL)				Enyart	Kinzinger (IL)	Petri
Holding	Michaud	Shea-Porter				Eshoo	Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)
Holt	Miller (FL)	Sherman				Esty	Kline	Pittenger
Honda	Miller (MI)	Shinkus				Farenthold	Kuster	Pitts
Horsford	Miller, Gary	Shuster				Farr	Labrador	Pocan
Hoyer	Miller, George	Simpson				Fattah	LaMalfa	Poe (TX)
Hudson	Moore	Sinema				Fincher	Lamborn	Polis
Huelskamp	Moran	Sires				Fitzpatrick	Lance	Pompeo
Huffman	Mullin	Slaughter				Fleischmann	Langevin	Posey
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)				Fleming	Lankford	Price (GA)
Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NE)				Flores	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)				Forbes	Larson (CT)	Quigley
Hurt	Nadler	Smith (TX)				Fortenberry	Latta	Rahall
Israel	Napolitano	Smith (WA)				Foster	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Issa	Neal	Southerland				Fox	Levin	Reed
Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod	Speier				Frankel (FL)	Lewis	Reichert
Jeffries	Neugebauer	Stewart				Franks (AZ)	Lipinski	Renacci
Jenkins	Noem	Stivers				Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Ribble
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Stockman				Fudge	Loeb sack	Rice (SC)
Johnson (OH)	Nugent	Stutzman				Gabbard	Lofgren	Richmond
Johnson, E. B.	Nunes	Swalwell (CA)				Garamendi	Long	Rigell
Johnson, Sam	O'Rourke	Takano				Garcia	Lowenthal	Roby
Jolly	Olson	Terry				Gardner	Lowey	Roe (TN)
Jones	Owens	Thompson (CA)				Garrett	Lucas	Rogers (AL)
Jordan	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)				Gerlach	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)
Joyce	Pallone	Thompson (PA)				Gibbs	Lujan Grisham	Rogers (MI)
Kaptur	Pascarell	Thornberry				Gibson	(NM)	Rohrabacher
Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Tiberi				Gingrey (GA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Rokita
Kelly (IL)	Paulsen	Tipton				Gohmert	(NM)	Rooney
Kelly (PA)	Payne	Titus				Goodlatte	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Kennedy	Pearce	Tonko				Gosar	Lynch	Roskam
Kildee	Pelosi	Tsongas				Gowdy	Maffei	Ross

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—7

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1551

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 110-229

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4751) to make technical corrections to Public Law 110-229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—422

Aderholt	Bera (CA)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Billirakis	Broun (GA)
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Bachmann	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Barber	Black	Bucshon
Barletta	Blackburn	Burgess
Barr	Blumenauer	Bustos
Barrow (GA)	Bonamici	Butterfield
Barton	Boustany	Byrne
Bass	Brady (PA)	Calvert
Beatty	Brady (TX)	Camp
Beceerra	Brady (IA)	Campbell
Benishak	Bridenstine	Capito
Bentivolio	Brooks (AL)	Capps

Rothfus	Shuster	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Simpson	Veasey
Royce	Sinema	Vela
Ruiz	Sires	Velázquez
Runyan	Slaughter	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (MO)	Wagner
Ryan (OH)	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Salmon	Smith (TX)	Walorski
Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)	Walz
	Southerland	Wasserman
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Schultz
Sanford	Stewart	Waters
Sarbanes	Stivers	Weber (TX)
Scalise	Stockman	Webster (FL)
Schakowsky	Stutzman	Welch
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup
Schneider	Takano	Westmoreland
Schock	Terry	Whitfield
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Williams
Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Scott (VA)	Thornberry	Wittman
Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Wolf
Scott, David	Tipton	Womack
Sensenbrenner	Titus	Woodall
Serrano	Tonko	Yarmuth
Sessions	Tsongas	Yoder
Sewell (AL)	Turner	Yoho
Shea-Porter	Upton	Young (AK)
Sherman	Valadao	Young (IN)
Shimkus	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais	Latham	Rush
Dingell	Nunnelee	Tierney
Gallego	Perry	Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1559

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 493 I was temporarily off the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 717, I call up the bill (H.R. 3522) to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-56, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 113-584, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3522

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. IF YOU LIKE YOUR GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN, YOU CAN KEEP IT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including any amendment made by such Act or by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010), a health insurance issuer that has in effect health insurance coverage in the group market on any date during 2013 may after such date offer such coverage for sale through December 31, 2018, in such market outside of an Exchange established under section 1311 or 1321 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18031, 18041). A group health plan shall not be treated as not complying with the requirements of such Act (or the amendments made by such Acts) insofar as it provides health benefits through health insurance coverage that is permitted under the previous sentence.

(b) *TREATMENT AS GRANDFATHERED HEALTH PLAN IN SATISFACTION OF MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.*—Health insurance coverage described in subsection (a) shall be treated as a grandfathered health plan for purposes of the amendment made by section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(c) *CONSTRUCTION.*—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of States with respect to the regulation of health insurance coverage in the group market.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3522.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014, sponsored by my good friend and colleague and important member of the Health Subcommittee, Dr. BILL CASSIDY of Louisiana.

This bill is a necessary tool for America's workers that will allow for health insurance coverage in the small group market during the 2013 calendar year to be continued to be offered through calendar year 2018. In other words, if you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it.

It has been over 4 years since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, and we are still hearing from constituents, small business owners, and employees who are continuing to struggle with the adverse effects of this law.

Here is what Roger from Columbia, Pennsylvania, wrote to me last year:

I am the third generation family owner of a business. We have 32 employees and have been providing health insurance for our em-

ployees and their families for over 25 years. This week, we received a renewal notice from our current provider, which is a 40 to 50 percent higher premium than our current contract, with less overall benefit coverage. If we choose to renew early, before the ACA takes effect, our premiums will increase 11.4 percent. Our President told us that the ACA would decrease health insurance costs.

My constituents—businesses, as well as individuals—have bitterly conveyed to me the myriad of concerns they face.

Eastern Lancaster County School District announced it would "outsource" about 100 of its support staff workers to private companies to avoid possible penalties under ObamaCare.

In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, the community college decided to cut hours for 400 adjunct faculty and other employees, so it wouldn't have to pay \$6 million in ObamaCare-related fees.

From Auntie Anne's franchises, I have been told they have put their growth plans on hold, hiring has been pushed off, and they may no longer be able to afford to provide employee insurance coverage. In 2012, they experienced a 19 percent increase in insurance premiums and a 30 percent increase in 2013.

Here is what Tom and Rosemarie had to say from Lititz, Pennsylvania:

I have been crunching numbers to prepare for ObamaCare, and this is what I face: close my doors December 31, 2014 . . . or . . . pay \$40,000 a year to insure my employees or "pay" a fine of \$2,000 per employee per year over the first 30, at the price of \$166 per month per employee over the first 30. So now, the 10 that have insurance, as well as my husband and I, will no longer be insured because the penalty is more affordable than to cover . . . this is ridiculous. I am outraged.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than this. We can enact patient-centered free market reforms, where private insurers engage in robust competition and create the same kind of market-based inducements to reduce prices and improve services that occurs in most other parts of the American economy.

We can start by enacting H.R. 3522. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. American workers who like their health care plan should be able to keep it, just like President Obama and the supporters of the Affordable Care Act promised.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing concerning H.R. 3522, the "Employee Health Care Protection Act," which is scheduled for floor consideration today.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Section 5000A of the

Internal Revenue Code requires individuals to maintain minimum essential coverage or pay a penalty. Section 2(b) of H.R. 3522, both as reported out of your Committee and Rules Committee Print 113-56, modifies which health care plans would meet the requirement of minimum essential coverage. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3522, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON ENERGY AND COM-
MERCE,

Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Committee on
Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3522, the "Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2013." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on Ways and Means' Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 3522, and I agree that your decision does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 3522 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than another political attack on the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I think this bill serves as House Republicans' 53rd vote to repeal or undermine the health care law.

If enacted, this bill would allow insurance companies to discriminate against small businesses if they have an older workforce, more women in their workforce, or if any of their employees or their children have pre-existing health conditions. The impact is taking away from millions of workers key protections and puts insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

Even worse, I believe, it gives insurance companies the best of both worlds: millions of new customers through the ACA, but the ability to continue to cherry-pick employers with young, healthy workforces.

In fact, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the bill would have serious adverse effects on premiums, causing them to rise substantially for many small firms, and

the CBO agrees. This bill causes serious harm.

Republicans are claiming that this is just another effort to help people keep the coverage they have, but let's be clear, if your insurance starts covering your child to the age of 26, you are not losing your old coverage, your coverage is simply getting better.

If your insurance starts covering preventive services like annual physicals and vaccinations and cancer screenings for free, that is not losing your old coverage, that is your coverage getting better. There is no evidence employers are dropping coverage en masse.

So Republicans are left to claim people are losing their coverage when their coverage is actually getting better. This is again the Republicans misleading the public.

Mr. Speaker, when the ACA passed, employers and health insurers had the option to grandfather their coverage. They could keep that coverage the same, and it would not have to comply with the new ACA reforms. They could even raise premiums and cost-sharing and still stay grandfathered.

For plans that did not grandfather, a host of important new consumer protections went into place before 2014. For example, plans had to limit their profits and overhead to 20 percent of the premiums they collect. If they failed to meet this standard, they must pay rebates to their customers. As a result, small businesses have saved a total of \$2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

Mr. Speaker, in November 2013, the President announced that individuals and small businesses who are not yet ready to transition into the new, more fair, secure health coverage guaranteed by the ACA could remain in their existing plans for another year.

In March of this year, the President extended that policy, so that individuals and small businesses could keep their plans into 2016, but this bill goes much further and allows these plans to be sold to new customers.

So we are not talking about people keeping their plans. We are talking about selling old lousy plans, discriminatory plans, to new customers.

Since the ACA was passed, we have added key new benefits and protections to employer coverage, but at the same time, we have added 10 million jobs, we have helped 10 million people get health coverage, we have seen premiums rise at historically low levels, and we have extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by 13 years.

This is amazing progress, and we should not turn back. That is what the Republicans would have us do with this other repeal of the Affordable Care Act: turn us back to the old days where the insurance companies reigned, where discriminatory practices reigned, and where preexisting conditions were a basis for not getting coverage.

I urge Members to vote "no." This should not be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his diligence on this effort and on behalf of the American people to allow them the choice and the options that they are seeking in their health care.

My colleague is concerned that we are looking at repeals and that we are looking at replacements and we are looking at allowing choice and options for Americans. We are going to continue to do that because what we have found, Mr. Speaker, what we have found is that premiums are rising.

□ 1615

In my State, they are going to go up another 18 to 20 percent this year. We have an insurance product in the marketplace that many of our constituents tell us is too expensive to afford. We are seeing narrowed networks. People have an insurance card, but guess what. They don't have access to the queue. They can't see the doctor. We are hearing from our hospitals that they are seeing their emergency rooms crowded.

So yes, indeed, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. It is the right thing to do. If you like your health care plan, under this bill you would be able to keep your health care plan. We would be helping the President to fulfill a promise that he broke. Let's get back on track and let's fulfill that promise.

This is what the American people want right now, by the administration's own admission. These aren't my numbers. It is the administration's number. Up to 80 percent of the small business health plans would not make the ObamaCare cut because they are not government-compliant. The operative word here is they are not government-compliant. The government is forcing people into a plan that they don't want, don't like, and can't afford. This is the administration admitting this. They are taking away options and choice in the marketplace.

We have heard from small business owners all across our district who are struggling to find ways to provide health insurance to their employees and still manage to stay in business. What they are looking for is a way to provide jobs and increase wages. ObamaCare is making it more and more difficult.

We have heard from our constituents about how their insurance premiums and their copayments are escalating and the complaints they have from employees because they don't like the

ObamaCare plans. We have heard that they do not understand why they are forced into purchasing government-compliant insurance which does not meet their needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act, will provide some relief to the small business community by allowing them to maintain their current health insurance plans. If you like the health insurance plan that you have, you would be able to keep it. It is fulfilling a promise. It is what small business employers want. It is what the American people want.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a very simple question: When will the Republicans accept their share of responsibility in guaranteeing the health security of all Americans?

The bill under consideration today, H.R. 3522, is really nothing more than a senseless, heartless, 53rd vote by the Republicans to eviscerate the Affordable Care Act.

Where the ACA is a historic leap forward in health security for millions of Americans, this bill is a shameless stumble backward to the days when insurance companies could exploit the American people with impunity.

Where the ACA promotes women's health and security, this bill allows health companies to charge more to women for their coverage than they do for men.

Where the ACA ends the reprehensible practice of price-gouging Americans with preexisting conditions, this legislation allows insurers selling small business health plans to charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

This legislation would also allow insurers to impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that health security will run out for many Americans when they get sick—a tragic state of affairs that often results in folks going bankrupt in the face of a pile of unpaid medical bills.

This legislation sends us back to a dark day when too many American families had to choose between a roof over their head and food on the table or paying their health care bills.

The ACA was passed into law to protect hardworking Americans, in part, by making bad, exploitative health insurance plans a thing of the past. The fact that they are wanting to add more people to it is really reprehensible. This legislation allows insurers to sell

the same bad business plans that they had before to more people until 2018.

The Republicans have been in charge here and haven't proposed any alternative whatsoever. This legislation jeopardizes the health security of American families by rolling back vital insurance protections made law by the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: When will the Republicans act on behalf of the health security of the American people? When will they stop having these PR campaign events just before we are going home so they can send out press releases and say they have done something, when they have done absolutely nothing except try to remove the ACA? When will they care about the people?

Sadly, not today.

This bill is an embarrassment and demands a "no" vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, a valued member of the Health Subcommittee and prime sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about keeping a promise and doing right by the American people. The Employee Health Care Protection Act is a bipartisan bill that allows American workers, if they choose, to keep their employer-sponsored health care plan that they depend upon for health care security.

I am amused my colleagues across the aisle seem to think the American worker doesn't know what is best for herself, her family, or her business. It just amazes me they have so little regard for the average American. They feel like they must tell the average American what is best for them. They cannot make their own decisions.

Frankly, I am disappointed that this legislation is even necessary. President Obama and congressional supporters of ObamaCare made unequivocal promises dozens of times that Americans can keep their plan if they wished. Yet, last year, millions of Americans found their health care canceled because it did not comply with "Washington knows best, you don't" rules set forth in ObamaCare.

Ninety-three thousand Louisianans lost their health care in the individual market, and thousands more in the group market are in danger of losing their plans unless we pass this bill.

The President apologized to Americans who lost their coverage, saying that he is "sorry that they are finding themselves in this situation based on assurances they got from me." If the President were truly sorry, he would call Senator REID and tell him to pass this bill and provide relief from ObamaCare to the millions of Americans who relied on a false promise. He would then work with this body to repeal and replace ObamaCare with market-based solutions that give the power

to the patient, not the Washington bureaucrat.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this bill. The Employer Health Care Protection Act allows American families to save money on health care, increases access to affordable health care choices, and will raise wages for workers. On top of that, it will decrease the deficit by \$1.25 billion over the next 10 years. It is a commonsense bill that provides relief to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep the promise to middle class workers and ensure that, if they like their health care plan, they can keep it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3522 marks the 53rd vote to repeal or undermine ObamaCare. But worse, it means taking away guaranteed benefits for the consumers that you seem to be so concerned about.

Does anyone really believe that Americans want insurance companies to be able to deny them coverage or charge them more due to a preexisting condition? Do they want insurance companies to be able to refuse to pay for their lifesaving treatments because they have hit an annual limit? Do they want insurance companies to be able to not cover maternity services for pregnant women, as so many plans did?

I believe we can all agree the answer is "no." That is why we have to reject H.R. 3522 and all other efforts to repeal or undermine the consumer protections of ObamaCare. Americans simply can't afford it. They can't afford to have insurance companies back in charge of their health care.

This isn't about consumer choice. This is about turning over decisions to insurance companies that want to cut the benefits.

I want to end my remarks by just mentioning one story of why the Affordable Care Act is so important to constituents. This is from John. He says:

I wanted to share with you the good news that by accessing health insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act, my little business, a law firm, was able to avoid a substantial premium increase and, in fact, obtain the same full coverage at reduced deductibles and copayments and add dental care for thousands a month less than our old premiums costs, which we had just been advised was to be raised approximately 14 percent. I have been practicing law for over 37 years and have always felt a responsibility to provide full health care benefits for all my employees, including clerks and staff, paying the total premium for all participants. My firm expanded at one point to include my then-partner, seven associate lawyers, and multiple staff, though we are now downsized to three lawyers and two office staff that we now are able to provide insurance for. Thanks for your efforts. Thanks for the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, another valued member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

I would like to begin with the words President Obama first said to the American Medical Association in June of 2009 before any committee in Congress held a markup of what later became the Affordable Care Act. He said to that group of physicians, and repeated on many occasions after that:

If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away from you, no matter what.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, like many assurances that were delivered to the American people about the President's health care law, this has been nothing more than an empty promise. Since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, millions have been notified their insurance plans have been canceled.

I commend Chairman PITTS of the Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce for holding numerous hearings to examine this very issue. That is precisely why we need to pass H.R. 3522. Mr. Speaker, this commonsense legislation would simply allow health insurance companies to continue to offer group coverage that was in effect in 2013.

I commend our physician colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this legislation.

If the President will not keep his promise to the American people that "if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan," then we need to do it for him. H.R. 3522 accomplishes that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is frustrating to me because, again, we have just another effort to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act when we should all be working to implement the Affordable Care Act. Just to show what a waste of time, if you will, that this debate is today, I wanted to read a statement of President Obama's policy that was issued today with regard to this legislation. It says:

The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3522 because it threatens the health care security of hardworking middle class families. The Nation is experiencing the lowest rate of health care price inflation in nearly 50 years, and exceptionally slow growth in other measures of health costs, which have combined to dramatically slow the growth of small business premiums.

□ 1630

With health care costs rising at low rates and choices for small businesses improving

through the Health Insurance Marketplace, this bill would be a major step backwards.

H.R. 3522 would roll back the progress made because of the Affordable Care Act and would allow insurers to deploy practices such as charging businesses more when a worker has a preexisting condition, or when it has more workers who are women than men. The bill would allow insurers to go back to capping the amount of care that enrollees receive, or to excluding coverage of proven preventative care. The administration supports policies that allow people to keep the health plans that they have. Its transition policies allow States and issuers to do just that. But policies that reverse the progress made to extend quality, affordable coverage to millions of uninsured, hard-working middle class families are not the solution. Rather than refighting old political battles to sabotage the health care law, the Congress should work with the administration to improve the law and move forward.

If the President were presented with this bill, he would veto it.

So, again, this is just a waste of time. We have so many other things that we need to work on in this House before we adjourn, particularly jobs and the economy. Instead, we are trying to repeal, again, the same legislation that actually has created more jobs and kept health care costs low, and it is just, again, a complete waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this piece of legislation, also the sponsor, Dr. CASSIDY, for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation.

I rise today in support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act.

When the President said, "If you like your plan, you can keep it," that was deemed PolitiFact's Lie of the Year.

Then, millions of Americans across the country in the individual market received cancellation notices. They felt the impacts of the broken promises of the President's health care law.

Now the specter of cancellations looms again. Up to 50 million people who get health care through their employers could have their plans canceled or disrupted because of rules and regulations in the President's health care law. That is 1 in 6 Americans, Mr. Speaker.

If one of my constituents wants to keep their plan, they should be able to. Support this bill, and make the President keep his promise to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), another member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS for his leadership, and my colleague, BILL CASSIDY, for this wonderful bill, H.R. 3522.

This bill is very simple. It will allow people to keep the health insurance they had before ObamaCare took it away, their choice.

Eighty percent of those people in this country are women who have made those choices in health care, and this would put it back in place.

President Obama infamously stated, as my colleague before me stated, "If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period."

However, many plans offered prior to the ACA were not compliant with the numerous requirements this law required. As a result, millions of Americans were no longer able to purchase their old plans.

One of many of the business owners who provide health care coverage for their employees right there in my district, Mr. Steve Lozinsky, who runs Sparkle and Shine Cleaning Service in Apex, North Carolina, called me just the other day concerned about this issue.

Steve has about 240 employees, and he will be forced to lay off 31 of them because of the ObamaCare mandate.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of employers like Steve Lozinsky, who take care of their employees, who consider them family and want to do the right thing, it is because of them, and every American and every family in this country, that we need to pass H.R. 3522.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a direct assault on the health security of American families. The bill would allow insurance companies in their small business health plans to charge more for women's coverage, meaning workers in small businesses with more women than men have to pay more.

It would charge more for coverage for those with preexisting conditions, meaning workers in small businesses that have more people with preexisting conditions have to pay more. And these small businesses would face higher premiums and would continue to see their premiums spike year to year if an employee had an accident or got diagnosed with cancer.

Under the legislation, insurers group plans' could also impose annual limits on coverage, meaning that insurers could cease to provide any coverage after an individual's care reached a certain overall cost and impose extensive waiting periods before an employer could enroll in coverage.

Now, if the Republicans were serious about helping America's small businesses, they would be bringing up, instead, a bill to expand access to the

ACA's small business health care tax credit, as actually proposed by the Obama administration.

The President has proposed allowing small businesses with up to 50 workers, rather than the current 25, to qualify for the credit, and adopting a more generous phaseout schedule.

Furthermore, instead of strengthening the small business tax credit, Republicans have actually voted to repeal the tax credit three times.

Republicans are completely misrepresenting what this bill does, calling the bill's section 2 "If you like your group health insurance plan, you can keep it."

Well, first of all, the bill does not require that insurers keep selling these group policies. Insurers discontinue policies every year, and there is nothing in this bill that prevents them from doing so.

But more important, the bill goes well beyond the issue of people keeping plans they have now. Instead, it allows insurers to sell group plans that do not include ACA consumer protection to new customers through 2018.

Once again, the Republicans are misrepresenting what this bill does, and they are simply trying to repeal or undermine the ACA, which has been so successful in expanding insurance coverage, keeping down costs, and eliminating discriminatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the time remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats constantly say that the ACA is not a perfect bill, and that they want to make changes. If they are sincere about that statement, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522, a bill that received bipartisan support at Energy and Commerce to protect American workers who will lose their plan under the Affordable Care Act.

Thirty-nine Democrats joined us last year and voted for a similar bill to let Americans keep their plan in the individual market. We should work together to provide that very same protection to the tens of millions of American workers who depend on employer-sponsored health coverage.

Last fall, millions of Americans all across the country had their health plans canceled, despite repeated promises from the President and his allies in Congress that if you liked your health care plan, you would be able to keep it. And so, in the fall of 2013, health plan cancellations were concentrated in the individual market.

Sadly, millions of Americans with employer-sponsored coverage, group plans, will also face plan cancellations because of the Affordable Care Act. And some experts have testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee that approximately 50 million young American workers with fully insured coverage face plan cancellations or disruptions because of ACA requirements and regulations.

Forbes warned last year, and I will quote: "Starting in October 2014, many employees of small businesses will start getting the same notices that are now being mailed to individuals, informing that their existing health plans are also being canceled."

Well, Mr. Speaker, Americans rightly feel misled by the President, by congressional Democrats. Their false assurance that Americans could keep their health care plan was recognized as the 2013 "Lie of the Year."

So, we have this legislation before us this year to apply to the group plans. As long as they were in existence in 2013, they could be available today. And I urge Members to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is bad for consumers. It is bad for small businesses. The only beneficiaries of this bill are the health insurance companies that want to sell bad policies, charge higher premiums for women, for children with preexisting conditions, and who want to put limits on health care coverage when people need it the most.

I want to take a minute to go back to the time before the Affordable Care Act and remind my colleagues why we passed that health care reform in the first place.

Before the ACA, consumers were seeing health insurance premiums rise by double-digits each year. Not anymore.

This morning, the Kaiser Family Foundation released a new report on small employer premiums. The report found that since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, premium increases for small business coverage have slowed considerably. This past year, premiums barely budged.

Before the ACA, there was no requirement for how much of your premium dollars go to an insurance company, how much of that had to actually go for your health care. Your premiums could be used to pay for exorbitant executive salaries, lavish conferences, and other expenditures that had nothing to do with the health coverage for the insured.

Now, consumers are saving billions of dollars from this new requirement that

insurers actually spend premium dollars to provide health care.

Before the ACA, parents could find that they had no coverage at all for a child's preexisting conditions, even something as common as asthma. Today, all parents are guaranteed the peace of mind that their insurance will cover their children's medical needs.

Before the ACA, an individual struggling with cancer could find that the insurance plan would impose annual coverage limits and simply stop paying for care. Today, this is no longer the case.

Before the ACA, small businesses had few choices and no leverage with insurance companies. The ACA put consumers and small businesses back in charge, and it did so in a way that is cutting health cost growth and providing coverage to millions of previously uninsured Americans.

So what do we have on the other side of the aisle from the Republicans? Sour grapes.

We took a Republican idea, implemented by their very own Presidential candidate in Massachusetts, and we took that idea and made it work for the whole country, made it work for families, made it work better than even the most optimistic supporters had expected.

And Republicans are mad. So rather than work to implement the law, they have been working to thwart it. Sour grapes.

This bill is just another example of that mentality. It would not help small businesses. To the contrary. Small businesses that wish to grandfather and keep their old coverage already have that opportunity.

This bill would let insurance companies sell non-ACA-compliant policies to any business, policies that do not protect against benefit limits, rate hikes, discrimination against women or against children with preexisting conditions.

□ 1645

The bill would allow insurance companies to cherry-pick, offering low rates for inadequate, bare bones policies for some groups and then discriminate against, charging higher prices or offering weaker coverage for others.

Mr. Speaker, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities yesterday released a new analysis of the bill and what it would mean. The analysis concluded that it would "likely cause premiums to rise substantially for many small businesses and undercut health reform's small group market reforms and consumer protections."

So I am opposed to this bill. It is not about helping businesses. It is not about helping families. This bill puts insurance companies back in charge, and it returns the insurance market to the days when they could discriminate with impunity. I am not for that, and I

hope my colleagues are not for that. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President not only made a promise that, if you liked your doctor you could keep your doctor, he said, if you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan no matter what—period. He also promised reductions in premiums of \$2,500 per family.

Americans are not seeing the \$2,500 reduction in premiums that the President promised under the ACA. Instead, Americans are seeing higher premiums and deductibles under the President's health care law. Some of the premium increases are outrageous, and the deductibles—I don't know how a family could save the \$10,000 to \$15,000 for their deductibles that some of them are telling us they are going to have. In fact, the administration's own actuaries have confirmed that premiums are going up under the ACA. Earlier this year, actuaries from CMS estimated that 65 percent of small businesses will see premium increases under the Affordable Care Act. Middle class Americans working for these 11 million small businesses will see higher premiums, meaning less take-home pay for working Americans.

The American people want real health care reform, but the ACA is making things worse. The President's health care law has led to canceled health care plans, fewer choices, higher premiums, and higher deductibles for middle class families. Ultimately, the law needs to be replaced with better solutions that lower costs and provide better health care choices.

However, let's be clear about what H.R. 3522 actually does. The bill does not repeal the ACA. We have heard the mantra of how many 50-some votes there have been to repeal. Instead, this bill simply lets American workers keep their health care plans, and it expands coverage options.

Congressional Democrats constantly say that they want to change the parts of the ACA that don't work. If they are sincere about that pledge, they should join us in supporting H.R. 3522. This is a bipartisan bill to protect American workers who will lose their plans under the health care law. As I said last year when we had a similar bill for the individual market cancellations, 39 Democrats joined us and voted for that bill to let Americans keep their plans in the individual market.

Congress should work together to provide the same protection to the millions of American workers with group coverage, and that is what the Employee Health Care Protection Act does. Families, not Washington, should decide if they want to keep their health care plans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

My friend on the other side of the aisle said that this doesn't repeal the Affordable Care Act, but in reality, it does. This is the 53rd time. When I was a little boy, I went to PS 53 in the Bronx. I feel we have now reached that level of 53, with no end in sight, and I really wish that both sides of the aisle could put their heads together and keep what we like and fix what we don't like.

All of the major bills that have ever been put into effect, be it Medicare, be it Medicaid, be it the civil rights bills of the 1960s, had to be tweaked because, when you have an omnibus bill, you really don't know what its effect is going to be until you roll it out and you see, and then you make changes. I mean, that happens with every major bill. The problem is that most of our friends on the other side of the aisle hated the law and never really wanted it to succeed. So, if you don't want it to succeed and if you throw roadblocks in its path and if you have a situation in which Republican Governors are refusing to expand it, you will have failure because, if you don't want to work with something and if you don't want to make it better, it won't get better. In my home State, where we embrace it, it has worked. It hasn't worked in every single instance but in a vast majority of instances. Again, we should change what doesn't work and keep what works.

In New York, this year's insurance rates, on average, were—and here is another 53—53 percent lower than the rates in 2013 for comparable coverage. Our exchange, New York State of Health, has already announced next year's rates, which will continue to be more than 50 percent lower than they were before our insurance exchange was established.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation and Health Research & Educational Trust's annual Employer Health Benefits Survey, individuals obtaining health insurance from their employers are generally facing “similar premium contributions and cost-sharing requirements in 2014 as they did in 2013.” Furthermore, we know that these individuals are often benefiting from more quality, comprehensive coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to return to the bad old days when insurance companies where permitted to discriminate against small businesses that employed large numbers of women, older individuals, or those with preexisting conditions. I don't want to return to the bad old days when you couldn't keep your child on your premium until that child was 26 years old, as you can under the Affordable Care Act.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this legislation, and I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to really sit down with us. Let's put our heads together, and let's once and for all help fix this bill. There are a lot of good features in it. We should expand on those. The things that we think need to change we should change, but, please, let's not ever vote to repeal again. We don't need to have a 54th time. Enough is enough.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to close the debate.

The frustrating thing for me and for so many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle is that we know how successful the Affordable Care Act has been, and yet the Republicans continue to negate the positive aspects of the ACA and seek to undermine it with the repeal or with legislation like this that would seriously undermine the goals and the success of the Affordable Care Act. I just want to point out that, since the Affordable Care Act was enacted in March of 2010, 9.9 million private sector jobs have been created.

According to the latest estimates from the CBO, the overall number of Americans receiving employer-based coverage is expected to grow from 156 million in 2014 to 166 million in 2023, and the number of uninsured is expected to fall by 26 million Americans. Also, since Massachusetts enacted health care reforms that were almost identical to those in the ACA, the percentage of employers offering coverage has increased from 72 percent in 2007 to 77 percent in 2010. Since the ACA was enacted, the Nation has seen 4 years of the slowest health care spending growth since recordkeeping began in 1960. Slower growth in health care costs translates into slower growth of employers' health benefit costs, helping businesses and workers save money. Indeed, employers' hourly health benefit costs rose just 1 percent after adjusting for inflation over the year ending in June 2014, near the bottom of the historical range.

In addition to slowing down the rate of growth of health care spending, which is benefiting employers, the Affordable Care Act is also producing premium savings for America's small businesses due to its 80-20 rule. That rule requires that insurers spend at least 80 percent of premiums on medical care rather than on CEO pay, profits, and administrative costs. If an insurer fails to meet this standard, it must pay rebates to its customers. As a result of this rule, according to a recently released report, America's small businesses have saved a total of \$2.5 billion on their premiums since 2011.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is that the Affordable Care

Act is delivering on the promise of affordable, quality, and dependable health coverage for millions of Americans, but that doesn't stop the Republicans. We can't shake their obsession with undermining the law, and that is what they are doing again with this bill. The vote on this bill will be the 53rd GOP vote to repeal or to undermine the ACA, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Employee Health Care Protection Act, a bipartisan bill authored by our committee, particularly by Dr. BILL CASSIDY as the prime sponsor, to protect the health care choices for literally millions of American workers.

Last fall, we learned the harsh reality that the President's oft-repeated promise that if you liked your health care plan you could keep it—you have heard that here today—was simply not true. Many were shocked to learn that their individual policies were being canceled because of the President's health care law. They didn't like that at all.

Sadly, the wave of canceled plans under the President's broken promise has not ended. The very backbone of America's health care system, employer-sponsored coverage, provides health care security to about 170 million American workers and family members. The President's health care law now threatens the health care plans of many of America's middle class workers who rely on employer-sponsored coverage. Many with employer-sponsored coverage will face the same plan cancellations that millions of Americans received with their individual policies last fall.

This legislation provides a thoughtful solution and relief from the President's broken promises. The bill before us simply allows America's small businesses and workers to choose from health care plans that were in effect in 2013. The bill would also allow other small businesses and workers to choose from more affordable group health care plans available before the President's health care law.

America's workers and families know their health care needs better than do Members of Congress or officials at the Department of HHS. This bill empowers Americans with more choices, the same choices that they were promised. If Americans like their health care plans, they should be able to keep them—period, end of story.

I am also pleased that, this week, the nonpartisan CBO confirmed that this bill would lower the deficit by more

than \$1 billion, provide more health plan options with lower premiums, and, yes, raise wages for American workers.

We have all heard firsthand of the struggles facing middle class American families because of the health care law. Tom Harmon, from my district, and the trusted workers at American Waste—in a little town called Union, Michigan—are seeing their health care premiums more than double. Sadly, their deductibles are much higher to boot, forcing them to deal with higher health care costs. Rather than make life easier, Washington, through this President's health care law, has, in fact, made life more expensive for Tom and the working families of American Waste in southwest Michigan.

In conclusion, I am proud to say that this bill, H.R. 3522, is a bill dedicated to helping workers across the country who are struggling with the costs and consequences of the President's health care law. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Dr. CASSIDY's bill. America's workers deserve the chance to pick the health care plans that best suit their needs, not lose them.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3522.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in support of Mr. CASSIDY's bill—the Employee Health Care Protection Act H.R. 3522.

This bill is very important to ensure employers and their employees can keep their plan—a broken promise from President Obama.

Just last week I was contacted by the Cornerstone Staffing Inc. based in Omaha who is currently facing hard decisions in order to be in compliance with this disastrous law.

Cornerstone Staffing is a woman-owned nine-year-old local business that will now suffer due to a law that no one read.

Cornerstone Staffing Inc. has 15 full time employees with a range of 150 to 450 temporary employees at any given time.

Previously they didn't offer insurance to all temporary workers but had the flexibility to secure coverage for those workers who needed it.

Now, Cornerstone Staffing Inc. is forced to provide coverage to all of their employees—whether they need it or not—which means they can't afford to place as many individuals in needed jobs.

Not only will H.R. 3522 bring some relief to companies and their employees but it will also increase government revenue by \$400 million. This is common sense.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and give some relief to families across the nation. I am submitting a letter Cornerstone Staffing Inc. sent to me regarding their problems with the President's health care law.

HELLO CONGRESSMAN TERRY, We have met briefly in the past, actually my company was previously located on the second floor of your office building on Burt Street. I work for Cornerstone Staffing Inc, we are a nine year old, local, woman-owned staffing firm servicing the Omaha metro area.

I'm very late in the game sending this message but we recently met with representa-

tives from Silverstone Group regarding ACA and how it will affect our company in 2015. I have to be honest, I don't fully understand the requirements or implications but we currently have 15 full-time, internal employees. We also employ temporary/contract employees and depending on the season we could have 150 to 450 contractors working for us at a time. Some might work one week, some might work twelve months and some might work for us 3 times in a year at a variety of our clients with months off between assignments.

It is my understanding that "PEO" (employee leasing services) are exempt from Obamacare. We W-2 all of our contractors (versus 1099) as many are required to be by Nebraska state law. Therefore we have the same obligations to offer a temporary/contract employee healthcare as if they are hired to work in a long-term permanent position.

We are not against offering benefits to our contract employees, especially if they work more than 90 days on a project. Our concern is that much of our temp/contract workforce is paid \$10-\$13/hour. If the individuals out of pocket healthcare costs can not exceed 9.5% of their income, we will be forced to pay the majority of their healthcare monthly. In our business, we may only make \$2-\$3/hour on each of these employees so they might have to work weeks before we make a profit especially after we pay taxes, background checks and payroll expenses. This has the potential to be a huge blow to our company profits and it could have an adverse effect if we are forced to decide if it is even "worth" employing someone who is willing to work because the risk is too great on our end.

ACA is going to put a major strain on our industry. Omaha is home to many staffing firms including several large nationally focused firms. Is there anything more we can be doing to amend or exempt recruiting/staffing agencies from the standard requirements of ACA?

Thank you for your consideration and any suggestions,

BRAD JONES,
Vice President of Operations,
Cornerstone Staffing Inc.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act of 2014, a bill that sponsors say will permit a health insurance issuer that sold insurance coverage to employers who are mandated under the Affordable Care Act to provide insurance to their employees in 2013 to continue offering the same insurance in 2014.

I oppose H.R. 3522 for three reasons:

It does not obligate employers to provide insurance coverage for the essential health care services enumerated in the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Provisions of the ACA that prevent discrimination based on age, pre-existing conditions and gender are not part of the plans allowed under this bill.

Finally, the bill is opposed by the Administration and will not become law.

The ACA limits the ability of insurers in the small group market to charge higher premiums based on age, preexisting health conditions and gender.

The H.R. 3522 creates exceptions to these important protections in the ACA for the next five years.

In addition, this bill allows insurers to charge small businesses higher insurance rates for

coverage based on the age, gender and health status of their employees, which is prohibited by the ACA.

This will make working for small employers less attractive to workers, which can make the cost of labor higher as employers are forced to offer higher pay to attract workers while simultaneously paying higher rates for insurance.

H.R. 3522, will continue unnecessary uncertainty regarding the year-to-year cost of providing ACA mandated healthcare coverage to employees should a major health event occur or accident impact the health care cost of an employee.

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3522 because it threatens the health care security of hard working, middle class families.

Today, the nation is experiencing the lowest rate of health care price inflation in nearly 50 years.

We are also seeing a very slow growth in other measures of health costs, which have combined to dramatically slow the growth of small business premiums.

While health care costs are rising at low rates and choices for small businesses are improving through the Health Insurance Marketplace, this bill would be a major setback.

The Administration's transition program for non-ACA compliant plans to ACA compliant health insurance plans allows States to work to make sure that health plans remain affordable and compliant with the ACA.

We should make sure insurance plans offered to millions of small business workers do not reverse the progress made to extend quality, affordable coverage to millions of uninsured, hardworking, middle class families.

Before the ACA, ill people could only obtain high premium insurance that did not provide coverage for a pre-existing illness or medical condition.

Insurance companies could use annual caps on coverage that resulted in very high out-of-pocket costs to people who were paying for health insurance, but had no coverage for a medical condition.

The ACA brought relief to those with health insurance, those with pre-existing health conditions and the working poor where the Medicaid expansion was implemented.

Because of the health care law, for the first time, insurance companies in the individual and small group market are required to cover ten essentials, which include:

- Outpatient care;
- Emergency room visits;
- Treatment in the hospital for inpatient care;
- Care before and after child births;
- Mental health and substance use disorder services: behavioral health treatment, counseling, and psychotherapy;
- Prescription drugs;
- Services and devices to promote recovery from injuries, disabilities or chronic condition: physical and occupational therapy, speech-language pathology, psychiatric rehabilitation, and much more;

- Lab tests;
- Preventive services such as counseling, screenings, and vaccines; and
- Pediatric services that cover dental care and vision care for kids.

The Affordable Care Act is one of the largest expansions of general healthcare, mental

health and substance abuse disorder coverage in a generation.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

13 million Americans received \$1.1 billion in rebates from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have free preventive services.

Millions of women now have free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive medical services.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans.

6.3 million Seniors in the "donut hole" have saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers.

STATISTICS ON TEXAS AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

3.8 million Texas residents receive preventive care services.

7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance.

300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26.

5 million Texas residents can receive a rebate check from their insurance company if it does not spend 80 percent of premium dollars on healthcare.

4,029 people with pre-existing conditions now have health insurance.

In 2014, insurance companies will be banned from: discriminating against anyone with a preexisting condition, charging higher rates based on gender or health status, enforcing lifetime dollar limits, enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

Attempts to weaken or end the ACA are wrong. The unwillingness of the majority to make sure that those in our society with the greatest need health care coverage, but do not have the financial means to be denied access to healthcare are doing the nation a disservice.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3522. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 717, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3522 is postponed.

□ 1700

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. And I will be joined by some other members of the Progressive Caucus to talk about issues that are important to this country and issues that are important to have a debate about in public.

This is our first week back. After 5 weeks of being in our home districts, we have a lot to get done in this Congress. And so far this week, we have not exactly risen to the occasion. We have important things to do regarding the continuing resolution. We have important things to do regarding legislation that this Congress simply has not gotten done. And, instead, another week has gone by without addressing some of the most important issues of the day.

One of those issues that, I think, is front and center in people's minds is what is going on overseas, what is going on with ISIL in Iraq, perhaps in Syria, and what does that mean for the American people.

And I am here today asking many of the questions that I get from people in the district. The President is going to address the Nation this evening, and he is going to give us his vision for where he thinks this country should go. And I am asking the President to please come to Congress before military action is taken against ISIL because it is so important that we are a part of this debate. We are the closest to the people in this country, and Congress needs to be involved. And I have some questions that I would like to see Members of Congress debate and the President help us address as we decide this extremely important issue.

I want to give props to Rachel Maddow who, last night, I thought did an excellent job on her program in looking at some of the questions that we should be debating in this body to make sure that we are doing the right thing by getting involved and that we have got the thought ahead of time going into it, unlike I think what we have done previously when we have gone into Iraq, as a country.

So these are some of the questions that we would like to have answered and we would like to have assistance with. One, why should the President seek congressional authorization and debate for military action against ISIL? Well, for one, it is in the Constitution. The Constitution, article I,

section 8: "The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

Directly in our United States Constitution is the power that this body, Congress, has to be involved if we are going to get involved in what would essentially be seen as war. And I think the debate that we have to have is, what are we looking at as we look at the situation in Iraq and perhaps in Syria.

John Nichols from *The Nation* magazine wrote: "It is a healthy respect for the complex geopolitics of the region, combined with a regard for the wisdom of the system of checks and balances and the principles of advice and consent outlined in the US Constitution" that we have a say. Those are the words of John Nichols.

This Congress, in July, before we left to go back to our districts, voted 370-40 for H. Con. Res. 105. We don't get many 370-40 votes in this House. It was a bipartisan resolution. It had overwhelming support and said: "The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization."

That is the resolution that was passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan way by this body just weeks ago. We are facing these questions today. And the President is going to present to the Nation this evening exactly what he would like to see us do and hopefully will let the Congress have a say in it because, clearly, the situation has escalated. It needs a debate.

The beheadings have certainly caught the attention of the country, but we want to make sure that attention is on our behalf, not the attention of someone who did that to try to provoke a reaction, and that we don't fall into the hands of doing the reaction that some people would hope that we would do to engage in a region that could be very complex.

And after this country has had so many unfortunate failures in Iraq—twice in my adult lifetime we have gone into this region, with very limited success, and we have gone into Afghanistan—we owe it to the American people, to our veterans, our servicemen and -women and their families, those who have gone in and put their lives at risk following 9/11, to have this rigorous debate in this very body before us.

This is a complex situation. But given the failures that we have had previously in going into Iraq—whether it be the lack of debate, the lack of buy-in from other nations and other partners specifically in the region and, quite honestly, the faulty intelligence that we had or that were told at the

time—it has put us in a bad situation in the past in this region.

In fact, one of the reasons we have to have this debate is there are a number of Members who are right now writing authorizations for us to go in. In fact, there is one from the gentleman from Virginia, Representative FRANK WOLF, that would essentially be an Authorization for Use of Military Force that could authorize force virtually anywhere, with no expiration date and no specific targets.

And I can tell you, when I talk to people across Wisconsin, when I talk to my colleagues in this room and they talk to their constituents, I think people want better answers than that. I know a year ago, when we had the debate about whether or not we would get involved in Syria, within 2 weeks in my district, I received 2,200 responses, 97 percent to 3 percent who were leery of us getting involved in Syria. And while the situation is different from a year ago and is even a situation different from a month ago, I think the public still has questions, certainly questions that we need to debate in this body. So we need to have that debate in Congress.

What do we want from the President in a new authorization? Well, I think there are three things that should be in that. One is that Congress has a say. Again, we have the ability to have a vote. We are elected and accountable to our districts, and these decisions are not just made behind closed doors without the advice and consent of Congress. We will have a stronger effort if we have that public debate. So that is one. Two, that we have a narrow scope. We simply can't bomb our way into success.

And let me just go over a little bit of the timeline just in the very few months since ISIL has been out there. Let me just talk a little bit about that timeline. Back on June 16 of this year, the administration announced it was sending 275 military personnel to protect the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Three days later, they announced that 300 military advisers would collaborate and train Iraqi forces—3 days later. On June 30, the administration announced the deployment of 200 more troops to Iraq. On August 7, the President authorized airstrikes in Iraq. On the 12th of August, the administration announced 130 additional U.S. military personnel to assess the scope of the humanitarian mission. On the 26th of August, the President authorized surveillance flights over Syria. On September 2, the administration announced the deployment of 350 additional military personnel to Iraq, bringing our total to 1,100 U.S. troops now deployed in Iraq. And in the last month alone, there have been 153 airstrikes in Iraq. Just in the little bit of time that has passed, that is what we have seen happen. And I think we need to be very specific in

the limited scope of what that is going to be so we don't have mission creep leading us into perhaps more involvement than we thought was going to happen in the beginning.

And third, I think—and others that I talk to think—it is important that we go in with a coalition, that we are not doing this either alone or largely alone and that we are doing this with partners from the region. Right now, there are 10 other countries that I know of that are involved in saying that they will commit to help work with us. But we need to build a moderate Sunni support and buy-in from some of the Arab States specifically to help us in this region because right now, this is a regional situation, and we need to have partners within that region to make sure that we can accomplish any goals.

There are many questions that we continue to have, and I think there are many about what that strike would look like, what exactly does it mean to have that involvement.

I just mentioned who are some of the allies that we are going to have. But what are some of our short-term goals? What do we expect to accomplish when we decide that we are going in? What would we carry out in military action? It is one thing to say that we are not going to have boots on the ground, but clearly, we are having pilots in the sky.

Right now, we are using U.S. attack aircraft, fighter aircraft, and drone aircraft to do attacks within that region. So you already have a presence that—I don't like the term "boots on the ground," because these are people with families, sons and daughters, nephews and nieces, brothers and sisters that we have who are overseas, and we need to know exactly what that means.

There has been potentially a request to aid some of the moderate Syrian rebels that may come out of the conversations. And, once again, I think there are questions that this body has to have a debate on. Steven Sotloff, the journalist, who was the second person that was beheaded, that we have followed very closely, as an American citizen, his family recently said that it was moderate Syrian rebels who essentially sold access to ISIL to get Steve Sotloff. And who is it that we are going to provide assistance to? And what does that assistance mean? And who are the people that we can potentially be doing that for?

What is our long-term commitment to military action? Now, if we would have asked this question years ago when we first looked at Iraq and Afghanistan, I don't think anyone would have expected to hear a 13-year commitment to Afghanistan. More than 2,000 Americans have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 4,000 in Iraq. The cost has been estimated to be 4 to \$6 trillion in that region just since that last action was called years ago. And,

as I mentioned, there have been 153 airstrikes just in the last month. How many more airstrikes will it take to say that that is enough? So we need to have more meat put onto this to have an idea of what that involvement is if we are going to be authorizing something.

And finally, the question I would ask is: How do we define mission accomplished? What is the end goal that we are going to have? And where does that end happen? I certainly hope the end goal is not flying in military gear on an aircraft carrier with a banner behind it that says "Mission Accomplished." Because we all know, there was no mission accomplished at that time. We need to have clear and definite goals of what it means to defeat ISIL and to make sure that that region can have some stability after the instability of so long that it has had.

So, in conclusion, the President has a constitutional obligation, I feel, to work with Congress before engaging in extended military operations. The public is still very war-weary. And while right now, polls may say people think we should get involved in Iraq and Syria with limited airstrikes, we have to have that much longer debate.

Clearly, the public beheadings of two American citizens has raised the ire of the American people and I think many in Congress. It is a different situation than it was a year ago. It is a different situation than it was a month ago. But at the same time, we have got to be sure that we are not falling into doing something that could be counter-productive because, clearly, ISIL did that to provoke a reaction, and I think that needs to be a part of the debate we have.

After being entangled in a global conflict for 13 years, we owe it to the American people and to the servicemen and -women and their families and the veterans who have already made tremendous sacrifices and the support of our country that we have a transparent and thorough debate on any action that would happen with ISIL in Syria or Iraq.

So those are my hopes. Those are my questions. I am looking forward to hearing the President tonight, and I am hoping that this body will be able to have that full debate so we know everything that we can possibly have for information prior to continuing and perhaps enhancing any actions there.

□ 1715

Now, I am very proud to be joined by other members of the Progressive Caucus. We have one of the most senior Members of this body, who has become a mentor and a friend to me, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you sincerely.

It looks like it is going to be pretty lonesome in this House. I have been

looking since I have returned from the recess to see how a nation that is about to embark on another intrusion, military intrusion, what concerns we would have to have and to explain when we go home and tell our constituents that we have done this because of you, that your Nation's security was threatened.

Now, I agree with the gentleman that when we see these atrocities committed something should be done, but by us? Haven't we suffered enough? Haven't we sacrificed enough?

So few Members of Congress have to attend the funerals of those dedicated men and women. Less than 1 percent are making this sacrifice. There is no financial sacrifice being made, no tax put on the war, and people think that people are volunteering to put themselves in danger. Well, the families don't always feel the same way about it. And I have been involved in being a part of getting citizenship for people who have come to this country and enlisted and fought and died for this country, and I give the family a little flag.

Now, it wasn't too long ago that America was under the impression that enough is enough. We have lost. We have sacrificed enough. We have got to get Iraq on its feet, help stabilize the government, and then we will get on and deal with Syria.

Now, in the old days, when I was in the Army, we knew who the enemy was. They had uniforms. They had flags. But as I understand, the fluid situation that came to our intelligence during the recent recess, it seems as though ISIS is worse than al Qaeda and all the other evil terrorists that we have been involved with and that now some of them have acquired weapons that we have given to some of the Arab cults that were our friends, but somehow the weapons have been taken and are in the hands of people that I am not certain which ones are our friends.

Now, I know the President has said no boots on the ground. I don't know what that really means, that we don't expect to lose any American lives. I don't know whether that means that only drones will be used and that we can rest assured that no American in uniform is going to be fighting anybody in that part of the world.

But since the threat to our national security appears to be so uncertain, and since the President believes he already has the power constitutionally to enter into this stage of engagement with this threat to our national security, and since I know that, polls notwithstanding, very few Americans are going to have a problem going to sleep tonight thinking about ISIS, it would seem to me that one of the ways that we could discuss and debate this is a part of what I was saying when I introduced the draft bill.

I don't want to see our young people having to serve in the military. I think

it is good to have some type of public national service, but I don't think people should be trained to kill. But I know one thing. If the security of this great Nation is at risk, it shouldn't be less than 1 percent of America that has to be placed in harm's way.

So, even though most of the lives we lost started off with not troops going in initially, but consultants, advisors, and those that are going to instruct our friends to defend themselves, but ultimately the number gets larger and larger and larger. So I am going to submit some kind of way that one criteria that Members can use when going back home when their voters ask, "Well, what was it that impressed you so much after all our country has suffered in getting involved, all the trillions of dollars, the 6,000 lives, what did they say that caused you to believe that our Nation was threatened?" you might say that we had attached to that a draft bill, and we said that if it appeared as though our Nation was going to embark on a military excursion in another country, every American must be registered between certain ages, men and women, if they are able, to say our security has been threatened, and we should be proud as Americans to say that that is the reason why we have done that.

I bet you one thing. If that is what we were talking about this recess, neither party would be anxious not to have a vote on this, and we wouldn't be getting out of here tomorrow or the next day or the day after if we have to explain why someone's son, husband, or brother or sister may have to be involved in Selective Service because we felt in our hearts that our Nation's security was threatened.

So I, like you, want to hear what the President has to say. When Republicans come to the floor and say they are going to join with Democrats to support the President, that is something I haven't heard of in years. So I do hope that the President is able to bring us together with a better understanding as to we as Members of Congress and Representatives of the Nation's citizens and noncitizens, that we can come together, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of the House of Representatives where the people govern. And all of us would feel better in knowing it is not an easy choice, but we are convinced that it was the best choice.

So thank you so much for taking the time out, and I only hope that 435 of our Members would be doing the same thing so I can leave more secure in knowing that I have done the right thing. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

Mr. POCAN. Representative RANGEL, you have been an outspoken advocate for equality within the draft, making sure that everyone understands that there is an expense when we go into

war. As someone who has had several nephews personally get involved and plenty of constituents, those decisions are something that are mighty, and this body has to have that as part of that debate, and that is why we should have that debate. Thank you so much for your time and your efforts.

One of the other issues that is extremely important that this body get done before we leave is addressing income inequality and addressing how we can best help those who need help the most, those who are aspiring to be in the middle class and helping the middle class. One of the very best ways and one of the priorities of the Democrats in this House is to give America a raise, to raise the minimum wage, through a bill that we have, to \$10.10, to make sure that people have more money in their pockets. When that money is in their pockets, they will spend it in the community, and that will lift the economy and help create more jobs. It is exactly what we need right now.

For too long, we have not raised the minimum wage. If the minimum wage were the same and kept up with inflation from 1967, it would be well over \$10.60 an hour. And we are not. We are at a much lower rate, and we need to have that.

One of my colleagues from California has been an outspoken advocate for raising the minimum wage, and I would love to, on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, yield to my colleague from the great State of California, Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about working families, and I will be talking about the minimum wage.

I just want to preface that it was an honor to listen to Congressman RANGEL really talk about what is probably the most important issue before us in terms of how we as a deliberative body deal with issues of war and peace and where our Nation is going. I, too, hope that we have, as this goes on, a really thoughtful discussion as you have laid out for us tonight. And I hope that we follow up with what the President says later on tonight and that, when we reconvene, we do talk about this in a very, very thoughtful, thoughtful way.

But I am also concerned about how working families and individuals are struggling to make a living on our current minimum wage of \$7.25. That is why I think Congressman POCAN and my colleagues and I are discussing this issue. It is a key component of raising this minimum wage, of closing the opportunity gap and building an economy that works for our working families.

We spend a lot of time in this body talking about building the economy. We spend time discussing tax breaks for large corporations. But really what we should be about is: How do we rebuild the middle class? How do we give

people an opportunity to join the middle class? Raising the minimum wage is a critical component.

By raising it from \$7.25 to \$10.10 an hour, we would lift 900,000 Americans out of poverty. Do we raise it into wealth? No. We just take the first step. And this is a minimum step. It would raise it for 28 million people, including more than—in my home State, 2.7 million Californians live below the poverty level, working Californians, we are talking about, live below.

Who are they? Seventy percent of them are women. The average age is not as it is often told to us, young people, 18 to 25. We are talking about the average age of a person on minimum wage is 35 years of age. That is a significant year.

I think I meant to say 1.3 million Californians in my State. It is going to raise it for 2.7 million, and of those, almost a million and a half are women who would be impacted by an increase.

This is a bill we are talking about that is a bill that was put forth by Senator TOM HARKIN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER, and it is going to go have a tremendous impact upon job growth. Sometimes we hear, well, if you raise the minimum wage, we are going to lose jobs. But if we really get through the scare tactics, we will listen to what people who are experts and who have studied the issue have said, that a recent analysis by the Economic Policy Institute has calculated that a higher minimum wage within 3 years creates 85,000 new jobs and it has a boost of almost \$22 billion into the economy.

So, when we raise the minimum wage, we are talking about protecting families, protecting individuals. We as a Congress have, I think, a responsibility to support those families who are the foundation of our workforce. And now is not time to turn our backs on the people who are raising the next generation. We are talking about working families. We need to help the men, women, and children who provide the foundation for our economy and our country, who are raising the next generation.

If we cannot provide an adequate wage for Americans who are living in poverty and working, why are we here? What is our role? Our role, I think, is to listen to those working Americans who are desperately trying to make ends meet, who work two and three jobs, and say: We hear you; it makes economic sense for the Nation; we will support you. And we should not leave this Congress until we take the first step, and that is to raise the minimum wage to at least \$10.10 an hour.

□ 1730

It is a minimum raise of the minimum wage.

So with that, I thank you for providing me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. POCAN. If I could just ask you, gentlemen, one question—and I will go to Mr. RANGEL again for a comment.

Let me ask you a question. The leadership in this House, the Republican leadership, has refused to schedule a bill to raise the minimum wage, and we have one other device to do that called the discharge petition.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Yes.

Mr. POCAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if you signed the discharge petition so that we can force a vote in this House to raise the minimum wage in the remaining weeks we have before we finish the session for the year.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Absolutely would I sign a discharge petition, one of the most important things that we can do.

Mr. POCAN. And we have done that.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. All we are asking for is a right to vote.

I still remember when the President came, in his State of the Union speech, and it was really just after—in my first year here in the Congress and he was talking about the horrible episode that happened at Sandy Hook and said, "Give the people the vote. Just give us a vote."

That is all we are asking our Republican colleagues. Let us vote on raising the minimum wage. That is all. That is the democratic way and "democratic" with a small D. That is the American way. Give the people a vote.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Because that is the problem—we have been told the Speaker won't schedule the vote, but there are other ways. Every single Member of this body can sign a discharge petition, and if we get a majority of us, 218 of us, to sign that, it will come to this body. So there are no excuses not to get this done.

I would like to yield to my good friend from New York, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. We were talking about war and peace. To me, we are still talking about a moral issue.

Here in this great Nation, the richest in the world, we are asking people to work 40 hours, many without sick leave, many without vacations or vacation pay, and—at the end of the day—end up in poverty. There is something terribly wrong with that picture.

It seems to me that it goes beyond just doing the right and the moral thing. Even churches and synagogues and mosques should recognize that their membership is going down because you can't pay the rent, buy the food, and still give your money to the religious institutions.

Beyond that, what are they going to do with the money? I will tell you: they are going to be able to get nutritional diets for their kids. They will be able to buy clothes for their kids. They can aspire that their kids get a better education and be able to get higher jobs and have higher ambitions.

They can make America more productive because they have more self-esteem because being poor is not the worst thing in the world, if you feel that you can come out of that poverty and you have an opportunity to do it.

There is something worse going on in this country today. I was privileged years ago to sponsor a bill that we all know is the earned income tax credit, and the earned income tax credit says this shouldn't happen. If you have got a family and, after you follow the Federal formula, you are still poor, why, we will give you a check. You won't owe taxes; we will give you a refundable check.

Guess what? Some of the people that are hiring these people at very low wages also hire accountants that advise the potential applicant how to become eligible for the earned income tax credit. So they give a little bit, the government gives a little bit, and the people still end up poor.

It just seems to me this is not a Democratic issue; it is not a Republican issue. It is an issue of: What does America stand for? Where is the equity involved if we are not going to allow our country to be pumped up by the middle class people who made this country great?

We are not a country of rich and poor folks. It is the middle class that have demands, that want to go to the local store, so that they can sell and hire people and have communities that feel proud about themselves.

I know one thing: with the rents that are going up in communities all over this country and people who used to consider themselves middle class, you miss one or two payments of your rent—and Judge Judy doesn't want to ask you what were the circumstances.

If you didn't pay your rent, you are going to get evicted. If you don't have resources, if you have no place to go, you can go from a plateau that you thought was middle class into a homeless shelter.

Getting out of that situation and seeking employment is almost impossible. How much does it cost? Hundreds of billions of dollars in social costs because you wouldn't give Americans an opportunity to earn a living wage.

So it is lonely down here with you guys, but I do hope before we leave that we can have not just Democrats, but all of the Members be able to go back home and say, "I was late getting this started, but we do have the issues, and we are going to make you proud."

Thank you so much for taking the time to allow us to express what we know most people believe, but politically, they can't support.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL.

One of the things I look at—it is pretty simple math to someone like me, coming from America's heartland, when productivity is going up and

wages are flat, the money is going somewhere.

In 1988, the average CEO made 40 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, it is 354 times the lowest-paid employee. Now, if you put extra money in the pockets through raising the minimum wage of someone who is in the middle class or aspiring to be in the middle class, it is going to go back into the economy. If they can afford a long weekend vacation to the Wisconsin Dells in my area, that helps boost the economy, helps create jobs—but you know what? That CEO can't take 354 vacations to make up for it.

Clearly, when the money goes into the pockets of those who need it the most, it is going to go instantly into the economy, help create jobs, and help do everything that we need to, to stimulate the economy to the point that we can be as great as we possibly can be.

To me, it is a no-brainer. I think to many of the constituents I talk to it is a no-brainer.

You are very articulate in talking about the troubles that people go through in trying to just get by. It is another thing this body simply has to take up before we leave.

If we don't take this up before November, quite honestly, those who didn't try to take it up shouldn't come back because we need people who will take it up because it is the will of the people. Democrats, Independents, and even Republicans are looking at this as an issue that is important and has to happen.

Again, thank you so much for all your work on this for so many years. ALAN LOWENTHAL and I are freshman here. We are the newbies. We are taking up the fight, but you have been doing it for so many years and been a mentor to so many of us. Again, thank you, Mr. RANGEL, and thank you, Mr. LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you very, very much.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. LOWENTHAL went through all the numbers for the State of California. It has the same effect in my State of Wisconsin. When you look at it, if you raise that minimum wage to \$10.10, as the bill from Senator HARKIN does and the one that Representative GEORGE MILLER from California has introduced in this body, not only is it 28 million people in this country that will get a raise, but it is half a million people just in my home State of Wisconsin, a half million people.

One of the things that I have heard sometimes when you talk to people, they say, "If you raise the minimum wage, all you are doing is giving extra pocket money to teenagers who are living with their parents."

Well, that is one of the great myths that is out there because here is the reality: the average age of a minimum wage worker is 35 years old. When you look at the exact breakout of who it is,

90 percent are over 20 years old, and more than half of them are older than 25 years old.

You are not talking about a teenager living at home. You are talking about people who are living independently in the community, trying to get by on \$7.35 an hour or close to \$15,000 a year, in a job that often has no benefits—health benefits, pension, et cetera.

Fifty-five percent of the people on minimum wage are working full time. Forty-four percent have some type of college education, an associate degree or bachelor's degree or other higher education. That is the reality of the minimum wage worker in this country. It is not the myth of a teenager living at home, looking for some pocket money.

These are hardworking people trying to get by, often on two or three jobs, without the benefits. Without that ability, if they miss their rent, they get evicted, and then they are homeless. As Mr. RANGEL said, these are some of the same people that then show up on our health plans that States provide for being low-income.

So you know who then is subsidizing their salaries? We all are. Every single individual who is a taxpayer pays into those programs. While that employer may not offer a wage that they can live on, we all subsidize it, so that they can actually get something as basic as health care.

So there is a real need to pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act that is proposed. We have tried and tried in this body to get a vote on it. We have signed a discharge petition. Virtually every Democrat in the House of Representatives has signed that.

We need those Republicans, especially those Republicans who are on record supporting a minimum wage, to also sign that, so we can get a vote before we leave in a few weeks, before the November elections, before the end of the year—because I think a question that I would want to ask my Representative when I see them in the community in the coming weeks before the election is: What have they done to help make the middle class stronger? What have they done to help people who are aspiring to be in the minimum class? What have we got done in Congress?

There was a Congress in 1948 that was called the do-nothing Congress because they got so little done. The first year of that session, they passed 350 bills. Last year, this body passed 88.

Here we are sitting another week back in Congress, and we haven't raised the minimum wage, we haven't passed equal pay for equal work so that women make just as much as men do, and we haven't done anything about the affordability of higher education, allowing students to refinance their loans.

These are simple issues that aren't partisan issues. They are not Democratic/Republican. They are not liberal/conservative. They are about whether or not you are fighting for the middle class and those who aspire to be in the middle class or whether you are here trying to help out the special interests and the lobbyists who represent the special interests. It is really that simple.

So we need to pass a raise for the American people. That means you pass an increase in the minimum wage. As other Members have said, it will lift so many people out of poverty and give a raise to so many people to help stimulate the economy.

So the Progressive Caucus is fighting each and every single day while we are here for a variety of issues: raising the minimum wage, trying to stop wage theft in this country, trying to extend unemployment insurance so that everyone who is out of work can still get some benefits while they are looking for work so that they can get that job. We all know the best social program is a job, and we want to make sure that everyone can get that job.

We need to continue to do the things that Congress needs to get done and we have not gotten done. So the minimum wage is one issue that we wanted to talk about today.

As we have the President speaking to us this evening, we want to make sure that this body has a very full and rich debate. As we passed in a bipartisan way, 370–40, we need to have a real debate and have real questions answered before we get involved, so that we never again have what happened the last time we got involved in Iraq because we are back again. There was no “mission accomplished.” A banner and a fly-in in military gear is not a successful end to an involvement.

We need to make sure whatever we do this time is thoughtful, done with consultation of Congress, with narrow scope, and with a partnership with other nations specifically in the region to make sure that we are doing this not alone or not largely alone.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus appreciates this time this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

ISSUES FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleagues across the aisle talking about the economy and pushing for a raise in minimum wage because that is what a party does after

their party has totally devastated the economy. It is what you do after your party's President, with help from the majority in the Senate led by HARRY REID, are able to just wreak havoc with an economy that should be doing really well.

This economy is ready to take off. ObamaCare, as we have said for over 4 years, is going to harm the economy. It is going to knock people out of work. It is going to put people from full time to part time. Republicans have been explaining this ever since not one of us voted for that bill. We also explained there were \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare.

A lot of seniors that vote Democrat voted for this President, voted for a Democratic majority in the Senate. They have now been shocked this year as they are not getting the health care they once did. Why? Because of ObamaCare—seniors are getting mistreated.

When we want to talk about the economy, the most staggering numbers I can imagine have come out in the last year, and the President has even acknowledged it was true. He complains we are not doing enough for the middle class.

Well, we agree with that. We certainly agree with that. We need to help those that are not making enough money. Then quit knocking them out of their jobs, Mr. President, HARRY REID. We have got over 360 bills down at the Senate. Passage of just 10 of them would help this economy, but they won't bring them up.

So the devastating, most incredible numbers are these: since Barack Obama has been President of the United States, for the first time in our Nation's history—it has never ever happened before in any President's tenure, whether it was 4 years or 8 years or shortened by tragedy, no President before Barack Obama has ever presided over an economy in the United States in which 95 percent of all the income in the United States went to the top 1 percent, never ever.

Only under the leadership of President Barack Obama, of all the Presidents, only this President has brought us to the place where 95 percent of all of the income in America goes to the top 1 percent.

People wonder why there is so much money that flooded into the Obama campaign in 2008. Not as much flooded into his campaign in 2012 because there was some people losing money. The economy wasn't doing as well as expected.

Is there anything more devastating than a President acknowledging the fact that 95 percent of all income has gone to the top 1 percent? Then he gives speeches and talks to people like he can't understand how the Republicans could allow this big growth between the poor and the rich. Well, we

need the President to tell us how he has done it, but the trouble is we know how he has done it.

He talks about fat cats and then makes sure that they are the ones that get rewarded. He talks about going after Big Oil and proposes a bill that would do nothing to hurt Big Oil, but would absolutely have devastated independent oil producers who actually drill and produce around 95 percent or so of the United States' oil and gas wells.

Because of this President's ObamaCare, because of his overregulation, because of his top-down demands from the EPA wanting to usurp all authority for people that couldn't find their rears with both hands, they are the ones that are telling industry how to run their industries.

This President has created a mess. He demonizes companies for trying to survive by moving to a country that has a corporate income tax rate that is a fraction of the rate we have.

We now have the largest—the highest corporate tax in the world, and this President thinks the answer is more taxes. He has never been educated by people who know how an economy really works, people like Arthur Laffer that helped Ronald Reagan get the economy going after President Carter nearly killed it.

He has never sat down at the feet of people really who understand economies and what makes them work, what makes them fail. So he doesn't understand that when government uses its heavy, heavy hand, they hurt economies.

When the President pronounces laws out of his mouth that have never passed Congress and makes that the newly enforced law, then it creates havoc in the economy because capital goes where it feels safest.

When you have a President, like a dictator, that just pronounces new laws because he doesn't like what Congress has passed and prior Presidents have signed, then companies are not going to be able to survive very well in that environment, so they move on and go somewhere where they can survive better.

The answer to getting people better jobs and higher wages is not to mandate further regulation. The answer is to lower the corporate tax, draw more companies back here, so that people can have better jobs, people can have more jobs.

I know at some point—because there is so much intelligence in the African American community, I know at some point a majority are going to figure out that the Democrats have done massive damage to the African American communities and that the answer is not making them more dependent on the Federal Government, but in pushing them to reach their potential, to reach for the sky, not with Federal handouts, but with good-paying jobs.

I was in Marshall, Texas, just in the last few weeks. There was a young African American who has been out of school for a while. He was so excited because he had been able to go through the 5-week truck driving school there, was getting his commercial driver's license, and for the first time in his life, he was going to get a good job paying \$40,000 to \$42,000. It excited me seeing him so excited. He is just a huggable guy that was so thrilled.

So now that he had a job promise that was coming up in a couple of weeks when he finished and he knew how much he was going to make and that, in 3 years, he had the chance of making \$100,000, that he has now gotten engaged—because he wanted to wait until he had a job and he could take care of his wife and they could take care of each other.

He didn't want to be on the Federal dole. He wanted to provide for himself. This man had all kinds of capability, and now, he is going to be able to meet it, not because of this President or the overregulation, but because he took a 5-week training program and was going to get a good job.

That is where you help people, not in the handouts, but in the hand helping to rise up to the potential that God has given them.

Some have claimed Republicans have a war on women, that women only make 70 percent of what the men have. There are so many false statistics that are quoted. We know it is very unfortunate. We are very sorry that the White House penalizes women and rewards men because the men make a lot more in the same top positions than the women do. So apparently, that does happen some places, and we hope the President will address it in his own White House lawn, in his own house and yard.

The fact is if across the country everybody was paying women only 70 percent of what they paid men for the same job—people are smarter than the President realizes—they would be hiring nothing but women because they work for so much cheaper.

That is one of the problems that the African American community has. When huge businesses combined with the Democratic Party to bring in and lure as many illegal aliens into this country as they can and start giving massive numbers of amnesty, then they are not going to have as many job opportunities, and they are not going to make as much money.

People are beginning to see that in the African American community. That is why their unemployment rate is so much higher than that in other ethnic communities and the overall unemployment rate—such damage to such wonderful people.

Just like that young man in Marshall, Texas, another—he was a much older guy, big guy, African American,

just thrilled for the man because he is graduating, he has got a job coming up, he has been out of work so long.

You don't help people by saying, "We are going to pay you for a year not to work." You help create an environment where there are jobs where you can reach your potential.

Mr. Speaker, the question that my friends ought to be asking is, "Why is one job no longer enough for so many Americans?" If we get to the bottom of it, you will find out. ObamaCare is a problem, overregulation is a problem, stifling America becoming energy independent by propping up forms of energy that do not create a profit unless they are propped up by taxpayer dollars—let this economy run. Let people reach their potential.

One other thing: I know the President is going to be making a speech on Syria. I literally thank God that the President was not able to do a bombing campaign like he wanted to do a year ago, in which he literally would have done so much damage to—not a good man, but the leader in Syria, Assad, that it would have allowed ISIS to be in charge now. People across America have figured out ISIS is a threat to all of us.

I will wait to see what the President has to say, but when you know that the President was wrong about Egypt, about the Muslim Brotherhood taking over in Egypt, was wrong when he was pushing to keep the Muslim Brotherhood and a tyrant like Morsi in charge in Egypt, when over a third of the population in Egypt came to the streets and said, "We don't want radical Islam; and you, America, under Barack Obama, you helped us with a constitution that doesn't even include impeachment, it is shari'a law"—and they have now passed a constitution that requires the Christian churches and Jewish synagogues be rebuilt with government money, and this administration continues to be heavy-handed against them because they didn't want radical Islamists in charge.

□ 1800

In Libya, as moderate Muslims in the Middle East have told me in visits over there: None of us really liked Qadhafi, but he was helping you and helping us against terrorism and you helped al Qaeda-backed rebels take him out.

But for America's bombing, the radical Islamists would not have control of Libya, Algeria, or Tunisia today. Thank God for the Egyptians rising up and saying, as moderate Muslims, as secularists: We stand with the Jews and the Christians, and we don't want radical Islamists running our country.

I hope this country—our country's leadership, at least, under the President—will wake up. Stop hurting the freedom-loving Egyptians that don't want the radical Islamists you supported in Egypt back in charge of

Egypt. Don't help ISIS in Syria. Don't help them in Iraq. And if he had just signed the Status of Forces Agreement that President Bush had all but had ready to sign, getting cute with that so it fell apart, then we wouldn't be having all these problems today in Iraq and Syria that we are.

He is getting horrible advice, and it is time the President took a hard look at who he really gets advice from, because the moderate Muslims in the world don't want radical Islam taking over and they don't, as they have told me privately, like the people that this President has advising him.

The economy is ready to take off, if this President will get out of the way, and people can make money and get back to where one job is enough for a person to make it and do well. And if we cut down on the massive expenses ObamaCare is causing, we can get rid of that and get back to real health care reform. Because even if you save \$100, \$200 a month, that would get you a vacation that people have not gotten this year.

There is so much we can do for America if the government of this country, the people at the top of the government, will just finally realize the American people have more answers than we do, and then they will show us.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to talk about the United States economy. I want to talk about the number one thing that politicians talk about when they ask you to support them when they are on the campaign trail, and that is that we want to put America to work.

I know what it is like to put America to work because I am very proud to say that, before I got elected to office, my full-time job was to put Americans to work. I owned a business, and there were dozens of families who depended on me as the leader of that business, as the owner of that business, to make sure that we were successful. So I had to do my job so that dozens of people could go to work and do their job.

Every year, millions of Americans go to the polls and hope and pray and think and expect that their elected people are going to focus on putting America to work. But unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, the leadership of this House under Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has been delinquent in doing one simple thing, and that is to focus on bills that create jobs. In some cases, it is bills that move government out of

the way to make sure that people can put people to work in private industry. In some cases, it is about changing laws that are broken and old and just don't work for today's economy, changing those laws to make sure that Americans can go to work.

Democrats have made jump-starting our economy a priority, and I believe in that priority. Since I have been elected to Congress, I have been fighting for that priority to try to get bills heard in our committees that will create jobs, that will move America forward, and that will move Americans who are hard-pressed and want to get off of the unemployment lines back into work. I have been trying to get them through committee and eventually to the floor of this House so we can have the debates and we can cast our votes for America. Unfortunately, those bills just languish, sitting somewhere in the corner, and don't see the light of day.

For example, the biggest bill to ever pass either the House or the United States Senate since this 113th Congress has come into session was a bill that was passed by the United States Senate with bipartisan support. There are 100 United States Senators, ladies and gentlemen, and 68—Democrats and Republicans—voted “aye,” voted “yes,” voted affirmatively for that bill. If this House would have taken up that bill, or H.R. 15, a bill that looks just like it, that would have boosted our economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, you hear people all the time right now today on the campaign trail saying, “Reelect me,” or, “Elect me,” and they are talking about the economy and talking about deficit reduction. That one bill was analyzed by a third party. It was not analyzed by the Democrats, not analyzed by the Republicans, not even analyzed by the Independents. It was analyzed by a third party whose job is just to call it like it is. That bill, if passed by Congress and put on the President's desk, would give us an opportunity to have a deficit reduction of at least \$900 billion. But that bill doesn't see the light of day—not in this House.

That bill has not been taken up in this House. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER has said over and over: I'm not going to take up that bill. I'm not going to take up that issue. I'm not going to support the American economy with that bill. I'm not going to do the right thing by America and give the economy of the United States of America the biggest boost we could ever see coming out of the actions of the United States Senate and this House of Congress.

It has been sitting here in this House in the corner collecting dust while too many Americans are having their unemployment run out, while too many Americans are losing their homes, while too many Americans are telling their children: I'm sorry, son, we can't afford to continue to send you to col-

lege. We don't have any money because we don't have a job.

The United States economy can do better, but unfortunately, it is because this Congress chooses not to do the right thing that the United States economy moves along slowly, picking up just a little bit. That is not good enough. That is not right.

What I am doing here at this moment tonight and the reason why I came to this floor, the reason why I asked the Speaker to give me some time to speak on an important issue—the economy of the United States of America—is because it tears me apart to know that the lack of leadership in this House and the lack of leadership of Speaker BOEHNER is crippling our economy.

We have \$900 billion of deficit reduction wrapped up in one bill, and that bill has sat in this House and has not heard a debate in any committee. It has not heard a debate on the floor of this House. The people that you elected have not had an opportunity. The 435 Members of the United States Congress have not had an opportunity to stake a claim on whether or not they believe that we ought to put Americans to work, that we ought to get out of the way and fix a law that is broken, a law that does not work, a law that should have been changed a long time ago; but we can change it at any moment on any given day in this House, and this Speaker refuses to allow that to happen.

What is going on right now in the United States Congress is just like what happens in your home or sometimes in a workplace. Let's say you have a family and everybody in the family has been assigned their chores, their responsibilities. Let's say you have a workplace where everybody has their job duties and their titles.

In the United States Congress, we have our chores and we have our responsibilities. Our job is to pass laws to help America move forward and to make sure that all the different dynamics of the number one economy in the world can flourish. That is our job. But the United States Congress, this House, has refused to do its job.

What is going on is just like that example I gave you. Let's say in your home one member of your family chooses not to do their part. You know what happens? Something good eventually happens. Somebody in that house, somebody in that home, somebody in that workplace sees that that job is not getting done, even if it is not their primary responsibility, and they think of the bigger picture. They think of the whole family, the whole house, the whole home. That person in the workplace thinks of the whole body of workers there and says: Somebody ought to take that job and get it done, even though so-and-so isn't doing their part—and that is their job.

Congress is not doing its job. It is not passing this law. But you know what

happens eventually? Somebody walks over there and does it themselves, even though it is not their primary responsibility. But we ought to be grateful that there are people like that in every community, in every household, in every business, in every work environment. But not in this House, not as long as JOHN BOEHNER, our Speaker, chooses not to allow us to have a debate, to do our job, to have a vote. Maybe it passes, maybe it fails, but our job as Members of Congress is to legislate, put ideas, good, bad, and otherwise, before the Members of this House and vote up or down, “yea” or “nay”, “yes” or “no,” to move America forward and let the votes fall where they may.

There is a bill that has been languishing in this House for close to a year and a half, and the bottom line is we have not taken up our duties and our responsibilities. As a result of that, in another branch of government there is that one person—not 435, not 100—that says: I want to move the economy of the United States of America forward. I want to fix a broken system. I want to see it fixed. I want Congress to put this on my desk so that I can do my job and sign it and watch Americans go back to work. All of a sudden, the one person who says: Since you won't do your job, I will go over there and to the best of my ability, to the extent that I legally can, I am just going to have to do as much as I can, lift as much as I can and do the heavy lifting because Congress won't, and he gets criticized.

□ 1815

That is a shame, ladies and gentlemen. That is a shame.

When, in the workplace, or somebody's household, somebody decides to step over and say, you know what, since you won't do it, and it is the right thing to do, I am going to do it. And then they criticize that person. He is the bad guy.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. The bad guy, the bad person is the one that says, I know I have duties, I know I have responsibilities, I just don't want to do it because I can say I don't want to. And if I don't want to, it doesn't get done, at least not in this House.

That is what is going on, ladies and gentlemen. The United States Congress is sitting on a bill that will supercharge the economy of the United States of America, to the tune of deficit reduction of as much as \$900 billion with one bill, one vote of this House. And our current speaker, the Republican leader, does not want to let that happen.

The President of the United States is another branch of government. The President of the United States is part of that balance of power. But when one branch of government is delinquent, is derelict in their duties, there comes a

time where that person has to say, hey, what can I legally do? I want to step up. I want to put America to work and, as a result of that, has to take action.

Now, to me, that is a duty bestowed upon every single one of us elected officials, and I am so disappointed that I got elected to a Congress that has been labeled as a do-nothing Congress. I got elected to a Congress that the statistics, not just opinions, but the facts show that this Congress has passed so few laws that people can actually legitimately say that we are do-nothing Congress.

That is a shame. We have responsibilities to this country. When we act responsibly, we make our country what it is, the best country on the planet, and when that happens, the whole world is a better place. But that has not been this 113th Congress, not under this Speaker, not now.

But the most important thing that I want to get across today, that could change. That could change tomorrow morning. We could have that bill on the floor of this Congress tomorrow. We could have it on this floor next week, and we can unleash what Americans go to vote for, and that is action.

Let the votes fall where they may, ladies and gentlemen. Our duty, as Congress, is to hear bills on this floor, have the debate from the left and from the right, from the center and all, come one, come all, Members of Congress, and then the Speaker says, open the roll, and there go the votes, green ones, red ones, "yea," "nay."

But just on that one bill, ladies and gentlemen, more Americans will go to work as a result of one piece of legislation than any other thing that this Congress has been poised to do in this 113th Congress.

So right now, as the clock ticks, as Congress might adjourn in just a couple of weeks or so, it is going to be left for another branch of government to decide to move this economy forward, to put Americans to work.

That is a shame. That is not the way it should be. That is not the way it was designed to be.

But the Constitution of the United States, you have all heard it, everybody who has taken government class, it is called the balance of powers: executive branch, judicial branch, the legislative branch.

But when one of those branches is derelict in their duties, as this House has been derelict in their duty to put Americans to work, it takes a committed American, it takes a brave American, to step up and say, "I will do it"; to be careful about how it is done, to be doing it in a way that is legal and does follow the Constitution of the United States of America.

But more importantly, ladies and gentlemen, to get the job done, to put America to work, to break a broken system, to break a set of laws and

renew that into a law, into action that will actually put America to work and allow us to continue to be the great Nation that we have become.

But, unfortunately, there is a piece of our government, this House, that is not living up to that greatness. It is not living up to its responsibilities. It is not living up to its duties, this House, this do-nothing Congress.

When I say do-nothing Congress, that is so painful to me. I am the son of parents who used to wake me up, sometimes before the sun came up, to go to work in my father's business. And what my father used to tell me—I was 5, 6 years old when he had me working with him—he used to say, son, the work is not done. We have got to keep working.

Sometimes, so much that my hands would bleed, and I would put on my best crying game and I would say, Dad, look, my hands are bleeding. Can I sit in the truck?

My father was a handyman. We used to clear fields and clean out houses or whatever odd job that people had for us. He would take me to work with him. And I remember the first time I thought I was going to be able to sit it out and not do my part because my hands were bleeding. I had blisters, they turned into—they busted, and then they turned into blood, and I showed them to my dad and I tried to give him my best sob story.

And he told me, son, the work is not done. We have got to get back to work. Now get back to work.

Oh, I hated him for it.

That is a leader, someone who can look someone in the eye and say, you need to be what you need to be right now. And that is someone who gets the job done, not someone who looks for excuses, not someone who tells stories, not someone who tries to get off the hook. You need to be the person that gets the job done.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, this House is not the House that gets the job done. It hurts for me to say that. I hate saying it. But sometimes the truth hurts. That is not my opinion, ladies and gentlemen. I am just restating the facts.

I hated my father when he taught me that lesson. But it wasn't until I grew up, and it wasn't until I had to put food on the table for my family, it wasn't until I grew up and ran my own business, that I realized that it is not about the easy way out. It is not about quitting. It is not about being derelict in your duties. It is about accepting your responsibilities, acting out on those responsibilities, working through your responsibilities, not making up stories, not holding press conferences and hoodwinking the American public into thinking that it can't be done.

No, no, no, ladies and gentlemen. We can take care of business on this floor from today to tomorrow and get a bill to the other House, or take a bill from

the Senate, take it through this House and get it to the President overnight.

So any time some Congressman or U.S. Senator tells you, no, no, no, there is not enough time, as long as there is at least 1 day, 1 day of legislation left—oh, as a matter of fact, both Houses have the authority to call back their entire House and say, our business is not done. We can get it done tomorrow. Call every Member of Congress, call every Member of the United States Senate to their Chamber, and say, we have got work to do.

There is no time off for us. There is no time away from these Chambers, we are going to get the work done.

But this House chooses not to do its job.

Some people might think, well, this Congressman, this Congressman CÁRDENAS, he is kind of talking a little strong about this House. You better believe it. We are the Congress of the United States of America.

There have been moments in this House where we have been applauded by America for the kind of bravery and the kind of work that gets done in this House. That hasn't happened much lately, not in the 113th Congress.

One bill, ladies and gentlemen, one bill has been sitting in this House, languishing, collecting dust, while millions of Americans are out of work. That is a shame. That is a shame.

I wish there were more Members of this Congress like my father, who knew how to get the job done, who knew how to focus on the people that depended on him, who had a "don't quit" attitude.

My father was a man of few words. Few words. But when he spoke, he was serious, he was forthright, and he got the job done. And he had the guts, he had the fortitude, he had the character to know that sometimes, when it meant him getting the job done, it meant that maybe he wasn't going to be too popular, even with his own son.

I am so glad, so proud to be the son of a man and a woman, Maria and Andres Cárdenas, who taught me how to go to work every single day, and whatever my duties were, whatever my responsibilities were, it wasn't about me, it was about the work that I committed to do and to get it done.

Every week I leave my family in my district in California, in the San Fernando Valley, and I kiss them goodbye, and I hope and pray that they put me to work, that I get to do the work that I was elected to do. But that hasn't been happening in this House.

And I am not alone, ladies and gentlemen. I talk to a lot of Members of this House and they feel the same. They want to move America forward. They want to get this economy up and running the way it should be, the way America deserves to be.

□ 1830

This House refuses to help make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I really do hope and pray that we can put America to work, that we can pass a bill that will create \$900 billion of deficit reduction opportunity. I hope and pray that we can do that. Unfortunately, it is not up to me. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. It is not up to me. I do not have the authority or the ability to put a bill in the House of Congress.

I have introduced bills. That is my right—I can introduce bills, and I do do that—but the only person who has the authority to decide if a bill will be heard by this House is the Speaker of this House, and he is elected Republican JOHN BOEHNER. He is the man. He is the person who refuses to put a bill on the floor of this House, so that every Member of Congress can have the opportunity to do his job and help put America to work.

I am a proud American, and I am so honored and privileged to be a Member of the United States Congress, to represent the 29th District in California, the place that I was born and raised in and the community that I love. It is just a microcosm of what this great Nation is about, what it is, and my hands are tied. I am not making excuses, ladies and gentlemen. I am just telling you the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, please, please put that bill on this floor. Put it in motion. Do your job, so that we can do our jobs, so that Americans can have jobs, so that we, as Members of this Congress, can put America to work.

We have a broken immigration system, and one bill can fix that. We have a broken system in this country, and that one bill will put \$900 billion toward deficit reduction for America. That one bill will unleash our economy and create hundreds of thousands of opportunities for Americans to go back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REAUTHORIZE THE ZADROGA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the 13th anniversary of the terrorist attack of 9/11. It is a day for us to remember and mourn those we lost, to comfort those who suffer still, and to honor those who responded on that day with courage and determination.

In New York on those dark days, there were thousands of anonymous civilians and first responders who, without a second's thought, gave their aid. They ran into burning buildings to save the lives of others. It is a day on which we lost 3,000 people, and thousands more lost their health in the wake of 9/11.

In response to the health crisis that the responders and others faced, this Congress came together in a bipartisan way and introduced the Zadroga Act. The Zadroga Act would provide health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others.

Whenever we talk about 9/11, we have to acknowledge the heroes and heroines of 9/11, some who lost their lives that day and those who are still sick and dying from the injuries and illnesses related to 9/11. As a Congress, we came together in groups all over America to comfort one another, and we stood together in our Nation's capital and vowed that we would never forget.

Never forget means that we don't forget next year or today, but we are always there to honor and to provide the health care to those who risked their lives to save the lives of others that day.

We came together this week in New York with a determination to put forward a reauthorization of the Zadroga Act for 25 years, which would continue this program, so that the certainty would be there, so that the services and health care would be there for the first responders, the victims, the residents, and others who became ill.

That vow of never forget comes with an obligation on the part of Congress, which is to ensure that we as a country remember, honor, and care for those who are now sick and for those who may still become sick from exposure to the deadly toxin mixes down at 9/11, mixes of fuel and glass and toxins and all kinds of chemicals that they breathed that day.

A major piece of that promise was the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. This legislation established the World Trade Center Health Program to provide medical monitoring and treatment for 9/11-related illnesses and reopened the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide for economic losses and harm incurred from the aftermath of the attacks.

We know that there are thousands of individuals with at least one 9/11-related illness or injury. That includes over 2,900 people in the World Trade Center Health Program who have been diagnosed with cancer.

We know that more than 800 New York Fire Department members and more than 550 New York Police Department personnel are struggling with serious 9/11-related illnesses.

We know that we have already lost over 70 firefighters and 60 New York Police Department officers who have died from their 9/11-related illnesses since 9/11. These are people who got sick while working at the pile, and they have died because of their exposure.

We must continue to provide the specialized medical monitoring and care these heroes received through the

World Trade Center Health Program and continue to provide economic compensation for the terrible costs they have borne by caring for those who cared so much for us.

As it stands, the Zadroga Act is set to expire in October 2015, yet the medical and economic crises of sick 9/11 responders and suffering survivors will not end in 2 years. They will only get worse over time. Research shows significantly higher rates of cancer among the 9/11 population, a disease with a long latency period. Diseases can take decades to manifest themselves.

That is why I plan to introduce, along with PETER KING, JERRY NADLER, the New York delegation, and many others, legislation that would reauthorize the Zadroga Act's program for 25 years.

Named after Detective Zadroga, who was the first to die from 9/11-related injuries, many others have been helped through this important program. It would continue the specialized Centers of Excellence, the national health program, the research into new medical conditions, and the victims compensation fund for those who may develop 9/11 illnesses later and suffer related economic damages.

This is not just a New York issue, and I would like to share this map with my colleagues to demonstrate how widespread it is. This map shows that there were first responders and volunteers who came from every corner of America.

They returned to their hometowns, and that is why we have Centers of Excellence across this country to serve the responders and the volunteers who came to 9/11. Many of them are now sick from the toxins that they were exposed to at Ground Zero.

Some from the tristate area have since moved to other parts of the country. The map demonstrates the health programs participating, and participants are in 429 of the 435 congressional districts. This means that in almost every Member's district, there are constituents who are accessing or who are being treated under the Zadroga health program.

These are your constituents who are being monitored and who may be receiving treatment for 9/11-related diseases.

These Zadroga Act programs are vital to the sick and dying. They are vital to those to whom we said we will never forget. If we do not continue this program, then we are forgetting, so it is critical that we keep this promise and renew this program.

Together, we can affirm what we said 13 years ago, that we will never forget what happened here, that we will never forget what was endured, and that we will never forget what we promised.

As I said, this map illustrates that the populations in most of the congressional districts are being served by this.

Today, there was a Gold Medal given to the museum in New York City for 9/11, to the museum at the Pentagon for 9/11, and to the museum in Pennsylvania for 9/11. I urge my colleagues to visit all of these museums and the National September 11 Memorial and Museum which, so far, has had more than 14 million visitors since opening in September of 2011.

The museum serves as the focal point to examining the implications of the events of 9/11, documenting the impact of these events, and exploring the continuing significance of September 11, 2001. The 12,000 artifacts, 23,000 images, and almost 2,000 oral stories displayed at the museum remind all of us of that tragedy and what befell and happened that day.

I want to tell the story of the man with the red bandana. He has since been identified as an equities trader who stayed behind and tied a red bandana around his face and helped many, many people get rescued, yet he fell when the towers fell.

It tells the brave stories of many heroes and heroines—of first responders and participants—who helped others in the burning buildings that day.

Now the museum has a new exhibit, one that marks an important event in our Nation's response to 9/11. It now displays at the museum a uniform worn by one of the members of SEAL Team Six.

This is the courageous team that raided Pakistan, where Osama bin Laden was found and killed. It is a magnificent exhibit. I am proud to have had a role in helping to secure this artifact, and I hope people will have the opportunity to visit this new exhibit.

The story of 9/11 is not just of the suffering and of the tragedy of that day, but also of the response—how we came together, united and determined, as a Congress. We came together to fight back, and I have never seen us work so strongly towards a common goal.

In 2002, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security, which brought together 22 separate agencies and offices into a single Cabinet-level department in order to secure our country from threats such as border security and cybersecurity, as well as coordinating efforts to respond to emergencies.

We also created the bipartisan 9/11 Congressional Caucus, which eventually led to the creation of the 9/11 Commission to investigate what exactly went wrong with our security and to make recommendations to protect our Nation against a terrorist attack.

The Commission and its staff reviewed over 2.5 million pages of documents; interviewed over 1,200 individuals in 12 countries, including every relevant senior official of both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations; and held 19 days of public

hearings across the country, with over 160 witnesses testifying.

This independent bipartisan Commission produced a book, the "9/11 Commission Report," which is a well-informed report that served as a blueprint for improving our security. The book sold more copies than Harry Potter, and it came out with suggestions of what we needed to do to make our country safer.

□ 1845

Released in August of 2004, the Commission's report diagnosed the national security failures that led to 9/11 and offered steps that we needed to take to avoid future attacks. We worked together in the Congress—Chris Shays and myself and other Members of Congress—to support all of the 9/11 Commission Caucus' recommendations and the Commission recommendations.

This led to the biggest reorganization of our country's security system, the biggest reorganization of our government, since 1948, after World War II, and it created the Department of Homeland Security and forced all of the independent intelligence agencies to share information, not only on the national level but on the local level, with people who were working in the intelligence area for our protection.

Since 9/11, former Police Commissioner Kelly has informed us that well over 14 attacks on the city of New York were stopped because of the improved intelligence and police work that came out of this reorganization that we passed and put in place in Congress.

Congress established a whole Civil Liberties Oversight Board in 2004 and later strengthened it in 2007. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board was there to ensure that privacy and civil liberties concerns are fully considered when implementing antiterrorism laws, regulations, and executive branch policies.

So the story of 9/11 is not only the suffering, the health challenges, but also the story of how this Congress came together to address the challenges to reorganize, rebuild, change our government, our intelligence system, and put in place many safety measures that have served us well and have built our country into a stronger country and one that is better able to address terrorist attacks.

I am pleased to have with me now JERROLD NADLER from New York. He represents the 9/11 site. It is in the district that he is privileged to represent. He has worked long and hard not only on the 9/11 Caucus, on the 9/11 Commission Report, the laws that we have worked hard to put into law, but also the Zadroga Act, which together we worked on for over a decade, and yet it is now nearing a time when it will expire.

We have to make sure that this bill is reauthorized and that never forget

means just that, that we will never forget, and that means continuing the health care and compensation for those who sacrificed so much to help others. They were there for us. We need to be there for them.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York, JERRY NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, Osama bin Laden orchestrated the deadliest terrorist attack in American history, killing almost 3,000 people immediately and wounding thousands more. The attacks also created an environmental nightmare. Hundreds of tons of contaminants poured onto the streets and canyons of Manhattan and Brooklyn and other areas, northern New Jersey, covering responders and survivors in toxic dust.

In the days following the attack, the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States Government, contrary to ample evidence, insisted that the air in lower Manhattan and Brooklyn was safe to breathe. Thousands of responders remained on the site for search, rescue, and cleanup efforts; and thousands of survivors returned to their homes, but the air was not safe to breathe. The EPA was not telling the truth.

Now, I don't get angry at the government for the first few days, maybe even a week or two, encouraging people to help with the rescue operation when we still thought it might be a rescue operation, but after that 2 weeks, when people were working at the site for weeks and months without proper respiratory protection because the Federal Government was telling them that no protection was necessary because the air was safe to breathe, that was no longer a rescue operation. It was a cleanup operation. There was no one alive to be saved at that point, and people whose lives and health were put in danger at that point were put in danger in vain because the air was not safe to breathe, despite the assurances of the EPA.

Today, more than 30,000 first responders and survivors are sick and in need of special care because of that. It was for those tens of thousands of brave, selfless, and innocent responders and survivors that Congress came together in 2010, after many years of struggle and negotiation, to pass the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act in order to fulfill a moral obligation to, as Lincoln said, "care for him who shall have borne the battle."

Today, the programs are working. Residents of all 50 States and 431 of the 435 congressional districts receive health care through the 9/11 health program. More than 7,800 individuals have been found eligible for compensation from the victim compensation fund.

More than \$490 million has so far been awarded, and new applications are processed every day.

But the Federal Government's duty to support those who have become ill in the aftermath of 9/11 and those whose illnesses have yet to manifest themselves—because we know that many of the illnesses and many of the cancers take years to show themselves, that duty is not done, even as the programs we authorized in 2010 are set to expire.

We must continue to provide health care coverage to the tens of thousands currently enrolled in the 9/11 health program and ensure that no eligible individuals are denied access to the victims compensation fund. Our obligation will carry us far into the future.

Thousands of individuals exposed to the toxic air on 9/11 and in the weeks and days following that—even those who are healthy today we know will face major health issues in the years to come, as latent cancers and other illnesses emerge. For that reason, I am proud to work with Representatives MALONEY and KING and Senators GILLIBRAND and SCHUMER to try to reauthorize these critical programs.

I urge all of our colleagues to work with us in support of a reauthorization and to move this bill through Congress and onto the President's desk as soon as possible.

Just as we stood together, as a Nation, in the days following September 11, 2001, just as we stood strong together in 2010 to create these vital programs, we must join forces again to ensure that the heroes of 9/11 are not abandoned when they need us most. We must pass a new reauthorization to sustain these programs. We must protect the heroes and survivors of 9/11.

There are really two separate moral imperatives here that we must meet. The first is that we must show that the United States takes care of its own. We take care of those who fall in our battles, who are wounded in our struggles. And the attack on 9/11 was not an attack on New York City. It was not an attack on the World Trade Center. It was not against the Port Authority of New York. It was an attack on America, an attack on the United States. The particular victims happened to be located in New York. And we must show that we do not leave people behind on the battlefield, that we take care of those who are wounded on our behalf.

The second moral imperative is that much of the injuries that continue to be felt, much of the illnesses with which people suffer, much of the illnesses which we don't know about but which people will suffer from in the years to come are the direct fault of the Federal Government because of its assurances, contrary to known facts at the time, that the air was safe to breathe, that people should go back to

work, stay working on the pile, and go back to school. We knew better. Many of us said, don't believe the EPA. Don't go back to work. Don't go back to school. This is poison. And it was clear.

And at first, when the EPA was saying this, there was no data to support their safety assurances, and they kept saying it when there was plenty of data to say that the air was not safe to breathe. So because of the false assurances by the Federal Government, many thousands of people relying on those assurances worked without the proper respiratory protection to clean up the site, worked in the area, and helped revive the economy at the expense of their health. And we must, to the extent possible, make them whole today. That is a second moral imperative.

And finally, it must never be said that the United States remembers its heroes and honors its wounded for 13 years and then forgets about them. It has been 13 years. In 2 years, the 9/11 health bill will expire. Let it not be said that we remember for 13 years and take care of people for 15, and that is it. That would be a heck of an epitaph on a moral country.

As we are involved in a war—which it is, unfortunately—against many terrorists across the world, and the President is going to address us on some aspects of that tonight, let us not abandon those who fell, who gave up their health, who continue to suffer on our behalf. It would be wrong. It would be immoral. It would not be worthy of the United States. This is a great and moral Nation. This Congress must show it by reauthorizing the 9/11 bill in a timely fashion.

It is one of the things we must do in response to 9/11. There are many other things we must do, many other things that we have done. But taking care of our own wounded is one of them and one of the attributes of a civilized today.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and so many other important issues.

I would now like to recognize a leader on this issue from New York, Representative of Staten Island and Brooklyn, Congressman GRIMM.

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the gentleman from New York. And I echo the sentiments of my colleagues with the need to reauthorize the Zadroga bill in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise alongside my colleagues in the New York delegation also to honor and commemorate the nearly 3,000 innocent Americans whose lives were cut short in the unspeakable attacks on our Nation 13 years ago. Like so many of my constituents in Staten Island and in Brooklyn, I have images of the most horrific sight that I have ever seen burned into my memory forever.

I will never forget what it was like searching for the survivors in the rubble after both towers of the World Trade Center disintegrated into ash. I will never forget the look in the eyes of the firemen, the police, the construction workers as we worked side-by-side. It was a look of overwhelming despair.

And though our hearts broke at the loss of those taken from us, I am very proud of the fact that Americans soon rallied together. We united around an unshakable truth that the servants of hatred and terror did not strike the greatest Nation on Earth at random but because we embodied the very freedom and liberty that they so despise.

As Senator MCCAIN said on the floor of the Senate the day after the attacks, "Those who unleashed these attacks and those who support them are not our enemies alone. They are the enemies of freedom and independence, of justice and peace. And they wage war on the United States because we are and will remain the principal guarantors of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, in the Arrochar neighborhood of Staten Island lies a beautiful memorial dedicated to some of the 274 Staten Islanders murdered on 9/11, many of whom were first responders and fallen heroes of our beloved FDNY and NYPD, all of whom went above and beyond the call of duty to bring their fellow New Yorkers to safety.

Amidst the pictures and devotions to the fallen lies an inscription: "On September 11, 2001, the World Trade Center was attacked by terrorists. From that hatred, a little piece of heaven evolved here called Angel's Circle."

It reminds us, Mr. Speaker, that from the horror and despair our Nation endured on 9/11 and endures in all of our hearts until this day comes the constant reminder of strength, our pride, and the unwavering heroism at the heart of the American spirit.

May God eternally bless the victims of 9/11. May he bring peace to their loved ones. And may we never, ever forget the sacrifice they bore for our freedom.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for joining us tonight on this Special Order.

Tonight is a time to remember how just 13 years ago, this entire country and even this fractious Congress came together. We were united and determined as I have ever seen this Congress before, strong in our resolve and ready, without question, to put country before self.

□ 1900

We worked together to bring comfort to the afflicted and justice to the terrorists behind this attack. With bipartisan cooperation, we rebuilt Lower Manhattan, the Pentagon, and put in place a memorial in Pennsylvania honoring the heroes on United Flight 93

that was headed towards our Nation's Capital.

There is still much more left to do, and we need to have that same spirit to approach the challenges, such as the crucial Anti-Terrorism Risk Insurance Plan, the TRIA bill, has not been reauthorized yet, and the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010 needs to be reauthorized. This and still much more needs to be done, not some day, but now.

Around 9/11, there is a great deal of rhetoric, but actions speak more than words. Let us come together, and let us get these two important bills and other bills done in a bipartisan way.

We shall never forget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1934. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey the Clifford P. Hansen Federal courthouse to Teton County, Wyoming; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6976. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Kevin J. Kovach, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6977. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral Sean S. Buck, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6978. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; City of Newport News, Virginia [Docket ID:

FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6979. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Harrison County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0004] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6980. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Cass County, Indiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6981. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Montgomery County, Texas [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6982. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Oceana County, Michigan [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6983. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6984. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection-IDEA Data Management Center [CFDA Number: 84.373M.] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6985. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection-IDEA Fiscal Data Center [CDFA Number: 84.373F.] received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities, pursuant to Section 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6987. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a declaration that circumstance exist justifying an authorization pursuant to Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. Section 360bbb-3(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6988. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addi-

tion to Food for Human Consumption; Vitamin D3 [Docket No.: FDA-2012-F-0138] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6989. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Early Warning Reporting, Foreign Defect Reporting, and Motor Vehicle and Equipment Recall Regulations [Docket No.: NHTSA-2012-0068] (RIN: 2127-AK72) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6990. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6991. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6992. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded by the American Institute and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Understandings Reached at the 2005, 2012, and 2013 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings and a 2009 NSG Intersectoral Decision; Additions to the List of NSG Participating Countries [Docket No.: 090130094-3271-01] (RIN: 0694-AD58) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notice of a Determination on Imposition and Waiver of Sanctions under Sections 603 and 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6995. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Corrections, Clarifications, and Movement of Definitions (RIN: 1400-AD64) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6996. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the April 16, 2014 — June 14, 2014 reporting period, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a waiver determination pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6998. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-14-3948); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act for the use of funds to provide non-lethal assistance to the Syrian Opposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7000. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a Drawdown under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to Provide Airlift and Refueling Services to France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7001. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7002. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7003. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of the Navy, transmitting six reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7004. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7005. A letter from the General Counsel and Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7006. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Sufficiency Certification for Washington Convention and Sports Authority's (Trading As Events DC) Projected Revenues and Excess Reserve to Meet Projected Operation and Debt Service Expenditures and Reserve Requirements for Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7007. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Critical Habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Loggerhead Sea Turtle Distinct Population Segment (DPS) and Determination Regarding Critical Habitat for the North Pacific Ocean Loggerhead DPS [Docket No.: 130513467-4401-20] (RIN: 0648-BD27) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7008. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section Criminal Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Resources, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. at the covered facility in Fort Wayne, Indiana, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7010. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting Activities of the Review Panel on Prison Rape in Calendar Year 2013 and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Data Collection Activities for 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7011. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2015-2019, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7012. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Debris Removal: Eligibility of Force Account Labor Straight-Time Costs Under the Public Assistance Program for Hurricane Sandy [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0004] (RIN: 1660-AA75) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7013. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 49.0 to 50.0, West of Harvey Locks, Bank to Bank, Bayou Blue Pontoon Bridge, Lafourche Parish, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0411] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7014. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Treasure Island, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7015. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mantua Creek, Paulsboro, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0710] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7016. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Triathlon, North Coast Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0427] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7017. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Annual Events on the Maumee River, Toledo, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0714] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received

August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7018. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Raccoon Creek, Bridgeport, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0711] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7019. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gay Games 9 Open Water Swim, Lake Erie, Edgewater Park, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0635] received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7020. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0807; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-17888; AD 2014-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7021. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AgustaWestland S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0478; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17902; AD 2014-07-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7022. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Specially Adapted Housing Eligibility for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Beneficiaries (RIN: 2900-AO84) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7023. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2014 annual report; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of September 9, 2014]

The Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4067 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5431. A bill to impose sanctions on foreign financial institutions that engage in certain transactions with the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 5432. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree or doctoral degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5433. A bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434. A bill to suspend the visa waiver program in order for the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the national security risks posed by the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide research, training, and navigator services to youth and young adults on the verge of aging out of the secondary educational system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437. A bill to expand the Pajarita Wilderness and designate the Tumacacori Highlands Wilderness in Coronado National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the Transportation Security Administration from accepting as valid identification an I-862 Notice to Appear form; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441. A bill to amend the Federal charter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to reflect the service of women in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclo-

sure of total corporate tax paid by a corporation in each annual report required to be filed under such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end tax deferrals on profits accumulated offshore and to terminate the deferral of active income of controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the interest deduction for excessive interest of members of financial reporting groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 5445. A bill to impose a temporary moratorium on the closure or consolidation of any mail processing facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5446. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to exempt certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to increase the availability of pesticides for the management of parasitic pests that adversely impact the health of managed pollinator bees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 719. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of AmeriCorps on September 12, 2014; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which

shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 5436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of section 8, of article 1.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 5438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sixteenth Amendment

Congress shall have power to levy, or repeal, taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 5445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 5447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to law and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 259: Mr. PERRY and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 292: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 640: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 647: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 842: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1030: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1263: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1278: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1314: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1507: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1563: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1652: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1653: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1699: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1801: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1812: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1827: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1852: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1915: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2130: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2305: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2350: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2355: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2364: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2450: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2500: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2502: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2504: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2536: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2607: Mr. TERRY and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2651: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2664: Mr. GRIMM and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2770: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2835: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2955: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2981: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3043: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 3150: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3279: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3374: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3482: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 3486: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3489: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 3560: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3673: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3712: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3717: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 3833: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3877: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3899: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3912: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3988: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4013: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 4056: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4119: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 4128: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4136: Mr. COSTA and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4149: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4161: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4190: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4223: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4256: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4259: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4351: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4395: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4432: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4462: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4504: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4510: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 4551: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4552: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4567: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4577: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4580: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4629: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4675: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4679: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4682: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 4716: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4717: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4727: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4790: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4793: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4814: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENYART, Mr. VELA, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4818: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4837: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4852: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4854: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 4857: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 4885: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4920: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4957: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 4960: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4963: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4969: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4977: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4981: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4998: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 5065: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5071: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5083: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 5087: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 5088: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 5110: Mr. HARPER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 5156: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5159: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 5168: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 5182: Mr. HOLT and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 5213: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 5217: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VELA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5219: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5226: Mr. POLIS, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5227: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5228: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 5256: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 5268: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5314: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 5334: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 5364: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5370: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5384: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 5392: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 5403: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LANCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5406: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 5407: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 5409: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 5415: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 5425: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 5430: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.J. Res. 119: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 109: Mr. PETRI.

H. Res. 281: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H. Res. 428: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 456: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 522: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 543: Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 558: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 596: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Res. 620: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H. Res. 668: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 684: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 711: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.

SENATE—Wednesday, September 10, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our rock, our fortress, and our deliverer, You know when we sit and when we rise. Before a word is on our tongue, You know it completely. Guide us and our lawmakers with Your spirit's wisdom, keeping us from paths that lead to ruin. May we seek the wages of righteousness that will bring us life. Make the mouths of our Senators fountains of life that will bring peace and stability to our world. Give us all a reverence for You that will enable us to serve Your purposes for our lives in this generation.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,

President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Repub-

lican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res 19 postcloture. That is the legislation of the constitutional amendment to allow us to set the campaign spending limits and not have the battle with the billionaires trying to buy America. At 2 p.m. all postcloture time will be considered expired and the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion to proceed. I expect this vote to be done by voice.

Shortly after 2 p.m. we expect a roll-call vote relative to the paycheck fairness bill. That legislation deals with, for example, my daughter doing the exact same work as her male counterpart. She should make the same amount of money. That is what this legislation is all about. We tried to move forward on it once before and we were blocked by the Republicans. We will see what happens again today. It seems fair that my daughter should make the same amount of money for doing the same work as her male counterpart.

SUPPORTING OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I had the opportunity and good fortune to be invited to the White House with Speaker BOEHNER, Leader PELOSI, and Leader MCCONNELL. We spent more than an hour with the President and Vice President talking about what is going on in the world.

We do know what is going on in the world separate and apart from that meeting at the White House. There is a murderous, vile terrorist group that is taking over parts of Iraq and is trying to move into other parts of the world in the Middle East. Their brutality is unprecedented, especially unprecedented in that they want to advertise how vile they are. They are so vicious, going after everyone—civilians, women, children—trying to eliminate anyone who they think disagrees with them. They have targeted minorities, they have targeted Jews, Christians, and anyone whom they disagree with—religious minorities. We saw that. We had thousands and thousands of ancient religious minorities trapped on a mountain by these vicious, vile people.

Of course, they are after any American. The two innocent journalists who were out just covering the news were beheaded and they advertised the beheadings. The Islamic State or ISIS—whatever we want to call them—will be stopped. They must be stopped and they need to be destroyed and they will be destroyed.

President Obama has taken decisive action during the month of August to protect Americans and help prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. Yesterday the President described his initiative to take on this terrorist group as we move forward, and I support him. President Obama has made it clear it is going to take decisive action to destroy the Islamic State through the use of air strikes and drones. This is a smart, strategic, and effective approach and I support it.

But there are people in Congress who are taking advice from Dick Cheney. He was here yesterday. I think they better be very careful of the advice they take from Dick Cheney. Dick Cheney is more responsible than anyone else for the worst foreign policy decision in the history of the country, the invasion of Iraq. Almost 6,000 dead Americans and tens of thousands wounded, thousands and thousands grievously wounded. Our fighting men and women did a yeoman's job. They made us proud. But was that war necessary? In hindsight, it appears to me it wasn't. Not only have we lost thousands of American lives, it has destabilized the whole Middle East and hundreds of thousands—hundreds of thousands—hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed. They are now gone.

But there are some pushing hard in Congress to authorize use of military force right now—right now. Dick Cheney was here yesterday. I guess that is whom they are following. But wouldn't it be a good idea for us to stand back a little bit and see what the President of the United States has to say tonight? He is addressing the Nation. Let's allow him to speak to our country, to our fellow citizens, and lay out his plan.

It is absolutely critical that the American people and Congress hear directly from the President of the United States.

In the Senate we are going to have an all-Senators briefing tomorrow afternoon. The administration will come to one of our classified rooms in the Capitol complex and lay out to us in detail what is going on that is not in the news. So every Member of this body will have a chance to get as much information as possible. The President speaks tonight. Tomorrow afternoon there is a briefing.

It is clear—the President has said so publicly, his administration has said so publicly, and the officials who work directly with the White House—he is doing his utmost. He just returned from Europe and much of the time that

was spent there in the NATO conference was about what they are going to do to go after this evil in the Middle East, this ISIS group. He is doing his utmost to build a robust international coalition including the Sunni Arab States.

For this mission to be successful, of course, Sunni Arab countries must play a role and they will do that. That is being worked on as we speak.

It is clear to me that we need to train and equip Syrian rebels and other groups in the Middle East that need some help. It is called title 10 authority. The rebels have tried to get it from us and they should get it. That is our way of building an international coalition. Congress should do that. The Republicans are worried about money. There is money to do that. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee is on the floor and he can certainly vouch for that. It would give authority for the President to help equip these rebels.

Going it alone is not going to work. We must have the support of the international community if we are to rid the world of ISIS. We know France—I at least believe that—has stepped forward, I believe Great Britain has stepped forward, I understand Poland is part of the coalition that has stepped forward, and there are many other countries the President met with in Europe just a few days ago. We need to build a coalition, and that is what he is doing, rather than declaring war today. Title 10 authority is something we need.

I repeat. Going it alone will not suffice. I also believe that as Commander in Chief the President has the authority he needs now to act against ISIS. I believe the vast majority of the Members of Congress agree with that. Now it is critical we support our Commander in Chief as he takes this decisive action. I am amazed—amazed—that some Members of Congress want to rush to war, because that is what they are talking about is a war. How did that work out for us last time? Not so well. The Bush-Cheney strategy of rushing into conflict didn't work then and it will not work now. Let's be cautious and let's be deliberate.

I repeat. Former Vice President Cheney was here yesterday giving the Republicans a pep talk. He gave them advice on foreign policy. Please—please—taking advice from Dick Cheney on foreign policy, that is a terrifying prospect. We should be learning from our past mistakes, not repeating them.

Air strikes and strategic use of drones and of course covert action are the most effective ways to take out ISIS without committing American troops, placing troops in harm's way. So I support President Obama's decision not to send in ground troops. That is not an option for the American people. I can guarantee everyone that within the sound of my voice.

But now that the Republicans are taking advice from Dick Cheney on foreign policy, I am concerned they once again will rush to commit U.S. troops to a ground war in the Middle East when we could accomplish the mission in a more strategic way.

I say to Democrats and Republicans, let's destroy these despicable terrorists, but let's do it the right way this time. The President knows and the American people know we have to take decisive action. The President knows how to destroy terrorists and their organization. Osama bin Laden is proof of that.

Let's give the President of the United States the time to do this the right way. Troops are out there defending us as we speak. They are not Democrats. They are not Republicans. They are not Independents. They are fighting for us to protect Americans. We need committed, decisive action to stop ISIS.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

MIDDLE EAST STRATEGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Last month I got to spend a lot of time with the people of Kentucky, and since there has been no shortage of issues to keep people up at night over the past few months, I got a lot of straight talk on a lot of topics. I heard a lot about the crisis at the border, about lost health care plans, the chronic shortage of good jobs, stagnant wages, even Ebola, the spread of which is a threat that must be taken seriously.

Yet one issue that kept coming up is America's role in the world and the growing sense that some in Washington are more or less content to let others shape our destiny for us. For many that concern was crystallized when they witnessed the barbaric execution of an American citizen by an ISIL terrorist and the halting reaction to it by a President who has yet to find his footing when it comes to dealing with this group that clearly has the will, the means, and the sanctuary it needs to do more.

Last week the White House announced that the President plans to explain the nature of the threat ISIL poses in a speech to the American people tonight. Well, after spending a month talking with folks in Kentucky, it is pretty clear—to me, at least—that the American people fully appreciate the nature of this threat. After the beatings of two American citizens, they don't want an explanation of what is happening, they want a plan. They want some Presidential leadership.

I hope the President lays out a credible plan to defeat ISIL. I hope he out-

lines the steps he intends to take beyond simply the defense of Baghdad, Erbil, Sinjar, and Amerli, and what legal authorities and resources he thinks are required to execute a successful campaign against ISIL. But the fact is the rise of ISIL is not an isolated failure. The spread of ISIL occurred in a particular context, and if we hope to defeat this threat, we need to come to terms with that now.

So before speaking with a little more specificity about ISIL and the ongoing threat of global terrorism, I would like to briefly restate my concerns about the consequences of the President's foreign policy, as I warned a few months ago, because ISIL's military advance across Syria and Iraq carries a much larger lesson—a lesson that should prompt the President to reconsider and revise his overall national security policy and better prepare the country and our military to confront the threats that will survive his time in office.

First, it is important to note a few of the consistent objectives that have always characterized this President's national security policy: drawing down our conventional and nuclear forces, withdrawing from Iraq and Afghanistan, and placing a greater reliance upon international organizations and diplomacy.

As I have noted on other occasions, I have serious differences with the President over this approach. In my view, we have a duty as a superpower without imperialistic aims to help maintain international order and balance of power, and that international order is maintained by American military might. Indeed, American military might is its backbone. But that is not a view this President seems to share.

The defining bookends to the President's approach were the Executive orders signed his first week in office which included the declaration that Guantanamo would be closed within a year without any plan on what to do with its detainees and the Executive orders that ended the CIA's detention and interrogation programs at the same time. In May of this year the President also announced that all of our combat forces would be withdrawn from Afghanistan by the end of this term whether or not the Taliban is successful in capturing parts of Afghanistan, whether or not Al Qaeda's senior leadership has found a more permissive environment in the tribal areas of Pakistan, and whether or not Al Qaeda has been driven from Afghanistan.

All of this underscores something I have been suggesting for some time—that the President is a rather reluctant Commander in Chief—because between those two bookends much has occurred to undermine our Nation's national security. Yet, tragically, the President has not adapted accordingly.

We have seen the failure to negotiate a status of forces agreement with Iraq

that would have allowed for a residual military force and likely prevented the assault by the Islamic State of Syria and the Levant.

We have seen how the President's inability to see Russia and China as the dissatisfied regional powers they are, intent on increasing their spheres of influence, has exposed our own allies to new risk. The failed reset with Russia and the President's commitment to a world without nuclear weapons led him to hastily sign an arms treaty with Russia that did nothing to substantially reduce its nuclear stockpile or its tactical nuclear weapons. And, of course, Russia was undeterred in its assault upon Ukraine.

The President announced a strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific without any real plan to fund it. This failure to invest in the kinds of naval, air, and Marine Corps forces we will need to maintain our dominance in this region in the years to come could have tragic consequences down the road.

Of course, we have all seen how eager the President was to declare an end to the war on terror, but as the President was focused on unwinding or reversing past policies through Executive order, the threat from Al Qaeda and affiliated groups only metastasized. Uprisings in north Africa and the broader Middle East resulted in additional ungoverned space in Syria, Libya, Egypt, and Yemen. There were prison breaks in Iraq, Pakistan, and Libya, and the release of hundreds of prisoners in Egypt. Terrorists also escaped from prisons in Yemen—a country that is no more ready to detain the terrorists at Guantanamo today than they were back in 2009.

The President's response to all of this has been to draw down our conventional forces and capabilities and to deploy special operations forces in economy-of-force train-and-assist missions across the globe. Speaking at West Point in May, he pointed to a network of partnerships from South Asia to the Sahel to be funded by a \$5 billion counterterrorism partnership fund for which Congress has yet to receive a viable plan. In those cases where indigenous forces prove insufficient and a need for direct action actually arises, the President announced his intent to resort to the use of armed, unmanned aerial vehicles for strikes, as has been done in Yemen and Somalia. By deploying special operations forces, the President hoped to manage the diffuse threat posed by Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, Boko Haram, terrorist networks inside of Libya that now threaten Egypt, the al-Nusrah front, the Taliban, ISIL, and other terrorist groups.

But as the nature of terrorist insurgencies has evolved, the President sees no need to reverse the harmful damage of the defense cuts he insisted upon, to rebuild our conventional and

nuclear forces or to accept that leaving behind residual forces in Iraq and Afghanistan is an effective means by which to preserve the strategic gains we have made over the years through tremendous sacrifice.

The truth is that the threat of some of these al Qaeda affiliates, associated groups, or independent terrorist organizations has simply outpaced the President's economy-of-force concept. In some cases the host nation's military, which we have trained and equipped, has proven to be inadequate to defeat the insurgency in question, as is the case with AQAP, the Taliban, or ISIL. In some cases the insurgency does not affiliate itself with al Qaeda or builds upon territorial gains before aspiring to attack the U.S. homeland.

The growth, advance, and evolution of ISIL presents a turning point for the President. Will the fall of Anbar Province and the threat posed by ISIL to Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey lead to a reconsideration of his entire national security policy, the kind I have alluded to here and elsewhere, or will the President confine himself within the bookends of shortsighted national security policies that were originally conceived on the campaign trail back in 2008?

If prior events or arguments left the President unpersuaded, the emergence and recent actions of ISIL should convince him that the time has come to revisit his prior assumptions and rethink his approach. ISIL is large and lethal, and its rapid growth has outpaced the capacity of either the Peshmerga, the Iraqi security forces, or the moderate Syrian opposition to contain it. Ominously, ISIL has developed expertise in small-unit infantry tactics, the use of insurgent tactics, and as a terrorist organization. As a result of oil sales, ransoms, bank robberies, and donations, it is also well funded.

We need a plan, and we need it now. The President has now declared that defeating ISIL is his objective, and that is a very good start. But Americans don't want a lecture, they want a plan—a credible, comprehensive plan to deal with this menace that clearly wants to harm us here at home and is only becoming stronger by the day.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Dempsey has said that defeating ISIL will require military action within Syria, and the President has now declared that defeating ISIL is his objective. Tonight the President needs to set forth the military strategy and the means required to defeat ISIL and to link those actions to any additional authorization and appropriations he would like to see from Congress. If the President develops a regional strategy, builds a combat-effective military coalition, and explains how his strategy will lead to the defeat of ISIL, I believe he will have signifi-

cant congressional support. This is no small matter. If Congress is asked to support a strategy, it needs to be a strategy that is designed to succeed and not a mere restatement of current policy which we know is insufficient to the task.

The President must seize this opportunity to lead. This is not the time to shirk or put off his solemn responsibilities as Commander in Chief because passing off this threat to his successor would not only be irresponsible, it would increase the threat ISIL poses to Americans by enabling it to secure its gains within Iraq and Syria. In my view, ISIL's campaign across Syria and Iraq presents the President with an opportunity. It is an opportunity to reconsider his failed national security policy.

The President and his advisers may have convinced themselves of their standard straw man argument that anyone who disagrees with this failed approach is bent on serial occupations or bent on invasions, but that is really a false choice, and it is certainly not a plan.

It is time to put the straw man aside and to realize the fight is not with his critics here at home, it is with ISIL. That is why this morning I am calling on the President to present us with a credible plan the American people have been waiting for, explain our military objectives, and rally public support for accomplishing them. That is what the Commander in Chief should be doing at a moment such as this.

If the threat from ISIL demands the commitment of American resources and the risk of American life, the President has a duty to explain that to the Nation and Congress this evening even if it doesn't conform with the tidy vision of world affairs he outlined as a candidate 6 years ago. If his strategy is little more than a restatement of the current policies, if all he plans to do is manage this threat and pass it off to his successor, well, we need to know that too because Americans are worried and they are anxious. They want and deserve the truth. Most of all, they want a plan, and that is what I am hoping for tonight.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL MATTHIAS N. HANSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to mourn the loss of a U.S. marine and a Kentuckian from the hometown of Abraham Lincoln. LCpl Matthias N. Hanson hailed from Lincoln's birthplace of Hodgenville, KY, and was killed on February 21, 2010, of wounds suffered as a result of conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. He was 20 years old.

For his service in uniform, Lance Corporal Hanson received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the National Defense Service

Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Purple Heart.

"Matt's our hero because of how he lived," says the Reverend Norm Brock, who spoke at Matt's memorial service. "Matt didn't miss life. He lived life."

Service was a proud tradition in Matt's family. His father Lowell R. Hanson, Jr., served in the Army. One of Matt's brothers is currently Active Duty Army, while the other is in the Army Reserve. Matt himself was born in Germany on a military base. As Mary Huff, Matt's mom, puts it: Matt "had to go rogue and join the Marines."

Matt had a strong work ethic in high school says his father Lowell:

He used to get up at 4:00 in the morning to milk cows on a nearby farm, then go to school, then onto football practice, and back to work on the farm. Other people noticed and were impressed by his work ethic, and I was proud of him. He was determined that when he got old enough, he would join the Marines and serve his country.

Growing up, Matt was known for his blue eyes and sneaky smile, and he had a way of talking himself out of anything.

He had an easygoing manner and a lust for life. "He was quiet, a trickster and a charmer," says his mother. But ultimately, he was a country boy who wanted to do right by his country. Matt was a country music fan who particularly liked the song "Way Out Here" by Josh Thompson. He was "funny, energetic, really outgoing," says family friend Emily Johnson. "He could make anyone laugh. He had the brightest blue eyes ever. That's what we'll remember him as."

Matt graduated from LaRue County High School in Hodgenville, where he was a member of the football team and the Student Technology Association. Next to his picture in the school yearbook he put the following quote: "Life moves pretty fast. If you don't look around and pay attention, you could miss it."

Soon after graduation he enlisted in the Marine Corps in the spring of 2008. "He was very proud of what he had done when he signed up to go to the Marines," remembers LaRue County High School football coach and assistant principal Rodney Armes. "He got his hair cut short and he was a Marine from the day he signed up."

Matt was trained as a rifleman and assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force based in Camp Lejeune, NC. He was deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in January of 2010. Matt played a key role in a crucial multiday battle in Afghanistan just days before his death in mid-February 2010. Matt's platoon came under fire from Taliban forces in the town of Marjah. Matt walked up, under air cover, to the fortified bunker where the enemy fire was coming from and fired a

grenade launcher into the bunker with great poise and accuracy, killing the enemy forces. "The battle was over," said Matt's father, thanks to his bravery. "He played a critical role," says Capt. Gordon Emmanuel, Matt's platoon commander. "Anytime he shot he was on impact. Marines were cheering with his shots."

Matt's father was told by Matt's platoon sergeant and by Captain Emmanuel that Camp Hanson, once the biggest U.S. position in Marjah and well known to any Marine who has served in the area, was established at that site in Matt's honor because of his actions.

"The last time I saw [Matt] was on Christmas Eve 2009," said Matt's father. "He hugged me around the neck and said: Daddy, don't worry about me. Everybody dies. Not everybody has Jesus. Not everybody gets to be a Marine."

We are thinking of Matt's family as I recount his life for my Senate colleagues today. They include Matt's mother and stepfather Mary and Larry Huff; his father and stepmother Lowell R. Hanson, Jr., and Cynthia Hanson; his siblings Megan, Samantha, Erika, Lowell, and Brendan; his grandparents; and many other beloved family members and friends.

Matt was buried with full military honors in Hodgenville. The town that is the birthplace of one of America's greatest patriots, Abraham Lincoln, is also a fitting resting place for this brave young man and Marine. The Commonwealth of Kentucky will never forget the life and service of LCpl Matthias N. Hanson or his ultimate sacrifice given freely to his country. It is thanks to men like him that our Nation is free.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 471, S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask that I be allowed to proceed as in morning business for up to 4 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIL

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I believe the President will lay out a strong approach against ISIL tonight. That approach will include going after them wherever they are located, including Syria. The President and Secretary Kerry are making every effort to help lead a broadly based coalition which is so critically important to avoid the consequences of a Western go-it-alone approach which was mistakenly used when we invaded Iraq.

This President, like all Presidents, will welcome bipartisan Congressional support, even though he has the authority in this situation to act without explicit Congressional authority. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will lay aside partisan attacks and make a true effort to find a way to take on ISIL in a united manner. A strong bipartisan approach here in the United States will help the President and Secretary Kerry attain the explicit open support of a broad cross section of this world, including Arab and Muslim countries.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our constitutional amendment. I think we have had a very good debate this week—an overdue debate. I want to thank my colleagues for coming to the floor and for speaking out. But there have also been many misrepresentations by the other side about what our constitutional amendment would do.

Michael Keegan, the President of People for the American Way, wrote a piece in the Huffington Post yesterday. He summed up the debate from the other side of the aisle quite well. He said, "a good rule of thumb in politics is that the scarier someone sounds, the more you should doubt what they're saying."

We heard some scary things in the last couple of days. Lorne Michaels is going to jail. And he is sharing a cell with a little old lady who put up a \$5 political yard sign. Books and movies are banned. The NAACP, Sierra Club, and moveon.org have been prohibited from speaking about politics—scary stuff but none of it is true.

Erwin Chemerinsky, a great constitutional scholar, recently wrote an op-ed in the Hill, rebutting many of the claims we have heard. He wrote:

The amendment—

He is talking about our constitutional amendment here.

—gives no authority to the government to ban or limit anyone's speech. It provides the government no power to "muzzle" messages

the government doesn't like. It does not change in any way the longstanding First Amendment principle that the government cannot restrict speech based on the content of the message or the views expressed. The amendment would do no more than allow the government to regulate spending in election campaigns.

That is the heart of what we are doing, regulating spending—out-of-control spending—in election campaigns, dark money, big interests weighing in in an unprecedented way.

Professor Chemerinsky is right. S.J. Res. 19 reaffirms the First Amendment principle of equality. It will undo the damage done by the Court over the years, most recently with *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* that said: Those with the most money have the most free speech. Nothing in the amendment would permit the arrest of anyone for engaging in political speech. It would not allow books or movies to be banned.

All the amendment does is restore to Congress and the States the power to set reasonable limits—reasonable limits—on campaign contributions and expenditures, a traditional power that the Court has stripped from us. The amendment returns the First Amendment to its pre-Buckley interpretation when money and speech were not the same thing.

Prior to *Buckley*, we did not see the kind of legislation against free speech that my Republican colleagues envision, offering extreme examples of laws Congress could pass. That is one way to argue against this amendment. But it ignores the long history of laws Congress did pass to protect the voices of individual voters.

These reforms were not radical. They were narrowly tailored responses to restore America's faith in the political system after a lack of regulations led to scandals and corruption. Let's not forget that any law must pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. That is a significant check against any radical legislation getting passed or these days, against almost any legislation getting passed.

Critics also fail to acknowledge something else. Our amendment does not give Congress free reign to pass any and all campaign finance laws. When the Court interprets any amendment to the Constitution, it reads in a reasonableness requirement. This means that even if Congress did abuse its authority and passed the extreme laws that conservatives suggest, they could still be overturned as unreasonable.

But more importantly, Members of Congress who pass extreme laws can be held accountable by their constituents. The same cannot be said for Supreme Court justices willing to strike down sensible regulations by a narrow majority.

We also heard a quote from the late Senator Ted Kennedy. Senator Ken-

nedy did oppose a similar amendment in 1997 and 2001. The truth is, we do not know if he would oppose the amendment today.

Citizens United and *McCutcheon* changed the landscape and changed it dramatically. Senator Kennedy was a champion for the underprivileged throughout his career—in civil rights, education, health care, the minimum wage. He stood up for those who did not have a voice, the very people who are harmed by most of these misguided Supreme Court decisions.

We do know some of Senator Kennedy's colleagues who also opposed the amendment in the past are still here in the Senate. They have reconsidered. Chairman LEAHY, Senator DURBIN, the chairman of the Constitution subcommittee. Thoughtful Senators who felt an amendment was unnecessary in the past now see that it is the only way to fix a broken system.

Changing the Constitution is a big step not to be taken lightly. In the *Federalist Paper No. 49*, James Madison argued the Constitution should be amended only on "great and extraordinary occasions." I agree. I also believe we have reached one of those occasions.

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the op-eds I referenced by Michael Keegan and Erwin Chemerinsky be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huffington Post, Sept. 9, 2014]

THE FIRST AMENDMENT ACCORDING TO MITCH MCCONNELL

(By Michael Keegan)

Have you heard that Senate Democrats are working this week to repeal free speech? I did, yesterday morning, from Mitch McConnell.

Have you heard that Democrats are going to go out and "muzzle" pastors who criticize them in the pulpit?

We did, from Ted Cruz.

Did you hear that Democrats are going to shut down conservative activists and then "brainwash the next generation into believing that this is how it should be"?

We did, last month, from the Family Research Council's Tony Perkins.

A good rule of thumb in politics is that the scarier someone sounds, the more you should doubt what they're saying. Another good rule in politics is not to trust what Mitch McConnell says about money in politics.

Because, yes, that's what we're talking about here. Not a secret new Orwellian regime. Not a new anti-pastor task force. What we're talking about is simply limiting the amount of money that corporations and wealthy individuals can spend to influence our elections.

This week, the Senate is debating a constitutional amendment that would overturn recent Supreme Court decisions that have paved the way for an explosion of big money in politics. In those decisions, including *Citizens United* and this year's *McCutcheon*, the Supreme Court radically redefined the First Amendment to allow corporations and the

wealthy to drown out the speech of everyday Americans with nearly unlimited political spending. The Democracy for All amendment would restore to Congress and the states the power to impose reasonable restrictions on money in politics, just as they had before the Supreme Court started to dismantle campaign finance laws.

So, what are Mitch McConnell and Ted Cruz so scared of?

In fact, it wasn't that long ago that Mitch McConnell supported the very laws that he is now dead-set on blocking. Back in 1987, McConnell said he would support a constitutional amendment to allow Congress to regulate independent expenditures in elections—just as the Democracy for All amendment would. And then he introduced that very constitutional amendment. Either McConnell has dramatically changed his mind regarding what constitutes a threat to the First Amendment, or he's motivated by something more cynical.

So, if Mitch McConnell doesn't actually think that limiting the amount of money that wealthy interests can spend on elections is a violation of the First Amendment, what is he up to? Could it be that he now finds it more useful to court the dollars of major donors than the votes of his constituents?

Washington is the only place where campaign finance reform is a partisan issue. A poll this summer found that 73 percent of voters support a constitutional amendment to get big money out of politics. Americans know that our First Amendment is about protecting the speech of citizens, not the interests of wealthy campaign donors.

Faced with a large, bipartisan grassroots movement that threatens their big-spending friends, the only arguments that Mitch McConnell and Ted Cruz have left are wild accusations, flat-out falsehoods, and outlandish interpretations of the Bill of Rights.

[From thehill.com, July 3, 2014]

TED CRUZ SHOULD BE ASHAMED

(By Erwin Chemerinsky)

Reasonable people can disagree on whether it would be good to amend the Constitution to overcome the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, but Sen. Ted Cruz's (R-Texas) false claims about the proposed amendment have no place in an informed debate. In a series of speeches and writings, Cruz has lied about what the amendment would do. Surely we can and must expect more from our elected officials.

The occasion for Cruz's wrath is a proposed constitutional amendment concerning campaign finance that is now being considered in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The amendment's purpose is to overturn the Supreme Court's recent decisions that have limited the ability of Congress and state governments to regulate campaign spending.

In *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, in 2010, the Court, 5-4, declared unconstitutional a provision of federal law and held that corporations have the right to spend unlimited amounts of money in independent expenditures in election campaigns. This year, in *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission*, again by a 5-4 margin, the Court held unconstitutional another provision of federal law that regulated the total amount that a person could contribute to candidates or political parties in a two-year period. As Justice Breyer lamented in his dissent, these cases "eviscerate" federal campaign finance law.

The proposed constitutional amendment seeks to restore the power of Congress and

the states to enact laws of the sort that the Court declared unconstitutional in these cases. These laws existed without problems for many years until the Supreme Court declared them unconstitutional. In fact, seven years before *Citizens United*, the Supreme Court upheld the very provision that it invalidated in that case.

The proposed constitutional amendment, in its key provision, simply would say: "To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections." Another provision would make clear that the government can limit campaign spending by corporations.

It is impossible to reconcile this language with Cruz's claims about it. In a statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee, Cruz declared: "This amendment here today, if adopted, would repeal the free speech protections of the First Amendment. . . . This amendment, if adopted, would give Congress absolute authority to regulate the political speech of every single American, with no limitations whatsoever."

Similarly, in an op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal*, Cruz said, the amendment "gives Congress power to regulate—and ban—speech by everybody." In remarks at the Family Research Council, Cruz declared: "What it [the proposed amendment] says is that politicians in Washington have unlimited constitutional authority to muzzle each and every one of you if you're saying things that government finds inconvenient."

The amendment does nothing of the sort. It gives no authority to the government to ban or limit anyone's speech. It provides the government no power to "muzzle" messages the government doesn't like. It does not change in any way the long-standing First Amendment principle that the government cannot restrict speech based on the content of the message or the views expressed. The amendment would do no more than allow the government to regulate spending in election campaigns.

Cruz's repeat statements are more than just political hyperbole. They are false assertions intended to scare people into opposing the proposed constitutional amendment.

In a statement before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Cruz said, "Any politician who put his or her name to an amendment taking away the free speech rights of every American, in my view, should be embarrassed." But it is Cruz who should be embarrassed by his false assertions. Ted Cruz is a lawyer who had a very distinguished career in government and private practice. I have debated him on several occasions and know that he is a person of great intelligence. He knows exactly what the proposed amendment would do and yet has chosen to vilify it by misrepresenting it.

Whether it is desirable to try and amend the Constitution to allow campaign finance regulations is the question to be debated. In this, and all debates, we should expect and demand honesty from our elected officials. Cruz, in his statements about the proposed campaign finance amendment, is far below the most minimal standards of honesty.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, most Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the American people are awaiting the President's speech this evening. It is a critically important speech about America's national security from our Commander in Chief. It is going to address the horror of terrorism in the Middle East and particularly the Islamic state, a terrorist group like few others—maybe like none we have ever seen.

This Islamic state, known as ISIS or ISIL, has been moving in full force in Syria and in Iraq. They are different than other extremist terrorist groups because they take and hold territory. That has not been seen in the past. They are also hell-bent on establishing resources and ongoing visible treasury. Some say they generate \$1 million a day in revenues from the oil production they are in charge of. They swoop into a city and take over the banks, raiding them of all the money they can get their hands on.

In addition, they are engaged in some of the most barbaric and depraved tactics we have seen. The beheading of two Americans comes to mind instantly. It is a heartbreaking situation for their families and friends but an enraging situation for all of America, to think that innocent journalists would be subjected to such horrific treatment. And they threaten to do more. It isn't just Americans who are in their sights. They have targeted minorities. They have targeted those who are struggling in Iraq to survive, and they are prepared to literally force them into starvation or death. It is a harrowing situation. To think that some 11,000 or 12,000 of these ISIS terrorists have wreaked such havoc on the country of Iraq and the neighboring country of Syria really is a wakeup call for America.

The President is going to speak to the situation this evening. We, of course, want him to lay out the threat, and he will. We want him to spell out why this threat is important to the security and the future of the United States. I am certain he will. I want him to speak as well to our approach and how we are going to deal with this threat, and I believe he will, in some detail. I want to know who else is on our side in this effort as we move forward, what the scope of our activities will be, and the limitations of that scope of activities. The duration and

the justification, the constitutionality and the legality are all critical issues, and we await the words of the President of the United States.

Most of us have held back at this point, waiting for the President's statement, but some have not. Some have already come to the floor of the Senate this morning to criticize the President when it comes to this issue of foreign policy. That is unfortunate. I think the President is entitled to at least present his case this evening before people come to the floor and condemn the President's foreign policy. We need to hear from the President what his plan is. And my hope is—and it would be nothing short of a political miracle in Washington, DC—that there would actually be bipartisan support for a plan emerging from the President's statement tonight.

Some of us may have our differences with some part of it. That is natural. That is our responsibility in the legislative branch of our government. But we should try to find common ground where we can. When America speaks in unity, with one voice, with one determined effort, that is when we are strongest.

There was a time in the history of this country—and I have lived through part of it—when there would be vigorous debates on foreign policy on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, leading up to a vote on a critical question such as the invasion of a country or a war. Even after a contentious and sometimes partisan debate, without fail—without fail—there would be bipartisan support for the emerging policy.

People remember the war in Kuwait. I was one who voted against it. Do my colleagues know there was offered on the floor of the House immediately after the vote in favor of the President's policy a bipartisan resolution supporting the President's policy? That was considered the natural, reasonable thing to do.

We can look back to the war in Iraq. Go back to October 11, 2002. On the floor of the Senate we had a debate that ended in a vote on the invasion of Iraq. It is one of those moments in my career I will never forget because 23 of us voted no, including 1 Republican, Lincoln Chafee, and 23 Democrats. We voted no on the invasion of Iraq.

It wasn't long thereafter, though, that we were presented with appropriations bills to fund the military effort in Iraq. I voted for them. The reason I voted for those appropriations is pretty obvious. If it were my son, my daughter, my spouse fighting in Iraq, I would want them to have every resource necessary to accomplish their mission and come home safely.

So there was a bipartisan consensus, even though there was a difference in the formulation of foreign policy. I hope that is what emerges tonight. I

hope once the President has stepped forward and said that this is a plan, let us work together toward that plan, that we will see some bipartisanship emerging in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

We can have our differences and questions, but at the end of the day we need to come together as a nation. This horrible terrorist group, which has beheaded two innocent Americans and is absolutely depraved in its conduct, is going to continue. It is going to create chaos in Iraq. It is going to destabilize that country, and it is going to endanger not only innocent people but it is going to endanger innocent Americans. Let's listen carefully to what the President has to say.

This morning the majority leader HARRY REID of Nevada came to the floor and talked about a chance occurrence yesterday. Who should return to the Halls of the Capitol yesterday? Former Vice President Richard Cheney. What a moment for him to return to Washington as we debate foreign policy. We remember the foreign policy of Vice President Cheney and others. We know the price we paid for what turned out to be some very questionable, if not wrong, decisions.

At the end of the day in Iraq, 4,476 Americans lost their lives; 30,000 came home with serious injuries. We added \$1 trillion to our national debt to pay for it.

It was Vice President Cheney's idea that the United States would be strong and muscular after the 9/11 attack, and he picked Iraq as a target. We would take out Saddam Hussein. The purported weapons of mass destruction never existed, never were found, but we invaded nevertheless. Now comes former Vice President Cheney again to inspire his troops in terms of this conflict.

I hope not only Democrats but Republicans as well will think twice about that advice. We have listened to this man's counsel before, and the world did not turn out to be the place he promised it would be.

Let us listen carefully, objectively, and honestly to the President tonight. Let us try to find some common ground as Americans where we can stand together against this terrorist threat.

The President has made it clear to all of us he is not going to be sending ground troops into this Iraq situation. We want to be careful that we don't engage ourselves in a long-term war involving the vulnerability of our troops for a long period of time, so I was disappointed with some of the statements made on the floor this morning on the other side.

I hope Americans will listen carefully, as I will tonight, to the President.

VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS ENHANCEMENT ACT

Tomorrow marks the 13th anniversary of 9/11. Our thoughts turn to the

Americans we lost that day and to the men and women who showed such heroism above and beyond the call of duty. Firefighters, police, first responders, and Americans from all walks of life showed on that day that although terrorists might try to destroy our way of life, they cannot keep us down. Americans do stand together when we are threatened.

Since that day, to support the global war on terror, the Defense Department says about 2.5 million Americans—members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and related National Guard units—have been deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq wars. Of those, more than one-third were deployed at least one time. More than 11,000 lost their lives in those two wars.

There are ways we can show our gratitude and help our veterans, including service veterans from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, now that they are home.

Tomorrow I am introducing, along with Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut, the Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act. It will allow veterans who own small businesses to participate in GSA's excess Federal property program. This program makes items that the Federal agencies no longer need available to nonprofits and other groups that have a justifiable need for the property. We are talking about everything from vehicles to computers, office furniture, tools, and even heavy construction equipment. Participants in the program can claim the items for their businesses if they demonstrate a justifiable need for the property and they agree to pay for shipping and handling so there is no expense to the Federal Government.

By keeping their equipment overhead low, in this way the small businesses can grow their businesses. If unclaimed, the Federal property has to be disposed of by our government as excess property—and that costs money. The items have to be organized into one physical location, then photographed, catalogued, and ultimately auctioned off to scrap dealers who pay pennies on the dollar.

The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, which helps facilitate the GSA's excess Federal property program, estimates that taking surplus property off the Federal Government's hands, pairing it with those who could use it, saved the United States \$200 million last year alone.

Minority-owned small businesses participate in this program now and have since 1999. My bill would extend that opportunity to veteran-owned small businesses as well.

Veterans throughout Illinois have contacted me to let me know how the surplus property program might help their small businesses.

Jim Ward, for example, a retired Army veteran, owns a popular tile

business in Mount Sterling, in west central Illinois. His small business could benefit from maintenance equipment typically found in the Federal surplus program. Tile saws and cutters, kneepads, mixers, scrapers, trowels, and other hand tools are all items that appear from time to time in the program. He says he doesn't need state-of-the-art equipment. Getting his hands on something that works would be a big help to his veteran-owned business.

Then there is veteran Jim Sodaro. He owns a bar and a snow removal business in Springfield, IL. There are quite a few surplus items that could help him operate his business and free up resources for employees and overhead. Jim says he needs things such as tables, brooms, paint, and hand tools to run his bar. His snow removal business needs a pickup truck and other vehicles.

We heard from Jason Harris, a Marine Corps veteran who runs a popular landscaping business in Carbondale, IL. Shawnee Landscaping designs and installs patios, fencing, and retaining walls for gardens and porches. Mr. Harris would benefit from Federal surplus equipment too: Bobcats, tractors and loaders, hand tools and office supplies.

Tom Lomelino is a retired Army veteran and owner of the Lomelino Sign Company in Jacksonville, IL. Mr. Lomelino makes and installs advertising signs. He can use a bucket truck, a backhoe, or other equipment needed for installation and maintenance.

All of these Illinois veterans have a legitimate need for items that otherwise would go to waste and we would pay to destroy. Wouldn't it be better to put these items in the hands of veterans so their businesses can succeed and they can hire people in their local communities? I think so. Small business is the engine of the American economy. Our veterans have served our country well. Let us serve their next phase in life and make sure their businesses are successful.

I encourage my colleagues who want to support the veterans and dispose of surplus property in a productive way—not an expensive way—so that it continues to make money for the United States to join me in support of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. I rise today to speak about an issue that is fundamental to our democracy and vital to the future of our Nation. This is an issue so important that it requires us to take the monumental step of amending our Constitution.

This is not an action any of us should take lightly, but our democracy is

under assault and I will not stand by and watch the damage being done without trying to do something to repair it.

Because of the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United*, a tsunami of undisclosed, unlimited campaign funding is corrupting our democracy. Our government is supposed to be about checks and balances. *Citizens United* and the recent McCutcheon decision make it more about who is writing the checks and how big is their bank balance.

In the 2012 election, 60 percent of the contributions to super PACs came from just 159 donors. Sixty-four percent of the money raised by the Senate candidates came from a mere .04 of 1 percent of the population.

Our government is in jeopardy of no longer being of the people but instead becoming of and for the wealthy. The voices of the majority of the American people, those of middle-class families, seniors on fixed incomes, workers making minimum wage, are being drowned out by an ocean of campaign cash. This is utterly undemocratic and it needs to stop.

Congress has tried to stop this tidal wave of unlimited money, but the Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment not as a guarantee of free speech but of who can pay to speak. As a result, our democracy is in peril.

Campaign finance limits don't limit our free speech. They increase it by ensuring that every citizen can be heard and that no one gets unfair access to our government at the expense of everyone else. Campaign finance laws don't stifle democracy, they enhance it.

We need to fix our broken campaign system. We need a constitutional amendment that overturns the *Citizens United* and *McCutcheon* decisions.

Our democracy is based on the fundamental principle that all voters, and each and every vote cast, are created equal. People, not dollars, are the true currency of our Constitution and democracy.

That is why I will be voting for Senate Joint Resolution 19, to support a democracy for all attitudes in the United States.

NET NEUTRALITY

I also rise in support of another principle that enshrines democratization to access of information and ideas: net neutrality.

Net neutrality is as basic to the functioning of the Internet as non-discrimination is to the U.S. Constitution. In fact, net neutrality is just a fancy word for nondiscrimination.

The Internet is a success today because it is open to anyone with an idea. An open Internet enables freedom of expression and the sharing of ideas across town or across the world. Yet the vitality of this open platform is at stake. The FCC is currently considering a proposal that could allow

broadband providers to charge Web sites, applications, and services more for faster delivery times to consumers. We cannot allow that to happen.

That is why I am proud to stand with the netizens—all Internet users—to show what the Internet would look like with fast and slow lanes.

Today is our battle for net neutrality. Today we demonstrate on our Web sites what paid prioritization really means: Web users stuck on a bumpy gravel path while the select few whiz by on a sleek highway with their Internet E-Z passes.

In solidarity with netizens everywhere, I have posted on my Web site a symbol familiar to Internet users everywhere—the loading symbol you get when your video is waiting to appear because there is congestion on the net. My Web site today, along with countless others, serves as a harbinger of the dark days that lie ahead if we let the broadband behemoths win.

I believe we should never forget that the net comes with a manufacturer's guarantee: No one should have to ask for permission to innovate.

To prevent this from happening, this summer I led 12 of my Senate colleagues in urging the FCC to reclassify broadband as a telecommunications service under title II, enabling the Commission to put the strongest rules on the books to prevent discrimination.

Internet access today is like traditional phone service was decades ago, it is essential for everyday living. But if the ISPs have their way, the FCC would turn the Internet from a democratic "Field of Dreams" into an exclusive set of gated communities.

But the good news is the online activist community—the Netroots and the startups, the Internet investors—have spoken out in favor of implementing title II to protect net neutrality.

I will continue to join with my colleagues in the Senate to fight for an open and nondiscriminatory Internet because the future of our country depends upon it.

I yield back the remainder of my time and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, as many of you know, my wife and I still farm, and for part of August I had the pleasure to be able to be on the tractor and have some quality time to think about what makes our Nation great. There are many reasons, but one of them is the belief that everyone has a

say in the decisions we make in this democracy, that each of us—from the richest to the poorest—has an equal stake in electing our leaders and impacting how we govern. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has not figured that out.

From the *Citizens United* case to this year's McCutcheon decision, the Justices continually side with big money and corporations. They are siding with those who think government should work for the rich and the elite. They are siding with those who think that money equals speech and think it is OK for the wealthy to drown out the voices of the working folks, of the middle class, of everyone else.

Our current election system is hurting our democracy by reducing public confidence in our elections and increasing apathy in the political process. After all, why should someone take time out to follow our political process and vote when our system leads them to believe their vote does not make a difference? We simply cannot let that happen.

I agree with my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, when he says that sooner or later our current system is going to cause a scandal in this body. This body cannot afford to fall further out of favor with the American people. After all, negative numbers are right around the corner.

The unprecedented amount of money—much of it unaccountable and anything but transparent—is allowing corporations to have an outsized say in not just who gets elected but how they act once they get into office. And trust me, corporate voices already have plenty of influence in Congress. It is putting up walls between regular folks and elected leaders who spend more and more hours on the phone with donors or bowing to those who might finance an outside ad campaign on their behalf and leaves less time for constituents.

Too many of the Justices—and too many of our colleagues—do not understand that many of Washington's current problems are tied to our campaign finance system. A lot of folks in the Senate and the House talk about working together. They talk about reaching across the aisle for responsible solutions that move our country forward. So what is holding them back? In many cases, it is the threat of big money coming after them in their next election.

We are not talking about Rick who works at Walmart or Amanda who teaches third grade chipping in \$20 for a candidate they believe in. We are talking about corporate executives plowing millions—sometimes tens of millions—of dollars into independent and often secretly financed campaigns.

We have all seen colleagues hesitate to introduce legislation that is popular in their home State but were afraid it would spur big-moneyed outside groups

to spend millions of dollars to defeat them. When that happens, it leaves constituents without any real say in who represents them.

Lawmakers are also held back by the hostile political climate that these expensive campaigns create. When you constantly see an ad that distorts your record, and then you see a fellow Senator from out of State endorse that ad, it makes it hard to compromise on legislation with somebody that, quite frankly, you do not trust.

Politicians also know that most of the money in campaigns is on the extremes of the political spectrum. And the extremes fight almost any sign of compromise and the folks who are willing to get things done. Heck, why are we having trouble confirming ambassadors? It is because "compromise" is a dirty word. It leads me to wonder: Could we do big things today like our predecessors did? Could we pull it together to build an Interstate Highway System or send a man to the Moon? Right now I think not.

Supporters of the current system defend their views by citing the Constitution. They put up some fun charts here on the Senate floor that cross out lines of the First Amendment, pretending as if this legislation actually changes the First Amendment. It is entertaining, but it is incorrect.

I guarantee you that our Founding Fathers—men such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson—would not want to see the Constitution used to justify our current campaign system. Leaders such as Washington and Jefferson had a vision for our Nation. They knew America would change with the times as new technologies were developed and new lands came into the Union. Back in 1787 there was no Montana.

If the Framers warned against political parties, I can only imagine what they would have to say about the rise of super PACs.

Folks who support Citizens United talk about protecting free speech and the First Amendment, but who is protecting the free speech of regular working-class folks? Who is protecting the voice of the schoolteacher or the repairman being drowned out by special interests? With this amendment, we are.

If the Congress needs inspiration, they should look at my home State of Montana. More than 100 years ago Montanans voted to limit the influence of Big Money elections. We were ahead of the curve. We called for fair elections after wealthy mining corporations bought influence, support, and even a U.S. Senate seat—and our laws worked pretty well for those 100 years. But 2 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Montana's law, citing its own Citizens United decision.

In 2012, Montanans stood once again to Big Money and its influence over a

democratic process. In a voter referendum passed by a 3-to-1 margin, Montana voters called on Montana's congressional delegation to overturn Citizens United, and I proudly accepted that challenge. That is why I am co-sponsoring Senator UDALL's amendment. Together we are saying enough is enough.

Congress and the States should have the power to regulate campaign spending to ensure that election spending does not corrupt elections. States should be able to decide whether to allow corporations' unchecked spending power in Governor and legislative races.

I heard one of my colleagues suggest yesterday that we are threatening to silence the voice of the little old lady who wants to put up a yard sign in front of her home. In fact, it is quite the opposite. We are working to ensure that her voice is louder than that Fortune 500 corporation—or at least as loud—when deciding the future of her town, her State or her country because that is what our country is supposed to be about, one person, one vote.

Spending for the Senate election in Montana in 2012 topped \$50 million. That is more than \$100 for every vote cast. In a State such as Montana, where the average household pulled in \$45,000 in 2012, that is a big sum of money. It is the kind of money that can buy a lot of ads come election season. It can give a platform to drown out any other voice.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, spending by outside groups in this 2014 election cycle is currently three times higher than the amount spent at the same point in 2010, and as of the end of August, outside groups have spent about \$170 million on Federal midterm races—just the Federal part. Folks don't spend that kind of cash without thinking they are going to get a return on investment. Things are out of control, make no mistake.

Senator MCCAIN is right. Sooner or later it will lead to another Watergate or worse, and that is what is frustrating. We know how the story of unchecked money in politics ends. We have seen it before. Yet the Supreme Court has opened the door to yet another scandal. So it is time to overturn Citizens United, and it is time to overturn this year's McCutcheon decision which invalidated a 40-year-old law that limits the total amount of money an individual can contribute to campaigns each cycle.

Since that ruling in April, about 300 folks have taken advantage of that ruling, contributing over \$11.5 million to political campaigns this year—just since April—300 in this Nation of 300 million. We must put regular people and their ideas back in charge of our elections.

Amending the Constitution is not something we should take lightly. The

Constitution is our founding document, and it has held up under the test of time. But Big Money interests and defenders of Citizens United are distorting our First Amendment for their own gain. Getting Big Money out of elections is critical to improving how we govern, to make responsible decisions for all Americans. It is critical to electing leaders who put people first. I am proud to step forward in this fight. Our democratic system has worked for over two centuries. It has made our Nation the greatest Nation in the world, and I will not let that be jeopardized without a fight.

Back in Montana it doesn't matter whether someone has 5 acres or 5,000 acres: They jump on that tractor, and that tractor is still going to break down; the weather can be good, the weather can be bad. It is still going to happen.

The lesson is this. We are in this together, we all need to pitch in, and we all deserve a fair and honest say in how our election process works and our leaders are elected.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator UDALL on this important amendment. It is simply the right thing to do for our democracy.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise to speak against the bill before us, S.J. Res. 19. This is a constitutional amendment that would significantly curtail the free speech rights of all Americans.

I oppose this amendment because I believe that while it is critical to support speech with which we agree, it is even more crucial to support speech with which we disagree.

Whether it has been campaign finance laws or amendments to prohibit flag burning, I have consistently opposed amending the Constitution to limit the First Amendment.

As others have mentioned, if this amendment is adopted, it would be the first time Congress has limited rights protected in the Bill of Rights. This would be a very dangerous precedent to set.

By limiting the amount of money individuals and corporations can spend on elections, this amendment would clearly limit their rights under the First Amendment. The Supreme Court has made clear that this would be tantamount to a restriction on "the number of issues discussed, the depths of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached."

This amendment would allow us to decide what amount of money is speech and who can use it. This is a perilous

amount of power to place in the hands of politicians. I don't think we need to protect incumbent politicians. I think we need to protect the rights under the First Amendment.

In addition to concerns with what we know this amendment will do, I am even more concerned about what we don't know. Before we amend the Constitution, we are obligated to understand the effects of the legislation.

What does it mean to "influence elections," as the bill states? Who is a "candidate"? What is the "press"? Does this include bloggers? What about a citizen who writes his or her own newsletter to their community association and prints it on her home printer? All of these terms and more seem ripe for litigation, which leaves the true meaning of this amendment in the hands of unelected judges.

It also bears mentioning that opposition to this amendment is not limited to Republicans or conservative organizations. The ACLU wrote a letter to the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, opposing this legislation. The ACLU stated: "As we have said in the past, this and similar constitutional amendments would fundamentally break the Constitution and endanger civil rights and civil liberties for generations."

I could not agree more.

Amending the Constitution is serious business. I believe limiting the Bill of Rights for the first time in our history is a bad decision. I will once again vote to preserve and protect the First Amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same by rejecting S.J. Res. 19.

As an incumbent politician, I am the first to concede that elections are daunting. They are unpredictable. It is unnerving to see other groups and individuals spend money to run ads against you. But the alternative is to have me, as an incumbent politician, write rules and regulations to limit the speech of those who would run against me or support those who would run against me. That is wrong. It is wrong for people in this body to define speech and to define who is entitled to it.

We need to tread carefully. That is why we need to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

RACIAL PROFILING

Mr. CARDIN. I rise today to discuss the tragic shooting of Michael Brown last month in Ferguson, MO.

Michael Brown did not need to die. This cycle of needless sacrificing of our teens to violent ends must end. It has been heartbreaking to see yet another American town gripped by such a tragedy. I welcome Attorney General Holder's decision last week to begin a pattern or practice investigation into the allegations of unlawful policing by the City of Ferguson's Police Department. I also strongly support the Justice Department's outreach efforts through their Community Oriented Policing Services Office. This office, known as the COPS Office, can help better evaluate and train local law enforcement to carry out fair and impartial policing.

In addition to the recent investigation announced by the Department of Justice, I urge Attorney General Holder to expedite the issuance of new guidelines that would, once and for all, prohibit racial profiling by law enforcement officers at all levels of government, including the federal, State, and local law enforcement officials. Congress should also examine the program that provides for the transfer of surplus military equipment to local law enforcement agencies to ensure local government is not inhibiting the First Amendment rights of people to peaceably assemble and petition their government for the redress of grievances.

Local government must also respect the First Amendment rights of the press to do their jobs, report the story, and help provide the truth to the American people.

For a more permanent fix, Congress should take up and pass legislation that I authored, the End Racial Profiling Act, known as ERPA, which is S. 1038. I want to thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this legislation, including Senators REID, DURBIN, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, HARKIN, MENENDEZ, STABENOW, LEVIN, MIKULSKI, WARREN, BOXER, GILLIBRAND, HIRONO, WYDEN, and MURPHY. I also thank Congressman JOHN CONYERS, the ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, for introducing the House companion legislation, H.R. 2851, which has 54 cosponsors in the House of Representatives.

This legislation provides training and monitoring for law enforcement agencies at all levels of government. By enacting this legislation, we can begin to reduce the racial disparities that plague our Nation's criminal justice system. We need to better educate more of our law enforcement officials in the differences between specific suspect descriptions and sweeping generalizations or profiling that wastes valuable resources. Racial profiling is un-American. It has no place within the values of our country. It turns communities against the partnerships needed to keep our neighborhoods safe.

Two years ago, I want to remind my colleagues, the Senate and the Amer-

ican people were having this very same conversation. So it is heartbreaking to me that we are having this conversation again without having taken more definitive action. In 2012 the Nation's attention was riveted to the tragic avoidable death of Trayvon Martin in Florida in February 2012. As we all know from the news, an unarmed Martin, 17, was shot in Sanford, FL, on his way home from a convenience store while wearing a hoodie and carrying a can of iced tea and a bag of Skittles.

After the tragedy I met with the faith and civil rights groups at the Center for Urban Families in Baltimore to discuss the issue of racial profiling. Joining me were representatives of various faith and civil rights groups in Baltimore, as well as graduates from the Center's program.

I heard there first-hand accounts of typical American families who were victims of racial profiling. One young woman recounted going to a basketball game with her father, only to have her dad detained by the police for no apparent reason other than the color of his skin.

Trayvon's tragic death led to a discussion in the Senate of the broader issue of racial profiling. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on "Ending Racial Profiling In America" in April 2012 which was chaired by Senator DURBIN. At the hearing I was struck by the testimony of Ronald L. Davis, the Chief of Police of the City of Palo Alto, CA.

I want to quote in part from Chief Davis's testimony, in which he said:

There exists no national, standardized definition for racial profiling that prohibits all uses of race, national origin, and religion, except when describing a person. Consequently, many State and local policies define racial profiling as using race as the "sole" basis for a stop or any police action. This definition is misleading in that it suggests using race as a factor for anything other than a description is justified, which it is not. Simply put, race is a descriptor, not a predictor. To use race along with other salient descriptors when describing someone who just committed a crime is appropriate.

Then Chief Davis continued:

However, when we deem a person to be suspicious or attach criminality to a person because of the color of his or her skin, the neighborhood they are walking in or the clothing they are wearing, we are attempting to predict criminality. The problem with such predictions is that we are seldom right in our results and always wrong in our approach.

After the hearing I was joined at a press conference by Baltimore's Reverend Dr. Jamal Bryant, a leading youth activist and adviser to the Trayvon Martin family. Reverend Bryant echoed the call of ending racial profiling by law enforcement in America, and let me quote him:

This piece of legislation being offered by my Senator, Senator Cardin, is the last missing piece for the civil rights bill from 1965 that says there ought to be equality regardless of one's gender or one's race. Racial

profiling is in fact an extension of racism in America that has been unaddressed and this brings closure to the divide in this country.

I have called for putting an end to racial profiling, a practice that singles out individuals based on race, ethnicity, national origin or religion. My legislation would protect minority communities by prohibiting the use of racial profiling by law enforcement officials.

First, the bill prohibits the use of racial profiling by all law enforcement agents, whether Federal, State or local. Racial profiling is defined in a standard, consistent definition as the practice of a law enforcement agent relying on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin as a factor in their investigation and activities. The legislation creates an exception for use of these factors where there is trustworthy information relevant to the locality and timeframe which links a person of a particular race, ethnicity or national origin to an identified incident or scheme.

Law enforcement agencies would be prohibited from using racial profiling in criminal or routine law enforcement investigations, immigration enforcement, and national security cases.

Second, the bill would mandate training on racial profiling issues and require data collection by local and State law enforcement agencies.

Third, this bill would condition the receipt of federal funds by State and local law enforcement on two grounds. First, under this bill, State and local law enforcement would have to "maintain adequate policies and procedures that are designed to eliminate racial profiling." Second, they must "eliminate any existing practices that permit or encourage racial profiling."

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Justice Department to provide grants to State and local governments to develop and implement best policing practices that would discourage racial profiling such as an early warning system.

Finally, the bill would require the Attorney General to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices. The bill would also provide remedies for individuals who were harmed by racial profiling.

The legislation I have introduced is supported by a broad coalition of civil rights groups. These groups include the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the ACLU, NAACP, Rights Working Group, and numerous other national, State and local organizations.

Racial profiling is bad policy, but given the state of our budgets, it also diverts scarce resources from real law enforcement. Law enforcement officials nationwide already have tight budgets. The more resources spent investigating individuals because of their

race, religion, national origin or ethnicity, the fewer resources are used towards suspects who are actually demonstrating illegal behavior. Using racial profiling makes it less likely that certain affected communities will voluntarily cooperate with local law enforcement and community policing efforts, making it harder for our law enforcement community to fight crime and terrorism.

Minorities living and working in these communities in which racial profiling is used may feel discouraged from traveling freely, which corrodes the public trust in government. This ultimately demonizes entire communities and perpetuates negative stereotypes based on an individual's race, ethnicity or religion.

Racial profiling has no place in modern law enforcement. The vast majority of law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line every day handle their jobs with professionalism, diligence, and fidelity to the rule of law, and they understand that racial profiling has no place in their work.

However, the Congress and Justice Department should still take steps to prohibit racial profiling and finally root out its use.

I agree with Attorney General Holder's remarks to the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee where he stated:

In this Nation, security and liberty are—at their best—partners, not enemies, in ensuring safety and opportunity for all. . . . In this Nation, the document that sets forth the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—is meant to empower, not exclude. . . . Racial profiling is wrong. It can leave a lasting scar on communities and individuals. And it is, quite simply, bad policing—whatever city, whatever state.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the equal protection of law to all Americans. Racial profiling is important to that principle. It should be ended once and for all.

As the late Senator Ted Kennedy often said: "Civil rights is the great unfinished business of America." Let's continue the fight here to make sure that we truly have equal justice under the law for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation I have introduced that will end racial profiling once and for all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to express my strong frustration—and the frustration of Nebraskans—with the Senate's current debate.

Similar to many of my colleagues, I spent the past 5 weeks traveling my State and meeting with constituents. I held over one dozen listening sessions in communities all across Nebraska. Not a single Nebraskan told me to go back to Washington and vote to limit free speech. Not a single Nebraskan told me to come and play politics or take show votes.

The message I received from almost every Nebraskan was the same: Get something done, turn the economy around, deal with overregulation, help control the costs of health care, and help businesses create jobs. Prevailing concern with the economy and weak job growth exists all across our country. According to several leading economists, 225,000 jobs were supposed to be created last month. Instead, the number of jobs created was just 142,000. The real unemployment rate—those who are unemployed or underemployed—remains unacceptably high at nearly 12 percent. That is 19 million Americans who are out of work or want to work more hours.

It is a disgrace the Senate is not debating policies that will help them. Instead, we are debating a bill to limit free speech. It is no wonder the American people have such a poor opinion of Congress. Seriously, what are we doing here? In Washington, those in power are more concerned with winning elections so they can stay in power than with actually governing and making tough decisions that will protect our country and help our families, and that is what we are doing today with another show vote, another sound bite that is engineered by campaign strategists who don't have any interest in sound policy.

I wish to address the two proposals before the Senate this week—a resolution to amend the Bill of Rights and campaign legislation that is targeting women voters. The resolution offered by the Senator from New Mexico is, I believe, a clear attack on the First Amendment and a series of recent Supreme Court rulings. The measure grants unlimited authority to Congress and State legislatures to criminalize speech on any platform, and that includes the Internet.

This proposal guts the First Amendment and the principles of free speech that have endured since the Bill of Rights was ratified in 1791. It further empowers incumbent politicians to make decisions with less accountability, and it muffles the voices of private citizens. It is perverse that the Senate is actually devoting time to debating the constitutional amendment that would actually diminish democratic participation and decrease freedom.

What have we become?

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, the ACLU wrote that the proposed amendment "would severely

limit the First Amendment, lead directly to government censorship of political speech and result in a host of unintended consequences that would undermine the goals the amendment has been introduced to advance—namely encouraging vigorous political dissent and providing voice to the voiceless, which we, of course, support.”

The ACLU is not exactly an ally of the Republican Party, but their letter shows there is broad concern over this poorly crafted resolution.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand for free speech, to stand for democratic participation, and to reject this resolution.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

At this time I wish to address the issue of equal pay and the paycheck fairness legislation. Make no mistake, some women in this country continue to struggle with gender-based pay discrimination. Equal pay for equal work is a principle I strongly support. With 60 percent of women working as primary breadwinners, lost wages hurt families and single women alike. Republicans fully agree that gender-based pay discrimination in the workplace is unacceptable.

In April I worked with Senator COLLINS, Senator AYOTTE, and Senator MURKOWSKI on a reasonable proposal to modernize key portions of the 51-year-old Equal Pay Act. Our proposal prevents retaliation against employees who inquire about, discuss or disclose their salaries. In fact, one of the President's April Executive orders also deals with nonretaliation, suggesting this is an area we can agree and work together.

Our proposal also reinforces current law which prohibits pay discrimination based on gender and it requires employers to notify employees of their rights.

Finally, it addresses the opportunity gap or the need to provide both men and women with good-paying jobs. It consolidates duplicative job training programs and provides Federal grants to States for the creation of industry-led partnerships. This program is meant to provide women and men underrepresented in industries that report worker shortages with the skills they need to compete.

I believe this proposal could pass the Senate. It is reasonable, it is targeted, and it is a serious solution. Instead, we have a Senate that is laser focused on election-year politics, bills that no Republican can support, and bills that even some Democrats reject.

The majority leader does not appear to have any interest in putting bills on the floor that can pass—bills we can work on together. That idea doesn't fit into that election-year playbook. At the end of the day, this is raw politics. That is all it is. Nebraskans expect more. Americans expect more. They expect us to do our jobs, to work to-

gether to offer solutions, to debate, to amend, and to vote.

There are so many proposals I would love to vote on. Sometimes you win, sometimes you lose, but we should be voting. We have to start having meaningful debate. We have to start taking votes, and they better be real votes. That is the only way we are going to do our jobs, and that is the only way we will be held accountable by our constituents. We should be tackling those very important issues we spoke to our neighbors and friends about when we were at home traveling our States during the August recess.

Enough with the sound bites, enough with the show votes, enough speaking to cameras. Let's listen to the American people. Let's get back to the Senate we all admired when we were in school and read about in our country's history. As students we studied those serious—and many times very heated—debates that took place on this floor.

As Senators we may not always agree on what is the best policy, but we better start doing our jobs. We need to return to debating real policy that addresses the very real needs of the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I was not scheduled to speak at this time, but there is something going on today that is pretty exciting and I wish to share with everyone.

There is a new group that has been formed that is called the IDC, In Defense of Christians. I just came from addressing this group's summit, and it is pretty amazing. There are over 1,000 people in the Visitor Center's big auditorium. It is the largest crowd that has ever been down there, and it has been quickly formed because of the persecution that has taken place throughout the world and primarily in the ISIS area.

Unfortunately I don't have charts that are big enough to project this issue well, but at least the President is there and can see them. This is the area where ISIS is working. They are not just in Syria and Iraq. They are in Jordan and other areas. It is a very large area. They are not confined to any particular area.

One of the problems that is being addressed—we know about what they are doing. We know they are probably the strongest force and greatest threat against the United States we have ever faced.

I was very proud of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Hagel. He was very outspoken when he talked about the threat we are facing. He characterized it as a great threat.

Why is it a great threat? It is a great threat because they have already declared war on America, and that is why I stood here yesterday to get support in the Senate for authority to use military force—that is AUMF—and we are going to make every effort to get that done.

Tonight the President is going to speak about this issue. Hopefully he will come out stronger than he has in the past and say something meaningful about how he, as the President of the United States, is going to win this war. I am not expecting it, but I am hoping for it. There is no doubt that once we pass this resolution, he will have the authority to do it. This group is concerned with that matter, but the reason they are together is because they are concerned with the Christian and religious persecution that is going on.

I have a lot of background in this area. Way back—before a lot of you guys were born—in 1979, I was mayor of the city of Tulsa, OK, and I remember a man named Boris Penson. Boris Penson was sent to a Siberian gulag prison for 9 years. He was there because of the fact that he would not relinquish his Jewish faith. He was persecuted because of his faith, and we were able to get him out. That was a long time ago.

I had another experience in 1988 in Damascus. There was Christian persecution going on at that time. We were able to get them to change the geography a little bit so the people there could openly pray to their lord and savior Jesus Christ. That was unheard of in Syria. It was not like it is today. Today they are killing them. Back then they were putting them in prison.

I think it is important for people to understand that ISIS is the most well-organized, well-funded terrorist group in history. More than 1 million people have fled their homes in Iraq after being given the ultimatum by ISIS to convert to Islam or be put to death. Since they invaded Iraq, hundreds and thousands of men and women have been enslaved and have been beheaded as a result of the ultimatum to Christians. I will read it to my colleagues because I don't want to be misquoted. They issued the ultimatum to Christians living in the region I just showed: “Convert to Islam or face death by the sword.” That is what is going on today.

As I told this group a few minutes ago, now and then we have a happy ending. I have been active—and a lot of people know this—in Africa now for 20 years. I have actually made 135 African country visits. I have seen all kinds of things take place in terms of religious intolerance, persecution. But I remember very well being in the new country

called South Sudan. South Sudan is to the south of Sudan. Sudan is up there near Khartoum. We are all familiar with that and the problems taking place there, and we know how intolerant they are there.

It happened there was a lady there named Mariam Ibrahim. I am going to show my colleagues a picture. We have never seen a prettier lady in her life. That is in her wedding dress. She is beautiful. She is Sudanese. She had been a Muslim. However, she renounced that and she now is a Christian. So they went to this beautiful young lady who had one baby and she was 8 months pregnant with her next baby, and they said, We are going to put you on trial. You have to renounce Christianity. She said, I can't do it. They said, Well, you have to do it. So she was found guilty of not renouncing her Christianity. She was sentenced to 100 lashes, which would kill her, and then they would hang her up by her neck for public display as an example of what happens.

Several of us were involved in this. We had a lot of cooperation from some of the surrounding African countries, including Uganda, President Museveni came through; President Kagame from Rwanda; President Kabila from Congo, and our State Department and others, and we were able to get them to have an appeal. As of today, she is now out of prison. She is back. She has two children, and she and her husband and children are living in the United States.

If it hadn't been for seeing what Mariam Ibrahim was facing and knowing that was going on and seeing the beautiful picture of her and a few of us finding out about it, she would be right now still hanging up for display.

This is what is happening. A lot of people out there are saying, Well, ISIS is a very serious thing, but this isn't our problem. Yes, it is. I can remember 3 months ago I made the statement that ISIS is a threat to our homeland and people didn't believe that was the case. There is a poll that came out yesterday that I thought I had with me and I don't. But the ABC poll shows that 71 percent of the American people believe ISIS is a direct threat to the homeland of the United States of America. That is 71 percent of the people. They also believe—the same 71 percent of the people—that our President does not have the strategy to win this war. So tonight we are hoping to hear something that is out of character for him. We are hoping it will be something strong that will allow us to win the war.

Let me wind up by welcoming those over 1,000 people who are downstairs right now in the Visitor Center who are from the Defense of Christians Summit that is taking place as we speak. We have a lot of people out there. They are doing the Lord's work and they will be richly blessed for it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I come to speak today on a question of enormous importance. Before I do so, I wish to take a moment, as I was just with the majority leader and the deputy leader and a number of our colleagues where we held a ceremony in commemoration of a Congressional Medal of Honor that was issued in remembrance of those who gave their lives on September 11, 13 years ago. Neither the Presiding Officer nor I were Members of the Senate at that time, but I think all of us remember where we were that early Tuesday morning, and the ceremony we just came from was an appropriate tribute.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Madam President, during the most recent recess in August, I crisscrossed Virginia in a variety of efforts. One that was particularly meaningful to me was where I did a statewide student debt tour, where literally I spoke with hundreds of students and graduates from families of nine Virginia colleges and universities about student debt and what this crushing amount of student debt is doing to their opportunities to get the same kind of fair shot the Presiding Officer and I both had.

The schools I visited ranged from big 4-year public universities, small, private liberal arts colleges, to one of our historically Black colleges, as well as a 2-year community college. The student debt figure right now is at \$1.2 trillion, exceeding credit card debt. Student debt has exceeded the aggregate of auto loan debt, credit card debt, and home equity debt balances, becoming, next to mortgages, the second largest debt of U.S. households. That means that for far too many young people, and not so young people, they are forced to put off their decisions about starting a family, launching a startup business, or buying a home because of the burdens of student debt. Many young people find themselves working in jobs they didn't want or necessarily train for just to pay off their student debts.

At Old Dominion University I spoke to Carina. She is a bright and ambitious young woman who told me that in her sophomore year, she worked three jobs, at one point four jobs, to ensure that she met tuition. She mentioned that she was the first of all her family members to step foot on a college campus. She said: "College is a foreign field in my family." She said: "I am a pioneer." She is not alone. The

challenges she faces are repeated time and time again.

At Virginia State University, one of our historically Black colleges, I met with Tobias, who mentioned that a lot of his peers had to drop out of school because they could not afford to take out any more loans or debt. He told me: Senator WARNER, I have made the decision to stay in school. It is the key to my future, but I do so knowing that I will have to spend a lot of years paying off student loans.

At one of our finer public institutions in Virginia, the College of William & Mary, I had a great conversation with Jacob, a junior originally from the far southwest part of our State, in Lebanon, VA. He is graduating from college in 3 years instead of 4 because of dual enrollment he took while he was in high school, at Southwest Virginia Community College. He told me that despite his ambition, it is financially impossible for him to go on to immediately get a graduate degree or buy a home or buy a car or start a business, because even with shortening college from 4 years to 3 years, he still has a tremendous amount of student debt.

I have to tell my colleagues, across Virginia I have heard over the last year more about this issue than virtually any other issue, from young people, from families, from parents. I remember somebody in Virginia Beach not too long ago, a young man, 31 years old, who actually served in elective office. He had graduated from the University of Michigan Law School, had worked as a lawyer, had been laid off, and was moving back in with his parents at the age of 31. I could almost see his ambitions being crushed because his student debt payments amounted to \$2,000 a month. Where does he get the same kind of fair shot that many of us had?

I am the first member of my family to graduate from college. I got out of college and law school and worked for a while, started businesses, failed miserably twice. The third time I managed to do well in a startup industry called cell phones. But I came out of that experience with a total of \$15,000 worth of debt. I am not sure I would have taken the first shot or second shot or, Lord knows a third shot, if I had come out with \$50,000 \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000, or \$100,000 of debt that many people come out of school with now.

We have to get on this issue. This issue is having an effect on our economic recovery. I meet with homebuilders on a regular basis and with realtors on a regular basis. They are saying, The real estate market is recovering for everybody except people buying starter homes. Why are they not buying starter homes? Time and again because of crushing amounts of student debt.

I hope during this shortened period we will get a chance to have a conversation about a broadbased proposal to refinance student debt at lower rates. I am not sure we are going to be successful in that proposal, but I think it is a conversation and debate we ought to have. I look forward to supporting that effort. But if we are not able to get that effort across the finish line right now, we can't walk away from this issue.

I have worked on a series of bipartisan, targeted reforms that would reduce costs, increase transparency, and allow students to better manage their amounts of debt. Any one of these proposals isn't going to completely solve this problem, but this should not go into the bucket of issues we continue to kick down the road. The issue of student debt, the affordability of college, are issues of enormous economic proportion and, frankly, one that shouldn't be viewed as a Democrat or Republican issue.

Let me speak briefly about a couple of my proposals. First is a proposal I partnered with Senator WYDEN and Senator RUBIO on that in any rational place should be a complete no-brainer. It is a bill called Know Before You Go. The idea is quite simple. Let's do with higher education what we have done in real estate with the Zillow Web site or what we have done with the travel pricing, with Travelocity and a series of other Web sites, and try to take every 4-year institution, 2-year institution, career and technical education program, graduate program, and make them totally transparent on a single user-friendly Web site, where before you go, you know what your chances of graduating are, how much debt you might want to take on, if you major in art history, the way my daughter did, what your chances of getting a job are and how much it is going to pay, so that we can actually make people better informed consumers before they choose higher education.

Probably next to buying a house, higher education is the most expensive investment you will make in a lifetime. Maybe students will find out that if they go to UVA and drop out after 3 years and come out with a lot of debt, they will not have much with which to get into the job market, whereas if they went to Piedmont Community College and actually came out with a 2-year degree in medical tech fields, they will have a 90-percent placement opportunity.

This Know Before You Go Act—we have collected most of this data already, so it should not be that big a stretch to put this in a user-friendly fashion. What if Tobias's friends at Virginia State had a better idea before enrolling in college how much they would be expected to pay, how this would actually break down grants versus loans, a recognition of the actual graduation

rate and their job prospects upon graduation? Maybe some of them might choose a different path.

Better informed consumers of higher education would be one no-brainer step.

A second opportunity—and I do not know where it falls on the ideological spectrum, but on the commonsense spectrum it makes an awful lot of sense. Why does college have to be 4 years anymore? Why can't we have more students—particularly first-generation students—getting a jump-start on college with dual enrollment in high school? The key on this is to make sure the credits they get in their dual enrollment at community college actually count toward their degree requirement, which requires what are called articulation agreements between the 4-year institutions and the 2-year institutions. It does not do much good if you come into college with a lot of course credit but it does not count toward your degree requirements. Let's try to make sure more students can knock off a semester or a year of college in high school. That would save families \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, in effect, if we could make that happen.

If you are a low-income student and you qualify for a Pell grant, why not be able to use part of those Pell grant proceeds in high school if the credits you receive in high school in dual enrollment actually count toward your degree requirements? Again, that is a jump-start on college. It would make sure that a student such as Jacob at William & Mary, rather than being the exception, would become more the rule.

Let me talk about another proposal. Again, I am working with my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, on this legislation. Senator RUBIO has a story similar to mine. He is the first generation in his family to graduate from college and law school. He tells stories as well of years of repaying student debt.

In our student debt processes, we already have a series of payment proposals. Unfortunately, most of them are confusing. Many of them end up like the student I know or the young person I know in Virginia Beach who is on a fixed payment proposal. This individual, as I mentioned—\$2,000 a month, completely crushing his abilities to take any chances at all.

So what Senator RUBIO and I have done is we put together a proposal that would say the first option—it would still be the young person's option to opt out of, but the first option would be an income-based repayment proposal that would cap your student debt repayment at 10 percent of your income. What would this do? Ten percent of your income would allow you to take that chance on that startup business. Ten percent of your income, capped, would maybe give you the ability to say: Oh gosh, if I hit a rough

spot, I will not get crushed. I will not have to move back in with my family.

This better structured, financially sustainable, income-based repayment proposal would allow young people to better manage their debt and avoid the impact of default.

Part of our proposal includes loan forgiveness programs that will provide borrowers such as Jacob in southwest Virginia the kind of relief they want.

Even if we cannot agree on a grand refinancing proposal, this income-based capping at 10 percent—which has been greeted by left and right alike as a dramatic step forward—ought to be part of our discussion.

Then I come to another proposal—one that, quite honestly, even this body with all of its dysfunction ought to be able to get done. I partnered with my colleagues Senator THUNE and Senator AYOTTE on a very business-friendly proposal that would be an option for an employer and employee. Right now, if an employee wants to continue with their education, an employer can take up to \$5,000 of that employee's salary and apply it to their tuition, tax free, on continuing education. Well, if we are allowing an employer to do that for an employee to continue their education, to increase their skills, why not provide that same kind of option for an employer to apply that same amount—up to \$5,000 of a person's salary—directly against an employee's student debt pretax and tax free as well? It does not cost the employer another dime. This is purely at the option of the employee. It would be a great retention tool for a company to say: Hey, keep working with us. We are going to give you this benefit.

That young or not-so-young person will get this money pretax going against their student debt. It is common sense, bipartisan, and something on which—even with all of our bitter battles back and forth—we ought to be able to find common ground.

As I mentioned at the outset, like many Virginians, like many probably in this body, as the first in my family to have graduated from college—I could not have gotten to college; my family did not have the resources. I had to work. I got grants. But I also had to take out student debt. The student debt that I had at \$15,000 pales in comparison to the average amount of debt with which people come out of even public universities in Virginia right now—more than \$25,000. I had \$15,000 of debt after college and law school. Look at people who come out of graduate school. On average those numbers more than double.

This is an issue whose time has come for us to address. In America in the 21st century, you should not go broke if you decide to go to college. We all encourage our young people to get that education that will allow them to prosper in a knowledge-based economy, but

we hold out a false hope when we say: Go get that education, but we are going to put you into such debt that for the next 20 years you are not going to be able to exercise that education in the way you wanted to because you are going to be scrambling to repay the obligations it took you to get those skills.

I say this as a former Governor. This is the case. I was proud of the amount of the investment we made in higher education when I was Governor. Quite honestly, if we look across the board at every State in our Nation as a whole, over the last 20 years Federal and State direct aid to higher education has been virtually a straight line down. The cost of a higher education has been a straight line up. How have we filled that gap? We have filled that gap with basically an unfair deal to a whole generation. We have said: Do not worry about the cost; just take out more debt. For a while, when the economy was good and you could get a job pretty much guaranteed coming out of college or graduate school, this did not present a crisis. In the last 4 or 5 years, as we have seen college graduates, law school graduates, graduate school graduates coming out without job opportunities, we have seen this house of cards collapse.

I again remind my colleagues that there is \$1.2 trillion of student debt—greater than credit card debt. The cost of a higher education is continuing to escalate at a rate even higher than health care costs.

For those of us who are lucky enough to serve in this body, we all got our fair shot. If we are really going to honor our commitment to this next generation—and, quite honestly, the parents who are also helping to pay off this next generation—we have to deal with this crushing issue of student debt. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we address this problem in a reasonable, responsible, and timely manner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Texas.

ISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we all are anticipating the President's speech tonight in which hopefully he will make the case for why it is in America's national security interest to eliminate the ISIS or ISIL threat from the Islamic State that is forming a new caliphate in what used to be called Iraq and Syria and which hopefully will be restored.

When the President first campaigned for President in 2008, I know he did not promote himself as a future war President—just the opposite. He told supporters that on his first day in office he would give U.S. military forces in Iraq a new mission, which was ending the war. But just because one side of a war quits does not mean the war ends. I

think now we found that to be painfully obvious.

When the President was running for reelection, time and time again he boasted that he upheld that 2008 campaign promise and brought the Iraq war to a close. He further assured us that the tide of war was receding. I am sure if he had a chance he would probably take back those words because history has disproved those very arguments.

As recently as mid-June, even after the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria had conquered the second largest Iraqi city, the city of Mosul, a national security spokeswoman was still repeating the White House talking points that are 3 years old, telling the Wall Street Journal that President Obama promised to responsibly end the war in Iraq and he did.

Of course, America's complete withdrawal from Iraq in 2011 did not end the war, as I suggested a moment ago. It just ended the U.S. involvement in the war in Iraq until now. But it did make the resurgence of war much more likely. It was, in hindsight, a tragic mistake. We were the glue that held Iraq together, but once we left and pulled the plug without—because we did not negotiate a status of forces agreement or a bilateral security agreement, the old sectarian strife that is perhaps centuries or more old came back to the forefront. Iran continued its aggression in Iraq, as it had been doing all the time we were there, as well as their support for Bashar al-Assad and his support for Hamas and other terrorist organizations. Meanwhile, in Libya—remember, NATO went to war in Libya as well, primarily using U.S. assets and money.

Our complete and utter neglect of Libya following the neglect of Muammar Qadhafi did not end that war either; it merely created a security vacuum that was quickly filled by radical militias and terrorist groups with ties to Al Qaeda.

If we learned anything from 9/11—and I just returned from a Congressional Gold Medal service in the Capitol—if we learned anything 13 years ago, it is that vacuums get filled. If we do not fill the vacuum with constructive self-governance and respect for the rule of law and individual human worth and dignity, then that vacuum will be filled by terrorists and others who reject all of those fundamental values of our country. We did not learn it. We did not learn the lesson. We did not learn it in Libya. We did not learn it in Iraq. Eleven months after Qadhafi's death and less than a week after President Obama told the Democratic National Convention that Al Qaeda was on the path to defeat, Al Qaeda-linked terrorists killed four Americans in Benghazi, including our U.S. Ambassador—less than a week.

I mention all this recent history because it all comes back to the issue of

credibility, not only of our Commander in Chief in the United States, but of the American people. It comes down to our Nation's credibility around the world.

Will we be trusted by our friends and allies? Will we be feared by our would-be adversaries, the bullies, the tyrants, the thugs, and the terrorists who will take advantage of the vacuum left once America withdraws?

From the Middle East to the Far East, from Baghdad to Beijing, to Mosul, to Moscow, this administration has done tremendous damage to America's credibility.

America is the one indispensable nation in the world. We may not like that sometimes; it may seem like too big a responsibility, but no one else can fill a void left when America retreats. Ronald Reagan understood that. That is why he stood for what he called peace through strength, and you know it works.

But when the President announced a withdrawal date from Afghanistan in the very same speech in which he announced a U.S. troop surge, he damaged America's credibility again. Is that any way to encourage people to support the United States and NATO's mission in Afghanistan, to tell them: Well, we are going to surge troops today, but we are going to be gone tomorrow, so you better make your bets in terms of your long-term interest—which, in Afghanistan, means they are betting with America's adversaries.

Of course, as we saw in Iraq, tragically—the investment the United States made in terms of blood and treasure, which was squandered in Iraq—he created another prospect of the squandering of America's blood and treasure in Afghanistan unless we have learned the lesson of Iraq.

Then there is Syria. The President has given speech after speech. The Department of State, Hillary Clinton, others, the national security advisors, have said it is American policy that there be regime change in Syria, that Bashar al-Assad has to go.

But then nothing happened—well, I take that back. Something did happen; 200,000 civilians have died in Syria as a result of that civil war.

The President came to Congress to ask for authority to conduct air strikes in Syria, but then when he couldn't explain what his strategy was, he got a lifeline from Vladimir Putin. Putin said: We will help you get rid of those chemical weapons in Syria. And the President retreated from that red line and nothing seemed to happen.

In addition to those 200,000 Syrian civilians killed since the civil war started, we have seen millions of Syrians displaced in refugee camps in Turkey, in Lebanon, in Jordan.

Then there is Ukraine. When the President promised to help Ukraine defeat Russian aggression, and to help it

maintain its full territorial integrity and sovereignty, he subsequently refused to give the Ukrainians even modest defensive weapons. I think we sent them MREs, meals ready to eat. We sent them, maybe, some medical supplies which are important. But they needed not MREs but weapons to defeat Russian aggression, to raise the cost to Putin and his regime in their continued invasion of Ukraine and Crimea.

Then the President decided: Well, we are just going to use economic sanctions against Putin. Putin could care less about the economic sanctions.

Again, as to the extent to which our allies and friends can rely on us when they get in trouble, they begin to doubt our credibility. The bullies, tyrants, and terrorists lick their lips and take full advantage of the situation. We have seen that time and time again.

Then there was when the President—I bet this is another couple of words he wished he could take back in light of subsequent events—dismissed the Islamic State terrorists as the JV team. Even though they were gaining a stranglehold over eastern Syria and western Iraq, again the President—by underestimating a threat, a threat I am sure he will confront head on tonight—undermined America's credibility.

Make no mistake. America's credibility does matter. And when America loses credibility, the world becomes a much more dangerous place. That is exactly what has happened over the past several years.

I would say that despite the criticism I have made of the President's policy, I believe he has an opportunity tonight, starting tonight, to reverse some of that damage. Beginning with this speech on U.S. policy in Iraq and Syria, he has an opportunity to reverse the impression that he is aloof and detached from the ongoing chaos. He has the opportunity to lay out a clear strategy for destroying perhaps the richest, most well-armed terrorist group on the planet. He has an opportunity to describe how our strategy might utilize Syria's more moderate anti-Assad rebel groups and describe how he plans to work with Congress on implementing that strategy. He has an opportunity to sell the American people on his strategy.

Make no doubt about it. While the President thinks he can go this alone and he doesn't need to come to Congress for additional authorization, he does need and we do need the support of the American people. There are practical reasons why the President should come to Congress. Because if he makes the case to a bipartisan Congress and Congress issues the authorization for him to act because we actually believe he has a strategy that can work, then I think the American people will be much more inclined to support that strategy.

Tonight I hope he will speak not only to Congress, he will speak to the American people candidly about the threat and about our military goals and how he intends to achieve those goals by the strategy he lays out.

He has an opportunity to explain the evolving nature of the terrorist threat and also explain what he is going to do and what we can do together to defend U.S. interests and to keep America safe.

Yesterday the Washington Post-ABC News poll revealed some very important data with regard to the American people's understanding of the threat and their support for what the President is talking about doing. In some ways it seems as if the American people were way ahead of their leadership in Congress and in the White House. From the Washington Post-ABC poll I will read three questions.

No. 1:

As you may know, a group of Sunni insurgents called the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, also known as ISIS, has taken control of parts of Iraq and Syria. How much, if at all, do you see ISIS as a threat to the vital interests of the United States?

Ninety-one percent of the respondents responded said they see it as a serious threat to the vital interests of the United States.

No. 2:

Do you support or oppose U.S. air strikes against the Sunni insurgents in Iraq?

Seventy-one percent support.

No. 3:

Do you support or oppose expanding U.S. air strikes against the Sunni insurgents into Syria?

Sixty-five percent support.

So we can see from the first question people recognize ISIS as a threat. Fewer support kinetic strikes against the insurgents in Iraq and Syria, but still a two-thirds majority do.

My point is, while the President of the United States may take what I think is a very generous view of his authority as Commander in Chief and under the Constitution to do this without congressional authorization, I think it is a terrible mistake for him to do so for two reasons, one I just mentioned, which is he needs and we need the support of the American people before we send any American into harm's way to deal with this threat. We need to have a robust debate and there needs to be bipartisan support for this effort in order for the American people then to see we are united and thus to unite them in common cause against this terrible threat.

Then the last reason is practical too. The President wants, it is reported, \$5 billion. We have already burned up about \$½ billion with air strikes in Iraq. War is expensive, and if the President says this is going to go on for another 3 years, which is one estimate I saw, he needs to come to Congress in order to get the appropriations, to get

the money, in order to carry this out. If he thinks he can just come and request \$5 billion and Congress is going to rubberstamp that or write him a blank check without any strategy, I think he is terribly mistaken. From what we have seen, since our Nation has been at war in Afghanistan and Iraq for these many years, 13 years in Afghanistan, we know war is expensive and \$5 billion is a very minimal downpayment on what it will cost the American taxpayer to conduct this effort.

The President may have a very narrow view of his responsibility to come to Congress and get authority, but there are very practical reasons why he should, as I said—both in terms of gaining the support of the American people for this effort before he sends more Americans into harm's way, and the fact that under the Constitution the Executive, the President, can't appropriate one penny. That is going to have to come from Congress.

One party can't do this. Heaven forbid our national security would break down along purely partisan lines. But if the President doesn't have a plan and if he doesn't lay it out tonight, it is hard to see how he will get either the support of Congress, whether it is official or not, or of the American people.

It is hard to see where this is going to go if he thinks he can fund this on the cheap when, in fact, by his own estimate and others' it is going to take 3 years or more to defeat ISIS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME EQUALITY

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer is well aware, as one of our great leaders on our economic agenda, of what we are calling a fair shot, it is incredibly important in the time we are in session that we have an opportunity to vote again on each of those items and hopefully pass each of the items at the front line of what American families, American people, care about in terms of lifting their standard of living and creating more opportunities.

It is great that we have seen the stock market more than double in the past 5, 6 years. It is great that someone who is living off of interest earnings has a better portfolio. That is great.

But the person who is getting up every day, going to work, and maybe takes a shower after work, ought to have the same fair shot to get ahead so that this economy is growing—and that is great—but it needs to grow and create opportunity for everyone.

We can help with that by having the right support and the right policies, and that is what the fair shot agenda is all about.

This afternoon we are going to be voting on a very important piece—which I frankly can't believe we are even having to talk about in 2014—whether we are going to actually enforce equal pay for equal work laws.

When I think about my own family, my daughter, daughter-in-law, and granddaughter at 7 years old—I hope by the time she grows up we are not still going to be talking about this issue. I think about they are working hard every day and the assumption they have is that they will get paid just as their male counterparts are.

There are those who have said: Well, this is a distraction. This isn't really an issue. There are some in Michigan who have said: Women don't care about equal pay. What they care about is flexibility.

My response is flexibility doesn't buy my groceries. It does not buy my daughter's groceries. It does not put gas in her car. It does not pay her mortgage.

The reality is, in America, in 2014, there is absolutely no reason—zero—that we would not have a 100-percent vote not just on the procedural vote to proceed but on a final bill to make sure enforcement is in place on equal pay—a pretty big deal. An awful lot of women who are the sole breadwinners in their families are counting on us to get this right so they can make sure their kids, who are now going back to school, can have the school clothes they need, they can put the food on the table, they can put the gas in the car to get them to school and get to work, and so on.

Another big piece of all this agenda in terms of creating opportunity for people is to make sure you can afford to go to college. That same person who is trying to put food on the table would love to put money aside in a bank account for their kids to go to college and would love to know that, when they are doing the right thing—they are making the grade, they are going to college—they will not be stuck with mounds of debt, buried in debt, because we do not have the right kind of system that provides funding for higher education and access to low-interest loans.

So another piece of the fair shot agenda, which is absolutely critical, is to make sure—let's start with ground zero, which is “at least”—that anybody who has a student loan now will have a chance to refinance it, just like you would a house, at the lowest possible interest rate, which is impossible today.

Now, what does that do? We know there is more student loan debt today than credit card debt. Think about that for a minute. There is more student loan debt than credit card debt—\$1 trillion. There are mortgage bankers in Michigan saying to me: You have to fix this because I have folks who want

to buy a house and they cannot qualify because of their student loan debt. They want to start a small business and they cannot get a loan because of their student loan debt. We also know there are actually people who are on Medicare who are older than 65 years of age in this country who are still paying off student loan debt. When we talk about opportunity and a basic value of America: Work hard, go to school, have opportunity, it seems to me this flies in the face of that.

So another really important piece we want to get to and we want to pass is the ability to allow people, step one, to renegotiate and to refinance their student loans at the lowest possible interest rate from last year, which is 3.86 percent for undergraduate students. So that needs to get done so we are addressing one of the huge burdens and costs on middle-class families.

We also know that, unfortunately, we have another agenda item that came about because of the Supreme Court deciding that for women—that for women only—our choices on preventive health care, on birth control—if we are on the job covered by insurance our boss can actually overrule personal decisions about what type of birth control a woman will choose for herself, for her family. So we have a bill called Not My Boss's Business. I think it is pretty clear. It is not your boss's business what decisions you make, and you should be able to have your birth control decisions and what you need covered just like anything else in terms of preventive health care for men are for women.

So that is another piece of all of this that needs to get passed to make it clear. This is an economic issue for people. I know in my own family, when I think about my daughter and son and nieces and nephews who are planning their families and making decisions, these are economic issues about health care coverage.

We have two other critically important economic issues that are part of what we want to get done before this session ends in September. One is raising the minimum wage. It seems to me pretty basic that if you are working 40 hours or more a week you should not be in poverty, plain and simple. If we are going to reward work, if we are going to expect people to work, then working should pay more than not working. If you are working 40 hours a week, you ought to be making more than the poverty level. It has been way too long for American workers to get a pay raise.

So that is an important part of it.

Then finally there is a bill that I have introduced that, to me, ought to be a no-brainer. I do not understand; we tried to pass it a couple years ago. It was blocked. And it was blocked again by Republican colleagues a few weeks ago. We need to get this done. It

has to do with a part of our Tax Code that allows a company that packs up shop and moves the factory overseas to write off the cost of the move, so the American taxpayers, including workers who just lost their job, would be paying for it.

Unfortunately, over the years, we have seen too much of that in Michigan. Now things are coming back. Manufacturing is coming back. We are very happy about that. But we want to send a very strong message that if you pack up shop and decide to move overseas, American taxpayers, the workers and their families, the communities are not going to pay for the move. But if you want to come back, we are more than happy to allow you to write off those costs through the Tax Code, and we will even give you another 20 percent tax credit for those costs on top of it.

So it is very simple. The Bring Jobs Home Act simply says: If you want to come back to America, great, we will help you do that. We will help you pay for those costs to come back to America. But if you want to leave the country, you are on your own.

So those are the five items that we want to get done before the end of this month that all relate to whether we are going to have opportunity and we are going to focus on the middle class of this country. Too many folks are barely holding on or are not holding on or used to see a path to get to the middle class and cannot anymore. That is not going to work for America. If we do not have people who know they have a fair shot to make it—that they have opportunity, that they see opportunity for their children—if they do not have money in their pocket so they can take care of their family and invest in the future, we are not going to have a strong economy. That is just a fact.

So we are glad that Wall Street is doing well. But it is time to focus on Main Street, middle-class Americans. That is what the fair shot agenda is all about, and I hope colleagues will come together and help us get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, when I was home last month, I heard a lot from Missourians, for really the first time over and over: What about all of the bills the House has passed that the Senate has not taken up? What about funding the government? My good friend from Michigan just mentioned the five things she would like to get done before we get to the end of the year. I think everybody on the other side of the aisle knows those five things, for various reasons, will not happen this year.

But what are we not doing? We are less than a month away from the beginning of a new spending year. We have not voted on a single one of the

appropriations bills. There is no budget. The fundamental work of the government is not going on while we continue to debate the same things over and over because there are some people who think there is a good title to the bill or a good headline: The five things we want to get done.

Equal pay. Who is not for equal pay? The law requires equal pay. In fact, when the President signed the Lilly Ledbetter Act, he said: This solves the problem. Well, suddenly, it does not solve the problem because we want to get that title back out there again where we can talk about the title.

Access to college. I am the first person in my family to ever graduate from college. I had the chance to be a university president. I believe people's lives are affected by the right kind of education after high school. Nobody is opposed to access to college. We ought to be talking about that. But we ought to be talking about that in a way that can produce the right kind of result.

When the people of Missouri are saying: You are not getting the work of the country done, that is clearly right—just the fundamental things that need to get done, and here we are back in Washington, reminded by our friends on the other side that really we are here to just hold votes we have already had. Not a single thing was mentioned in the preceding remarks that we have not voted on already and not a single thing was mentioned in the preceding remarks that has any chance of passing both the House and the Senate and, frankly, has no chance of advancing in either the House or the Senate. But here we take these critical 2 weeks—the government is unfunded, no budget to talk about, with work not being done—to talk about these things.

Right now, the joint resolution we are on—with all the critical challenges we have not solved, we are talking about changing the Constitution. The only person in the Senate who can decide what bill comes to the floor is the majority leader, and the majority leader has brought a joint resolution to the floor, an amendment to the Constitution, an amendment that would take 67 votes in the Senate to pass, an amendment that has 45 sponsors, all from the other side—not very close to 67. Nobody believes this is going to happen.

To amend the Constitution, two-thirds of the Senate has to agree. That will not happen. Two-thirds of the House has to agree. That will not happen. Two-thirds of the States have to approve the amendment. That will not happen. More importantly, it should not happen. We are talking about amending the Constitution of the United States when there is no chance of doing it. So the only thing we are surely talking about is just trying to score some kind of last-minute election-year points. But if people are paying attention, the points that will be

scored will be scored by those defending the Bill of Rights and those defending the Constitution.

What is being proposed here would have a chilling effect on the First Amendment, which says "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging [among other things] the freedom of speech." We are thinking, for the first time ever, we would amend the Bill of Rights? Now, nobody really thinks we are going to do that so apparently everybody thinks, as long as it is just a show vote, it does not matter. But if you can take these freedoms today and decide they are worth bandying around as a show vote, I suppose you could take them tomorrow and actually think about taking these freedoms away.

The Constitution would not have become the Constitution of the United States without the promise of the Bill of Rights. The Founders got a lot of things right. They did not get everything right. But one of the things they got right was the Bill of Rights. One thing that the States demanded when the Constitution was shown to them was: We can do that, but we are not going to do that unless we are promised that these fundamental rights that make us who we are and have the potential to make us more than we are—that these fundamental rights are guaranteed. We have never amended the Bill of Rights. So suddenly 45 Members of the Senate—with no enthusiasm for this anywhere else that I can find in the country—45 Members of the Senate have decided that for the first time ever we would amend the Bill of Rights.

Now, what does the Bill of Rights give us? It gives us freedom of religion—the first right. There will be another debate, I assume, late in the next 2 weeks to once again talk about how important is that right of conscience, that the Constitution in the Bill of Rights guarantees—the very first freedom it gives us is the freedom to believe what we believe. In fact, President Jefferson said in the decade after the Constitution was written that of all the rights, that is the one we should hold most dear: the freedom to hold our beliefs and not let the government decide how you conduct yourself in ways that violate your faith beliefs.

But right after that comes—what we are talking about—freedom of speech, the second of all those freedoms. There may be people here not at all offended by the fact that we can just bandy that around with no chance we are going to change this amendment. It is not like there are 67 cosponsors of this amendment.

I find it offensive we would talk about this as if it is a freedom so easily discussed and so easily utilized for political reasons that we just bring it up here a few weeks before the election and talk about it, even though there is

no chance it could possibly be changed at this point and shouldn't be changed in the future.

The right of conscience, the freedom of speech, the freedom of press, the right to peaceably assemble, the right to petition the government—those are the five freedoms given in the First Amendment to the Constitution, and here we are talking about them as if they are nothing more than political talking points. They are who we are as a nation.

The chilling effect this discussion has on the First Amendment is concerning. I suppose part of it is to convince people: You don't want to participate in the system because you are going to be criticized if you participate in the system.

One of the great rights we have as Americans is the right to criticize those who are participating and, if we do participate, the right that others have to criticize us. This is an effort that if it occurred would certainly be a great thing for the current occupants of public office because you begin to write the rules in a way that makes it harder for those who don't hold public office to challenge those who do. No one likes being criticized, but in our country it is a fundamental part of who we are.

The Constitution wouldn't have been agreed to without the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights, as I said before, hasn't been changed. The freedom of the press is one of those rights, but it is not the only one. This amendment would go a long way toward making the press the only way people get their information and news. The press—the media generally—has a guaranteed right to do what they do, but individuals have a guaranteed right to say what they want to say, to participate as the courts and the Constitution allow in this great debate we call America.

To see that dealt with in this way—I actually wonder what people would think if they thought this was going to happen. Nobody believes this is going to happen because it is not going to happen. We are taking the people's time. We are taking the time given to us by the Constitution and the people to do the people's work, to instead talk about things that shouldn't happen, to talk about things that will not happen.

To suggest there is a real debate going on in Washington, when this is exactly what people are tired of—people in Washington not doing their job and trying to convince the people whom Washington should be working for that somehow great debates are going on, when all we are doing is getting ready for the next election, I am tired of that. I think most citizens of our country are tired of it.

For those who want to defend the Constitution, count me on their side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SCHOOL CERTIFICATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on Thursday this country will commemorate the 13th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

We learned many lessons from that day. One key lesson was that terrorists can and will exploit our immigration system and policies to enter and remain in the United States and now and into the future potentially harm Americans.

The 9/11 attacks were carried out by 19 hijackers, some of whom entered on student visas and trained in flight schools in the United States. The 19 individuals applied for 23 visas. They lied on their applications. They failed to abide by the terms of their visas. This was a wake-up call that we needed better oversight of our visa programs, especially student visas. But this wasn't our first wake-up call.

In 1993 the American people were confronted with the first terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. One of the instigators of that attack was on an expired student visa.

Since 1993 we have mandated the tracking of foreign students and gave schools and universities a responsibility to help us monitor these programs while these students are on U.S. soil. Unfortunately, while this tracking system is up and running today, it is still antiquated and the Federal Government remains incapable of ensuring that those students who enter the country are truly attending our educational institutions.

Today nearly 10,000 schools across the country accept foreign students, and those schools are responsible for communicating with our government about the whereabouts of these students. Enrollment of foreign students is increasing.

According to the Brookings Institution, the number of foreign students on F-1 visas in U.S. colleges and universities grew from 110,000 in 2001 to 524,000 in 2012. Despite this overwhelming increase, the technology and oversight of the student visa program has insufficiently improved.

Now, 13 years after 9/11, we have sham schools setting up in strip malls with no real classrooms. We have foreign nationals entering the United States with the intent to study but then disappear and never attend a class. I will give just two examples of sham schools.

In 2011, Tri-Valley University reported that they would bring in less than 100 students but actually brought in over 1,500. Tri-Valley University officials were caught giving F-1 visas to undercover agents posing as foreign nationals who explicitly professed no intention of ever attending classes. Stu-

dents paid \$5,400 per semester in tuition to the school to obtain those student visas until that school was shut down.

On May 29 this year, the Micropower Career Institute in New York was raided by Federal officials. Its top officials were arrested on student visa fraud. Allegedly, school officials did not report foreign nationals when they didn't attend classes, and they falsified those student records so the school could continue to collect Federal education dollars for those students. But despite the indictment of officials at this so-called school, it still remains open for business.

The Government Accountability Office reported to Congress in 2012 that sham schools posed a problem. We put a lot of faith in the work of the Government Accountability Office. The GAO said the Immigration and Customs Enforcement does not have a process to identify and analyze risks across schools. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has overlooked major indicators of fraud, and they cannot follow trends or predict abuse. Two years later the problems continue to exist and the Obama administration just fiddles while the problem burns.

ABC News investigated the student visa program and made it public last week. They said 6,000 foreign nationals on student visas have disappeared. An ICE official acknowledged that they had "blended into the landscape somewhere." Yet this number of 6,000 is not the total number of student visa overstays. This is the number of students that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement is trying to locate. That ought to be alarming news that it is only 6,000.

It is time to close the loopholes and clamp down on schools that have a poor track record with regard to foreign students. So this week I am introducing legislation that requires schools to be certified in order to bring in foreign students, and it would suspend schools if there are noncompliance issues. My bill would increase penalties for those who perpetrate fraud and require background checks and training for school officials. It would also put an immediate end to a flight school's participation in the foreign student program if they are not FAA approved.

Finally, it would require the Department of Homeland Security to deploy an upgrade to the existing tracking system. This upgrade can be paid for by using fees from student visas and the schools that participate.

What I just said aren't new ideas. These are provisions that were taken from a 2012 bipartisan bill led by the senior Senator from New York. That bill never passed the Senate. When the Gang of 8 wrote their misguided immigration bill, they failed to include these reforms. So I offered an amendment during committee consideration

of the immigration bill last summer and it was included in the bill that passed the Senate.

The bill I am introducing today is the exact same language. It has been debated. It was accepted by unanimous consent in the Judiciary Committee.

I hope my colleagues will seriously consider the bill I am introducing. It is well past time that we close loopholes and be more vigilant in the foreign student visa program, especially with the growing terrorist threat we face.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. JEFFORDS

Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to Senator Jeffords of Vermont, who passed away last month.

Senator Jeffords died this last August while the Senate was in recess. Yesterday, the Senate appropriately adopted a resolution commemorating the former Senator.

Senator Jeffords is probably best known for switching parties, from being a Republican to an Independent and caucusing with the Democrats back in 2001. As much as that switch hurt at the time, I always held Jim in very high regard and I knew him to be a very honorable man.

Jim and I were both so-called Water-gate babies—two of the very few new Republican House Members who survived the 1974 election after Nixon's resignation and subsequent pardon. So we joined the House of Representatives together and became friends then.

It wasn't only a tough political environment back then, it was also a physical challenge for us. During that campaign year I had surgery on my leg and was walking on crutches. Jim had been in a car accident and had a neck brace as a result of that accident.

An amusing story has been reported about the two of us. I didn't hear it myself, but it had been brought up in a report on the funeral. The amusing story is about the two of us walking down the aisle of the House to be sworn in as freshmen after that devastating election for Republicans—this Senator on crutches and Jim with his neck brace.

Somewhere in the Chamber, a Democratic Member yelled out, "There's two more that we almost got!"

The two of us laughed for years about that because of course we had the last laugh, serving for many years and being elected to the Senate and both becoming chairmen of committees in this body.

One of the most honorable things Jim did for me and, I believe, for the country was in regard to the 2001 tax relief bill that was by some measures the largest tax cut in history. Not many know the history of that bill. I was chairman of the Finance Committee and so was in charge of putting the bill together and getting it passed in the Senate. The process started with a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions to our Finance Committee.

The Bush administration pressed that year for a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. Senator Jeffords and others insisted that the number had to be cut by \$300 billion because they feared the money wouldn't be there in the end. Of course, as we now know from history, they ended up being right on that point a few years later when we sank into years of deficit spending, but we needed their votes. I made it clear to President Bush and our leadership that if we wanted to get something done and have a historic tax cut, we had to lower our sights some and still get most of what we wanted.

Unfortunately, I took a lot of criticism from my side for supporting Senator Jeffords and others, but I knew where the votes were and where the votes weren't. I remember a bunch of House Members even had a press conference saying some not-so-nice things about me and the idea of only accepting a \$1.3 trillion tax package. But our Senate Republican leadership wanted a good result, and they agreed to compromise in order to get it. That is not something you see nowadays around here on very big bills. If the majority cannot have their way, they just file cloture and let the bill die, which is why we don't get much done around here anymore.

But the pivotal point on the 2001 tax bill came right before the time Senator Jeffords switched political parties. I could never really blame Jim for his decision. I didn't agree with that decision, but I know he felt he had been mistreated by some in our party and had strong disagreements with some of us on issues.

During floor consideration of the tax bill that year, we were near the end, and the Democratic minority at that time was offering amendment after amendment to stall the bill. We had gotten to the point where they were just changing a few words in an amendment and offering the same amendment again.

At that point I walked over to then-minority whip—who happens to be the current majority leader—Senator REID and asked what was going on. He said: Well, we think things may be changing around here very soon. Of course, I didn't know what he was talking about and I assumed that some votes were going to change. But of course he was talking about the impending party switch that none of us knew anything about involving Senator Jeffords. Remember, at that time we were split 50/50. Of course, what that meant was the Senate leadership would change and presumably the new Democratic leadership would pull the tax bill from the floor and kill it. So it was important for the Democrats to stall as long as they could on the bill, anticipating the Jeffords switch. But to his great credit, Senator Jeffords came to me and told me that out of respect for me and the

way I worked with him on this tax bill, he would not officially change parties until after the tax bill was passed. So we were able to finish that historic bill and get it signed into law.

This little-known episode demonstrates what an honorable man and true friend Jim Jeffords was. He didn't let politics dictate whatever he was determined to do, and he stood by his word. I only wish we could see more of that now in today's Senate. If we did, we would all certainly be better off, it would be a better place, our policies would be a lot better, and we would be more productive.

I commemorate Senator Jeffords in his death. My sympathies are with his family. I will miss him, and I wish him Godspeed.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Madam President.

FACING GREAT CHALLENGES

As I come to the floor today, the Senate is debating a plan by which Washington Democrats seek to restrict the First Amendment rights of American citizens—part of the Constitution. Under this proposal certain people would no longer enjoy the same right to free speech and the same right to express themselves.

I believe this amendment is a terrible idea, and it really has no chance of becoming law. Majority Leader REID wants the vote anyway. He thinks this outrageous amendment that he dreamed up will somehow help Democrats win elections this November. The majority leader has come to the floor repeatedly to criticize and to demonize American citizens who don't share his views. It is nothing but political grandstanding and showboating.

President Obama was on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. The President talked about what is going on in Washington. The President said that "people want to get stuff done." That is what he says the American people want from their representatives in Congress. So if the American people want us to get stuff done, why are the Democrats in the Senate so determined to do nothing? Why are they wasting time on political show votes? Why are they not allowing amendments and debate on important bills? Why are they blocking legislation that has passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support and is right now sitting on Senator REID's desk waiting for a vote?

Our Nation faces great challenges, and many Americans are hurting. Republicans have solutions that will create jobs while strengthening our energy security, improving our health care, and cutting government redtape. New numbers came out just last week that show America's labor force participation rate is at about the lowest level it has been in decades. The House

of Representatives—where Republicans are in charge of the schedule—has passed more than 40 bills to help get Americans back to work. Those bills are sitting in the Senate waiting for a vote. Is that what the President means when he says people want to get stuff done?

There was a headline in Politico on Tuesday morning that read "Majority say that President Obama a failure." A new poll found that 52 percent of Americans think the Obama Presidency has been a failure. So what do Washington Democrats do in response? Absolutely nothing.

People want Washington to deal with the challenges that matter most in their individual lives. We could start by doing something about the President's health care law that is causing so much harm to people across the country.

A bipartisan plan has already passed the House that would stop the employer mandate that businesses provide expensive Washington-mandated health insurance. That part of the President's health care law forces small businesses to cut hours—therefore cutting paychecks—for the workers and is also holding back hiring. We should take up that legislation here in the Senate.

We should restore people's freedom to buy health insurance that actually works for them and their families because people know what works best for them. They don't need Washington to tell them. We should replace the President's health care law with reforms that actually get people the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

The people I talk with back at home in Wyoming are also worried about energy costs—especially since it is starting to get colder in much of the country. Washington should be looking for ways to help Americans produce more affordable, reliable, and efficient energy right here at home. The opportunity is there. That would mean jobs for American families, and it would also mean energy security for our Nation.

We could start right now by approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. For 6 years the application has been sitting waiting for action. A bill to do that passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support. Why aren't we voting on that today in the Senate? The Obama administration admits the pipeline would actually support thousands of good American jobs. The application to build the Keystone Pipeline has been stalled for 6 years. The administration should demand action today. If the President won't do it, Congress still could and should.

Congress should pass legislation to speed up exports of liquefied natural gas. Our Nation has abundant supplies of natural gas, and producers want to

export it to customers around the world who are seeking it. The Obama administration has delayed the permits to let them do it. Democrats right here in the Senate have delayed the bipartisan solution that has already passed the House. We should take a vote on that bill today and pass it.

We should pass a bill that would reform the regulations blocking energy production on Federal lands.

We should end the Obama administration's pointless and destructive war on coal and let the men and women across this country who work in that industry get their jobs and their lives back.

American businesses are waiting to create jobs. The only thing standing in the way is the Senate majority leader. Senate Democrats don't want to vote. They don't want to vote to help the millions of Americans who are out of the labor force. They would rather protect the Washington bureaucracy—a bureaucracy that slows down and stifles economic growth.

Cutting through the redtape to help Americans get back to work is one of the top priorities of Republicans, and it should be the top priority of every Senator in this body. We could do it by passing a bill—one that has already passed the House—that would rein in excessive regulations that make it tougher for small businesses to invest, to grow, and to hire.

We could pass another bill from the House that helps businesses defend themselves against abusive patent lawsuits. That is going to help small businesses hire more people and help them grow. There were 130 Democrats in the House who voted in favor of it. Why aren't we voting on that today? We cannot get a simple up-or-down vote in the Senate. The majority leader will not bring it to the floor. Why won't he allow it?

There is one bill after another that Republicans have offered. Republicans have passed in the House of Representatives—bipartisan bills—and the Senate Democrats don't want to talk about them. They don't want to talk about Republican ideas for tax reform that would lower tax rates and make the whole tax system simpler, more fair. They don't want to talk about Republican ideas to strengthen and stabilize the entitlement programs—such as Social Security and Medicare—to make sure they are there for future generations. They certainly don't want to talk about Republican ideas to address Washington's out-of-control debt.

Those are the kinds of measures we should be talking about today on the floor of the Senate. That is the legislation which Republicans have introduced and which we are going to keep fighting for in the Senate. That is what the American people are talking about when they say they want Washington to get stuff done. They don't mean

more terrible ideas like the President's health care law and its multiple damaging side effects. They don't mean job-killing redtape and Washington mandates. They don't mean political show votes that would restrict Americans' free speech.

President Obama and Democrats in the Senate have turned their backs on middle-class families who are desperately in need of jobs. Democrats want to waste time while they are trying to salvage their political careers. Republicans want to help get Americans back to work.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PRISCILLA A. ROSS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, one of the joys of being an elected member of Congress is getting to hire and know and work with dedicated public servants who toil behind the scenes—our staffs. One of those individuals is my policy director Priscilla Ross, who first joined my staff over 16 years ago when I was serving in the House of Representatives.

I rise this afternoon in a bittersweet moment to thank Priscilla for her service to me, the citizens of Maryland, and all Americans on the occasion of her departure from the Senate.

Starting next week she will be the senior associate director for Federal relations at the American Hospital Association, AHA, which is the national organization that represents and serves all types of hospitals, health care networks, and their patients and communities. The AHA is comprised of nearly 5,000 hospitals, health care systems, networks, other care providers, and has over 43,000 individual members.

Priscilla Ross is a consummate Senate staffer. She is extremely intelligent. She has mastered her subject areas, which include health care and budget. She works hard. She is both a pragmatist and an original creative thinker. She works well with her colleagues across the aisle and across the Hill. She is a problem solver. She sees the big picture but pays attention to detail.

Her political acumen and sense of timing are first rate. She tells me what I need to know and, more importantly, what I need to hear—even when I don't want to hear it. Above all, Priscilla has been driven by a passion to help people and make things better for Americans, especially the disadvantaged and vulnerable among us. The disparity of health outcomes between different

communities and racial groups in this Nation—I know—continues to concern Priscilla, who has made me more aware of the problem.

Members of Congress, especially Senators, depend on their senior staff to sort through the innumerable demands on our time and to help us concentrate our time on the most important opportunities and priorities. To do that as well as Priscilla has done for 16 years requires not only deep policy expertise but a shrewd understanding of the Senate and a comprehensive familiarity with the people and the institutions of Maryland. It also demands a willingness to bring a seasoned, respectful skepticism to the scores of requests every Senate office receives every week to support this or that legislative initiative and to have the judgment to sort out the strong policy cases from the powerful interests. In that, Priscilla has excelled. I am grateful for the high standard she has met.

Priscilla came to Capitol Hill to improve people's lives. She has succeeded in that regard—far beyond what most of us are able to accomplish. She has had an extraordinary career.

While I am sad that she is leaving the Senate, I take solace in the fact that she is not leaving “the arena.” She will continue to find ways to make health care better, more accessible, and more affordable for all Americans in her new post at the AHA.

Priscilla is a proud native of the District of Columbia—born and raised in the shadow of the Capitol building, so to speak. She likes to reminisce about taking the number 30 bus along Independence Avenue to her school at Tenley Circle every day. She said that as a child she never imagined she would some day work in the Capitol building she passed on her way to and from school.

Fortunately, at some point, she did get that idea and pursued it. Fortunately for me, I was the one who hired her. Before that happened, Priscilla went to Boston University before finishing her college career at American University, where she received a B.A. in political science. She held a summer internship in the office of Yvonne Braithwaite in California.

She was an outstanding student. She was inducted into Pi Sigma Alpha, which is a national political science honor society, and the Golden Key National Honor Society. She is also a member of the Zeta Phi Beta sorority, a national sorority founded nearly 95 years ago at Howard University here in the District.

Before Priscilla joined my staff, she was the political affairs manager for the American Association of Health Plans, the trade association for more than 1,000 managed care plans across the country. Priscilla also represented the investor-owned hospital industry as an assistant vice president for legislation at the Federation of American

Health Systems where she lobbied Congress on issues important to 1,400 hospitals and health care systems with a specific focus on Medicaid and Medicare reimbursement.

In that position she also represented the association in various Washington-based health care coalitions, prepared congressional testimony for association members, designed and coordinated the FAHA grassroots program, staffed the legislative steering and PPS-exempt hospital committees, and drafted comments to proposed Health Care Financing Administration regulations affecting hospital reimbursement.

Priscilla has also worked in health care delivery settings as a new member representative for the Harvard Community Health Plan in Boston, as administrative services coordinator at the Psychiatric Institute of Washington, a private 201-bed acute-care facility, and as an information assistant with Blue Cross Blue Shield of the national capital area. She came to me with some experience, and she used that to help people.

With regard to Priscilla's accomplishments while working on my staff, the list is so long and comprehensive, I will only be able to comment on a few items.

Priscilla has staffed my efforts to repeal arbitrary and unfair outpatient physical, occupational, speech-language therapy caps for Medicare beneficiaries since they were enacted in 1997—first in the House and now in the Senate. Because of Priscilla's efforts we have been able to prevent the caps from being implemented.

With Priscilla's help, the legislation I authored to expand Medicare to include preventive benefits, such as colorectal, prostate, mammogram, and osteoporosis screening was enacted into law.

Thanks to Priscilla's persistence, Congress finally passed the Patients' Bill of Rights, which means that individuals with private health care plans will have the right to choose their primary health care provider, that women will have direct access to obstetrics and gynecology services and be able to pick their own providers, and that patients with medical emergencies will be guaranteed coverage for necessary emergency room visits in accordance with the "prudent lay person's standard." Because of Priscilla's work, we were able to move forward in these areas.

Because of the work of Priscilla Ross, tens of thousands of retired veterans and their spouses have access to the health care benefits to which they are entitled, including Medicare Part B, without being penalized for signing up too late. So let me explain.

Under current law, people who do not enroll in Medicare Part B when they are first eligible, to do so must pay a

10-percent penalty for every year they have not participated. But 10 years ago, military retirees could not have anticipated the rules changes that have occurred in military health systems since 1996 when the Department of Defense replaced CHAMPUS with TRICARE, nor could they have known that participation in TRICARE after 1965 would eventually require Medicare enrollment. In some cases, the military advised retirees that Medicare coverage was duplicative, recommending that they do not enroll. We fixed that. I would note that a couple from Oklahoma—not Maryland—brought this problem to Priscilla's attention and the result was we were able to get it done.

While Priscilla has spent most of her time working on health care, she has aptly demonstrated her ability to get things done on other issues. Let me speak for a moment about the fiscal year 2012 consolidated appropriations bill that contained \$919 million for the Small Business Administration—\$189 million more than previous years. This was the first time in many years that the SBA got a bump-up in their appropriation. I was on the Budget Committee at the time.

The Disaster Loan Program received an increase of \$72 million. With Priscilla's help, I authored an amendment to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that increased the surety bond limits from \$2 million to \$5 million to help small businesses. Each of these initiatives was started by Priscilla Ross. She marshaled them carefully through the committee and through the process, and the end result is they became law.

A moment ago, I mentioned that my and Priscilla's concern is about health disparities. The United States spends nearly \$1 trillion in excess health care costs due to racial and ethnic health disparities. Priscilla has taken the lead in fashioning policies to close the gap. It is not just about economics; it is a social justice that strikes at the heart of who we are as a nation. At Priscilla's suggestion, I authored provisions that establish in statute Offices of Minority Health in the key agencies in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Without the basic research needed to discover the causes of disparities and develop new treatments, we will not be able to make significant progress in closing the gaps, so Priscilla successfully advocated to elevate the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities to the newest institute at the National Institutes of Health. We now have a National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities, thanks to Priscilla Ross.

In 2007, shortly after I became a Senator, 12-year-old Marylander Deamonte Driver died of a toothache just a few miles from this building. As the Washington Post recounted:

A routine, \$80 tooth extraction may have saved him. If his mother had been insured. If this family had not lost Medicaid. If Medicaid dentists weren't so hard to find . . . By the time his aching tooth got any attention, the bacteria from the abscess had spread to his brain, doctors said. After two operations and more than six weeks in the hospital, the Prince George's County boy died.

Priscilla was determined to turn this terrible tragedy into something positive. She immediately began working to expand access to health care for all Americans, regardless of their income. Thanks to Priscilla we were able to secure guaranteed dental benefits for children in the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, along with a dental education program for parents of newborns, and a new HHS Web site and toll-free number with information about the State's dental coverage, and a list of participating providers. We were able to secure funding for a mobile dental health care lab dedicated in 2010 that now carries Deamonte's name. To encourage public service activities that promote oral health, the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act includes the provision ensuring that activities assisting individuals in obtaining dental services can qualify for funding.

Each of these accomplishments was initiated by Priscilla Ross.

These are just a few of Priscilla's accomplishments. Suffice it to say that young children across America too numerous to count now have access to dental care, thanks to Priscilla Ross, although they will never know her name. Suffice it to say that seniors across America will be saved from premature death by preventive health screenings, thanks to Priscilla Ross, although they will never know her name. Because of Priscilla, we are closer to a more perfect union, which is the birthright of each and every American, regardless of race, color, creed, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or economic status.

When Thomas Jefferson followed Benjamin Franklin to Paris as Minister of America, he remarked that no one could replace Franklin. He, Jefferson, was merely a successor. I feel the same way about Priscilla: There may be a successor, but no one will be able to replace her.

I thank her for her wise counsel, indomitable spirit, outstanding public service, and enduring friendship, and I wish her the best of luck in her new career.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today to support the Paycheck Fairness Act. Equal pay for equal work is the law of the land. It has been for over 50 years. Yet the law is one thing and the reality is quite another. Women still get paid far less than men for the same work.

Last year Hawaii News Now, a TV station in Hawaii, shared the story of a woman in Honolulu. She had been asking for a raise for over a year, to no avail. Her employers acknowledged that she was underpaid, but they didn't do anything about it. Then she found out a new male hire with less experience would be paid \$5,000 more to do the same job.

She is not alone. In Hawaii a woman makes, on average, 83 cents for every dollar a man makes. While that is better than the national average, it is still not equal pay for equal work.

Research shows that the gender gap in pay begins with a woman's first job and widens from there. So when a young woman graduates and takes her place in the workplace, her starting line is already behind that of her male colleagues. That makes it harder for her to catch up, no matter how hard she works.

The women I know work incredibly hard. Many of them are heads of households and sole breadwinners, which makes the pay inequality that much tougher for them.

The gender pay gap persists even for workers with the same level of experience and education. The gap is even wider for older women.

Congress passed the Equal Pay Act over 50 years ago. As I said earlier, this is the law of the land. Yet the pay gap persists. While the gap has shrunk—not by much—women only earn 77 cents on the dollar nationally. As Senator MIKULSKI often says, in 50 years, women have only gained a few cents.

In 2009, I was proud to support and vote for the Lilly Ledbetter Act which President Obama signed into law. It was the very first bill he signed into law after his election. Without this law, women had only 180 days after their first discriminatory paycheck to challenge it, even if they only found out about it years and years later. After all, Lilly's employer did not announce they were discriminating against her in pay. So in her case it took many years, and she was far beyond the 180 days the Supreme Court said would be the timeframe in which she could try and get redress.

While the Lilly Ledbetter Act addressed one part of the equal pay problem, if we are going to make sure all women get a fair shot, we need to pass

the Paycheck Fairness Act. This bill would require employers to prove that pay gaps between men and women are based only on a business reason and not on gender.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will make it easier for workers to compare their salaries and figure out whether they are victims of discrimination. Right now, without this act, employers can still fire workers for sharing the basic information about how much they are getting paid. This bill strengthens penalties for companies that discriminate against women. It would bring class action protection for women in line with other civil rights laws.

The bill includes an exemption for small businesses and a phased-in time for businesses to learn what they are required to do.

In addition, the Paycheck Fairness Act would help prevent pay discrimination in the first place by providing training for both management and workers. This past April 8 was Equal Pay Day. That is the day when women's earnings in this country caught up with men's earnings from the previous year. In other words, it took women 16 months to catch up with what their male counterparts were making in 12 months.

The very next day, here on the Senate floor, every single Republican Senator voted to filibuster the Paycheck Fairness Act, which failed on a procedural vote. I hope our Republican friends will reconsider their position on this important issue this time around.

This year President Obama signed an Executive order to implement parts of the Paycheck Fairness Act for Federal contractors. That is a major step forward for thousands of women. But there are millions more who are not covered by this executive action. Today in the Senate we have another chance to give the women of our country a fair shot, another chance for us to live up to a law that we passed 50 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without delay. Fifty years is long enough to wait.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 19 is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES INTENDED TO AFFECT ELECTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, as follows:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

“ARTICLE—

“SECTION 1. To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

“SECTION 2. Congress and the States shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence elections.

“SECTION 3. Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge the freedom of the press.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3791

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the committee-reported substitute, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3791 to the committee-reported substitute.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike “and the electoral process” and insert “the electoral process and to prevent corruption”

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3792 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3791

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3792 to amendment numbered 3791.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

“, which shall not be limited to bribery or quid pro quo corruption”

AMENDMENT NO. 3793

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the underlying joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3793 to S.J. Res. 19.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike "electoral processes" and insert "the electoral processes and to prevent corruption in government"

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3794 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3793

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3794 to amendment numbered 3793.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, insert the following:
 " , which shall not be defined solely as bribery or quid pro quo corruption "

MOTION TO RECOMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3795

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to recommit S.J. Res. 19 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendment numbered 3795.

The amendment is as follows:

In Section 1, strike "and electoral processes" and insert "process and prevent corruption in the electoral system"

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3796

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3796 to the instructions to the motion to recommit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "system" and insert "process".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3797 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3796

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3797 to amendment numbered 3796.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:
 " , which shall not be constrained to bribery or quid pro quo corruption "

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Mark Begich, Joe Manchin III, Amy Klobuchar, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Al Franken, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum to rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Richard J. Durbin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Heidi Heitkamp, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Mazie K. Hirono, Kay R. Hagan, Mary Landrieu, Claire McCaskill, Jeanne Shaheen, Dianne Feinstein, Amy Klobuchar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Ayotte	Grassley	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown	Johanns	Rockefeller
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Scott
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Markey	Walsh
Cornyn	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Mikulski	
Graham	Murphy	

NAYS—25

Alexander	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Flake	Rubio
Blunt	Hatch	Sessions
Boozman	Hoeben	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Thune
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	
Enzi	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin

Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 73, the nays are 25. Upon reconsideration, three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Americans across the country have been riveted by the crisis occurring on our southern border.

President Obama is correct with one regard: What we are seeing is a humanitarian crisis. But it is a crisis, sadly, of the President's own creation, and it is the direct consequence of President Obama's laws. To understand why, one merely has to look at the numbers.

Three years ago, in 2011, there were roughly 6,000 unaccompanied children entering the country illegally. Then in June of 2012, just before the election, the President unilaterally granted amnesty to some 800,000 people here illegally who entered as children.

As a direct foreseeable consequence of that—the predicted consequence of that is: If you grant amnesty to people who enter as children, you create an enormous incentive for more and more children to enter the country illegally. That is exactly what we have seen happening.

As a result of the President's amnesty, we have seen the numbers go from 6,000 kids 3 years ago to this year, it is expected, when there will be 90,000 unaccompanied children entering the country illegally, and next year the Department of Homeland Security predicts it will be 145,000.

I have traveled down to the border of Texas many times. As recently as the last couple of months I have been down to McAllen. I visited with the Border Patrol chief in McAllen. I visited with the Border Patrol agents and line agents down there. I have been to Lackland Air Force Base where there are roughly 1200 children being housed. I am sorry to say that President Obama, when he visited Texas, had time to do neither. He had time to go to Democratic Party fundraisers, to pal around with the fat cats in the Democratic Party and to raise money but no time to travel to the border and see the human suffering his failed immigration policies have produced.

It is worth underscoring, these are little boys and little girls who are not being brought into this country by

well-meaning social workers with beards and Birkenstocks trying to help the kids. They are being brought in by hardened, drug-tough coyotes, cartels. And these little boys and little girls are being physically victimized, physically abused, sexually abused.

When I was at Lackland Air Force Base, a senior official there described to me how the cartels, when they have control of these kids and are smuggling them illegally into this country, sometimes will hold the kids hostage and try to extract more money from the families. In order to do so, horrifyingly, they will sever body parts from these kids. This senior official at Lackland described to me how these coyotes will put a gun to the back of the head of the little boy or little girl and order that child to cut off the fingers or ears of another little boy or little girl, and if they don't do it they will shoot that child and move on to the next one. They describe how on this end we are getting, No. 1, some children who have been horribly maimed by these vicious coyotes and, No. 2, we are getting children who have enormous psychological trauma from being forced to participate in such horrors.

The crisis at the border cannot be solved without ending the promise of amnesty. The data demonstrates that, compellingly, it was when the President granted amnesty that the numbers spiked, but more recent data demonstrates that as well. A few months ago the Border Patrol conducted a survey of over 200 people who entered illegally, many of them children, and asked the obvious question: Why are you coming? What has changed? Just 3 years ago it was only 6,000 kids and now it is 90,000. What has changed? Ninety-five percent of them told the Border Patrol they were coming because they believe they will get amnesty. They believed they will get a permiso, a slip of paper that lets them stay once they get there.

When I was in McAllen, I took the time not just to meet with the chief but to meet with a number of Border Patrol agents who spend every day out on the river, up in the air, on horseback, working to secure the borders. I asked the line agents the obvious question: Why are they coming? What has changed? What has caused this humanitarian crisis? Every single Border Patrol agent gave me the exact same answer: They said they are coming because they believe they will get amnesty.

In fact, they explained to me, they said: Right now the Border Patrol is not apprehending these kids. When they cross the river, they often have nothing, sometimes just rags on their back after a long, arduous journey where they have been subjected to horrible physical and sexual abuse, but the one thing they almost inevitably have

is their documents. And these children immediately look for the first person in uniform they can find. The Border Patrol isn't apprehending them; they are looking for the Border Patrol, because they come to the Border Patrol and hand them their documents because they believe they will get amnesty; they will get a permiso; they will be allowed to stay.

If we want to solve this crisis, if we want to stop these children from coming and from being abused, the only way to do so is to end the promise of amnesty.

Before the August recess, I introduced legislation in this body to do exactly that. It was very simple legislation. It was directed to the source of the problem. It provided in black-and-white law that the President of the United States prospectively has no authority to grant amnesty to anyone. The legislation doesn't address the 800,000 who were the subject of the 2012 order. It simply says going forward the President cannot grant amnesty to anyone else, and the reason for that is the cause of this crisis is these children coming believing they will get amnesty.

The White House, in their talking points, routinely said that children coming today are not eligible for amnesty.

I see my colleague from Illinois nodding in agreement with that statement. If that is the case, then my colleague from Illinois should join me in sponsoring this measure because the legislation I have introduced would simply put into law what the White House talking point is, which is that—

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Can the Senator tell me what the cutoff date is for eligibility for DACA?

Mr. CRUZ. I don't have the precise cutoff date in my mind, but the point that is being raised is these children don't fall under the precise terms of DACA, but they believe they will get amnesty.

I would respond to my friend from Illinois, does my friend from Illinois believe these children who are coming today should get amnesty, yes or no?

Mr. DURBIN. No. I would say, if I might, through the Chair, it is not the argument that anyone is making that these children should receive amnesty. What we are saying is they should be treated humanely—

Mr. CRUZ. Absolutely.

Mr. DURBIN. And go through an orderly process returning to their countries. But what the Senator from Texas is asking us to do is to disqualify up to 2 million young people who are here in the United States and can qualify for DACA as DREAMers—people who were

here long before these unaccompanied children showed up at the border. That was the proposal that came from the House which the Senator inspired them to vote for. They stood for a standing ovation because they denied an opportunity to 2 million young people in this country to be able to stay here without fear of deportation. That is what the Senator is asking for today.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Illinois, but I would note that the comments he made are not connected to the facts of the proposal. The proposal is explicitly post-DACA.

Some 800,000 people have already received amnesty. Let's be clear. The President had no legal authority to grant amnesty at the time. He did so unilaterally, contrary to the rule of law.

Now we are in a broader context where the President has quite publicly promised to grant amnesty—again unilaterally and illegally—to some 5 or 6 million people. Yet at the behest of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, he announced this weekend he is delaying the decision until after the election, because apparently Senate Democrats up for election have noticed their constituents don't support the President in illegally and unilaterally granting amnesty.

I would suggest that Members of this body cannot have it both ways.

My friend from Illinois stated he doesn't think we should be granting amnesty to these children, and yet the legislation I introduced, the legislation the House of Representatives passed, does not act retroactively, does not address anyone who has fallen within the previous DACA. It simply says going forward the President doesn't have the authority to grant amnesty. Instead it is Congress that has the authority to pass or not pass immigration.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to ask the Senator this question: If amnesty means the person has a right to citizenship or legal status on a permanent basis, is the Senator from Texas suggesting the deferral of deportation under DACA—is that a kind of amnesty?

Mr. CRUZ. The deferral of deportation under DACA is a written determination from the President that the individuals who receive this, No. 1, will be immune from the black-letter text of the immigration law that subjects them to removal; and No. 2, the administration has created an authorization-to-work document as a component of DACA that has no basis or authority in existing Federal law.

Let us be clear. The President has been absolutely explicit. He intends to expand that to another 5 or 6 million people who are here illegally.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for a question in a moment.

The President intends to expand this to 5 or 6 million people who are here illegally to give them presumably the same authorization to work unilaterally and with no authorization in law to transfer their status from being illegally here to legally here on executive dispensation. I understand my friend from Illinois and other Members of the Democratic Party support that decision. I believe—and I would allow him in his question to clarify that. If I mischaracterized it, I would welcome his clarification. But there certainly are some members of the Democratic Caucus who do support that. But the American people powerfully don't, profoundly don't. They recognize it is inconsistent with the rule of law, is bad policy, and is creating this crisis at the border.

I have to say the President's decision to delay the amnesty until right after the election reflects a cynicism that even in Washington, DC, is unusual. Because what it is saying is: I understand the policies that I, President Obama, am trying to force that are completely unpopular with the American people, so I am going to jam them through right after the election. Because what it reflects is that President Obama and unfortunately many of the Senate Democrats hold their constituents in very low regard. It reflects the view that if we do this after the election, even if the people don't like it, they will forget about it in 2 years.

If my friends in the Democratic Party believe the right policy solution is amnesty for 5 or 6 million more people and the President acting unilaterally, then we have a very simple solution. Let's bring this up for a vote before the October recess.

The House of Representatives took the legislation I introduced in this body and they stayed over an extra day, they voted on it, and they stood up and led, acting to solve the crisis at the border. And what happened in the Senate? The majority leader of the Senate refused to allow a vote on the proposal and sent every Senator home for August while having done nothing to address this crisis.

If my friend, the Senator from Illinois, believes amnesty is the right policy decision, then let's have a debate, let's bring it up for a vote, and let's have every Senator in this body go on record.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Most people believe amnesty means a free pass. Whatever you have done, you stay in the United States and you stay in the United States and you become a citizen.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas that DACA is a temporary suspension of deportation. It is temporary. It has to be renewed. And in order to

qualify for it, you must have been in the United States as of June 15, 2007.

What we have now are 600,000—my number is 600, you say 800—600,000 who have come forward. They have paid the fee—a substantial fee—and they are allowed to stay here, without being subjected to deportation, on a temporary basis that needs to be renewed. There are another 2 million who may be eligible.

What the Senator is doing is not addressing the unaccompanied children at the border. The Senator is saying to the remaining 2 million: You don't have a chance. You have got to leave. You are illegal. You are going to be deported.

This isn't about amnesty. It is about whether those who are qualified under the DREAM Act, which incidentally was endorsed by the House Republican Caucus when they put out their statement of principles—whether those under the DREAM Act are going to have a chance to stay.

And to think that the Senator's colleagues in the House stood and applauded themselves for denying 2 million young people a chance to stay in the only country they have ever called home to me doesn't speak well of that caucus or their sensitivity to the reality of their lives.

These children who are brought here by their parents—some as infants—didn't vote on it. They were brought here. They have been raised in our schools. They have been taken care of in our hospitals. They pledge allegiance to the flag, as Senator MENENDEZ says, every day. They pledge allegiance in the classroom to the only country they have ever known. And you are glorying in the possibility that you can deport these children.

Is that what you consider to be—and in your own background—I am a first-generation American. I believe you have similar claims to make. Do you believe this is what this country is all about?

Mr. CRUZ. I appreciate my friend from Illinois impugning the integrity of our friends in the House and also describing the plight of innocents.

As you rightly noted, 67 years ago my father came here. He came from Cuba and spoke no English. He had \$100 sewn into his underwear. He came here legally on a student visa to study. He followed the rule of law. And I would note—my friend from Illinois knows full well—there is no stronger advocate of legal immigration in the Senate than I am. Indeed, on the Senate Judiciary Committee I introduced two amendments, one for high-skilled workers, H-1B workers, to increase that fivefold from 65,000 to 325,000 because temporary, high-skilled workers are progrowth. Every one of those who comes along produces 1.7 American jobs. I am sorry to say my friend from Illinois and every Senate Democrat on

the Judiciary Committee voted against that proposal—voted against increasing legal immigration for temporary, high-skilled workers.

My friend from Illinois is also aware—since we are both members of the Senate Judiciary Committee—that I introduced another amendment that would take our current failed legal immigration system and dramatically simplify it by reducing the barriers and costs and eliminate the per-country caps which have the effect of discriminating against nations such as Mexico, China, and India and take the legal cap from 675,000 and double it to 1.35 million so we can have a legal system we can continue that welcomes legal immigrants who come here to celebrate the American dream.

Again, I was sorry to see every single Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee vote against increasing legal immigration, streamlining it, making the system work better, and eliminating the discriminatory per-country caps on nations such as Mexico, India, and China.

I understand the Senator from Illinois just gave a passionate speech in defense of granting amnesty to people who are here illegally. He is certainly entitled to those views. We should indeed have a full and robust debate, but I will note that the Democratic Senator from Arkansas, the Democratic Senator from Louisiana, the Democratic Senator from North Carolina, and the Democratic Senator from Alaska are all busily telling their constituents they disagree with what my friend from Illinois just said. They are at home telling their constituents: No, no, no, no. We don't want amnesty. No, no, no, no. We don't want the President to unilaterally grant amnesty.

If that is indeed their position, I welcome them to come to the floor right now. If that is indeed their position, there is an easy action. For centuries this body has been called the world's greatest deliberative body. Unfortunately, that label is no longer accurately applied because this body, sadly, under Majority Leader REID and the Democratic majority, neither deliberates nor votes on much of anything.

There are over 350 bills the House of Representatives has passed to address the great challenges in this country—mostly with substantial bipartisan support—and over 350 pieces of legislation are sitting on HARRY REID's desk and he will not allow a vote on them.

When it comes to solving the crisis at the border, the only way to do so is to end the promise of amnesty. The 90,000 children who are coming believe when they get here they will get amnesty. The position, sadly, of President Obama and the majority leader and the Senate Democrats is that they will do nothing—zero—to fix that problem.

Let me say it is not compassionate, it is not humane to continue a system

where tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of little boys and little girls are being victimized and assaulted physically and sexually by violent coyotes. Under the Democratic plan that will continue. It will continue this year. It will continue next year. In response, they do nothing—zero, nada—to fix the problem. That is a hard-hearted approach to this challenge.

We have a demonstration, a study in contrast. Looking at a humanitarian crisis, the House of Representatives stood and voted on legislation to lawfully make it clear that the President of the United States has no authority to grant amnesty to people who are here illegally. The Senate had a chance to do the same.

President Obama has promised the American people that right after the election he intends to unilaterally and illegally grant amnesty to another 5 or 6 million people. Every Senate Democrat has an opportunity to make clear where he or she stands.

In a moment I am going to ask for this body to take up the bill the House has passed to make clear in law that the President has no authority to grant amnesty prospectively. I understand my Democratic friends are going to object to this. That should surprise no one because my Democratic friends for the last 2 years have objected to considering almost every major piece of legislation to address the challenges in this country.

What this means is that the 55 Democrats in this body who are standing united in blocking this legislation that the House of Representatives has passed—all 55 Democrats bear responsibility for President Obama's amnesty, for the amnesty of 5 or 6 million people.

I understand the President thinks it is politically clever to delay the amnesty until after the election, but I have real faith in the American people, that it is too clever by half, that all 55 Senate Democrats who are standing together, standing united with President Obama and saying we want the President to have the ability to illegally grant amnesty, every Senate Democrat in this body bears responsibility for that choice. If they did not, any Senate Democrat is welcome to come to the floor. I will note that other than the Democratic Senator from New Jersey, who is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I expect will object to my unanimous consent momentarily—there is not a single Democrat in this Chamber speaking out on eliminating the President's authority to grant amnesty.

Clarity in elections, enabling the American people to hold all of us accountable is a very good thing. One body, the House of Representatives, is leading. The other body, the Senate, under Democratic control, refuses to

even allow a vote on solving the crisis at the border or stopping the President's illegal amnesty.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5272

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 551, H.R. 5272. I further ask consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will first respond to the unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Texas, the son of immigrants himself, to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for students in the United States whom we call DREAMERS. For these young people, as Senator DURBIN said, the only flag they have ever pledged allegiance to is that of the United States. The only national anthem they have every sung is the "Star-Spangled Banner."

They came to this country not because they made a decision to do so but because their parents came here, just as Senator CRUZ's parents came here. He now ultimately enjoys the benefit of being an American, even though it was a different time and under a different set of circumstances. Nonetheless, he didn't have a choice in that decision and neither did these children.

We have learned and we have often heard in this Chamber that you never subscribe to the child whatever errors exist of the parent, but that is exactly what the Senator from Texas would do.

My friend from Texas is entitled to his views and his opinions, but he is not entitled to his own set of facts. The reality is that he continuously refers to the deferred action on deportation for these young people as amnesty. Amnesty suggests that someone is forgiven for something they did wrong and they have a clear pathway to permanent residency and ultimately to U.S. citizenship. That is not what the President did for these young people who know no other country than the United States. Any action that would be taken on these young people will be deferred until after Congress has acted on the pressing question of immigration reform.

The Senator from Texas suggested that the Senate has failed in leadership. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that the Senate exerted leadership over 1 year ago, when in broad bipartisan votes—notwithstanding the Senator from Texas—a group of eight Senators, four Republicans and four Democrats, joined together and got two-thirds of the Senate to send comprehensive immigration reform to the House of Representatives. We sent over commonsense immigration reform that

was the toughest on border protection that has existed in the history of the country, that was in the national security interests of the United States, that provided for the economic imperative as described by the Congressional Budget Office of the opportunities that immigration reform would provide for the country by raising the gross domestic product of the United States, raising the wages of all Americans, and reducing the national debt, all by virtue of immigration reform.

Two-thirds of the Senate voted on that at a time when it was rare to see two-thirds of the Senate come together on controversial or significant issues of the day. It was sent to the House of Representatives over 1 year ago, and they did not once cast a vote on that legislation or their own vision of what immigration reform should be.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I will be happy to do so a little later.

At the end of the day, the Senator from Texas argues that this measure is necessary to deal with the humanitarian crisis at the border. I will say that has gone dramatically in a downward slope.

He may argue that immigration policy is driving these children to make a dangerous and deadly journey. While I agree we need a long-term solution to the humanitarian crisis on the southern border, saying that this opportunity for DREAMers to stay in the United States is the cause is simply not true.

DACA, which is the law we refer to that the President did by administrative order, was announced in June of 2012. The influx of unaccompanied minors was reported months before that announcement. As a matter of fact, we can ask Senator CRUZ's own Governor, Rick Perry, who sent a letter warning about the influx of children months before the President's DACA announcement.

The fact is that all of this talk about ending deferred action for children who have been here sometimes well over a decade or more ignores the elephant in the room; that is, that DACA does not cover these children. It only covers children who were brought here before the announcement was made. Eliminating DACA, as the Senator from Texas wishes to do, would not make any of these children less likely to come here. These children are fleeing extreme violence in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, which have some of the highest murder rates per capita in the world.

If I saw my father killed and my sister raped, it is likely I would think about trying to flee that set of circumstances regardless of what the promise might or might not be, and that is in fact what drove this humanitarian crisis.

We should solve the roots of the crisis and not try to create some connec-

tion to something that has absolutely nothing to do with it.

I know we are in the season in which—even if 10 angels came swearing from above that DACA is not the cause of the unaccompanied minor circumstances or that it is not amnesty, there will be those who will say, no, those angels are wrong. The reality is that one is entitled to their own views but not their facts.

Finally, the undeniable consequence of the Senator's attempt to dismantle these deferred actions for DREAMers would serve only to further separate families. I have listened time and time again to my Republican colleagues say they are the heart of family values. Well, tearing apart families is not my sense of a family value. Tearing children away from their mothers and fathers is not my sense of family values. Destroying any hope of a better life and a chance at success is not the doctrine of family values.

There is a reason the Senate hasn't voted on this bill—and it won't. I think the Senate Democratic leadership understands it would be a disservice to our country, a disservice to hundreds of thousands of these young people who we have already invested in through our public schools. Now is the time to take advantage of their service, whether in the military of the United States or whether through their intellect. Some of them are the valedictorians and salutatorians of our schools and colleges and universities. It is an opportunity to ensure they can be productive members of our society, with no guarantee—with no guarantee—as it relates to their ultimate status.

I hope the immigrant community in this country—I hope the Hispanic community in this country, I hope the Asian and Indian communities in this country, I hope the Eastern European community in this country, all who are rightly concerned about comprehensive immigration reform—are listening to this debate, because as disappointed as some may be about the President saying: Well, we cannot move forward at this time until we get it right because of the politics that have been generated by the undocumented children along the border—as disappointed as some may be with the President—listen to what we will get if, in fact, this November there is a change of who ultimately has the majority in this Chamber. This is what we will get: We will get what we got in the House of Representatives, which is over a year of not casting one vote for their own vision of immigration reform. And every vote they have cast has been anti-immigrant at the end of the day.

For all of those reasons, I have to object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from New Jersey talked about legislation that was debated and voted on a year ago—legislation that I believe, if passed into law, would only make the problem worse, would only increase illegal immigration, would only exacerbate the problem.

I, as do most Americans, want to see commonsense immigration reform, but not reform that fails to secure the border, that grants a pathway to citizenship for those here illegally, and that incentivizes further and further illegal immigration.

But that legislation was a year ago. The President of the United States tells us we have a humanitarian crisis on the border today—right now, not a year ago, today—with little boys and little girls being subjected to physical and sexual violence and being victimized.

The question I would ask my friend from New Jersey is: Why is it that neither President Obama nor the Senate Democrats have introduced any legislation or allowed a vote on any legislation whatsoever that would actually solve the problems?

Now, the President did introduce a \$3.7 billion social services spending bill, less than 5 percent of which went to securing the border and none of which went to the underlying amnesty that is causing this crisis. That was a bill designed to deal with the symptoms to care for the kids once they come, but that bill assumed that tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of kids would continue to come, continue to be victimized.

So the question I ask of my friend from New Jersey is: Why have the Democrats not allowed a vote on anything to solve the problem and prevent these little boys and little girls from being victimized this year and next year and the year after that?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, first of all, I would say to my friend from Texas that he totally mischaracterizes the comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform that was passed in the Senate. Do we know who voted for that? A whole host of Senators on the Republican side of the aisle who represent border States and who said: This is the most significant border protection and security effort we have had in a long time. They believed the national security of the United States was better preserved by virtue of that legislation. Our colleague JOHN MCCAIN worked assiduously on that question, as well as others.

So the bottom line is, that reform was going to end the process of those coming in an undocumented fashion; it controlled the border, moved the economy, and would bring out of the darkness those who are here to pursue the American dream, which is the only way we can secure America, to differentiate from those who might be here to do

harm to the United States. I can't know that if people who are in the dark don't come and register with the government, pay their taxes, go for a criminal background check, and earn their way over the course of a decade to the possibility of becoming a permanent resident. That is what the Senate did.

So failure in this regard rests in the House of Representatives—failure on the border, failure on national security, failure on the economy, and failure to reunite millions of people with their families.

Now, with reference to the second part of the question, the President acted. It is the President who brought the Central American presidents here and said: You have to work with us to stop your young children from coming to our country and you have to create better conditions in your country, and we want to work with you to do that. We want to work with Mexico to ensure that what they call the Beast—the train of death—ultimately Mexican authorities interceded to stop immigrants from getting on that train to the United States. It is the President who ultimately took the resources that existed in the Department of Homeland Security and reauthorized them to send them to the border and deal with the challenge. All of that, among other efforts, ultimately has found us with a dramatic reduction.

So I understand the politics of this. I appreciate everybody in this Chamber has the right to pursue that. But the bottom line is the President acted and the reality is we have dramatically reduced it, and the core challenge here is to have comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I wish to make two final comments to conclude this exchange. My friend from New Jersey admitted that Senate Democrats introduced nothing—zero, nada—to do anything to fix this humanitarian crisis. Indeed, the majority leader dismissed the Senate and sent the Senators home for the month of August, perfectly content to let the crisis continue, to let tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of children be victimized. He suggested instead the solution was Presidential action, unilateral action.

There was a time when the Senate believed we had a responsibility to legislate, to actually pass laws to address challenges. Yet under the Senate Democrats, we have a do-nothing Senate. That is why over 350 bills passed by the House of Representatives are sitting on HARRY REID's desk, because this body no longer votes on meaningful legislation to address the challenges facing this country.

My friend from New Jersey suggested that the reason the legislation the

House of Representatives passed prohibiting the President from illegally granting amnesty—the reason it is not going to come up for a vote is because he said it is a bad idea. Well, I recognize the Senator from New Jersey may well think that. Indeed, the Senator from Illinois may well think that. But no one who is paying attention to the Senate thinks that is the reason it is not coming up for a vote.

If it were objectively a bad idea—if it were a bad idea and the Democrats agreed on that, bringing it up for a vote would be very simple. We would bring it up for a vote. The Democrats have 55 Democrats in this body. They could all vote it down and it would be defeated. If the point were on the merits it is a bad idea, bringing it up for a vote would be very straightforward.

The reason the majority leader is fighting so hard to prevent a vote is that a great many of the Members in his caucus are doing everything in their power to convince their constituents back home they don't support amnesty.

As we travel the country, the most frequent thing we hear all throughout the country is that the men and women in Washington aren't listening to us. Something happens. I don't know if it is the water or what it is, but they get to Washington, they stop listening to us, and they don't tell us the truth. They are lying to us. We hear this from Republicans, from Democrats, Independents, Libertarians, all across this country. There is a reason why the popularity of Congress rivals that of Ebola, because the American people recognize the people in this body aren't telling them the truth. There is one reason and one reason only that Majority Leader REID does not want to vote on this legislation: because he wants to allow Senators in red States—the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from Alaska, even the Senator from Colorado, even the Senator from New Mexico—he wants to allow them to tell their constituents, No, I don't support amnesty. And the reality is, of the 55 Members of this Senate who are Democrats, who caucus with the Democratic Party, today it has been conclusively demonstrated that all 55 support President Obama's illegal amnesty and are responsible for his promised amnesty of 5 million to 6 million more people right after the election. If that were not the case, we would have seen one Democrat show up and speak out to the contrary. Not a single Democrat showed up.

There is a reason we don't have a vote, because if we had a vote, it would force Members of this body to be on record.

The Senator from New Jersey is entitled to make the case on the merits why he thinks amnesty for 5 million or 6 million or 12 million is a good idea.

He is entitled to make that case, and if his constituents agree with him, he will keep getting reelected. But far too many Senate Democrats want to pretend they disagree, and a vote makes that impossible because if we had a vote, we would see all 55 Senate Democrats vote in favor of amnesty. They are right now hiding behind their leadership because they don't want that vote. They don't want their constituents to understand they support amnesty. So, instead, they shut this body down.

The American people are frustrated. They are disgusted with the Senate that won't do its job, that won't allow votes, that won't consider legislation to address the problems in this country, and that consistently lies to the voters.

I will tell my colleagues on my side of the aisle, I am happy to have as many votes as we like. It is interesting. The Senate majority leader today seems to view as his principal obligation protecting his Members from hard votes. I wish to point out the concept of a hard vote only makes sense if there is a disconnect between what a Senator says at home and what he or she does in Washington. Votes are hard if we have Democratic Senators who go home to their States and tell their constituents: I am really conservative and I don't agree with that crazy stuff President Obama is doing. Then they come here and vote lockstep with the majority leader and the President. Then votes are hard.

I will tell my colleagues from my perspective, I don't consider votes hard. In 2 years, what I have tried to do in the Senate is very simple—2 things: Do what I said I would do, and tell the truth. The 26 million Texans I represent, I believe, understood the principles I am defending when they elected me. And whether we have 1 vote or 10 or 100 or 1,000, it doesn't surprise the men and women back home, because what I say in Texas is exactly the same as what I say on the floor of the Senate, and it is the way I have tried to vote since I arrived here. The reason the majority leader has 350-plus bills sitting on his desk is because a substantial number of Senate Democrats tell their constituents one thing and vote a different way. This is all predicated on deception.

So I am glad for this exchange because this exchange has shined light and made clear to the voters that, No. 1, amnesty is coming and President Obama intends to grant amnesty to 5 million to 6 million people right after the election; and No. 2, all 55 Senate Democrats bear direct responsibility for President Obama's illegal amnesty because all 55 Senate Democrats are standing in lockstep, preventing legislation that would stop that amnesty. That clarity is good. It allows accountability. It allows decisionmaking to be made by we the people.

The one thing I would encourage of my Democratic friends is, given that reality, go home and be honest with your constituents. All 55 of you go home and say: Yes, I stand with President Obama. I stand with majority leader HARRY REID in support of amnesty.

Those are not the views of the American people, but they are the views of every Democratic Senator in this body. We have a natural check when elected officials ignore the views and values of the people for whom we work in the place where sovereignty resides in our system: We the people.

I yield the floor, and I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to talk about an important piece of the Democrats' "fair shot" agenda: ensuring that women across America have access to the basic and often lifesaving health care benefits guaranteed under the Affordable Care Act.

Just a few months ago five men on the Supreme Court decided that there should be a group of woman across America who are required to ask their bosses for permission to access basic health care and that a corporation should have more rights than the women it employs. Just a few months ago those five men rolled back the clock on millions of women across America.

As the ink was still drying on Justice Alito's misguided opinion in the Hobby Lobby case, I made an unwavering commitment to do everything I could to protect women's access to health care since the five male Justices on the Supreme Court decided they would not. That is why I worked with my partner, the senior Senator from Colorado, to introduce the Not My Boss's Business Act to restore those lost benefits and protect women's health care. I am proud that in the months since we have received strong support from men and women across the country.

Our straightforward and simple legislation would ensure that no CEO or corporation can come between you and your guaranteed access to health care, period. This should not be a controversial issue. In fact, nearly 7 in 10 people say health plans should cover birth control. The only controversy about

birth control today is the fact that it is 2014 and we are still fighting for this basic health care that is used by 99 percent of sexually active women in this country.

Despite the resounding outrage we have heard from women and men across America, Senate Republicans stood with this misguided Supreme Court decision and blocked our efforts to right this wrong. If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle thought their obstruction of the Not My Boss's Business Act in July would end this conversation, they were dead wrong. Since then, millions of Americans have taken action. They have voiced their outrage on social media. They have organized action in their communities. They will continue to speak out until our Congress in turn takes action.

Unfortunately, it appears this message has fallen on deaf ears among some Senate Republicans. It has become increasingly clear on that side that some of the Members have decided to put the tea party ahead of women and have no intention of even allowing a debate on the Not My Boss's Business Act in the near future. I am extremely disappointed by that. I would have hoped our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have maybe—just maybe—spent a little time at home in August listening to women in their States. If they had, they would have heard the women across America asking Congress to fix this horrible decision that resulted from Hobby Lobby.

By the way, it is not just women who want Congress to act. People across the country understand that if bosses can deny birth control, they can deny vaccines or HIV treatments or other basic health care services for employees and their covered dependents. I think what men across America understand is that it is not just the female employees at businesses who are affected, it is their wives and their daughters as well who share that health care plan.

The data is clear. Ensuring access to contraception coverage is not just the right thing to do, it is also a critical part of making sure women and their families have a fair shot in the 21st century. Women and their family members should not be held back by outdated policies and unfair practices. As I said yesterday on the Senate floor, it is not just about access to contraception, it includes pay equity, access to childcare, a higher minimum wage, and it absolutely includes the right to make their own medical and religious decisions without being dictated or limited by their employer.

The bottom line is this: Women use birth control for a host of reasons, none of which should require a permission slip from their boss.

Unfortunately, Americans are most likely not surprised at what they are seeing. This obstruction is coming from Members of the same party that

has been threatening to subject women to invasive and degrading ultrasounds; the same party that had candidates making outrageous statements, as we all remember, about legitimate rape and then defending those comments during their disastrous book tour; the exact same party that on Capitol Hill, in State houses across America, and in courtrooms at all levels is actively attempting to block women's ability to make their own decisions about their own health. They have shown they will go to just about any length to limit access to care.

Just in the past few weeks we have seen last-ditch efforts from Republicans to distract from their embarrassing record on women's health by claiming to support "cheaper and easier access to contraception" by simply making it over the counter. Well, the reality is that these proposals would actually cost women more by forcing them to pay out of pocket for the birth control they are getting now at no cost thanks to the Affordable Care Act. This is a basic piece of women's health care. It should not be available only to those who can afford it.

The American people are not fooled. In fact, just yesterday PolitiFact rated one Republican birth control claim as "Mostly False" given that it was "lacking in concrete detail."

Time and again Republican leadership has put politics between women and their health care. Now, with their continued obstruction, they have put employers between women and their access to free or low-cost basic health care under the Affordable Care Act. They have shown us they are not focused on what is best for women; they are focused on political calculations, appeasing the far right, and their continued efforts to do whatever it takes to pitch their extreme agenda even when it burdens working women and their families.

Despite this disappointing turn of events, I stand here today to say the deck is stacked against them because millions of women who benefit from this basic and often lifesaving health care will not be silenced. They are still watching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, how much time am I allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has up to 1 hour postcloture.

Mr. CORKER. Well I assure you that will not be the case. I will speak for possibly 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

ISIS

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, tonight the President is going to address an issue on which I know almost every American has been focused; that is, the rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria and the

beginning of that in many other places around the world. This is obviously a big speech. It is one that I know all of us will be paying attention to and watching.

I am hopeful that what the President will do tonight is, first of all, explain to the American people from his perspective what our national interest is in ISIS. I think that should be very easy to do. I also hope that what he will do is lay out a general strategy. Obviously, in a speech such as this you never want to give every detail of what it is you want to do, but I hope he lays out the objectives he wishes to accomplish as he talks to the Nation and really the world about how he plans to deal with ISIS.

So I wanted to say at the onset that I look forward to listening. I hope this is a speech that is meaty. I hope it is a speech that speaks to the essence of why we as a nation need to deal with the threat ISIS poses not only in the Middle East but, over time, in the West, with us being the greatest symbol.

I know there have been many conversations with the administration about ISIS. I know that obviously their concern about ISIS has risen over time. Again, I look forward to very clearly listening to the speech.

Most of us here in the Senate, if we were in the White House, might choose to guard the authorities we have. Many Presidents have said—most Presidents have said they themselves have the authority to conduct operations of this nature. While that is debatable, that is not a topic I wish to debate. I know the President has said he has the ability to go about these actions, to take these actions without any additional authority from Congress. What they have said is they plan to not come to Congress. I think that is absolutely preposterous.

If you think back in history, back in 1991 President Bush 41, in getting ready to undertake the activities in Desert Storm, felt as though he had the authority to move ahead with those activities. Yet they realized within the administration that the best thing they could do was to get the American people behind what they were doing, and the best way to do that was to seek an authorization from Congress, to have that debate, to have Members of the Senate be able to ask questions about how this operation was going to take place, to get people comfortable with what the objectives were going to be, and to finally win over the Senate. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, Sam Nunn, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee at the time, was opposed to this effort. Yet, with Bush 41 coming up with his Cabinet members to talk to Members of Congress, they were able to pass it over the objection of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. But what that meant was there had to be interaction, there had

to be questions and answers, and there had to be a feeling by Members of this body that what was getting ready to happen was something that was going to make a difference. So they came and did that. They were successful, and the operation itself was successful.

President Bush 43 did the same. In 2001, after what happened with the Twin Towers and other activities around 9/11, the country was outraged. He actually sent forth his own AUMF, the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Action was taken. It was 60 words, it was broad, but action was taken. The same thing occurred in 2002, which led us to what happened in Iraq. So President Bush 43 did those same things even though he felt as if he himself had the authority to take on those activities without Congress approving them. But they felt it was much better for the American people to see what was going to happen and for Congress to be fully informed, to understand what the objectives were, and then to have Congress authorize it.

This President, President Obama, came before us last year—almost 1 year ago exactly—and asked for an authorization on Syria.

I find it truly preposterous and hugely lacking in judgment that this President is discussing—and hopefully he will change his mind in the next few days—undertaking activities in Iraq. Remember, the President declared that in 2011 the war in Iraq was over, that we had won, that it was a stable country. Yet this new enemy—I do not want to get into the past too much, but because of policies of this administration in both Iraq and Syria, things have changed. So now we have a new enemy—ISIS—that has arisen. They are incredibly well funded, well equipped, well energized, and savvy to social media.

We have seen the detestable things that this group is doing to people of all kinds of ethnic persuasions in Iraq. We understand the threat this is to Iraq and to the Middle East.

What we also know is this is something that is affecting directly today not only Iraq but Syria. There is really no border there. It is porous.

We actually know the ISIS headquarters are in Syria. So this is an operation that can in no way be confined just to Iraq. We have to deal with this in Syria.

The President hopefully tonight—while laying out what our national interest is, while laying out what his general strategy is, while laying out what his objective is—certainly will talk about the fact that we have to deal with this in Syria.

I will say to the Presiding Officer of the Senate that it seems to me, even if the President feels that he has the authority to do this with his own constitutional powers under article 2—even if he feels that—it is totally pre-

posterous that he would not seek our authorization to take on a different enemy. Certainly, to take this into another country that we have not been involved with in this way in the past—Syria—to take on operations in that country with a different enemy and not come to Congress, to not seek the approval of the people whom the people of this country have elected to weigh in on these matters to me, again, is tremendously lacking in judgment.

One of the benefits of the President coming to seek our approval is that he has stated over the weekend that he believes this could take 3 years. Let me say this one more time. This is a conflict that he believes could take 3 years in duration and take us into another country where we are now not involved in this matter anyway. He is talking about not coming to us.

Again, bad things happen in conflict. Our Presiding Officer has a distinguished career in serving our country—and I honor that—a distinguished public service in the military, and he knows that things don't always go the way we intend.

For the President to undertake something of 3 years in duration—by his own words, in another country and an enemy that is one of the most well-funded terrorist operations that we have dealt with, knowing that he has to pull together a coalition of people with very different interests but with like interests relative to this particularly detestable group of folks—to think that this President would undertake that without Congress being behind him and having 535 Monday morning quarterbacks because there was never any buy-in by Congress to me is foolish.

But because of what happened 1 year ago where our allies in the region who were going to help us deal with Assad were waiting by the telephone to respond because they, with us, were going to conduct activities against Assad about 1 year ago today—they watched on CNN as the President had changed his mind without even notifying them, without notifying their leaders or their armed services—there is a credibility issue.

The President has talked about building a coalition, and he says that there are 12 countries that are already interested.

I would say to him that coming to Congress would show that there is durability, that he has sought our support, that he has answered our questions, that his Cabinet members have laid out their plan, both in public and in private—talking about details that have no business in the public sphere—and that he has the buy-in of the Congress.

I would say to the other members of the coalition, the people in the region who question our durability, question, candidly—I hate to say it—his credibility. They would say that after he

had done this that they believe this Nation is unified in dealing with this issue.

I just want to say again I hope the President is good tonight. I hope he delivers to the American people why this is in our national interest. I hope he lays out a strategy that makes sense. I hope he deals with the objectives that he wants to come forth with.

Importantly, to me, I understand how we are going to deal with the ground in Iraq. I understand we have an Iraqi military—as weak as they are—that we can build off of. I understand that we have the Peshmerga—the Kurds—who we can build off of in support.

What I don't understand in Syria, especially since year after year we have done nothing to support the moderate opposition like we have said we would do—or very little—let me not say nothing, but really very little. Since we have nothing of substance on the ground in Syria, how are we going to deal with that?

Our Presiding Officer knows more about military officers than I do by far. But how do we deal with a country with nothing on the ground. I want him to explain that. But I think all of us would like to understand that.

But, again, I think if he were to come to the Senate to seek our support overtly and to explain to the Presiding Officer, myself, and many others in this body how he has a strategy that could be effective, I believe that he would receive overwhelming support, and I believe he would have the durability necessary to deal with an enemy of this sort.

I do hope, again, the President is on target tonight. I hope the President will seek our authorization for the use of military force—now.

I hear people say: Well, gosh, CORKER, it is right before an election.

So our President is going to talk to the Nation about what we are going to be doing with this enemy in Iraq, in Syria—candidly—and in other places. Because there is an election coming up, maybe he is not going to—I don't know that this is his reason, but I know there are a lot of people in Congress who say they don't want to deal with it before the election.

Are you kidding me—the most significant decision that is made; that is, sending men and women in harm's way—because it is 2 months before an election. If there are people in this body who don't want to be put to the task by the President of asking for an amount, whether it is 2 hours, 2 days, 2 weeks, 2 months or 2 years before an election. Someone shouldn't serve in the Senate if they don't want to take up these issues and deal with them.

I hope the President will change his mind. I hope the President will come to the Senate and seek our input and say that he wants an authorization and send us that authorization.

That is what he did with Syria. Let's look at it. Let's deal with his Cabinet Members, both in public and private. Let's deal with him. Let us see his commitment. Let's understand the coalition that is being put forth and let's deal with this in the manner that people in the Senate should deal with it, but it should come only after the President seeks that authorization. That is an important thing for him to do. I hope he will do it tomorrow after giving his speech.

I stand by ready to work with him in that regard, and I close with those comments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Vermont.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, later this week, one of the most important Senate votes in the modern history of this country will take place, and that vote will be about whether the Senate begins the process to move forward on a constitutional amendment which overturns the disastrous 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision on Citizens United.

What the Citizens United Supreme Court decision was about 4 years ago is to say to the billionaires in this country, to say to the largest corporations in this country: OK, you already own much of the economy of the United States of America, but now by a 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision we are going to allow the billionaires and the large corporations of this country to own the U.S. Government because they will now be allowed to spend unlimited sums of money on political campaigns.

Poll after poll tells us that whether you are a progressive, as I am, a moderate, or a conservative, all over this country people are profoundly disgusted by the ability of big money to buy elections. What democracy means, what people fought and died for is the right of you, her, and him to have one vote.

What democracy is not about is allowing the Koch brothers—a family worth \$80 billion, the second wealthiest family in this country—to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to elect candidates whose job it is to make the wealthiest people in this country even wealthier while they continue to attack the needs of the middle class and working families of this country.

There was a piece the other day in the Washington Post talking about how the Koch brothers alone—just one family—has already in this election cycle put 44,000 ads on television and radio, and we have 2 months left before this election.

Does anybody believe that is what democracy is about?

In this country today we are suffering a major economic crisis. What that crisis is about is the disappear-

ance of the middle class, the fact that since 1999 the typical middle-class family has seen its income go down by more than \$5,000 after adjusting for inflation. The crisis is that all over America, working people are not working 40 hours a week, they are working 50, 60 hours a week. They are not working at one job—they are working at two jobs, they are working at three jobs, trying to cobble together an income and maybe some health care to take care of their family.

The crisis in America today is that unemployment is not the official rate of 6.1 percent, it is the real rate of 12 percent if we include those people who have given up looking for work and are working part-time.

The crisis is that youth unemployment today is 20 percent; African-American youth unemployment is 35 percent. The American people are calling out. They are saying to the Congress: Why doesn't Congress create the millions of jobs our people need. Why don't you rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. Why don't you transform our energy system so we can address the crisis of climate change and move away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency, wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and create huge numbers of jobs. Why don't you rebuild our crumbling bridges, roads, water systems, and wastewater plants. Why don't you raise the minimum wage to a living wage.

That is what people tell me in Vermont and that is what people are saying all over this country.

People ask that today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act, how does it happen that the United States is the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people as a right?

We have 40 million people uninsured, even more paying large copayments and premiums.

Why don't we join the rest of the world and guarantee health care to all of our people?

The answer is very simple. The answer is that Members elected to the House and the Senate increasingly are dependent upon big money campaign contributions in order to win their seats. That is not what democracy is about; that is what oligarchy is about. Oligarchy is when you have a nation owned and controlled by a handful of wealthy families. That is where we are moving today.

On issue after issue, the American people are very clear about where they want to be going. On this issue of Citizens United, the American people are very clear that we need real campaign finance reform to prevent billionaires from buying elections. That is what the American people want. That is what they say in poll after poll. Yet it remains to be seen whether, in a few days when we vote on this issue, we will get one Republican vote. And I can

understand that because the Republicans today are the beneficiaries in a very big-time way of all of this billion-aire money.

A couple months ago a constituent of mine in Vermont made a very interesting suggestion. He said: Bernie, do you ever see these guys in NASCAR, the racing car drivers, and they wear their jackets, and their jackets have all of the sponsors on them? They are sponsored by Goodyear Tire Company, and they are sponsored by this oil company, and they are sponsored by this brake company. Maybe we should have the Members of the U.S. Senate wear jackets which tell us who is sponsoring them. So somebody can come forward in their nice blue blazer and say: Hey, I am owned and sponsored by the Koch brothers. Somebody else can come forward and say: No, I am not owned by the Koch brothers, I am owned by the oil industry or I am owned by Big Energy or I am owned by Wall Street. It would be very instructive, when you see people get up and vote, about why they do not want to raise the minimum wage, to find out they are controlled by significant contributions coming from large corporations.

I think it would be very interesting to see Members of the Congress wear those types of coats.

The men and women of our country know there is something profoundly wrong when 95 percent of all new income generated in this country goes to the top 1 percent. They know there is something profoundly wrong when one out of four profitable corporations pays nothing in Federal taxes in any given year. Yet the reason we are unable to come up with real tax reform—so we can find the money to help our kids go to college, so we can deal with the fact that we have the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world—has everything to do with large corporations not paying their fair share, and that has everything to do with the types of campaign contributions these institutions make.

There was a poll that came out just the other day. They asked the American people: Should we cut Social Security? Do you know what the American people say, whether they are progressives, moderates, or conservatives? They say: You have to be nuts. We can't make it on Social Security benefits today, and you want to cut Social Security? You want to cut Medicare? But that is exactly what the Business Roundtable from corporate America wants us to do.

So we are living in two separate worlds. On the one hand you have an agenda here in the House and among many of my Republican colleagues that says: What we need to do is give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people and the largest corporations. Is that what the American people want? Overwhelmingly, they do not want that.

You have an agenda among many who say: We have to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Is that what the American people want? No, they do not.

There is an agenda among some Republicans that says: Not only should we not raise the minimum wage, we should do away with the concept of the minimum wage so that in high-unemployment areas people could work for \$4 or \$5 an hour. Is that what the American people want? Quite the contrary. They want to raise the minimum wage to at least \$10.10 an hour.

So you have an amazing dynamic right now in American society. On the one hand in the real world outside of the beltway, ordinary people are hurting. They are struggling. They are worried about their kids. They are worried about their grandchildren. They are worried about their parents. They want the U.S. Government to do something to create jobs, to raise the minimum wage, to change our disastrous trade policies. They want us to do something to make college affordable, to lower interest rates on student debt. They want us to create jobs by rebuilding the infrastructure. They want everybody in this country to have health care as a right. They want us to address the crisis of global warming. But we do not do that. Why not? Because increasingly the Congress is not responsive to the needs of ordinary Americans. They are responsive to the big-money campaign contributors, and that has everything to do with this constitutional amendment beginning the process to overturn *Citizens United*.

So of all of the issues out there—whether you are concerned about education, health care, the environment, the economy—the most important issue underlying all of those issues is the need to end this disastrous Supreme Court decision which allows billionaires to buy elections. That is not what people fought and died for in the name of democracy. That is called oligarchy. Abraham Lincoln talked about a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, not a government of the billionaires, by the billionaires, and for the billionaires, and that is where we are today.

I hope the American people are watching. The media has not paid, for interesting reasons, a lot of attention to this issue, but there is no domestic issue that I can think of more important for the future of this country.

Do we elect Members of Congress who are beholden to the constituents back home, to the middle class, to working families, or do we elect Members of Congress who are beholden to corporate America and the billionaire class? Do we fight to sustain the democratic foundation of this country or do we move toward an oligarchic form of society controlled by a handful of billionaire families? That is the issue.

That is what this debate is all about, and that is what this vote in a few days will be about. I hope very much the American people will demand that every Member of this Senate vote for this piece of legislation which begins the process of overturning this disastrous *Citizens United* Supreme Court decision.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to follow up on the Presiding Officer's comments a moment ago about the crux of this issue—why this big money in campaigns is so bad for our country.

The public does not really care who has an advantage, who has a disadvantage. They do not really care if a Republican wins or a Democrat wins. They care about what we do here and how we can help people's lives.

The Presiding Officer talked about the minimum wage. In my first year in the Senate, 2007—my first speech on the Senate floor, four or five desks over from here, was about the minimum wage. It passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote. It was signed by a Republican President, increasing the minimum wage. That was then. Today we cannot even get a minimum wage out of the Senate because of a Republican filibuster.

The minimum wage is worth one-third less in real dollars, in purchasing power, than it was in 1968. The subminimum wage—the tipped wage—has been stuck at \$2.13 an hour for 20 years. People who push wheelchairs at airports, valets, and waiters in downtown diners can make as little as \$2 or \$3 an hour, and they hope to get up to \$7 or \$8 or \$9 on tips.

If it were not for the political pressure, the money that just rolls across the political landscape, that washes across the candidates for the Senate, the candidates for the House, we could pass the minimum wage. But Members of the Senate, when they think about voting on this, they think about the big money that might come in against them if they vote for the minimum wage.

I am convinced that if we could pass this constitutional amendment, we could begin to address the issues of Wall Street and oil companies and Big Tobacco buying elections, spending not millions, not even tens of millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars. We could pass the minimum wage. We could pass a real jobs bill. We could reform Wall Street. We could pass consumer protection bills. We could invest

in education and community colleges and federally qualified health centers and veterans' benefits the way we should. That is why this constitutional amendment is so important on campaign spending. That is why it matters.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as we all know, we are discussing a constitutional amendment sponsored by 45 members of the Democratic Party to restrict free speech.

This constitutional amendment pending before the Senate is a real threat to one of the two most vital developments in our Nation's legal and constitutional history.

One of those legal successes was the development of a body of civil rights laws to protect the basic freedoms of all Americans. That took a long time and required massive effort and even bloodshed as well as judicial rulings. The second development was the enhancement of free speech as protected by the First Amendment. That process also required massive time and effort and judicial rulings.

Both of these struggles were made necessary because the Supreme Court failed to give effort to the intent of the authors of the First and 14th Amendments in guaranteeing liberty and equality. It took President Jefferson assuming office—not the courts interpreting the First Amendment—to address the criminalization of free speech under the Alien and Sedition Acts.

When Congress in the 1830s and 1840s denied the right to petition for redress of grievances to those who opposed slavery, it took John Quincy Adams and Congress—not a court relying on the First Amendment—to change those rules.

The reality is the First Amendment had a very limited scope until well into the 20th century. After a judicial sea change, the courts now give broad protection to free speech.

Political speech is now constitutionally protected unless the government has a compelling interest, and the restriction is narrowly tailored to further that compelling interest. Those free speech battles took many years to win. If the arguments that proponents of this constitutional amendment are making were adopted, we would be turning the clock back on 100 years of progress of protecting free speech. The constitutional amendment before us is a content-based restriction on free speech.

Speech influencing campaigns for elective office would be restricted. No

other speech content, however, would be restricted. Some of that speech by corporations and other entities could be prohibited entirely, and those who engage in such speech could be criminally prosecuted.

The Supreme Court has allowed content-based restrictions on speech in only a very few cases, such as obscenity, defamation, child pornography, and threats.

The proposed constitutional amendment would restrict the most important speech the First Amendment protects—and that happens to be core political speech. It would treat that speech as if it were like child pornography.

In the Judiciary Committee, one Democrat actually compared core political speech to child pornography. It is incredible that would be said. Comparing the core political speech the Bill of Rights protects to the video recording of an unspeakable crime against a child doesn't make any sense.

That same Senator and the sponsor of the amendment on the floor both argued that campaign-related speech can be restricted because free speech doesn't include the right to falsely shout fire in a crowded theater. This is the argument that would reduce free speech protection in this country to the minimal level that it enjoyed 100 years ago, before there was expansion of protection under the First Amendment.

When Justice Holmes made that famous fire statement in that case, the Supreme Court wasn't being asked to rule on the legality of a conviction of someone who had falsely yelled fire in a crowded theater. Rather, the case involved a man who was convicted of distributing leaflets urging young men not to comply with the draft laws during World War I.

Justice Holmes compared that peaceful protest to a shout that would immediately lead to serious bodily injury and perhaps loss of life for larger numbers of people. That is obviously a false analogy.

Those who speak in support or opposition to candidates are comparable then to those who pass out leaflets in opposition to government policy. It is obviously false analogy to compare that speech designed to persuade fellow citizens in their voting to falsely yelling fire in a crowded theater.

It is easy for the government to determine whether a cry of fire is true or false, but a campaign ad isn't often clearly false. Even a false ad doesn't create the risk of death. When a government prosecutes those who falsely cry fire in a crowded theater, that prosecution will have the beneficial effect of deterring others from engaging in that same conduct. But when government criminalizes ads that it determines are false or limits how much can be spent on those ads, backed up by

criminal penalties, that in fact will produce the harm of reducing the likelihood that others will speak about important public subjects—hence, weakening our democracy.

Justice Holmes quickly came to realize the errors of his ways. In subsequent Supreme Court decisions, he and Justice Brandeis dissented when the majority applied the clear and present danger test that the fire-in-the-theater analogy supported. They voted to protect peaceable free speech. They understood that in a free country, the way to address controversial speech was through speech by others with different views—not by shutting up people with the threat of jail.

It took a long 50 years for the Court to adopt the protections for free speech that Justice Holmes and Judge Learned Hand had advocated to no avail. And if this constitutional amendment passes, that glorious history of the understanding of the importance of free speech in a democracy will be undone.

It was only a few years after its 1969 ruling providing strong constitutional protections of free political speech that the Supreme Court ruled on its first campaign speech case; that is, *Buckley v. Valeo*. In that case the Court ruled that the independent expenditures could be limited. The decision wasn't the work of supposed conservative judicial activists. Wealthy individuals have been able to spend unlimited amounts on campaign-related speech since then. That isn't a novel development that dates only to *Citizens United*. *Buckley* also permitted nonprofit corporations to engage in independent expenditures designed to influence campaigns. Corporations and others could contribute to these nonprofit entities.

In context, *Citizens United* represents an advance over the prior law, especially in promoting transparency. Floyd Abrams, the Nation's foremost First Amendment litigator, wrote to the Judiciary Committee in questions for the record:

What *Citizens United* did do, however, is permit corporations to contribute to PACs that are required to disclose all donors and engage only in independent expenditures.

If anything, *Citizens United* is a pro-disclosure ruling which brought corporate money further into the light.

So I don't think my colleagues are correct in saying this amendment is about so-called "dark money." And limiting speech is totally separate from disclosure of speech. This amendment says nothing about disclosure.

It is the constitutional amendment, not *Citizens United*, that fails to respect precedent. It doesn't simply overturn one case. The Supreme Court has repeatedly found that engaging in campaign speech is fully protected by the Bill of Rights. Time after time it has ruled correctly that because effective speech can only occur through the expenditure of money, government cannot restrict campaign expenditures by

candidates or others. Repeatedly, the Court has recognized that effective campaign speech requires that individuals have the right to form groups that will spend money on campaign speech. Those Supreme Court decisions were joined and sometimes written by great liberal Justices.

This proposal represents a radical departure from long-established free speech protections. It is at war with an entire body of jurisprudence. It extends well beyond corporations.

Despite the sponsors of this amendment limiting their criticism to one or two cases, the amendment would overturn not just those few cases but 12 Supreme Court decisions, according to that expert, Mr. Abrams. As the amendment has been redrafted, it may be only 11.5 cases now, depending upon what the word "reasonable" means. And why the word "reasonable" was left out in the first place and why it was included now, I don't know, but it is included now because people realize the extremities to which this constitutional amendment would take it. But even with the word "reasonable," that extreme position would take us down a slippery slope, amending the Bill of Rights, and I don't think we want to go down that slope.

Justice Stevens, whom the committee Democrats relied on at length in support of the amendment, voted with the majority in three of the cases the amendment would overturn.

It is hard to imagine what would be more radical than the Congress passing a constitutional amendment to overturn a dozen Supreme Court decisions that have protected individual rights. Free speech would be dramatically curtailed. That is why the arguments made here on the Senate floor that matters were fine before Citizens United 4 years ago are beside the point.

Also off-point is the argument by another Democrat that the debate here concerns only whether Citizens United was correctly decided under the First Amendment and that the overall protection of free speech is not at issue whatsoever. The amendment before us doesn't just reverse Citizens United. It doesn't just take us back 4 years. It reverses decades of precedent that gave broad protection to free speech. That is why the stakes are so high and why we are spending so much time debating this constitutional amendment.

Yet another argument was raised on the floor that overturning Citizens United through a constitutional amendment is comparable to overturning earlier Supreme Court decisions on women's suffrage or poll taxes. In response to a written question from the Judiciary Committee, the same scholar, Mr. Abrams, forcefully rejected any such comparison. He wrote this back to us Senators:

The notion that a Supreme Court opinion protecting First Amendment rights should

be viewed as comparable to one depriving slaves or women of their rights is both intellectually flawed and morally repugnant.

How can constitutional amendments assuring freedom of slaves or equality for women possibly be viewed as analogous to taking away—

Emphasis on "taking away"—citizens' First Amendment rights?

This morning the lead sponsor of the amendment contended that the amendment wouldn't lead to banning books or putting people in jail. He also claimed that Congress had not provided for such results in earlier years and would not do so now. He said that even if Congress tried, it would be very unlikely that both Houses would pass such a measure. He maintained that even if such extreme measures were enacted, the Supreme Court would strike down them as unreasonable. It reminds you that the alien and sedition laws never put anybody in prison. But this sponsor did not deny that Congress could, in fact, pass legislation that would have the effect the opponents have raised. What does he think would happen if someone violated the reasonable spending limits? Some government agency would have to enforce them with criminal penalties. Violating them would subject people to jail for speaking. The Obama Justice Department, which would enforce those criminal laws, told the Supreme Court that if Citizens United had been decided as the sponsors of the amendment desire, it would prosecute book publishers.

In this country constitutional rights do not depend on the kindness of politicians not infringing them. Otherwise, we wouldn't have had the Alien and Sedition Acts. Those limits prevent Congress from violating rights in the first place.

The Bill of Rights was adopted precisely because the citizens rejected the argument that the Constitution's difficult passage to legislative enactment by itself was adequate to protect fundamental liberties such as free speech. And it is cold comfort that after the election is over and they have been barred from speaking, citizens can spend money to ask the Supreme Court to reverse their convictions.

I have made clear that this amendment abridges fundamental freedoms that are the birthright of Americans. The arguments made to support it are very unconvincing. The amendment will weaken, not strengthen, democracy. It will not reduce corruption but will open the door for elected officials to bend democracy rules to benefit themselves, and that is benefiting incumbency.

The fact that the Senate is considering such a dreadful amendment is a great testament to the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in insisting upon and adopting the Bill of Rights in the first place, a necessary forerunner to wheth-

er the Colonies would approve the Constitution in the first place.

Justice Jackson famously wrote:

The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts.

One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.

We must preserve our Bill of Rights, including our right to free speech. We must not allow officials to diminish or ration that right. We must not let this proposal become part of the supreme law of the land.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to discuss legislation pending before the Senate which wages an unprecedented attack on a fundamental American freedom. The Framers of our Constitution were clear when they stated in the Bill of Rights . . . "Congress shall make no law . . . prohibiting the free exercise of speech." However, this week, the Senate majority has sought to undermine this fundamental freedom by offering a constitutional amendment to give Congress more control over the free speech rights of Americans.

I opposed moving forward with this amendment because political speech is essential to the American way of life. Our Nation was founded on those who openly criticized the king and argued for a better form of government. All branches of our government rely on the ability for Americans to passionately defend their interests. Additionally, when we elect candidates for office we the electorate rely on open dialog about why he or she ought to serve a particular community or State. The Constitution would have never been adopted without the Bill of Rights. Political speech is exactly the type of expression the Founders sought to protect when they adopted the Bill of Rights—however, this proposal completely forgets about that freedom.

Giving the Federal Government the ability to regulate what we say is flat out dangerous. What is a reasonable limitation on political speech? The sponsors of this proposal can't answer that and it is reckless to assume that Federal courts will determine the correct answer. What concerns me the most is where does this regulation stop? The answer is not clear and at the very end of the day this constitutional amendment limits the way in which Americans can voice their concerns about their elected officials.

With all that the Senate needs to accomplish it is an embarrassment that the majority leader would bring this up now, not allow amendments and expect this institution to forget about the very freedoms our Founders sought to

protect when they drafted our Federal Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator answers from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAMEST LAMEDUCK SESSION

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I became a practicing physician over 30 years ago. I delivered well in excess of 4,000 babies. And right now in my Senate career and where the Senate is, I feel as if I am the father in the waiting room. I keep wondering when we are going to make any progress, when we are actually going to have the delivery of something positive for the country.

What we are seeing this week is really disappointing to me because if you read just the headlines in the last 4 days, here are the headlines about Congress.

Here is today's Politico: "The Lamest Lame Duck Looms Over Congress."

"Lame Ducks Will Roost in a Do-Nothing December."

"December will be the lamest lame-duck session in a long time."

The Economist: "Congress is useless."

America's legislature has become something of a joke in recent years, a place where good policy ideas go to die and where decent policy ideas go to be twisted into something incomprehensible.

It is enough to make one lose faith in representative democracy, I tell you.

CNN:

Congress has taken off the whole year. But here's the current math: What is less than nothing? And if you do less than nothing, at what point does it become completely counterproductive and silly?

That is our debate. The sum total of our big ideas right now is not wanting to start any fights within our own party and unity above all else as we head into the midterm election.

What is the political solution? No substance, no ideas, no serious debate that might actually engage voters. Instead, each side suits up, armed with its slogans and its bromides.

This is a quote from CNN: "Congress defined: 'Useless,' 'worthless,' a 'joke.'" That is according to the most recent response of the popular responses on CNN's Web site from 5,000 respondents on social media.

Also:

Still trying to get a pulse on the most common feelings toward Congress? The other words on the top 10 list are "corrupt," "incompetent," "lazy," "inept," "idiots," "selfish" and "dysfunctional."

The article goes on to say: "I'll describe Congress with two words," he said. "Term limits!"

The CNN article also had a Washington Post poll that said a majority of Americans feel their representatives in Congress are part of the problem.

From the Washington Post: "Congress is making a lot of history by being so unpopular."

The real topic of today is what is not happening in the Congress. I will describe where we are. This year we are going to have borrowed an excess of \$500 billion that we won't pay for. We have a continuing resolution coming up with \$49 billion worth of fake dollars in it. That way everybody can say they stayed within the requirements of the Ryan-Murray agreement. So there is no integrity in that.

We have done nothing to markedly increase the opportunity for jobs in America. What is not happening is a reversal of the decline in the median family income in this country, which is now at 1988 levels.

The big story is what is not happening. The big story is that Congress is not addressing the needs of the Nation. The big story is that Congress has not passed its first appropriations bill. The big story is what is not happening. It is not what is happening. What is happening is a political farce. Everybody knows it. It is all about the election, it is all about reemphasizing where we are, and the country suffers for it.

We know that there is no opportunity to actually amend the bill on the floor, but I have filed an amendment which would place term limits on Members of Congress. The No. 1 requirement—right now in this body—for most politicians on both sides is to get reelected. That is why we are not addressing the real issues; that is why we are not addressing the fraud in the Social Security disability system; that is why we threw \$30 billion at the VA system rather than effectively rearrange and totally rewrite the VA health care system.

Cyber security is important for this country. Bills have passed out of the Homeland Security Committee. Bills have—these are all bipartisan bills—passed out of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee. What is not happening is that they are not coming to the floor even though that is a great threat to our country right now because what is important is what is important to the politicians and not what is important for the long run, the best for our country.

If we are going to amend the Bill of Rights and take free speech away from people in this country, we should at least do something to secure the future—so our own worst tendencies won't be exaggerated in the future—and put term limits on Members of Congress. This system is rigged for incumbents. It is totally rigged for incumbents.

At one point last year the approval rating for Congress got down to 8 percent. That means only 1 in 12 people in this country thought Congress—and it is a little better than that now. I think it is 12 or 14 percent; 1 in 6 or 7 people

have confidence that we have their back and that our motivations are pure in terms of wanting to fix the problems with our country. They see the lack of leadership. They see the political posturing, and they don't like what they see because what they see is selfishness. They see politicians putting themselves first and the country second. That is where we are. It is the dirty little secret that people won't talk about but Americans outside of Washington innately know is true.

So we have a bill on the floor to amend—for the first time in history—the Bill of Rights to limit First Amendment speech. Why? Because the Supreme Court rulings have maybe changed the dynamics in terms of elections. Well, if you didn't care if you got reelected, you would not care about that.

So we are only going to be here in session—actively in Congress before the election in early November—for 7 or 8 more days so that everybody who is up for reelection, and those who are not, can go out and campaign and raise money so we can continue the progress of career politicians and the rigged incumbent advantage can stay in process.

So I know it is not in order to offer my amendment. It has been filed. One way to fix this is to put term limits on Members of the Senate. Oklahoma has term limits for its Members of Congress. Oklahomans believe in it. It is a 72-to-80 percent issue all across the country. Americans believe in it, but the politicians in Washington are never going to vote for it because it puts them second and the country first.

We have a Defense authorization bill that needs to be passed. It is critical for the future of our country. We are not talking about it, and we are not doing anything on it.

As I have mentioned, we have several cyber bills that need to be passed that have gone through committee—bipartisan bills—and they are not on the floor. We have significant appropriation bills that need to have the attention of the Members of Congress—and this is not the committee's fault.

The committee is a bipartisan committee and has done good work. This is a leadership problem within the Senate. They have done their work, but the bills can't come to the floor because we don't want to have to take up and defend those votes back home. So when you read what the press says about Congress, they are actually pretty nice to us given where we are today. We are lame ducks. We have taken the year off. We are worthless. We are a joke. We are useless, incompetent, corrupt, lazy, and inept. I don't think those words are too harsh. We are repeating votes that we have already voted on that are political votes that are designed to enhance turnout in certain groups.

So this place is a show place, and the downside is that the country suffers for it—our country. Whether you are a conservative male who is 66 years old like me or you are a liberal Latino female at 18, our country suffers because our eye is off the ball. Our eye is off the oath that we took. Our eye is off our commitment and the historical lineage that has been here before us as Members of Congress willing to do what was necessary to solve the problems for the country. What is not happening in the Senate is that there is no leadership. We say leader, but there is no leadership in the Senate.

The leadership of the Senate is now totally disconnected from what is needed by the country. So instead of the greatest deliberative body in the world, what we have in the Senate today is the greatest political body in the world that doesn't care about deliberation and only cares about winning the next election. There are a lot of ways to cure that, and when you read and see the poll about Congress and read the words and look at it, the majority of Americans today believe that their Member of Congress is part of the problem. The average Member of Congress has a lower reelection than nonreelect.

The American people get it. The question is: What can they do about it? What you have to do is you have to eventually have term limits so that we take the inherent bias of the career politician out of the mix, and we make it not about the politicians but we return the Senate to its original intention; and that is, what is in the best interest of the country.

Quite frankly, for the last 3½ years, that is not what has been happening in this body. It is a soulful, shameful period in the history of our country. The thoughts and creative power of our Founders as they instituted a body that was meant to consider very straightforward, very solemnly, every issue that came—that was meant to drive consensus, to force consensus. We have no consensus when the whole goal is not to solve problems for the country but to win elections.

I would love to be able to take a poll of Democrats, Republicans, Whigs, Independents, and everybody else who has ever been in this body—it is less than 2,500, although I don't know the exact number—and see what they would say about how the Senate operates today and how it is not doing its job and what is not happening at a time when our country's economic growth is anemic at best, when job creation doesn't come anywhere close to what we need, where deficit spending is kind of a yawn, and the moral fact that every day we have mortgaged the future of the next two generations. I would love to hear what the other Senators who stood in this building would say about what we are doing today. I think there would be a rousing round of condemnation.

So I think it is important for the American people right now to look at the Senate and say: What are we doing? I mean, it is true that Social Security disability will go bankrupt next year. It is true that in less than 15 years Medicare will be bankrupt. It is true that in less than 18 years Social Security will be gone. Those are all true things. It is true that we are going to have a \$500 billion deficit—at least \$500 billion—which is about \$1,400 a person. We are spending more than we are taking in this year, and we are charging it to the 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6-year-olds in this country today. Those are true statements.

Is that anywhere close to integrity? Is there any moral value in mortgaging the future of the next generation? Probably not.

I have listened to a lot of speeches on the floor this week. I hardly ever come down and talk except for maybe once every 2 weeks now since we have no opportunity to offer or debate our amendments.

I wonder what the American people must be thinking about what we are not doing, what we are not addressing, the problems that are unfixed that need a fix, that need a bipartisan solution, that need compromise, that need the power of the original Senate, with the rights of the minority and the majority running toward a compromise that gives us the best we can get based on where we are as a country. There is no opportunity for that anymore in this body. We don't pass muster, and we don't pass muster not because there are a lot of those on both sides of the aisle who don't want to pass muster but because the leadership isn't there.

The Senate has been run into the ground as far as its intended function and its intended working. I think that is highly unfortunate for our country. I think it is highly unfortunate for our children. In this time of world morass and trouble all around the world—conflict, complications, difficulty—and in this time when we are having trouble ourselves staying above water, in almost every aspect of what we are doing, we need a vigorous, alive, functioning Senate that is full of riveting debate about the issues of today that are presented to our country. Instead, we have political games, and we are going to have political games the rest of the week.

I wonder what our future holds when we have this kind of leadership. What does it portend for the country when the U.S. Senate no longer debates the current topics and issues before the country and spends all its times trying to get its Members reelected. That is a sad commentary, and it is a Senate that is very far away from the Senate I joined 10 years ago.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I first wanted to acknowledge the severity of the challenges we face as a country right now, whether it is military action to stop the threat of ISIS or the crisis in Ukraine. Colorado is waiting to hear from the President tonight. We are all concerned with that, as we should be.

Today on the floor of the Senate is a proposed constitutional amendment. While it is on the floor I wanted to take a minute to talk about it.

Tonight in Colorado, a swing State, families will endure an avalanche of political ads. Many of them will come from obscure interests with deceptive names such as America, Inc., the Government Integrity Fund Action Network, something called Citizens for a Working America, and so on and so forth. There will be no way to tell who these folks are, because under the laws of the United States many of these organizations do not have any obligation to disclose where their money comes from, a privileged status that individual Americans do not have when it comes to funding political campaigns. It is enough to make everyone in our State, in Colorado, hate their TV, much less American politics, and probably not in that order.

In Washington, on the other hand, which—I guess I should say only in Washington, which has become a Disneyland when it comes to any sense of reality, there are people defending the current system—the current campaign finance system—on the grounds that it is a great victory for free speech and a great victory for our democracy. It is the position—it is the position of the defenders of the current system that what we need in our politics is more money, not less, that more money is going to help our politics, not less.

I have never met a Coloradan who thinks what is wrong with our politics is that we do not have enough money. In fact, they believe the reverse. They believe the exact opposite. That is because they know our system of financing campaigns, far from being about elucidating the truth, is a system expressly designed to obscure the truth. From Colorado's perspective, it is a system that is really good for the special interests and the occupiers of the past, and really terrible for the American people and for our future.

Over the last several months, almost every one of us at some point has lamented the Senate's inability to address the big issues facing our Nation, whether it is reforming our broken immigration system, creating a more competitive Tax Code that encourages

innovation and helps produce an economy that lifts middle-class family income again in the country. Energy, climate, education, and infrastructure are left unanswered as we barely summon the votes to approve another non-controversial judge or nominee.

My colleagues, we share the pathetic distinction of being on target to becoming the least productive Congress ever. Ever. Close readers of American history will know this is a particularly ignominious achievement. How will it feel when the next history books are written to know that we managed to do even less than the do-nothing Congress? That is how you acquire a Congress that now has a 14-percent approval rating, below President Nixon even had during the height of Watergate.

This less-than-do-nothing Congress is not just failing the American people on the big issues. We have given up on those for now around here. We are struggling to pass basic appropriations bills, to keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent over the long term. Some of my colleagues in this Chamber, this land of flickering lights, have argued that the tea party and obstruction are to blame. Others have argued that the majority's limits on debate and floor amendments are at the root of the problem. But I think it all starts with our broken campaign finance system, which has never been perfect but recently has become substantially worse.

First, let me say when I first studied the Court's most significant prior opinion on finance, the case of *Buckley* against *Valeo*, decided in the early 1970s, it seemed to me that if the Court had actually understood what had happened as a result of that decision, they might reconsider their holding that money is speech. But by then it was abundantly clear that the wealthier you are the louder your voice, an outcome that seemed to me at odds with a democracy grounded on the notion of one person, one vote. This is not to say we should expect to live in a country where everybody has equal speech. We could never succeed in ensuring that, and we would certainly fail if we tried. But we could address unfair practices and advantages. We could devise commonsense regulations of our campaign finance laws to make sure our government could actually function. We could hope to lift the voices in the town square and on every street corner in the country and reward the effort of each individual American, no matter what they believe, no matter who they were, who became involved in politics to help create the future of this country. We could do that. In fact, we did do that for decades. We could do it until *Citizens United* was decided, when the Court not only did not wince at its holding in *Buckley*, but doubled down, holding, among other things, that independent expenditures do not

give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption, an absurd proposition on its face to anyone who serves in the Congress.

Also, in *McCutcheon*, another opinion, the Supreme Court held that there is "only one legitimate governmental interest for restricting campaign finances: preventing corruption or the appearance of corruption."

That is it. It can't be regulated to do anything else.

The Court went on to hold that "spending large sums of money in connection with elections, but not in connection with an effort to control the exercise of an officeholder's official duties, does not give rise to quid pro quo corruption. Nor does the possibility that an individual who spends large sums may garner 'influence or access to' elected officials or political parties."

Think about that for a minute. The majority in *McCutcheon* doesn't believe that an individual who spends large sums of money would garner influence or access to elected officials? The Court doesn't think they are trying to influence our official duties? Could anyone in this Chamber agree with this conclusion with a straight face?

In fact, some do agree, but there isn't a single soul in Colorado who does.

But to me the more significant point is that the Court failed to recognize how unlimited and undisclosed campaign spending corrupts the very act of government. This extends far beyond the traditional notion of quid pro quo corruption.

In search pretty much in vain—not entirely but pretty much in vain—for the pitiful politician hiding cash in his icebox or somewhere beneath the south 40, the Court missed the real corruption. In doing so these decisions and the looming threat of unchecked spending have led to almost complete paralysis—the end of principled compromise on behalf of the public interest.

In his dissent in *Citizens United*, Justice Stevens warned of this potential problem when he wrote:

The influx of unlimited corporate money into the electoral realm also creates new opportunities for the mirror image of quid pro quo deals: threats, both explicit and implicit. Starting today, corporations with large war chests to deploy on electioneering may find democratically elected bodies becoming much more attuned to their interests.

That is precisely what we found. Inertia has become the new reality in the Senate and in the House. Congress is now frozen by its own fear of taking on incumbent interests, whether it is our failure to address long-term deficits or to create a coherent energy policy.

We can see this corruption in the difficult decisions we avoid. It is the tough vote that we will not take. It is the bill we can't pass even in the face of urgent need. It is the deal that can't be reached. It is the speech that is

never made. It is the story of the do-less than the do-nothing Congress.

This corruption, by its nature, is difficult to prove because it is invisible, but it suits the incumbent interests just fine.

The Court imagined a world where people with bags of money are wandering around Capitol Hill—and only then could you regulate it—trying to get people to do something for them. Ninety percent of what happens around here is people coming and trying to keep you from doing something, trying to keep things the same, trying to keep the incumbent interests embedded in our Tax Code, in our regulatory code, and in our statute book.

The Supreme Court was silent completely on that corruption. I would argue that is at the core of our dysfunction as a Congress.

There is a reason the dysfunction that is so hated by the people I represent coincided with the era of these Supreme Court opinions.

This is why everybody in Colorado continue to scratch their heads and wonder how we can be so disconnected from their set of priorities, so decoupled from their set of priorities—what they care about, for the future of their families, the future of their business—and how we can come here all week and just vote on judges.

To my knowledge, there are no super PACs devoted to votes on judges one way or another, which is maybe why that is what we spend our time doing.

I have a lot of respect for the Supreme Court, as I know the Presiding Officer does, and the separation of powers, and I know how serious it is to consider a constitutional amendment, an amendment to the Constitution, which is why it should be a last, not a first resort.

But the Court got it wrong when it came to the practical day-to-day operations of this Congress and the way its campaigns work, and its decisions have unleashed a new torrent of spending that is corroding the vibrancy of our democracy.

I think it is useful for us to take a moment to think about or to consider the practical effect of these decisions.

During the entire 2010 election cycle—that is the year *Citizens United* was decided—super PACs spent a total of \$63 million in this country.

So far, September 10, in this election cycle, super PACs have spent \$116 million. That is almost twice what was spent in 2010, and it is only the beginning of September. There are States where you cannot buy TV time because so much TV time has been bought by these outside groups.

For the three election cycles before *Citizens United*, outside spending totaled about \$113 million. In contrast, in the three election cycles since *Citizens United* was decided, outside spending has totaled about \$530 million. This is almost a fivefold increase in spending.

There probably are people around the country who aren't beneficiaries of this incredible speech. Unfortunately, folks in Colorado are because we are a swing State, as I mentioned at the beginning. You can't actually at this point watch anything else on television.

In 2012 the top 100 individual donors to super PACs—the top 100 people, people along with their spouses—represented 1 percent of all individual donors to super PACs, but their donations totaled 67 percent of the funding and therefore 67 percent of the spending.

But the spending doesn't only affect how this place works, as I mentioned earlier, it affects what we work on in Congress.

That is why Congress has repeatedly enacted reasonable limits on campaign spending, which have largely been upheld until very recently, until 2010.

In fact, as recently as 2003, in *FEC v. Beaumont*, the Supreme Court found that “any attack on the federal prohibition of direct corporate political contributions goes against the current of a century of congressional efforts to curb corporations’ potentially ‘deleterious influences on federal elections.’”

The Court made the point that our current laws grew out of the late 19th century belief “that aggregated capital unduly influenced politics, an influence not stopping short of corruption.”

It is an influence that stops the work of the Senate and the House dead in its tracks.

This concern about aggregated capital and its effect on our democracy actually goes back to the earliest days of our country.

In the *Federalist Papers* James Madison wrote:

We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people. . . . It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it.

So there is nothing unprecedented about seeking to regulate campaign spending. What is unprecedented is the ease by which the Supreme Court has undone decades of campaign finance laws, which has led to this dysfunction in Congress and the misery the folks in Colorado are suffering as they watch these ads.

What is unprecedented is the sheer volume of money that is flooding the Senate and congressional races. What is unprecedented is the corrupting influence this money is having on the institution of Congress.

Because of this new world of unlimited spending, Members of Congress are a lot less likely to seek compromise than they once were and work together if they know they may become the target of a super Pac from people who can write checks that are larger than my imagination.

Reasonable limits on campaign spending can help address this problem.

We believed for decades and decades and decades that the Constitution allowed us to do that.

The Supreme Court has now decided that we can't, and we are looking at this choice.

I would say also on this point that notwithstanding my observations about the Court, it is also true that eight of nine Supreme Court Justices have said that disclosure requirements are constitutional, that disclosure does not require a change to the Constitution. I, for one, say at least let's pass that, Republicans and Democrats coming together and saying, You know what. We have always had an expectation about the First Amendment that we are going to be willing to stand and say who we are—or maybe we will not require people to say who they are, but we will just say at the end: Paid for people who are so embarrassed about what they are doing that they refuse to put their actual names on this advertisement.

But it seems to me that if we can be required to say: I am Senator so and so and I paid for this message, we ought to be able to say that about everybody who is advertising in political ads.

Changing these rules would bring more compromise and consensus building to this institution but, most important, above all else, it would help give individual families a greater say in the political process. We offer this amendment not as a one-size-fits-all solution but to allow Congress and the States to place reasonable limits on campaign spending to experiment with what works and put away what doesn't work, similar to the rules that had existed for decades, similar to the rules that existed when the Congress actually functioned, similar to the rules that existed when Democrats and Republicans didn't seem to have such difficulty working across the aisle.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST DEREK A. CALHOUN

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my honor to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Derek A. Calhoun, of Oklahoma City, OK who died on June 23, 2007, of wounds suffered when his vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device while serving his Nation in Taji, Iraq.

Derek was born on September 8, 1983 in Oklahoma City, OK and attended Moore High School. After completing high school, he enrolled at Wright Business School where he received his associate degree. In 2005, he enlisted and was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, TX.

Derek had been in Iraq for 8 months and was on his first tour of duty when he was killed. He was injured several months earlier when a car bomb exploded outside a building he was in. He had shrapnel in his wrist, abdomen and shoulder and spent the several months in the hospital having two surgeries. Because of his injuries, Derek was unable to use his right hand and was going through physical therapy to get his hands back to normal.

A funeral service was held on July 3, 2007 at South Lindsey Baptist Church in Oklahoma City, OK with interment in Moore City Cemetery with full military honors.

Derek is survived by his parents Alan and Lou Calhoun of Oklahoma City; one sister Lanesha Morris of Oklahoma City; grandparents Jean and JoAnn Calhoun of Choctaw, OK; three nieces Sierra, Cheyenne and Autumn Morris; and one nephew Takoda Morris. Derek is preceded in death by his grandparents Brooks and Eula Choate.

Today we remember Army SPC Derek A. Calhoun, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST RYAN S. DALLAM

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Ryan S. Dallam, of Norman, OK who died with two other servicemembers on April 6, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Ryan was born September 22, 1982 in Norman and lived in Midwest City, OK for a time after his parents divorced. When his mother Laura went to teach on an American Indian reservation in AZ, he accompanied her and graduated from Show Low High School in 2002. He later attended Oklahoma City Community College.

His father Scott Dallam retired in 2003 after 23 years in the Army. A third generation soldier, Ryan joined the military during the early spring of 2005

and reported to Fort Leonard Wood, MO for basic training. As a member of the Headquarters Company, 1st/18th Infantry, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division Schweinfurt, Germany, Ryan deployed to Iraq in September 2007 and he was scheduled to come home on leave the next week. His family was enjoying making plans to spend time with him when the chaplain arrived at their home with the unwelcome news.

A memorial service was held at First Christian Church in Norman on April 12, 2007 with interment at Fort Sill National Cemetery in Fort Sill, OK.

"He really liked what he was doing," Scott Dallam said. "That makes us feel pretty good. He really enjoyed it and the camaraderie of being in the military and being around other soldiers."

Ryan is survived by his mother Laura Dallam; father Scott Dallam; stepmother Leslie Dallam; and a younger brother and sister.

Today we remember Army SPC Ryan S. Dallam, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL JARON D. HOLLIDAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army CPL Jaron D. Holliday, of Tulsa, OK who died with two other servicemembers on August 4, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Hawr Rajab, Iraq.

Jaron always wanted to be in the Armed Forces and began researching which branch he wanted to go into when he was 11, his mother, Kelly Holliday, said. "That was always his desire—to go into the military and serve," his mother said. "When 9/11 happened, he was 15, and he said, 'If I were old enough to serve, I would.'"

The oldest of eight siblings—seven boys and one girl—Jaron was homeschooled and graduated through the Christian Home Education Fellowship of Oklahoma in 2004. He joined the Army in 2005 when he was 19 and was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 40th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne), 25th Infantry Division, Fort Richardson, AK.

Funeral services were held August 16, 2010 at Tulsa Bible Church with interment at Memorial Park Cemetery, Tulsa, OK.

Jaron is survived by his parents John and Kelley Holliday and seven siblings.

"He was a people-watcher," his mother said. "He loved people. He was the kind of person who, if he saw someone sitting by themselves looking depressed or upset, he made it his mission to make them smile before he left, and usually accomplished that goal."

"We didn't want to waste time going to an amusement park or sitting in a movie theater because you can't look at each other and talk to each other in those places. We decided to make

memories by just being together," said his mother.

Today we remember Army CPL Jaron D. Holliday, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST THOMAS R. LEEMHUIS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I also wish to remember Army SPC Thomas R. Leemhuis who died along with four other servicemembers on June 21, 2007 of wounds sustained when their vehicle struck an improvised explosive device in Baghdad, Iraq.

Tom was born in Lawton, OK, on August 2, 1983 and attended Binger-Oney High School in Caddo County, OK before moving to nearby Anadarko after he graduated in 2002.

In 2005 he was inspired to join the Army after the death of his uncle Melvin Jody Stevens, a Vietnam veteran. Upon completing basic training he was assigned to 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, Schweinfurt, Germany.

About 500 friends, relatives and fellow soldiers attended a memorial service at Binger-Oney High School Auditorium with interment at Williams Family Cemetery in Binger. At the service, Tom was remembered as a fun-loving young man who enjoyed cracking jokes and playing video games. "His No. 1 football team was the Nebraska Cornhuskers, and he loved to wear his Nebraska hat around the University of Oklahoma," said his mother. "He loved to push it to the limit."

Tom had first thought of becoming a teacher and basketball coach when he got out of the military, but then decided to become a police officer because he hated drugs. He had decided to return to Binger after he completed his commitment with the Army because he wanted to make a difference there. He was extremely proud of the military and being a Native American.

Tom is survived by his mother Patty Leemhuis; father Paul Whitehorn of Birmingham, AL; a brother Paul Whitehorn Jr. of Binger, OK; and three sisters, Stephanie Leemhuis of Dublin, CA; Renee Whitehorn of Anadarko, OK; and Dream Cox of Birmingham, AL.

Today we remember Army SPC Thomas R. Leemhuis, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

STAFF SERGEANT WILLIAM D. SCATES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would also like to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SSG William D. Scates, of Oklahoma City, OK who died with three other servicemembers on August 11, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Arab Jabour, Iraq.

Born March 8, 1976 in Oklahoma City, Dan was a graduate of Western Heights High School and had a lifelong passion to join the military. "When he was a little boy, he was always drawing pic-

tures of soldiers. That's all he ever wanted to be," said his mother. He had been in the Oklahoma Army National Guard before joining the Active Duty Army where he was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, based at Fort Stewart, GA.

A memorial service was held September 1, 2007 in Oklahoma City with interment in Fort Bliss National Cemetery in El Paso, TX. His mother Moreana Whitson said her son wanted to be buried there because it was in El Paso where he met his wife Raquel, while in training.

Dan is survived by his wife Raquel; daughters Jade 9, and 7-month-old Kendra; his mother Moreana Whitson; his stepfather Randy Whitson; and two sisters Courtney Champagne of Idaho and Shannon Scates of Oklahoma City. He was preceded in death by his father William Leon Scates, who died when Dan was a child.

At the memorial service, the Rev. Michael Jackson noted that Dan "as a child protected kids in the neighborhood from the bullies" and said he was doing the same thing in Iraq.

The minister read a poem that Dan's mother had written some time ago about her son, who was serving his third tour of duty in Iraq.

"A long time ago, when you were just a little bitty fellar," she wrote, "little did I know the hero in you. We are not here today to mourn," Jackson said. "We are here to celebrate a hero who is going home to receive his greatest award . . . his greatest honor."

"I believe he was a hero before he was born," Jackson said. "Then he lived up to that calling, not just as an adult, but through his whole life."

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Dan's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JERIMIAH J. VEITCH

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army PFC Jeremiah J. Veitch, of Dibble, OK who died with four other servicemembers on June 21, 2007, of wounds suffered when his vehicle was struck by a rocket propelled grenade while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq. He was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO.

Born in Moore, OK, Jeremiah moved to San Jose, CA and then back to Dibble, OK with his mother Valorie Sanchez and stepfather Tony Sanchez before high school. According to his sister Amanda Testerman, he gave his all

at Dibble High School where he graduated in 2005 so that he could play football and use the weight room.

A memorial service was held at Union Hill Baptist Church with interment in Dibble Cemetery in Dibble, OK.

At the funeral, LTC Steven Michael said that Jerimiah was only 5 foot 4 inches, but was "strong as an ox, tenacious." One year he took second place in a State weightlifting competition, lifting more than 1,000 pounds in three lifts in the 132-pound weight class. More than 400 pounds of the total he lifted with a single deadlift.

After returning home from the Army he planned to go to Dibble, buy some land and build a house. He wanted to go to work for his stepfather in the roofing business. "He is more of a son than anyone could ask for," his father said. "He was my partner. He was the heart of our family."

Jerimiah is survived by his mother Valorie Sanchez; stepfather Tony Sanchez; his sister Amanda Testerman; and two brothers Caleb and Jacob Veitch.

I extend our deepest gratitude and condolences to Jerimiah's family. He lived a life of love for his family, friends, and our country. He will be remembered for his commitment to and belief in the greatness of our Nation. I am honored to pay tribute to this true American hero who volunteered to go into the fight and made the ultimate sacrifice of his life for our freedom.

SERGEANT RYAN M. WOOD

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my privilege also to honor the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Ryan M. Wood, of Oklahoma City, OK who died with two other servicemembers on June 21, 2007, of wounds suffered from a roadside bomb while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born June 11, 1984 in Oklahoma City, OK, Ryan graduated from Putnam City North High School in 2002 and signed up for the Army after the September 11 terrorist attacks. "The war gave Ryan a mission," said his sister, Candice Bunce. He was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Infantry Division, Schweinfurt, Germany. "He accomplished his mission and left this world with dignity and honor."

Ryan was an accomplished artist who had received an acceptance letter from the University of Central Oklahoma to study art and political science. On his second tour to Iraq, he had the names of two other soldiers who died in combat tattooed on his chest.

His stepfather Scott Vincent said he hoped Wood's death will remind others that American soldiers are dying for their country in Iraq. "The majority of them are proud to be there," he said. "They don't want to be forgotten. They want to have the tools to do their job."

Funeral services were held at the Church of the Servant in northwest Oklahoma City, OK.

Speaking at the funeral, Ryan's uncle Army Maj. John Litchfield said his nephew had a noble spirit that his men could sense. He spent 607 days in combat, his uncle said. "Even as a teenager, that noble spirit would not allow you to sit by and accept the injustices of the world," he said.

"Ryan felt Iraq was a job we had to finish. It wasn't something we could walk away from," Scott Vincent said. "He was dedicated to being there, and he was extremely well-loved by all his men."

Ryan is survived by his mother Renee Wood-Vincent; father Bonner Wood; stepfather Scott Vincent; sister Candice Bunce; and numerous other relatives and friends.

Today we remember Army SGT Ryan M. Wood, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:53 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4067. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2014.

H.R. 4290. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

H.R. 4701. An act to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5078. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to

waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3670. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4701. An act to provide for research with respect to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4290. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 5078. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 10, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 231. An act to reauthorize the Multi-national Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6826. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9913-99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6827. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sweet Orange Peel Tincture; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9909-83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6828. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "C.I. Pigment Red 112; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9914-14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6829. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9914-37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6830. A communication from the Manager of the BioPreferred Program, Office of Procurement and Property Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement" (RIN0599-AA18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6831. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment" (AMS-LPS-13-0079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6832. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0054; FV14-906-3 IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6833. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection" (RIN0583-AD32) received during adjournment of the

Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6834. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cotton Transition Assistance Program and General Provisions for Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage Programs" ((RIN0560-AI22) (7 CFR Part 1412)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6835. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Animal Welfare; Importation of Live Dogs" ((RIN0579-AD23) (Docket No. APHIS-2009-0053)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6836. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Existing Conservation Program Regulations" ((RIN0578-AA60) (Docket No. NRCS-2014-0006)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6837. A communication from the Director of Congressional Activities (Intelligence), Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the results of a study of security measures on United States military installations by June 24, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6838. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Burton M. Field, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6839. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of one (1) officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6840. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6841. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Environmental Compliance Recordkeeping Requirements" (RIN2506-AC34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6842. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing

and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Handling Prepayments: Eliminating Post-Payment Interest Charges" (RIN2502-AJ17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6843. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Adjustable Rate Mortgage Notification Requirements and Look-Back Period for FHA-Insured Single Family Mortgages" (RIN2502-AJ20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6844. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Manufactured Housing Program Fee: Final Fee Increase" (RIN2502-AJ19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6845. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (Economic Policy), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6846. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Oil Industry Sanctions and Addition of Person to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6847. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, pursuant to law, the July 2014 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6848. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was originally declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6849. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6850. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on

the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6851. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6852. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Understandings Reached at the 2005, 2012, and 2013 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings and a 2009 NSG Intersessional Decision; Additions to the List of NSG Participating Countries" (RIN0694-AD58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6853. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6854. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6855. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Ethiopia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6856. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6857. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6858. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asset-Backed Securities Disclosure and Registration" (RIN3235-AK37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6859. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6860. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery

and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2014 Smart Grid System Report"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6861. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6862. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "National Air Toxics Program: The Second Integrated Urban Air Toxics Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6863. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Light Load Handling System and Refueling Cavity Design" (NRC-2013-0148) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6864. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maintenance Rule" (NRC-2013-0179) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6865. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses that support the Administration's fiscal year 2015 Capital Investment and Leasing Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6866. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Sutter Basin Project in Sutter and Butte Counties, California, for the purpose of flood risk management; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6867. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The 2014 Radiation Source Protection and Security Task Force Report"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6868. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 1; Correction" (FRL No. 9914-08-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6869. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Kent, Seattle, and Tacoma Second 10-Year PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9915-40-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6870. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9915-28-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6871. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Nitrogen Oxides and Volatile Organic Compounds" (FRL No. 9913-00-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6872. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Certain Coals to Be Washed" (FRL No. 9915-30-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6873. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, Negative Declarations" (FRL No. 9914-75-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6874. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES): Use of Sufficiently Sensitive Test Methods for Permit Applications and Reporting" ((RIN2040-AC84) (FRL No. 9915-18-OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6875. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Hawaii; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone and the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9914-62-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6876. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Infrastructure Requirement (Visibility) for the 1997 and 2006 PM, and 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 9915-65-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to

the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6877. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District And Shasta County Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9913-13-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6878. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Revisions to the Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations; Ambient standards for Particulate Matter and for Lead." (FRL No. 9915-75-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6879. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Residual Risk and Technology Review for Flexible Polyurethane Foam Production" (FRL No. 9914-30-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6880. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of Compliance and Attest Engagement Reporting Deadlines for 2013 Renewable Fuel Standards" ((RIN2060-AS29) (FRL No. 9914-88-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6881. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Vehicle Rule—SCR Maintenance and Regulatory Flexibility for Nonroad Equipment" ((RIN2060-AR46) (FRL No. 9914-63-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6882. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commonwealth of Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9914-70-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6883. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ocean Dumping: Cancellation and

Modification of Final Site Designations" (FRL No. 9914-59-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6884. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Indiana PSD Increments" (FRL No. 9914-94-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6885. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9914-90-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6886. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revision to the Maintenance Plans for the Richmond 1990 1-Hour and Richmond-Petersburg 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Areas to Remove the State II Vapor Recovery Program" (FRL No. 9914-49-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6887. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds" (FRL No. 9914-54-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6888. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Finding of Failure to Submit a PSD State Implementation Plan Revision for PM2.5" (FRL No. 9914-95-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6889. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Two Operating Permits and a Consent Agreement for the Potomac River Generating Station from the State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9915-06-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-320. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states under Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, Corporations are legal entities that governments create and the rights that they enjoy under the United States Constitution should be more narrowly defined than the rights afforded to natural persons; and

Whereas, Corporations do not vote in elections and should not be categorized as persons for purposes related to elections for public office and ballot measures; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court, in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (2010) 130 S.Ct. 876, held that the government may not, under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, suppress political speech on the basis of the speaker's corporate identity; and

Whereas, Article V of the United States Constitution requires the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention upon application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California, speaking on behalf of the people of the State of California, hereby applies to the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech and would further declare that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited; and be it further

Resolved, That this constitutes a continuing application to call a constitutional convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states apply to the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would limit corporate personhood for purposes of campaign finance and political speech and would further declare that money does not constitute speech and may be legislatively limited; and be it further

Resolved, That this application is for a limited constitutional convention and does not grant Congress the authority to call a constitutional convention for any purpose other than for the sole purpose set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from

California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1275. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue a fishing capacity reduction loan to refinance the existing loan funding the Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction program (Rept. No. 113-251).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

H.R. 2052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment (Rept. No. 113-252).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2783. A bill to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2784. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out activities to improve rail safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2785. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent earnings stripping of domestic corporations which are members of a worldwide group of corporations which includes an inverted corporation and to require agreements with respect to certain related party transactions with those members; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2787. A bill to expand and clarify the prohibition on inaccurate caller ID informa-

tion; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2788. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2789. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2791. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 540. A resolution recognizing September 15, 2014, as the International Day of Democracy, affirming the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encouraging all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 541. A resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the

number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1535, a bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1690, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria

for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 2199

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2258, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support after-school and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2546

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to repeal a requirement that new employees of certain employers be automatically enrolled in the employer's health benefits.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2687

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2687, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2689

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2689, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2707, a bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account.

S. 2758

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2758, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C-130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

S. RES. 466

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 466, a resolution designating the week of October 27 through November 2, 2014, as "National Drug Take-Back Week", and designating October 2014 as "National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month".

S. RES. 538

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. Res. 538, a resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2788. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the key to America's continued success lies in improving our Nation's educational system to meet the demands of the 21st century job market. Today, many students enter high school and college with little knowledge of the careers available to them outside of traditional pathways. With college costs continuing to rise, it is critical that students have exposure to the wide range of available work and career choices early in their academic careers so that, by the time they enter high school, they are more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Career and technical education, CTE, are a proven way to help students explore their own strengths and preferences, as well as how they match up with potential future careers. However, limited funding for middle school CTE programming often means students have to wait until high school for this exposure.

Studies have found that middle school students greatly benefit from career and technical education development programs that promote career exploration skills, as well as increase knowledge of career options and career pathways. Middle school is an important time for students to explore their own strengths, likes, and dislikes, and career and technical education exploration programs are great tools to educate them about the type of course or training that goes into a career field that matches their interests.

This is why I am pleased to introduce the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, which establishes a pilot program for middle schools to partner with postsecondary institutions and local businesses to develop and implement career and technical exploration programs. This legislation will provide support for middle schools to create career and technical education programs that will provide students with introductory courses, hands-on learning, or afterschool programs. Career guidance and academic counseling is vital to ensuring that our students understand the educational requirements for high-

growth, in-demand career fields. Many times students receive this information too late in their academic careers.

We need to make middle school more career-relevant and expose students to the career pathways they may choose. This legislation also requires that programs help students draft a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses would prepare them for a given career field. If we give students at a younger age applied career and technical opportunities, they will be more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them. I hope this bill spurs discussion on how vital middle school is for exposing students to career choices.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 2789. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, throughout my career in public service I have focused on ensuring that each and every child with a disability is ensured the right to a good education. To this end, I have fought tirelessly to safeguard the rights of children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, landmark legislation that has been improving the educational outcomes of millions of students across the nation since 1975 on the bedrock principles of inclusion and equality.

When Congress passed IDEA, we understood that our commitment to provide high-quality educational opportunities and serve the needs of students with disabilities in our classrooms entailed excess costs compared to others students, which would have a significant financial impact on States and school districts. That is why Congress committed to covering up to 40 percent of the excess cost of educating students with disabilities. However, we have failed to deliver on that promise, and the law has been consistently and grossly underfunded.

This is why I am pleased to introduce the IDEA Full Funding Act, which will allow us to make good on the full federal commitment. Given the current financial difficulties that many state and local governments are facing, this legislation is more essential than ever for ensuring that students with disabilities get the high-quality education and services they need in order to fulfill their potential.

Since enactment of IDEA, students with disabilities across the United States have made tremendous progress.

Today, nearly 6.6 million students receive special education services designed to meet their individual needs. Ninety-five percent of students with disabilities attend a neighborhood school, and almost two-thirds of those students spend at least 80 percent of their day in the regular school environment. Nearly 350,000 infants and toddlers receive early intervention services. More than 6 out of 10 students with disabilities graduate high school with a regular diploma—twice the percentage of 25 years ago. Moreover, approximately half of students with disabilities enroll in postsecondary education. We must do our best to continue this progress and make good on our 39-year-old promise because there is still a long way to go. For instance, students with disabilities who graduate from high school have an employment rate that is less than half the employment rate of the general population.

Today, the Federal Government provides about 16 percent of the additional cost of educating a student with a disability, less than half the 40 percent that Congress committed to when we passed IDEA. In the current fiscal year, this means Federal funding for IDEA is almost \$24 billion short, which forces states and school districts to make up the federal shortfall at a time when they are cash strapped.

The IDEA Full Funding Act will fully fund the federal commitment to IDEA by gradually increasing the federal government's share of the excess costs of educating students with disabilities to its committed level over 10 years. Specifically, this legislation will increase the Federal dollars appropriated from \$11.5 billion in fiscal year 2014 to \$35.6 billion in fiscal year 2023.

This bill is supported by 34 organizations including: ACCSES, the Association of Assistive Technology Act Programs, the Autism National Committee, the Autism Society of America, the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, the Collaboration to Promote Self-Determination, the Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf, the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, the Epilepsy Foundation, Easter Seals, the Kentucky Protection and Advocacy Division, the Jonathan Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities, the National Association of School Psychologists, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, the National Center for Special Education in Charter Schools, the National Down Syndrome Congress, the National Down Syndrome Society, the National Disability Rights Network, Perkins School for the Blind, TASH, the School Superintendents Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Speech Language Hearing Association, the Association of Edu-

cational Service Agencies, the Council of Great City Schools, the Council for Exceptional Children, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Education Association, the National School Boards Association, the National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, and the National Rural Education Association.

By making good on our 39-year-old promise, we will supply schools with the necessary funding to enhance the quality and range of services available to students with disabilities. The funding increase will help to raise salaries for teachers and related services personnel, thereby allowing districts to enhance recruitment and retention high-quality staff. It will support school districts in increasing graduation rates and postsecondary enrollment rates of students with disabilities.

In these difficult times, it is essential for Congress to provide these revenues without increasing the deficit. The IDEA Full Funding Act is fully paid for by increasing income taxes for those with an adjusted gross income greater than \$1,000,000 per year. This increase in funding for schools will have a powerful impact on the lives of children with disabilities by improving their educational and future employment outcomes.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this long-overdue legislation.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to permit a prevailing party in an action or proceeding brought to enforce the Act to be awarded expert witness fees and certain other expenses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President: Ensuring that all students, regardless of background or ability, have access to an education that gives them the opportunity to live a successful and fulfilling life has always been a major focus of my career in public service. To achieve this goal, I have fought hard for students with disabilities to have access to the general education curriculum and the services and supports they need to succeed, and to safeguard their rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. That is why I am pleased to reintroduce the IDEA Fairness Restoration Act. This critical legislation will remove the financial barrier that families, especially low- and middle-income families, face when they pursue their children's rights to the free, appropriate public education they deserve and are entitled to under the Fourteenth Amendment.

When Congress originally passed IDEA, we recognized the vital importance of parent and school collaboration in special education and required they jointly develop an Individualized Education Plan, IEP, to identify goals to promote the academic achievement of students with disabilities. Usually, this partnership serves students well. There are, however, times when parents believe schools have not fulfilled their responsibilities to provide an appropriate education to their children. In these cases, IDEA provides parents the right to challenge the schools through mediation and due process. The educational needs of children with disabilities can be quite complex and when there is a disagreement between the family and the school it may be necessary for experts to lend their help in determining what interventions and supports are best for the child. For families asking for mediation or a due process hearing, the use of expert services can be costly, ranging on average from \$100 to \$300 per hour. In one case, a single mother whose son struggled with dyslexia and written expression disorders had to borrow \$1,400 to pay an independent evaluator to testify at a hearing. She also had to pay for the expert's time spent being cross-examined by the school district for two days. Without access to expert witnesses, families may be unable to make an argument for the educational needs of their children.

When Congress amended IDEA in 1986, it recognized the financial barriers that parents face in pursuing due process to resolve disagreements with their school and specified in the Conference Committee Report that when the court finds in favor of the parents a judge could award attorney's fees, including "reasonable expenses and fees of expert witnesses and the reasonable costs of any test or evaluation which is found to be necessary for the preparation of the parent or guardian's case." For years, parents who prevailed in judicial proceedings were awarded these fees, as Congress intended. But in 2006, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Arlington Central School District v. Murphy* that courts could no longer award these fees because Congress made its intention explicit in the Conference Report rather than in statute. As a result, many parents are discouraged and even prevented from pursuing meritorious cases to secure the rights of their children. Low- and middle-income families are particularly put at a disadvantage by this ruling.

The IDEA Fairness Restoration Act clarifies Congress' express intent that parents should recover expert witness fees, as they currently can do with attorneys' fees, if they prove that the school system has wrongfully denied their child an appropriate education as defined by IDEA. By including "reasonable expenses and fees of expert wit-

nesses and the reasonable costs of any test or evaluation which is found to be necessary for the preparation of the parent or guardian's case" and reestablishing the right of judges to award such fees to parents who prevail in IDEA cases, as Congress intended, this legislation will level the playing field and restore the ability of low- and middle-income parents to be effective advocates for their children's educational needs.

This bill is supported by 18 advocacy organizations including: ACCSES, the Autism National Committee, the Autism Society of America, the Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, the Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf, Collaboration to Promote Self-Determination, the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, the Epilepsy Foundation, Easter Seals, the Kentucky Protection and Advocacy Division, the Jonathan Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities, Our Children Left Behind, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, the National Center for Special Education in Charter Schools, the National Down Syndrome Congress, the National Down Syndrome Society, the National Disability Rights Network, and TASH.

This legislation is an essential step for protecting the rights of students with disabilities and ensuring that all families, regardless of their financial resources, can advocate for and protect their children's rights through due process, consistent with Congressional intent and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 540—RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 15, 2014, AS THE INTERNATIONAL DAY OF DEMOCRACY, AFFIRMING THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY AS A CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRACY, AND ENCOURAGING ALL GOVERNMENTS TO STAND WITH CIVIL SOCIETY IN THE FACE OF MOUNTING RESTRICTIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 540

Whereas in 2007, September 15 of each year was established by the United Nations as the International Day of Democracy, a day set aside to review the state of democracy in the world;

Whereas democracy is a means of government that makes manifest the free exercise of certain inalienable rights, among them being the freedom of assembly, the freedom of association, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of speech;

Whereas democracy allows for participatory governance, mobilizing citi-

zens to strive for their version of the good and instilling hope that the aspirations of the people may one day be realized;

Whereas an analysis of 84 independent studies shows that democracy has a favorable impact on the formation of human capital, the rate of inflation, the level of economic freedom, and the stability of political institutions;

Whereas democracy promotes tolerance and respect by recognizing the human dignity of all people and is necessary to the full realization of the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines "civil society" as associations around which society voluntarily organizes itself and which represent a wide range of interests and ties, including community-based organizations, indigenous peoples' organizations, and non-government organizations (NGOs);

Whereas a vibrant civil society is an essential element of democratic societies and plays a key role in providing transparency, ensuring the legitimacy of elections, advocating for marginalized groups, and making clear the will of the people;

Whereas, since 2012, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law has identified 69 new restrictive measures in over 50 countries hindering the ability of civil society organizations (CSOs) to freely operate;

Whereas of the 98 countries for which data is available, research presented in a 2013 article for the *Journal of Democracy* explains that 12 prohibit and 39 restrict foreign funding of domestic NGOs;

Whereas in 2000, the Community of Democracies was founded "to bring together governments, civil society, and the private sector in the pursuit of a common goal: supporting democratic rules and strengthening democratic norms and institutions around the world";

Whereas in 2011, the United States joined other like-minded governments to establish the "Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund" to provide small grants to CSOs for immediate needs and to support short-term advocacy projects;

Whereas, through the Open Government Partnership, 63 countries have committed to protecting the ability of CSOs to operate in a manner that is consistent with the rights to freedom of expression, association, and opinion;

Whereas in September 2013, on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States launched a coordinated multilateral effort encouraging countries to stand with civil society and push back against growing restrictions on CSOs;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association stands on the front lines of civil society protection, documenting extensive global threats to civil society and strengthening international norms; and

Whereas the United States remains committed to its stand with civil society by developing new mechanisms to combat restrictions on civil society and bolster civil society's efforts to support democracy around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the International Day of Democracy;

(2) recognizes the importance of civil society to the healthy development of nations;

(3) celebrates the invaluable contributions civil society has made to the creation, strength, and preservation of vibrant democracies and democratic institutions;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the protection, advancement, health, and sustainability of democracy throughout the world;

(5) condemns the use of restrictions, coercion, threats, or force to impede the activities of civil society organizations;

(6) recognizes the important multilateral work of the Community of Democracies, the "Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund", the Open Government Partnership, and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association to protect global civil society;

(7) recognizes the important role diplomacy plays in defending global civil society and creating new openings for civic space;

(8) emphasizes the value of programs of the United States Government in protecting civil society and defending civic space, including the work by the Senior Advisor for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the United States Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID);

(9) calls on private sector partners and other governments to develop new tools and leverage existing technologies to support the efforts of civil society; and

(10) encourages the people of the United States and the world to observe the International Day of Democracy, September 15, 2014, with appropriate programs and activities.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize the important role civil society plays in the promotion of democracy as we observe International Day of Democracy this September 15.

Twenty-five years ago, I stood in Berlin as the wall was coming down. I will never forget that moment when the will of the people was finally recognized. It's true that we have seen extraordinary progress over the years. But in too many parts of the globe, basic rights continued to be denied to those fighting for democratic ideals.

Today, there is an unprecedented global crackdown on civil society organizations seeking to express their voice and exercise their rights. We've seen pervasive restrictions on civil society organizations enforced around the globe. Russia, in its worst political crackdown in post-Soviet history, has stamped the label of "foreign agent" on any civil society organization that receives support from other countries. Ethiopia's 2009 Charities and Societies Proclamation continues to hinder the work of human rights organizations and other civil society groups that receive more than 10 percent of their funding from foreign organizations. In 2012, Sudanese security forces violently attacked civil society representatives who were protesting against government restrictions. Egypt has prosecuted over 40 international aid implementers, sentencing them to prison for up to five years. In Laos, activist Sombath Somphone—a leader who dedicated his career to expanding civic space in Laos—has been missing for nearly two years after video footage documented his abduction at a police

checkpoint. In 2013, government harassment in Sri Lanka forced the German Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Foundation to close its office.

The developments that we see today have several notable features. First, the pushback against democracy is a global phenomenon and countries like Russia have established antidemocratic practices that are being emulated elsewhere. Second, global democratic reversals are not merely temporary aberrations but are likely to pose challenges for years to come. Finally, the global response has thus far been inadequate to meet these threats.

Moreover, democratic achievements cannot be taken for granted. A few days ago, Hungary's National Investigative Office raided the offices of two organizations which help distribute civil society funds from the government of Norway. Thirteen NGOs are currently under investigation in Budapest, including the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union, HCLU, the local office of Transparency International, and the Roma Media Centre. These raids signal further deterioration of good governance, the rule of law, and human rights in Hungary.

I regret that the Hungarian government is pursuing practices at odds with the historic path to freedom Hungary pursued 25 years ago when that country opened the door for East German refugees and courageously helped pave the way for the end of communism. At a time when we need more democracy in Europe, not less, Hungary's actions are not only harmful for democracy in Hungary, they undermine efforts to build democratic institutions throughout the region.

To call attention to widespread infringements upon civil society, I, as Chair of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the International Day of Democracy resolution. This resolution urges the recognition of the International Day of Democracy, affirms the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encourages all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations.

We cannot take success for granted; every day we must work to protect democratic progress. As we observe the International Day of Democracy this September 15, the international community must push back on these grave threats to civil society as well as protect the efforts by these organizations to build strong democratic institutions.

I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me in support of the International Day of Democracy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 541—RECOGNIZING THE SEVERE THREAT THAT THE EBOLA OUTBREAK IN WEST AFRICA POSES TO POPULATIONS, GOVERNMENTS, AND ECONOMIES ACROSS AFRICA AND, IF NOT PROPERLY CONTAINED, TO REGIONS ACROSS THE GLOBE, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY THIS EPIDEMIC

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 541

Whereas Ebola hemorrhagic fever is an extremely infectious virus that causes severe illness with a fatality rate that can well exceed 50 percent;

Whereas Ebola is spread through contact with blood, secretions, or other bodily fluids of infected humans and animals and can have an incubation period of up to 21 days;

Whereas the Ebola virus first appeared in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1976 and has afflicted communities in Africa at least 20 times since then;

Whereas the current Ebola outbreak first occurred in February 2014 in forested areas of southeastern Guinea and subsequently spread to Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, and Senegal, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo recently discovered the outbreak of a separate strain of the virus;

Whereas this is the first outbreak of Ebola in West Africa and the biggest and most complex to date, due to its emergence in populated, transient border areas, making containment a significant challenge;

Whereas, to date, Ebola had infected more than 3,600 people in West Africa and caused almost 2,000 deaths;

Whereas the current Ebola outbreak has occurred in countries with some of the weakest health systems in the world facing severe shortages of healthcare workers, laboratories essential for testing and diagnosis, clinics and hospitals required for treatment, and medical supplies and protective gear, such as latex gloves and face masks required to prevent contamination of health facilities;

Whereas these weak and inadequate healthcare facilities, a lack of health staff trained in Ebola response, and misconceptions about the virus have resulted in numerous infections of health workers and patients unable to receive appropriate response and care;

Whereas effective countermeasures for stemming the spread of Ebola, such as isolation, meticulous infection control practices, case investigation, and contact tracing require more trained personnel and resources than are currently available in West Africa;

Whereas, although Ebola can be contained with good public health and burial practices, it continues to spread due to a lack of accurate public information, insufficient treatment facilities, limited local language capacities required for health education, and an unwillingness to allow those infected to be isolated from family members;

Whereas governments are collaborating closely with international donors and taking strong measures to contain the virus, including announcing states of emergency and establishing emergency response centers;

Whereas the limitations on transportation and travel and closing of businesses have had

a devastating economic impact throughout the region and may cause social instability and exacerbate the humanitarian crisis if not properly managed and offset;

Whereas the international community has committed to support solutions to the current limitations on air traffic and establish a common operational platform to address acute problems associated with food security, protection, water, sanitation and hygiene, primary and secondary health care, and education, as well as the longer-term recovery effort that will be needed in the face of the complex social consequences of this emergency;

Whereas the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda have sent experts familiar with such outbreaks to Liberia to assist with the outbreak response, and the Government of Ghana has agreed to serve as the international community's logistics and coordination center and is providing a vital corridor for supplies and personnel;

Whereas, after visiting affected communities in West Africa, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Director Tom Frieden said on September 2, 2014, "There is a window of opportunity to tamp this down, but that window is closing... we need action now to scale up the response.";

Whereas the United States Government has provided more than \$101,400,000 in support through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the United States Agency for International Development, the World Health Organization, and the United States Armed Forces since February 2014;

Whereas the United States Government helped to fund the development of the Zmapp biopharmaceutical experimental drug that was given to 2 United States health workers afflicted with the virus and was recently donated to 3 Liberian doctors with encouraging effect and has prompted calls for further research and development of such vaccines;

Whereas, on August 5, 2014, the United States Government deployed a multi-agency Disaster Assistance Response Team composed of staff from Federal agencies, including the United States Agency for International Development, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Forest Service to coordinate the United States Government's response efforts;

Whereas the World Health Organization published on August 28, 2014, a roadmap for scaled-up response that aims to stop the virus in 6 to 9 months and calls for 750 international and 12,000 local health workers to contribute to the halt of the Ebola outbreak; and

Whereas, earlier this year, the United States Government joined with partner governments, the World Health Organization, other multilateral organizations, and non-governmental actors to launch the Global Health Security Agenda, a 5-year commitment to prevent, detect, and effectively respond to infectious disease threats such as Ebola: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the severe immediate threat that Ebola poses to populations, governments, and economies in Africa;

(2) recognizes that the limited capacity of the initial outbreak countries of Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia to combat the epidemic has been exhausted and the potential threat to regions beyond Africa if this, the largest of all Ebola outbreaks, is not contained;

(3) expresses support for those affected by this epidemic and affirms its sympathy for victims of Ebola and their families;

(4) supports the Governments of Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Senegal, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo for their ongoing efforts to combat the Ebola virus in their countries and regionally;

(5) urges citizens of affected countries to respect preventative guidelines provided by their governments and medical professionals from Africa and around the world in order to stem the outbreak;

(6) supports the work of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of State, the Forest Service, and other United States Government agencies providing technical, logistical, and material support to address the Ebola crisis in West Africa;

(7) encourages deepened United States and international commitments to the global Ebola response;

(8) welcomes the delivery of assistance and increased engagement from donors such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union, the World Bank, the European Union, and the Government of Canada;

(9) expresses support for the promotion of investments in global health in order to ensure that governments can better prevent and detect, contain, and eventually eliminate outbreaks of disease while also providing other essential health services;

(10) supports the World Health Organization's Ebola Response Roadmap and a common operational platform in response to the crisis;

(11) encourages the Governments of Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, and Sierra Leone to work together and with other nations and regional and subregional organizations to establish institutional emergency response systems to more effectively respond to this and future outbreaks of Ebola and other highly infectious diseases;

(12) welcomes proactive measures taken by governments in West Africa to formulate national plans of action in response to the crisis; and

(13) recognizes the work of thousands of African, United States, and international officials and volunteers on the ground in West Africa, particularly healthcare workers, who are working diligently and at great risk to help address this multidimensional crisis, and encourages other healthcare workers and logisticians to volunteer.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3790. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3791. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3792. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3791 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3793. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3794. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3793 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3795. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3796. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3797. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3796 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, supra.

SA 3798. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3799. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3790. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

SA 3791. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike "and the electoral process" and insert "the electoral process and to prevent corruption"

SA 3792. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3791 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

" , which shall not be limited to bribery or quid pro quo corruption"

SA 3793. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to

the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike “electoral processes” and insert “the electoral processes and to prevent corruption in government”

SA 3794. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3793 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:
 “, which shall not be defined solely as bribery or quid pro quo corruption”

SA 3795. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In Section 1, strike “and electoral processes” and insert “process and prevent corruption in the electoral system”

SA 3796. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “system” and insert “process”.

SA 3797. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3796 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3795 proposed by Mr. REID to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
 “, which shall not be constrained to bribery or quid pro quo corruption”

SA 3798. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVI, add the following:

SEC. 2614. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2602 of that Act (124 Stat. 4453), and extended by section 2612 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1003), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2011 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorization

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Virginia	Fort Story	Army Reserve Center	\$11,000,000

SA 3799. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 3, add the following:

SEC. 3A. FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING PARENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer, consistent with the other provisions of this Act.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Freight Rail Service: Improving the Performance of America’s Rail System.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 10:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Cybersecurity, Terrorism, and Beyond: Addressing Evolving Threats to the Homeland.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Irrigation Projects in Indian Country.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR-301 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 10, 2014, in room SD-562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Indebted for Life: Older Americans and Student Loan Debt.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Clinton Fuchs, a

detailee on the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 113th Congress. This is a request on behalf of Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 480, S. 2154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w-9(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and \$30,387,656" and inserting "\$30,387,656"; and

(2) by inserting before the period "and \$20,213,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2154), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GOLD STAR FATHERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 549, S. 2323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2323) to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2323) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2323

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Gold Star Fathers Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

"(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

"(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

"(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

"(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

"(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

"(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 487, H.R. 1233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

H.R. 1233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Presidential records.
- Sec. 3. National Archives and Records Administration.
- Sec. 4. Records management by Federal agencies.
- Sec. 5. Disposal of records.
- Sec. 6. Procedures to prevent unauthorized removal of classified records from National Archives.
- Sec. 7. Repeal of provisions related to the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials.
- Sec. 8. Pronoun amendments.
- Sec. 9. Records management by the Archivist.
- Sec. 10. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging account.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS OF CONSTITUTIONALLY BASED PRIVILEGE AGAINST DISCLOSURE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure

"(a)(1) When the Archivist determines under this chapter to make available to the public any Presidential record that has not previously been made available to the public, the Archivist shall—

"(A) promptly provide notice of such determination to—

"(i) the former President during whose term of office the record was created; and

"(ii) the incumbent President; and

"(B) make the notice available to the public.

"(2) The notice under paragraph (1)—

"(A) shall be in writing; and

"(B) shall include such information as may be prescribed in regulations issued by the Archivist.

"(3)(A) Upon the expiration of the 60-day period (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) beginning on the date the Archivist provides notice under paragraph (1)(A), the Archivist shall make available to the public the Presidential record covered by the notice, except any record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) with respect to which the Archivist receives from a former President or the incumbent President notification of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure under subsection (b).

"(B) A former President or the incumbent President may extend the period under subparagraph (A) once for not more than 30 additional days (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) by filing with the Archivist a statement that such an extension is necessary to allow an adequate review of the record.

"(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), if the 60-day period under subparagraph (A), or any extension of that period under subparagraph (B), would otherwise expire during the 6-month period after the incumbent President first takes office, then that 60-day period or extension, respectively, shall expire at the end of that 6-month period.

“(b)(1) For purposes of this section, the decision to assert any claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) must be made personally by a former President or the incumbent President, as applicable.

“(2) A former President or the incumbent President shall notify the Archivist, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of a privilege claim under paragraph (1) on the same day that the claim is asserted under such paragraph.

“(c)(1) If a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) is asserted under subsection (b) by a former President, the Archivist shall consult with the incumbent President, as soon as practicable during the period specified in paragraph (2)(A), to determine whether the incumbent President will uphold the claim asserted by the former President.

“(2)(A) Not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date [of] on which the Archivist receives notification from a former President of the assertion of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure, the Archivist shall provide notice to the former President and the public of the decision of the incumbent President under paragraph (1) regarding the claim.

“(B) If the incumbent President upholds the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, the Archivist shall not make the Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) subject to the claim publicly available unless—

“(i) the incumbent President withdraws the decision upholding the claim of privilege asserted by the former President; or

“(ii) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

“(C) If the incumbent President determines not to uphold the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, or fails to make the determination under paragraph (1) before the end of the period specified in subparagraph (A), the Archivist shall release the Presidential record subject to the claim at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Archivist received notification of the claim, unless otherwise directed by a court order in an action initiated by the former President under section 2204(e) of this title or by a court order in another action in any Federal court.

“(d) The Archivist shall not make publicly available a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) that is subject to a privilege claim asserted by the incumbent President unless—

“(1) the incumbent President withdraws the privilege claim; or

“(2) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

“(e) The Archivist shall adjust any otherwise applicable time period under this section as necessary to comply with the return date of any congressional subpoena, judicial subpoena, or judicial process.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 2204(d) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, except section 2208,” after “chapter”.

(B) Section 2205 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 2204” and inserting “sections 2204 and 2208 of this title”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “subpena” and inserting “subpoena”.

(C) Section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by inserting “, except section 2208,” after “chapter”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure.”.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (2)(C) shall be construed to—

(A) affect the requirement of section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, that Vice Presidential records shall be subject to chapter 22 of that title in the same manner as Presidential records; or

(B) affect any claim of constitutionally based privilege by a President or former President with respect to a Vice Presidential record.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “memorandums” and inserting “memoranda”; and

(B) by striking “audio, audiovisual” and inserting “audio and visual records”; and

(C) by inserting “, whether in analog, digital, or any other form” after “mechanical recordings”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “advise and assist” and inserting “advise or assist”.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND CUSTODY OF PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2203 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “maintained” and inserting “preserved and maintained”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “advise and assist” and inserting “advise or assist”; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) During a President’s term of office, the Archivist may maintain and preserve Presidential records on behalf of the President, including records in digital or electronic form. The President shall remain exclusively responsible for custody, control, and access to such Presidential records. The Archivist may not disclose any such records, except under direction of the President, until the conclusion of a President’s term of office, if a President serves consecutive terms upon the conclusion of the last term, or such other period provided for under section 2204 of this title.”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(1), as so redesignated, by striking “Act” and inserting “chapter”.

(d) RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2204 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) The Archivist shall not make available any original Presidential records to any individual claiming access to any Presidential record as a designated representative under section 2205(3) of this title if that individual has been convicted of a crime relating to the review, retention, removal, or destruction of records of the Archives.”.

(e) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a Presidential record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

“(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record; or

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the Presidential record to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee within five days after the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record.”

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, the Vice President, or a covered employee may not create or send a Presidential or Vice Presidential record using a non-official electronic message account unless the President, Vice President, or covered employee—

“(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the President, Vice President, or covered employee in the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record or Vice Presidential record; or

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the Presidential or Vice Presidential record to an official electronic messaging account of the President, Vice President, or covered employee not later than 20 days after the original creation or transmission of the Presidential or Vice Presidential record.

(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) by a covered employee (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ means—

“(A) the immediate staff of the President;

“(B) the immediate staff of the Vice President;

“(C) a unit or individual of the Executive Office of the President whose function is to advise and assist the President; and

“(D) a unit or individual of the Office of the Vice President whose function is to advise and assist the Vice President.

“(1)(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term ‘electronic messages’ means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

“(2)(3) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends electronic messages.

“(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(3), is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.”.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF RECORDS FOR HISTORICAL PRESERVATION.—Section 2107 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2107. Acceptance of records for historical preservation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—When it appears to the Archivist to be in the public interest, the Archivist may—

“(1) accept for deposit with the National Archives of the United States the records of a Federal agency, the Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, or the Supreme Court determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government;

“(2) direct and effect the transfer of records of a Federal agency determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government to the National Archives of the United States, as soon as practicable, and at a time mutually agreed upon by the Archivist and the head of that Federal agency not later than thirty years after such records were created or received by that agency, unless the head of such agency has certified in writing to the Archivist that such records must be retained in the custody of such agency for use in the conduct of the regular business of the agency;

“(3) direct and effect, with the approval of the head of the originating Federal agency, or if the existence of the agency has been terminated, with the approval of the head of that agency's successor in function, if any, the transfer of records, deposited or approved for deposit with the National Archives of the United States to public or educational institutions or associations; title to the records to remain vested in the United States unless otherwise authorized by Congress; and

“(4) transfer materials from private sources authorized to be received by the Archivist by section 2111 of this title.

“(b) EARLY TRANSFER OF RECORDS.—The Archivist—

“(1) in consultation with the head of the originating Federal agency, is authorized to accept a copy of the records described in subsection (a)(2) that have been in existence for less than thirty years; and

“(2) may not disclose any such records until the expiration of—

“(A) the thirty-year period described in paragraph (1);

“(B) any longer period established by the Archivist by order; or

“(C) any shorter period agreed to by the originating Federal agency.”

(b) MATERIAL ACCEPTED FOR DEPOSIT.—Section 2111 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2111. Material accepted for deposit

“(a) IN GENERAL.—When the Archivist considers it to be in the public interest the Archivist may accept for deposit—

“(1) the papers and other historical materials of a President or former President of the United States, or other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with a President or former President of the United States, subject to restrictions agreeable to the Archivist as to their use; and

“(2) recorded information (as such term is defined in section 3301(a)(2) of this title) from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply in the case of any Presidential records which are subject to the provisions of chapter 22 of this title.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUDIO AND VISUAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2114 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2114. Preservation of audio and visual records

“The Archivist may make and preserve audio and visual records, including motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings, in analog, digital, or any other form, pertaining to and illustrative of the historical development of the United States Government and its activities, and provide for preparing, editing, titling, scoring, processing, duplicating, reproducing, exhibiting, and releasing for non-profit educational purposes, motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings in the Archivist's custody.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item for section 2114 and inserting the following:

“2114. Preservation of audio and visual records.”

(d) LEGAL STATUS OF REPRODUCTIONS; OFFICIAL SEAL; FEES FOR COPIES AND REPRODUCTIONS.—Section 2116(a) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “digital,” after “microphotographic,” each place it appears.

SEC. 4. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 3106 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3106. Unlawful removal, destruction of records

“(a) FEDERAL AGENCY NOTIFICATION.—The head of each Federal agency shall notify the Archivist of any actual, impending, or threatened unlawful removal, defacing, alteration, corruption, deletion, erasure, or other destruction of records in the custody of the agency, and with the assistance of the Archivist shall initiate action through the Attorney General for the recovery of records the head of the Federal agency knows or has reason to believe have been unlawfully removed from that agency, or from another Federal agency whose records have been transferred to the legal custody of that Federal agency.

“(b) ARCHIVIST NOTIFICATION.—In any case in which the head of a Federal agency does not initiate an action for such recovery or other redress within a reasonable period of time after being notified of any such unlawful action described in subsection (a), or is participating in, or believed to be participating in any such unlawful action, the Archivist shall request the Attorney General to initiate such an action, and shall notify the Congress when such a request has been made.”

SEC. 5. DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RECORDS.—Section 3301 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3301. Definition of records

“(a) RECORDS DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As used in this chapter, the term ‘records’—

“(A) includes all recorded information, regardless of form or characteristics, made or received by a Federal agency under Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the United States Government or because of the informational value of data in them; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) library and museum material made or acquired and preserved solely for reference or exhibition purposes; or

“(ii) duplicate copies of records preserved only for convenience.

“(2) RECORDED INFORMATION DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘recorded information’ includes all traditional forms of records, regardless of physical form or characteristics, including information created, manipulated, communicated, or stored in digital or electronic form.

“(b) DETERMINATION OF DEFINITION.—The Archivist's determination whether recorded information, regardless of whether it exists in physical, digital, or electronic form, is a record as defined in subsection (a) shall be binding on all Federal agencies.”

(b) REGULATIONS COVERING LISTS OF RECORDS FOR DISPOSAL, PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSAL, AND STANDARDS FOR REPRODUCTION.—Section 3302(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “photographic or microphotographic processes” and inserting “photographic, microphotographic, or digital processes”.

(c) LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHIVIST BY HEAD OF EACH GOVERNMENT AGENCY.—Section 3303(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “photographed or microphotographed” and inserting “photographed, microphotographed, or digitized”.

(d) EXAMINATION BY ARCHIVIST OF LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS LACKING PRESERVATION VALUE; DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.—Section 3303a(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate”.

(e) PHOTOGRAPHS OR MICROPHOTOGRAPHS OF RECORDS CONSIDERED AS ORIGINALS; CERTIFIED REPRODUCTIONS ADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE.—Section 3312 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Photographs or microphotographs of records” and inserting “Photographs, microphotographs of records, or digitized records”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “photographs or microphotographs” and inserting “photographs, microphotographs, or digitized records”, each place it appears.

SEC. 6. PROCEDURES TO PREVENT UNAUTHORIZED REMOVAL OF CLASSIFIED RECORDS FROM NATIONAL ARCHIVES.

(a) CLASSIFIED RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall prescribe internal procedures to prevent the unauthorized removal of classified records from the National Archives and Records Administration or the destruction or damage of such records, including when such records are accessed or searched electronically. Such procedures shall include, at a minimum, the following prohibitions:

(1) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not view classified records in any room that is not secure, except in the presence of National Archives and Records Administration personnel or under video surveillance.

(2) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not be left alone with classified records, unless that individual is under video surveillance.

(3) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not review classified records while possessing any cellular phone, electronic personal communication device, or any other devices capable of photographing, recording, or transferring images or content.

(4) An individual seeking access to review classified records, as a precondition to such access, must consent to a search of their belongings upon conclusion of their records review.

(5) All notes and other writings prepared by an individual, other than covered personnel, during the course of a review of classified records shall be retained by the National Archives and Records Administration in a secure facility until such notes and other writings are determined to be unclassified, are declassified, or are securely transferred to another secure facility.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED PERSONNEL.—The term “covered personnel” means any individual—

(A) who has an appropriate and necessary reason for accessing classified records, as determined by the Archivist; and

(B) who is either—

(i) an officer or employee of the United States Government with appropriate security clearances; or

(ii) any personnel with appropriate security clearances of a Federal contractor authorized in writing to act for purposes of this section by an officer or employee of the United States Government.

(2) RECORDS.—The term “records” has the meaning given that term under section 3301 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE NATIONAL STUDY COMMISSION ON RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 3315 through 3324 of title 44, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3315 through 3324.

SEC. 8. PRONOUN AMENDMENTS.

Title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2116(c), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(2) in section 2201(2), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”, each place it appears;

(3) in section 2203—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(II) by striking “those of his Presidential records” and inserting “those Presidential records of such President”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(D) in subsection (d), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(E) in subsection (e), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(F) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(4) in section 2204—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “his” and inserting “a President’s”; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking “his” the first place it appears and inserting “the Archivist’s”; and

(II) by striking “his designee” and inserting “the Archivist’s designee”;

(5) in section 2205—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “his” and inserting “the incumbent President’s”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “his” and inserting “the former President’s”;

(6) in section 2901(11), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(7) in section 2904(c)(6), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(8) in section 2905(a)—

(A) by striking “He” and inserting “The Archivist”; and

(B) by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(9) in section 3103, by striking “he” and inserting “the head of such agency”;

(10) in section 3104—

(A) by striking “his” the first place it appears and inserting “such official’s”; and

(B) by striking “him or his” and inserting “such official or such official’s”;

(11) in section 3105, by striking “he” and inserting “the head of such agency”;

(12) in section 3302(1), by striking “him” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(13) in section 3303a—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “him” and inserting “the Archivist”, each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(C) in subsection (e), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”.

SEC. 9. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.

(a) OBJECTIVES OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2902 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “creation and of records maintenance and use” and inserting “creation, maintenance, transfer, and use”;

(2) in paragraph (6), by inserting after “Federal paperwork” the following: “and the transfer of records from Federal agencies to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “the Administrator or”.

(b) RECORDS CENTERS AND CENTRALIZED MICROFILMING SERVICES.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 2907 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”; and

(B) by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 2907 by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”.

(c) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2904 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Archivist”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “their” and inserting “the”;

(ii) by striking “subsection (a) or (b), respectively” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(iii) by striking “and the Administrator”; and

(iv) by striking “each”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “or the Administrator (as the case may be)”; and

(3) subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) The Archivist shall promulgate regulations requiring all Federal agencies to transfer all digital or electronic records to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible.”.

(d) INSPECTION OF AGENCY RECORDS.—Section 2906 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “their respective” and inserting “the”;

(ii) by striking “the Administrator of General Services and”;

(iii) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “the Archivist’s designee”;

(iv) by striking “solely”; and

(v) by inserting after “for the improvement of records management practices and programs” the following: “and for determining whether the records of Federal agencies have sufficient value to warrant continued preservation or lack sufficient value to justify continued preservation”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “the Administrator and”; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “the Administrator or”; and

(II) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “Archivist’s designee”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the Administrator, the Archivist,” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “the Administrator and”; and

(B) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “Archivist’s designee”.

(e) REPORTS; CORRECTION OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 2115 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “their respective” and inserting “the”;

(B) by striking “and the Administrator”; and

(C) by striking “each”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “either”;

(B) by striking “or the Administrator”, each place it appears; and

(C) by striking “inaugurated” and inserting “demonstrably commenced”.

(f) RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—The heading for chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “AND BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item related to chapter 29 by striking “and by the Administrator of General Services”.

(g) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM OF MANAGEMENT.—Section 3102(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Administrator of General Services and”.

SEC. 10. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

“(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the record; or

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the record to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee [within five days] not later than 20 days after the original creation or transmission of the record.

“(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term ‘electronic messages’ means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

“(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends electronic messages.

“(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.”

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1233), as amended, was passed.

NATIONAL DRUG TAKE-BACK WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 466, and the Senate now proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 466) designating the week of October 27 through November 2, 2014, as “National Drug Take-Back Week”, and designating October 2014 as “National Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse Awareness Month”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 466) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 3, 2014, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

APPROVING THE LOCATION OF AN AMERICAN REVOLUTION MEMORIAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 120, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the House joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) was read the third time and passed.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 5078

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading but, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S.J. Res. 19, the Senate proceed to executive session and consider Calendar Nos. 544, 977, 685, 867, 976, 917, 914 and 758; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, without any intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of Senators, we expect the nominations considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, September 11, 2014, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following the prayer and pledge, there be a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001; that following any Leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2199 postcloture; that all time during adjournment, recess or morning business count postcloture to the motion to proceed to S. 2199; and finally that the filing deadlines for first-degree amendments to S.J. Res. 19 be 12 noon tomorrow, and second-degree amendments be at 1 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, ultimately we hope to move forward on the Pay-check Fairness Act and vote on cloture on the constitutional amendment early tomorrow afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senator SESSIONS, which will last for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer and appreciate the opportunity to share some thoughts on an important subject tonight.

Earlier this week I spoke about the President's promise that he would issue an Executive amnesty, a grant of amnesty to 5 or 6 million people by some form of Executive order with his own pen. The planned amnesty would include work permits, photo ID's, and Social Security numbers for millions of people who illegally entered the U.S., illegally overstayed their visas, or defrauded U.S. immigration authorities.

The Senate Democratic Conference has supported and enabled the President's actions and blocked—so far—every effort to stop it. Not even one of our Democratic colleagues has backed the House legislation that would stop this Executive amnesty or demanded that Senator REID bring it up for a vote at least. Every Senate Democrat is therefore the President's partner in his planned lawless acts. Plainly the President must execute the law that was passed by Congress, and the law does not allow for unlawful immigrants to work in the U.S. It doesn't allow for many other things they are suggesting the President may plan to do by Executive order.

Tonight I would like to talk about the influence of special interests on our nation's immigration laws and how it is creating unwise and unlawful policies. How did we get to the point where elected officials, activist groups, the ACLU, and global CEOs are openly working to deny American workers the immigration protections to which they are legally entitled?

How did we get to the point where the Democratic Party is prepared to nullify and wipe away the immigration laws of the United States of America? And we are at that point, colleagues.

Just yesterday Majority Leader REID wrote in a tweet something that was shocking. He said:

Since House Republicans have failed to act on immigration, I know the President will. When he does, I hope he goes real big.

That is the majority leader of the Senate. He intends to do nothing in the Senate to stop the President's actions. But colleagues, we know better. This body is not run by one man. We don't have a dictator in the great Senate. Every Member has a vote. And the only way Senator REID could do such a thing to block this Senate from voting in a way that would stop the President's Executive actions is to not support him in his plan.

Every Senator needs to stand up and represent their constituents, not big business, not the ACLU, not activist groups, not political interests but the American interests, the workers' interests. That is what we need to expect from them, and we don't have but a few weeks, it looks like, to get it done.

Let this sink in for a moment. The majority leader of the Senate is bragging that he knows the President will circumvent Congress to issue Executive amnesty to millions, and he is encouraging the President to ensure this amnesty includes as many people as possible. And the White House has acknowledged that 5 to 6 million is the number they are looking at.

Has one Senate Democrat stepped forward to reject Mr. REID's statement? Has one Senate Democrat stepped forward to say: I support the legislation passed by the House of Representatives that would secure the border and block this Executive amnesty? Have they ever said they support that? Have they ever said: I will do everything in my power to see that the House legislation gets a vote in the Senate so the American people can know what is going on? No. All we hear is silence.

In effect, the entire Senate Democratic Congress has surrendered the jobs, wages, and livelihoods of their constituents to a group of special interests meeting in secret at the White House—what Congress has refused to pass and the American people have rejected. They are plotting at the White House—maybe even more so today—to move forward with Executive action anyway, no matter what the people think, no matter what Congress, the people's House, votes on.

Politico reports that "White House officials conducted more than 20 meetings in July and August with legal experts, immigration advocates and business leaders to gather ideas on what should be included in the order." Now that is a quote from Politico. Twenty meetings with legal experts, immigration advocates, and business leaders to gather ideas on what should be included in the President's order. So who are these so-called expert advocates and business leaders? They are not the law enforcement officers; they are not our ICE officers; they are not our Border Patrol officers; they are not the American working man and woman; they are not unemployed Americans. They weren't in the room. You can be

sure of that. Their opinions weren't sought.

No, White House officials are meeting with the world's most powerful corporate immigration lobbyists and activists who think border controls are for the little people. We know better. The administration is meeting with the elite, the cosmopolitan set who scorn and mock the concerns of everyday Americans who are concerned about their schools, jobs, wages, communities, and hospitals. These great and powerful citizens of the world, we know, don't care much about old fashioned things like national boundaries, national sovereignty, immigration control, let alone the constitutional separation of powers or even the consistent and even-handed enforcement of plain law, passed by the elected representatives of the American people in due fashion.

Well, don't you get it? They believe they are always supposed to get whatever it is they want. They are used to that. They spend hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, one report says they have spent \$1.5 billion since 2007 trying to pass their desired immigration bill—\$1.5 billion. They think whatever they want is good for America. They tried and tried and tried to pass the bill through Congress, but the American people said: No, no, no. So they decided to just go to the President. They decide to go to President Obama, and we will insist that he implement these measures through Executive fiat. And Senate Democrats have apparently said: Well, that is just a wonderful idea. We support that. Just do it. Go big. But, Mr. President, wait a little bit. Wait until after the election. We don't want the voters to hold us accountable for what you are doing. We want to pretend we in the Senate have nothing to do with it.

One of the groups that has joined the chorus of special interests demanding Executive action on immigration is FWD.us, run by Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg. He just turned 30, and I understand he is worth about \$28 billion.

Mr. Zuckerberg has been very busy recently. One of his fellow billionaires, Mr. Carlos Slim—maybe the world's richest man—invited Mr. Zuckerberg down to Mexico City to give a speech. What did Mr. Zuckerberg promote in his speech? Well, this is a report of it.

I guess I will first note that young Mr. Zuckerberg maybe doesn't know there is a deep American tradition—a tradition in most developed nations—that you don't go to a foreign capital to criticize your own government. I suppose he doesn't know about that. They probably didn't teach him about that when he was at one of the elite schools he attended.

This is what he said in Mexico City:

We have a strange immigration policy for a nation of immigrants. And it's a policy unfit for today's world.

Well, the “masters of the universe” are very fond of open borders as long as these open borders don’t extend to their gated compounds and fenced-off estates.

I have another article from late last fall that was printed in *Business Insider* about Mr. Zuckerberg’s actions. The headline is “Mark Zuckerberg Just Spent More Than \$30 Million Buying 4 Neighboring Houses For Privacy.” The article says:

Mark Zuckerberg just made an unusual purchase.

Well, four purchases.

Facebook’s billionaire founder bought four homes surrounding his current home near Palo Alto, Mercury News Reports. The houses cost him more than \$30 million, including one 2,600 square-foot home that cost \$14 million. (His own home is twice as large at 5,000 square-feet and cost half as much.)

Larry Page made a similar move a few years ago so he could build a 6,000-square-foot mansion. But Zuckerberg’s reason is different. He doesn’t want to live in excess, he just wants a little privacy.

That is a world the average American doesn’t live in.

So Mr. Zuckerberg, who has become the top spokesman for expanding the admission of foreign workers, championed the Senate immigration bill for which all of our Democratic colleagues voted. One of the things the bill did was double the supply of low-wage foreign workers brought into the United States for companies such as Facebook.

We have been told for a long time—and most of us have heard this repeatedly—that there is a shortage of STEM and IT workers. STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. This has been the central selling point of these massive demands for increases in foreign worker programs across the board—programs that bring in workers for every sector in the U.S. economy. But we know otherwise from the nation’s leading academics, people who studied this issue and are professionals in it. I have a recent op-ed here from *USA TODAY* which reports that there is actually not a shortage but a surplus of Americans who have been trained in the STEM and IT fields and that this is why wages have not increased since 1999.

If you have a shortage of workers in a field such as information technology or science and mathematics, wages go up, do they not? If wages are not up and are basically down since 1999, I think the case for our free-market friends is pretty clear—we don’t have a shortage.

So rich high-tech companies are using the H-1B visa program to keep wages down and to hire less expensive workers from abroad. Indeed, the same companies demanding more guest workers are laying off American workers in droves.

I would like to read some excerpts from that op-ed published in *USA*

TODAY. The article was recently co-authored by five of the nation’s experts on labor markets and the guest worker program. I think it tells a story that has not been refuted. We have partisans and advocates who have been claiming there is a shortage in these fields, but the experts say no. And since they have been speaking out on this issue, we have seen no real data that would dispute what they say in this article dated July 27, 2014.

Headline: “Bill Gates’ tech worker fantasy.”

Subheadline: “Silicon Valley has created an imaginary staffing shortage.”

Business executives and politicians endlessly complain that there is a “shortage” of qualified Americans and that the U.S. must admit more high-skilled guest workers to fill jobs in STEM fields: science, technology, engineering and math. This claim is echoed by everyone from President Obama and Rupert Murdoch to Mark Zuckerberg and Bill Gates.

Yet within the past month, two odd things occurred: Census reported that only one in four STEM degree holders is in a STEM job, and Microsoft announced plans to downsize its workforce by 18,000 jobs.

The five writers of this article—referring to themselves—go on to say:

None of us have been able to find any credible efforts to support the IT industry’s assertions of labor shortages.

The article was written by Ron Hira, Paula Stephan, Hal Salzman, Michael Teitelbaum, who has recently written a book on this subject, and Norm Matloff. These are labor economic experts who have studied these issues for years. Many of them have testified before Congress. They say:

None of us have been able to find any credible evidence to support the IT industry’s assertions of labor shortages.

What a statement that is.

They go on to write—they all signed this article together—that:

If a shortage did exist, wages would be rising as companies try to attract scarce workers. Instead, legislation that expanded visas for IT personnel during the 1990s has kept average wages flat over the past 16 years. Indeed, guest workers have become the predominant source of new hires in these fields.

The ‘predominate source of new hires’ in information technology fields is coming through guest worker programs from abroad.

They go on to say:

Those supporting even greater expansion seem to have forgotten about the hundreds and thousands of American high-tech workers who are being shortchanged—by wages stuck at 1998 levels, by diminished career prospects and by repeated rounds of layoffs.

They go on to say:

There is an ample supply of American workers who are willing and qualified to fill high-skill jobs in this country. The only real disagreement is whether the supply is two or three times larger than the demand.

There is no doubt we have a surplus of IT workers. The question is whether the supply is two or three times as big as the number of job openings.

They go on to say:

Unfortunately, companies are exploiting the large existing flow of guest workers to deny American workers access to STEM careers and middle-class security that should come with them. Imagine, then, how many more Americans would be frozen out of the middle class if politicians and tech moguls succeeded in doubling or tripling the flow of guest workers into STEM occupations.

That is exactly what the bill before this Senate—the bill the House of Representatives rejected—would have done. It would have doubled the number of guest workers coming into America just to take jobs—coming in for the very purpose of taking a job that we need Americans to be taking.

The article goes on:

Another major, yet often overlooked, provision in the pending legislation—

That is the bill President Obama is pushing for, the Gang of 8 bill

would grant automatic green cards to any foreign student who earns a graduate degree in a STEM field, based on assertions that foreign graduates of U.S. universities are routinely being forced to leave. Such claims are incompatible with the evidence that such graduates have many paths to stay and work, and indeed the “stay rates” for visiting international students are very high and have shown no sign of decline. The most recent study finds that 92 percent of Chinese Ph.D. students stay in America to work after graduation.

So there is this myth that we have thousands and thousands of students graduating from schools and being sent home. That is not accurate, according to the experts who study the data.

The article continues:

The tech industry’s promotion of expanded temporary visas (such as the H-1B) and green cards is driven by a desire for cheap, young and immobile labor. It is well documented that loopholes enable firms to legally pay H-1Bs below their market value and to continue the widespread age discrimination acknowledged by many in the tech industry.

I talked to a gentleman whom I knew a little bit who worked at a computer company. He is well into his forties, maybe close to 50. I asked him what kind of security there is. He said, Well, in the tech industry these companies go and fall. I said, What happens if you were to lose your job? He said, At my age, it would be very difficult.

That was a poignant moment for me. This man, with a family, raising children, doing the right thing, is worried at his age whether he can get a job, when the majority of people being hired in these fields are H-1B guest workers.

The *USA Today* op-ed concludes by saying:

IT industry leaders have spent lavishly on lobbying to promote their STEM shortage claims among legislators. The only problem is that the evidence contradicts their self-interested claims.

I think this is a dramatic article. It is an article by undisputed experts in their field. To my knowledge no one has disputed it. The false, tech world fantasy claims, the *USA Today* op-ed

referred to, is an imaginary shortage, not a real shortage.

So I would pose a question to Mr. Zuckerberg, who is a brilliant man with so many fabulous qualities, and I respect that. But I read in the news that Facebook, his company, is now worth more than \$200 billion. Is that not enough money to hire American workers for a change? Your company now employs roughly 7,000 people. Let's say you want to expand your workforce 10 percent or hire another 700 workers. Are you claiming you can't find 700 Americans who would take these jobs if you paid a good wage and decent benefits?

Let me just say one more thing: Facebook has 7,000 workers. Microsoft just laid off 18,000. Why doesn't Mr. Zuckerberg call his friend Mr. Gates and say: Look, I have to hire a few hundred people; do you have any resumes you can send over here? Maybe I will not have to take somebody from a foreign country for a job an unemployed U.S. citizen might take.

It is a serious matter. I want to continue to talk about this. There is this myth that we have surging employment in the high-tech industry. According to a recent Reuters report, U.S. employers announced 50,000 layoffs in August of 2013, up 34 percent from the previous month, then up 57 percent through August 2012.

As Byron York reported, Hewlett-Packard, a high-tech company, laid off 29,000 employees in 2012—29,000. In August of 2013, Cisco announced plans to lay off 4,000 workers in addition to the 8,000 cut in the last 2 years, and Cisco was right in the White House this summer with a group of other companies demanding more workers from abroad. Cisco was signing a letter with a bunch of other companies; United Technologies has announced 3,000 layoffs this year; American Express cut 5,400 jobs; Procter and Gamble announced 5,700 jobs cut in 2012; T-Mobile announced plans to lay off 2,250 employees in 2012.

The shortage is not there. The experts tell us and the plain facts, if we look around, indicate that.

But instead FWD.us and other immigration lobbyists are working with the White House to extract Executive orders from the President that provide them with the same financial benefits that were included in the Senate bill that was rejected by the House of Representatives. One proposal would increase by as much as 800,000 the number of foreign workers admitted for the explicit purpose of taking jobs in the United States.

This is an article that talks about that. It is a matter of importance. The Associated Press article, the title of it: "Obama Weighs Broader Move on Legal Immigration."

President Barack Obama is considering key changes in the nation's immigration sys-

tem requested by tech, industry and powerful interest groups—

Not by the American people was he being requested to do this, not by the national interests but by powerful special interest groups that are referred to here.

It goes on to say:

After recent White House meetings, top officials have compiled specific recommendations from business groups and other advocates.

"Other advocates." Who are they? We know the ACLU has been there. We know La Raza has been meeting there on a regular basis. It goes on. The article says:

One of the more popular requests is a change in the way green cards are counted that would essentially free up some 800,000 additional visas the first year, advocates say.

Other requests would extend work permits to the spouses of all temporary H-1B skilled workers who have not been able to work. But how about the fact that a single mom might like that job? An unemployed single mom or a single mom who has a job prospect that would pay \$3 more than the job she is now working while trying to raise a family? Or an unemployed father? Maybe they would like those jobs first.

So these actions fall on the heels of previous Executive action in which the President already acted unilaterally earlier this year to grant companies an additional 100,000 guest workers. He has already done that. In just the first year of this order, we added 100,000 guest workers by providing work authorizations to the foreign spouses of temporary guest workers. So he would increase the supply of guest workers by approximately 30,000 each year thereafter—this at a time when we have 58 million working-age Americans who are not working. Since 2009 the number of adults has increased by 13 million, while the number of people actually working has decreased by 7 million.

Median household income has dropped \$2,300 since 2009. According to the National Employment Law Project, wages are down across all occupations. According to a CBS report titled "Why American workers feel increasingly poor":

Real median hourly wages have declined across low, middle and high income levels from 2009 to 2013, the study found. No matter if workers were in the lowest bracket (\$8.84 to \$10.85 an hour) or the highest (\$31.40 to \$86.34) median hourly wages declined when you take into account the impact of inflation.

It goes on:

Across all occupations, real median hourly wages slipped 3.4 percent since 2009. While even better-paid workers saw median hourly earnings erode, the worst hit segments were at the bottom—

The people who got hurt the most were at the bottom—

with declines in their wages of more than 4 percent.

We have business CEOs, lobbyists, activists, immigration groups, and clever politicians who are able to demand that we have to have more workers in America even when we have a decline in wages and a decline in jobs. But what does the President do? His administration issues an Executive order to provide foreign spouses—the citizens of other countries, not American citizens—with 100,000 jobs in the United States, precious jobs that many Americans would love to have. How many American spouses struggling to support their families would benefit from one of those jobs? How many single moms would benefit from a chance to earn a better paycheck?

Our Senate Democratic friends talk about paycheck fairness repeatedly. Yet they are supporting policies that take jobs and wages directly from American women by the millions.

Immigration policy is supposed to serve the national interest and the people of the United States, not the interests of a few activist CEOs and the politicians who are catering to them. We have had 40 years of mass immigration combined with falling wages, a shrinking workplace, and exploding welfare rolls. We know that, don't we, friends and colleagues? It is time for a shift in emphasis. It is time to get our own people back to work and our communities out of poverty and our schools back on their feet.

Harvard professor Dr. George Borjas—probably the leading academic in this entire area and has been for many years—estimates that our current immigration rate results in an annual loss of more than \$400 billion in wages for Americans competing with immigrant labor. Between 2000 and today the government issued nearly 30 million visas to temporary foreign workers and permanent immigrants, largely lower skilled and lower wage.

A recent Reuters poll showed that Americans wish to see record immigration reduced, not increased, by a huge 3-to-1 margin, as the Gang of 8 bill would have done.

Another poll from pollster Kellyanne Conway recently showed that 80 percent of Americans think companies should hire from among the existing unemployed rather than bringing in new workers from abroad to fill these jobs. Yet Senate Democrats have unanimously supported legislation to double the annual supply of labor brought into the United States.

Some people think this is agricultural work. Not so. The increase in immigration under that bill would be more than 90 percent nonagricultural work. These jobs are going to be taken by anyone. So what about the good, decent and patriotic citizens of our country who fight our wars, who obey our laws, who follow our rules, and want a better future for their children? Should their needs not come first?

As the National Review explained, “we are a nation with an economy—not an economy with a nation.” We cannot put the parochial demands of a few powerful CEOs ahead of an entire nation’s hopes, dreams, and aspirations.

The basic social contract is that citizens agree to follow the law, pay their taxes, devote their love and loyalty to their country, and in exchange the nation commits to preserve and protect and serve their interests, safeguard their freedom, and return to them in kind their first allegiance of loyalty.

The job of elected officials is to answer to the people who sent them to

Washington, not to scorn them, not to demean them, not to mock them, not to sell their jobs and dreams to the highest bidder.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 11, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE THOREN BOND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS), VICE JANICE L. JACOBS, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW
COMMISSION

MICHAEL YOUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE POLISH AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY

HON. BRADLEY S. SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Polish American Chamber of Commerce (PACC) on the occasion of its Annual Golf Outing, hosted in Riverwoods, IL, in my district.

The PACC is a strong and clear voice for the Polish American business community in the Chicagoland area and an important advocate for the interests of its member companies and the working families they employ. The Chicagoland area is proudly home to one of the most prominent Polish American business communities in the country. Through a tightly-knit network of member organizations, the PACC strives to enhance the vitality of this community by facilitating cooperation, building partnerships and promoting mutually beneficial trade relations between Poland and the United States.

Our business community in the Tenth District is strong because it is just that: a community.

Working together and sharing strategies, being inspired by the innovation of fellow small businesses, companies in the Tenth District have fostered a community of mutual success and prosperity. It is this type of activity that the PACC promotes and is so important to our economic success in the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, business associations like PACC are integral to driving the success of small businesses throughout our nation, which in turn will lift the rest of our economy. I thank the PACC for its work, and I wish only great success for this year's golf outing and PACC's future.

CONGRATULATING STEVE PLUNKETT FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS' HERO OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Steve Plunkett of North Pekin, Illinois and celebrate his receipt of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Hero of the Year Award.

Mr. Plunkett, a local letter carrier, was finishing his shift as a troubling scene unfolded in the parking lot of the East Peoria Post Of-

fice. Employees witnessed a man forcibly lead a tearful young boy towards the back of the post office. Recognizing the child's distress, Plunkett and his colleagues sprang into action and confronted the man; little did the post office employees know that they had intercepted a registered sex offender.

The man fled the scene and Plunkett followed, using his cell phone to capture pictures as well as his license plate number; images which led to his arrest several hours later.

Plunkett's actions thwarted a kidnapping attempt and contributed to the conviction of a dangerous criminal, earning him one of the highest honors a letter carrier may receive. Sexual predators are every parent's nightmare and, as the mother of three sons, I commend Mr. Plunkett for his courage.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Plunkett demonstrated bravery and selflessness, much to the credit of his character, and I can think of no one more deserving of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Hero of the Year Award.

RECOGNIZING THE UMATILLA WOMAN'S CLUB

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Umatilla Woman's Club, a member organization of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The Umatilla Woman's Club was founded in 1920 by a group of civic-minded women who established the first library in Umatilla. The group first organized informally, but recognizing the need for formal organization to better promote civic events, the Umatilla Woman's Club became one of the original twelve Woman's Clubs.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs acts as a unifying force, bringing women together to strengthen their local communities through volunteer service. There are over 100,000 members worldwide who inspire change by supporting the arts, advancing education, encouraging civic involvement and promoting cooperation.

I thank the Umatilla Woman's Club for their ongoing commitment to bettering our Central Florida community. Their philanthropy and spirit of volunteerism is an inspiration to us all.

HONORING PARNICK JENNINGS

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Parnick Jennings and to

recognize his steadfast commitment to the Cartersville and greater Bartow County community, and for his exemplary leadership.

Fifteen years ago, on September 11, 2000, Parnick Jennings sought to honor all of the wonderful men and women who serve not only Bartow County, but each of its seven cities. He did this by establishing an annual "Public Servant's Luncheon" to honor those that give so much to make Bartow County and each of its cities some of the best communities to live in all of America.

During his time in Bartow County, Parnick was one of the founders, and now chairs the Annual Bartow County "Can-a-Thon," which helped in the creation of the Bartow County College & Career Academy. He served on the committee that helped build the Clarence Brown Conference Center, served as Chairman of the Cartersville-Bartow County Chamber of Commerce, and along with Ms. Jessica Fleetwood, founded the Bartow Business Connection in 2009 as a way to help local businesses network with the goal of making it through the recession together. Parnick and his wife, Tina, organize and host the annual Toyo Tire Community Christmas Luncheon which feeds up to 1500 people annually during the Christmas season. Parnick's public service started thirty seven years ago, when he founded the Parnick Jennings Funeral Home in Cartersville, Georgia. The firm came to be nationally recognized for outstanding customer service, and in 1995 was sold to Service Corporation International. For the next 5 years, under Parnick's leadership, the firm was ranked #1 in Customer Satisfaction among the top 1500 funeral homes in the United States. I have been honored to call Parnick Jennings a friend for well over a decade and his selfless guidance has played a major role in helping me represent the 11th District of Georgia with a servant's heart. Bartow County is blessed to have such a fine shepherd like Parnick Jennings looking out for our community. A native of Rome, Georgia, Parnick attended the University of Georgia and graduated from Gupton-Jones College. Parnick and Tina are active members of Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cartersville, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 11th District of Georgia, I offer my deepest thanks to Mr. Parnick Jennings for his unfailing commitment to the service to others; he is truly one of our country's "points of light."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF FIREBAUGH, CALIFORNIA

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Firebaugh, California as

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

they celebrate their Centennial on Friday, September 12, 2014.

The City of Firebaugh, located in Fresno County, was incorporated on December 17, 1914 and has seen enormous growth in the past 100 years. The city was named after Andrew D. Firebaugh who owned the local ferry that transported locals and visitors across the San Joaquin River, many of whom were prospectors looking to strike it rich in gold country.

Although small, Firebaugh is home to a thriving community. Known as the "Jewel of the San Joaquin," Firebaugh is home to a rich agricultural industry. The major crops grown in the region include tomato, garlic, cantaloupes, and cotton, as well as various other fruits, vegetables, and nuts. In addition to agriculture, Firebaugh has seen new growth in manufacturing, packing, and processing plants in recent years.

As one of the oldest historical towns on the Central Valley's Westside, Firebaugh has a rich history and certainly has a bright future ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the City of Firebaugh, California on their centennial celebration.

HONORING MAGENIUM SOLUTIONS, LLC

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Magenium Solutions, LLC, an IT services firm based out of my hometown of Glen Ellyn, which has been recognized as being one of the best places to work in the State of Illinois. Magenium Solutions is a company dedicated to delivering technology based answers to hundreds of businesses nationwide. They are well known for improving the productivity of their clients, helping them to stay competitive and reducing costs through the use of technology.

For the second year in a row, Magenium Solutions has earned the distinction of being one of the "Best Places to Work in Illinois" by the Daily Herald Business Ledger, one of only sixty Illinois companies to receive this honor. With more than 60 employees, Magenium Solutions strives to provide a work life balance, career growth, professional development, training, and incentives aimed at helping employees move forward successfully on their career paths. In addition, Inc. Magazine has ranked Magenium Solutions as one of the nation's fastest growing private companies.

Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues in the House, please join me in honoring Magenium Solutions for their legacy of achievement and care not only for their clients, but also for their employees.

HONORING THE NAPA VALLEY VINTNERS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Napa Valley Vintners. In an outstanding display of generosity, Napa Valley Vintners donated \$10 million to create a Napa Valley Community Disaster Relief Fund, which will be used to help residents and businesses recover from the recent earthquake in our Napa Valley.

In the aftermath of this devastating earthquake, the Napa Valley Vintners sprung into action. Propelled by a desire to help our community in its time of need, the Napa Valley Vintners devised a plan to help those impacted by the earthquake in a big way. The creation of this fund and the initial pledge of \$10 million will provide immediate financial assistance for individuals and businesses as they work to get back on their feet. The Napa Valley Vintners hope that this fund will grow with additional donations and thereby be able to help even more people throughout our community. With the generosity of groups like the Napa Valley Vintners, our 5th Congressional District will be back up and running in no time.

I am proud to represent a district with kind-hearted, community-minded and generous people such as those with the Napa Valley Vintners. Mr. Speaker, the Napa Valley Vintners deserve to be recognized and honored here today.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,757,884,048,448.05. We've added \$7,131,006,999,534.97 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF DELBARTON SCHOOL

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Delbarton School in the Township of Morris, Morris County, as it celebrates its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

The Delbarton School is an independent, all male, Roman Catholic school led by the Benedictine Monks of St. Mary's Abbey. Founded in

1939, the school has graduated more than 4,000 students and has a current enrollment of about 540 students. The school's motto "Succisa Virescit" conveys the value of perseverance, a principle on which the school was founded. Delbarton's first graduating class consisted of only 8 students from grades sixth, seventh, and eighth. It was not until 1942 that an upper school was added by Headmaster Father Stephan Findlay.

In the late 1800s Luther Kountze, a wealthy stock broker from New Jersey, began to purchase land in rural New Jersey and quickly accumulated over 4,000 acres. In 1883 he built a large mansion and decided to call it Delbarton. The name comes from taking a syllable from each of his first three children's names: Barclay Ward, William Delancey, and Helen Livingston. After Mr. Kountze's death in 1918, the property was put up for sale and in 1927 St. Mary's Abbey bought 400 acres of the property, including the mansion and farm. They planned to use the property as a place to start educating their younger members.

Situated on 200 acres in rural Morris County, Delbarton is home to rolling hills and picturesque landscapes as well as impressive facilities. The school boasts a 24,000 square foot science pavilion, 4 science labs, 6 computer labs, a 36,000 square foot Fine Arts Center, a language lab, and a 25,000 volume library. The Delbarton School offers a traditional liberal arts education serving grades 7–12. The school is founded on the 1,500 year old tradition of Benedictine learning which is based on the Judeo-Christian tradition and pursues development of the whole person, both in spirit and in mind. They believe that there is more to the education of men than just academics and strive to create an environment where both personal and religious confirmation can be acquired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me today in congratulating the Delbarton School, its teachers and administration, trustees and many successful alumni and supporters, as it celebrates its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary.

SAFE AND SECURE DRINKING WATER ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Safe and Secure Drinking Water Act, an important step to sustain America's clean drinking water.

On August 2, Microcystin-laced, toxic algae overtook the drinking water intake process for Toledo, Ohio during an explosion of algae growth in western Lake Erie. For three days, half a million Americans were without safe drinking water.

In Toledo, the taps are back on, but the crisis remains.

The growth of harmful algal blooms in Lake Erie will continue to threaten communities, local economies, and the 11 million people who depend on the lake for fresh water. Until the flow of algae-feeding nutrients into the

lake is stopped, the risk of further water emergencies will persist.

This concern is not isolated to Lake Erie. Millions of Americans across the country rely on drinking water from natural sources that are similarly threatened by increasing levels of nutrient runoff, and the resulting toxic algal growth.

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recognizes harmful algal blooms as a major environmental problem in all 50 states, with severe impacts on human health.

Despite this realization, the U.S. EPA fails to take a most basic step to protect public safety—setting federal guidelines or standards for unsafe consumption levels, testing practices to determine the presence of Microcystin in water systems, or feasible treatment techniques. Without these basic protections, millions of Americans' health is at risk.

This necessary legislation will compel the EPA to take these important first steps within 90 days of its passage, and in the absence of regulatory action, to report on additional steps to promote safer practices in areas affected by harmful algal blooms.

Mr. Speaker, our communities across this great nation need this guidance and cannot continue to wait. The Safe and Secure Drinking Water Act must be passed quickly to provide our communities the guidance and answers they need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 2014, I was off of the House floor for rollcall vote No. 480 on agreeing to the Senate Amendment to H.J. Res. 76—Emergency supplemental funding to Israel for the Iron Dome defense system. I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I missed one recorded vote on September 8. I would like to indicate at this point how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 482, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the “Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office,” I would have voted “aye.”

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MIYA FAMILY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Miya Family for being named

the 2014 Agriculturalist of the Year by the Kings County Farm Bureau. The Miya Family's history exemplifies the hard work and dedication of California's farmers.

The Miya Family, of Hanford, California, has been farming in Kings County since the early 1900s. The family farm was started by Katsunosuke Miya, a recent immigrant from Japan, who settled in Kings County in 1914 and first started working at Vierra Ranch in Hanford. By 1920, Katsunosuke began farming property for Lacey Milling Company. In 1932, Katsunosuke was ready to purchase his own property and began farming 40 acres independently. This was the first establishment of the Miya's farming operation in Kings County. By the late 1930s, the Miya family had expanded their operation to include over 200 acres of land, growing and drying apricots and peaches, as well as cultivating Muscat grapes and oats for horses on the farm.

Katsunosuke built a great foundation for his eight children, but with the start of World War II, the family, including Katsunosuke's two sons Harry and Kiyoshi, was forced to evacuate to the Fresno Assembly Center and was later moved to Jerome, Arkansas. By 1946, Harry and Kiyoshi had both returned to Hanford to join their parents growing walnuts, grapes, apricots, peaches, and cotton. Harry and Kiyoshi worked side by side with their father and later became partners, taking over the family business that their parents had worked hard to build.

In 1976, Miya Farms, Inc. was established by Harry and Kiyoshi, who worked together on the farm for almost 60 years. Today, Harry's children run the daily operations at Miya farms, growing walnuts and pistachios. The Miya family has persevered and thrived and truly embodies what it means to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker it is with great pride that I congratulate the Miya Family for being named the Kings County Farm Bureau's 2014 Agriculturalist of the Year.

REMEMBERING S. TRUETT CATHY

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of distinguished entrepreneur and philanthropist S. Truett Cathy, who died early this week at the age of 93, and to honor him for the legacy he has left in Georgia and across the country.

A native Georgian from Eatonton, Cathy moved with his family to Atlanta when he was four. There, he attended Boys High, now known as Grady High. In 1946, Cathy built a tiny diner in Hapeville, which would eventually develop into Chick-fil-A—the nation's largest quick-service chicken restaurant chain based on annual system-wide sales and one of the nation's largest family-owned companies. Cathy created the sandwich that became the company's signature item—the original Chick-fil-A Chicken Sandwich.

Currently, Chick-fil-A has more than 1,800 locations operating in 40 states and Wash-

ington, D.C., and currently holds an unparalleled record of 47 consecutive years of annual sales increases. But Truett was much more than just a notable businessman: he was a devout Southern Baptist who was active in teaching the word of the Lord to youngsters. His devotion to his religion and “principles before profits” attitude showed in his “closed on Sunday” policy—giving employees time for family, worship, or rest.

In addition, Cathy took a keen interest in his local community by creating the WinShape Foundation in 1984, an organization aimed at helping young people succeed in life through scholarships and youth support programs. Also, through Cathy's Leadership Scholarship Program, Chick-fil-A has donated more than \$32 million in financial assistance to their employees seeking higher education since 1973. Truett Cathy exemplified what it meant to give back to the community. In his own words, “I'd like to be remembered as one who kept my priorities in the right order. We live in a changing world, but we need to be reminded that the important things have not changed. I have always encouraged my restaurant operators and team members to give back to the local community. We should be about more than just selling chicken; we should be a part of our customers' lives and the communities in which we serve.”

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to Truett Cathy's family and loved ones during these most difficult of times. It saddens me to know that the world is now missing such an honorable man, but I am humbled to know that he is in a better place—now that he's left our world a better one.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FREDERICK LEO WAHL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate and celebrate the life and extraordinary contributions of Frederick Leo Wahl, one of the most knowledgeable and insightful government relations professionals many of us had the privilege of knowing.

Fred was a selfless patriot in support of our Great Nation since the late 1960s, beginning with his days as a Naval Intelligence Officer, then as special assistant to the Director of Naval Intelligence, and as staff for Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Fred continued his service to our country and troops as Manager of Advanced Program Planning at E-Systems, and then Director of Strategic Planning for Raytheon Systems Company. When Raytheon acquired E-Systems, he continued his rise to the top of his field and was an active participant in the subsequent merger and acquisition of Hughes and Texas Instruments. Fred then joined a technology startup company, ComCept, which was acquired by L-3 Communications. For the past 14 years, Fred served as Vice President of Government Relations for L-3, assisting business units with congressional visits, interpreting legislative bills and representing the L-

3 brand on Capitol Hill and throughout the Washington, DC, area.

Fred was selected to attend the Harvard JFK School of Government's Executive Course for National/International Security Executives and the Penn State Executive Development Forum. He attended Idaho State University, where he was Class President and Student Body President. Later he attended the University of Oklahoma, the National Law Center at George Washington University, the U.S. Navy Integrated Operational Intelligence Center and the Joint Air Intelligence Training Center.

Fred always made time for his family. His two daughters Camille Wahl and Stephanie Wahl, his grandchildren Fernando Daniel Gonzalez, Holden Khaira, Atticus Khaira, Ethan Taylor, and Sophie Taylor were the center of his personal life. Fred frequently took his grandchildren with him on vacations to exotic locations around the world. Travel and learning were a legacy Fred wanted to pass on to the next generations. He hoped to inspire curiosity and give his family a sense of perspective through their exposure to new places and people.

Fred Wahl was the kind of man who could make even a new acquaintance feel like an old and trusted friend. He always had an anecdote to keep the story interesting and remind us that we can do the crucial work of the nation while not taking ourselves too seriously. His bright presence will be sorely missed. As we adjourn today, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying our last respects to this great American, Fred Wahl.

THE RETIREMENT OF SPEIGHT JENKINS FROM THE SEATTLE OPERA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer special recognition to my constituent, the esteemed Speight Jenkins, on the occasion of his retirement from Seattle Opera. Throughout his 31 years as General Director, Mr. Jenkins' passion for the arts and energetic leadership style have been instrumental in the Opera's success. Under his steady guidance, Seattle Opera captured national and international attention and significantly raised the city's profile as an arts destination. Notably, Mr. Jenkins helped to intensify Seattle Opera's focus on Wagner, and presided over many superlative productions of the Wagner operas, which helped draw opera-lovers from all over the world. In fact, his captivating productions drew visitors to Seattle from all 50 states and over 60 countries, generating increased tourism and strengthening the local economy. Over the course of his career with Seattle Opera, Mr. Jenkins produced an incredible 1,227 performances of 92 operas, while missing only 6 performances.

Locally, The Seattle Times named Mr. Jenkins one of the 150 most influential people who have shaped the character of Seattle and King County. Additionally, both the City of Se-

attle and King County proclaimed August 9, 2014 "Speight Jenkins Day" in recognition of his work. Nationally, the National Endowment for the Arts gave him an Opera Honors Award in 2011, and Opera News has called him one of the 25 "most powerful" names in American opera. His knowledge of opera has tremendous depth, and is reflected in Seattle Opera's many innovative productions, significant publications, and comprehensive educational services.

An ardent lover of the arts, Speight Jenkins proudly served on the National Council on the Arts from 1996–2000 following his nomination by President Clinton, and has been a lifelong advocate for increased arts funding and opportunities on both a national and local level. He also played an important role in the creation of McCaw Hall, one of the nation's most beautiful and acoustically exceptional performance facilities.

Speight Jenkins has been an invaluable asset to the Seattle arts community. His dedication to excellence with Seattle Opera and commitment to making the arts accessible provide a model for us all. The people of Seattle are grateful for the guidance and leadership he has shown and I join them in thanking Mr. Jenkins for his service and in wishing him all the best in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCING THE MEDICARE HOME INFUSION SITE OF CARE ACT

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare fee-for-service program stands virtually alone among health care payers in the United States in not fully recognizing the clinical and cost benefits of providing infusion drug therapy to patients in their homes. Infusion therapy is fully covered by Medicare in hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, hospital outpatient departments, and physician offices, but not in patients' homes. As a result, Medicare beneficiaries in need of infusion therapy often must receive their treatments in health care facilities rather than in their homes, which is the setting that is the most desirable, convenient, and by far the most cost effective.

This is unfortunate and unnecessary. In the private sector, the accepted standard of care and practice for over 30 years is to provide infusion therapy at home where medically indicated and when requested by the attending physician. Ironically, patients who have access to this benefit under their private plans lose this coverage when they enroll in Medicare.

Medicare's lack of coverage of infusion therapy in the home setting can lead to substantial beneficiary lifestyle disruptions and costs. Because Medicare covers infusion services in institutional settings, the beneficiary either has to travel to a health care facility to receive infusion treatments, sometimes multiple times a day, or remain in a facility for the duration of the treatment episode.

Today, Representative ELIOT ENGEL and I are introducing The Medicare Home Infusion

Site of Care Act so patients can receive the same infusion treatments in the comfort and convenience of their homes at a lower cost to Medicare. I look forward to working with Representative ENGEL and my other colleagues in Congress to see this commonsense bill move forward, and I urge all of my colleagues to support our bill to give patients better quality and better care at lower costs.

HONORING LAWRENCE BROOKS

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Lawrence Nathaniel Brooks, Sr. Mr. Brooks, a World War II veteran and Louisiana resident, will be celebrating his 105th birthday on September 12, 2014.

Mr. Brooks served his country in World War II with the United States Army's 91st Engineer Battalion. A father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great grandfather to a large family, he is known and loved by even more. But perhaps Mr. Brooks' most enduring legacy is his engagement and involvement with his community in New Orleans, Louisiana. He is widely known as a pillar of his community and regularly volunteers at his church, St. Luke's. His positive attitude and dedication to family and friends are an inspiration to us all.

It is my honor to introduce Mr. Brooks to the country. I invite everyone to join me in congratulating Mr. Lawrence Brooks on a life well-lived, and wishing him the best.

JOHN ARTHUR JONES

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary leader and hero of the Tampa Bay community, Mr. John Arthur Jones. Mr. Jones had a distinguished career and has spent a lifetime serving this country with honor and valor. Today we salute his many contributions to our community.

John Arthur Jones was born in 1921 in San Antonio, Florida. During World War II, he served with distinction in the European Theater under the command of General Patton's 3rd Army and received a Bronze Star for his contributions in the Battle of Metz, France. The men of the 95th Infantry became known as the "Iron Men of Metz" for their capture and defense of the castle and river crossing in the city of Metz against several German SS Armored and Infantry Divisions. Mr. Jones finished his military career through the reserves and attained the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. He married Sally Johnson in 1949 and the couple enjoyed 64 happy years together. They also have four children Matthew, Lisa, Malcolm, and Darby.

After graduating from the University of Florida, College of Law, Mr. Jones began his legal

career. In May 1949, Mr. Jones joined the Tampa law firm of Knight, Thompson and Turner which under his guidance resulted in the formation of Holland and Knight. Throughout his long career, Jones earned a national reputation in the field of trusts, estates and fiduciary law. Integrity was certainly one of Mr. Jones' hallmarks throughout his entire life. He frequently said, "You can't afford not to be honest and not do your best." He was one of the first recipients of the firm's highest individual accolade for a partner, the prestigious Chesterfield Smith Award. The Chesterfield Smith Award is given to lawyers who have demonstrated in extraordinary commitment to pro bono service. In 2009, he was honored by the firm for his six decades of contributions to the field of law.

On August 12th, 2014, Mr. Jones passed away at the age of 92. He will be remembered not only as an attorney and an expert in his field, but also as a man who bravely served this country as well as the legal profession with courage and dignity. Mr. Speaker, John Arthur Jones was a great American. I join the Tampa Bay community in recognizing Mr. John Arthur Jones for his lifelong service to the State of Florida, his high ethical standards, and his commitment to good causes.

HONORING LYNNE MOFENSON,
M.D.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lynne Mofenson, M.D., who is retiring after 26 years of service to the federal government, and is currently Chief of the Maternal and Pediatric Infectious Disease Branch at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), National Institutes of Health.

Dr. Mofenson received the 2012 Federal Employee of the Year Award from the Partnership for Public Service. The award is one of nine Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals bestowed on public servants who make "high-impact contributions to the health, safety and well-being of Americans." She was recognized for playing a pivotal role in preventing the AIDS epidemic among U.S. children through an effective means of preventing pregnant women from passing HIV on to their infants, and for dedicating her career to conducting research on HIV which has influenced and informed national HIV policy.

In 1989, when Dr. Mofenson, a pediatric infectious disease physician, came to the NICHD, 25 to 35 percent of all infants born to mothers with HIV infection were themselves infected with HIV. The landmark research study published by Dr. Mofenson and her colleagues in 1994 showed that use of the anti-HIV drug AZT reduced the rate of mother-to-child HIV transmission rate to 8.3 percent. Dr. Mofenson's further collaborations led to other successful strategies for blocking mother-to-child transmission, and currently, there are fewer than 100 new mother-to-child HIV cases

in the U.S. each year—well under 1 percent. This is a true public health success story.

Dr. Mofenson has continued to work with colleagues in this country and around the world to reduce mother-to-child HIV transmission and to improve the treatments for children with HIV infection. She has played a critical role in the development and ongoing updates of evidence-based guidelines for the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and the World Health Organization that provide blueprints for the timely conversion of research findings into real changes in medical care for women, children, and families affected by HIV worldwide. Please join me in honoring the lifelong work of this extraordinary scientist.

RECOGNIZING TOM HOWELLS OF
WISCONSIN

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the many contributions of Mr. Tom Howells, who retired last month after serving 35 years as the President of the Wisconsin Motor Carriers Association (WMCA).

All of us in the Wisconsin delegation know Tom well from events around our state and here in the nation's capital, including the annual Washington visit of WMCA members. We know Tom to be a man of great integrity and character. He has provided outstanding leadership over these past decades, with dedication, ingenuity and enthusiasm. Above all, Tom is simply a nice guy.

Under Tom's leadership, the WMCA established the first state trucking association "Road Team" in order to recognize safe truck drivers and promote highway safety. Similarly, he was involved in the creation of the President's Safe Driver Club in 1996 to recognize professional drivers with exemplary safety records employed by WMCA member companies. Eighteen years later, the club currently has over 1,350 drivers.

In 2004, Tom Howells was presented the Frank W. Babbitt Award for outstanding service to the local trucking industry, the association and the local community. Three years later in 2007, he was recognized by his peers and the American Trucking Associations when he was awarded the prestigious J. J. Keller President's Award. Tom was elected to serve as the National Chairman of the Trucking Association Executives Council from 1992–1993 and as the Chairman of the Wisconsin Highway Users Alliance from 2003–2013.

Tom Howells has been an institution in Madison and in the State of Wisconsin. He has provided stable and steady leadership in so many areas, and particularly in the area of highway safety. I will miss seeing him in his role as President of the WMCA, but I wish Tom and Muriel well in retirement and congratulate him for a job well done.

HONORING THE NAPA COUNTY
LIBRARY LITERACY CENTER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Napa County Library Literacy Center as they celebrate their 30th Anniversary of offering literacy services for adults in Napa County.

Thirty years ago, the Napa County Library received a grant for library literacy programs. At the time, they were one of few public libraries to have received such a grant in California. Since then, Napa County Library has developed their literacy program into the robust, comprehensive and effective program that it is today. More than 2,500 adults have received private tutoring sessions in English language literacy free of charge. Of course, this staggering accomplishment would not have been possible without the wonderful tutors that over the past 30 years, have volunteered more than 900,000 hours to help their fellow community members achieve their English language literacy goals.

I firmly believe that every American deserves the opportunity to learn to read, write and speak English. I could not be more proud to represent a district that not only shares this belief, but that works every day to make this a reality in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize the Napa County Library's Literacy Program for all they do to increase literacy in our community. On behalf of a grateful community, we honor and thank the Napa County Library today.

H.R. 5078—WATERS OF THE UNITED
STATES REGULATORY OVER-
REACH PROTECTION ACT

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act. I unfortunately missed the vote due to a conflict and had I been present, I would have voted "no." H.R. 5078 would prevent a proposed rule to protect clean water from taking effect and continue to give polluters a free pass.

Two Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 resulted in confusion and uncertainty about which bodies of water are subject to federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act, creating a loophole. This led the Bush Administration to issue guidance for regulated communities, but instead created the currently inconsistent, patchwork system. The proposed rule replaces the Bush Administration era guidance documents to reduce regulatory uncertainty and establish a clear process for asserting Clean Water Act jurisdiction over waters.

The proposed rule closes the loophole by clarifying federal jurisdiction to protect America's waters and does not seek to regulate

bodies of water which have not historically been regulated under the Clean Water Act. In fact, the rule proposes to exclude ephemeral and intermittent ditches while maintaining historical exclusions and exemptions for agriculture. The rule also provides clarity about which wetlands are covered by the Clean Water Act. The rule would also prevent the agencies from moving forward with any similar rule or guidance regarding the scope and enforcement of the Clean Water Act. According to a Tampa Bay Times editorial in support of the rule, "the EPA estimates that the marginal costs of implementing the rule would generate about double the return in benefits to public health, flood control and the economy."

Federal regulations to close the existing loophole and protect water quality are especially important to my home state of Florida which depends on a healthy environment for a prosperous economy. As the loophole stands, nearly 30 percent of Florida's streams and millions of wetlands are at risk of unchecked pollution and development and threatens the drinking water for 1.7 Floridians. More than 80 percent of the lakes and reservoirs that have been tested in Florida have failed basic water quality standards. Densely populated Hillsborough County, where my district is located, ranks first in Florida for miles of streams unprotected by the Clean Water Act. The rule would improve Florida's waters by closing the existing loophole. Unfortunately, this piece of legislation before us would prevent the government from cleaning our polluted waters. The President threatened to veto this legislation for good reason, noting that "this bill is not an act of good government."

Millions of Americans get their drinking water from rivers, lakes, and reservoirs that are at risk of pollution from upstream sources. In Florida, several rivers, including the Apalachicola, Choctawhatchee, Suwannee and Escambia Rivers have their headwaters in other states. Floridians are directly affected by upstream degradation to the quality of these rivers before they enter our state. Major pollution from the Mississippi River and other out of state factors have severely harmed the Apalachicola Bay and consequently the northwest Florida economy where the sponsor's district is located.

Florida's economy is inextricably linked to a healthy environment, particularly its bodies of water and the wetlands those waters rely on. Wetlands, rich in biodiversity, provide services that are critical for drinking water, water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, flood control, recreation such as fishing, and habitat for threatened and endangered species. Florida, the state with the most wetlands in the continental United States, has already lost half its historic wetlands acreage due to degradation and continues to do so.

Florida's and the Gulf of Mexico's waters are poisoned every year by more than 4 billion gallons of oil, fertilizer ingredients and other hazardous materials. Tampa Bay, the largest open water estuary on the Gulf, is also fouled by other sources, with more than half of the nitrogen entering it coming from urban stormwater runoff that carries lawn fertilizer, pesticide residues, and trash. Pollution throughout Florida's waterways has led to record amounts of toxic red tide and algae

blooms which are created by nutrients from farm fertilizers. Scientists theorize that algae and red tide have contributed to the record deaths of 10 percent of the Florida manatee population over the past year. Likely due to red tide, pollution has resulted in an unprecedented number of deaths of dolphins and pelicans.

Pollution costs Floridians billions of dollars each year. Sustainable water supplies are at risk in Florida due to the loss of natural systems. The rule is needed to restore protections for streams and wetlands across the country. Florida's economy and public health depend on clean water.

I would like to submit a list of the members of the Florida Conservation Coalition. The Coalition is composed of over 50 conservation organizations and thousands of individuals devoted to protecting and conserving Florida's land, fish and wildlife and water resources and it strongly opposes this piece of legislation.

FLORIDA CONSERVATION COALITION

Bob Graham, Fmr Governor of Florida and U.S. Senator; Nathaniel Pryor Reed, Fmr Assistant-Secretary of the Interior; Commissioner Lee Constantine—Seminole County Commissioner; Audubon Florida; Audubon of Southwest Florida; Conservancy of Southwest Florida; Florida Wildlife Federation; Friends of the Everglades; National Parks Conservation Association; Peace River Audubon Society; Sierra Club; South Florida Audubon Society.

League of Women Voters; 1000 Friends of Florida; St. Johns Riverkeeper; Trust for Public Land; Lester Abberger; John Finlayson—Former Chairman SRWMD; Bill Herr, Environmental Consultant, Former Chairman SJRWMD; Gary Kuhl, Former Exec Director, SWFWMD; Jay Landers, Fmr Secretary of the Department of Environmental Protection; Sonny Vergara, Fmr Executive Director SWFWMD and SJRWMD; Estus Whitfield, Fmr Principal Environmental Advisor to 5 FL Governors.

Affiliates:

Alliance of Florida Land Trust; Alliance to Protect Water Resources, Inc.; Back Ten Feet; Caloosahatchee River Citizens Association; Center for Earth Jurisprudence; Citrus County Audubon Society; Citrus County Council; Conservation Trust for America; Coral Gables Area Democratic Club; Current Problems; Dade City Garden Club.

Defenders of Wildlife; Duval Audubon Society; Estero Council of Community Leaders; EarthJustice; Florida Consumer Action Network; Florida Conservation Alliance; Florida's Eden; Florida Defenders of the Environment; Florida Native Plant Society; Florida Federation of Garden Clubs; Florida Trail Association; Florida Outdoor Recreation Coalition.

Friends of the Wekiva River; Florida Wildflower Foundation; Great Old Broads for Wilderness; Gulf Restoration Network; Ideas For Us; Lake Area Water Alliance; Homosassa River Alliance; Martin County Conservation Alliance; North Florida Land Trust; Paddle Florida; Rainbow River Conservation, Inc.

Santa Fe Lake Dwellers Association; Save Our Suwannee; Save the Manatee Club; Silver Springs Alliance; Suwannee River Garden Club; Southwest Florida Watershed Council; St. Johns River Alliance; The Conservation Fund; United Waterfowlers—Florida; Wildlands Conservation; Wakulla Springs Alliance; War, Inc.; Wildwood Preservation Society.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE AND HELPING WORKING AMERICANS

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the millions of hard-working men and women in America today who are barely making ends meet, living paycheck to paycheck, and how this chamber can help our fellow Americans by raising the minimum wage.

Last year the Census Bureau reported that over 10 million Americans work full-time and are still below the poverty line, about \$24,000 for a family of four.

In my home state of Texas, over 450,000 people are paid the minimum wage, more than any other state and account for nearly 8 percent of all working Texans.

African-Americans and Hispanics are the most likely in our country to be among the working poor. Nearly 1-in-7 black and Hispanic Americans work full-time and live below the poverty line.

Eight percent of all working women in our country, 5.5 million, are also among the working poor.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not right. We cannot allow our country to become a place where hard work is not valued and allow millions of our fellow Americans to continue to live in poverty despite their great efforts.

This is why this chamber must bring H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, for a floor vote before we go into recess.

This legislation would raise the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour and index it to inflation afterwards.

The House Majority has refused to bring this bill for a vote in spite of its overwhelming support among the American people. The current Congress' record of inaction and obstruction has undermined our economy's recovery and harmed American families.

This is why I urge my colleagues to demand a vote before we recess for the November elections.

HONORING THE COLORADO CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Greeley, Colorado chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (NSDAR) for their outstanding service to our state and nation.

Abiding by the motto "God, Home and Country," the Centennial State chapter of NSDAR has worked tirelessly over its 110 year existence to provide assistance for members of our military serving overseas and those honorably discharged. This group of

women has a commitment to the veteran's community of Greeley, but also to education and higher learning within the community at large. It is an inspiration to see an organization so committed to educating our children, serving those in need, and preserving American history.

I am honored that the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution serves Colorado's 4th district. Their service resonates throughout the community. I commend them for preserving their long and storied history, and wish them continued success in the years to come.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOHN C.
GARGIULO

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Judge John C. Gargiulo for being appointed to serve as a Magistrate Judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of Mississippi.

John graduated from the University of Southern Mississippi as a U.S. Army ROTC Graduate and was ranked in the top 10% of candidates nationwide. Upon his graduation, John was commissioned into the active military as an Intelligence Officer in the 24th Infantry Division.

While serving during Operation Desert Storm, John was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for his participation in the first combat dismounted patrol into enemy territory, as well as receiving the Meritorious Service Medal by the Governor of the State of Mississippi for his voluntary service during Hurricane Katrina.

After serving on active duty, John graduated from the University of Mississippi School of Law, receiving his Juris Doctorate, and was the recipient of the James Alexander Scholastic Scholarship, as well as serving on the Moot Court Board.

Upon graduation, John began his legal practice at an insurance defense firm, serving the Gulfport and Mississippi Gulf Coast region.

In 2000, John was appointed as an Assistant District Attorney where he was lead prosecutor for all felonies with emphasis on cases involving high-profile sexual and violent crimes. While serving as an assistant DA, John successfully tried two of America's Most Wanted criminals, resulting in guilty verdicts.

In 2009, the Governor of the State of Mississippi appointed John as Circuit Court Judge for the Second Circuit Court District. He was reelected in 2010 and served in this position until his appointment as Magistrate Judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of Mississippi in August 2014.

I would like to send Magistrate Judge Gargiulo my best wishes in his future of continued service to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING THE
MORRISON-REEVES LIBRARY OF
RICHMOND, INDIANA

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Morrison-Reeves Library on its 150th Anniversary.

The Morrison-Reeves Library has been a landmark in Richmond, Indiana for a century and a half. The library provides invaluable resources and services and promotes a passion for learning and reading in the community. This exceptional institution has dedicated itself to service and education in Richmond and has been an asset to area residents of all ages.

The longevity of the library would not have been possible without the dedication, commitment and vision exhibited by the Morrison-Reeves Library's members and staff throughout its history. I am extremely appreciative of the efforts these dedicated individuals have put forth to diligently serve for the good of the public and set an example for all Hoosiers to follow.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Morrison-Reeves Library on its 150th Anniversary and thanking its employees for their continued service. I have no doubt that the extraordinary individuals who make up this great institution will be serving the people of Richmond, Indiana for many more years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF TED RADKE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Ted Radke, a dynamic leader in the community, and congratulate him as he retires after more than thirty-six years of service to the people of the East Bay.

From a young age, Ted understood the importance of environmental preservation. He grew up learning to hike, camp, fish and hunt, while hearing stories about Theodore Roosevelt's and John Muir's adventures as early conservationists. While studying at San Francisco State University, he founded Contra Costa Ecology Action. Through Ted's continued support, Ecology Action has blossomed into an award-winning organization committed to environmental and economic sustainability. Throughout Ted's tenure, he has served in a variety of positions, including educator and public official. As an elected member of the Martinez City Council, Ted was an active leader on environmental issues and successfully opposed the development of the Martinez shoreline.

Ted's valued advice and input improved California's environmental policies and regulations. His ingenuity, brilliance, and breadth of knowledge shaped California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which now requires local

and state agencies to identify and consider their impact on the environment.

In 1978, Ted was elected to the East Bay Regional Park District Board, where he served for more than thirty years. The organization attributes much of its success to Ted's experience, leadership, and enthusiasm. During his time as a Board Member, Ted more than doubled the District's landholdings, expanding regional parks and nature reserves. He was also instrumental in the passage of Measure AA, an essential source of funding for land acquisition and preservation. In 2008, he again secured this funding through Measure WW, ensuring the future protection of our beloved parks and reserves.

I ask my colleagues to join with me today in commending Ted Radke for his committed and diligent service to the people of the East Bay. I am pleased to congratulate Ted on an outstanding career and wish him the very best as he begins a well-deserved retirement.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014 RECIPIENTS OF THE COVETED
ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2014 recipients of the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

Presented annually by the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations—NECO, the Ellis Island Medals of Honor pay tribute to our Nation's immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. The Medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from diverse ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage and culture. We honor these outstanding individuals because the important work they do today, creates a better world for all of us tomorrow. Since the Medals' founding in 1986, more than 2,000 American citizens have received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, including six American Presidents, United States Senators, Congressmen, Nobel Laureates, athletes, artists, clergy, and military leaders. This Medal is not about material success, nor is it about the politics of immigration; it is about the people who have committed themselves to this nation, embraced the opportunities America has to offer, and most importantly, who have used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in our country and in the lives of its people.

Citizens of the United States hail from every nation known to man. The iconic metaphor of this nation as a veritable melting pot of cultures continues to ring true, and it is this diversity that adds to the unique richness of American life. It is the key to why America is the most innovative, progressive and forward thinking country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our forebearers to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the

American way of life. This award serves to remind us all that with hard work and perseverance anyone can still achieve the American dream. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they have made to America.

I commend NECO and its Board of Directors headed by my good friend, Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as to promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NECO and in congratulating all of the 2014 recipients of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. I also submit the names of this year's recipients.

2014 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR
RECIPIENTS

Salpy Akaragian RN-BC, MN; Iran Davar Ardalan; Marina Arsenijevic; Sherry S. Bahrambeygui; Lily Ring Balian; Maria Bartiromo; Gerald A. Benjamin; Robert S. Bennett; Norbert R. Berg; Narpat Bhandari; Barbara J. Bowers, M.D.; Ian Bremmer; Major General Mark A. Brilakis; Charles Tapeng Chang; Edwin M. Chang, M.D.; Hazem H. Chehabi, M.D.; Quyen D. Chu, M.D.; Vice Admiral Daniel L. Cooper; Brigadier General Ruben A. Cubero; Vice Admiral Philip Hart Cullom.

H.E. Archbishop Hovnan Derderian; Samir A. Desai; Paul J. DiMare; Captain Jeffrey F. Dixon; Diana L. Ecclestone; E. Llywyd Ecclestone; Salim F. Fadil, M.D.; Phillip Frost, M.D.; Chief Thomas P. Galati; Diana Xing Wu Gao; Jean-Pierre Garnier, PhD.; Colonel Michael J. Gould; General Frank J. Grass; Scott Green; Felix 'Phil' Grucci; Admiral Harry B. Harris, Jr.; Samuel R. Harris; Richard B. Herman, Esq.; Evander Holyfield; Joan B. Horning.

Professor David P.J. Hung, O.M.D., PhD.; Vahe Imasdownian; Jae Kung Jeung; Larry E. Jodsaas; Yue-Sai Kan; Shaygan Kheradpir; Minsun Kim; Gary Sze Kong; Gwen S. Korovin, M.D.; Dr. Alma Kunanbaeva; Kin Y. Lam, M.D.; Norma Lerner; Anita Bevacqua McBride; Douglas W. McCormick; Honorable Robert Carl McFarlane; Raffi Megerian; Dr. Aria Mehrabi; David C. Meltzer, Esq.; Ali Mojdehi; Dariooush Nasserli, M.D.; Jerar Nishanian.

Herbert V. Nootbaar; Dattatreyaudu Nori, M.D.; Pejman Nozad; Ivan Obolensky; Fatih Ozmen; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Peter Kihyo Park; Jorge M. Perez; Lauren Pizza; Rabbi Joseph Potasnik; Arun Kumar Pramanik, M.D.; Helen Psaras; Major General L. Scott Rice; U.S. Representative Edward R. Royce; Major General Jay Santee; Elizabeth Sharquis; Timothy R. Scully, CSC; Ketki Sharadkumar Shah, M.D.; Yash Paul Soi; Andrew Strzalkowski.

Abdul M. Suleman; Elie Tahari; Honorable David H. Thorne; Honorable Gaddi H. Vasquez; Elizabeth Lee Vliet, M.D.; Honorable John P. Walsh; Robert R. Weinstein, Esq.; Honorable Jesse White; Steven W. Wong; Yannis C. Yortsos, PhD; Lotfi Zadeh; Tim H. Zagat; Charles Zhang.

And receiving the International Ellis Island Medal of Honor, Ahmet Calik and Nigel Lythgoe.

MR. MONROE MACK

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated community leader and trailblazer, Monroe Mack of Tampa, Florida. Mr. Mack's boundless energy and constant civic engagement were an inspiration to all. Today, I am grateful to recognize his innumerable contributions and honor his legacy.

Monroe Mack was born in Campbellton, Florida, but later moved to Tampa where he spent the majority of his life. Mr. Mack's service to this country began when he joined the Army Reserves where he served as a 2nd Lieutenant and retired as a Lt. Colonel in 1985. Mr. Mack went on to graduate from Florida A&M University in 1956 with a degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences and later received an MBA from Nova University. He later married Laverne Griffin to whom he was married for 50 happy years.

Throughout Mr. Mack's career he was a pioneer for African American advancement in the Tampa Bay medical community. He created the pharmacy services at Clara Fry Memorial Hospital. Following the success of that program, he moved to Tampa General Hospital, where he broke down racial barriers by becoming its first African American professional staffer and later rose to become its Director of Pharmacy. His trailblazing continued as he became the first African American to be appointed and reappointed to the Florida Board of Pharmacy by both Governors Reubin Askew and Bob Graham. He then chaired the Examination and Negative Formulary Advisory Committees, and served as their first African American President.

Mr. Mack's service was not limited only to his work in the medical field. Throughout his life, he displayed a passion for civic engagement and for shaping young minds. He inspired the next generation of pharmacists by working as a professor at both the University of Florida and Florida A&M University Colleges of Pharmacy. He also diligently advocated for greater engagement in politics throughout the community. Mr. Mack could often be found educating people about candidates and encouraging them to vote.

Even after his retirement from Tampa General Hospital, Mr. Mack continued to give countless hours in service to his alma mater. He chaired the alumni funding campaign which raised funds and created a \$100,000 Alumni Endowment for the FAMU College of Pharmacy. He was also inducted into the Gallery of Distinction in the FAMU College of Pharmacy.

Mr. Mack selflessly dedicated his life to our community. Countless students have benefited from his immeasurable philanthropic efforts and leadership in the medical industry. His commitment to civic engagement and education will always be remembered and appreciated. Mr. Speaker, I join the Tampa Bay community in recognizing Mr. Mack for a lifetime of exemplary service. Although Monroe Mack passed away on August 16, 2014, his life and legacy will live on.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION KINGS COUNTY AND BOB BEEDE

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE) Kings County and Bob Beede for being named the 2014 Agriculture Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

For 100 years, UCCE advisors and specialists have worked with communities across California to solve economic, agricultural, natural resource, youth development, and nutrition issues. UCCE has 64 offices in California that act as local problem-solving centers bringing together local issues and UC research. Across California, more than 300 campus-based specialists and county-based farm and youth advisors work together to provide solutions to agriculture related problems. UCCE helps farmers develop more efficient growing methods, solve pest management problems, and institute irrigation methods that require less water. UCCE also promotes the importance of healthy eating habits and regular exercise to adults and children through the 4-H Youth Development Program.

Mr. Bob Beede, UCCE Emeritus Farm Advisor, has been an instrumental part of UCCE success for many years. In 1980, after two years as Staff Research Associate for tree crops and grapes at the Kearney Agricultural Center, Bob became a farm advisor for grapes, tree fruits, nuts, and vegetables in Kings County. Since 1980, Bob has served in many capacities, including advisor of Tulare County nut crops, which was his main focus until his recent retirement. Bob has had an incredible impact on the booming nut crop industry and is a world authority on pistachio production as well as a key advisor for walnut culture.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I congratulate the University of California Cooperative Extension Kings County and Bob Beede for their recognition as 2014 Agriculture Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE SERGEANT KIMBERLY JAYNE JOWITT

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Hamilton County Sheriff's Office Sergeant, Kimberly Jayne Jowitt. Sadly, after a more than three-year battle with cancer, Sergeant Jowitt passed away on July 27, 2014. For more than three decades, she served the people of Hamilton County with a dedication that our community

and the entire state of Indiana owe a debt of eternal gratitude.

Born on August 2, 1955 in Indianapolis, IN, Sergeant Jowitt was a lifelong Hoosier. After graduating from Heritage Christian School and Indiana University Kelley School of Business, she was hired as a civilian employee by the Hamilton County Sheriff's Office in 1978.

During her career with the Sheriff's Office, which spanned an admirable 37 years, Sergeant Jowitt held several positions serving Hamilton County; most recently as an administrative sergeant handling special assignments. A career public servant, she worked tirelessly to make Hamilton County a better place to live.

Although Sergeant Jowitt had many ups and downs during her battle against cancer, she remained faithfully optimistic and never lost her will to fight. She brought this same tenacity to her career serving Hamilton County becoming the first female officer, investigator and supervisor in the history of the Hamilton County Sheriff's Office. I am proud to represent a community with a legacy of female public servants as dedicated as Kim Jowitt.

As a member of the House Homeland Security Committee and Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I know firsthand the important role that public servants like Sergeant Jowitt play every day. Without people like Kim Jowitt, who are willing to dedicate their entire career to public safety and service, Hamilton County would not be the safe, prosperous and vibrant community it is today.

Sergeant Jowitt is survived by her husband, Noblesville Police Chief Kevin Jowitt, and her daughter, Crystal. My condolences and well wishes go out to Sergeant Jowitt's entire family and the Hamilton County law enforcement community. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

INTERNATIONAL PLASMA AWARENESS WEEK

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate International Plasma Awareness Week, which will occur October 12 to 18, 2014. During this time, there will be observances throughout the United States and Europe designed to raise global awareness of the need for plasma to create lifesaving therapies, recognize the value that plasma donors contribute in saving and improving lives, and increase understanding of rare diseases and plasma protein therapies.

Raising awareness about plasma protein therapies is vitally important for the following reasons:

Plasma-derived therapies and recombinant blood clotting factors, collectively known as plasma protein therapies, are unique, biological products for which no substitutes or alternative treatments exist. They save and improve lives of individuals throughout the world;

Plasma protein therapies are used to treat bleeding disorders, primary immune deficiency

diseases, alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency, and certain rare, neurological disorders;

These therapies are also used in emergency and surgical medicine to save and improve lives;

Plasma protein therapies have significantly improved the quality of life of, markedly improved patient outcomes for, and extended the life expectancy of individuals with rare, chronic diseases and conditions;

Healthy, committed donors provide plasma essential to manufacture these lifesaving therapies; and

There are over 430 plasma collection centers in the U.S. that have demonstrated their commitment to plasma donor and patient safety and quality by earning International Quality Plasma Program (IQPP) certification.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and rise in commemoration of International Plasma Awareness Week, a time dedicated to raising awareness about crucial, lifesaving therapies attained through using plasma proteins.

TRIBUTE TO TEAYS VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Teays Valley Christian School, located in Scott Depot, Putnam County, West Virginia, who is celebrating the 30th anniversary of its first graduating class with a Gala on October 18, 2014. I am happy to say that, under the direction of Principal Jack Davis, teachers and staff, Teays Valley Christian School has become one of the finest private, Christian schools in the state of West Virginia.

Founded in 1979, Teays Valley Christian School started in converted Sunday school classrooms at Scott Depot Christ Fellowship, offering kindergarten through 8th grade classes to approximately 65 students. The school expanded, offering kindergarten to 12th grade and currently, 351 students are enrolled from Putnam, Kanawha, Mason and Cabell counties. In addition, the student body represents 83 churches which support the school's emphasis on "unity of spirit across denominational lines."

The school's mission statement reflects the core values of the school and the reason for its formation: "Teays Valley Christian School is dedicated to working in partnership with the family to provide a high quality, balanced, Bible-based education that develops the essential knowledge, skills, and character traits necessary for students to make a lifelong commitment to Jesus Christ and to fulfill God's purposes in their lives."

Teays Valley Christian School is accredited through the Association of Christian School International (ACSI) and the North Central Association (NCA). It is affiliated with the Association of Christian Schools International, North Central Association, ACSI Ohio River Valley, West Virginia Christian Athletic Tournament, and the West Virginia Department of Education.

The school is proud of its rigorous academic curriculum and qualified staff that have provided an education to over 600 students, 90 percent of which have attended and completed college. The school's college entrance exam scores are consistently higher than state and national averages. The school is proud of two national merit scholars who have graduated over the past 5 years. A well rounded program is offered to students including programs in the fields of music, fine arts, drama, as well as athletics.

Since its humble startup, Teays Valley Christian School has evolved into a full scale academic institution offering students a well rounded faith based academic curriculum. The emphasis on hard work and academic achievement with a Christian foundation has proven to be a successful formula for the school, its students and alumni.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to Congratulate Teays Valley Christian School on its success and on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of its first graduating class. I wish the school great success with its upcoming Gala celebrating all graduates of this special academic institution. Hopefully, this will be the beginning of the next 30 years of academic excellence at Teays Valley Christian School. I am truly privileged to serve such a distinguished group of West Virginians.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VET- ERAN, ORLANDO MARTORANI, AS HE CELEBRATES HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Orlando Martorani a Happy Birthday as he turns 100 years old on October 19, 2014.

Orlando Pedro Martorani was born October 19, 1914 in Bayamon, Puerto Rico. He began a career as a bookkeeper and married Mercedes Delgado Garcia in San Juan, Puerto Rico on December 14, 1941, exactly one week after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Orlando and Mercedes began their life in Puerto Rico and their first child, their daughter, Gilda, was born in 1942. In December of 1943, Orlando answered the call to military service, joining the U.S. Army as a member of the Coastal Artillery Corps.

The Coastal Artillery Corps was responsible for the defense of the coasts and harbors of the United States during the first half of the 20th Century. As a member of that corps, Orlando was briefly assigned to duty in Inglewood and San Diego, California before being stationed in Panama, guarding the Panama Canal. He also would be stationed in Boston, Massachusetts to guard German Prisoners of War.

On being discharged in February of 1946, Orlando returned to his life in Puerto Rico where he and Mercedes raised their family. After retiring in 1980, Orlando and Mercedes came to live in Murphysboro, Illinois.

A short-wave radio enthusiast, Orlando is also a Chicago Cubs fan and, even though he

has been waiting 100 years, he still has hopes of seeing the Cubs win a World Series in his lifetime.

Orlando cared for Mercedes until she passed away in 2003. He has two children, Gilda and a son, Orlando, who is also a U.S. Army veteran who served in Vietnam. He also has six grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Orlando Martorani a Happy 100th Birthday and wishing him all the best in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 480, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HONORING THE HONOREES OF THE MAINE WOMEN'S LOBBY GALA

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorees of the 2014 Maine Women's Lobby Gala: The Voice of Maine Women—Loud and Clear. The Maine Women's Lobby works tirelessly to increase opportunities for women and girls in Maine and to ensure that they are protected from violence and discrimination through education and advocacy.

The Maine Women's Lobby Gala celebrates the power of Maine women and honors five inspirational female leaders in the state. These women have demonstrated a commitment to furthering the lives of Maine women through work in civil rights, economic security, health care, violence prevention, and more.

This year's award recipients are Mary J. Herman, Cheryl Miller, Maine Attorney General Janet Mills, Zam Zam Mohamud, and Abbie Strout. Mary J. Herman, one of the earliest lobbyists for the Maine Women's Lobby, is the recipient of the Liz Crandall Spirit Award for her continued volunteer work and philanthropy in the state. Cheryl Miller is the recipient of the Catalyst Award for fostering economic growth and building community as the head of the Maine Development Foundation's Leadership Maine Program. Maine Attorney General Janet Mills is the recipient of the Trailblazer Award for setting an example for women in Maine politics as the state's first female District Attorney and Attorney General. Zam Zam Mohamud will receive the Community Power Award as the first Somali woman in Maine to run for public office and for being a dedicated leader in her community. Abbie Strout is the recipient of the Spark! Award for her work as a tireless women's health activist with the Mabel Wadsworth Women's Health Center.

Through their leadership and incredible commitment to their communities, these recipients improve the lives of Maine women today and serve as inspiring role models for our young girls.

Mr. Speaker, please join me again in congratulating the honorees of the Maine Women's Lobby Gala on their outstanding service and achievement.

HONORING KATHLEEN A. MILLISON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kathleen A. Millison, City Manager for the City of Santa Rosa, upon her retirement.

Ms. Millison's four years as City Manager in Santa Rosa cap off a career of more than 35 years in public service. Before she brought her talents to Santa Rosa, Ms. Millison served the City of Clovis as City Manager for almost 20 years and previously held the position of Assistant City Manager for Clovis. Before settling in California, Ms. Millison served as an Assistant City Manager, Planning Director and Assistant Planner for multiple communities throughout Washington and Oregon.

During her time serving the City of Santa Rosa, Ms. Millison is credited for countless improvements in our community that will benefit residents for years to come. For instance, Ms. Millison worked to create guidelines for managing community growth. She improved public utilities and community amenities while also working diligently to create a stronger, more robust and inviting local economy.

In addition to her work for the city, Ms. Millison served as a board chair of the California Association of Local Economic Development, a member of the board of directors of the Institute for Local Government, and is a past president of the City Manager's Department of the League of California Cities. In recent years, Ms. Millison has been involved in local leadership as well, particularly with public school foundations, local history associations and regional economic development associations. Her fellow community members have recognized her for this work with numerous awards.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Millison for her invaluable service to the City of Santa Rosa. Her unyielding dedication to protecting and improving our community is greatly appreciated by the entire Santa Rosa community and we wish her a most enjoyable retirement.

HONORING BLUEFIELD, VIRGINIA'S GRAHAM HIGH SCHOOL

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today in honor of Blue-

field, Virginia's Graham High School, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

Graham High School was first established in 1914 as a secondary school, and thousands of students have graduated in the time that has passed since its doors first opened a century ago. Obviously, the students, staff, and the Graham High School building itself have changed over the last 100 years, but the school's tradition of excellence has remained constant.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating the students, faculty, and alumni of Graham High School on its 100th anniversary. As we note the school's great alumni and many championships including everything from football and basketball to creative writing, may we also take a moment and reflect on what is yet to come. I congratulate Graham High School and the surrounding community on this exciting milestone, and look forward to many more great accomplishments from future Graham G-Men and G-Girls.

HONORING MUELLER & CO., LLP

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mueller & Co., LLP, a certified public accounting and business consulting firm with locations in Elgin and Chicago. Mueller & Co., LLP, which serves my constituents in the Sixth District, has been recognized as one of the best places to work in the State of Illinois.

For over 45 years, Mueller has cultivated personal and professional relationships with their communities and clients. Mueller & Co., LLP clients include privately held and publicly traded companies, local governments, non-profit organizations from a wide variety of industries, and independent professionals.

With over 75 employees at their Elgin office, Mueller has been listed in Crain's Chicago Business as the 19th largest accounting firm in the Chicagoland area. They have also consistently earned the distinction of being one of the "Best Places to Work in Illinois" by the Daily Herald Business Ledger, one of only sixty Illinois companies to receive this honor.

Mr. Speaker and my distinguished colleagues in the House, please join me in honoring Mueller & Co., LLP for their legacy of achievement. Mueller & Co., LLP is a company that truly cares not only for their clients, but also for their employees.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF CORCORAN, CALIFORNIA

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of Corcoran, California as they celebrate their 100th Anniversary this summer.

Corcoran was incorporated in 1914 and has grown tremendously over the last 100 years. The city is located in the middle of California's fertile Central Valley and has played an important role in supporting this region's vibrant agricultural economy.

At the turn of the 20th century, the area where Corcoran now stands was a major component of the state's economy as it served as a junction for the San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railroad. The city began when H.J. Whitley, a land developer from Southern California, purchased 32,000 acres and moved his colleague, J.W. Guiberson to the area. Guiberson and his family were responsible for building the city's first home and business and establishing the first church in the community. Agriculture was, and still is, the highlight of this area. At its infancy, the most successful crops in Corcoran were alfalfa, grains, and sugar beets.

Despite its size, the city is home to a thriving community. For example, the J.G. Boswell Company, founded in 1925, has ties in both agriculture and real estate and is one of the largest irrigated farming operations in the world. The area also offers many educational opportunities for its youth including West Hills College and College of the Sequoias. In 2009, the Technology Learning Center opened at Corcoran High School to serve students in the community. There are also many organizations that work hard to cultivate an interest in and further understanding of agriculture in our children, such as the Future Farmers of America program and the Corcoran 4-H Club. This wonderful city is rich in history and certainly has a bright future ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the City of Corcoran, California in celebrating a successful and prosperous 100 years.

IN HONOR OF KEVIN L. COTTER OF
QUINCY, MA

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kevin L. Cotter in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the United States' labor movement and to his hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts.

The son of Edward and June Cotter, Kevin was born on October 15, 1948, in Somerville, Massachusetts. Kevin attended St. Catherine's Grammar School in Somerville, and then went on to Sacred Heart High School in East Cambridge until it closed in 1965. Kevin then completed his schooling at Somerville High School, graduating in 1966.

Upon his graduation, Kevin applied to Plumbers' Union Local 12, where he was sworn in on October 24, 1966. He served a five-year apprenticeship and became an active Journeyman member of Local 12 in 1971. Since then, Kevin has held several appointed and elected positions throughout his career: 1973, elected to Local 12's Examining board, 1976, elected as a trustee to the Pension Annuity, Health, and Welfare Funds, 1982,

served as President of the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1985, elected Business Manager of Local 12. He was re-elected as Business Manager of Local 12 in 1997.

Further, Kevin held positions in addition to his responsibilities at Local 12 including: President of the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston in 1983, appointment to the Board of Directors of Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency by Governor Michael Dukakis in 1986, Marketing Officer for Custody Services to Union, Taft-Hartley Benefit Funds at State Street Bank, appointment to Board of Directors of the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority by Boston Mayor Thomas Menino in 2002, and Commissioner of the Quincy Housing Authority in 2002. Kevin was also elected as a delegate to the United Association National Convention in 1976, 1981, 1986, 2001, 2006, and 2011, in addition to serving on dozens of national and local labor related boards, committees, and councils.

Recognizing his good work, several organizations have honored Kevin throughout the years. In 1991, he was the recipient of the Daniel J. Tobin award from the New England Chapter of the Irish American Coalition. In 2000, he received the Jewish National Fund "Tree of Life" Award. In 2004, he was the labor recipient of the "Cushing Gavin Award" from the Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston for excellence in Labor Relations. Additionally, in 2007 he was selected for the "Gompers, Murray, Meaney Award" by the MA AFL-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin is known for his integrity, loyalty, and his quick sense of humor. He has had the good fortune of being married to Betty for forty-two years; they are the proud parents to three children: Lisa, Colleen, and Kevin, and grandparents to four grandchildren: Isabelle, Gianna, Gabrielle, and Cecilia. I thank Kevin for his leadership and his service.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY
OF CARY MEDICAL CENTER

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 90th Anniversary of Cary Medical Center in Caribou, Maine. Nearly a century after its founding, Cary continues to serve the people of Northern Maine with the highest quality of care, all while maintaining a special commitment to our nation's veterans.

Cary Memorial Hospital first opened to the public in September of 1924. The medical center was built on land donated to the City of Caribou by the late Dr. Jefferson B. Cary for the purpose of building a hospital. Over the next 50 years, the Hospital would welcome a number of expansions, before Caribou voters welcomed a new state-of-the-art \$7 million hospital in the mid-1970s.

Just as its namesake was a pioneer as one of the first medical professionals in Aroostook County, since its opening, the new Cary Medical Center has continued to lead the way in the future of healthcare. From the new private

hospital rooms at its opening to the new Women's Imaging Center—offering the most advanced breast cancer diagnostic service in Northern Maine—the hospital has been a medical leader for the state and the region.

Perhaps closest to my heart, Cary Medical Center is known for its unwavering commitment to our nation's veterans. In 1988, Cary was the first hospital in the United States to open a VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic. For the last several years, Cary has offered specialty care to veterans through VA's Project ARCH (Access Received Closer to Home). I was proud to help bring this program to Maine and work closely with Cary's leadership to ensure the program will continue through the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, Cary is consistently recognized as one of the top hospitals in Maine and is focused on improving the health of all Mainers. As Cary nears a century of service and caring for the community and the region, I hope that you will join me in honoring the medical professionals, hospital staff, and patients who make Cary a wonderful place to provide and receive care.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE THERESE
MCCUSKEY

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my friend, Anne Therese McCuskey, who died September 4, 2014, in our hometown of Charleston after a long illness. Anne was an exemplary public servant and avid Republican. She always exhibited common sense about political issues, personal issues and was a tireless advocate. I have always been grateful that Anne was willing to work in my first Congressional campaign and serve as my District Director when I entered Congress in 2001.

Born in 1949 and raised in Erie, Pennsylvania, Anne graduated from Villa Maria Academy high school and was among the first women to graduate from Gannon University. She came to West Virginia University as a graduate student in 1971. At WVU, she earned a master's degree in social work, met her beloved husband John, and developed an abiding affection for the Mountain State. She loved her adopted home state and devoted the next 40 years to inspiring West Virginians to reach their true potential.

After graduating from WVU, she and John moved to Bridgeport, where Anne served as Clinical Director for Summit Center, an eight-county regional mental health center, and held leadership positions in the United Way of Harrison County. Anne and John moved their family to Charleston in 1985, when my father, Governor Arch Moore, appointed John as the state's Commissioner of Finance and Administration. As a Charleston resident, Anne expanded her professional efforts on behalf of West Virginians. She was appointed to the Commission for National and Community Service, as well as the West Virginia Governor's Committee on Crime Delinquency and

Corrections, the West Virginia Parole Board, the West Virginia Behavioral Health Advisory Council, and the Governor's Advisory Committee on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. She served as Vice President of Government Relations for the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Director of Government Relations for the Charleston Regional Chamber of Commerce and Development, and President of the Black Diamond Girl Scout Council.

Anne took great pride in finding talented people and cultivating their talents on behalf of West Virginia. She turned this pride into a career as a campaign professional, working on campaigns throughout the state. In addition to serving as my District Director, Anne later became Executive Director for the West Virginia Republican Party. But Anne always had two favorite candidates, her husband and her son, both named John McCuskey. Beyond her impact at the state and national level, Anne's efforts had a personal impact on everyone in her path.

Although leading an active civic and social life, Anne's first devotion always was to her family. She leaves behind her husband of 38 years, John F. McCuskey, and their children, John B. McCuskey and daughter-in-law Wendy, their daughter, Elizabeth McCuskey and her partner, Victor, as well as an extensive, extended family.

Anne was a truly a great wife, parent, public servant, and patriot. I am so honored to have known and work as closely as I did with her. All, who had the pleasure of knowing her, will experience a void as a result. She had a determined confidence and I will always remember her sage words of advice, "always soldier on and politics isn't Sunday school."

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia, and indeed, the United States of America owe Anne McCuskey a debt of gratitude for her many years of distinguished service in her professional and personal life. I am honored to call her my friend and fellow West Virginian.

RECOGNIZING YATES CONSTRUCTION 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor a hallmark industry in South Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District, Yates Construction, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

In 1960, Bill Yates began managing small construction projects for Central Construction while attending classes at The University of Mississippi. While working for Central Construction during college, Bill was able to learn how to develop the skills that would lay the foundation for starting a construction company of his own. In 1963, Bill led his first significant project under the name of W.G. Yates, General Contractor, and in 1964 W.G. Yates & Son Construction Company was formed. Later that year, the company was incorporated as Yates Construction, and has been family owned and operated ever since.

As Yates Construction began to grow, they developed the company motto to be: "On

time, within budget, to your satisfaction", which was cultivated as the company's reputation for all of those who have had dealings with Yates Construction over the 50 years of their existence. In 1977, Yates Building Supply was formed and opened their first location in Philadelphia, MS, providing building supplies and home improvement products. In 1978, Yates Heavy Division was formed to accommodate larger projects, helping meet the needs of their clients on a broader scale. In 1986, Yates Engineering Corporation was established, and has been dedicated to provide total performance and management service as well as related support-services to their clients. In 1997, The Yates Companies was incorporated and expanded, opening locations across the southeast region of the country and North America. In 2002, Yates Services was formed. In 2009, Yates Construction's mission statement and core values were formally recognized as "to provide value to our clients" and "Safety, Integrity, Passion, Commitment."

Now, with William G. Yates, III in the President's seat, it is easy to see why this company is a respected part of our local, state, and regional economy. It is my privilege to recognize the 50th anniversary of Yates Construction, and wish the Yates family success for many generations to come.

ROGER STEWART

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate to honor the life of a true champion of environmentalism, Roger Stewart. His outstanding career in public service and his countless efforts to protect the natural resources of our community will be forever remembered.

Mr. Stewart grew up on a farm in the New York-New Jersey area. At the age of 18, he joined the Army Air Corps where he served during World War II. He went on to spend the next 21 years serving his country as a pilot. Prior to his retirement as an Air Force Major, he went back to school for a degree in zoology from the University of South Florida. Soon after graduation he accepted a position as a County Health Department biologist with Hillsborough County Department of Health's Pollution Control. Mr. Stewart created the original Water Sampling Network while at the Health Department.

Mr. Stewart paved the way for environmental advocacy in Tampa Bay. He zealously led the, then newly created, Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) in the late 1960s. Despite only having a handful of employees, Mr. Stewart aggressively spearheaded the cleanup of Tampa Bay by creating rules that protected wetlands and forced powerful local companies to reduce air pollution. In February 1974, Mr. Stewart courageously appeared on CBS's "60 Minutes" and expressed concern about the rate of development which was outpacing the protections for sensitive environmental ecosystems as well as air and water quality. He showed viewers the dam-

aging sewage spilling into Tampa Bay. After the interview Mr. Stewart was temporarily fired but brought back to lead the EPC a short time later.

Thanks to Mr. Stewart's leadership, the EPC has grown to a robust staff that has carried out many State, Regional, and Federal level regulatory duties without losing the ability to enforce and maintain local standards. Mr. Stewart, an Air Force pilot-turned-environmentalist, kept Hillsborough County elected officials consistently accountable for making natural resources a priority over corporate profits. He retired in 2000 and passed away on August 21, 2014 at age 89.

Mr. Stewart was an unabashed "purist in the environmental business". His heroic commitment to environmentalism made an unforgettable mark on the Tampa Bay community. Tampa Bay is a better and more beautiful place to live thanks to his efforts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay community, I am proud to recognize Roger Stewart for his lifelong service to the State of Florida.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 11, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 15

3 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine equality for the District of Columbia, focusing on discussing the implications of S. 132, to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

SD-342

SEPTEMBER 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the state of small depository institutions.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine retirement savings 2.0, focusing on updating savings policy for the modern economy.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD-342

2 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine harnessing the power of telehealth, focusing on promises and challenges.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold a joint hearing to examine Ebola in West Africa, focusing on a global challenge and public health threat.

SH-216

Committee on Finance

Subcommittee on Health Care

To hold hearings to examine the Children's Health Insurance Program, focusing on protecting America's children and families.

SD-215

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

9:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States policy towards Iraq and Syria and the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2141, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, H.R. 4366, to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement, the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine why net neutrality matters, focusing on protecting consumers and competition

through meaningful open Internet rules.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine the impact of rising inequality on the American economy.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 2670, to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

SD-628

SEPTEMBER 18

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine tax audits of large partnerships.

SD-342

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 11, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The attention of our Nation is drawn toward a raging tragedy. We are torn by aversion to a repeat of years of military engagement while compelling narratives unfold in so many places around our world.

Send Your spirit among the Members of this people's House, that they might judiciously balance seemingly irreconcilable interests. Help them to execute their consciences and judgments with clarity and purity of heart, so that all might stand before You honestly and trust that You can bring forth righteous fruits from their labors.

On this anniversary of the 9/11 tragedy, may Your healing presence continue in the lives of all who were immediately impacted by the events of that day, and may we as a nation continue to heal and work toward bringing greater peace and security to our world.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MARKING THE ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 13th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on our Nation.

Thirteen years ago, the Nation was reeling in anger and confusion. We were trying to process the enormity of the loss of life we had suffered from the brutal attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and from the downing of the American passenger plane in the field outside Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Thirteen years ago, we did not yet know the full extent of the losses we had suffered or the identities of those responsible or the story of the heroics on the United Flight 93 that in all likelihood saved this historic building from attack.

Thirteen years ago, at this hour, we could not know how these events would change our country and the world, but one thing we do know, even in the midst of all the anger, pain, and the confusion of that awful day, we know that the United States of America would respond with courage and resolve, that the American spirit would triumph, and it has, Mr. Speaker.

So today, let us remember those who died, over 700 from my own home State of New Jersey and from many States and nations around the world. Let's remember those who have fought from that day and given their lives to protect our country over those past 13 years.

Let us renew our determination to honor forever all those whose memories remain a blessing to us and to the Nation we love so much.

INTRODUCING THE SCAN CONTAINERS ABSOLUTELY NOW ACT

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the victims of September 11 and to introduce legislation to protect Americans from potential attacks against targets that I believe still remain vulnerable 13 years later.

Our airports are more secure, but I live near the Port of Los Angeles, and I know that our Nation's ports are not as secure as they should be.

Top security experts recommend that shipping containers entering our Na-

tion's ports be screened for radiological and nuclear materials and other potentially dangerous cargo. If something happened to disrupt commerce at our ports, it would be catastrophic for our entire Nation and the global economy.

Congress passed laws requiring that 100 percent of all cargo be screened by 2012, but that deadline came and went, and we are nowhere near screening/scanning all our cargo. Only 3 percent of our cargo is screened today.

Today, I am introducing the Scan Containers Absolutely Now Act, the SCAN Act, to finally make port security a reality.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 11, 2014 at 10:21 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2154.

That the Senate passed S. 2323.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H.J. Res. 120.

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 1233.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EMPLOYEE HEALTH CARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

consideration of H.R. 3522 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. BROWNLEY of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3522 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. 3 PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

Nothing in this Act shall result in discrimination based on gender, including higher premiums for women or loss of contraception or pregnancy care.

Mr. CASSIDY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3522, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My amendment would ensure that nothing in the underlying act would result in health care discrimination against women. It would prevent insurance companies from charging small businesses that employ women higher premiums, and it would stop insurance companies from selling group plans that deny women contraception or critical maternity care coverage.

I hope that we can all agree that women should never have to pay more for their health care than men would pay simply because of their gender. Being a woman is not and must never be treated as a preexisting condition.

Health care reform has created many new and needed consumer protections, which are helping women live healthier lives and build stronger families. Health care costs are the number one cause of bankruptcy in the United States. Allowing insurance companies to charge women more than men would hurt working women struggling to make ends meet. It would hurt families raising children who are trying to give them the healthy start they deserve.

Before this unfair practice was banned, the National Women's Law

Center reported that gender discrimination in premium prices alone cost women approximately \$1 billion per year more than men. That is \$1 billion that could have prevented many women and their children from living in poverty or being homeless.

That is \$1 billion that women and their families could have spent on rent. That is \$1 billion that women and their families could have spent on child care. That is \$1 billion that women and their families could have used to pay for college. That is \$1 billion that women and their families could have used to start a business. That is \$1 billion that could have been better used to strengthen the American economy.

In a nation where women earn only 77 cents for every dollar that men earn, charging women more for health care compounds the financial strain on women and their families. Stopping gender-based premium discrimination is just one example of health care reform that works, and it is a new consumer protection that women and their families cannot afford to lose.

My amendment will ensure that insurers continue to cover critical maternity care and contraception coverage. Until recently, many States did not require all health care plans to cover maternity care.

Today, the law requires every new insurance policy to cover maternity care. We must ensure that women continue to have access to this critical coverage and access to contraception coverage that gives many women the economic independence to succeed because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Contraception coverage ensures women can prevent unplanned pregnancies and choose the best time to start a family. When surveyed by the Guttmacher Institute, 63 percent of women said that access to contraception had enabled them to take better care of themselves and their families. Over half said they were better able to support themselves financially or complete their education.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans support these policies. A Kaiser health poll found that Americans support birth control coverage by a 2 to 1 margin and 86 percent of Americans support coverage of maternity care.

A vote for my amendment is a vote to protect women from unfair discrimination. It is a vote promising our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters that they will be treated fairly and equally.

These are the values of my constituents in Ventura County, and they are the values of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit. Vote "yes" for equality for women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill empowers female-owned small businesses and workers to keep the health care policies they prefer and make their own decisions regarding health care.

Women make 95 percent of the decisions regarding health insurance and families across the United States. I don't think we have to be patronizing and assume that they cannot make their own decisions.

In fact, I am asked continually by women who are 50 years and above why are they having to pay for maternity benefits. They are just flabbergasted by that.

This is important economically. The Manhattan Institute reports that the Affordable Care Act, so-called ironically, has increased insurance premiums by 41 percent on average—for women, as much as 62 percent.

Imagine that woman sitting at home, lying awake at night, wondering how she is going to pay her bills, being forced to pay for benefits the opposition doesn't think she is smart enough to know that she doesn't need and unable to afford her house. That has happened in an instance I know of.

Now, today, the House has the opportunity to help Americans keep the health care plan of their choice, and how we vote comes down to two questions: First, do you think control over someone's health care plan should reside with a Washington politician or bureaucrat? Or do you trust that American woman to make the proper decision for herself, for her family?

I will tell you where I stand: I think we should give power to the patient, not to a Washington bureaucrat.

Secondly, do we think that politicians should keep the promises made to constituents? Four years ago, supporters of the health care law looked Americans in the eye and said, "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it, period."

I tell you where I stand. Representatives in the people's House should honor their word and uphold the commitment to those who sent us here, period.

Let's protect the health care choices of America's workers. Let's hold politicians accountable for the promises they made.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit. Vote "yes" to protect the health care plans of America's middle class. Vote "yes" to keep the promises made.

Vote "no" on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5161; H.R. 5057, if ordered; and S. 276, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 223, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—187

Barber	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garcia	Nadler
Beatty	Grayson	Napolitano
Becerra	Green, Al	Neal
Bera (CA)	Green, Gene	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pallone
Bonomici	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Braley (IA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Holt	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Cappers	Horsford	Pocan
Capuano	Hoyer	Polis
Cárdenas	Huffman	Posey
Carney	Israel	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Chu	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	T.
Clay	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Costa	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Courtney	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Loeback	Sherman
Cummings	Lofgren	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeLauro	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maffei	Tierney
Doggett	Maloney,	Titus
Doyle	Carolyn	Tonko
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matsui	Vargas
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Veasey
Engel	McCollum	Vela
Enyart	McDermott	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Esty	McIntyre	Walz
Farr	McNerney	Wasserman
Fattah	Meeks	Schultz
Foster	Meng	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waxman
Fudge	Miller, George	Welch
Gabbard	Moore	Yarmuth
Galleo	Moran	

NAYS—223

Aderholt	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Amash	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Amodei	Grimm	Pitts
Bachmann	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Hall	Pompeo
Barletta	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barr	Harper	Rahall
Barrow (GA)	Harris	Reed
Barton	Hartzler	Reichert
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bentivolio	Hensarling	Ribble
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rigell
Black	Hudson	Roby
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rooney
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Burgess	Jolly	Ross
Byrne	Jones	Rothfus
Camp	Jordan	Royce
Campbell	Joyce	Runyan
Capito	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Salmon
Cassidy	Kinzing (IL)	Sanford
Chabot	Kline	Scalise
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schock
Clawson (FL)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Coffman	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Latham	Shimkus
Conaway	Latta	Shuster
Cook	LoBiondo	Simpson
Cotton	Long	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Marchant	Stewart
Daines	Marino	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Stockman
Denham	McAllister	Stutzman
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DeSantis	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Thornberry
Duffy	McHenry	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Tipton
Elmiers	McKinley	Turner
Farenthold	McMorris	Upton
Fincher	Rodgers	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walberg
Fleming	Messer	Walden
Flores	Mica	Walorski
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Noem	Wittman
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Wolf
Gohmert	Nunes	Womack
Goodlatte	Olson	Woodall
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoder
Gowdy	Paulsen	Yoho
Granger	Pearce	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Perry	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Peterson	

NOT VOTING—21

Calvert	Hinojosa	Rangel
Coble	Jackson Lee	Rush
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	King (NY)	Schwartz
Gardner	Lipinski	Southerland
Gibson	Negrete McLeod	Speier
Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee	Wilson (FL)

□ 1305

Messrs. STOCKMAN and JONES changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 494, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, noes 167, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

AYES—247

Aderholt	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Forbes	Maffei
Amodei	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Bachmann	Fox	Marchant
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Barber	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Barletta	Galleo	Matheson
Barr	Garcia	McAllister
Barrow (GA)	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Barton	Garrett	McCaul
Benishek	Gerlach	McClintock
Bentivolio	Gibbs	McHenry
Bera (CA)	Gibson	McIntyre
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	McKinley
Black	Goodlatte	McMorris
Blackburn	Gosar	Rodgers
Boustany	Gowdy	Meadows
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Meehan
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	Mica
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Miller (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Guthrie	Miller, Gary
Buchanan	Hall	Mullin
Bucshon	Hanabusa	Mulvaney
Burgess	Hanna	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Byrne	Harris	Neugebauer
Camp	Hartzler	Noem
Campbell	Heck (NV)	Nugent
Capito	Hensarling	Nunes
Carter	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Cassidy	Holding	Palazzo
Chabot	Hudson	Paulsen
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Pearce
Clawson (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Perry
Coffman	Hultgren	Peters (CA)
Cole	Hunter	Peters (MI)
Collins (GA)	Hurt	Peterson
Collins (NY)	Issa	Petri
Conaway	Jenkins	Pittenger
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jolly	Pompeo
Crawford	Jones	Posey
Crenshaw	Jordan	Price (GA)
Culberson	Joyce	Rahall
Daines	Kelly (PA)	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Reichert
Denham	Kinzing (IL)	Renacci
Dent	Kline	Ribble
DeSantis	Kuster	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rigell
Duffy	LaMalfa	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roe (TN)
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Elmiers	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
Enyart	Latham	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	Latta	Rohrabacher
Fincher	LoBiondo	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Loeback	Rooney
Fleischmann	Long	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleming	Lucas	Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg

Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swellwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Calvert
Clyburn
Coble
DesJarlais
Dingell
Fortenberry

Granger
Hastings (WA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Nunnelee
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz

□ 1312

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 495 I was inadvertently detained during rollcall No. 495 and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I announced that we were delaying consideration of the continuing resolution so all Members could be briefed on the President's request for additional authorities related to ISIL as part of the continuing resolution.

Members received a bipartisan classified briefing this morning. I know many are still digesting that information and getting their questions answered regarding this threat and our response.

In order to properly consider the President's request and act on the continuing resolution, Members are advised that the House will now meet on Monday at 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes at 6:30 p.m. on suspensions.

Members are advised that the House may consider legislation related to the President's request and the continuing resolution as early as Tuesday.

These are changes from the previously announced House schedule.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman and I have discussed this, and I believe he has taken the appropriate action in this instance, and we certainly support his determination.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for working together on this.

The one thing we know, this is a threat, and this House will act as one as Americans, and I look forward to continuing to work on it.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5161) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI)

that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—402

Aderholt	DeGette	Hunter
Amash	Delaney	Hurt
Amodei	DeLauro	Israel
Bachmann	DelBene	Issa
Bachus	Denham	Jackson Lee
Barber	Dent	Jeffries
Barletta	DeSantis	Jenkins
Barr	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Bass	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Beatty	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Becerra	Duckworth	Jolly
Benishek	Duffy	Jones
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Bera (CA)	Edwards	Joyce
Billirakis	Ellison	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Ellmers	Keating
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Enyart	Kennedy
Black	Eshoo	Kildee
Blackburn	Esty	Kilmer
Blumenauer	Farenthold	Kind
Bonamici	Farr	Kingston
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kinzing (IL)
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Kirkpatrick
Braley (IA)	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Kuster
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Lamborn
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Lance
Brown (FL)	Fortenberry	Langevin
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lankford
Buchanan	Fox	Larsen (WA)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Bustos	Fudge	Latta
Butterfield	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Byrne	Gallego	Levin
Camp	Garamendi	Lewis
Campbell	Garcia	Lipinski
Capito	Gardner	LoBiondo
Capps	Garrett	Loeb sack
Capuano	Gerlach	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Gibbs	Long
Carney	Gibson	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Carter	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Cartwright	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham
Cassidy	Gosar	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Graves (GA)	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Chabot	Grayson	Lummis
Chaffetz	Green, Al	Lynch
Chu	Green, Gene	Maffei
Cicilline	Griffin (AR)	Maloney
Clark (MA)	Griffith (VA)	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Clawson (FL)	Grimm	Marchant
Clay	Guthrie	Marino
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Massie
Coffman	Hahn	Matheson
Cohen	Hall	Matsui
Cole	Hanabusa	McAllister
Collins (GA)	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
Collins (NY)	Harper	McCaul
Conaway	Harris	McClintock
Connolly	Hartzler	McCollum
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Cook	Heck (NV)	McGovern
Cooper	Heck (WA)	McHenry
Costa	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cotton	Herrera Beutler	McKeon
Courtney	Higgins	McKinley
Cramer	Himes	McMorris
Crawford	Hinojosa	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Holding	McNerney
Crowley	Holt	Meadows
Cuellar	Honda	Meehan
Culberson	Horsford	Meeks
Cummings	Hoyer	Meng
Daines	Hudson	Messer
Davis (CA)	Huelskamp	Mica
Davis, Danny	Huffman	Michaud
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)
DeFazio	Hultgren	Miller (MI)

Miller, George	Roe (TN)	Stockman
Moore	Rogers (AL)	Stutzman
Moran	Rogers (KY)	Swalwell (CA)
Mullin	Rogers (MI)	Takano
Mulvaney	Rohrabacher	Terry
Murphy (FL)	Rokita	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (PA)	Rooney	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Napolitano	Roskam	Thornberry
Neal	Ross	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Tierney
Noem	Roybal-Allard	Tipton
Nolan	Royce	Titus
Nugent	Ruiz	Tonko
Nunes	Runyan	Tsongas
O'Rourke	Ruppersberger	Turner
Olson	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Owens	Salmon	Valadao
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Pascarella	T.	Vargas
Pastor (AZ)	Sanford	Veasey
Paulsen	Sarbanes	Vela
Payne	Scalise	Velázquez
Pearce	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pelosi	Schiff	Wagner
Perlmutter	Schneider	Walberg
Perry	Schock	Walden
Peters (CA)	Schrader	Walorski
Peters (MI)	Schweikert	Walz
Peterson	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Petri	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Pingree (ME)	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Pittenger	Serrano	Waxman
Pitts	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Webster (FL)
Poe (TX)	Shea-Porter	Welch
Polis	Sherman	Wenstrup
Pompeo	Shuster	Westmoreland
Posey	Simpson	Whitfield
Price (GA)	Sinema	Williams
Price (NC)	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Slaughter	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (MO)	Wittman
Reed	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Renacci	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Ribble	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Rice (SC)	Southerland	Yoder
Richmond	Speier	Yoho
Rigell	Stewart	Young (AK)
Roby	Stivers	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—29

Barton	Granger	Nunnelee
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Calvert	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clyburn	King (IA)	Rush
Coble	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lowe	Schwartz
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Frankel (FL)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Gowdy	Negrete McLeod	

□ 1322

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I missed rollcall vote 496. Had I been present, I would have cast the following vote: rollcall 496—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—“yes.”

EPS SERVICE PARTS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5057) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from cer-

tain efficiency standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT INVOLVING AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 276) to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will convene at 9 a.m. and will welcome the President of Ukraine for a joint meeting at 10 a.m. There will be no morning hour and the House will meet at noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, as I previously announced, the House may consider the

President's request and act on the continuing resolution as early as Tuesday.

The House will also consider a package of 14 bills designed to encourage an American energy revolution. This commonsense energy plan will be comprised of previously House-passed bills that received bipartisan support and focus on production, infrastructure, reliability, and efficiency.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members are advised that the House will also consider a package of jobs bills that will include 15 House-passed bills. This bipartisan jobs plan fosters an economic recovery and gets Americans back to work in good-paying jobs.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his information.

Before asking him questions about the schedule for the week to come, I want to commend the gentleman. We had a meeting just a few minutes ago in which almost all the Members of the House rose in a moment of silence, Mr. Speaker, to remember those not only who lost their lives on 9/11 13 years ago, but also those who acted so heroically to save lives.

We certainly remember those brave individuals that knew what was going on and took that plane down in Pennsylvania that we believe was undoubtedly directed towards the dome of the Capitol to decapitate the symbol of the world's greatest democracy.

I want to thank the majority leader for leading us in that time of silence to remember that horrific event and to say, as he said just a few moments ago, we are still threatened by those who would use terror and barbarism to attack their own people and others around the world.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership on that issue, and I also thank him for his comments about the fact that we came together on 9/11 not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans. We now are at a similar time where there is a great threat posed to us and to others.

The gentleman's suggestion that we would meet that with the same kind of bipartisanship is welcomed on this side of the aisle as well, so I thank the gentleman for that.

Now, with respect to the schedule, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether or not—and it may not have been decided yet—whether or not the President's request to which the gentleman referred in his announcement and the CR would be considered together or separately?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There has been no decisions yet. As you know, the President requested this week, that is why we postponed, and we are continuing to work through. I will notify the gentleman as early as we get a decision.

□ 1330

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me ask further—and I know the answer to this question is that we will have to see, but I have put our own Caucus on notice, Mr. Leader—if we may need to be here for the week after the break for the holy days. Is that consistent with your thought?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Currently, we are scheduled to be here that last week. There has been no change to that schedule. As I noted just a little earlier, the only change we made is coming back this Monday. I want to make sure all the Members have enough time to digest and get their questions answered, but currently that schedule continues to hold.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to the Appropriations Committee and the CR, it is our expectation that the CR is scheduled to have a date of December 11. I notice Senator CRUZ has made another suggestion. To clarify, is December 11 still the date that the majority is looking for to run the CR through?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, as of this time. We have posted it this week. December 11 is the duration that the continuing resolution would go through.

Mr. HOYER. Lastly, I would say that the majority leader and I have had discussions about this, and so he knows our strong conviction on this side of the aisle that we are still very hopeful that we could have a longer term extension of a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We believe that it is very important to give some stability and competence to the marketplace, to lenders and borrowers and manufacturers, large, medium, and small. I hope the gentleman would continue to consider with his caucus the possibility of having a longer term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which, as the gentleman knows, expires on September 30.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have had many discussions. As the gentleman knows, in the last reauthorization, it was a shorter time period, with many reforms in there. Many feel that those reforms have been ignored. Many feel that the bank provides certain things the private sector is doing.

Knowing that we are in a short-term period, also knowing the threat before America today and the time, we want to make sure that we can have this debate. As for the expiration date, we felt that it was best to extend that out to June in the CR and have that debate later, moving forward, so you are not disrupting any time debating the threat from the terrorists and also doing the work that needs to be done.

I do understand the gentleman has talked to me many times about that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, September 15, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2014, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCEL- LENCY PETRO POROSHENKO, PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, September 18, 2014, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in Joint Meeting His Excellency Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THANKING OUR VETERANS OF WAYNE TOWNSHIP, PENNSYL- VANIA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our veterans.

This weekend, I will have the great honor to join the 2014 Hometown Heroes Celebration in Wayne Township, which is Clinton County, Pennsylvania. The focus for this year's celebration is honoring those from the Vietnam war, and will also include paying tribute to our veterans from the Korean war and World War II eras. We will honor these local heroes for their service and their brothers in arms, including those who didn't make it home or gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Each day, especially on September 11, we are reminded of the many threats posed to America and its citizens. We are also reminded of how blessed we are to have brave men and women who have, for generations, served their Nation and laid their lives

on the line in protection of our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, we owe those who have served and are serving in uniform our unwavering support and thanks, and today I offer my sincere praise for the veterans of Wayne Township and the surrounding areas. You are our hometown heroes, and you deserve as much.

REMEMBERING THE FALLEN HEROES OF 9/11

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today we remember those who lost their lives 13 years ago on a day that changed our Nation forever.

Yesterday Congress bestowed the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, on the fallen heroes of 9/11. One of those was Todd Beamer, a high school friend of mine. Declaring, "Let's roll," he and the other brave Americans on Flight 93 helped prevent further catastrophe while sacrificing their own lives in the process.

This summer I had the privilege of touring the Flight 93 National Memorial and museum in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. There I presented a Wheaton Academy High School yearbook to be included in the museum archives. Construction is still underway on this moving tribute to the 40 heroes.

Looking out over the crash site, I was reminded again that the world is still a dangerous place, and our freedoms are only a generation away from extinction. Freedom isn't inherited. It must be protected against those who destroy it. Honoring the sacrifices of Todd and all who perished on 9/11 requires we forever remain vigilant in defense of our Nation's cherished values.

MOURNING 9/11 VICTIMS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is one American that will forget where they were on 9/11, that crisp morning with the bright sun shining. I was here in the United States Capitol when the unimaginable occurred. We could not have fathomed that the homeland would be attacked.

I rise today to acknowledge the brave men and women who risked their lives and those that lost their lives, along with the families that still mourn. It is particularly important, now that we are in the backdrop of another terrorist act and another President has to rise to defend America. This Congress must also do so.

But we must recognize, as well, that peace is an important value that Americans love. We are peace-loving. We must do that in the name of those who

lost their lives on United Airlines Flight 93, American Airlines Flight 77, American Airlines Flight 11, and United Airlines 175.

We must recognize that we were unsuspecting of this disaster. Therefore, our pledge to those who still mourn—those who have lost their father, mother, husband, wife, child, or friend—as we debate these serious times is we are reminded that there must be no one that terrorizes us and causes us to do the wrong thing.

Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, I ask that on this day we hold a moment of personal silence, one that will reflect our love for those who were lost. Then, to take the words of George W. Bush, the President at that time:

Whether terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done.

A firm hand, yes; but we must be reminded of the humanitarian aspect of this and realize that, as we stand with the President and debate our further steps, we honor those who are in mourning. Let's remember 9/11 as a tribute to the Americans who sacrificed their lives.

I mourn this day.

Mr. Speaker, on this, the 13th anniversary of the attack launched against the United States on September 11, 2001, I rise to remember the victims of that horrific tragedy and those first-responders who risked, and in too many cases, sacrificed their lives to rescue the occupants of the besieged World Trade Center Towers.

The morning of September 11, 2001 is, and will always be, a day like no other. It is a day all living Americans will remember because not since Pearl Harbor had there been such a dastardly and deadly attack on American soil.

As I stand here today, my heart still grieves for those who perished on flights United Airlines 93, American Airlines 77, American Airlines 11, and United Airlines 175.

When the sun rose on the morning of September 11, none of us knew that it would end in an inferno in the magnificent World Trade Center Towers in New York City and the Pentagon and in the grassy fields of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. I stand here remembering those who still suffer, whose hearts still ache over the loss of so many innocent and interrupted lives.

My prayer is that for those who lost a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a child, or a friend will in the days and years ahead take comfort in the certain knowledge that they have gone on to claim the greatest prize, a place in the Lord's loving arms. And down here on the ground, their memory will never die so long as any of the many of us who loved them lives.

Mr. Speaker, as hard as it is to believe, out of a tragedy so overwhelming and horrific, something good and great emerged in the aftermath of September 11. On that day there were no Republicans or Democrats. There were no Northerners or Southerners or West or East Coasters. We were not Red State or Blue State. We were all simply Americans.

On that day, we were united in our shock and anger and sadness. We were united in our resolve to defend our country and protect the freedoms that has made America the greatest country in the history of the world.

We lit candles, held hands, helped neighbors, and prayed for our country and its leaders. A united America can never be defeated as Operation Enduring Freedom showed.

The brave and valiant armed forces of the United States swiftly toppled the Taliban and liberated Afghanistan.

As President George W. Bush announced to the American people and to the world: "Whether the terrorists are brought to justice or justice is brought to the terrorists, justice will be done."

And though he ran and hid for almost ten years, Osama bin Ladin could not hide forever and evade the long arm of American justice, which, under the leadership of President Barack Obama, caught up with him on May 2, 2011.

Mr. Speaker, Americans take care of their own. Americans cherish freedom. Americans cherish liberty. And Americans want peace. Not just for themselves alone, but all persons in every corner of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring that America is safe and secure and protected from another attack on American soil is the least we owe to the heroic passengers on Flight 93 and to the brave firefighters of the FDNY and officers of the NYPD and the officers and civilians we lost in the Pentagon who gave faithful service to our nation.

I believe all Americans want their country to remain safe, free, and invulnerable to another cowardly attack like the one we witnessed thirteen years ago today.

We owe that much to the Americans who lost and gave their lives. We owe it to them to ensure that their children and loved ones will never again experience such pain, suffering, and loss.

We can do this. We must do this. After all, we are Americans.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO 9/11 VICTIMS

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the innocent victims who lost their lives on September 11, 2001.

Thirteen years ago today, our homeland was attacked. Evil manifested itself in the form of extremists who murdered 3,000 Americans. Our world and America was forever changed by the tragedy that unfolded in New York; Washington, D.C.; and Pennsylvania.

The evil that came out of the shadows in 2001 still exists today in 2014. If left unchecked, it will continue to grow for the foreseeable future and threaten us once more. Now, more than ever, we must remain vigilant in the defense of our great country and against those who wish America harm. We can no longer afford to be divided into Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals. We must come together

today, from this point forward, as Americans.

Today, let us pause and pray in remembrance of those who fell on 9/11 and for all who continue to stand in harm's way at home and abroad.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed in a security briefing on the issues dealing with the terrorist group ISIL and I missed the vote on the motion to recommit on H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

TERRORISM ACROSS THE GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my dear friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

HONORING S. TRUETT CATHY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to honor one of Georgia's greatest: Mr. S. Truett Cathy.

Truett Cathy was known across the globe as a successful businessman, author, and the "inventor of the chicken sandwich." Mr. Cathy would also say, "God created chicken; we created the chicken sandwich." But most importantly, he was a beloved great-grandfather, grandfather, father, and husband, above all else. His strong Christian faith could be seen in everything he did. It didn't matter if it was his company, his employees, or his generosity. It was all embodied in the love and good news of Jesus Christ.

Truett's whole life was about giving hope and opportunity to those who had none. His dedication to helping children who have been abused and lost in the foster system reflected how important family values were to him and are only a fraction of what Truett, a man of such great integrity, was able to accomplish.

Having come from nothing himself, he wanted every child to have the same chance at success and happiness as he did. Truett established the WinShape Foundation, which includes 11 long-term foster homes for 95 children. The WinShape Foundation helped not only children in bad circumstances, but for all periods of an individual's life.

Truett also used his foundation as an opportunity to show you that faith in God can help you through your journey by providing opportunities for young adults to reconnect with their faith in the college program, offering retreats for married couples to renew their love in each other and in God, and creating

our next generation's leaders through Christian wilderness camps to learn how to be a better leader and a part of a team.

Truett believed building Christian leaders shouldn't be limited to our country's borders and took WinShape International through missionary trips and projects in over 43 countries.

The generous work and humble spirit of Truett Cathy has touched more lives than we could ever imagine, and many successful individuals today have him to thank.

Even in business, Truett Cathy treated his Chick-fil-A employees like family, endowing a scholarship foundation to help send them to college. Chick-fil-A has actually awarded more than \$25 million in the last 35 years, done through \$1,000 scholarships to 20 or 30 hardworking and deserving employees every year.

□ 1345

Through all his work, Truett gave the most important gift of all to many underprivileged children and teens, and that is hope.

You can never put a price on having someone believe in you and give you a chance at success by giving you your first job and teaching you the value of respect and hard work, and what the ethics of being employed was all about.

Truett sums up his life mission and his work best himself:

Nearly every moment of every day, we have the opportunity to give something to someone else, our time, our love, our resources, and I have always found more joy in giving when I did not expect anything in return.

Having the opportunity to know Truett and his wonderful family has been a privilege, and I thank him for all he has done for the people of Georgia and across this Nation, for the hope and confidence that he has given so many young people to continue on and to fight for what they believe.

Joan and I want to send our condolences and prayers to the Cathy family during this time of great sorrow for us all.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman. I do appreciate that tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), my friend, for such time as he may consume.

HIGHLIGHTING COMPLEXITIES OF OUR NATION'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Mr. HULTGREN. I want to thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the complexities of our Nation's health care system on the eve of the first open season since ObamaCare was launched.

I want to offer a hope to the millions of American consumers who still need real solutions to help ensure that their families can obtain necessary and affordable health care.

Today, our health care system in America has two faces. It can provide state-of-the-art care while, at the same time, can be one of the most complex and frustrating systems in the world.

Americans feel the effects of these complexities every single day. They repeatedly put health care near the top of their list of issues that concern them, and they should be concerned.

The system today has so many conflicting incentives, rules, and regulations, that few Americans have the ability to make sound and affordable decisions for themselves and their families. ObamaCare introduced a whole new level of fuzziness to an already opaque system.

Families are increasingly worried that they will pay more and more for health insurance that covers less and less and lowers the quality of care. They search for long-term economic security, but find unsustainable costs instead.

Even with the advent of the President's health care law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, many middle class Americans haven't found their health care to be more affordable, nor have they felt secure with the current system.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the Affordable Care Act today. It is far from what they were promised.

I have heard stories from too many of my constituents who received letters terminating their coverage, like Julia, from Gurnee, Illinois, or of others facing rising health care costs, like another who told me: "I wonder if the administration ever thought about those of us who have to pay for our health care coverage with no extra help, and how much more we would be paying."

Or of the employers who have had to eliminate health benefits, or of workers and teachers whose hours have been reduced because employers can't afford the higher premiums, or of families losing access to doctors they have known for decades.

Those doctors also face conflicting rules that result in adverse consequences. They want to continue to provide care, but many are no longer accepting Medicare patients and must now require upfront payments for care just to keep their practice open.

There aren't enough doctors and specialists to go around in the narrow networks. We have tried to address the long and sometimes life-threatening waits for veterans. Now is the time to address those long lines for everyone else.

Surely, this is not the health care system we were promised, nor does it paint a bright future for the health status of Americans. That is why, on August 28, I convened the third Community Leadership Forum in Illinois' 14th Congressional District. Our topic? Health care. Our focus? The consumer.

I assembled three separate panels to discuss issues ranging from the ACA and how it will continue to affect consumers in 2015, to how technology and innovation can improve health care outcomes, to how best to increase consumer access to and quality of health care. It was clear that there was a thirst for the community to come together.

In the weeks preceding the forum, I was excited to hear about the panelists' enthusiasm. The forum included CEOs of local and statewide health care organizations and hospitals, CMOs and executive vice presidents of insurance companies, and, most importantly, my constituents.

I heard about the issues directly affecting every level of our health care system. Most importantly, our focus remained on offering consumer-oriented solutions. Never before had I been confronted with such passion and desire to offer answers for our national health care system and work together to implement solutions.

Today, I want to share just a selection of the great ideas that could help American consumers of health care. Many of these will be available in a full report I plan to release on my Web site, hultgren.house.gov, in the coming days.

During the first panel, one of the primary challenges health care and small business insurance professionals discussed was how to ensure consumer choice and access to the broader market of providers. I heard numerous times about the need to reduce health care costs overall by pursuing a market-based system with less regulation.

Surprisingly, the only sub-industry in health care that is lowering costs and increasing the quality of care is elective procedures, an industry perpetuated by market control.

Insurance providers told me the difficulties they face operating within the ACA's demands and slim margins. Certain insurance regulations, like the medical loss ratio, exacerbate costs. These costs translate directly into higher premiums for constituents and businesses.

Instead of encouraging higher quality of care and lower costs with advancements in technology and economy, we find ourselves moving in the opposite direction. Relieving these ineffective and inefficient mandates could be a first step to opening up more options for insurers and consumers.

In the second and third panels, I heard from hospital executives and university innovators about the biggest challenges facing medical technology and innovation.

With innovators and leaders in the biotechnology and medical technology industry at the table, I learned about the ever-present and insurmountable "valley of death," the period of time between a potentially lifesaving device

or product discovery and its introduction to the broader market. This period is encumbered by regulation and bureaucracy.

In Europe, devices and medicines that show promise are approved and brought to market faster and more effectively.

To help with technology transfer and to quicken innovation and its application, I learned about ways to fill the gap between discovery and investment. Legislation like the TRANSFER Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative CHRIS COLLINS from New York, will help reduce the strain caused by the valley of death in the innovation process.

Another method is the preservation of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. One speaker recommended fully funding the FDA to speed the approval process to bring new devices to market in the United States.

The conversation went so far as to talk about the intersection of education policy and scientific research, highlighting the need to make sure our kids receive the best STEM education our schools can provide. These conversations clarified that medical innovations are a vital component to strengthening treatments and reducing the costs in the health care system.

Throughout the day, it was confirmed again that the current health care landscape is rocky and uncertain, but there are many who are willing and eager to work together to tackle these challenges.

The House is also eager to work hard to help fix our health care system. Numerous times the House has said “yes” to fixes and alternatives that address our system’s deep challenges. We don’t need to wait for our health care system to get worse before it gets better. We can work to fix it now.

Americans have a right to feel frustrated with the ACA today. It is far from what they were promised. But that should only spur us onward.

We are only months from the start of open enrollment, November 15. The question is, can all of us, in Congress, in health care, and constituents, work together to bring much-needed reform to our health care system? Can we raise the quality of care our country offers while lowering costs for Americans across the country?

I believe we can, and I trust these solutions will help get us there.

I want to thank my good friend from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much at risk right now in this country, and the President gave us a fine address last night, very interesting. I know some people say, you know, in times of trouble, when the United States is threatened, we need to all get together behind our leader.

As someone once said to me about Republicans, he said, I just wish the

Republicans would all run the same play together. And I responded, I agree. I wholeheartedly want for the Republicans to all run the same play together at the same time.

But I said, the trouble is, if my leader calls a play running to the wrong end zone, I am not blocking for him. And that is also, I think, applicable with the President of the United States.

I was blasted after statements on FOX News saying that if the President wanted to go to war with ISIS, I would support that. So I was anticipating something last night that would unite us and not divide us.

To relate, one of the problems with the President is, he starts off early in his speech saying, as Commander in Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people. Well, I have come to know friends, close friends with a number of the family members of Ty Woods, Glen Doherty, Sean Smith, and Ambassador Chris Stevens, and they debate, they don’t believe that the highest priority of this President is the security of the American people.

The actions of this President, in saying that he cares so deeply about the security of the American people, don’t seem to resonate when you stand by weeping parents who have watched their son’s head be cut off by these enemies, and you say it is your highest priority to protect the American people, but they are wondering, that same day that you spend 5 or 6 hours playing golf, do you spend that much time figuring out a way to protect other Foleys?

That is a tough sell.

The President said, now, let’s make two things clear. ISIL is not Islamic. No religion condones the killing of innocents.

Well, that has certainly got to be a shock to the radical Islamists who brutally kill, behead, maim innocent people in the name of what they say is their religion.

In fact, the American people don’t seem to be sold on what the President said. This story from CNN filed at 8:15 a.m. this morning by Ashley Killough quotes what the President said about ISIL’s not Islamic. No religion condones killing of innocents.

Then they have a number of tweets. According to the CNN article, Twitter just lit up with responses to the President saying that. Lots of retweets.

Let’s see, from Ron Christie: “ISIS isn’t Islamic? What kindergartner briefs the President on terrorism?”

Another: “Obama: ISIL is not Islamic? He just countermanded anything he plans to say tonight. Right there is the fatal flaw.”

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic? Hello? THIS ISIL, ‘Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant?’”

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic and Lois Lerner and the IRS is not corrupt.

Obama is such a freaking”— Well, Mr. Speaker, I can’t say that word. JOE WILSON said that and it was found not to be appropriate.

Another: “ISIL is not Islamic? Is he kidding? I suppose those black flags are just for giggles then.”

Another from the CNN article: “ISIL is not Islamic—POTUS opens a section aimed at motivating Muslims around the world to disown ISIL, aid U.S. fight.”

Another from Mohammed Ansar: “ISIL is not Islamic, says prime time @BarackObama (and virtually every Muslim and reasonably educated person on the face of our planet).”

□ 1400

Michael Oleaga: Some folks on Twitter didn’t understand Obama’s “ISIL is not Islamic” statement. Study foreign affairs, folks, or religion—all religion.

It is interesting because President Obama’s statement is apparently similar to the historic reaction that Thomas Jefferson had before he was President when he was negotiating with the radical Islamist Barbary pirates in northern Africa, who had been capturing American ships—killing, enslaving, holding people for ransom.

Jefferson was rather shocked when he reportedly indicated, “I don’t understand why you keep attacking us. We don’t have a navy. We are not a threat to you.”

It was explained to him, “We believe if we are killed while attacking infidels like you, then we will go instantly to paradise.”

Jefferson is perplexed, and he ends up getting his own copy of the Koran because he couldn’t believe that any religion would ever promote going to paradise for being killed while killing innocent people. He read for himself, and history can tell you exactly what his conclusion was.

As President, he ultimately decided that the only way to deal with these radical Islamists was not to keep paying 10 to 20 percent of the American budget for ransom to get people back.

The solution was to send this new group called the United States Marines to the shores of Tripoli to fight the radical Islamists with everything they had until they yelled “uncle” or were wiped out, and they ceased to come after Americans.

The President says:

I have insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government.

That strikes me as strange because if the Commander in Chief’s highest priority, as he said at the start of the speech, is the security of the American people, then it begs the question: Why is he so worried about what the Iraq Government does if he knows he has to do something to protect the American people?

Now, I remember Senator Obama repeatedly went after the Bush administration. It seemed that he thought little or nothing of the coalition that President George H. W. Bush put together with 43 countries to go in and liberate Kuwait and that he thought even less of the 49 countries that put people and money on the line to support the effort in Iraq—49 countries.

President Obama thought that was not a real coalition, yet they put people, and they put money. Now, magically, since he is President, he thinks a coalition of nine countries that he won't name or commit what they are going to put into the coalition is somehow better than the 49 countries' coalition that President Bush put together before going into the Middle East.

President Obama said:

In June, I deployed several hundred American servicemembers to Iraq.

He goes on to say:

We will send an additional 475 servicemembers to Iraq.

He has made very clear he is not going to put boots on the ground, as he said, in Iraq, so the only conclusion logically that you can make from the President's saying, on the one hand, we are not going to put boots on the ground in Iraq and that he has already sent several hundred soldiers and is sending 475 more, is that those thousand or so U.S. soldiers will be wearing sneakers.

He said that America will be joined by a broad coalition of partners. It is hard to believe that nine people who are a bit timid about being named and committed to what they will do are really that broad of a coalition.

He said "mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges."

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard from General Kelly, testifying before the House and the Senate—he is the commander of SOUTHCOM, the Southern Command—he knows what threats are to our south. As he testified, the penetration of our southern border by the criminal networks and radical Islamists, in his words, is an existential threat to the United States.

You have got the man who is supposed to know the most about the southern border and protecting us, telling Congress that the penetration going on of our southern border is a threat to the very existence of the United States of America.

So I would urge the President, Mr. Speaker, when he says he will "mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges," to change that word in his teleprompter to read "border" challenges, so that we can protect ourselves from the criminal networks and the potential for radical Islamists who want to destroy us from coming across our southern border.

I truly hope that the late Tom Clancy was not as clairvoyant in one of

his last novels as he was in the early nineties, when he wrote about someone who was irritated with the United States flying a jet into the Capitol to wipe out a joint session of Congress.

I love George W. Bush, but when he said "who would have ever thought somebody would use a plane for a bomb and crash it into a building," I was thinking, well, Tom Clancy several years ago, as that was in one of his novels.

In one of his recent novels, one of his last, he wrote about a coalition beginning to form between radical Islamists and drug cartels in Mexico and ultimately a deal where they brought in—I can't remember—10 or 12 radical Islamists with surface-to-air missiles.

They paid tremendously to the drug cartels to smuggle those into the United States, so they could get themselves in vans and, at the appropriate time in areas all across the country, step out and shoot down American passenger planes.

We know that although the radical Islamists are really insane—crazy—when it comes to the killing of innocent people, they are not stupid. When we give them an opening to come after us, they will take it. The President lost further credibility last night at a time when he really needed to be getting the world behind him.

Credibility was lost when he said:

It is America that has rallied the world against Russian aggression and in support of the Ukrainian people's right to determine their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, people around the world—as I have traveled in west Africa, north Africa, the Middle East, moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Europe—all understand that this President has done virtually nothing to help Ukraine.

They haven't rallied the peoples of the world, and when the people around the world hear that, they have to think: What? Does he think we are crazy ourselves?

You go back and see what this administration did in response to the invasion of Ukraine by Russia, and the response was a Twitter campaign. They actually did try to put restrictions on, as I recall, 10 or 11 bank accounts that the Russians laughed about.

This President needs to do more to rally the world around us—with us—against radical Islam, against imperialism, like we have seen from Putin, and we can all stand together.

After the President seemed to indicate that he wanted to take out ISIS—or he said "ISIL"—I really felt that when the President had finished last night, that I would be saying that that is something I have got to support, that I am with him. ISIS has said they are a threat to us. We need to take them seriously. They are cutting off American heads. We have got to take that seriously.

Yet when I hear the President, he wants to give support to the moderate, vetted Free Syrian Army; and we read the article from Patrick Poole, where he quotes one of those vetted, moderate Free Syrian Army brigade commanders, saying that his forces were working with the Islamic State and Jabhat al-Nusra, al Qaeda's official Syrian affiliate—both U.S.-designated terrorist organizations:

We are collaborating with the Islamic State and the Nusra Front by attacking the Syrian Army's gatherings in . . . Qalamoun.

Then a quote from another Free Syrian Army commander—vetted, moderate—that this President is going to help:

We have reached a point where we have to collaborate with anyone against unfairness and injustice.

Let's face it: the Nusra Front is the biggest power present right now in Qalamoun, and we as FSA would collaborate on any mission they launch as long as it coincides with our values.

I really expected to be standing today and saying we need to get behind the President's activity, just as I said in the last couple of weeks, immediately after the President's speech, that I agree, and let's go to war with ISIS; but with the President's wanting to continue what he has been doing for over a year—giving weapons to the Free Syrian Army which somehow, magically, keep having them taken away by the Islamic State—or ISIS/ISIL—the President finally suspended giving them more arms in December.

This President kept sending arms to the vetted, moderate Free Syrians, and they ended up in the hands of ISIS every time, so it was suspended in December. Then in April, for some reason—they think they can now trust the Free Syrians—he started sending more weapons to the Free Syrians, and magically, they keep ending up in ISIS/ISIL control.

This President does a speech last night, and now, we are supposed to get with him and send more weapons to the people whose leaders are saying publicly, "We support ISIS. We support al-Nusra. We support the enemies of the United States."

I yield to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for doing this Special Order and for giving me an opportunity to come down and not only listen to him, but to share a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we could have learned a lesson from Libya in the fact that we gave air support to the rebel groups that were overthrowing Qadhafi, who wanted Qadhafi gone.

Was Qadhafi a good man? No, but his enemies were the same as our enemies, and he had really turned over his nuclear arms, his chemical weapons. I mean, he had stopped with his nuclear

enhancement and had turned over his chemical weapons.

□ 1415

Yet we saw fit that we would help the rebels because of humanitarian reasons and what was going on.

You know, sometimes different sides get blamed for different things by just saying, "Oh, we didn't do that. Somebody else did that."

It was interesting that after Qadhafi was gone, all of a sudden, it becomes a wild west in Libya, and as a result of that, we had four brave Americans lose their lives in Benghazi because we were trying to play nice and be friends. Some people don't want to be our friend.

In fact, as the gentleman from Texas was talking about, the real ambition of these jihadists, these radical Islamic groups, is to really have shari'a law control the world.

They want all of us to be under the shari'a law, and that is what their goal is. In fact, if you look at ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, they want to go back in history and put together this caliphate that would include Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, and others. I mean, that is their goal.

For people who might get confused with ISIS, ISIL, Daesh—there are a lot of different names that this group is called. I think ISIL is the best because I think that describes their intent of gaining this area that was once held.

So I think we have to really think about this, as far as who we are going to train and arm. Do we know who these groups really are, as the gentleman from Texas read about the article that Patrick Poole had.

We have had fighters that went to Syria. In fact, we just had our first American fighter that was fighting for ISIL. I believe his name was Mr. McCain. He lived in Minneapolis. He went back to San Diego and finally ended up in Syria. I think Josh Earnest used in one of these press briefings that these moderate forces had killed Mr. McCain and that they were fighting both ISIL and Assad.

Now, the interesting thing about this moderate opposition group that killed Mr. McCain is that they killed other ISIL fighters too. They beheaded six of them. Now, I don't know how moderate that is, but according to American standards, that is not moderate.

So I think we really have to give some close scrutiny to these folks that we are going to arm, that we are going to give different weapons. We really don't have a list of what those weapons would be yet. We are going to let the military train them.

We trained the Iraqi military, their police, their defense force for, what, 7 years, I guess, or longer; and then at the first sight of combat, they left the American equipment that they had been given and fled. So I don't know

what kind of training we are going to give these moderate groups, but I know we haven't got 7 years to stop ISIL.

So I agree with my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), that I wish the President had used some different words rather than "degrade." Maybe "destroy"—maybe "defeat" would have been a great word to use, that we want to defeat them.

If you read open source reports, there are 10,000, and then you hear, "Well, now there are 15,000." Then we have got people in the government saying, "Well, they could be up to 30,000. We don't know how many there are."

I promise you, whether it was 30,000 or 50,000, we have got the greatest military in the world, and we could have controlled that situation if we just had the fortitude and the guts to do it, but because of the indecisiveness of this President, this thing has festered.

If we had gone into Syria originally—or at least armed the opposition forces then—we actually knew who they were because they were a small group. There is probably over 100 different opposition forces, and as the gentleman said, they are fighting both Assad and ISIL.

Now, to me, it is really confusing over there about who is fighting whom. If you look at Hamas and the Lebanese Army teaming up with them in Aarsal to drive out the rebels that Assad had driven into Lebanon, it is very confusing about who is on whose side.

We need to be particularly aware of that and make sure that we have a vetting process—if it is even possible—that we have a vetting process to make sure that these people are worthy of getting assistance from the American taxpayer.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he has time for one, because I am struggling a little bit.

Byron York has a good article out, published last night at 11:46, where he points out that there are some real potential problems. He says "five things that could go horribly wrong with Obama's action in Iraq." One of them, he mentions the lack of a status of forces agreement.

We all know that President Bush had been working on a status of forces agreement. He thought he would leave it to the President to accomplish that great task and have instant international credibility for signing a document immediately like that coming into office, but for whatever reason—we hear a lot of different stories—but it blew up, but the President says that we couldn't leave troops there without a status of forces agreement because you can't have troops in a country where you don't have, for example, an immunity agreement, so that American soldiers, American contractors that are there to help protect Iraq from harm—sometimes, bombs go off in the wrong place. Sometimes, somebody

gets killed that wasn't meant to be—cause it becomes a war zone.

As the President pointed out before, we couldn't leave troops there because we have no immunity agreement. Well, I haven't heard that there is any immunity agreement with Iraq, and yet he announced last night that he has already got several hundred American sneakers on the ground over there and is going to add 475 more troops—apparently wearing sneakers because there are not boots on the ground.

So I am needing some help here. Why is it safe to send in American troops now without the promise, the agreement of immunity from Iraq when it was not safe to do so when he took office? I am struggling here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, and you should. People claim it is all Bush's fault or that it was all the prior administration's fault that this happened.

By the withdrawal of our troops—because I am telling you, I think President Bush laid it out pretty clear in 2007, when he made that speech about how a lot of people in Washington were clamoring about getting our troops out, and he said, "We are not going to get our troops out until our ground commanders in Iraq tell us that we are ready to get our troops out."

He points out the dangers of that, and that is exactly what happened. I think if this administration had understood that and had actually listened to the former President, who had been involved in all the things that had gone on recently in the Middle East, then they would have been persistent enough to persuade Maliki to allow for some agreement.

Now, you know, I don't understand all the politics that have gone into this, but I think last night he authorized another 475 sneakers on the ground, and I think there was already roughly, what, 900-and-something over there.

So we have a lot of guys over there, but we don't know what they are doing, and I don't know that they know what they are doing.

What are the rules of engagement? Are they carrying weapons? Are they carrying notebooks, iPads? What are they doing? I mean, these are some of the most well-trained people that we have in our military. These are valuable assets to us that are over there, and just from the reports I read, I don't see that they really have any operational plan that they are going with.

So that has got to be really confusing. I would think, if I was over there, as to what the rules of engagement were and, you know, if I was going to be sent out as an adviser or as protection, security forces for the Americans that are there, Erbil or Baghdad or wherever they are, so I think it is confusing to them too.

I think that that is the reason, as you mentioned in one of your speeches

today that I heard, about the resolution, so we can actually define what we think and what our committees think would be a good military plan for going in and what the expectation was of any forces that we have over there, whether it is air or some of these boots on the ground.

Let's clarify that and make that a separate vote.

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it is worth pointing out what concerns many others in the world, and that is the judgment of this administration.

As we travel around the world, we have allies who talk to us privately, leaders in countries in the Middle East, moderate Muslims, people in Israel, and they keep asking about the judgment of this country, of the national leaders.

Everybody knows that this President agreed to release five Taliban terrorists complicit with murder, and the statement has come out on August 27—this is after the release of five Taliban murderers by this administration. This statement has gone out, and it is in their language. The translation says, in part, "We consider ISIS and every other Mujahedin group as our brothers."

That is kind of important to understand when he released the Taliban Five—who don't have a problem with cutting people's heads off or friends cutting people's heads off, they support ISIS—and the President did so in violation of the law.

It required that there not be one dime of American money spent to release somebody from Guantanamo unless the law was complied with, and the law required a notice of 30 days to people in Congress, and that didn't happen.

He broke the law in order to help the lawbreakers. So people around the world see that, and they are puzzled, and I happened to be standing here on the House floor with one of the two other people that went to the FBI disclosure. They classified it, which I thought was ridiculous.

We wanted to see the documents that the FBI and their advisers on Islam had purged from the FBI training materials. Now, these are the materials that train FBI agents—the kind of people that have to go talk to Tsarnaev and his mother and people at the mosque and friends—who have to know the questions and what to look for that might indicate that this person has been radicalized.

□ 1430

Now, since they classified those materials they purged, we went through them, but we don't get to disclose what is in them. But I can say I was shocked at how ridiculous some of the purging was. Some things were purely from—well, some of them were so clearly important, that people trying to learn

about radical Islam, it is important that they know and understand.

So, once you understand that there has been that kind of purging of material, then you begin to understand how this administration could get two—not one, two—heads-up from a country like Russia that Tsarnaev was radicalized, he could kill people, you better watch him, you better check on him, he is dangerous, he is going to hurt people, and they do nothing meaningful about it.

As we found out through a hearing in Judiciary, at first Mueller said, We did go to those mosques. But it turns out he said it was on their outreach program. They never went out there to see whether they were radicalized.

And then, we knew at the time—Mr. Speaker, I hold here the articles from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, articles of organization for the Islamic Society of Boston, and the Islamic Society of Boston is the one that organized the two mosques. And the organizing official is a man named al-Amoudi, which was familiar to the FBI Director because, on his watch, although he had helped the Clinton administration hire what were thought to be moderate Muslims in the Clinton administration and he had originally had an agreement to be of assistance to the Bush administration, the Bush administration ultimately finds out he is supporting terrorism. They have him arrested out here at Dulles Airport, and he's now doing 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism. He's the one that organized the Islamic Society of Boston that created the two mosques where the Tsarnaevs went. The FBI didn't even know that a guy they helped convict of supporting terrorism started the mosque that has created terrorists out of more than one person.

There are others that we find out that have had relations with that mosque that may be a threat. One other thing I want to mention before I yield to my friend. We have a chart—I have had a blowup of this used before, but it points out how many times, as this points out, terminology is important in defining our goals. The 9/11 Commission identifies Islamist terrorism as the threat. The Muslim Public Affairs Council recommends that the U.S. Government find other terminology.

So, in the 9/11 Commission Report, bipartisan, bicameral people trying to take an objective look, they used the term 322 times in the 9/11 Commission Report. However, the last FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon does not include the word "Islam." The National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 does not include the word "Islam." In the 9/11 Commission Report, it used the word "Muslim" 145 times, but since then, under this administration, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon doesn't use the word "Muslim." It doesn't use the

word "jihad." It doesn't use the word "enemy." Now, it does use the words "violent extremism" 29 times. In the 9/11 Commission Report, it uses the word "religious," and it is normally referencing these radical Islamists. It uses that word "religious" 65 times; whereas, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon only uses it three times.

Then the President, basically the only time he used it last night was to say that people that called themselves Islamists are not religious. The people who have had their heads cut off by these people in the name of Islam are looking at what we are doing, I believe, and wondering: How can you say that was not, in their minds, a religious act to cut off my head?

I think, as a Christian, there are references in the Bible. I think people know what goes on here. We know from Scripture that there is rejoicing in Heaven over one soul being saved. Well, how could they rejoice unless they know what is going on? So I think people that have had their heads cut off would have to be wondering about the President's assessment.

"Al Qaeda" was used 36 times in the 9/11 Commission Report, but in the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon, not used at all. In the National Intelligence Strategy of 2009 under this administration, it is used once. "Caliph," that is not used at all by this administration in their FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon; National Intelligence Strategy of 2009, the 9/11 Commission Report used it seven times. And it is a little more understandable, too, when you find out that one of the advisers on the Homeland Security Advisory Council that Janet Napolitano put there and gave a secret clearance is named Mohamed ElLibary.

There is an article from Adam Kredo, and he quotes a tweet sent out by the Homeland Security Advisory Council member, and the tweet says:

The caliphate will return; that is inevitable.

Well, we know now that the Homeland Security Advisory Council member's tweet has been used by ISIS in recruiting, that even this President's close adviser on Homeland Security that he has secret access to our databases given by this administration, that he is out there saying the caliphate is inevitable. So it is being used to recruit people to kill Americans. The Homeland Security Advisory Council has people helping with recruiting for terrorists to kill Americans.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, when the five of us went in that 12-by-12 room—

Mr. GOHMERT. I think it was three Members of Congress, you, me, and MICHELE, but then there were two FBI agents sitting there, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Well, there was one more Member, I know, TRENT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, that's right. TRENT came, too.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. So there were four of us in a 12-by-12 and two FBI agents and several boxes of paperwork, and they were nice enough to bring one copy so we could share.

The FBI is the greatest. I mean, they are great crime fighters. They do great investigative work. I think it was probably under great political pressure that they purged these documents to take those words out of it. Like you said, even the 9/11 Commission did that.

I want to go back to what you said about our allies and indecisiveness, if I could.

LOUIE, we look at what is going on in the country and we all talk to small business people every day, and they go: You know what? We are not going to expand our business. We are not going to grow because we don't know what our health insurance is going to be; we don't know what our energy cost is going to be; we don't know what the regulations are going to be. So it is kind of a stalemate. I think that is the way our allies look at us. They don't know what our next move is. So, with all this uncertainty, there are different elements that are coming in and filling that void in us being the world leader—Russia being one of them, coming in to fill that void.

People like to know that there is a leader somewhere that they can follow. I just don't think our allies in this world have seen that. Now we have actually got Germany and France and others leading different parts of these charges where America should have been out in front of it.

I know our time is just about up. I want to thank my friend from Texas for allowing me to share with him. I look forward to doing some more of the Special Orders with him and making sure we can get the truth out.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have another article that accentuates what my friend from Georgia was saying about our allies not being sure what we are going to do. Unfortunately, our enemies seem to know very well what we are going to do. It is an article published by Al Bawaba, published today. It says—we've identified Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. Well, the deputy leader of Hezbollah, Sheikh Naim Qassem, has said:

"The flurry of international activity, which is sponsored by the U.S., is not serious in ending the takfiri threat . . . He said Obama spoke of 'containing' the threat and not 'stopping' it."

I am quoting from him.

"Comments made by Barack Obama are clear. The word 'contain' means to identify risks and disable some of its objectives while maintaining this terrorist organization's role to frighten certain countries in this region and to keep this risk as a scarecrow in appropriate places to make political gains, particularly in Iraq and Syria."

Our enemies know that this President's speech last night indicated he's not serious. We have got to get serious.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today, because on Monday a very important hearing, the first of its kind in two decades, a hearing on statehood for the District of Columbia will take place in the Senate of the United States.

The hearing is called by Senator CARPER, the Chair of the Jurisdictional Committee. This hearing takes place at a time and in a season when we have seen unusual progress for statehood for the District of Columbia.

□ 1445

In the Senate, the majority leader himself became a cosponsor of the bill and indeed announced it with great energy, which is very unusual because the majority leader of the Senate cosponsors very few bills. The top Democratic leaders are sponsors of the bill. The bill has more House and Senate sponsors than is has ever had. Together this is normally seen as momentum, Mr. Speaker.

Now, when I say we are having the first Senate hearing in two decades, it is not because we haven't tried to get a Senate hearing or because a Senate or House hearing on statehood was what was on the agenda for each immediate period. The District of Columbia residents have tried many ways to get their equal rights to other American citizens. There has been a House Voting Rights Act. I would have the vote on the House floor as I speak had an amendment not passed that sought to wipe away all the gun laws of the District of Columbia. There have been bills for House and Senate votes. There have been bills for budget autonomy, and we are still seeking budget autonomy.

Through all of this, we have always sought statehood for the District of Columbia because, Mr. Speaker, there is no way for the District to get the same rights that every other American has without statehood. I will go into that a little later.

The Senate hearing is entitled: "Equality for the District of Columbia: Discussing the Implications of S. 132, the New Columbia Admissions Act."

That is the companion bill to my bill here in the House, H.R. 292.

I want to take a moment to thank Senator TOM CARPER, who is the new chair of the committee of jurisdiction, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. As you might expect, that committee has a lot on its plate, and, yet, in only his first term as chair, Senator CARPER has made many strides forward and always has been very helpful to the District of Columbia, and now culminates the work that he and I have done in the Senate with a hearing. It is a hearing that we, of course, requested, but it is a hearing that he had to be willing to do and find time for on a very busy agenda. I cannot thank Senator CARPER enough in the name of the people of the District of Columbia for affording us the opportunity to be heard.

We do not pretend that statehood is around the corner. We do know this: that if we do not continue to use vehicles like hearings to put the matter before the House and the Senate, and before the people of the United States, we cannot build to the point where we can achieve what we will achieve, statehood for the 650,000 people who live in the Nation's Capital.

When I say this is the first hearing, I do want to say that Senator Joe Lieberman, who was the prior chairman of the Senate Homeland and Governmental Affairs Committee, was also a great champion for statehood. And while he didn't have a hearing, he introduced a bill for statehood that achieved the majority of committee votes. And indeed there was a hearing for statehood when my first bill, the bill when I first came to Congress in the early 1990s, came to the floor and we got the first and only vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. There was a Senate hearing. It was not a jurisdictional hearing. And that is what this hearing is, and therefore it is a landmark hearing. It is a historic hearing. And that is why I felt it merited my coming to the House floor today.

On top of the momentum that we have now seen in the Senate, I shouldn't leave the subject without mentioning the momentum that has been here in the House. We have Republican and Democratic support for budget autonomy for the District of Columbia, for example. That is a very essential element of statehood, that is, your own budget, your own local funds, and nobody gets to look at it but you, your own jurisdiction. That is not what the District has now. That is what some Republicans and most Democrats believe we should, indeed have.

There is not yet the kind of support for statehood that I expect to see in the House of Representatives, but we will be glad to work with the Senate and the House when it lives up to its own principles that every American is

entitled to be treated equally in the Congress and in our country.

Quite aside from the progress we have seen in the House and the Senate on statehood and on the particular elements of statehood, we now have the formal endorsement of the President of the United States for statehood.

I would like to quote what he said when he endorsed the bill:

I have long believed that folks in D.C. pay taxes like everybody else, they contribute to the overall well-being of the country like everybody else, they should be represented like everybody else. It is not as if Washington is not big enough compared with other States. It is absolutely the right thing to do.

I will have something to say about the population of the District of Columbia as compared with other States in a few minutes.

Now, of course, I wasn't surprised that the President of the United States supported statehood. The reason I wasn't surprised is because he has long supported and been on record as supporting all of the elements of statehood: budget autonomy, the right of the people of the District of Columbia, who raise \$7 billion, to spend their own money without coming to this Chamber, which has raised not one penny of it. He has long supported that and has put budget autonomy in his own budget. Legislative autonomy so that the Congress doesn't have some say over the District of Columbia's laws, the President has put that in his own budget. And the President, going back to the time that he was in the Senate of the United States, supported voting rights for the District of Columbia.

So there you have it, voting rights, legislative autonomy, and budget autonomy, the elements of statehood. We have Members of this House and of the Senate who have long supported all of them. We want to bring it all together with support of statehood for the District of Columbia. So there will be then a historic hearing at, I believe it is 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon with witnesses who are particularly able to speak to the issues.

Professor Viet Dinh of Georgetown Law School, a professor of constitutional law, a former U.S. assistant attorney for legal policy in the Bush administration. That made him the highest legal policy official in the Bush Justice Department. He has previously testified here in the House about the constitutionality of the D.C. House Voting Rights Act. He will testify as to the constitutionality of our statehood bill.

Alice Rivlin, who, of course, was the Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve Board and Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget, and, finally, as a D.C. resident, was called upon by the President to chair the Financial Control Board of the District of Columbia, will testify at that hearing. Now, of course, Dr. Rivlin is an expert

on the Nation's economy and on the finances of the District of Columbia. We are very pleased that Wade Henderson of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights will also testify, a longtime champion of statehood and equal rights for the District of Columbia.

The elected officials of the District of Columbia will testify, of course, the mayor, the chair of the City Council and I, and also the statehood delegation.

At the same time that we have been pressing on what amounts to two tracks for statehood, we have been making the progress I have indicated on the elements of statehood, such as budget and legislative autonomy.

In this House, we have got to work on what we need to work on all at the same time. There is no sequential matter when it comes to the many rights that the residents of the District of Columbia are denied. However, with the many issues on which we have struggled for equality one at a time, sometimes two or three at a time, statehood has always been what the residents—the American citizens who live in the District of Columbia—have needed and wanted. And it is during this Congress that statehood has gotten great footing.

I do want to thank the growing statehood movement and coalition, the many residents who struggle for statehood and have helped us in so many ways, including many in the statehood coalition who went around asking for cosponsors.

I think among the reasons that statehood has gotten so much momentum this year is that the residents of the District of Columbia are fed up with paying such high Federal taxes without equal representation in the Congress of the United States. They have simply had it on second-class citizenship.

As if to dramatize what it means to be a second-class citizen, there were several violations of the rights of the people who live in the District of Columbia as American citizens this year which highlighted the need for statehood. The House actually passed two provisions that would overturn laws passed by the Council of the District of Columbia, laws that were entirely local in their nature. Imagine what would happen if the Congress tried to pass a law to overturn some law in Maryland, Virginia, Oklahoma, Utah, California, or New Hampshire. People would think the Congress had lost its mind.

Because of the anomaly of the status of the District of Columbia as a district and not a State, the Congress can meddle in—if you will forgive me—the local business of the District of Columbia. Two Members decided to and, in fact, got passed in this House bills that overturned our local laws. I am pleased to say that as of now those bills have and will not be passed in the con-

tinuing resolution that is pending in the House or the Senate.

Thus far, we have been successful despite the passage of these two bills. One of them was passed by Representative THOMAS MASSIE, a Republican who lives in Kentucky. He lives in a county of 11,000 people, but has sought and absolutely got passed in the House—a bill that would keep the District of Columbia—which has 650,000 people—from having any local gun laws. None. All the local gun laws would be gone. This is a big city, people. The reason big cities have gun laws of the kind that you will not find in Kentucky is because of the difference—the differences we all respect in our country. Moreover, public safety—think about it—is the quintessential local concern. You depend upon your own local officials who know you best, and whom you have elected to deal first and foremost with public safety. Nobody would try to tell somebody what to do about public safety in her own district.

□ 1500

Yet that is what Representative MASSIE tried to do. This is in spite of the fact that in 1973, though not yet for statehood, the Congress of the United States, recognizing how un-American it was to try to pass laws or to interfere with the laws of a local jurisdiction, devolved local lawmaking authority to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Until this year, most Members on both sides of the aisle had respected that. To be sure, we have had to fight them off in prior years, but we had a long run where nobody tried to interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia.

Thus, it was surprising to us that Representative MASSIE, who is a Tea Party Republican, who stands first and foremost for localism, would leave those principles when it came to the District of Columbia and try to interfere with local matters in this city.

We had the same thing happen to another colleague, a Republican from Maryland, who should have known better, who has a particular distaste for the decriminalization of marijuana laws that is happening all over the United States—18 States so far, plus legalization in two States—so he tried to get a law and passed a bill, that we now have kept from getting through the Senate, that would block the District's recently passed marijuana decriminalization law. Our law would require that it be a fine rather than a conviction for possessing marijuana.

The District didn't do this for the reason that some States, the 18 States, perhaps some of them did—although some of them may have done it for the same reason we did it. Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate in the United States and in D.C.

Yet in the District, 90 percent of those who had criminal convictions for

possessing small amounts of marijuana were Black. Half the population is Black; half is White. These laws have had an obvious racial effect.

I am not for smoking anything, but I must tell you I also don't believe that people ought to have a criminal conviction because they possessed marijuana any more than they ought to have a criminal conviction for possessing alcohol. In any case, whatever you think, that is not your business, it is a local matter, and the District ought to have the same right when it comes to local matters as they have.

This was Representative ANDY HARRIS. What was ironic about his trying to block the District's marijuana decriminalization laws is that he couldn't block it in his own State of Maryland, which has decriminalized marijuana.

Perhaps what pointed most to the need for statehood this year was what the District went through this past appropriation period when it almost got shut down, not because of anything the city had done, but because this House and this Senate shut down.

The District was an innocent bystander, but because the Congress still requires that the District's local budget pass through this House and Senate—the budget was here a budget of \$7 billion, raised by the people and the businesses I represent, not one dime of it Federal money, a balanced budget, the likes of which the Federal Government has not seen since the Clinton administration, \$1.5 billion in reserves, and there is virtually no State in the Union that has that kind of reserves—and yet when the Federal Government shut down, the District of Columbia was in jeopardy of shutting down—this despite the fact that I have a shutdown avoidance bill, that shutdown avoidance was in the President's budget, but not passed.

The mayor did the right thing, for the first time in American history. He refused to shut down. What are you going to do to him?

What he did instead was to keep the District open, but pay for our employees and our services out of contingency funds. Those funds were almost exhausted before the Federal Government finally opened up, and the District finally didn't have to worry about spending its contingency funds and got its local budget.

If you face our citizens with that kind of challenge over time, obviously, they begin to feel that they have to find a remedy. Yes, residents have been trying to find a remedy for more than 200 years, and there are interesting historical reasons why it hasn't happened, but whatever those reasons are, the time is at hand when it is impossible to call yourself the United States of America, which stands for equality for citizens throughout the world, and not begin to apply that same principle to the people who live in your own Nation's Capital.

We have been preparing for this hearing for some time. We took particular pains on what is called D.C. Emancipation Day. D.C. celebrates this day, April 16, every year because it is the day that Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in the District of Columbia before the slaves were freed in other parts of the country.

DC Emancipation Day, the District's way of saying there is an absence of freedom that still exists in your own Nation's Capital.

As Emancipation Day came—by chance, the U.N. Human Rights Committee issued a report indicating that the denial of voting rights in the House and Senate to the residents of the District of Columbia was a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a treaty which the United States signed in 1992.

So let's be clear: by not granting equal citizenship rights to the people who live in the Nation's Capital, the United States, this Congress, is in violation of international law.

On Emancipation Day, I did not come to the floor to speak about the slaves. That was then; this is now. It has always been interesting to me because my great-grandfather was a runaway slave from Virginia and was in the District of Columbia on Emancipation Day, but Emancipation Day cannot be about nostalgia.

The residents of the District of Columbia put it to good use. I thought what I ought to do was, in preparation for what I knew Senator CARPER wanted to do, to come to the floor to speak about why we should have statehood—what is it about the residents of the District of Columbia that merited statehood?

Well, first, let's start with the most elementary of qualifications, and that is the population. Yes, this is a city. Yes, it is called a district. It is the District of Columbia. Yes, we have a population equal to, but in this case, larger than the population of two States that have two Senators and, by the way, a Member, one Member, to represent the entire State, just like I represent the residents of the District of Columbia—the states are Vermont and Wyoming, one in the West and one in the East.

What does that say to you? It says the Framers believed in equality. They wanted everybody to have representation in the House and the Senate. When there was a dispute between the large and the small States, they made a compromise and gave the small States equal representation in the Senate and what amounts to per capita representation here.

There is no question that there are enough people here for statehood. I mention Vermont and Wyoming because we are larger than those States, but there are half a dozen States which have a population about equal to that of the District of Columbia. That is the first qualification.

Let's take a look at the one that will probably get the attention of more Americans than any others, and that is taxes paid. On our license plate, you will see the words "taxation without representation." Let's put that in dollars and cents.

We are not just talking about paying taxes without representation. I am talking about paying more taxes per capita than any other jurisdiction without representation, almost \$12,000 per resident of the District of Columbia in taxes paid to support the Federal Government, which does not reciprocate with voting representation in the House and the Senate.

I have the vote in committee. As the representative of the District of Columbia, I have the same rights to come to this floor and to do everything else that other Members do, except that which is emblematic of my citizenship and the citizenship of the people I represent, and that, of course, is the final vote on the House floor.

This poster is simply a graph to show you the vast differences in taxes per capita paid throughout the United States. It goes from \$12,000 down to Mississippi, which pays—Mississippi citizens pay \$4,000 per capita to the Federal Government, with the same rights that those who pay more, as should be the case, and it should also be the case that those of us who live in the Nation's Capital, who pay more and more than all others, should have the same rights as all others.

Just to dig down further into what this means, Vermont, which I indicated is a State somewhat smaller than the District, pays about half the taxes, \$6,000 per resident. Wyoming pays \$8,000 per resident. These are both compared to our \$12,000.

California, if you look at the large States of the Union, pays \$8,000 per person compared to the District of Columbia's \$12,000 per person.

Perhaps of all of the qualifications for statehood, none is more worthy of mention than the sacrifices District of Columbia residents have made throughout the more than 200 years of our existence as the Nation's Capital for our country in the wars of the United States, often suffering casualties above and beyond those of States that are considerably larger in population than the District of Columbia.

□ 1515

So let's look at some of the major wars of the 20th century.

In World War I, there were more D.C. casualties than in three States of the Union. In World War II, there were more D.C. casualties than in four States of the Union. In the Korean war, there were more D.C. casualties than eight States of the Union. In the Vietnam war, there were more casualties than 10 States of the Union. There is a memorial for the 635 D.C. residents who died in World War I on The Mall.

It is in that sacrifice that we feel most dishonored as a jurisdiction. How could our country continue to send our residents to war without granting those who go to war, often to get rights for others, the same rights that we afford every citizen of our own country?

All of the essential elements, even the one that is hardest to endure without full equality, all of the elements of citizenship have long been made by the residents of the District of Columbia, as well as all of the elements of statehood.

So why not statehood? That is a fair question.

What was wrong with the Framers? Why didn't they make the District of Columbia a State in the first place?

Well, nothing was wrong with the Framers. The District of Columbia is a historic anomaly. It is a figment of history and an incident in history that could not happen today.

The reason the District of Columbia is not a State is an accident that must be corrected. The accident came out of the meeting of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1783. There were some angry Revolutionary War soldiers. They did what citizens do. I must say, though, that they went not only to petition the Continental Congress, but they took their guns with them. And while it is not said that a shot was fired, they did point their guns at the windows where the Continental Congress was meeting.

Well, the Pennsylvania and Philadelphia authorities didn't know what to do. They didn't want to go out after the Revolutionary War heroes, so the Continental Congress said: We better get out of here. So they fled Philadelphia.

Well, that stuck in the Framers' minds. They said: My goodness, States are not going to protect us, so I guess we must have a District that is controlled entirely by the Federal Government.

Well, when I say that it is an accident of history, do understand that that history is long gone. The way in which we protect the Nation's Capital today is the same way it would be protected in the event of statehood. The Federal Government, and the District of Columbia government—after all, it is the same area of land—get together to protect the District, whether it is from 9/11 or from any other threat.

You can't rest, then, on any notion that the Framers intended to have any residents who did not have equal rights. The existence of a jurisdiction that did not have full and equal rights was not in the capacity of the Framers to envision. Those who fought the Revolutionary War lived in the Nation's Capital, those parts of Maryland and Virginia which became the Nation's Capital.

The brilliant Framers realized that they did not have all the answers. They

had every reason to think that this would be fixed. And one reason we know that they understood that things could get fixed—shame on us that for over 200 years we haven't fixed this moral outrage—one reason we know that they understood it could be fixed is what they did to make the residents of the Nation's Capital equal in the first place.

During the 10-year transition from the territory in Maryland and Virginia to form the Nation's Capital, the Framers did not want those residents to be left without their equal rights for even one second. So while they had jurisdiction, they saw to it that during that transition period when they weren't really a part of Maryland and Virginia and weren't really a part of the new Capital, they would retain their rights.

Those people who lived in Maryland and Virginia who were on their way to becoming the Nation's Capital still voted in those two States and had every single right preserved until jurisdiction passed to the United States Congress. And that is when tyranny set in—the tyranny of not having that representation carried over under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

In 1801, when we became the Nation's Capital, the people of the District of Columbia went into the streets to demand their rights. They have been in the streets demanding their full rights ever since, as any red-blooded Americans would be.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried every route, some of it more gradual than others, to pursue and to obtain our full rights as American citizens. We have tried voting rights for the House, voting rights for the House and Senate, all other ways—budget autonomy, legislative autonomy. Even if we had gotten those, they would have been insufficient, but it says everything about the shortcomings of the Congress that even those insufficient routes to statehood are not yet a part of our law.

On September 15, there will be a full jurisdictional Senate hearing. That hearing will take place next Monday. That hearing will set an important guidepost. It will educate many in the Senate and House and many in our country about what the people of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, do not now have and what they are entitled to.

There can be no doubt that no American would believe that those who pay taxes as they do should not have the same representation in the House and Senate that they do. There isn't any American who would say that the funds that are locally raised in your local jurisdiction should come to the Congress of the United States for any reason.

I do not believe that our problem lies with the people of our country. I do believe that many of them are not fully aware that their own Capital is less free than any part of our country.

So what we will hear on next Monday is not all about the moral reasons; some of them, of course, but also the reasons that go to our creed as Americans and go to practical matters such as whether the Federal government should be able to close down the District of Columbia when they have a disagreement among themselves at the Federal level. We will hear not only the moral reasons, but the practical reasons for statehood.

So, Mr. Speaker, we seek statehood in the name of the people I represent, perhaps even more so in the name of the thousands of American citizens who happened to live in the District of Columbia and went to war for their country in Germany, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq but never came home, and in the name of those who will once again protect our country now that the President has indicated that we ourselves must take on the fight against ISIS.

On this 9/11, as we remember those innocent people who died simply because they happened to be in New York and Pennsylvania, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress remember the 650,000 people who live in the Nation's Capital, who are proud of their residency in the District of Columbia, many of whom, like me, a third-generation Washingtonian, are proud of their lineage in the Nation's Capital.

In the name of all those I represent, I ask for statehood for the District of Columbia so that our residents may have equal citizenship, those same rights which led the Founders of our country to create the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST WITH ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the events in the Middle East and with ISIS, and I want to address three separate areas. The first is what should be the role of Congress in deciding American policy on these horrific events.

Second is to respond to the unjustified attacks on the President of the United States by those who claim he doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a detailed enough plan, doesn't have a perfect plan, or whatever.

And the third is to discuss what should be our policy in the Middle East and what dangers there are, no matter which policy we pursue.

As we try to protect our Nation, we should also protect our Constitution.

Article I of the Constitution vests in Congress the exclusive duty to decide when we declare war, when we go to war.

Article II makes the President of the United States Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

These two provisions need to be reconciled so that both the Congress and the President can make the decisions that the Constitution charges to them in our foreign and military policy.

This is not a new issue. President Jefferson sent our Marines, in the words of the song, "to the shores of Tripoli" in 1801. This was our first foreign military deployment. This was our first fighting and involvement in the Middle East. And most relevant today, it was the first use of our military abroad in the absence of a formal declaration of war.

Well, what did Thomas Jefferson think was the appropriate congressional role?

Thomas Jefferson sought and obtained advance authorization to put our Marines ashore in North Africa.

We still face the same constitutional provisions, but several decades ago, we passed the War Powers Act, a reasonable statute that harmonizes the two provisions of the Constitution that I have discussed.

The War Powers Act makes it clear that the President can act for 60 or 90 days without the authorization of Congress, but that is it. Beyond those time limits, deployments require congressional authorization.

Now, we have heard from the President that he respects Congress, likes us, consults with us, and would welcome our support. But the President, I am sure, consults with many academics and think tanks and foreign officials, not as a constitutional duty, but just because it makes sense to consult with them. And the President would welcome the support of The Heritage Foundation or The New York Times editorial board for his policies.

Saying that you welcome the support of Congress, or that you consult with Congress, has nothing to do with the legal rights of Congress and the American people.

Now, the President has taken a very unusual legal stance. He asserted broadly last night that he has the authority to conduct the bombing campaign, but he needs Congress to approve training Syrians and providing arms. This stands the Constitution on its head.

The main decision to be made here is whether we put our pilots and/or soldiers in harm's way, whether we wage war and cause casualties, and perhaps incur casualties. The far less important decision is whether we train a few hundred or a few thousand Syrians and provide them with weapons.

Keep in mind, this training and arming of Syrians has occurred for well

over a year without congressional authorization.

What is happening here is the President wants us to vote in favor of his plan, or to take a vote of Congress and claim it is a vote in favor of his plan, when, in fact, we would only be voting on the smallest part of that plan, and that is, whether, without any risk of casualties to ourselves, without any risk that we would be directly causing casualties in the Middle East, to provide training to Syrian rebels. This is hardly what the Constitution requires.

Today, in response to my questions, the President's Deputy National Security Adviser explained, for the first time from this administration, why they think they have authorization to bomb Iraq and Syria without any further action from Congress. He cited the authorization to use military force passed in this House 13 years ago, in response to the tragic events which occurred 13 years ago to this day.

When Congress authorized going after al Qaeda, we never envisioned that that authority would be used in this manner.

Just as important, the President's plan is to go after ISIS, which has been repudiated by al Qaeda, which broke from al Qaeda, and which wages war against the al-Nusra Front, which is part of al Qaeda.

It is difficult to say that an authorization to use force against al Qaeda is an authorization to use force against those who are fighting al Qaeda, but it is a technical argument.

On the President's side, you can say that al Qaeda splintered, and that all the splinters constitute part of the organization that attacked us 13 years ago to this day.

That is why Congress needs to revise the authorization to use military force of 2001. We passed it for one purpose. Is it going to be there for 100 years?

Is it going to authorize things we never imagined?

Or shouldn't Congress define what it is we are authorizing under today's circumstance?

The other argument raised by the President's Deputy National Security Adviser is that the authorization to go to war against Saddam Hussein somehow applies to this situation. A reading of that resolution clearly shows that it is confined to Iraq, and would not justify that portion of the President's plan, a necessary portion, that involves bombing Syria.

So, again, Congress should vote on our authorization to use military force that is crafted to this situation at this time. But it is unlikely that we will do so because there is almost a silent conspiracy here in Washington.

Presidents want more power to act as they decide in the national interest, without having to ask Congress for authority. Members of Congress sometimes just want to avoid a tough vote.

So, the desire of the President to have all power, and the desire of some Members of this House to avoid responsibility, coincide with the idea of the President just boldly saying he has the authority to enter a new conflict and to enter it for far more than 60 or 90 days, and Congress never has to vote on the matter.

The President, of course, would like to say that he has a vote of Congress in favor of his plan. So we are going to end up with the sneakiest of all maneuvers.

What is likely to occur, and I hope it doesn't, is that we will vote next week on whether to continue government operations, whether to fund the government for the next several months, whether to prevent our national parks from closing, and buried in there will be a provision authorizing and funding the training of Syrian dissidents, and we will pass that package.

The President will claim that since we funded and authorized the training of Syrian dissidents, we voted for his entire plan, including the bombing. And Members of Congress can say they had no choice but to vote for the Syrian provision, but didn't actually like it, never really voted for it. They just voted to keep the national parks open. A silent conspiracy of empowerment and shirking responsibility.

What we should do next week is have three separate votes: one vote on whether to fund and authorize the arming of Syrians, because the President has asked for that vote; second, a vote on whether to authorize military force limited exclusively to air forces and not authorizing ground operations; and the third would be a vote to go further and authorize ground operations.

The exact contours of these resolutions should be subject to amendment and open amendment in this House. We would have to deal with the duration and the exact limitations. But then we would be performing our constitutional duty. Then we would be protecting the American Constitution.

I fear that, instead, we will cleverly avoid responsibility and the President will be able to say, ah, but you voted for my plan.

Now, in defense of the President, I want to respond to the constant harping that the President doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a detailed enough plan, doesn't have a strategy.

Well, first the President put forward a plan last evening. While Republicans have blasted it as insufficiently detailed, it is just as detailed as the plans put forward by the former President to invade Afghanistan and to invade Iraq.

Now, keep in mind, as we learned from those wars, whatever plan is put forward is going to be dramatically changed because once you engage in hostilities, things change.

Second, if the President were to provide as much detail as some

hyperpartisan Republicans are demanding, he would then be attacked for revealing our strategy, our tactics, and classified information.

The only thing that holds together, creates consistency among certain extremist partisan Republicans, is that whatever the President does, it is wrong.

Then I have got to ask, where is the Republican plan?

Have Republicans coalesced around any plan?

Has any prominent Republican even put forward a plan?

Where is your plan?

Vice President Dick Cheney has not put forward a plan, just an expression of anger and partisanship. Speaker BOEHNER has not put forward a plan. The Republican-controlled House Armed Services Committee majority has not put forward a plan.

There are a host of think tanks here in Washington that could aid Republicans in drafting a plan, yet, the Republicans have yet to even discuss their own plan, let alone coalesce around the Republican plan.

It seems like the Republicans do have a plan. Their plan is to reap political advantage from this crisis in the Middle East, while avoiding any responsibility for making decisions.

The Republicans are politically clever. And when I say Republicans in this speech, I am referring only to the hyperpartisan Republicans who have engaged in the activities that I described.

These Republicans understand that no one can draft the plan the American people really want. Americans want a plan that guarantees the immediate and total destruction of ISIS, without significant American casualties.

So hyperpartisan Republicans can constantly berate the President because he doesn't have a guarantee. He isn't offering immediate total destruction. He does have a plan designed to avoid American casualties.

Instead, we get a suggestion that somehow this guaranteed, no-cost, immediate total victory would be achieved if only we had a different President.

I think it is time for Congress to stop harping about whether the President has a plan. He has put forth a plan.

Now Congress must exercise its constitutional role in defining what authorizations the President is going to be granted and what portions of his plan are going to be authorized.

I look forward to—I hope, though doubt—a serious debate on the floor of this House, where we will discuss and vote on and amend and vote on the amendments of a resolution dealing with whether to arm Syrians and train them, with a resolution as to whether to have a long-term, multiyear, perhaps, bombing campaign against ISIS, and whether the President is authorized to use ground forces.

□ 1545

Finally, I want to focus on the Middle East, itself, and how complicated the situation is, and I want to praise the President not only for his decisive action but also for his wise caution, because the situation we face in the Middle East is far more complicated than the President's detractors would let on.

The natural reaction upon seeing those horrific videos is to say ISIS is the embodiment of all evil, and its total and immediate destruction is all that we need to do, that it should be our entire focus, but let's look at the situation. We look not only on the entity we want to destroy but also at who will be empowered by its destruction. Who is on the ground in Syria and in the Sunni areas of Iraq that is fighting ISIS and stands to gain if ISIS is destroyed? If we make the list, we see entities that are nearly as evil as ISIS and are, if anything, more capable of hitting our homeland, of hitting Europe, of hitting targets outside the Middle East, than is ISIS itself.

First, we see that ISIS is engaged in war with the al-Nusra Front. Al-Nusra is a dedicated branch of al Qaeda, one of its more capable branches. So the destruction of ISIS will, to some degree, empower al Qaeda and al-Nusra, since they are both rivals in fighting for support among extremist Sunnis.

Second, on the list of ISIS' foes is the Assad regime. Now, the very people who are attacking the President for not acting precipitously today were attacking the President last year for not bombing the Assad regime. So they attacked him last year for not bombing Assad and this year for not bombing Assad's number one enemy. The only consistency here is you are attacking the President for not bombing somebody. The fact is that Assad has the blood of many tens of thousands of people on his hands, and his empowerment, his success in removing the ISIS problem that he has, will be one of the disadvantages of destroying ISIS.

Third is Iran and Hezbollah. Iran and Hezbollah are waging war against ISIS today, and embody a greater long-term threat to the United States than ISIS. Keep in mind that Hezbollah killed hundreds of marines during the Reagan administration in Lebanon. Hezbollah and Iran, in working together, have conducted operations on a variety of different continents. There is all this talk about how there are numbers of people fighting with ISIS who have American passports, and they might come back and conduct an operation. There are those who are fighting with ISIS who have European passports who could go to Europe and conduct an operation. That is "might." Iran and Hezbollah have been conducting operations in South America, Europe, Asia for decades, and Iran came close to effectuating an assassination right here in Washington, D.C., just within the last decade.

So, yes, it would be good to destroy ISIS, but let's not kid ourselves. Those who would be empowered by that destruction include entities nearly as evil and probably more dangerous than ISIS itself.

I bring up this complexity to argue against those who wonder why we didn't just lash out immediately. Why do we need caution? We need caution because the situation is not as simple as an old Western movie where you have the good guy in a white hat and the bad guy in a black hat, and if the bad guy gets killed, there is peace and unity, and life is wonderful and restored, and the good cowboy in the white hat rides off into the sunset with the schoolmarm. Al-Nusra is not a schoolmarm. Hezbollah is not a schoolmarm. Iran is developing nuclear weapons. The Middle East is not nearly as simple as the President's detractors pretend.

I look forward to doing something that Members of Congress don't necessarily look forward to doing, and that is taking responsibility and casting tough votes, but if we are going to be true to the Constitution, we will not allow to stay on the books in its present form a 2001 resolution that was adopted in the immediate aftermath of the terrible events that occurred 13 years ago today. We will not allow that statement to be twisted and stretched and applied to situations well beyond its description. We will, instead, do what the Constitution requires of us, and that is to define:

What is the President authorized to do, under these circumstances, for the goals that we have this decade and at this time?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2323. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 15, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7024. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2014 report on the efforts of the Radiation Source Protection and Security Task Force, in accordance with Section 651(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7025. A letter from the President, Arab Parliament, transmitting a statement of the emergency meeting of the Arab Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs related to the repercussions of the Israeli aggression on the Palestinian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7026. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Action Under Section 5(a)(6) of the Iran Sanctions Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7027. A letter from the Speaker, Kuwait National Assembly, transmitting a letter calling attention to the continuous aggression by the Israeli forces on the Palestinian People; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7028. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter informing the Congress that approximately 50 U.S. Armed Forces personnel were deployed to the Central African Republic to support the resumption of the activities of the U.S. Embassy in Bangui; (H. Doc. No. 113-154); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7029. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting eighteen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7031. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled, "Veteran Hiring in the Civil Service: Practices and Perceptions"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7032. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Phased Retirement (RIN: 3206-AM71) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7033. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Patapsco River; Baltimore, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0201] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7034. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0005; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-17890; AD 2014-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7035. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0004; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-143-AD; Amendment 39-17900; AD 2014-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7036. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0206; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-068-AD; Amendment 39-17507; AD 2013-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7037. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0432; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-17898; AD 2014-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7038. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0863; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-17883; AD 2014-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7039. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International, Inc. (Type Certificate previously held by AlliedSignal Inc., Garrett Turbine Engine Company) Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0386; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-17897; AD 2014-12-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7040. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1059; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-17896; AD 2014-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7041. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AERMACCHI S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0939; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-17881; AD 2013-22-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7042. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0341; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-17874; AD 2014-12-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7043. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0953; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17877; AD 2014-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7044. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0241; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-17880; AD 2014-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7045. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Airbus Helicopters) (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0395; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-016-AD; Amendment 39-17876; AD 2014-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7046. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters (AHD) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0440; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-075-AD; Amendment 39-17885; AD 2014-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7047. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1025; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-17894; AD 2014-13-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7048. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1070; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-17892; AD 2014-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7049. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0296; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-102-AD; Amendment 39-17861; AD 2014-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7050. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS CASA (Type Certificate Previously Held by Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0980; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-17891; AD 2014-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7051. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0010; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-17882; AD 2014-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7052. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0867; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-17853; AD 2014-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7053. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0009; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-123-AD; Amendment 39-17887; AD 2014-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7054. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1027; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-121-AD; Amendment 39-17886; AD 2014-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7055. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0973; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-17893; AD 2014-13-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7056. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1009; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-17855; AD 2014-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7057. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0226; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-17884; AD 2014-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7058. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE GMBH & CO KG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0292; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-17904; AD 2014-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7059. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air-

worthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0308; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-17903; AD 2014-15-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7060. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corporation Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0159; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-17905; AD 2014-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7061. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0055; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-167-AD; Amendment 39-17907; AD 2014-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7062. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1024; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-17909; AD 2014-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7063. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0177; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-189-AD; Amendment 39-17912; AD 2014-15-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7064. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0007; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-038-AD; Amendment 39-17889; AD 2014-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Gwen Moore (Rept. 113-585). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5448. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Per-

forming Arts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DENHAM, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5449. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5450. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5451. A bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify the ability to use consumer reports in certain cases to establish and enforce child support payments; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5453. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 5454. A bill to amend the African Elephant Conservation Act to provide for trade sanctions against countries involved in illegal ivory trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5455. A bill to amend the Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006 ("SAFE Port Act") to administer a pilot program for 100 percent scanning of cargo containers at domestic ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5456. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to create an electronic database of research and information on the causes of, and corrective actions being taken with regard to, algal blooms in the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and other surface fresh waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 5457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for zero carbon emissions refueling property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 5458. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 5459. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 5460. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require any Member whose Members' Representational Allowance is used to pay for a flight on a private aircraft to report information on the flight not later than 30 days after the flight, and requiring any Senator whose official funds are used to pay for a flight on a private aircraft to report information on the flight not later than 30 days after the flight; to the Committee on Ethics, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution urging Congress to debate and vote on a statutory authorization for any sustained United States combat role in Iraq or Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CHU, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring civil rights workers Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, and the "Freedom Summer" of 1964, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the families of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 721. A resolution encouraging greater public-private sector collaboration to promote financial literacy for students and young adults; to the Committee on Financial Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

311. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 28 memorializing the President and the Congress to enact the Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

312. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 1 urging the Congress to take action to support, establish, or construct a national museum recognizing atrocities against American Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

313. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 notifying that the Senate and the House of Representatives of South Dakota have ratified the 26th Amendment of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 408 ratifying Amendment 17 of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 402 ratifying Amendment 17 of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 123 memorializing the Congress to make any murder of a police officer or corrections officer while in the line of duty a federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution 412 urging the state's delegation to pursue all efforts to have Rhode Island declared a "Promise Zone"; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 5448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 5449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 5452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 5454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which provides that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 29: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 36: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 318: Mr. BARBER.
 H.R. 482: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 679: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 690: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 713: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 725: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 792: Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 942: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1041: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1070: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 1127: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1201: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1318: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 1339: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1429: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 1437: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1731: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1750: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. DESANTIS.
 H.R. 1783: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1801: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1830: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1843: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1878: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2042: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 2224: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2229: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2305: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 2384: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2414: Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 2415: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2452: Ms. ESTY and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 2480: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2509: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2523: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 2529: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 2647: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 2673: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2794: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2852: Mr. HOLT and Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 2856: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 2918: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 3043: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 3399: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3400: Mr. HANNA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 3531: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 3544: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3662: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3708: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3723: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 3877: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 3902: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4060: Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 4128: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. RUPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 4136: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 4137: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 4142: Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 4170: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 4172: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 4190: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 4223: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4504: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 4515: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4526: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4608: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 4612: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 4659: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 4693: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 4717: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 4727: Mr. DENT.
 H.R. 4755: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 4852: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 4858: Mr. HOLT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4885: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 4920: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 4930: Mr. Polis, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4978: Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 4985: Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 5001: Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 5024: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 5033: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 5060: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 5071: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 5083: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 5098: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5126: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5182: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 5190: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 5194: Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 5212: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 5213: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5226: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 5227: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 5228: Ms. CHU and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 5235: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 5239: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5259: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 5267: Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5269: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5279: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5280: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 5285: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. PALAZZO.
 H.R. 5320: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 5328: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 5354: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 5364: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 5403: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 5408: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 5432: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.J. Res. 118: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. DELANEY.
 H. Res. 522: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 552: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H. Res. 688: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H. Res. 697: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. HOLT.
 H. Res. 716: Mr. HIGGINS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Mine Hill, New Jersey, relative to Resolution 102-14 urging the President to utilize the full powers and authorities of his office to immediately secure the release of Marine Sgt. Andrew Tahmooressi from Mexican custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

97. Also, a petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Cape May, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 613-14 urging the President to utilize the full powers and authorities of

his office to immediately secure the release of Marine Sergeant Andrew Tahmooressi from Mexican custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, a petition of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution, Louisville, Kentucky, relative to a resolution request-

ing that the National Society Sons of the American Revolution should be granted a leadership position on any U.S. Congressional Commission to celebrate the Quarter-Millennial (250th) Anniversary of the Boston Massacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, a petition of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No. 13-175 urging the House of Representatives to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, September 11, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who is in the world as well as above and beyond it, You are our refuge and strength. On this September 11, we remember the terrorist attacks on our Nation.

Lord, thank You for continuing to be a shelter for our land. In a special way, bless our military men and women who daily risk their lives to protect our freedoms. Remind us that righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is an equal opportunity destroyer. Empower us to become a people and Nation worthy of the blessings You have showered upon us. Guide our lawmakers with Your wisdom, protection, and strength, using them to make our Nation and world better. Surround them with the shield of Your favor as You provide them with the wisdom to do what is right, just, and true.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will observe a moment of silence to pay tribute to the thousands of Americans whose lives were taken on September 11, 2001.

(Moment of Silence.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act postcloture.

The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to S.J. Res. 19, the constitutional amendment on campaign finance reform, is 12 noon today and the second-degree amendments is 1 p.m.

We hope to move forward on the Paycheck Fairness Act and vote on cloture on the constitutional amendment early this afternoon. Senators will be notified when the votes are scheduled.

We remind everyone there is a briefing at 4 p.m. today. It will be in the Visitor Center in a classified room. We will be briefed on what is going on in the Middle East by administration officials.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 5078

Mr. REID. Mr. President, H.R. 5078 is due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title for a second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5078) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings at this time on this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am not sure everyone remembers where they were 13 years ago today, but most of us

remember. The vast majority of us remember. Just a few feet from here in S-219 Senator Daschle had his usual Tuesday morning leadership meeting. I was assistant leader at the time. I was first to come into the room shortly before 9. About 9—maybe a minute or two after—Senator John Breaux from Louisiana walked in and said: Flip on the TV. Something is going on in New York. And we flipped on the television. Something had happened in one of the towers, like an airplane had hit one of those towers.

We said: What happened there? And we kind of looked at each other.

People started coming into the room. The TV was turned off and the meeting was started. Just a short time thereafter—5, 6 minutes at the most, as I recall—someone came into the room and grabbed Senator Daschle, who was at the head of the table, took him out and came back in just a very brief minute and said: The building is being evacuated. We all have to leave. There is an airplane headed for the Capitol.

As we left that room, we could look out and see already the smoke billowing from the Pentagon. The airplane had struck the Pentagon.

Now that day was a day I will never forget—never forget. I was taken with Senator Daschle, Don Nickles, who was the Republican assistant leader, and Trent Lott, and we were flown to a classified location. We spent the day there with a number of people, including the Vice President of the United States.

Late in the evening we came back to the Capitol after having been cleared to come back. The Senators gathered on the Senate steps in the Capitol, Democrats and Republicans. We were gathering just to show we were supportive of this great country. BARBARA MIKULSKI, small in stature but powerful in soul, in every way, said so everyone could hear it: Let's sing "God Bless America."

I don't sing very often, but I sang that night. We all did. "God bless America." We did it because we knew it was a day we would never forget. It was a day we wanted to show we were together as Members of Congress.

So as I have said already two or three times this morning, I don't want to ever forget that moment, that day, and I want to make sure we honor the heroes who paid the ultimate price for our freedom. The greatest memorial we have to offer the brave men and women who perished on 9/11, thousands of them, is to simply never forget.

TERRORISM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I have indicated, 13 years since the evil attacks of September 11, terrorism continues to rear its ugly head throughout the world. As I speak, the terrorist group ISIS, like a scourge, is plaguing the Middle East. These radical Islamic terrorists are wreaking havoc in Iraq and Syria, butchering the innocent and instituting brutal edicts.

ISIS is a murderous, fanatical organization. It is evil in nature. They must be stopped, and they will be stopped. We will degrade and destroy them.

The Presiding Officer is a general who led hundreds and hundreds of troops to battle in the Middle East. We must honor our troops as indicated in the prayer this morning by our Chaplain because they are going to be called as they are through the air, as President Obama said last night, to do something to degrade and, working with others, to get rid of this scourge.

Last night President Obama delivered a stirring speech to the Nation outlining his blueprint for eradicating this threat without repeating mistakes of the past. We all know the mistakes about which I speak. The President made it clear: We will not rush into another ground war in the Middle East and we will not go it alone to destroy this evil. Instead, America will lead a coalition that includes European and Arab nations in a targeted, strategic mission to destroy ISIS. American air strikes will be supported by local forces that are trained by the U.S. military advisers and others who will assume the duties of defending and protecting their communities and homes. It falls upon us, Congress and the American people, to rally behind the President on his decisive strategy.

There are no ground troops—I repeat—and that is the way it should be. I am confident we will put our political differences aside and work together to give this administration the tools it needs to meet ISIS head-on—not the least of which is the authority to equip and train Syrian troops to fight these very bad—I repeat—evil terrorists.

However, it is disturbing that at a time such as this there are some in Congress taking cheap political shots at the President. Now is the time for us to come together. When tested, Americans have always closed ranks and engaged our adversaries as one united Nation. A matter such as this is no place for political posturing—political positioning. This is time for the rhetoric of campaign commercials to go away. We must draw together as a nation.

When President Bush called upon Congress to do something about the terrible economic crisis that hit this country, we joined together, we joined together as Democrats, Republicans, and Independents and took this head-on. This is the situation now. We must

draw together and support the President in eradicating the evil of ISIS, not only for our Nation but the world.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Motion to Proceed to S. 2199, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 345, S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to make some comments about the remarks of our distinguished leader and to join him in calling on Senators to remember this day and historical experience of 9/11 and to commit this body to our best efforts to help ensure our political institutions and our country remain free and safe for all Americans to continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty, the opportunities of an economic system that is the envy of the world, and to commit ourselves to a new sense of responsibility as representatives of our States, to help ensure this is a reality and not just a hope.

We appreciate the remarks of the leader on this important occasion and ask all Senators to express their views as may be appropriate.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

9/11 TRIBUTE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday I joined Congressional leaders in awarding three Congressional Gold Medals to the memory of thousands of men and women who perished so tragically on this very day 13 years ago. Every American that morning bore witness to the terrible tragedy and suffering. But that was not all we witnessed. We also saw incredible acts of bravery and compassion and heroism. We saw it in a great city. We saw it on the edge of the Capitol. We heard about

it high above the clouds. The sacrifices of those heroes of 9/11 inspired us then and they inspire us now. The memory of every man and woman who perished so tragically that day continues to serve as a unifying force for our Nation. We will never stop honoring them.

ISIL

Mr. President, the American people have a lot on their minds these days. Among their greatest concerns is the threat of ISIL, the brutal terror group that recently beheaded two American journalists. ISIL is growing stronger by the day and it is lethal. Every day we wait to confront them is a day they grow more deadly. I and others have called on the President to provide us with a comprehensive plan to defeat this menace. Last night, he described to the Nation what our military, intelligence, and diplomatic corps are doing to confront this threat, and outlined ways he will expand on existing operations.

Over the next week, following a series of briefings, Congress will work with the administration to ensure that our forces have the resources they need to carry out these missions. Specifically, the President set forth a near-term concept of operations to enhance the defense of Baghdad and Kurdistan, a midterm plan for retaking Anbar Province and Mosul from ISIL, and a long-term plan to contain ISIL within Syria.

The defense of Baghdad will require an air campaign to strike ISIL and target them within Iraq and extending into Syria. The midterm plan requires a new train-and-equip program and an increased scale to return the Iraqi security forces to the fight at a higher degree of combat readiness.

The President also envisions an effort to regain the trust and cooperation of the Sunni tribes through a new territorial or national guard, the same tribes and friends we abandoned when we completely withdrew from Iraq. The President's long-term plan, which is now clear, will be a responsibility left to the next administration, will be an effort to field a viable indigenous ground combat component to defeat ISIL within Syria.

Today, the President's staff will begin briefing the Senate on what will be required of our Armed Forces and intelligence community to effectuate this indefinite campaign, which we now know will include a multiyear air war of attrition. My expectation is that the administration will explain how best to build a moderate Syrian opposition capable of defeating ISIL. I am hoping the Congress will consider what this new multiyear campaign will mean for the overall defense program, the need to modernize our military, to retain dominance of the air and sea in the Asia Pacific theatre, to revitalize NATO in the face of Russian aggression, and how to field additional force

structure and combat power into the U.S. Pacific Command now that Europe and Central Command require additional tactical units and capabilities. Our Nation must also rebuild a nuclear triad.

That said, I am glad the President has brought a new focus to the effort against ISIL. He needs to take this responsibility head on. This Congress, the next Congress, and the next administration have serious work ahead as we consider this multiyear commitment and what it will take to defeat ISIL.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

One more point. Given the urgency of this situation, I have to say it is a little disconcerting to see the Democrat-led Senate focusing on things such as reducing free speech protections from the American people. At a time when the rest of the country is worried about the threat of ISIL, at a time when millions wonder how they are ever going to find a job in this awful economy, at a time when we find out the crushing Federal regulations have gotten so out of control that they now cost the economy more than \$2 trillion a year, this is what they choose to make their top legislative priority this week, taking an eraser to the First Amendment?

Now they plan to devote almost all the remaining time between now and November to what Democrats like to call messaging bills. These are bills designed intentionally to fail so that Democrats can make campaign ads about them failing. Yesterday, Roll Call got hold of an email from a Democratic aide who let the truth slip without meaning to. His email said that Senate Democrats plan to either “slam Republicans” for blocking the latest designed-to-fail bill or slam Republicans for voting to go ahead and debate the bill. How cynical can that be? The email just confirmed what everybody already knew, that Senate Democrats have zero intention of passing the bill before us today. Passage of this bill would represent failure for them. All they want is fodder for campaign commercials. That is why they refuse to address the growing crisis at home and abroad. That is why they obstruct nearly every good bipartisan bill from the House of Representatives. They even bury bipartisan bills that would help create jobs and help struggling middle-class families.

It is long past time for the Democrats to get serious. We were lucky to get serious things done for the Americans who sent us here. We need to let the Senate start doing that kind of thing. A good start would be to take up the dozens, literally dozens, of bipartisan jobs bills the House of Representatives has already sent us. Let's send those to the President's desk ASAP. Let's help make it easier to put the American people back to work.

Let's take up other commonsense legislation, such as a bipartisan bill

that just passed the House on Tuesday with the votes of dozens of Democrats. The bill, which is similar to legislation I have cosponsored, would stop the administration from implementing a so-called “waters of the U.S.” proposal that would allow it to regulate and fine almost every pothole and ditch in the country.

Passing this bill is critical to protecting the property rights of every American, especially farmers. One Kentucky farmer from Shelby County wrote me the other day to explain how the administration's heavyhanded regulation would affect him. He lamented that “The White House clearly wants me to spend more time figuring out additional permitting requirements and less time growing food for American families.”

Let's work together to fix this problem along with the many other serious challenges facing our country. Let's address the threat of ISIL together. Let's pass serious jobs bills together. Let's take Senate Democrats' focus off saving the jobs of Democratic politicians and start focusing on the needs of the American people instead.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

9/11 TRIBUTE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today marks 13 years since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. At that moment, I do not think Americans would have been surprised that we would still be dealing with that 13 years later. But in the 13 years that have passed, there have been moments when we wanted to hope this had passed from us, that somehow it was no longer a danger. But it is a danger today as it was a danger then.

We clearly should not forget those who lost their lives on 9/11. We continue and should continue to be grateful to our men and women in uniform. I appreciate the service the Presiding Officer provided to the country wearing that uniform. Intelligence professionals out there are doing what they are supposed to do. The first responder community is working diligently to be ready to respond in ways that keep us safe.

I remember well, as others do, one of the things we learned on 9/11 was that those first responders were not properly linked in a way that allowed them to communicate with each other as they generally now are able to. The response they had was probably adequate in Washington and New York, might not have been adequate in terms of capability in some other place. But even in Washington and New York, we found the firemen could not talk to the policemen and the policemen could not talk to other first responders. We have done a lot to try to close that gap in a way that further protects those who protect us.

As the President acknowledged in his speech to the country last night, there

is no doubt that our Nation and freedom-seeking people everywhere still face a real threat from terrorist groups and from enemies who wish to do us harm, who cannot tolerate our ability to live together in a society where everybody does not have to be the same way, and everybody does not have to believe the same thing.

We are reminded on this date that just 2 years ago four Americans were killed during a terrorist attack on the American consulate in Benghazi. There is a new book out, “13 Hours,” that provides some additional firsthand accounts of what happened there.

It has also been surprising to me that we had that information available to us from the people who were there, and whether it was at the end of the first week or the end of the first year, we still had not heard much of that.

We are beginning to hear that in a way that once again clarifies that that was a planned attack in the ongoing efforts to destabilize the world and move it toward some extremist view of the way people need to conduct themselves. We have seen what has happened with ISIS, sometimes referred to as ISIL. Whatever they are referred to as, they have managed to get themselves in a more powerful position than any terrorist group ever, a true terrorist army with natural resources that produces income, with looting of banks and financial institutions that produce income, and maybe the most terrifying, with the people from our country fighting alongside them.

They have American passports and can return here. People in probably much higher numbers from European countries are fighting alongside these extremists and have access in ways they never had because they would be the homegrown terrorists—the terrorists who would have access to us in different ways that we have always been most concerned about.

These terrorists are clearly not a manageable problem. The President must show it, and he gave real commitment last night to the understanding that this is a group that cannot be allowed to continue to exist. This is a group that we have to destroy—their capacity, their ability to attack us and to impact our way of life.

I am hopeful that the President's resolve and his strategy will actually be sufficient in both cases to meet what was his stated commitment to destroy this extremist group.

As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the Armed Services Committee, and the Appropriations Committee, I am going to do everything I can to be sure those who serve us, our first responders who protect America, have the resources they need.

On this day we should remember—and on every day we should remember—the innocent victims, the first responders, and the families who lost so much on 9/11.

We also need to remember that it is the strength of our society that is what puts the biggest target on us. It is the ability of Americans to live together, the ability of Americans to respect other points of view, the ability of Americans to share those points of view with each other—understanding we could do that in a free society that puts that big target on the United States of America.

We are not a target of these extremist groups because of what we have done to them. We are a target of these extremist groups because of what we stand for. May we continue to stand and stand strong. We should always remember the price to be paid by individuals and families if terrorism is able to achieve its objectives, which is to scare us away from standing for freedom and standing for the kind of society in which we live. That is one of the things that certainly 9/11 every year brings back into focus as perhaps no other date does.

HEALTH CARE

I, as I am sure the Presiding Officer and others did, spent most of August and the early days September at home.

I continue to hear from Missourians about their concerns about the impact of the direction we are headed with health care. We are now at the 1-year anniversary at the end of this month of the launch of the exchanges last October 1.

The unpopularity of where we are headed continues to grow. Just 35 percent of the people who were polled by the monthly poll of the Kaiser Foundation released on Tuesday were supportive of the Affordable Care Act.

How could it possibly be that we are at year-end of this discussion and only have that level of support? Maybe it is not so surprising. Premium costs continue to go up. PricewaterhouseCoopers finds the average insurance premium for health care is going to rise by 8 percent this year. The President's goal was for families to be paying—in fact, his promised goal—\$2,500 less. Instead of that, it seems they are paying \$3,000 more. That is a very substantial missing of the mark; so no wonder they are concerned.

Healthcare.gov was supposed to have undergone many repairs but we learned just last week that at some point—and it is my understanding they are not exactly sure how much or when—there was a major breach into that system to find out information that people had put there. People trying to verify their personal information so they could continue to have the coverage they have is a challenge. People are trying to submit all kinds of documents—citizenship, immigration documents—in

order to be able to keep their health care. Apparently it would be a huge imposition to prove who you are to vote but not a huge imposition to have to prove who you are to have government-assisted health care.

A new Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services report offers the latest proof that there are problems by saying the combined effects of the affordable health care coverage expansion, faster economic growth, and an aging population are expected to fuel health spending growth this year and thereafter to where we are going to see 6 percent per year, according to the administration, from 2015 to 2023.

This is one of the things that happens when the government believes it can do things that people rightly—we need to find better ways for people to have more choices—do for themselves. Hopefully this discussion will continue in a way that solves these problems, creates more choices for people, more opportunities for them to have people to have the insurance they want, the coverage they want, and what they believe their family needs and can afford.

I hope we can get back to having that debate on a clear problem for millions of families in America today as opposed to having the debate we are having this week, which is, again, to do things that our friends in the majority know can't possibly happen.

We are here without a budget, without a single appropriations bill being passed, and without dealing with the problems the country knows we should deal with. We are again going to spend the last 2 weeks we are here before the election voting day after day on things that can't happen. The one thing we will have to do is one more stopgap effort to keep the government funded after October 1, since we haven't done any of the other work to set our priorities and say what our government should be doing and what we can afford to do beginning October 1 of this year.

It is a sad commentary on a Senate that is not working. I hope we all come back after the elections with a greater resolve to get back to the basics of how the Senate, the Congress, and the country are supposed to work.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we gather here today in this remarkable place—a symbol of freedom and democracy for the whole world—to remember the tragic, horrific, unspeak-

able attacks of September 11, 2001, and we remember the innocent lives that were lost, the people of many different ages who worked to help the injured, brave heroes who have fought terrorism and extremism around the globe in the years since 9/11, and, of course, the victims themselves, many of them from Connecticut. This day has special meaning in Connecticut because it affects so directly and sadly the loved ones and families of people who sacrificed their lives as a result of that unimaginably cruel and brutal terrorist act. We remember them with pride. We remember their grace, civility, humanity, dedication to the public good, and their love for their families.

We have been striving since that terrible day to strengthen our Nation, to live proudly and unashamedly, consistently with our national values of peace, tolerance, and service. This effort requires commitment and sacrifice. It has required service at home and abroad from countless men and women who have served in uniform—our police, our firefighters, our first responders—believing that the best way we can honor the men and women who died on that day is to make America the best place it can possibly be. It is the greatest and strongest Nation in the history of the world, and it is so because people have always believed it can be made better, freer, stronger, braver. And that is what we have tried to do.

Today in the Senate, in the Committee on the Judiciary, I was proud to cosponsor and vote for a measure that will give those victims and their families some additional justice. The Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act will hold foreign sponsors of terrorism that target America accountable in U.S. courts.

Obstacles have been raised in our Federal courts, obstacles on procedural grounds and technical issues, most recently in a Second Circuit case, *In re Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001*, which, in my view, misread Federal law to provide immunity to the Saudi Government and entities that claim to be associated with the Saudi Government against the 9/11 victims' claims alleging its support for those attacks.

This new legislation will make clear that terrorism is unsupportable and must be held accountable in our U.S. courts. It will erase the immunity and the procedural obstacles that can be raised and make sure that sovereign immunity as a doctrine provides no safe harbor, no haven for terrorism when victims and their families seek to hold those terrorist sponsors as well as terrorist groups accountable for their horrific actions.

That measure was passed with the tremendous leadership and support of its two main cosponsors, Senators CORNYN and SCHUMER. I thank them for

their work, as well as our chairman, Senator LEAHY, and ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY, for their willingness to move this matter on September 11, and say to the victims and their loved ones: We will hold accountable the wrongdoers, and we will make sure the courts of the United States are places where justice is provided against terrorism.

We can also make America a better place by giving more Americans a fair shot. A fair shot is what America promises to men and women who live here now and men and women who come here. A fair shot is part of our basic principled existence. The terrorists struck the World Trade Center and they hit the Pentagon, but they missed America. What makes America great is those principled values.

As we gather today, we should say thank you to the brave men and women in uniform. The Acting President pro tempore is one of them, and I thank him. I thank my two sons who have served, one in the Marine Corps Reserve, deployed to Afghanistan, another now in the Navy. The fact is that the burden of this longest war in our history has been borne by less than 1 percent of our population. We owe all of them and their families our thanks, and we can best say thanks by giving them and all Americans a fair shot at the American dream.

A FAIR SHOT

I have just returned from 5 weeks in Connecticut, where I had the opportunity to listen to concerns of my constituents. The people of Connecticut are proud of this country, but they are also concerned about the great disparities that exist. No one is looking for a free lunch. Nobody in Connecticut thinks there is a free lunch. But people believe in a fair shot and the chance to make a better life for themselves and their families. The present disparities are stark and dispiriting and daunting and, at the end of the day, unacceptable and deeply disturbing.

Our country has made important strides toward recovering from the economic crisis of 2008, but we are far from done. We are still very much a work in progress economically and socially. Unfortunately, as the Federal Reserve noted just last week, economic burdens continue to fall hardest on Americans who can least afford them.

The disparities in this country have a particularly severe effect on women. Today women make up 50 percent of college graduates, but in order to do so they take on an average \$30,000 in debt, and they go on to work at places where they earn only 77 cents or 82 cents for every \$1 paid to men.

When women are treated fairly, we are all treated fairly. When women are treated unfairly, we all suffer. When college graduates struggle under crushing loads of debt, our whole economy suffers and we are all poorer. These

problems affect real people. There are real, attainable solutions available to us all.

I have participated in more than a dozen roundtables across the State of Connecticut, roundtables at colleges and universities where I have heard story after story from them—and also roundtables in high schools—about their struggles to stay on top of their debt. They understood, every one of them, that they were taking on a significant burden but not one that is insurmountable, not one that will cripple them financially for the rest of their lives.

I heard from Gillon, an honorably discharged Army veteran who is now studying law. He wrote to me to say:

Despite having done everything that society tells us while growing up is the right thing to do, I'm still saddled with over \$132,000 in federal school loan debt. My total monthly payments amount to nearly a third of my take-home salary each month, with no end in sight.

Dean, who has three children, earned a master's degree to try to move ahead in his career. A year after graduating, he is \$55,000 in debt, and he is struggling to support his family even though he and his wife work four jobs between them—four jobs and he is struggling to make ends meet, to put a roof over his family's head.

Along with my friend and colleague Senator MURPHY, I met last week with Susan Herbst, the president of the University of Connecticut, and with a number of UConn students and recent graduates, on the campus. They shared with me how excited they are about the vast and limitless opportunities afforded them by this great university.

I sensed the excitement while I was there of this great campus, making me envious for the time they are spending there in studying and exploring the tremendous reaches of human knowledge, both practical and theoretical, and yet the difficulty of how affording a college education has constrained and constricted the professional climate beyond that campus. As heady and glorious as the days on campus may be, there is an overhang of doubt and debt that restricts the reach of their lives. It restricts the reach of our economy because it constricts consumer demand, it restricts the reach of their ambitions to start businesses, and families to buy homes, and to move ahead with their lives. And that is a problem for all of us.

There are ways for Congress to address this problem. We can pass the legislation I am pleased to cosponsor with Senator WARREN of Massachusetts which would allow borrowers to refinance student loan debt. We can pass Senator FRANKEN's legislation to ensure that debt obligations are explained in clear, comprehensible terms so students know what they are taking on. I am developing a proposal to im-

prove the flexibility of loan forgiveness for students who pursue careers in public service such as teaching, public safety, or firefighting.

The current program requires students to work a full 10 years in these professions for any debt forgiveness. Any debt forgiveness hinges on those full 10 years. I believe shorter periods of work should allow for loan forgiveness in proportion to the time they spend on the job. There are ways to make public service a quicker and easier means for loan forgiveness.

There are other methods as well that we should pursue to enable college affordability. Paycheck fairness is basic to America. There is no reason that American women make only 77 cents per every dollar made by men. Male health care workers in Connecticut earn on average almost twice as much as women performing the same job. Men working in finance earn 61 percent more than women with the same position.

This shocking gap persists when controlled for education, experience, and other job-related factors. The data demonstrates unavoidably and inescapably that women make less than men in 97 percent of professions.

The event I attended in Connecticut, which was a meeting of the Connecticut Permanent Commission on the Status of Women, chaired by Antonia Moran, highlighted the shameful lag in women's compensation. Many women with college degrees told me about their personal struggles.

Lori Pelletier, the executive secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut AFL-CIO, explained how carefully crafted union contracts can often make a difference, but everyone agreed that better laws to address the problem are needed.

Fortunately, my distinguished colleague Senator MIKULSKI, who is here on the floor today, has introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act. It will bring into the 21st century, more than 50 years after the Equal Pay Act was signed by President Kennedy, the gap of full equality. It will improve the remedies available to victims of discrimination. It will prohibit employers from punishing workers who share salary information. It will require any differences in pay to be determined only by job-related factors. It will improve training and education regarding how to take action against discrimination.

Pay equity is good for families, it is good for the economy, it is good for America, and it is a matter of fundamental fairness. I thank my colleague Senator MIKULSKI for her great work on this issue. I am proud to stand here with her today and with so many other colleagues, because it is basic to a fair shot in the United States of America.

I know American people are counting on all of us to help make America better, to keep faith with the great men

and women who have served in our military around the world, who have served and sacrificed—the loved ones of 9/11 victims, of all the victims of terrorism who have perished since and before 9/11. To make America better is what we can do to keep faith with them. To give Americans a fair shot should be our mission today and every day. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Maryland.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I first thank the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, for his words on what the middle class is facing and his particular advocacy on behalf of women. It is well known and much appreciated.

I come to the floor today to talk about middle-class people who are trying to play by the rules. But before I do, on this auspicious day, September 11, 2014, I wish to pay my respects once again and express my heartfelt sympathy to the families of people who died on September 11 throughout this country—at the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, in Pennsylvania—to the wonderful first responders who risked their lives and many themselves who perished, to those who were wounded or sick and bear the permanent burden of their response to that awful tragedy, and to the families of the loved ones who have to live with it every single day—who have an absent chair at Christmas or Thanksgiving, or Hanukkah, whatever faith holiday where families gather and remember.

The Nation cannot forget what happened that day and it cannot forget why it happened, and we cannot forget the people who were there and paid this terrible price of terrorism.

I express my sympathy, my condolences, to say one way we can honor them is to make sure we don't have another terrorist attack in the United States. But what they were doing that day is to believe in America, and that brings me to what I want to talk about today.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

Yes, people talk about when we are out on our break we are on vacation. But I have been moving around Maryland, and one of the things I see and hear that is so clear is that, No. 1, the middle class is worried whether it is going to stay middle class. Those who want to be middle class worry if there is going to be an opportunity ladder for them to achieve middle-class status, where they can earn a decent living, raise a family, and make a contribution to their community.

They are repeatedly told: If you work hard and go by the rules, you will do OK. They are becoming increasingly skeptical of that, because they feel the very rules of government work against them and the very climate of government stops any change to be able to help them. They either feel that we are

irrelevant or we are working against them.

That is why they say: All we want is for America to be America again, where if you work hard, go by the rules, you can have a pretty good life and make a pretty good contribution to this great country of ours.

So when they talk about these issues and if you talk to the old-timers—particularly those who are facing families in long-term care—they worry about the very cruel rules of government that tell them to spend down their life savings until they are eligible for Medicaid; that if you worked hard and you saved, you are actually penalized for that—except for legislation I passed 25 years ago—that if they had gone and squandered their money, they would be better off and more eligible.

Then there are the young people who want to be able to go to school where they can make something of themselves and make America a better place to live.

I held student roundtables, along with my colleague Senator CARDIN. People talked to us about the careers they wanted. At Bowie State, four of the young people who were part of the roundtable want to go into nursing, both men as well as women. They think: I could help people. We have a nursing shortage in this country. Yet the very obstacle to them being able to afford to pay for their education will prohibit it.

Why is it that education is so expensive in this country when we look at tuition, books, fees? And then what is it that we do? First of all, we make sure that Pell grants aren't year-long. You can only go two semesters. But if you want to go during the summer to ace that class that you have to do for compliance purposes for graduation, or that especially hard class—you only want to take one class a semester—your government won't help you finish sooner or finish better. We won't help you. We can give tax break earmarks, but we can't give tax breaks or help there.

Then when they look at their student debt and the interest rates they carry, they ask me: Senator MIKULSKI, why is it that you can refinance a yacht but I can't refinance my student loan?

And I say: Well, you know, we are stuck on the motion to proceed, and we are two votes short of the filibuster; but then we will go backward if we do this.

They don't want to hear this parliamentary wonky stuff. What they want to hear is: We believe in them and we need them and we want them, and we are going to help them for what they believe we are going to help them achieve to be able to get a student loan. But underneath it all is that work should be worth it and work should be rewarded.

That brings me then to paycheck fairness. One of the other rules they

feel is against them is: The rules are rigged against you if you want to fight for equal pay for equal work. If you want to fight for equal pay for equal work, you can be retaliated against, you can be humiliated, you can be harassed, you can be fired, simply because you are asking the person standing next to you at the water cooler or the computer printout machine: How much do you make? That simple question, how much do you make, can trigger a whole retaliatory effort against you. That is the rule, and all it is you want to know is what kind of dough the person next to you is making. This is why we once again are bringing up the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is to fill and close the loopholes that came about in the original Equal Pay Act. We have been at this for 50 years. When this fight started under Lyndon Johnson, women made almost 50 cents for every dollar men made—and after 50 years, gee, we are up to 77 cents per every dollar. And for Latino women, African-American women, other women of color, it is even worse.

People might say: Didn't you fix this when you did the Lilly Ledbetter bill? The Lilly Ledbetter bill that we did pass restored the law to where it was before the Supreme Court decision. This updates and strengthens it. What it does is it deals with this whole issue of retaliation. The Lilly Ledbetter bill did not address employers who are currently able to legally retaliate against workers who share salary information. This legislation stops employers from being able to sue or punish workers for comparing wages.

It also helps restore congressional intent. It makes sure that employers who claim that differences in pay based on any factor other than sex are dealt with. This legislation limits employers' ability to exploit this loophole by requiring that this defense can only be used when it is related to job performance and is necessary for business.

This bill creates a fair playing field, simply knowing what the next person earns and being able to work and to negotiate for equal pay for equal work. The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes the law to keep discrimination from happening. It would have helped keep Lilly from having to sue in the first place.

This bill puts an end to the incentives that cause employers to think that paying women less is just a cost of doing business. It gets rid of the secrecy that makes it harder to uncover pay differences. Why should pay be such a secret unless you are ashamed to say what it is? Why would you want to keep it a secret? Maybe it is because you don't want to brag that you pay the men more than the women. Maybe you are too ashamed. Maybe you think it will lead you to an EEOC lawsuit. We want to end secrecy at the job place, where you know what the person next to you makes—you have a right to ask.

I have heard from women all over America and I have heard from men—men who work so hard, particularly for their daughters; men who have jobs they hate so their girls can go to school and have jobs they love. Men want equal pay for equal work. They want it for their spouses, they want it for their widowed mothers, and they want it for their daughters.

Listening to the cases—Donna Smith of Maryland's Eastern Shore worked as a retail clerk. She was told not to discuss her pay, but when she found out she was being paid less than a male cook and was doing the exact same job, she filed an EEOC complaint. And what happened? While she fought for her pay, they were fighting her with agitation and humiliation.

Latoya Weaver sent a letter to me. She is a single parent with three children, working in guest services at a hotel. She found out her pay of \$8 an hour was \$2 less than the males doing the same job. Two dollars when you are at bare minimum makes a pretty big difference. She filed an EEOC lawsuit. Although she only received compensatory damage because of the discrimination, the company's policy against discussing pay means it could happen again.

I could give example after example. I have been talking about this for a number of years. It is time. In the Senate, after all is said and done, more gets said than gets done. But this time, in the next 72 hours, we could actually vote to move the bill to the floor, to continue the debate and discussion and actually right the wrongs in equal pay for equal work. This is why American women want a fair shot. All they want is to be paid exactly the same—equal pay—as their male counterparts.

Mr. President, knowing of your own steadfast advocacy for the middle class in this country and an opportunity ladder in this country, we have to stop and make sure the rules government creates do not rig the game against people who are working hard and trying to play by the rules. The rules should work for the people and not for the government or for those who want to hold down wages or opportunities.

We are not going to accept women being paid less. We have paid attention to this problem, we've listened to the voices of the people, and we have a solution in the Paycheck Fairness Act. I look forward to working with my colleagues to see if there are amendments, whatever we could do to move this process forward. I would love a unanimous vote out of the Senate to have paycheck fairness finally in our lawbooks and in women's checkbooks. It's time to end pay inequity. It's time for Congress to act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today is the 13th anniversary of 9/11, a day that will be burned in all of our collective memories. I remember two events like this in my lifetime—9/11 is one, and the other is when John F. Kennedy, our President, was assassinated. I remember where I was, what I was doing, and I remember the feeling of horror as the reality of both of those events became more clear. And I bet I am not alone. I bet there are Americans all around the country who remember where they were and what they were doing and what their first thoughts were when those planes hit the World Trade Center in New York, the first and then the second, only to learn there were other planes that were flying with terrorists who had other targets. Of course there was the Pentagon, where many Americans lost their lives, and then there was the plane that was brought down in Pennsylvania that I will talk about a little more.

This is one of the defining moments in our Nation's history, a day that proved that our love of country and our fellow Americans will always prevail. I remember the overwhelming sense of unity the American people felt when this tragedy unfolded, and it is entirely right that we did so.

Nearly 3000 Americans lost their lives on that day, many in an attempt to save others from harm. As usually happens in moments of tragedy, there were sparks or hints or bright lights of the triumph of the human spirit, people rising to the challenge, showing some of the very best qualities we exhibit as human beings.

Today we pause with heavy hearts to remember those we lost and pray to God that He will continue to comfort the families of those who still mourn. Thirteen years may seem like a long time to many of us who did not have the personal tragedy of losing somebody we were close to or a family member, but I am confident that for many who did lose family members and loved ones and friends, that 13 years seems like just yesterday.

We also continue to keep our military, our intelligence professionals, our law enforcement officials, first responders, and others who dedicated their lives to that fateful day in our thoughts and prayers because it is they who help keep us safe and who have helped us avoid a similar attack on our homeland over the last 13 years. None of them should ever for a moment doubt our gratitude.

I wasn't serving in this body when those attacks came on September 11, but, as I said, I remember exactly where I was. Like other Americans, I was at home in Austin, TX, preparing for work when I heard the terrible news. I remember my wife called my attention to it after the first plane hit the World Trade Center. I didn't actu-

ally see it. Of course I saw it time and time again as it was replayed. But I turned to the television set, as my wife called my attention to it just as the second plane hit, and we all wondered what in the world was happening. Then when the towers actually fell and as people jumped out of the towers to avoid, they hoped, their death—but, in fact, they did jump to their death—it was all too vivid and is still today.

We should never forget, and that is perhaps the most important lesson we should learn. We should never forget what happened on that terrible day. It is said that those who forget history are condemned to relive it, and I believe that to be true.

September 11 is a solemn reminder of what can be taken from us in the blink of an eye and why we must never waiver in our efforts to protect this great Nation and the freedom it embodies.

Two simple words were spoken that will be remembered in history as one of the most courageous and powerful phrases ever uttered, and of course I am referring to the words spoken by Todd Beamer aboard Flight 93. When they heard terrorists were in command of the controls of the airplane and perhaps heading to the Nation's Capital, perhaps to attack either the White House or Congress and to knock out large portions of the U.S. Government, Todd Beamer's response, along with other brave patriots, was "Let's roll." They then attempted to overpower the terrorists in the cockpit. Those brave passengers on that flight did more than just save the lives of innocent Americans here in the Nation's Capital; absent their sacrifice, it is likely that flight would have claimed even more lives than just those on board.

The passengers on Flight 93, along with every American who died 13 years ago on September 11, were men and women with jobs, with families, and with dreams. I am sure that, like all of us, many of them made promises to their loved ones before they boarded that plane or left for work that day—promises to be home in time for dinner, to make a child's soccer game or birthday party. Some promises don't come cheap. Others cost us absolutely nothing. Others require that we risk everything we have and everything we are, even our very lives, to fulfill those promises. Their acts of courage offer us comfort even today and inspire every American as we have rebuilt from that terrible day 13 years ago.

The acts of courage displayed on 9/11 mark their last promise in a sense—a promise carried on to the Nation, to their children and other loved ones left behind; a promise that says the story of freedom will not end in the vile acts of evil men. It will endure and it will not be destroyed.

Early this morning I had the privilege of joining my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee in approving an important piece of legislation

called the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, which will now be eligible for movement across the floor. It is appropriate that we pass that piece of legislation on the anniversary of 9/11.

By amending the current law to hold foreign sponsors of terrorism potentially liable in U.S. courts for acts that injure or kill Americans, this bill will allow the families of the victims of the attacks on 9/11 and others to proceed to court against those responsible for those horrific attacks that took place 13 years ago.

Part of the attack against international terrorism has to be to go against the money that finances it, and this will provide another tool for those families to attack those who fund and finance international terrorism.

This bill, not surprisingly, is strongly supported by the 9/11 family victims, and it would allow their litigation to proceed on its merits. I am hopeful it will receive the prompt consideration here on the Senate floor that it deserves.

Americans have always been deeply concerned about the kind of country and the kind of world we leave our children. As parents, that is what keeps us going some days. Of course, grandparents have other reasons to keep going and to keep fighting for a better world. This remains true both abroad and here at home in our own communities and in our schools and at work. We must continue to push on undeterred, always confident in the pursuit of our ultimate goal: a just, free, and peaceful world not just for ourselves but for our allies and for future generations. Part of that mission involves stopping evil at its source, running it down, and eliminating it for good because we learned another thing on 9/11: We can either take the fight to the source of the evil where it exists or we can defend here on the homeland. Speaking for myself and I am sure others, I want to go fight it at its source and not just defend on the homeland.

The minions of terror have shown their capacity for inhumanity. We have seen recent reminders of that with the beheading of two American journalists by ISIS. We must never underestimate the capacity and desire of these evil people to do so again and again.

We have recently been reminded of this, and last night the President spoke to the Nation's commitment to deal with this sort of horrific activity and dangerous and extreme ideology. As we adapt to new threats and new challenges, Americans must maintain a sense of vigilance, a sense of purpose, and a sense of moral clarity.

We must never forget why we fight, and we must always make sure that our brave men and women in uniform have what they need in order to take the fight to our Nation's enemies. The greatest honor we can give to those we lost is to live our lives worthy of their

sacrifice, relish the freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution, and ensure the promise that those freedoms shall not perish for future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the distinguished Senator from Texas for yielding the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the motion to proceed to S. 2199 be considered expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. All postcloture time has expired and the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2199) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3800

Mr. REID. In regard to this, Mr. President, I have an amendment that is at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid] proposes an amendment numbered 3800.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, line 4, strike "6 months" and insert "7 months".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3801 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3800

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid] proposes an amendment numbered 3801 to amendment No. 3800.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "7" and insert "8".

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3802

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit S. 2199 with instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 3802.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, line 4, strike "6 months after the date of enactment" and insert "7 months after the date of enactment".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3803

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid] proposes an amendment numbered 3803 to the instructions to the motion to commit S. 2199.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "7 months" and insert "8 months".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3804 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3803

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Reid] proposes an amendment numbered 3804 to amendment No. 3803.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "8" and insert "9".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk that I ask the Presiding Officer to order reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Mazie Hirono, Kay R. Hagan, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Kirsten E. Gillibrand,

Barbara Boxer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to S.J. Res. 19 occur at 1:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

WEST AFRICA

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, this is an uneasy time in our world. There is no shortage of crises that demand our attention and our action. The President called on us last night to step up to the very real challenge posed by the terrorist group ISIS in Iraq and Syria. Russian aggression against Ukraine demands our attention. A fragile ceasefire continues between Hamas and Gaza. There is the Central American exodus to our southern border that riveted the attention of many this summer; and there is continuing negotiations to seek an end to Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program.

Behind all of this there is another and equally important challenge I wanted to draw this body's attention to for a few minutes today—the spread of a quiet and vicious virus throughout West Africa. While the Nation's attention today for good reason is on remembering the tragic events of 9/11, and the President's strategy for combating ISIS today, I would like to speak to another urgent challenge to our country and world, and that is the need to dramatically increase our support as communities across West Africa struggle to confront and combat Ebola.

I met and have spoken with Liberian President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf. She is a Nobel Prize winner and impressive leader who has brought her country back from a terrible civil war and was making huge progress toward the development of Liberia. I had the honor of meeting with her here and visiting her country. In my role as the chair of

the African Affairs Subcommittee, I have met few others who have impressed me as much as President Johnson-Sirleaf.

Leaders throughout this region are doing everything they can to save lives, but in my most recent communications with President Johnson-Sirleaf it is clear that Ebola is rapidly getting beyond the capacity and ability of these communities and countries to contain it and to recover from it. They need our action.

Individuals on the ground from groups such as Doctors Without Borders and Samaritan's Purse have done remarkable, heroic, and extraordinary work by putting their own lives on the line to help others, and they have borne the overwhelming majority of the risks, service, and sacrifice so far.

The news has just been announced that the Gates Foundation will contribute \$50 million to this fight, which is critical, as public funds alone will not be enough to end this crisis.

Our own people, through the U.S. Government, can and must do more. It need not be the role of the United States alone to resolve this problem, but it is our responsibility to stand side by side with those working tirelessly to stop it. It is our responsibility to not just lend a hand but to help lead in ways that only we can and to use our unique capabilities to address this crisis. If Ebola's spread reveals one thing it is that we are more interconnected today than we have ever been in our human history and that disease truly knows and respects no borders. We need to continue to act, not only because we are morally compelled to help the tens of thousands who are facing an immediate threat, but also because we have a direct stake in the resolution of this crisis.

This is a manageable public health crisis that we know how to solve, but doing so requires our focus, our attention, our resolve, and our resources, tools that only the United States has.

Let me briefly outline five specific steps I believe we should take now.

First, I think it is critical the United States has one leadership point—that the White House designate a coordinator to oversee the U.S. whole-of-government emergency response. There are many ways the United States is currently helping across many agencies from the Department of Defense to the Centers for Disease Control to the State Department and USAID. Those agencies are doing great work as part of the disaster assistance response team on the ground.

At a time when the U.S. Government is also facing and addressing crises in Iraq, Ukraine, and elsewhere, I think we need one organizer, one coordinator, one responsible figure addressing this crisis who is appointed by the White House to coordinate all of our resources and all the people necessary

from the U.S. Government for this growing effort. President Obama should designate an official to manage our country's response both overseas and here in the United States, including preparing us for the remote chance this virus might reach American soil.

Our ambassadors on the ground in the three most affected countries are playing the primary role in coordination right now, and they are doing remarkable work, but I will remind my colleagues in this body that in Sierra Leone there is no currently confirmed U.S. Ambassador. The nominee, John Hoover, has been waiting almost 8 months to be confirmed. This is just one painful reminder that the dysfunction of this body has prevented us from confirming nominated ambassadors to dozens of countries around the world. To be effective we need to coordinate our U.S.-based and our field-based efforts through ambassadors on the ground.

Second, we must begin to deploy U.S. military support to the maximum extent possible. Let me be clear: I don't mean combat capabilities, I mean the unique logistical capabilities of the U.S. military, their ability to deploy through their logistical capabilities. We have resources that no other country can bring to bear as quickly and as successfully as we can.

I was encouraged to hear an announcement this past week from the administration that they plan to use our military to establish a new hospital facility in Liberia to distribute equipment, to provide infrastructure and transportation support. I will admit I am concerned it will take weeks to deploy.

On my visit to Liberia last August, I was struck at how poor and underdeveloped this nation of brave and inspiring people currently is and how paved roads and the ability to move at any speed rapidly ends just a few miles from the capital, and how strained the infrastructure and the public health systems are by this rapidly growing crisis.

This is not everything we can and should be doing. We need to build more field hospitals for civilians in Liberia and beyond so there are facilities for health workers and civilians fighting the disease. We also can and should provide airlift of supplies from private donors.

I have heard from organizations that have worked at the transportation facility and have donated supplies that can fill cargo plane after cargo plane, but they are having difficulty getting it from here to West Africa. We need to deepen our coordination with foreign militaries. Other Nations possess similar advance capabilities, as we do, and we will be able to combat this crisis more effectively if we all work together.

I appreciate Ghana's efforts and partnership as it allows us to use some of

their facilities as an air bridge for logistics. As more air resources are poured into this fight against Ebola, we need other countries in the region to lend a similarly open hand.

My third point is directed to our private sector, to international organizations, to the American people, and to citizens of other developed nations. We need your support and your generosity and we need it now.

This is a letter that Liberia's President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf sent to President Obama this week, and I wish to read from it briefly.

Mr. President, as you know, the outbreak has overwhelmed the containment and treatment measures we have attempted thus far. Our already limited resources have been stretched to the breaking point and, up to now, only a private charity, Medecins Sans Frontieres, has responded robustly in all the affected countries. But they, too, have reached their limits.

My friend President Sirleaf is right: It is time for the rest of us to step up.

The World Health Organization has issued an Ebola Response Roadmap that calls for \$490 million and more than 10,000 additional health workers, and we are far short of reaching those goals today.

So far the U.S. Government has contributed more than \$100 million and has announced a commitment of another \$88 million that we in this body will hopefully approve before we end this session.

The Gates Foundation, as I mentioned, has also made an impressive and incredible addition of \$50 million, but the fact remains we need more.

I have heard from many in my State and across the country eager to give support. If you have the means, I urge you to go to usaid.gov/ebola for links to some of the impressive nongovernmental organizations that are doing what they can on the ground to stem this humanitarian crisis.

As much as this crisis needs money and equipment and supplies, it most importantly needs nurses and doctors, paramedics, and other medical professionals—literally thousands of them. The health systems of these countries, which were already among the least well resourced in the world, are overwhelmed, and so I am asking today for your help. We are asking for you to save lives. If you are a trained medical professional and willing to help, I urge you to please go to usaid.gov/ebola and consider how you might serve to help in this crisis.

Fourth, we need to develop and deploy a treatment and vaccine as rapidly as possible. Here is where in some ways America's unique gifts, our talents, and our strength in terms of the development and discovery of new pharmaceuticals, of new treatments, and of a new vaccine are a unique contribution we can make.

American scientists are making progress on both fronts, but the reality

is it will be hard to confront and ultimately end this disease in the long term without either. Much of the \$88 million President Obama has requested from Congress will go toward this most important goal. It is critical we support that funding in this Chamber on a bipartisan basis and prepare for the reality that this is only the first investment we will need to make to quickly develop and deploy these lifesaving drugs and these critically preventive vaccines.

Lastly, we need to invest in the governing and economic institutions in the countries that have been so devastated by this disease.

It is not a coincidence that this outbreak has emerged in countries with some of the weakest health care systems on Earth—countries that face severe shortages of health care workers, labs essential for testing and diagnosis, clinics and hospitals required for treatment, and the medical supplies and protective gear such as latex gloves and face masks that are commonly available in the United States but are now completely exhausted in the countries of Sierra Leone, Guinea, and Liberia.

We know how to combat this disease with practices such as isolation, meticulous infection control, good public health and burial practices, case investigation, and contact training. But all of these things require trained personnel and many more resources than are currently available.

In the short term we absolutely can fill many of these gaps with the additional resources I have just outlined but we need to act quickly. In the long term we need to think more deeply about why investing in local health care systems and institutions in the developing world is so critical, why a little preventive investment can go a long way toward making the country more resilient in a crisis such as this.

As we act now to do what we must to stop Ebola, we also must consider the actions we can and should take together to prevent the next public health crisis.

To that end, yesterday I introduced a resolution in the Senate with my colleagues Senators MENENDEZ, FLAKE, DURBIN, and CORKER, outlining some of these very steps and recognizing the severe and real threat the Ebola outbreak poses to West Africa and, if not properly contained, to other regions across the globe.

Here is the bottom line: We have what it takes to halt the spread of Ebola in West Africa and to save tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of lives in the process. Unlike other foreign interventions, doing so will take neither bullets nor bombs but rather our willingness, our compassion, our generosity, and our determination to act. The lives of thousands and the stability of entire countries is at stake.

It is my hope and prayer that we will rise to this occasion with everything we have.

ISIS STRATEGY

Mr. President, I have come to the floor this morning to speak about our military's critical mission to defeat and degrade the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, a terrorist organization that threatens the stability and security of tens of thousands across these two nations.

As we consider more deeply involving the U.S. military into a new combat mission, I am reminded of the brave young men and women who will carry out that mission with unparalleled courage and professionalism.

This past Saturday I had the opportunity to join hundreds of fellow Delawareans to welcome home and celebrate 70 men and women of the 3rd Battalion of the 238th Army National Guard Aviation Regiment who were returning from 1 year of service in Kuwait. Many of them were returning not just from one tour of duty but from what was their second or third deployment, having previously served in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Yet these volunteer citizen soldiers were and remain willing to continue serving. I have had the honor of knowing several current and former members of this unit, and my heart was heavy this weekend, thinking about how many more units such as these, how many soldiers and airmen and their families will be asked to continue serving in combat or in distant and difficult places supporting combat missions in the years ahead.

After more than a decade of conflict in the exactly 13 years since September 11, 2001, I know Americans are tired of war. I know we are weary of war. As the President spoke last night, it was clear he is as well, as am I.

But I would challenge my colleagues and my friends, as I challenge myself, that though we are weary, we cannot ignore the very real threats we face today. We cannot ignore the brutal events that have taken place in northwestern Iraq and in eastern Syria. We cannot ignore the threat that brutality poses to America and our allies. ISIS is a brutal terrorist organization. It has killed innocent Americans, such as the two brave journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff, whom they beheaded. Thousands of innocent Iraqis and Syrians have perished at their hands, and it will continue to do so unless the world comes together to stop it.

Let us not forget, one of the biggest reasons we first acted against ISIS militarily in Iraq this summer was to prevent the imminent genocide of a religious minority, the Yazidi people in Iraq. Images of tens of thousands of Yazidis and Christians who were being hounded and persecuted and threatened by ISIS and who then ultimately retreated to the top of a mountain I think transfixed the American people

this August, and the action our President took and our military executed, to allow them to safely flee, encouraged all of us to know there are times and places when American military might can and should be used for good.

Just as the ISIS terrorists threaten the Yazidis, they too threaten the very survival of Christians, Kurds, Turkmen, and other ethnic and religious minorities in the region.

Last night, with my Republican colleague Senator KIRK, I cochaired the first meeting of the Senate Human Rights Caucus. We heard from representatives from Iraq's minority communities in a conversation that focused on ISIS's atrocities against innocent civilians simply because of who they are or how they worship. As we expand our campaign against ISIS, we must continue to engage with the people of Iraq and Syria and the region to learn from the past and continue to prevent massacres of innocent men, women, and children. ISIS is a group bent on the destruction of all people, of whatever background or religion, who do not subscribe to their hateful ideology.

Our President is right. What makes the United States a global force for good is that we are still willing to do what is hard because we know it is right. That is the responsibility that comes from being a nation uniquely founded on principles of freedom, of liberty, of justice, and of having built one of the most capable and powerful militaries in the world, of being a nation and a people born of immigrants who came from all over this world and who remain connected to it and touched by the things that happen in the far reaches of our globe.

Last night President Obama addressed our Nation to make the case for expanding military action against ISIS. Already, sadly, today there are critics of his strategy, just as there have been over the past few weeks. In fact, in the 4 years I have served here, I have rarely seen a day in the Senate when the President isn't challenged, criticized, blocked, and harried by his opponents. There is always some way he could have acted more quickly or with more strength. Critics claim we would be better served by a sterner tone or a more eager finger on the trigger. I must say I was struck when former Vice President Cheney this past week criticized President Obama's restraint, as he has throughout President Obama's tenure. I remind my friends we can do better—we could do better—than to listen to the voices of those who misled this country into war in Iraq a decade ago, especially when it is clear they have learned none of the lessons of that tragic strategic blunder. Surely, as we consider carefully taking expanded military action now, we should applaud our President for proceeding with caution and humility.

Critical to our current strategy and what sets it apart from some past actions is this fact: We are not going alone. Seeking to lead a multilateral coalition is not leading from behind. It is not weakness. A muscular multilateralism is recognizing we are an indispensable nation, we are a leading nation, but we are not the only Nation that should take on and tackle the challenge ISIS presents. Much of the allure of ISIS is the illusion they have created that the Muslim world is at war with the West, when the truth is ISIS does not reflect or represent Islam and ISIS has killed more Muslims than any other people. The President's strategy of building a broad coalition of support, including across the Arab and Muslim world, is crucial to our success.

This is not just an American problem, it is a regional and global problem, and it will not be solved without the hard work of those living in the communities and countries most at risk, most affected, most harmed by ISIS.

We cannot and should not do this alone. That is the only way this works. It is a critical reason I support the President's strategy for expanded action.

Central to this strategy's success is our military action as well as diplomatic resources and pressure. Let's remember one of the reasons this has even happened is because of the abject failure of Prime Minister Maliki and his Iraqi Government to act in a pluralistic, inclusive way, as he had pledged he would, and has instead acted more as a Shia warlord over the last few years, sowing the seeds of dissent and of disconnection with his Sunni citizens that created the very vacuum into which ISIS has charged.

That is why this administration's diplomatic efforts to build an inclusive Iraqi Government—to demand an inclusive Iraqi Government—have been so important. We cannot defeat ISIS without Iraqis working hand in hand on the ground, and that requires a united Iraq whose future every Iraqi has a stake in preserving.

As we deepen our involvement, it is also necessary that we broaden our strategy. The fact is we cannot defeat ISIS by attacking it in Iraq alone. As we hit ISIS from the air, we also need to be cognizant of the fact that most of its strength and support is in Syria and that the boundary line dividing Iraq from Syria is today on the ground largely a fiction. So we need in Syria a strong and a moderate and an armed and a trained Syrian opposition ready, willing, and able to fight ISIS on the ground.

The President referred last night to our successful counterterrorism strategy in several places in the world. Let me, as the cochair of the African Affairs Subcommittee, briefly mention

ways in which this strategy in Syria is similar to what our strategy has been in Somalia in combating al-Shabaab, a deadly Al Qaeda affiliate, which has governed, ruled, and terrorized much of Somalia over the past decade. There has been a similar strategy to the one articulated last night, where the United States has combined training, equipment, logistics, and tactical support with an African ground force drawn from Uganda, Kenya, and Ethiopia, where those troops have done the hard work of retaking and holding territory while the Somali Government and security forces get reestablished.

In the case of Syria, Saudi Arabia has just stepped up and agreed to provide the facilities, the funding, and the space to train and equip Syrian coalition fighters.

In Congress, we must act swiftly and decisively to support that training and equipment mission that the President has asked us to support by granting our President the authority and funding he needs.

Air strikes could happen soon, and we cannot make the mistake of taking out ISIS while giving Bashar al-Assad, the dictator who still terrorizes Syria, the opportunity to rush in. By helping build a cohesive, trained, and equipped moderate Syrian opposition, we can help prevent the expansion of ISIS and the Assad regime.

In the long run, in Syria and in Iraq, it is Syrians—moderate Syrians—who must retake their country from ISIS and undertake the very difficult and daunting challenge of rebuilding a stable and inclusive and hopefully someday peaceful society, after decades of dictatorship and more than 3 years of a withering civil war. The United States and Syria's neighbors and the entire international community need to be invested and engaged to help them along this difficult path.

We need to be direct with the American people. This is not going to be easy and it is not going to be swift. We must ensure our military has the resources it needs to carry out this mission. As President Obama said last night, the lives of brave American pilots and servicemembers will be put at risk. But we must also be clear. In their courage and service, they will be part of an important effort to eradicate from this Earth one of the greatest threats currently walking the planet.

Last night President Obama asked for the support of the American people as our Armed Forces and our partners begin in combination to carry out this mission. Let me say, he has mine. I am committed to working with my colleagues as later today all Senators attend a classified briefing, an update on ISIS, and as next week committees in this Senate hear testimony from Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Defense Hagel. I am committed to working with my colleagues and with

Chairman MENENDEZ on the Foreign Relations Committee to review, consider, draft, and approve an authorization for the use of military force when submitted to us by the President that gives Congress an appropriate role in oversight and the President the authorization he needs.

We need to do everything we can together to ensure that ISIS will be stopped. It has already shown itself, demonstrating its capability to commit unspeakable crimes. If left unchecked, these terrorists will spread their reach beyond our ability to stop them. We cannot let that happen. As my colleagues discuss and debate this mission, I only ask that we leave the politics of the moment out of it. With an election soon upon us, the temptation is strong to use every opportunity to achieve any short-term partisan advantage. But this is too important. Too much is at stake.

Today all over this country we call to mind and honor the sacrifices of Americans who served and those who lost their lives 13 years ago today. We must consider this new mission with the utmost gravity, humility, and caution. I am eager then to work with my colleagues here in the Senate and with the administration in a bipartisan way as we move forward to take on the difficult task of defeating ISIS and strengthening the forces of inclusion and moderation in Iraq and Syria. I urge my colleagues to work together to support this mission every step of the way.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN.) The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana.

SUICIDE PREVENTION FOR AMERICAN VETERANS ACT

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rise today to remember September 11, 2001.

We all know the changes that came out of that terrible day. I watched the events unfold with my colleagues at the Montana National Guard, and we all knew it would change the course of America's long-term military strategy. That is what I want to talk about today, the victories, the consequences, and the true costs of sending America's men and women to defend our country.

In the 13 years that have passed since that awful day, we have experienced more tragedy and adversity. What hasn't changed is how as a nation we triumph over adversity. Throughout our history, Americans have united to face our biggest challenges.

Past and present, the need to work together to support each other, to lift

each other, and to inspire each other is what makes the United States a nation that triumphs over adversity.

Our Nation is not living up to the promises we made to the men and women we sent to war following the attacks of 13 years ago. The President and Congress have stepped up to provide more direction and more resources to the VA and to the Defense Department. We are addressing the unacceptable waiting times, and we have taken steps to improve the services our veterans have earned.

But when it comes to the health care of our Nation's veterans, we still have a long way to go. Twenty-two veterans die each day by suicide. Let me say that again. Twenty-two veterans die each day by suicide. It is simply intolerable. Imagine. If 22 servicemembers were dying each day on the battlefield, our Nation would act.

Too many veterans have returned to their homes, to their families, to their communities changed people. They are suffering from the unseen wounds of war: PTSD, traumatic brain injury, and post-concussion syndrome. As the only Member of this body who has fought in Iraq, I can state these unseen wounds are real.

Our Nation's veterans and their families are crying out for help. They are suffering, many of them in silence and isolation, and we must provide them with the support they have earned from the grateful Nation they fought to protect.

One of the first bills I introduced when I came to the Senate was the Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act, the SAV Act. With the partnership from the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the bill now has bipartisan support in the Senate and a companion bipartisan bill in the House.

Veterans who suffer from unseen wounds of war need access to specialized mental health care in order to be properly treated. In Montana, many veterans live in rural or frontier areas where access to mental health care means long journeys and long wait times.

In August, President Obama unveiled an important Executive order to tackle the challenge of helping our Nation's veterans better adjust to civilian life so that no veteran ever feels as if they are left alone. The President's action was a win for veterans and their families. This action included several elements of the SAV Act, including better standardization between the Department of Defense and the VA with regard to prescription medication, improved health record sharing between agencies, greater training to identify veterans at risk of suicide, a new focus on recruiting more mental health care providers to help our veterans and servicemembers, and important accountability measures to track the success of the VA's mental health care programs.

Recently, Secretary Hagel announced that the Department of Defense will more fully consider service-related PTSD when evaluating a veteran's petition to upgrade his or her discharge status.

All of these are the right steps in the right direction. But even with the President's important actions, there is still more we need to do to prevent suicide among our veterans. One essential component of the SAV Act addresses the need to extend combat eligibility.

PTSD can take years to manifest. We owe it to the men and women who return from combat to give them more time to come forward to receive treatment. Under this bill, veterans who have returned from conflicts can seek treatment for PTSD up to 15 years after returning home. I am committed to lengthening this eligibility time, which is currently only 5 years.

The SAV Act would also require the review of wrongful discharges for troops who struggle with mental health issues. Behavioral health issues are often caused by invisible wounds, and troops who have service-connected mental health problems may have been discharged incorrectly or cut off from the benefits and support they need to heal.

As we observe National Suicide Prevention Week and the horrific events of 9/11, we must remember our men and women who served our Nation so honorably. We must remember the sacrifice they made to defend us, and for many of them the sacrifices they continue to make after their return to civilian life. Our veterans deserve our support and we have a responsibility as a country to provide it.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in the fight to live up to the promises this country has made to our veterans.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask to be recognized to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume and engage in a colloquy with my colleague from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIS

Mr. MCCAIN. Today, Senator GRAHAM and I, on the 13th anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001—this anniversary—sadly, and unfortunately, we cannot agree and we cannot say, as President Obama did last night, that America is safer.

In fact, in many respects, America is in more danger than at any time since

the end of the Cold War. We look around the world at the challenges, the aggression, the provocations, and the continued slaughter of innocent Ukrainians.

It is a classic example of what happens when the United States of America decides to withdraw from the world and create a vacuum. That vacuum is filled by the forces of evil, innocents throughout the world suffer, and America's security is threatened.

So I strongly disagree—and I believe that most objective observers would strongly disagree—with the President's assertion last night that America is safer. By no objective measurement is America safer. In fact, when we look at Twitter and Facebook, we will see that ISIS is threatening the United States of America and urging others to come to the United States of America and attack the United States of America.

Yesterday, from a hearing before the Department of Homeland Security, it was very clear that our border is not secure. That is a recipe for at least attempts by those of ISIS who have dedicated themselves to the destruction of the United States of America to be made possible.

Mr. Baghdadi, the head of ISIS, was once a resident in the U.S.-run prison camp in Iraq called Camp Bucca. He spent 4 years there and then left. On his way out he said to his American captives: "I'll see you guys in New York." I am not making that up. He said: "I'll see you guys in New York." The leader of ISIS, Mr. Baghdadi's message has been: Attack and destroy the United States of America.

So, no, Mr. President, America is not safer. In fact, because of a feckless foreign policy, America is in greater danger than it has been, in some respects, in my lifetime—not in all but in some.

The fact is the President of the United States sees ISIS as some kind of terrorist organization. It is not. ISIS is a terrorist army. ISIS has the largest area in history of wealth, of military equipment and capability than of any terrorist organization in history, and they spread in an area larger than the size of the State of Indiana.

I would like to say the President got some things right in his speech on ISIS. He seems to have read the op-ed piece my colleague Senator GRAHAM and I wrote in the New York Times 2 weeks ago because he adopted most of our proposals—most but not all.

The President compared his plan to the counterterrorism approach he has taken in Somalia and Yemen. It is so disturbing to think that a strategy against ISIS would be the same as against Al Qaeda in Somalia and Yemen. There are terrorist organizations in Somalia and Yemen and, yes, we have been killing with drones, but we have by no means defeated them.

To compare what ISIS has done and the slaughter that ISIS is carrying out

to the terrorist organizations in Somalia and Yemen reflects a fundamental misunderstanding on the part of the President of the United States of the threat that we face.

The problem also is that even Al Qaeda has not been defeated in those countries. The President says he wants to degrade and defeat the way they are attacking Al Qaeda in Yemen and Somalia—but they are not defeated.

So what the President proposed last night can possibly, if done correctly, degrade ISIS, but it can't destroy ISIS. And we must destroy ISIS. Sooner or later, according to our heads of intelligence—whether it be the Director of the CIA or the Director of the FBI or the Secretary of Homeland Security—they want to attack the United States. Their goal is to attack the United States of America.

So let's start with what the President got right. He described the right goal: to degrade and to ultimately destroy ISIS. He called for expanding air strikes, to go on offense against ISIS. He explained the need to hit ISIS both in Iraq and Syria. He called for training and arming moderate Syrian opposition forces, and he described elements of a comprehensive strategy—diplomatic, economic, and military—all of which Senator GRAHAM and I have long championed.

He talked about the formation of a coalition—his Secretary of State has said he wanted as many as 40 nations. So far there are 9, and the interesting thing is there is not a single Middle Eastern country that has joined this so-called coalition.

Why is that? Is it because they are not afraid of ISIS? Of course they are afraid of ISIS. But they don't trust the United States of America. I hear that directly from leaders all over the Middle East.

They don't trust us because of the President's bungling, incredibly bad decision after he once said that if Syria crossed certain reds lines and used chemical weapons, then we would respond. They crossed that line. He then said we were going to respond, and then, after a 45-minute walk with his chief of staff, he announced to the world that we were not going to strike; he was going to Congress, knowing full well he would not get that permission from Congress. That nuance was lost on countries in the Middle East that were prepared to join us with air strikes into Syria.

So it is not surprising. It is not surprising at all that so far the President and his Secretary of State have been unable to convince any of these Middle Eastern countries—and we need them. We need them very badly.

One of the main things the President didn't say and should have said is that he recognizes he made a mistake. Every President has made mistakes. Certainly George W. Bush did in Iraq.

He at least had the courage to fire his Secretary of Defense and adopt the surge which basically stabilized Iraq. It had stabilized Iraq—before we made the decision not to do so.

Every one of the President's military advisers—the smartest people that any of us know: General Petraeus, General Keen, General Allen—I could go down the list—argued strenuously for leaving a residual force behind. The President of the United States decided not to. Now we are trying to rewrite history and say: Well, the President really wanted to.

Find me one statement the President of the United States made publicly that he wanted to leave a residual force behind, and I can find you 50 where he bragged about the last combat troop had left Iraq and we had left a safe, stable, prosperous Iraq behind—a lot of howlers about how well we had done in Iraq.

If we had left a residual force, the situation in Iraq would not be where it is today, which allowed Iraqi security forces to weaken, squandered our influence in Iraq, and harmed our ability to check Prime Minister Maliki's worst instincts.

Then there is his failure to support and arm the Free Syrian Army 2 years ago. I have been in Syria. I know how brave these people are. I know how disappointed they were when we failed to arm and equip them.

Two years ago, his entire national security team—including his Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton—strongly urged the President of the United States to arm, train, and equip the Free Syrian Army. The President of the United States turned them down. The President of the United States overruled the unanimous opinion of his national security team. That, my friends, was a huge impact—again giving rise to ISIS, giving Bashar al-Assad the ability and capability to slaughter innocent Syrians.

It breaks my heart that 192,000 Syrians have been massacred by Bashar al-Assad. He continues to drop these barrel bombs which are horrible killers.

Bashar al-Assad continues to have 150,000 Syrians dying in his prison camps.

I wish every American could see those pictures that were smuggled out of the tortured, killed, and starved-to-death Syrians—192,000 of them. We could have turned that around 2 years ago.

Then 3 years ago was when the President of the United States said: It is not a matter of whether Bashar al-Assad is leaving. It is a matter of when. He also said 3 years ago: It is time for Bashar Assad to leave.

Yet Bashar Assad today continues to slaughter innocent men, women, and children. Millions of refugees have fled the country. The horrors of this butchering continue, and what changed?

One aspect that changed the battlefield equation, when the President of the United States said it is not a matter of if but when, was when Iran—which some now are asking us to work with—sent in Hezbollah—5,000 of them from Lebanon—and it changed the momentum on the battlefield.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I were called over to the White House. We went in to meet the President, after the President had said that he was going to strike Syria. We sat there, and the President looked us in the eye and he said, I want to do three things: degrade Bashar Assad, upgrade the Free Syrian Army, and change the battlefield equation.

Senator GRAHAM and I, taking his word for it, went out in the driveway and said: We are backing the President of the United States.

Several days later, without being notified, we were stunned to read that the President had changed his mind. He had not told us the truth in the Oval Office. That is a unique experience for me, where I have been in the Oval Office under many Presidents.

I am confident the steps the President laid out last night can degrade ISIS. But that is not sufficient to protect our people. We need Special Forces and advisers on the ground.

The President continues to say there will be no boots on the ground. There are 1,700 boots on the ground right now. There will be more boots on the ground, but they won't be in the form of combat units. If we are really going to defeat ISIS, we are going to need close air support, forward air controllers, intelligence capability, Special Forces, and many others. We will soon have more than 1,500 there, and there will have to be more.

Tell the American people the truth, Mr. President. Those young men and women are going there, they are going to be in harm's way, and they are going to be exposed to combat. Tell the American people the truth. We need to do a lot more.

I wish to mention one other aspect before I turn to my friend from South Carolina, who was with me in 2008 at a townhall meeting.

A man stood up at the town hall meeting and said: Senator MCCAIN, how long are we going to be in Iraq?

I said: We may be in Iraq for a long, long time because although we have sustained this situation and we have stabilized it—that was after the surge had been implemented and succeeded—it is very fragile. We are going to have to leave a residual force behind—as we did in Japan, in Germany, Korea, Bosnia, where we have left residual forces behind for the sake of stability.

Well, in case any of my colleagues have forgotten, I was pilloried: MCCAIN wants to stay in Iraq.

Yes, I wanted a residual force in Iraq—not to engage in combat but to

provide stability, intelligence, and other capabilities. Now we know what happened when we left Iraq. Now we know the consequences.

I hope all those people who called me all of the names which I am not going to repeat here will render an apology, because I was right. I said that if we left Iraq completely, then we risked the great danger of it deteriorating.

I say to my colleagues, the situation today didn't have to be this way. None of the challenges we now face in Iraq and Syria had to be this dire. The rise of ISIS did not have to happen. We have lost too much time and missed too many opportunities. But we can still defeat our terrorist enemies, and we must protect our people and our partners and secure our national interests in the Middle East.

The President's plan, if he implements it—if he understands that this is not Yemen and Somalia, if he understands that this is a direct threat to the United States of America, if he comes to Congress and asks for—not welcomes, but asks for—debate and amendments and votes that show the American people's representatives will support them in this effort, then I think we have a chance of succeeding. But I have to tell my colleagues I am not very optimistic from the start I saw last night.

I would like to yield to my colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you. If I may, this is the anniversary of 9/11. Thirteen years ago on this date our country was attacked by radical Islamists who don't want your car, they don't want your bank account, they don't want your television. They are not criminals. They want to destroy your way of life. And the sooner we come to grips with the fact that there are people like this still out there, the better off we will be.

It is hard for the average American to understand why people think this way. I can't explain it. I have been to the Mideast more times than I can count, and I promise you there are plenty of devout Muslims who worship according to the Muslim faith, the Islamic faith, who would have plenty of places for me and you to reside in this world without fear. There are plenty of people—the vast majority of people of that faith we could live with in peace. But there is a strain called radical Islam that would kill every moderate Muslim, kill every Christian, destroy the State of Israel, and would kill as many of us as they could if somebody doesn't stop them.

Thirteen years ago close to 3,000 Americans were killed in the attacks on our country by the bin Laden group. The only reason it was close to 3,000 and not 3 million is because they couldn't get the weapons to kill 3 million of us. If they could, they would.

So what do we do? We have to keep them away from those weapons. We

have to keep the war over there so it doesn't come back here. And we need allies. I am here to tell you that contrary to what I hear in my own party, most people in Syria have two things in common: They don't like Assad and they sure don't like ISIL. If you don't believe that about Syria, you really don't know much about Syria.

This whole enterprise in Syria started when people demanded to be free from the dictator. Our lack of attention in not responding to the needs of those Syrians who would have defeated Assad and lived in peace with us has cost us greatly.

Three years ago Senator MCCAIN said: It is in our national security interest to side with the Free Syrian Army to get rid of Assad because he is the guy who helped kill Americans during the Iraq war. He is the guy who is cozy with Iran.

We had them on the ropes. The Free Syrian Army was about to beat Assad, and then in came 3,000 to 5,000 Hezbollah fighters—Iranian-inspired militia from Lebanon—and the Russians doubled down, we withdrew our support, and the army eventually collapsed. That happened simultaneously with a decision by President Obama—President Obama's decision to withdraw all of our troops from Iraq. We disengaged from Iraq. We had no presence there, and the rest is history.

About the speech last night, what bothered me the most was the way it started. The President tried to tell us that as a nation we are safer today than we have ever been. Do you believe that? I don't. There are more terrorist organizations with more money, more capability, and more weapons to attack our homeland than existed before 9/11. We are not safer than we were before 9/11, and that is an unfortunate fact.

The President also said this operation against ISIL will be like other CT—counterterrorism—operations over the last 5 or 6 years. No, it will not. This is not a small group of people running around with AK-47s; this is a full-blown army. They were going to defeat the Kurdish Peshmerga—a pretty tough fighting group—if we hadn't intervened. To underestimate how hard this will be will bite us.

Mr. President, please square. Be honest with the American people about what we face. Somebody has to beat this army. This is not a small group of terrorists. They have howitzers, they have tanks, and they are flush with money. They are getting fighters from all over the world. But they can and will be defeated, and they must be defeated.

To the family members who remember this as the day their lives were turned upside down, you will always be in my thoughts and prayers, like everybody else in the country. This is a day for most of us to remember with sadness, and it is a hurtful day, but if

it were one of your family members who lost their life that day, it would be the day your life was turned upside down.

There are four other Americans who died on September 11 whom I won't forget—Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Ty Woods, and Glen Doherty. They died 2 years ago in Benghazi. I am not going to forget them or their families, and we are going to get to the bottom of what happened in Benghazi. That is my commitment to you.

How do we move forward?

Mr. President, if you need my blessing to destroy ISIL, you have it. If you need to follow them to the gates of hell, I will send you a note—go for it. If you need Congress to authorize your actions, let me know. You say you don't. I agree with you, but if it makes us stronger for this body to vote in support of your plan to destroy ISIL, I will give you my vote. But here is what I expect in return: your full commitment to me.

I am tired of half measures. I am tired of misleading the American people about what we face. There is no way in hell we are going to beat these guys without an American ground component in Iraq and Syria. There is not a force in the Mideast that can take these guys on and win without substantial American help. We don't need the 82nd Airborne, but we are going to need thousands of troops over time on the ground holding the hands of the Arab armies that are going to do the fighting along with the Syrians to make sure we will win.

One thing I can promise the American people: If we take ISIL on and lose, we will unlock the gates of hell, and hell will come our way.

This is the last best chance to get this right, Mr. President. You made plenty of mistakes, and so have I, and so has Senator McCain.

And Senator McCain, nobody is going to apologize to you. I think they should, but they are not. I am not looking for anybody to apologize. We have all made mistakes. This is the time to do some soul-searching as a nation. You and I can do some soul-searching.

Those who have not seen the threat for what it is, all I ask of you is to be willing to embrace reality.

All I am asking of President Obama is to do what President Bush did: Change your tactics and your strategy because it is not working.

Senator McCain and I went to the White House during the Bush years, and we told President Bush: This is not a few dead-enders, Mr. President. It is not working in Iraq. You don't have enough troops. And if we don't change course, you are going to lose the country.

To his credit, he went from training and advising the Iraqi Army to a full-blown counterinsurgency strategy,

taking the fight to the enemy in the surge led by GEN David Petraeus, and it did work. That was an admission by President Bush that he had gotten it wrong and he had to change course.

Every President and every Senator makes mistakes. History judges you not by the mistakes you make but by what you learn from them.

Here is what I ask of the President: Quit caveating everything. Look the enemy in the eye and say, "We will destroy you" and stop. Look the American people in the eye and say, "We have to win. We will win. And I will do what is necessary to win." Come to the Congress and say, "We are in this together."

The American military is tired, but they are not too tired to defend this country. If you had a bunch of them in front of you and you asked them to follow you—"Would you go to Iraq and Syria to fight ISIL?"—they would say "Send me tomorrow" because they know what these people will do to the rest of us. Why do they serve over and over again? Why do they go to Iraq three and four times, Afghanistan three and four times? They have seen the enemy up close. They know what comes our way if we lose.

So this is the day to reflect as a nation. I am so sorry that 13 years after 9/11 we are having to deal with greater threats than before 9/11. Fifty years from now, long after I am gone, there is going to be an American soldier somewhere in Africa or the Middle East helping indigenous populations fight radical Islam. But over time, just as sure as I am standing here, radical Islam will fall because—here is the truth—what they are selling, most people don't want to buy. They don't have the capacity yet by themselves to stand and stare these people down.

As to Americans who are frustrated with the pace of democracy in the Mideast and who believe those people can't do this, all I ask you to do is to pick up an American history book. Within the first 100 years of our country, we were at war with Canada and Mexico. Within the first 100 years of our country, we were at war with ourselves, and it started in my State.

This is not easy. It is not easy to this day. To expect people who have lived under brutal dictatorships and had their society divided and destroyed for decades to get to where we are in 12 or 13 years is unrealistic.

Here is the hope for me. There is good news. There is plenty of will throughout the world to stand up to radical Islam. Our goal is to provide capacity to that will. Sometimes it will be with American soldiers; sometimes it will be clean drinking water; a small health care clinic that you wouldn't send your child to for 5 minutes that will save lives in Africa; a small schoolhouse where a young girl can get an education. If we are not willing to

do these things over there, they will come here.

Mr. MCCAIN. If my colleague will yield for one question.

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCAIN. I note the presence of our colleague from California, so I will make it short.

Last night I had an exchange with the former spokesperson for the White House, and again this issue came up and the assertion, the incredible assertion that it was the Iraqis who did not want to leave a residual force behind—a statement that continues to amaze me, that anyone would believe such a thing, particularly given the circumstances which the Iraqis were left under, including—by the way, every single one of our military leaders urged that we leave a residual force behind, and many of them, such as General Keen, General Petraeus, and others, predicted what would happen if we pulled everybody out.

I wonder if for the record the Senator from South Carolina would relate the experience we had in Iraq and our personal experience with regard to the issue of residual force behind.

Mr. GRAHAM. I remember getting a phone call from then-Secretary Clinton asking me and Senator McCain and Senator LEVIN to go to Iraq and see if we could intervene and help the Iraqis make a decision about a residual force because we thought it was in our interest.

President Obama has always looked at this issue as fulfilling a campaign promise. He got the answer he wanted, which was zero. The military told him we needed some people, but he really was intent on ending the war in Iraq.

Here is the problem: Without a residual force, we have lost everything we fought for. When we met with Barzani, Allawi, and Malaki, I was convinced they were willing to accept an American follow-on force; we just had to put it on the table in a way that it mattered.

When we were talking to Malaki, they said: Senator GRAHAM, how many troops are we talking about?

I turned to General Austin and our then-Ambassador Jeffrey and said: How many?

He said: We are still working on that.

We went from 18,000 recommended by General Austin—the last time I got a number from the White House, it was below 3,000. This cascading downward from 18,000 to below 3,000 was not because the Iraqis said it was too many; it was because the White House couldn't pick a number because they didn't want to stay. It is about as accurate to say the Iraqis didn't want us to stay as it is to say the President never called ISIS a JV team. The President did, but he is trying to rewrite that statement because it looks pretty naive.

Look forward. Let's beat on the Republicans for a minute. The Republican

Party—the party of Ronald Reagan—embraced sequestration. For those who don't know what I am talking about, it is a budget proposal that will gut our military over the next decade. We have the smallest Army since 1940, the smallest Navy since 1950, and the smallest Air Force in modern history. Republicans embraced that concept.

If we want to defeat ISIL, we better change sequestration because we are about to gut the military at the time we need it most. There is plenty of blame to go around here.

Here is the key for me: We as a nation have one last chance to get this right.

I will make the same offer to President Obama that I made to President Bush: If you come up with a strategy that makes sense and you are understanding and learning from your mistakes, as I try to learn from mine, I will be there with you.

There was not much help coming from our friends on the other side when Iraq was bad. Bush got absolutely no support when his mistakes came back to haunt him. I will not make that mistake.

The mistakes President Obama has made are real, and they have to be corrected. If the President will correct them, I will stand with him no matter what the polls show about troops on the ground. And I know how the President stands with South Carolinians—not very well. It is not about the President; it is not about this Senator; it is about us.

So on this September 11 anniversary, I make an offer to my Commander in Chief, Barack Obama: If you will destroy ISIL and mean it, you will have an ally in Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes, followed by Senator MERKLEY, who will speak for 8 minutes, followed by Senator VITTER, who will speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WAR ON TERROR

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I watched every word of the President's address to the Nation last night, and I have this to say to him: Thank you for your clarity. Thank you for taking the time you needed to put the pieces together so that we don't march into another Iraq war.

When I hear my colleagues—cheerleaders for the war in Iraq who told us it would be over in 6 months—come down here and try to lecture this President on how to deal with ISIL, I get the chills. When I watch Dick Cheney come up here to talk to House Republicans and lecture them about how they had

it right—had it right? They couldn't have had it more wrong. Because we know that the tragedy of 9/11—and as we revere the heroes and mourn the loss of those on that horrific day—was an attack by Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda. It wasn't Iraq and Saddam Hussein.

Our then-President Bush turned around—he could have had the whole world in his hand—but instead marches into Iraq. Thank the Lord I voted no on that. I voted yes to going after bin Laden and no to going into Iraq.

All those sunny predictions—of the war being only 6 months, and they will have democracy, and we will get the oil and the money, and the rest—turned out to be the worst foreign policy disaster. These same people who backed that war now come down here and tell the President: Look me in the eye and tell me you want to do exactly what I want to do.

Well, Mr. President, since they addressed you, I want to address you. First, I thank you for taking your time in putting together a winning strategy to defeat ISIL. We have to. We cannot sit by and watch a group with tens of thousands of members who are vicious and trained—some foreign, some I believe from this country—go around and behead people who won't convert. They want territory. They want to make their own state. We have to stop them with the world, with combat boots that are combat boots of those in the region, such as we are seeing in Iraq, and we will see in Syria if we give the President the funds he wants to train the moderate Syrians.

Here is the deal from me: We are going to go after ISIL, we are going to do it with a coalition of the world, we are not going to have a drumbeat of going back into the Iraq war. This is a counterterrorism mission, and I voted for that when I voted to go after Osama bin Laden. I believe the President has this authority.

I also have no problem with voting to put my feelings right there and I would be happy to take that vote. But beware of the people here who were the cheerleaders of the Iraq war who want to get this President to now say he is going to put combat boots on the ground. That is the wrong recipe. We already learned that. There are 4,000 dead Americans and tens of thousands wounded.

Let's do this the right way and the way the President laid it out—with a coalition. Let's not make any of the same mistakes.

So, Mr. President, please keep on track—and Secretary Kerry—and keep building that coalition. We already have nine nations and NATO and the Arab League, and we are going to get the U.N. That is the way to go.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor to Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I rise to address an issue affecting millions of families across America, and that is our rising student loan debt and the impact it is having on the vision of opportunity for every single American. As college students return to campus this fall, they are thinking about their hopes and dreams for the future, but increasingly, they are also thinking about how that future might be constrained by the debt load they will carry by the time they graduate.

Education is the key to the pathway for the American dream. When I was young, my father took me to the schoolhouse doors and he said: "Those are the doors to opportunity. If you study hard, you can do or be just about anything here in America."

My father was a millwright, a mechanic who keeps the sawmill operating. The vision he had for America and the vision that I have for America is that every child should have the opportunity to thrive whether you are the son and daughter of a CEO or you are the son and daughter of a millwright. But the cost of college and the consequential student loan debt is diminishing, degrading, and destroying that vision.

I was the first in my family to go to college. I never dreamed I would have the chance to end up in this esteemed Chamber fighting for the vision of the American dream, but throughout my service in the Senate, that is exactly what I will do. It is the heart of what our Nation is about. It is the "We, the People's" vision, not the few and powerful's vision, but the "We, the People's" vision of our Constitution, that everyone should have the opportunity to thrive.

Today we are competing in a national and world economy that is much more knowledge based. It is a global knowledge economy, and we have to be able to compete, and that often means a path to career technical education and a path to college. But for too many young folks today, the doors to college are looking a little less like doors to opportunity and a little more like trapdoors. They see those doors and they are not sure they see opportunity and mobility. They are concerned they see a lifetime of unaffordable and inescapable debt.

I live in a blue-collar community, and I hear this all the time—parents wrestling with whether their children should incur the debt necessary to go to college, knowing that debt might be the size of a home mortgage and will be hung around their neck like a millstone and that possibly their monthly wages will not even be enough to pay the loan payments. The prospect of a high level of debt and low level of pay has parents sending a different message to their children—not the message my parents gave to me, that everyone has the opportunity to thrive in America,

even from our blue-collar community. They are sending the message to their kids that the path of opportunity is being diminished by the enormous debt load and cost of college.

This situation is unacceptable. It is a threat to the future of our children, and it is certainly a threat to our economy. The economies that thrive in the world are the ones where the students have the education to compete in the global economy, and that is certainly destroying the aspirational vision of America—the American dream. There is a lot we can do to take on this challenge. We are not helpless in this effort. We must control the galloping costs and galloping inflation of tuition. We need to invest more in our community colleges because it is the most cost-effective portion of our higher education system. We need to enhance the bridges between our community colleges and our 4-year colleges and our high schools. We need to make sure students have the opportunity to get some college credit in high school through AP classes, the cheapest possible place to get that credit, and that gives them a step up in their route to college so they can see that vision and that path.

We should explore new models of financing, such as the pay-it-forward model, that would eliminate the fears students have between high debt and low pay. When Pell grants are not enough, when the job you carry at college is not enough, when tuition is too high and students of modest means still need loans, then those loans should be at the minimum possible interest rate.

Loans should never be viewed, as they have been by my colleagues across the aisle, as a source of profit to the U.S. Government. That vision is the wrong vision for America. That is why I so strongly support Senator WARREN's proposal that our students get the same low interest rate on their student loans that our big banks get when they borrow money from the Federal Reserve.

Moreover, we should enable every American to refinance their student loans, taking advantage of today's low interest rates.

In my home State of Oregon, there are 500,000 folks with student loans, many of them at high interest rates. These students would benefit enormously from being able to refinance. Just as you can refinance a mortgage or refinance a car, they should be able to refinance those loans, and not only would that help those individuals a lot—500,000 people in a State of about 3.7 million, which is a lot of people—but the additional purchasing power they have would enable them to contribute to the economy and raise everyone up, making them more likely to buy a house, for example.

Did you know that for the first time we have a situation where those young

adults 25 through 30 who have gone to college and have graduated are less likely to own a home than are high school graduates? The reason is simple: They are burdened by massive student debt that doesn't give them the credit standing and income necessary to buy a home. That shows how much is wrong.

So those individuals on this floor who are trapped in the few and powerful vision of America and have forgotten the first three words of the Constitution—that we are fighting so we can enable every child to thrive—they need to rethink their position. They need to quit blocking the bill that would allow every student to refinance their student loan.

Forty percent of graduates with student loans have delayed making a major purchase such as a car, 25 percent have put off continuing their education or moved in with relatives to save money. In other words, this is not an imaginary problem. This is extraordinary. It is real, and it is having a dramatic impact.

Let us give a fair shot for every child to thrive. Let us let every parent say to their children with confidence: If you go through the doors of the schoolhouse and work hard, you can do just about anything here in America.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S.J. RES. 19 AMENDMENT

Mr. VITTER. We have a significant proposal. It is a constitutional amendment to rewrite the First Amendment to the Constitution, the first portion of the Bill of Rights, and it would fundamentally alter and take away certain free speech rights of millions upon millions of Americans—not a few, not a few ultrawealthy, but many Americans.

I have a real problem with that. I think it is misguided. Instead, I think we should focus on other proposals and other provisions that can address what we all see and feel and hear from our constituents. They see a huge gap between Washington and the real world, Washington and Main Street U.S.A.

It is also unfortunate that this is, I believe, the first time in Senate history that we are debating a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate with no opportunity so far—zero opportunity of floor amendments. That is unheard of, and that is unfortunate.

That is why I wish to bring up two proposed floor amendments that I will strongly support that go to the real problem in America—Washington placing itself up here, separate and apart, higher than the American people in the real world.

The first idea was a floor amendment offered by my colleague TOM COBURN of

Oklahoma. I strongly support it. I have the leading bill regarding this proposal in the Senate—term limits for Members of Congress. I believe this is a significant step, but it is one, unfortunately, necessary and long overdue because of the separation I have described between Washington and the real world. Americans of all political parties, all backgrounds, all races think that Washington is on a different planet and Members of Congress just don't get it because they come here and "go Washington." We need to get back to the best traditions of our democracy, which include having true citizen legislators, to come here, to serve, to represent their constituents, yes, but for a limited period of time, knowing absolutely they are returning home after significant but limited service.

I strongly support Senator COBURN's amendment. I strongly support the same provisions in my stand-alone bill. I urge Senator REID to again open the floor of the Senate. Let's have the process the Founders intended. Don't be the first U.S. Senate leader in history to shut down all amendments under a constitutional amendment under debate on the floor.

The second proposal, which is a floor amendment I have at the desk, also goes to the same concern of Washington living on a different planet than real-world Americans, and it has to do with what I call the Washington exemption from ObamaCare. In the ObamaCare statute, we actually passed, through an amendment on the floor—through being able to pass a floor amendment—language that says every Member of Congress and all of our staff should be treated as all other Americans are treated, who are forced to go to the so-called exchanges. We will go to the exchanges for our health care—no special deal, no special exemption, no special subsidy, no special carve-out. Unfortunately, after that floor amendment passed, after the overall bill passed, I guess some folks took NANCY PELOSI's advice that we have to pass the bill in order to read it.

So after the fact, some folks around here started to read it and they got to that provision and they said, Oh, you-know-what; how are we going to deal with this? So a furious lobbying campaign began which resulted in President Obama issuing an Executive order—a special rule which is clearly illegal, in my opinion, because it is contrary to the statute—to create special treatment, a special carve-out, a special subsidy for Members of Congress and our staff. That is not right. We should live by that original language passed right here on the Senate floor in a floor amendment.

We should say, The first rule of American democracy should be that what Washington passes on America, it lives with itself, and we should treat

ourselves the same way as we treat other Americans who have to go to the exchanges under ObamaCare. That should be the first rule of American democracy: What we pass for America, we live with ourselves, because that is the right thing to do. That is the right principle. Also, for a very practical reason: Because sometimes the chefs in the kitchen should eat their own cooking, but sometimes that makes the cooking get a whole lot better. It is a very practical rule to follow.

I urge support for this proposal and I urge an open amendment process and a real debate which, unfortunately, heretofore has been completely shut down. I urge consideration of this amendment. I urge us to place ourselves along with everyday Americans in how we are treated under ObamaCare and everything else. I urge full debate and consideration of the measure, and then passage of it.

To further that, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S.J. Res. 19, that it be in order for my amendment No. 3786 to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Reserving the right to object, the Senate has heard the reasons for these objections before, but the fact is that staff and Senators are covered by the exact same plan that is offered under the exchange to millions of Americans. It works just as it has always worked before for employees here in the Senate, and, frankly, for millions of employees in the private sector. Senate employees, House employees pay their premiums and the employer picks up the employer share—no different than it has always been before.

Specifically, the law doesn't allow for any employees here to take advantage of the tax credits that are available to many other Americans.

This is, of course, just another attempt to undermine the law that is, by every available metric, working. The uninsurance rate in this country is plummeting. Health care inflation is at a record low—

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I think there was an objection to my unanimous consent request, and I wish to reclaim the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. Outcomes are getting better, and for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reclaiming the floor, as the Senator knows, it is simply not true that we are being treated on the exchange as other Americans are treated. That is flat out not true. No other American at our income level is getting the huge subsidy that Members of Congress are getting—I am not accepting it—but that Members of Congress are getting

under the President's illegal rule. No other American in our country, no other American gets that deal, and that was nowhere mentioned and nowhere included in the amendment we passed on this topic during the ObamaCare debate. So what the Senator says is just flat out misleading. If he wants to truly be treated as other Americans are treated under the exchange, absolutely. That is what I am asking for. But don't pretend that present practice does that. It does exactly the opposite.

The American people are sick and tired of it. The American people are sick and tired of being put down as second class and Congress and Washington lifting itself up as above them. That is a fundamental thing that is wrong with American democracy today. That is what my amendment goes to with regard to treatment under ObamaCare. That is what Senator COBURN's amendment goes to with regard to term limits for Members of Congress.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, September 11 should always be a day when we both remember those who were tragically lost on this day in 2001 and simultaneously reaffirm our solemn resolve to our country to keep America free, to keep America strong.

I rise today for a third time in opposition to S.J. Res. 19, the majority's Orwellian attempt to amend the Bill of Rights to permit the government to decide who is allowed to speak about political matters.

Make no mistake, this is an attack on the First Amendment's single most important protection. Under our Constitution, the government never gets to be the arbiter of permissible political debate—never, not ever. That is something we decided and we finally resolved back in 1791. Of all the things the government might do, it should never, it may never, it can never be the arbiter of what constitutes permissible political speech, of who gets to criticize the government, and how. That can never happen—not in our land, not in this free land, not ever.

Yet, under this proposed constitutional amendment, the one that is being debated on the floor of the Senate right now, S.J. Res. 19, Congress and the States would be given the power not just to become this kind of arbiter, not just to regulate this kind of speech, but to potentially prohibit

churches, civic associations, labor unions, and even the ACLU from speaking about political matters. That is a shocking proposal, repugnant to our traditions, dangerous to our liberty, and utterly ineffective in combating corruption.

But what is even more shocking, quite frankly, is the manner in which an amendment to our Constitution has been debated on the floor of the Senate this week.

We have to remember our Founding Fathers painstakingly debated and discussed and crafted the text of the Constitution in Philadelphia for nearly 4 months. What we know today is the Bill of Rights was not even in James Madison's first draft. The first Congress extensively debated it. It eliminated objectionable parts, changed the language to better reflect Congress's consensus, and ultimately passed it and sent it out to the States for ratification. What we have seen this week, by contrast, is nothing like that. The majority leader has refused to permit any amendments to be introduced or considered or voted upon by this body—any amendments to S.J. Res. 19. Its language is not up for discussion, nor, in truth, is it really up for debate. In fact, ironically, many of the same people who have signed their names to this legislation, who have cosponsored it, who have supported it, have refused even to come to the floor to speak about it. In fact, some of those same people have been openly critical of the fact that the Senate is devoting time to debating this constitutional amendment, which would be the first time we have ever made a change to the First Amendment, or to the Bill of Rights, since 1791.

The American people should be offended that the majority thinks this is how changes to the U.S. Constitution should be discussed by the people's elected representatives in Washington. But watching the Senate this week has been a useful lesson. The majority says Congress can be trusted somehow to impose "reasonable" limits and "reasonable" restrictions on political debate, on core political activity. Look no further than this debate occurring on the floor of this legislative body to see what the majority thinks reasonable debate looks like. What it looks like here is a take-it-or-leave-it vote with no opportunity to provide amendments, no opportunity for discussion about the intricate details of this proposal.

There was very little discussion. One of the reasons I find this distressing in this particular circumstance is we are talking about what it is that enables the American people to remain in charge of their own form of government, of their own system of laws that affects their livelihood and will affect their day-to-day operations.

When we tinker with the processes that allow the American people to remain in control of their own government, we are playing with fire. Under this proposed amendment, if it were somehow to pass by a two-thirds supermajority out of this body, if it were somehow to pass by a two-thirds supermajority out of the House of Representatives, if it were somehow to be ratified by three-fourths of the States, and if it were to become say the 28th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, it would dramatically change the balance of power, not between America's two leading political parties, not between one State versus another State but between Washington, DC, and the American people.

Under this amendment, if it were to become part of the U.S. Constitution, Congress could have the power to set up a system of rules that would restrict many Americans and their ability to influence the political debate process. Under this proposed amendment, there is of course a carve-out that says it is there to protect freedom of the press. So presumably someone who owns a newspaper could still devote a lot of money, thousands of dollars, tens of thousands of dollars, maybe millions or even tens of millions of dollars, to promoting the candidate of her choice; that is, if she is fortunate to own a newspaper company.

But if the owner of a newspaper company could do that, why not someone who chooses not to own a newspaper company or more likely cannot afford a newspaper company but wants to enter into a contract with a newspaper company to run the political advertisement. Why should someone's ability to promote the candidate of her choice be restricted and limited on the basis of whether she owns a newspaper company? It should not and nor should the American people be prohibited from entering into voluntary associations.

Most Americans are not wealthy enough to own a newspaper company or a radio broadcasting company or a television broadcasting company, but many Americans, let's say thousands or tens of thousands at a time, could pool their resources, each of them contributing what money they choose to devote to political debate and discussion in order to promote the candidates of their choice.

Why should they lack that opportunity, the same opportunity the owner of a newspaper company has, simply because they cannot afford to own a newspaper company or a broadcast company? The fact is they should not.

The fact is there are many unanswered questions about this proposed constitutional amendment, but all of those questions relate back to how we debate issues. If the manner in which this proposed constitutional amendment is presented is any indication

about what this constitutional amendment would do to debate in American society, it signals caution. It signals to us that a chill wind blows if this is the direction in which we are looking.

You see, when the power of government expands, it does so at the expense of individual freedom. When the power of government expands within the area of political speech, that is perhaps where the danger is at its greatest. That is perhaps where it comes at the greatest cost to the individual liberties of Americans because that affects not just their liberties but also their ability to control their own liberties in the future.

Because if they lack the capacity to decide who is in Washington representing them, making decisions that will dictate the future of their government, then they lack the ability to make these changes. That is where the threat to liberty is at its greatest. That is why we should be so concerned about S.J. Res. 19. It is important for us to remember we are creative Americans not because of who we are but because of what we do. We have set in motion a sequence of events. We have adopted a Constitution, a rule book that has itself fostered the development of the greatest civilization and the strongest economy the world has ever known.

This is not because we are great so much as it is because we have made good choices. We have made good choices that delineate the proper boundaries of government. We decided what belongs to the people and what belongs to the government. Where there are appropriate actions to be taken by the government, we also set out a series of rules that decided which government may do which things. This transgresses those boundaries. This would undertake a critical breach into that realm which distinctively, un-avoidably belongs to the people and not to the government.

Speech is sacred. The freedom of the press is sacred. We must never allow them to be trifled with. We must never allow them to be tampered with. We must never allow them to be weakened. This would weaken them. This is what the majority would have political debate in America look like. Here we are moments before casting a critical vote on a constitutional amendment that could forever change the political dynamics of this country that have made us strong. Yet I find myself speaking to an empty Chamber. The American people deserve better. The American people can expect more out of their government. The American people can expect freedom. This is incompatible with freedom. I would encourage each of my colleagues to oppose S.J. Res. 19, just as they would oppose any other effort to intrude on the sacred rights of the American people to express their political views, whether they be Repub-

licans or Democrats or belong to some other political party.

Whether they be liberals or conservatives or whether they would describe their political ideology in some other way, this is an issue that is simply an American issue. This is an issue that is simply about freedom. The American people today will choose freedom. I hope and I pray they always will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have heard from many Vermonters concerned about the threat posed to our democracy by recent Supreme Court decisions that have eviscerated our campaign finance laws. Just as opponents of campaign finance reform in the past described a parade of horrors that would occur if we strengthened campaign finance protections, today we again hear those exaggerations from the other side of the aisle. Some Republicans have falsely asserted that this resolution would somehow repeal the First Amendment and would even result in the banning of books. That is pure hyperbole.

Restoring the role that Congress and the States have traditionally had to set reasonable limits on how much a corporation or a millionaire can spend to influence an election is simply not the equivalent of prohibiting an individual from speaking out on a candidate. The constitutional amendment before the Senate does not ban or proscribe anything. It restores the ability of future States or Congresses to set reasonable limits if they decide to act but of course those limits would be guided by the American peoples' desire for such laws.

Over the course of this debate, we have heard Senators talking as if the First Amendment is absolute. Most Americans can see right through this. They know that the First Amendment does not protect child pornography; or obscenity; or statements that incite imminent lawless action; or defamation or slander; or speech integral to criminal conduct; or fraudulent speech or perjury. And they know that the First Amendment is not violated when laws restrict even political speech by regulating the reasonable time, place, and manner of demonstrations or protests. The idea that any future law on campaign contributions and expenditures that has an incidental effect on speech somehow renders it the equivalent of censorship is just not a serious argument.

The Framers of our fundamental charter anticipated that it would need to be amended from time to time. The story of our how our Constitution has been amended over the years is a reflection on our democracy. It is a story of inclusion and expansion of our representative democracy. The 14th and 15th Amendments, for example, guaranteed equal protection of the law for

all Americans, and ensured that all Americans have the right to vote regardless of their race. The 17th Amendment gave Americans the right to directly elect their representatives in Congress in the wake of concerns that corporations were corrupting state legislatures to choose Senators beholden to them. The 19th Amendment's expansion of the right to vote to women and the 26th Amendment's extension of the vote to young people made ours an even more representative democracy.

Those who oppose the amendment before us have made some outlandish claims. One of them was that we cannot consider this amendment because in their view it would be the first time that changes were made to the Bill of Rights. What is interesting is that opponents to previous constitutional amendments also claimed that they should not be adopted because they impacted the Bill of Rights. In the June hearing that I chaired before the Judiciary Committee, Professor Jamie Raskin testified that "the people have been forced to amend the Constitution multiple times to reverse reactionary decisions of the Supreme Court that freeze into place the constitutional property rights and political privileges of the powerful against the powerless." The 13th Amendment abolished slavery, stripping the absolute individual "property rights" that white slave masters had enjoyed under the Fifth Amendment as found by the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision in 1857. Similarly, Section 4 of the 14th Amendment completely blocked and made illegal any future compensation of slave masters for the confiscation of their vested "property rights" in their slaves. Not only did the 14th Amendment strip slave masters of their "property," it also made it impossible for them to seek restitution under the Fifth Amendment. Opponents to the 13th and 14th Amendments felt that their rights, granted by the Bill of Rights, were being undermined but history showed that those Amendments were necessary to move this great Nation toward a more perfect union. The amendment before the Senate would restore the First Amendment. It would not repeal it. It would, however, overturn several Supreme Court decisions that have distorted the First Amendment. If we fail to do so, many of us are concerned that corruption will flourish and our democracy will be distorted away from the needs of hard working Americans.

Millions of Americans have called on Congress to restore the First Amendment so that our democracy will be protected against corruption and so that everyone's voices can be heard in our democratic process. I have served in the Senate for almost 40 years and as chairman of the Judiciary Committee for nearly 10. It is a rare moment for this Senator to acknowledge

that the threat to our democracy is so significant that it warrants an amendment to our Constitution. I applaud the Vermonters who have taken action on this issue. I urge my fellow Senators to join me in voting for cloture and passage of this important constitutional amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, there is almost no measure Congress should consider more carefully than a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States. Such amendments are reserved only for issues that relate to the foundations of our great American experiment.

The value of each American vote is one such issue. Our system of government depends on this basic principle, that every American, whether they are rich or poor, weak or strong, whether they were born in Michigan or Mississippi, has an equal voice in the selection of their elected representatives. Time and again, Congress has amended our Constitution to protect this principle.

But recently, a succession of Supreme Court rulings has unleashed a tide of unlimited and secret special-interest money into our elections. This unregulated money drowns the voices of the public. It threatens to transform our government of the people, by the people, and for the people into one of campaign donors, by campaign donors, and for campaign donors. That is not democracy, and it is not America.

That is why I support this amendment to the Constitution concerning contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. This amendment would allow Congress to do what we have always done, and what our Founders intended us to do: take action to protect the integrity of our Nation's government and electoral processes.

Posterity vindicates the moments in our Nation's history when Congress simply did what was right. We honor those who voted to ensure that the right to vote cannot be denied based on race, color, previous condition of servitude or gender. We honor those who voted to ensure that a poll tax could never again prohibit an American from voting for their own representatives. I urge my colleagues to act in this tradition, to simply do what is right, and to join me in supporting this proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, we have had an important debate this week. A debate about bringing sanity back to our elections. I want to thank all of my colleagues who have joined this fight. And I want to thank the millions of Americans, regardless of party, who stand behind us.

Over 150 years ago, Abraham Lincoln saw the danger of too much money in politics. Lincoln warned about "corruption in high places . . . until the Republic is destroyed."

Changing the Constitution is a big step. As James Madison said, it should be amended only on "great and extraordinary occasions." I agree; but I also believe we have reached one of those rare occasions. The Supreme Court put up a "for sale" sign on our elections. On the foundation of our democracy. It is wrong. It is dangerous. It cannot stand.

Amending the Constitution can take a long time. The 19th amendment was first introduced in 1878. Opponents called it impractical, and immoral, for daring to give women the right to vote. It took more than 40 years to pass. But its proponents did not give up, and they eventually prevailed.

Today's vote is a step forward in that long process. One more step toward restoring our democracy. We will keep pushing until this amendment is reality.

But that will take the support of my Republican colleagues. I was disappointed that none of them voted in support of our amendment today, as it has a bipartisan history. Some of them have cosponsored and voted for similar amendments in the past, before the Supreme Court's Citizens United and McCutcheon decisions destroyed many of the bipartisan campaign finance laws that took years to pass.

Some of them said this was just an election-year stunt. But that ignores reality. This movement started decades ago—by a Republican. Many of our predecessors from both parties understood the danger. They knew the corrosive effect that money from sources across the political spectrum has on our electoral system. They spent years championing the cause.

In 1983—the 98th Congress—Senator Ted Stevens, a Republican icon from Alaska, introduced a constitutional amendment to overturn *Buckley v. Valeo*, the 1976 Supreme Court decision that established the flawed premise that money and constitutionally protected speech were the same thing.

Senator Stevens already saw the deteriorating effect unlimited campaign expenditures were having on Congress. In a speech on the Senate floor on the day he introduced the amendment, Senator Stevens said:

I, for one, would like to see the time come when there would be a limitation on the expenditures and the upward pressure on candidates, so that those who are seeking reelection, those who are seeking to challenge incumbents, or those who are seeking to fill a vacancy would not have this pressure that is brought about by the necessity to raise ever-increasing amounts to campaign for Federal office.

Senator Stevens recognized over 30 years ago that we were in an arms race—that the drive for money would only get worse and Congress's ability to function would suffer.

This was only the beginning of the movement to amend the Constitution. In every Congress from the 99th to the

108th, Senator Fritz Hollings introduced bipartisan constitutional amendments similar to S.J. Res. 19. Senators SCHUMER and COCHRAN continued the effort in the 109th Congress. Even Minority Leader MCCONNELL once had his own constitutional amendment to limit the influence of money on our elections.

That was all before the Citizens United and McCutcheon decisions, before things went from bad to worse. The out-of-control spending since those decisions has further poisoned our elections.

But no matter how bad things get, an amendment can only succeed if Republicans join us in this effort, as they have in the past. I know the political climate of an election year makes it even more difficult, but today's vote is not the end. I will reintroduce this amendment in the next Congress, and I hope my Republican colleagues will join me. Poll after poll shows that our constituents—across the political spectrum—want this amendment. It's time we listened to them.

We had a great debate this week. It raised awareness of the issue across the country. But we also heard a lot of hysteria on this floor from some of my colleagues across the aisle. Michael Keegan, president of People For the American Way, summed up the debate from the other side of the aisle quite well. He said, "A good rule of thumb in politics is that the scarier someone sounds, the more you should doubt what they're saying."

So, we have been treated to a parade of imaginary horrors. Saturday Night Live creator Lorne Michaels is going to jail for writing political satire. So is the little old lady next door for putting up a \$5 political yard sign. Books and movies will be banned. The NAACP and Sierra Club will be muzzled. Pretty scary stuff. And complete nonsense.

Congress has a long history, since 1867, of campaign finance reform. Any reading of this history is very clear. The reforms were sensible and reasonable. If they were not, they would have little chance of passing both houses of Congress. Or being signed by the President. And even under our constitutional amendment, extreme legislation can still be struck down by the Court. The other side knows this.

For over 150 years, Congress had a say in how money affects our elections. And it needed to. In the wake of scandals, it acted to curb excess and corruption. Reform was bipartisan. It was responsible. And it did not shut down the New York Times or the Heritage Foundation. Comedians and actors did not go to jail. It has not threatened free speech.

Those who think that money is speech need to look at where that flawed premise has led our country. Historically low approval ratings for Congress, polarization of the elec-

torate, and a failure to compromise on the most pressing issues facing the Nation. Senator Hollings recognized the deterioration of our legislative branch due to the increasing influence of money on our elections. In a Huffington Post piece titled "Money is a Cancer in Politics," he wrote:

Money has not only destroyed bi-partisanship but corrupted the Senate. Not the senators, but the system. In 1966 when I came to the Senate, Mike Mansfield, the Leader, had a roll call every Monday morning at 9:00 o'clock in order to be assured of a quorum to do business. And he kept us in until 5:00 o'clock Friday so that we got a week's work in. . . Today, there's no real work on Mondays and Fridays, but we fly out to California early Friday morning for a luncheon fundraiser, a Friday evening fundraiser, making individual money appointments on Saturday and a fundraising breakfast on Monday morning, flying back for perhaps a roll call Monday evening.

I agree with his assessment, and also remember when fundraising was not the priority it is today. My father was elected to Congress in 1954, when I was in first grade. Back then, the legislative branch was a Citizens' Congress. Members were in Washington for 6 months, and then they went home for 6 months and worked at their profession. But during those 6 months in session, Congress focused on legislating.

Unfortunately, our current campaign finance system has locked Members of Congress into an endless campaign cycle. Elected officials spend far too much time raising money for campaigns, and not enough time carefully considering legislation or listening to constituents. The drive to raise money is constant, and allowing vast new amounts of special interest money into the system will only increase the pressure. This causes a deterioration of Congress's ability to function, including its ability to adequately represent and respond to its constituents.

As the money raised and spent on campaigns by special interests continues to climb, Members of Congress will have to devote more time trying to keep up in the fundraising race. It is no wonder that, as the pursuit of campaign money has come to dominate politics, the American people have become increasingly dissatisfied with Congress' performance.

That is the whole point. That is why we are here. Because our elections cannot be for sale to the highest bidder. The Supreme Court has opened the floodgates. The American people are demanding that we close them.

Because they know, and we know, that we have a broken system. Today's New York Times editorial sums it up well. It states that, "As long as money is officially categorized as protected speech, there will be no brake on the ability of the rich and special interests to drown out other voices."

The First Amendment has already been hijacked by billionaires and spe-

cial interests. Our amendment rescues it.

Here's the bottom line. Billionaires want to stay at the head of the table and our amendment will not let them. Let's be clear, they oppose any restriction. Any reform. Today's vote may have been along party lines, but I will leave it to the American people to judge why.

We will continue this fight. The momentum continues to grow, and we will eventually win. The American people hate the influence of money on our elections. They want elections to be about the quality of ideas, not the size of bank accounts. They want us to fight for the middle class, not the moneyed class. They want us to spend our time raising hopes, instead of raising cash.

As I said in my remarks earlier this week at the beginning of this debate, there is a well-known quote from the Watergate era. "Follow the money." Because we all know the truth: The road to corruption, to undue influence, is paved with money. We need to get off that road. For the integrity of our electoral system. For the people who send us here. For the future of our country.

As we wrap up this week's debate, and this historic vote, I want to thank several people. Senator BENNET joined me in this effort over 4 years ago. Our amendment in the 111th Congress had four cosponsors. Today it has 49. I also want to express my appreciation for the efforts of Chairman LEAHY and Senator DURBIN, and thank their staff, particularly Josh Hsu and Albert Sanders. The amendment received a hearing in the Judiciary Committee. It went through markups in Senator DURBIN's subcommittee and in the full committee. It was debated, and revised, and improved.

I want to thank the diverse coalition of groups who have worked tirelessly to build support for our amendment. Groups like People For the American Way, Public Citizen, Common Cause, Free Speech For People, the Sierra Club, the NAACP, and all the organizations working under the banner of United For The People.

I ask unanimous consent that today's New York Times editorial, "An Amendment to Cut Political Cash," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 2014]

AN AMENDMENT TO CUT POLITICAL CASH

(By the Editorial Board)

There are 48 Democratic senators sponsoring a constitutional amendment to restore congressional control to campaign spending that is expected to come up for a vote later this week. They are not under the illusion that it will become the 28th Amendment soon, if ever. But their willingness to undertake a long and difficult effort shows the importance they attach to restoring fairness to American politics by reducing the influence of big money.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in outside spending—most of it from big business and labor interests—continue to flow into political races after being unleashed by the Supreme Court and lower court decisions. Each year a record is set: already, outside spending on this year's midterm elections (\$189 million so far) is more than three times what it was at this point in 2010.

The Supreme Court has said that's fine. In several misguided rulings, it has declared that spending money on politics is a form of free speech, and is thus deserving of constitutional protection. Beginning with the Buckley decision in 1976, the court ended the limitations on independent political spending in the name of speech, and with the Citizens United decision in 2010, it opened the spending floodgates to corporations and unions.

These decisions are the law of the land and cannot be overturned by simple legislation. Congress can encourage better behavior with public financing mechanisms, not that Republicans will agree even to that. As long as money is officially categorized as protected speech, there will be no brake on the ability of the rich and special interests to drown out other voices.

Barring a change in the makeup of the Supreme Court, it would take an amendment to reduce the flow of cash. The one under debate in the Senate declares that Congress and the states have the ability to "regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections." Addressing the Citizens United decision, it says that governments can "distinguish between natural persons and corporations" in setting those regulations, thus allowing restrictions on corporate or union spending that would not necessarily apply to individuals. To protect the free flow of information in the news media, the amendment adds the assurance that it will not abridge the freedom of the press.

Republicans, fearful of deflating their cushion of cash, are trying to portray the amendment as an assault on the Bill of Rights. But writing unlimited checks on behalf of politicians was never part of the American birthright. This measure defines protected "speech" as it had been understood in the First Amendment for 185 years until the Buckley decision: actual words uttered or written by natural persons, not money spent, and certainly not from corporate treasuries.

The amendment would not be a cure-all. "The press" is an amorphous term in the digital age, and political groups could try to claim free-press status to get around regulation. And amending the Constitution should not be taken lightly. It is a last resort to fix a grave civic problem. But the backers of this amendment recognize that the nature of American democracy is at stake.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Tom Udall, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Mark Begich, Joe Manchin III, Amy Klobuchar, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Al Franken, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Hagan	Murphy	Whitehouse
Harkin	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander	Cochran	Graham
Ayotte	Collins	Grassley
Barrasso	Corker	Hatch
Blunt	Cornyn	Heller
Boozman	Crapo	Hooven
Burr	Enzi	Inhofe
Chambliss	Fischer	Isakson
Coats	Flake	Johanns

Johnson (WI)	Paul	Sessions
Kirk	Portman	Shelby
Lee	Risch	Thune
McCain	Roberts	Toomey
McConnell	Rubio	Vitter
Moran	Scott	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Gillibrand
Cruz	Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN HOOVER, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE

NOMINATION OF ANNE E. RUNG TO BE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY

NOMINATION OF DAVID RADZANOWSKI TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

NOMINATION OF MIRANDA A. A. BALLENTINE TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH L. NIMMICH TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH SEMBLER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

NOMINATION OF JUDITH M. DAVENPORT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

NOMINATION OF DAVID J. ARROYO TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider

the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nominations of John Hoover, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sierra Leone; Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy; David Radzanowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Miranda A. A. Ballentine, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Elizabeth Sembler, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020; Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020; and David J. Arroyo, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time on all the nominations that have just been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON HOOVER NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Hoover, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sierra Leone?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON RUNG NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Anne E. Rung, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON RADZANOWSKI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Radzanowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BALLENTINE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Miranda A.A. Ballentine, of the District of Co-

lumbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NIMMICH NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph L. Nimmich, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SEMBLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elizabeth Sembler, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DAVENPORT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Judith M. Davenport, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ARROYO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David J. Arroyo, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2016?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

RADZANOWSKI CONFIRMATION

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, first of all, I thank the Senate for confirming the nominee for Chief Financial Officer of NASA, David Radzanowski. Now the team is fairly complete over there, and we can move to the next phase.

As we move to the next phase, as we are getting ready to test the capsule called Orion that will ultimately be part of the vehicle that will take us to Mars in the decade of the 2030s, the rocket itself is being readied and its final design will be tested on a test

stand in Mississippi at the Stennis Center in the next couple of years. So we are well on the way for NASA being able to get out and explore the cosmos beyond low Earth orbit.

As you know, we have an International Space Station that is 120 yards long. Think of a football field from one goalpost to the other, that is how big it is. There are six humans up there. We rotate the crews out with the Russians and with the Europeans and in some cases we have had Japanese astronauts, so it is an International Space Station with an international crew. I thank the Senate for the confirmation today.

ISIS

Madam President, I am here to speak about the threat to America by ISIS. Every one of us has seen how brutal, how inhumane, how savage this group is. It was certainly brought home by the killing—the beheading—of the two journalists, one of them from my State of Florida.

I would invite anyone to go on the Internet to see the images of what this group has done to others, just because someone has a different religious faith, in this particular case the Christians near Sinjar Mountain. You should see the photographs. Maybe you don't want to see the photographs of the infants they have beheaded because their parents are of a different faith.

You should see the photographs of the women whom they are slitting their throats and letting their lifeblood drain into a basin bowl as they hold down the women. This is the savagery. That is why the President so appropriately, eloquently, very directly and very firmly last night spoke about he is using his constitutional power as Commander in Chief to go after them. The President also said he wants the support of Congress.

It is true the President—in this Senator's opinion—has the authority to strike, but as he clearly reminded us last night, this is not a short-term deal. This is going to be a long-term and involved effort. So the Congress should register its support of the authorization to use military force. That is what we can do as we get into the debate of should that force be limited.

I have filed one version. I have no pride of authorship. I want it to be debated. I have suggested there would be the ability to use all the defense force except rotational ground forces, which is the term of art in the Department of Defense meaning big ground armies. That is what the President wants to avoid when he talks about boots on the ground, that he doesn't want that. That is what the American people do not want, and that is what this Senator does not want.

But we certainly don't want to handcuff the Department of Defense and our military in carrying out the successful objective of being able to go after and

help eliminate this savage beast called ISIS or ISIL or as they characterize themselves, the Islamic State.

Today Secretary Kerry is in the Middle East. He is working on the coalition. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel is making phone calls. Last week at the summit—the NATO summit—along with the President, he was already talking with his counterparts there. They are knitting together the coalition that will be a coalition not only of NATO but a coalition of so many in the region, including, we hope, a lot in the Arab League.

So isn't it time we know this effort that is hugely supported by the American people—isn't it time for the Congress to register our approval by exercising our constitutional duty? I would suggest it is.

I know some of the hearings are starting next week. Later this afternoon the Senate will have a classified briefing on the threat of ISIS. Many of us have already had a number of those briefings and know this is a threat like we have not faced before—not only because of the savagery but also the fact that they are well organized, they have a jihadist mission, and they are well funded.

Part of our effort as we reach out to our coalition is to get them to stop the avenues of funding that is going in to this organization.

I will close by saying that for the Congress to register our support, by the support of this type of legislation, is to show our allies and the world—not only to show the unity of America behind this effort, both clandestine and overtly military—but also to show our enemies the unity of America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to speak to regret that the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator UDALL lost 54 to 42. Of course, a majority voted for it, but we need two-thirds for a constitutional amendment. I first want to thank Senator UDALL for his great leadership on this issue. As chairman of the rules committee and a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have worked with him on this, and I know his passion and dedication to straightening our country out, straightening our system of campaign finance out.

Second, I want to say this: We are going to keep fighting until we get this done. The only way really to cure the

Supreme Court's misguided ruling, whether it is in Citizens United or McCutcheon, is with a constitutional amendment. Our day will come. We are not giving up.

When the Supreme Court issued its ruling in McCutcheon several months ago, it was another step on the path towards destruction of our system of campaign finance laws. First in Citizens United and then in McCutcheon, the Supreme Court has been chipping away at the actual foundation of our democracy that everyone is equal in the political arena. It just does not mean equal in terms of votes; it means that if you are a multimillionaire, you should not be allowed to drown out the messages of everybody else.

If Congress does not respond, our system is going to collapse. This year, the amount of independent expenditures from a small number of individuals will exceed the money spent by all the others. It is just amazing. We cannot have it. That is why Democrats will continue to fight for a constitutional amendment that would finally allow us to fight back and regulate the dark money that is flooding our elections and threatening to take us back to the era of the robber barons. The Federal Government and the States should be allowed to pass laws that prevent unregulated sums of undisclosed money from pervading our elections.

This constitutional amendment would do just that. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not see it that way. They have argued that the amendment would curtail freedom of speech. The Republican leader said in an op-ed earlier this week that Democrats are trying to take an eraser to the First Amendment.

Well, he is dead wrong. All Democrats are trying to erase is the hundreds of millions dollars—undisclosed—that are tainting our elections, whether they are coming from the Koch brothers or George Soros or Tom Steyer. All of them should not be allowed to have such huge influence.

Many other Republicans have portrayed this sensible amendment as an unparalleled attack on the First Amendment, which, they seem to argue, is absolute. I would say, for instance, to the Senator from Texas and my Republican friends that no amendment is absolute.

You cannot yell "fire" in a crowded theater. Child pornography is illegal. We have libel laws. These are all sensible limits to the First Amendment.

This amendment is similarly a sensible amendment. It creates balance. Every amendment—and the Founding Fathers, when they created the Bill of Rights, and the States, when they ratified them, realized that "balance" is a watchword. We believe in the right to buy arms, but people shouldn't be allowed to buy a tank and ride down the

street in it. We believe in all of the amendments, but none should be stretched to ridiculous extremes, which any law can be.

This amendment would go a long way to restoring fairness and credibility to a system of campaign laws that the Supreme Court has ripped to shreds over the past years.

I don't know if these Supreme Court Justices know the harm they are doing to our system in their abstract view that limiting many kinds of campaign finance violates the First Amendment, but I wish they could be on the ground and see the harm they are doing.

Simply put, unregulated dark money is poisoning our elections, and this amendment is the antidote. The American people want us to change the way elections are financed in this country not just for the sake of the system itself but because the current system results in a Congress that fails to do what average folks—the middle class—want it to do. Democrats want to raise the minimum wage, but the Koch brothers spend millions electing candidates who oppose it. Democrats want equal pay for equal work, but shadowy billionaires and corporate interests funnel millions to the campaigns of candidates who would block it.

We have to have fair elections in order to give the middle class a fair shot. And on the amendment the Presiding Officer has so valiantly sponsored, all we want to say is if you are a multimillionaire, you ought to pay taxes at the same rate as everyone else and use the money we gain to help make it easier for everyone to afford college and pay their college debts at a reasonable interest rate after they get out of college. But those who would be the small number who would be hurt by this have a few clarion voices who have billions of dollars who spend the money and prevent candidates who believe in this view—which most Americans believe in—from getting elected.

We have to have fair elections in order to give the middle class a fair shot. We hope our Republican colleagues will drop their objections and work with us to restore some semblance of fairness to our electoral system.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAMAS

Mr. REID. Madam President, much has been said about the terrorist group ISIS in the past few days—and rightfully so. ISIS is a vile mob of fanatics whose butchery knows no bounds. I am

confident President Obama's targeted action will degrade and destroy this menace.

But there is another evil organization in the world today that, like ISIS, has zero regard for humanity. They are kidnappers and executioners. They are violent extremists who murder innocent civilians. They are terrorists who cower behind women and children, even using them as human shields. They are saboteurs of peace and provocateurs of bloody conflict who will not stop their butchery. Once again, I am not talking about the Islamic State of Iraq; I am talking about Hamas.

Hamas and ISIS are both vicious, corrupt, hateful, evil groups. Both are extreme, outrageous, irrational, excessive, harsh, and radical. Yet for some reason Hamas's brutality doesn't elicit the same horror in the international community as ISIS. How can that be?

One of the few differences between these two terrorist organizations is that Hamas has a narrow, ghastly focus: the destruction of the State of Israel. Consider its actions over the past few months.

Hamas raided its own limited supplies for housing and general infrastructure, intended to repair the destruction that occurred during the last conflict they initiated. Hamas instead used the stolen materials to build tunnels to hide and infiltrate Israel—infiltrating to kill, maim, kidnap, and murder the innocent.

These depraved agitators launched thousands of rockets into Israel, hoping to inflict death and destruction. Their rockets had no aiming devices, no aiming capabilities. They fired indiscriminately, not caring whether they hit a child, a family, a school, or a place of worship. It begs the question: Without specific targets, why fire the rockets into Israel? We know why—provocation. Hamas knew Israel would be forced to defend itself, and, of course, that is what the Israelis did. Israel responded as any nation would to such attacks against its nation—by trying to protect its people. And what did Hamas do? They had such little regard for the people of Gaza that they used their own as human shields. Hamas used Palestinians as shields to carry out a sinister ploy, hoping they and their apologists could dupe the world into blaming Israel.

David Brooks, a distinguished columnist, said 2 months ago on PBS's "NewsHour," referring to Hamas:

It's a rare moment in military history where a party rejects a cease-fire in order to get more of their own people killed. But that's part of the strategy.

When Hamas wasn't scheming for more Palestinian fatalities to blame on Israel, it was carrying out more public executions of Gaza residents. For example, this is an article from the Wall Street Journal: "Alleged Collaborators

With Israel Killed in Gaza. Deaths Follow Israel's Targeted Killing of Three Top Hamas Military Commanders."

Hamas executed 18 people on Friday, some of them in the streets of Gaza City in the middle of the day, after accusing them of collaborating with Israel, according to media linked to the Islamic group, which rules the Gaza Strip.

In one instance, about 20 militants dressed in black and with their faces covered brought six of the condemned men, their heads covered with cloth bags, to an alley near the Great Omari Mosque in Gaza City after midday prayers, witnesses said. A militant shot the men in the head one at a time with a pistol, after which he sprayed them with automatic rifle fire, the witnesses said. The bodies were loaded into government ambulances and taken away.

These are the fanatics Israel faces every day, terrorist organizations as violent and extreme as any other on the face of the planet, as indicated by this Wall Street Journal article I just read.

There are those who refuse to condemn Hamas as they would ISIS. The hypocrisy is stunning. Those who reject tyranny, corruption, and terrorism should denounce Hamas. All those who honor peace and sovereignty should stand for Israel.

I stand with Israel. The United States of America stands with Israel. President Barack Obama and Congress continue to affirm America's unshakeable bond with Israel and our strong support for the security and safety of its people.

For my part, I will continue to do all I can to support Israel's right to self-defense. I know my colleagues join me in supporting the State of Israel and condemning Hamas for the depraved, horrid, repugnant terrorist organization that it is.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

ISIS

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I haven't watched the gruesome videos of the beheadings of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and I have no plans to do so. I don't think I need to do so in order to understand the brutality of ISIS and the threat this radical movement poses to our partners in the Middle East and Europe—and ultimately to the United States' national security interests.

As we stand here in the Capitol today with the flags at half-mast in remembrance of the 9/11 attacks, I think we all understand that we can't just ignore this crisis and hope that it passes. The risks are too high. ISIS presents a new and unique threat to global stability, and it must be met with a robust global response. Whether we like it or not, in today's world of decentralized power, it is still up to the United States to lead this effort.

Last night the President of the United States laid out a strong and

compelling case for taking the fight to ISIS. I wholeheartedly agree with the imperative for action he outlined. ISIS represents a serious threat, and we would betray our bond of trust with the world if we ignored it simply because of a wariness here at home with protracted military engagements abroad.

So for me the question is not if or whether we should confront ISIS. Rather, it is about the most effective way to go about this important task, and it is about making sure this debate happens in the proper context.

Americans today, more than ever, feel like they have lost control of their lives, of their ability to feel financially and economically and even physically secure. These videos and reports of ISIS's unconscionable brutality add to this feeling of insecurity, and they invoke rage—justifiable, appropriate rage—about those who would carry out such acts.

In this case this fear and anger we feel about ISIS's actions is complemented by the legitimate threat this group poses. So we shouldn't hesitate to act simply because our desire to do so is fueled by the intense emotion this enemy engenders in us. But our response—the details of our strategy—cannot be dictated by these impulses.

Our plan of attack against ISIS needs to be well thought out, nuanced, not rushed into because we feel an emotional compulsion to do something—anything—right now. We made that mistake in the past as a nation, and we shouldn't misstep again. We certainly shouldn't allow election-year politics to play into our calculations.

This is a debate about ISIS, but it is also a debate about how we are going to meet a potential plethora of anti-Western extremist groups that are organized and will organize against us throughout the world. We are creating a precedent for action, and we shouldn't rush into war simply because we feel pressured to get something done before an election.

As the President noted last night—and it is important to repeat—ISIS today does not have imminent plans to attack the United States. That doesn't diminish the necessity of taking them on. It simply means that we don't need to engage in a panicked response.

So today I will lay out four principles that I believe should serve as the foundation for action against ISIS.

First, our strategy needs to be guided by the recognition that ISIS's power comes in the first instance from a political vacuum in Iraq and Syria, and, second, from a military vacuum. Any strategy must lead with economic and political tactics to undermine ISIS's legitimacy, using military power as a tool to create the space for those efforts.

We can't defeat an ideology of extremism with an air campaign. Bombs and drone strikes will not help win the

hearts and minds of Sunnis who currently feel disenfranchised or ostracized by the Iraqi Government. As with any conflict, the real solution has to come from the people of the region. Elements of Iraq's Sunni population will continue to support radical Islamic insurgents—or, at best, just passively allow them to operate—as long as they see no future for them in their country.

So I applaud President Obama for making the centerpiece of his speech last night a call for continued efforts to create a truly inclusive political process in Iraq. The new Prime Minister has a difficult road ahead, and both Congress and our regional partners should do our part to support this tough political work.

For instance, as a complement to new military funding for operations in the Middle East, we should be debating funding a surge for political and economic work in the region. If we are going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars dropping bombs inside Iraq, we and our allies should commit to double that amount to support political efforts to empower moderates in the region.

Second, we will fail if we do not unite Shiite and Sunni nations in the region behind a military plan to confront ISIS.

I agree with the President that in the short term the United States is going to need to step up its military operations in Iraq, and I cannot disagree with the President that there may be limited imperatives to use the Air Force inside Syria should we have intelligence that ISIS there poses a threat to the United States. But any military campaign has to be fully cloaked in the legitimacy of a true regional coalition with Sunni partners front and center.

Further, it is clear that ISIS is getting funding and a flow of equipment and recruits from countries in the region. We need to turn off this spigot immediately. We need to hear from our partners in the region that ISIS does not truly represent Islam, that they do not condone the slaughter and rape of other innocent Muslims, Christians or Yazidis, for that matter. The United States needs to lead the effort to combat ISIS, but we must do so as part of a broad international coalition.

Third, a strategy to confront ISIS does not require America to become fully and overtly enmeshed in the increasingly complicated civil war in Syria. Over the last 2 years I have consistently opposed arming and training the Syrian rebels. Since the last time Congress debated this subject, the prospect that this intervention could be counterproductive to our national security interests has only increased. To begin with, it will be very difficult to thread the needle of supporting a Shiite regime against a Sunni insurgency

in Iraq while at the same time supporting a Sunni insurgency against a Shiite regime in Syria. That inconsistency is going to make it difficult to put together lasting regional coalitions.

More importantly, it is increasingly impossible to sort out the so-called vetted moderate rebels from the truly bad rebels. All of our focus on ISIS over the past months has diverted our attention from the fact that, increasingly, some moderate Syrian rebels are openly collaborating with Jabhat al-Nusra, a wing of Al Qaeda, inside Syria, and there are even reports that ISIS itself is working with elements of the moderate rebels.

Our goal would be to support the rebels and simultaneously defeat ISIS and Assad. But the very real possibility exists that the rebels could align with ISIS to defeat Assad or our military campaign against ISIS allows Assad to prevail. Both are plausible and unacceptable options.

I want ISIS defeated in Syria. I want Bashar Al-Assad to pay for his crimes against humanity. But too much can go wrong for not enough possible gain for the U.S. to increase our involvement in the Syrian civil war—if necessary, using limited counterterrorism measures to attack ISIS in Syria, but leave the civil war inside Syria to parties that, whether we like it or not, have much more at stake in the fight than we do.

This brings me to my fourth point. All of this should be done with congressional authorization. There is no viable excuse for Congress to abdicate its constitutional responsibility to authorize war.

President Obama finished his speech last night with a spectacular charge to the American people, and few can disagree with it: America is exceptional. We continue to stand as a symbol and a beacon of freedom and democracy to the world. Because of that standard that we bear, we should respect the version of democracy that our Founding Fathers granted to us by having a debate in Congress about the policy that the President has proposed.

Respectfully, I disagree that the authorization for military force passed in the days following September 11 grants the President the power to conduct an open-ended, long-term war against ISIS. If that were to be the case, then there is absolutely no congressional check upon the Executive's power to open military fronts against extremist groups anywhere in the world at any time.

The 9/11 AUMF was not intended to be perpetual, but it would transform into a permanent, easily manipulated authorization if we interpret it to cover ISIS, a group that specifically disavows an association with the only named group in the 9/11 AUMF.

Frankly, I believe a well-crafted, limited authorization of military force

against ISIS could pass the Congress. I also believe the Constitution requires us to find out if it can.

I commend the President for having the courage to refuse to rush to rash judgment. We need to build a strategy that uses military action as a complement to political reform—not the other way around. We need to build a real sustainable regional coalition to support any military action, with Sunni nations as the lead. We need to recognize the limits of American power and stay out of the Syrian civil war. And we need to unite the Nation by a congressional authorization of a sound plan to take on ISIS.

I am glad my Commander in Chief made his case last night, understanding the foreign policy mistakes of the past decade and with a willingness to learn from them. I am confident that if we get this strategy right, the American people will stand squarely with him as we fight back against an enemy like few we have ever faced before.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2199

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 2199 it be in order for my amendment No. 3808 to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut

Mr. MURPHY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I know that in just offering the amendment I sought to offer on the Senate floor I have received an objection. Let me briefly describe what I am trying to offer. The objection that I just received from the other side of the aisle is a demonstration of what is wrong in the Senate right now.

What is happening in the Senate right now is the majority leader keeps bringing legislation to the floor, and people are not allowed to offer amendments that directly pertain to the legislation.

In fact, right now pending on the Senate floor is the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act. I have an amendment I want to offer on the Senate floor to that act that deals with addressing pay discrimination, but I am not going to be allowed to offer that amendment.

I guess the first question we have to ask is: Why is that? Why is it that when we have such an important issue, which I acknowledge is an important issue—that people in this country be treated fairly, that we be paid solely based on our experience and qualifications, that we eliminate discrimination in the workplace; something I would hope we could work together on and

about which we could have a real debate on this Senate floor—if someone comes to the floor and offers an amendment, what we get is an objection, because, really, what we are doing right now on the floor—let's be clear about it—is a political charade. It is trying to score political points on an issue that is very important that we shouldn't be sitting here trying to score political points on.

Why can't both sides of the aisle offer their amendments on ideas on how to eliminate discrimination in the workplace? It seems to me that if they are serious about the issue, the majority leader would allow individuals like me and other Senators on both sides of the aisle to come to the floor and offer their amendments. But we have just seen that when I have done that, I got an objection instead of allowing my amendment to be debated fully on this floor.

All Americans should be treated fairly and paid solely based on their experience and qualifications, and discrimination has no place in the American workforce.

There are important laws we have passed on a bipartisan basis in the Congress. Laws like the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act are there to combat workplace discrimination. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became the first Federal law designed to protect U.S. workers from employment discrimination based upon a person's sex.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 requires employers to pay female employees the same wages that they pay male employees for equal work—very important laws.

Both title VII and the Equal Pay Act provide a way for those who are discriminated against to file complaints against their employers and pursue financial remedies if they are discriminated against in the workplace. Our focus, of course, always needs to be on enforcing those important laws that were passed by the Congress to ensure that both men and women in the workplace will be judged based on their performance and not based on their gender.

Unfortunately, despite these laws there are instances where pay discrimination still exists. With 60 percent of women serving as the primary earners in their households, this disparity must be addressed, and this is an important issue. But the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act that is pending on the floor, in my view, is not the answer. Instead of ensuring that women are treated fairly, the Paycheck Fairness Act would limit the ability of women in some instances to have flexible work schedules if that is what they need, and it would make it easier—much easier—to file frivolous lawsuits that, frankly, are a boon to trial lawyers. One concern I have about the bill

pending on the floor—and I think it is a legitimate concern—is that it could have an impact on reducing the ability of employers to award merit pay.

I had the privilege of serving as the first woman attorney general in New Hampshire, and before that I worked in private practice in a law firm. In my position and in the work I have done throughout my life, I have had the opportunity to meet incredible women in all fields in New Hampshire and throughout this country, whether it is leaders in the health sector, in the business sector—women working very hard every day in this country. There are many instances, I have to tell you, where women, based on merit, have outperformed their male colleagues. So what we don't want to do is create a law and pass a law that actually reduces the opportunities for employers in the workplace to reward merit, because women—like men—want the opportunity to earn more than their male counterparts when we do a better job.

We had this debate last April on the Senate floor, and when we had this debate on the Senate floor we experienced what we are experiencing right now. Paycheck fairness was brought to the floor and, in fact, I worked on an amendment with some of my colleagues—Senator FISCHER, Senator COLLINS, and Senator MURKOWSKI. We offered an amendment that we thought would help address the discrimination that can occur in the workplace and to address retaliation when employees discuss the salaries they make so that they can become informed in the workplace. But when we offered that amendment in April, we were denied a vote on it. We were in the same situation we are now.

So it is like “Groundhog Day.” The Senate rejected the bill pending in April, and we were denied all amendments and the ability to really debate and amend it and have a real discussion about this important issue. Here we are again leading into the November elections, and again the bill is on the floor, and again Senators like me who have offered an amendment that I hoped we could discuss and consider are going to be denied the ability to do so.

When I came to this floor in April, when this bill was pending on the Senate floor before, I said then and I firmly believe it now: If the majority leader believes this is an important issue, then we should have a real debate and an open amendment process and not engage in a political charade. I think the American people deserve better.

In New Hampshire, Republicans and Democrats actually got together and they were able to pass a bipartisan pay equity law which was signed into law in July. It is a commonsense measure that helps address wage disparities between men and women, and that law was the basis for the proposed amend-

ment which I have just tried to offer on the Senate floor so that the Senate could consider some of the very good ideas that were worked through on a bipartisan basis in my State as a way to address discrimination in the workforce.

This amendment that I have filed—but that I am not being permitted to offer—is modeled on New Hampshire's law and, again, it was bipartisan. In fact, the amendment that I have offered is called the Ensuring Fairness in Pay Act. It would make clear that employers have to pay men and women equal wages for equal work. It ensures equal pay for workers performing equal work under similar conditions regardless of sex. In fact, it also prohibits retaliation against employees who discuss their pay information and prohibits employers from requiring employees to sign a contract or a waiver that prohibits the employees from disclosing their pay. This would allow employees to know what their situation is so they can ensure that they are being treated fairly.

What was passed in New Hampshire—my amendment here—also contains teeth. In fact, similar to New Hampshire's law, my amendment would impose a \$2,500 penalty for any violation of this law and for pay discrimination. So putting teeth in it is important as well. We did that at the State level, and I thought we should consider doing this at the Federal level if my amendment could be considered by this body.

It also requires employers to post a notice that sets forth excerpts or summaries of the pertinent provisions of what is the law—title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—and information pertinent to how you file a complaint if you feel you are subject to discrimination in the workforce.

Finally, my amendment encourages States to provide pay disparity statistics including historical analysis and any information that would help the public understand and address this issue.

I urge the majority leader to put politics aside so that we can work together on a bipartisan solution, just as New Hampshire was able to do. In my home State of New Hampshire, when there is an amendment offered, you actually will get a vote on it. I think we are doing a real disservice to the American people, regardless of what the issue is, that Senators on both sides of the aisle when they are offering an amendment aren't permitted to have a vote on it on the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

MR. REID. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to the Baran and Burns nominations reported

out of the Environment and Public Works Committee earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1003.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2015.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tom Udall, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Thomas R. Carper.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN G. BURNS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie K. Hirono, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tom Udall, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Thomas R. Carper.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2199

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that not withstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to S. 2199 occur at 5:30 p.m. Monday, September 15, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, September 15, 2014, notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on cloture on S. 2199, the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 1003 and 1004; further, that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, on Tuesday, September 16, at 2:15 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on

confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote, and all rollcall votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EBOLA CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, over the past several months the world's attention has been focused on the Russian invasion of Crimea and fighting in the eastern Ukraine, the explosion of violence in Gaza, the flood of migrant children from Central America, and the horrific death and destruction in Iraq and Syria.

In each of these places vast numbers of innocent people have suffered terribly, and our own policies and capability to respond have been severely tested.

Yet one of the most urgent, difficult, and frightening challenges facing the world today is not the result of armed conflict or ethnic or religious extremism. It is the world's first Ebola epidemic, and it poses a potentially devastating threat to Africa and people everywhere.

Before the August recess we were preparing to receive dozens of African heads of state to Washington. At that time, Doctors Without Borders and other nongovernmental organizations had been ringing alarm bells for weeks about the worsening Ebola outbreak in West Africa.

But the World Health Organization and governments, including our own, were slow to respond to what was viewed as a manageable, localized public health problem, rather than a crisis that could spin out of control.

No longer. Infections and deaths in Liberia and Sierra Leone are increasing rapidly, with exponential acceleration in these countries and potentially in neighboring Guinea. Official reports may be only a piece of the picture. The ability of these countries to locate, diagnose, isolate and treat patients, trace and monitor contacts, and safely bury the dead cannot possibly keep pace.

Unfortunately, the lack of urgency exhibited by much of the international community was exacerbated by budget cuts at the World Health Organization, for which there is ample blame to go around. After the 2009 global financial crisis, WHO's budget dropped by roughly 1 billion dollars, nearly 25 percent of their budget today.

By the time of the current Ebola outbreak, staff levels at WHO had been cut by 35 percent, and their ability to prepare for and respond to health emergencies suffered accordingly.

Today, the Ebola crisis has the full attention of the World Health Organization, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USAID, President Sirleaf of Liberia, and other governments. They recognize that unless aggressive, coordinated actions are taken immediately, there will soon be tens of thousands of cases, the disease will spread into much of Africa, and it will be an ongoing global threat for many years to come.

The challenges are immense: weak government institutions; dysfunctional public health systems that cannot conduct reliable disease surveillance and response; lack of roads and other basic infrastructure; ethnic and political divisions in societies recovering from war; misconceptions about the disease and low levels of literacy; and inadequate and uncoordinated international aid.

While the epidemic is finally beginning to receive the attention it deserves, it is spiraling out of control. Huge numbers of cases are overwhelming local capacity to isolate and treat patients, trace their contacts, and safely bury the dead. The cost of personal protection gear is exorbitant and there is an acute shortage of trained people.

Also, the secondary effects of this crisis are increasingly apparent. Food insecurity is worsening and the economies of these countries, already fragile, are facing collapse as imports and exports are plummeting.

We and others have the knowledge and tools to contain and control this disease if cases are quickly isolated and contacts identified, but actions to date have not been well coordinated and have not always addressed the most urgent needs.

Just as for a raging wildfire, the focus should be on deploying all available resources to provide immediate support for urgent needs identified on the front lines to stop its spread, while there is time. It will require mobilization of the type and complexity as occurred after the Haiti earthquake.

In West Africa, that means immediately scaling up staff, transport, isolation and treatment capacity, infection control including personal protective equipment for health workers, funding through rapid and flexible funding mechanisms, training and su-

pervision, laboratory services, communications resources, and management and logistics support.

There is nothing new about this approach. But it is required on a far larger scale than was used to control Ebola outbreaks in the past.

The situation today is grave, but we can prevent many of these deaths. And as we do so we need to help build stronger public health systems that can contain future disease outbreaks.

Past efforts to build capacity have clearly been woefully inadequate. As public health systems in these countries have been overwhelmed by Ebola, patients suffering from malaria, TB, pneumonia, and other illnesses are unable to get treatment.

We should all pay tribute to the courageous public health workers who have risked their lives—and in many cases, lost their lives—trying to save others from this terrible disease. It is inspiring to read the stories of nurses and doctors, and those who dig the graves and bury the dead, who have labored on as their colleagues have died, who live with the daily reality that at any moment they could be next. They are as brave as any soldier on the front lines of battle.

I also want to commend President Sirleaf, her Minister of Defense, and others who have tried their best to deal with this unprecedented emergency in the face of woefully inadequate resources.

The United Nations says that \$600 million is needed immediately to fight this disease. The United States has already provided tens of millions of dollars. USAID announced another \$75 million last week. The White House has requested additional funding for CDC, which would bring the U.S. contribution to over \$250 million.

The Department of Defense announced that it will provide logistical, laboratory, and other support. The World Bank has pledged over \$200 million. Other governments are also coming forward, as are private donors. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation recently pledged \$50 million to enhance response efforts and accelerate research on potential treatments and vaccines.

The Congress has a role to play, and I am hopeful that as additional funds are needed we will act responsibly and provide them. I am a cosponsor of S. Res. 541, which recounts the history of this outbreak and the steps that are urgently needed to control it. I commend Senators COONS, DURBIN, MENENDEZ and others who introduced it. This is not a partisan or political issue. It is a public health issue, a moral issue, and one that should unite us all to do what is necessary to defeat this epidemic.

REMEMBERING JAMES M. JEFFORDS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senate passed a resolu-

tion recognizing the life and career of Senator Jim Jeffords. This Vermont icon passed away over the August recess, nearly 8 years after concluding a decades-long career in public service. That career, marked by historic moments on the national stage, was one in which Vermont came first. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Burlington Free Press, "Tributes pour in for Vermont GOP giant Jeffords," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Jim and I came to Washington together in 1975, he to represent Vermont as our lone Member in the House of Representatives, and I as Vermont's first Democratic Senator. But our years working together go back further, to the days when I was a State's attorney in Chittenden County, and he the State's attorney general. Our families knew each other. Marcelle and Liz knew each other well, having both attended Cathedral High School in Burlington. Both Jim and I would readily acknowledge that our wives were the hearts and souls of our families.

That longtime relationship served us and Vermont well when Jim came to the Senate in 1989. Together, we worked to protect Vermont's dairy farmers, to preserve Vermont's celebrated natural landscape, and to give Vermont a strong and powerful voice in Washington.

I joined many Vermonters in celebrating Jim's life last month in his home town of Rutland. Our sympathies are with his children Laura and Leonard, and his grandchildren.

Jim was a humble man, a Vermonter through and through, and a true friend. His legacy is that he held Vermont in his heart, and worked to advance the best interests of his constituents on the national stage.

For that, this Vermonter will join many others in simply saying, "Thanks, Jim."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Aug. 19, 2014]

TRIBUTES POUR IN FOR VERMONT GOP GIANT JEFFORDS

(By Sam Hemingway)

The Jim Jeffords For Governor campaign camper was headed up U.S. 2 toward East Montpelier in the summer of 1972 with the candidate behind the wheel.

"He almost drove off the road," recalled Bruce Post of Essex, who was aboard the camper as a just-out-of-college campaign volunteer. "He was the world's worst driver."

What Post also remembers from that day is that Jeffords, Vermont's attorney general at the time, telling him about a decision Jeffords had made to give no special treatment to a powerful Republican who had run afoul of Vermont's environmental laws.

"He told me that day, 'It might cost me my political career, but it's not going to cost me my political conscience,'" Post remembered Monday, the day Jeffords died.

Jeffords did lose the primary, but he went on to serve seven terms in the U.S. House and three in the Senate. In 2001, his conscience led him to leave the GOP, a stunning move that shifted control of the chamber to the Democrats.

Monday, Jeffords died shortly after 7 a.m. at Knollwood, a retirement home for military veterans in Washington, D.C. He was 80 and the last Republican to hold federal office elected from Vermont.

"While we are saddened by our father's passing, we take comfort in the knowledge that he lived a full life, from the hills of Vermont to the halls of Congress," Laura and Leonard Jeffords, the senator's son and daughter, said in a statement. "We will miss his kindness, his good humor, and his generosity of spirit."

Jeffords, afflicted with Alzheimer's disease, had been in declining health and had lived at Knollwood since retiring from his Senate seat in 2006. Jeffords was a veteran of the Navy and the Navy Reserve, but never served in combat. Jeffords' wife, Elizabeth Daley Jeffords, died in 2007.

News of Jeffords' death Monday morning, first reported by the Burlington Free Press, quickly spread across the state and the nation.

"Jim never lost the fiercely independent spirit that made Vermonters, and people across America, trust and respect him," President Barack Obama said in a statement.

"Whatever the issue—whether it was protecting the environment, supporting Americans with disabilities, or whether to authorize the war in Iraq—Jim voted his principles, even if it sometimes meant taking a lonely or unpopular stance."

In Vermont, Gov. Peter Shumlin mourned Jeffords' death. Flags at public buildings across the state were lowered at half-staff and will remain so through Saturday.

"The passing of Senator Jim Jeffords will be felt throughout Vermont and our country," Shumlin said in a statement. "We need more like Senator Jeffords. My heart goes out to his children and extended family."

THE MAVERICK

Jeffords's maverick political instincts served in him good stead as he navigated Vermont's shifting political currents over 40 years, emphasizing his moderate positions as the state leaned increasingly toward more liberal, Democratic positions.

As a House member, he was the only Republican to vote against President Ronald Reagan's tax cuts in 1981. In 1991, he voted against George H.W. Bush's nomination of Clarence Thomas to the U.S. Supreme Court. He supported President Bill Clinton's health care reform and, in 1999, voted against his impeachment.

"He was a partner in our work for Vermont, and he was a friend," Sen. Patrick Leahy said of Jeffords in a statement. "He was a Vermonter through and through, drawn to political life to make a difference for our state and nation. Part of his legacy will also stand as an enduring chapter of the Senate's history."

Leahy and Jeffords both won their first elections to federal office in 1974 and were rivals for a time. They grew closer over the years as they worked on dairy issues and others important to Vermont.

Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., who won the election to replace Jeffords in 2006, said Jeffords was a common-sense Vermonter who accomplished a lot.

Sanders toyed with running against Jeffords in 2000 but decided against it and said

Monday he would have passed on challenging Jeffords had Jeffords run for re-election in 2006.

"Vermonters admired him because of his low-key and down-to-earth qualities, and because of his obvious and strong love of the state and the Vermont way of life," Sanders said. "He was an effective champion of education, disability rights, the environment and the arts—and millions of Americans have benefited from his efforts."

Rep. Peter Welch, in an interview, spoke of how Jeffords and his wife helped him during his successful run for the House in 2006, and then in Welch's early months as a freshman congressman.

"He spoke softly but got a lot done," Welch said of Jeffords' career. "There are colleagues of his in the House who still remember him with great respect."

Former Republican Gov. Jim Douglas said Jeffords "will be long remembered as a Vermonter who gave his all and his best in every season of his storied career. As a friend, I will miss him dearly."

Republican Lt. Gov. Phil Scott said he fashioned his career after the example set by Jeffords. "He did what he felt was right, not what he felt would make him popular," Scott said.

THE SWITCH

Jeffords' decision to become an independent in 2001 rocked the nation. His move changed the balance of power in the Senate, which had been 50 Republicans and 50 Democrats.

The move cost his GOP colleagues their committee chairmanships and, for Jeffords, the loss of several lifelong friendships.

"I have changed my party label, but I have not changed my beliefs," Jeffords said in his May 24, 2001, speech at a jam-packed Radisson Hotel in Burlington where he announced the switch.

"Indeed, my decision is about affirming the principles that have shaped my career. I hope that the people of Vermont will understand it. I hope in time that my colleagues will as well. I am confident that it is the right decision."

The move catapulted Jeffords to rock-star national prominence, praised by Democrats and vilified by Republicans.

He wrote later that even members of his family opposed his decision. Sen. Trent Lott, R-La., and a member of the Singing Senators quartet along with Jeffords, fumed that Jeffords had carried out a "coup of one."

In the aftermath, Jeffords appeared on the covers of Newsweek and Time magazines in the same week. He also was the subject of several death threats, requiring required him to receive Capital Hill police protection for a time.

Back home, he was treated as a flat-out hero. His decision to leave the GOP spawned a popular "Thanks, Jim" bumper sticker and a special-edition beer called "Jeezum Jim," a reference to his modest nature and Vermonter accent.

"I have never been prouder of anything I've done in my life than being with him at that time, the time preceding the announcement and the time after that," said Eric Smulson, Jeffords' spokesman for 15 years. "How he handled himself, how he stood for his principles. He was a great statesman, a great Vermonter, but an even better person."

Others, including close friends and some Vermont Republican leaders, were distraught about the 2001 decision.

"I was very upset over it," said James Johnston of Montpelier, a former Jeffords

campaign adviser and close personal friend. "But I know he had good reason to do it at the time."

Johnston became emotional describing the loss of his old friend.

"I guess I knew this day was coming," he said, choking up as he spoke. "I'm not so sure I'm ready to deal with it."

Jeffords later wrote two books reflecting on his controversial move: a 2001 explanation of his decision titled "My Declaration of Independence" and a 2003 memoir, "An Independent Man."

A POLITICAL LIFE

Jeffords, the son of a Vermont Supreme Court justice, grew up in Rutland, studied at Yale University, received his law degree from Harvard University and entered politics in 1966, winning a race for state Senate from Rutland County.

Two years later, he was elected attorney general, and soon he became embroiled in a fight with International Paper's plant in Ticonderoga, N.Y., regarding the discharge of mercury-laden sludge into Lake Champlain.

Jeffords ran for governor in 1972, but many in the party resented his liberal positions on the environment and other matters, and he lost a bitter primary battle to Luther Hackett, a business-oriented Republican.

"He took it fine," said Bruce Post, recalling his time as a volunteer with the Jeffords for Governor campaign. "I don't think he was bitter or anything."

Hackett lost to Democrat Tom Salmon in the general election. Two years later, Jeffords won the state's lone U.S. House seat when incumbent Rep. Richard Mallory ran for U.S. Senate.

Jeffords initially lived in a camper in Washington after taking the House seat. He went on to win six House re-election contests, then won a seat in the U.S. Senate in 1988 when Sen. Robert T. Stafford, R-Vt., another Republican moderate, retired.

Jeffords was a consistent champion of education, helping to pass the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act as a freshman House member and becoming so immersed in efforts to support dairy farmers that he was dubbed "Mr. Dairy."

He also worked behind the scenes to help Soviet dissidents Alexander Solzhenitsyn by secretly arranging Solzhenitsyn's move to Cavendish, where the author lived for 18 years before returning Russia. Jefford also aided Soviet dissident Alexander Ginzburg after he was expelled from Russia in 1979.

During the Reagan years, Jeffords fought the president's plans to cut back on environmental regulations and lower taxes. In 1987, he was the only Republican House member to vote with Democrats to pass a \$12 billion tax increase. The measure passed the House by a single vote.

Surveys of his votes by liberal and conservative groups determined he leaned slightly toward liberal positions, and Jeffords continued to irritate GOP leaders.

He supported gay-rights legislation, voted for a gun-control measure after saying he opposed it and introduced a bill to force power producers to lower their emissions.

Opinions are divided on what caused him to finally decide to leave the Republican Party. Shortly before he made the decision, he voted against President George W. Bush's budget, saying it was too big on tax cuts and undercut spending on education, child care, veterans and the environment.

Jeffords also might have been irked that the White House had not invited him to an event celebrating the Vermont winner of the teacher of the year, even though Jeffords

was chairman of chairman of the Senate education committee.

"Looking ahead, I can see more and more instances where I'll disagree with the president on very fundamental issues—the issues of choice, the direction of the judiciary, tax-and-spending decisions, missile defense, energy and the environment, and a host of other issues, large and small," Jeffords said in the speech announcing his decision.

Jeffords, who had just been re-elected to the Senate in 2000, vowed to run for re-election in 2006 and repeated that assertion until 2005, when he abruptly scheduled a news conference at the Sheraton Hotel and Conference Center in South Burlington to announce he would leave the Senate at the end of 2006.

"I am feeling the aches and pains that come when you reach 70," he said in his speech. "My memory fails me on occasion, but Liz would probably argue that this has been going on the last 50 years."

Uncharacteristically, he took no questions at the news conference, and appeared tired and unsteady on his feet.

Jeffords' funeral is set for 11 a.m. Friday at Grace Congregational United Church of Christ in Rutland.

REMEMBERING 9/11

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today we remember 9/11. The President, First Lady and Vice President led a moment of silence at the White House this morning. The anniversary was observed at the Pentagon, at Ground Zero in New York, and in a field in Shanksville, PA. Across the country, we are connected by the sadness we all feel as we reflect on the lives lost, some 3,000 Americans, to this blatant act of terrorism.

We can all recall that moment. I recall looking down the Mall toward the Washington Monument and watching the black smoke billowing across the Mall from the Pentagon, where that deadly crash took the lives of passengers on that plane and innocent people working in defense of America. That was a moment that will never be forgotten.

There's a Hebrew word used in the Old Testament known as "selah." It doesn't have an easy translation but it is meant to serve as a pause-and-consider moment between passages. At 8:46 a.m. this morning, we observed a moment of silence to remember those souls lost on that day. We should all experience a "selah" moment today because we will never forget 9/11. Pause and consider, pause and remember.

Thirteen years later, we still live in the shadow of the fallen towers of the World Trade Center and the attack on the Pentagon. Al Qaeda brought its darkness to our shores and took the lives of innocent people. President John F. Kennedy said, "We are not here to curse the darkness, but to light the candle that can guide us through that darkness to a safe and sane future."

It was in our bleakest moments in those tragic days that we found the

light. Remember the outpouring of compassion and common purpose that united us on 9/11 and for weeks after. The attacks were the worst humanity could provide. Our response as a people was the best. The American people are always the candle that guides us.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to remember the precious lives lost 13 years ago in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. Our perception of the world changed in very dramatic ways by sunset on that day of infamy and we awoke on September 12 to what we believed to be a much more dangerous reality. We have learned a number of lessons since that day. Some were crystal clear almost immediately while others required us to walk a more difficult path to gain clarity. As we reflect on the 13th anniversary of 9/11, I would like to remind my colleagues of the two principles that can serve as our anchor amidst uncertainty and stormy circumstances.

First is that the followers of Osama bin Laden turned the openness and freedom of American society against us by savagely using civilian passenger jets as missiles to demolish the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center and destroy a large section of the Pentagon. They wield the weapons of fear, chaos, and destruction. We must remember that our foundation is built on freedom, justice, and equality. The greatest weapon in our arsenal is not a munition or aircraft but our light that remains shining upon the hill. Ours is the greatest democracy this planet has ever known and that is why it is a threat to those who seek darkness and destruction. We build, we progress, we encourage, we respect, but we do not sink to the level of our adversaries even if that means the fight is not fair. I am reminded of the words of President Kennedy, who said, "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

The second principle that we must remember is that the United States of America remains an indispensable Nation and to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return. We have a unique role in the world to lead the international community in providing stability, humanitarian relief, and defense of the innocent. Today we remain engaged in a war against elements of extremist terror organizations bent on the destruction of all people regardless of faith, nationality, or race who do not accept their tyrannical 9th century vision of the world. They are unlike any enemy we have ever faced in that they respect no boundaries, have no clear end, target civilians and servicemembers indiscriminately, and they are determined to make our home front the front lines.

Thirteen years ago, as the attacks unfolded and we learned of the scope of

the Al Qaeda network, we all questioned how our Nation would respond and whether we could recover. But as the days rolled by and we saw the determination, the compassion, and the commitment of so many individuals giving freely of their time and their money to help those affected by the attacks, we laid that question to rest. The bravery, resourcefulness, and the shared sense of purpose we witnessed that day and every day since 9/11 have shown the world the "stuff" of which Americans are made: an unquenchable love of freedom and an unwavering commitment to democracy. I have heard it said that 9/11 did not test America's character; it revealed it.

For the better part of the 20th century the United States and our allies fought a successful battle against the genocidal forces of fascism and totalitarianism. We defeated the Nazis. We won the Cold War. In the bloody struggle between ideologies, democratic governments triumphed over repressive regimes.

Since that day, we have consecrated the time and place where these terrorist acts occurred. We have commemorated the brave and dedicated individuals who faced 9/11 and its consequences head-on. We have honored and laid to rest our fallen war heroes. We have rebuilt the mangled section of the Pentagon, honored Flight 77's bravery in the Pennsylvania countryside and returned Ground Zero in New York City to the world's vibrant center of economic activity. When I think of these locations, I am reminded of the words President Lincoln delivered at Gettysburg that "we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract."

We have also made mistakes but we acknowledge and learn from those mistakes.

I believe we will prevail against this enemy for the same reason we have been victorious in previous conflicts: the overwhelming majority of people in the world want freedom and justice and dignity and opportunity. I am confident because America remains a beacon of hope to the oppressed everywhere. I am confident because I know this generation will meet all challenges and threats we face as a Nation as successfully as we met the challenges and threats of the last century. We must remain clear-eyed as to identity and objectives of our enemy and the distinction between us. We cannot shrink when the oppressed cry for freedom and the enslaved call for justice.

The 9/11 anniversary is especially poignant this year as it falls just 3 days short of the bicentennial of the Star-Spangled Banner, our National Anthem. The greatest navy in the world bombarded Fort McHenry for 25

hours, starting on September 13, 1814. British troops were poised to move into Baltimore after Fort McHenry fell. The Nation's capital was in flames; the Nation's future was in grave doubt. And then, an amazing thing happened: Fort McHenry did not fall to the British. A huge, glorious flag was flying over the fort as dawn broke on September 14, 1814. The British forces retreated. One of the darkest hours in America's history turned into one of its brightest moments, and Maryland lawyer Francis Scott Key was inspired to write the Star-Spangled Banner.

We will have additional challenges in the months and years ahead. But we must never forget the sacrifice previous generations of Americans have made to safeguard our liberty. And we must never forget that our enemies fight because they have so little freedom while we Americans fight because we have so much freedom and that makes all the difference.

RECOGNIZING CANYONLANDS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, thank you for the opportunity today to pay tribute to a timeless feature of Utah's beautiful geography: Canyonlands National Park. This week, citizens of Utah and friends around the United States join together in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Canyonlands National Park. As one of the "Mighty Five" national parks in Utah, the Canyonlands celebrate a landmark anniversary, and are a source of great pride for Utahns and the outdoors community nationwide.

Canyonlands National Park is located in the southeast of our State where the otherworldly cliffs, recesses, and red rock attract climbing, mountain biking, and rafting enthusiasts from across the globe. Anyone who walks down Main Street in Moab can hear languages from German to Japanese to English, as well as accents from all over America. People plan and save for years to visit Utah to behold the invulnerable landscapes of the Canyonlands. As one stands on the edge of a 1,000-foot cliff, while seeing hundreds of miles in all directions, nature somehow puts life in perspective.

This perspective gained should not be underestimated. There is a story in common between those who visit the park and the land they experience. It is a story told in rock layers that echo ancient seas, coastal mud flats, braided streambeds, and wind-blown dunes hundreds of feet thick. It is the story of time and change, to which all of God's creation is subject. Clues to this past lie preserved in stone, along the walls of deep gorges where great rivers once roared. The three main regions of Canyonlands: the Island in the Sky, Needles, and the Maze, were once an environment quite different and more lush. In what is now desert, shallow

seas once ebbed and flowed. In many ways the story of Canyonlands is a story of transformation, and this is something to which we can all relate. We are reminded of the hunter-gatherer peoples who once flourished in Canyonlands by the Native American rock art, in the "Great Gallery" region, that dates back as early as 2000 BC. When I consider those painted figures together with the mosaic of colors, shapes, and pinnacles of Canyonlands, I, like many others, recall the enduring relationship between man and nature. It is this continuing legacy that we call our attention to today.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the people, both elected officials and citizens, who possessed the foresight to recognize the value of Canyonlands and created the park 50 years ago. These efforts did not come without controversy and today much controversy remains. The area around the park holds diverse importance to the local community and a variety of stakeholders. Many spend their free time exploring over 2,500 miles of roads around the park in four-wheel drive vehicles while others find a special peace in the solitude of the Canyonlands desert. These interests may seem in conflict, but the vast lands of Utah amply accommodate the equally vast spectrum of pursuits.

For several years now, the Utah congressional delegation has been developing a public lands bill that will bring certainty and balance to the areas around Canyonlands and other landscapes in Utah. The land surrounding the national park would be protected with designations to ensure that our grandchildren can stand on the same red rock cliffs to look at the glorious sunsets that our pioneer ancestors saw and view vistas people from around the world come to see today. The bill will benefit our children by exchanging State lands in areas that do not produce revenues, with Federal lands that can be developed responsibly. The revenues derived, as a result of the thoughtful development enabled by these exchanges, will benefit school children in Utah. Only Congress can make these changes to the way our public lands are managed. At a time of congressional dysfunction, this is one area of positive happenings.

What better way to celebrate the anniversary of Canyonlands National Park than by bringing certainty to a region that has been denied stability for one-half century? I am proud to be a part of this ongoing process to protect the land surrounding Canyonlands National Park.

AMERICORPS PROGRAM ANNIVERSARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the AmeriCorps program.

I want to take a moment to say thank you—thank you to all of the volunteers and service workers out there. They are selflessly taking time out of their lives to help their fellow Americans in times of need. They are the ones out there building homes, clearing thousands of acres of forest burnt by wildfires, tutoring and mentoring our children, and assisting the elderly. They are unflagging, unflinching, and determined to make a difference.

National service has always been a passion of mine. When we started in the 1970s with the establishment of a domestic volunteer corps—similar to Peace Corps—I wanted to capture the fervor, the passion, and dynamic qualities of a social movement that would bring people to arms wielding change. At some point, it seemed we lost sight of what Alexis de Tocqueville called "habits of the heart"—neighbor helping neighbor. I wanted to help turn the ME generation into the WE generation.

That is why in 1989 I, along with Senators Kennedy and Nunn, introduced the National and Community Service Act—a bill to establish the Corporation for National and Community Service to oversee and coordinate our national volunteer efforts. This important legislation also created a demonstration program that has since evolved into what we know today as AmeriCorps.

I believe that AmeriCorps is the embodiment of the spirit of volunteerism and service to our country. When creating this program, I did not just want to create another government program. I did not want this to be another bureaucratic agency. What I wanted to do was capture the fervor, passion, and dynamic qualities of a social movement that would bring people to arms wielding change. I think we were successful in doing just that.

I am so proud of what AmeriCorps has accomplished and become. I never dreamt that I would be standing here 20 years later knowing that the AmeriCorps program would be the force that it is today. The data doesn't lie—it is quite impressive. Over the past 20 years, more than 820,000 AmeriCorps members have served our communities and country, providing more than 1 billion hours of service.

My home State of Maryland is lucky. We have 1,600 AmeriCorps members, and 5,400 Senior Corps members. Their stories are poignant, whether it is a Teach for America Corps member helping a child with long division after school, or a National Civilian Community Corps member helping restore order to communities after a devastating storm or an AmeriCorps member helping veteran families readjust to civilian life. Every day, national service changes lives. They all meet compelling human needs by helping out in our neighborhoods and communities across the country.

I used to be a social worker for Baltimore, but now I am a social worker for

America, and I believe civic responsibility is worth investing in. I want to continue to make sure that we make this kind of investment in AmeriCorps because the next generation is carrying the torch for national service. We must remember that it is not only young people signing up to serve their country. It is seniors serving as a foster grandparent to children who have been abused or neglected. It is veterans trading in their uniforms to work with Habitat for Humanity, building homes for their fellow service members. It is seasoned professionals heading into the corps, trading in corporate cubicles for classrooms and putting their real-world education to use. The next generation knows the importance of national service. Their dedication to its mission is inspiring.

Five years ago, I was at Mercy Hospital in Baltimore recovering from ankle surgery. An aide was helping me get back in bed and asked me if I knew Senator Kennedy. She said, "They tell me you had something to do with National Service. I was in AmeriCorps." She was working in modest means—she had heard you could work parttime, earn a bachelor's degree from college, and that there wasn't an age limit. At the local health department, she started to do some outreach. Her supervisor told her, "You have a real talent." This woman said, "People like me are never told they have a talent, but I found I had a talent by working for AmeriCorps." Through an AmeriCorps stipend, she completed her degree in social work and helped her grandson get into college. She is just one of the many who have been touched by AmeriCorps, who have changed the lives of others through service.

These stories and the work that AmeriCorps volunteers do give me profound hope, because while one person can make a difference, together we can make a change. I am so pleased to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the AmeriCorps program and look forward to the next 20 years.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to recognize the bicentennial of our national anthem, the Star Spangled Banner, and of Defenders Day. I thank Senator CARDIN, my partner in the Senate, for submitting a resolution to commemorate this occasion. Defenders Day, which inspired our national anthem, is momentous in the history of our Nation, the State of Maryland, and the City of Baltimore.

Two hundred years ago, the brave City of Baltimore led the way in the War of 1812 defending our Nation and holding the American line. Our troops stopped the British advance and claimed a much-needed victory for Baltimore and for the Nation.

Some call the War of 1812 the forgotten war. I believe it was the war that

forged our Nation. As the United States entered the war, it was a loose collection of States. As we emerged from it, we were on the path to becoming a true Nation.

It was also during this war at the Battle of Baltimore that we gained an enduring icon of national patriotism in our National anthem, inspired by the naval battle at Fort McHenry. Fort McHenry is now a revered National monument and a historic shrine.

The Battle of Baltimore was a rousing victory in the dark days following the British attack on our Capitol. The British had just burned Washington, setting our Capitol and White House ablaze, and hurting America's morale.

Less than a month later, the British sent a fleet of ships toward Baltimore sailing up the Bay to break America at the war's frontline in what is known today as Patterson Park, but first they had to get past Fort McHenry.

The British bombed the Fort for twenty-five consecutive hours. Nearby, a young lawyer named Francis Scott Key watched from a ship where he was being held. When the smoke cleared on the morning of September 14, 1814, he saw the fifteen stars and fifteen stripes of the American flag streaming over the Fort. He was so thrilled that despite the bombs bursting in the air, "our flag was still there." He went on to write the lines of the song that later became our National anthem, the Star Spangled Banner.

That day the line was held in Baltimore in our young country's war against the world's most powerful Nation. Fort McHenry has made history, and Fort McHenry has seen history. I am proud to represent Fort McHenry and Baltimore, and I encourage the passage of this resolution commemorating Fort McHenry, Defenders Day, and the Star Spangled Banner.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the War of 1812's Battle of Baltimore. The State of Maryland is proud of its contributions to this "Second War for Independence," which reinforced United States sovereignty and gave birth to our national anthem. While Star-Spangled 200 events are already underway in my home State, I wish to spend a few minutes to discuss the War of 1812 and the story of Francis Scott Key's poem "Defense of Fort M'Henry."

A generation after the United States declared its independence from Great Britain, the mercantilist ties between the two countries were not fully severed. The British impressed American merchant seamen, enforced illegal and unfair trade regulations, colluded with certain Native American tribes to attack frontier settlements, and attempted to block westward expansion. The United States declared war to reassert autonomy over its own affairs, establish free trade, protect sailors'

rights, and ensure that our Nation could prosper from sea to shining sea.

President James Madison eloquently outlined these justifications more than 200 years ago when he called on "all the good people of the United States, as they love their country, as they value the precious heritage derived from the virtue and valor of their fathers . . . [to] exert themselves in preserving order, in promoting concord, in maintaining the authority and efficacy of the laws, and in supporting and invigorating all the measures which may be adopted by the constituted authorities for obtaining a speedy, a just, and an honorable peace."

The contributions of the U.S. Navy were instrumental in repelling the British during the War of 1812. The U.S. Navy barely had a dozen warships compared to the hundreds of ships comprising the British fleet. British ships were undermanned, however, while well-trained and talented officers and seamen took command of American ships. These men were largely from coastal States, like Maryland, and were accustomed to seafaring. Master Commandant Oliver Hazard Perry took on the British Navy on Lake Erie in 1813 with a scrappy fleet of light ships. Even though his force was seemingly decimated by the British, Master Commandant Perry resorted to paddling a rowboat with a banner that read "Don't Give up the Ship." He then boarded the USS *Niagara*, double-loaded the carronades, and sailed directly into the British line, ultimately claiming victory.

The following summer, in 1814, the British Navy sailed up the Chesapeake Bay to attack our Nation's capital and seize the valuable port city of Baltimore. The British dealt heavy blows to Washington, DC, setting both the U.S. Capitol and the Executive Mansion—which we now know as the White House—ablaze. British forces then moved toward Baltimore. Citizens of Baltimore, including free Blacks, quickly mobilized to protect their city. Barricades stretching more than one mile long were constructed to protect the harbor, hulls were sunk to impede navigation, and a chain of masts was erected across the harbor entrance. When the British fleet approached Baltimore at North Point, Marylanders fought the British Army and helped repulse the British Navy from Fort McHenry during the Battle of Baltimore. It is important to note that American forces during the Battle of North Point were volunteer militia, heavily outnumbered by the highly trained British infantry, but they managed to delay the British forces long enough for 10,000 American reinforcements to arrive, preventing a land attack against Baltimore. Following 25 hours of intense British naval bombardment at Fort McHenry by more

than 1,600 cannonballs, the American defenders refused to yield, and the British were forced to end the Chesapeake Campaign and withdraw.

During the British bombardment, American lawyer Francis Scott Key, who was being held on board an American flag-of-truce vessel in Baltimore Harbor, took notice of the American flag still flying atop Fort McHenry. Key realized then that the Americans had survived the battle and had stopped the enemy advance. He was so moved by the sight of the American flag flying following the horrific bombardment, he composed a poem called "The Defense of Fort M'Henry," which was published in the Baltimore Patriot & Advertiser newspaper later that year. This poem, and later the song, inspired love of country among the American people and not only helped usher in the "era of good feelings" immediately after the war, but became a timeless reminder of American resolve. "The Star Spangled Banner" officially became our national anthem in 1931. The flag that flew over Fort McHenry and inspired this anthem is now a national treasure on display at the Smithsonian Institution, a very short distance from where we are today.

The War of 1812 confirmed the legitimacy of the Revolution and served as a critical test for the U.S. Constitution and newly established democratic government. Our young Nation battled against the largest, most powerful military on the Earth at that time and emerged with an enhanced standing among the countries of the world, both militarily and diplomatically. The U.S. economy was freed of its dependence on British goods, which unleashed domestic manufacturing and spawned the industrial revolution. The U.S. Navy proved its worth and the U.S. Congress rewarded the Navy with funding for a permanent, more expansive fleet. A new generation of Americans too young to remember Lord Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown, which effectively ended the Revolutionary War, and an older generation proud of defending American independence twice in their lifetimes, were inspired by Francis Scott Key's words, which embody our universal feelings of patriotism and courage.

I am proud that Maryland will lead the Star-Spangled 200 celebration, a 3-year celebration that began with Baltimore's "Sailabration" in June 2012. The Navy's Blue Angels treated more than 1.5 million spectators to dazzling air shows; the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra premiered the "Overture for 2012," composed by Philip Glass; and forty-six tall ships and naval warships from around the world anchored in the Inner Harbor, open for public tours. Through the course of 2014, Maryland will host numerous events along the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail to commemorate the Chesa-

apeake Campaign, and at the Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine to celebrate the bicentennial of the Battle of Baltimore. This weekend, the Star-Spangled Spectacular celebration will conclude with a fireworks display over Fort McHenry that Francis Scott Key would be proud of. These ceremonies are an opportunity to showcase to the world that Maryland is an exceptional place with a rich, colorful, and important history.

I am also proud that the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution I sponsored in the 112th Congress—S. Res. 388—to mark the beginning of the bicentennial of the War, to celebrate the heroism of the American people during the conflict, and to recognize the various organizations involved in the bicentennial celebration, including the U.S. Armed Forces, the National Park Service, and the Maryland War of 1812 Bicentennial Commission.

The Senate may soon consider another resolution I have sponsored, along with my colleagues, the senior Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the junior Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), to commemorate the bicentennial of the Battle of Baltimore and the creation of the Star-Spangled Banner, which officially became our national anthem in 1931. As we recognize all of these ongoing efforts during this commemorative period, I encourage all Americans to remember the sacrifice of those who gave their lives to defend our Nation's freedom and democracy in its infancy, and to join in the bicentennial celebration of our victory in the War of 1812.

RECOGNIZING PAM HAZE

Mr. REED. Madam President, today I honor the distinguished career of Pamela K. Haze, who retired from the U.S. Department of the Interior this past August after 34 years of Federal service.

Ms. Haze served as the Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition for the past 5 years. Her most recent position was the culmination of many years of experience working in various capacities within the Department's budget office. Her career prior to that time was spent in other bureaus of the Department, where Pam worked as a biologist and hydrologist, and served in other management roles with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

As the primary liaison between the Department and the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, Pam has been an indispensable and trusted adviser. I have had the good fortune as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee to both work and travel with Pam, most notably on a

trip to Alaska that included our subcommittee's ranking member, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, and former Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar. I have witnessed firsthand Pam's dedication to the Department's mission. She has worked tirelessly with me and my staff during the annual appropriations process and we have steadily relied on Pam's vast store of knowledge and keen insights to help resolve challenges that have arisen over the years.

The appropriations process simply would not be the same without her and the dedication, wisdom, and the good humor she brought to her work. I join with many in wishing her all the best as she begins a well-deserved retirement.

BETHEL MURDOCH CHURCH BICENTENNIAL

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to recognize the Bethel Murdoch Presbyterian Church as it celebrates its 200th anniversary. The Bethel Murdoch Presbyterian Church was founded in Warren County, OH, by a small group of faithful and passionate Christians.

In 1814, the Bethel Murdoch Presbyterian Church began when 12 pioneer settlers to Warren County first met in a maple grove to worship. The location of their first meeting spot is the site of the Murdoch Cemetery, where many of the early members are buried. The congregation's current home is a 140-year-old church building that was built with the financial assistance of James Murdoch, a well-known Shakespearean actor at the time.

On September 14, 2014, the church will be holding a Service of Celebration, during which this small but strong congregation will celebrate the anniversary of the church and all the good that it has brought to the community.

I would like to personally extend my congratulations to the Bethel Murdoch Presbyterian Church on 200 years of faith, service and worship.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JACKIE MCKINSEY

• Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to honor Mrs. Jackie McKinsey of Springfield, MO, for her dedication and service to the Ozarks Technical Community College, locally known as OTC. Twenty-four years ago, McKinsey became a founding member of the board of trustees as the school began operations. McKinsey has been a guiding force in OTC's evolution into the dynamic school it is today, providing a wide range of technical, highly sophisticated curricula for post-secondary education for more than 14,000 students. Since 1990, OTC has transitioned

into a modern campus with a series of new facilities in Springfield and the construction of a second campus with three additional education centers.

McKinsey led the search committee that resulted in the hiring of the current school president, Dr. Hal Higdon, in 2006. She has served in every office on the board of trustees, including chairperson, and has been a tireless advocate for community colleges in Missouri.

In fact, Jackie McKinsey has dedicated her life to activism in education. For 12 years she was a member of the Springfield School Board and spent 2 years on the Missouri School Board Association. She also served on the Missouri Special Education Advisory Board for 20 years. In 1996, she was appointed by the Governor to the Missouri Women's Council. Mrs. McKinsey is an experienced mediator and has served as a trained hearing officer in cases between parents of special education students and schools districts.

Jackie McKinsey announced her retirement last summer, and the board of trustees honored her with the title of trustee emeritus. McKinsey is the fifth individual to receive this honor, joining other founding trustees Dolores Brooks, Don Clinkenbeard, Frank Farmer, and Don Wessel. This team of Springfieldians gave OTC the steady direction to be a successful open admission, 2-year college dedicated to technical education. Offering students the opportunity to earn a 1-year certificate, a 2-year associate of applied science degree, A.A.S., or an associate of arts degree, A.A., OTC is now widely praised for its professional faculty and diverse curriculum. I wish Jackie McKinsey all the best in this next chapter.

Jackie McKinsey has played a major role in that success, and her legacy will continue to impact future generations through the foundations she help put in place at OTC. I wish her the best in her well-deserved retirement.●

RECOGNIZING THE SPRINGFIELD LASERS

● Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, Philadelphia, PA; Boston, MA; Washington, DC; San Diego, CA; Austin and Irving, TX; and Springfield, MO, are the seven cities represented by teams in the World Team Tennis, WTT, league. For the second year in a row, the Washington Kastles and the Springfield Lasers met in the Mylan WTT finals. With similar results as 2013, the Kastles prevailed at the Springfield home court, Mediacom Stadium in the Cooper Tennis Complex. The Springfield Lasers were the WTT Western Conference champions in 1999, 2001, and 2009. This year's Springfield squad, led by head coach John-Laffnie de Jager, made the finals with a changing roster of 12 different players rotating in and out of 4 spots on the team.

The Springfield Lasers are a remarkable story. The franchise was purchased and donated to the Springfield-Greene County Park Board in 1996 by the Cooper family, who also donated funds for the municipal tennis complex. The complex includes 12 indoor tennis courts and 16 outdoor courts, including the center court stadium used for WTT events.

Now preparing for their 20th season, the Lasers are one of the oldest teams in the WTT league, and Springfield, by far, is the smallest market in the 40-year-old tennis league. However, the Lasers play in front of big crowds—an average of more than 1,400 turned out for the first six home matches this season. The James Blake-Andy Roddick match drew more than 2,400 spectators.

Harry and John Cooper and family continue to support the team as their biggest fans. The new Lasers' general manager, Paul Nahon, Jr., has worked on building a fan base with a growing demand for season tickets. Nahon has hinted at more innovations to grow that base for the upcoming 2015 season.

The Springfield Lasers continue to make the State of Missouri proud with their success, and I wish them many more years of great tennis, growing and building the fan base for tennis in my hometown.●

CONGRATULATING ELVIRA CENOZ

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I wish to congratulate Elvira Cenoz on her retirement from the Overland Hotel in Gardnerville, NV. Despite the name, the Overland is not actually a hotel, but one of the finest places for a traditional Basque meal in Nevada.

Since its construction in 1908, the Overland Hotel has been a stopping point for many travelers making their way through Nevada. Conveniently situated on America's First Transcontinental Highway, the Lincoln Highway, the Overland Hotel has a long history of welcoming local ranchers, politicians, civic leaders, and weary travelers. The Overland Hotel has since become a place for the Basque culture to be celebrated in Gardnerville. Nevada has a proud Basque history, and the Overland Hotel and Saloon embodies that long and rich tradition. The Basque people originally settled in Nevada due to our proud ranching traditions. Their hearty cooking and family-centric meals quickly became a staple of Nevada's local cuisine.

The Overland Hotel is known throughout the State and to all of its patrons for its authentic Basque cuisine and charm, which is greatly attributed to Elvira and her late husband Eusebio Cenoz. Eusebio bought the Overland Hotel in 1972 after many years as a sheep herder. He and Elvira were married in 1980, and she joined her husband to run the restaurant. She

soon worked her way back to the kitchen, where she has remained until her retirement this year. Her love of cooking is exemplified in the menu of the Overland Hotel, which changes daily. The Overland Hotel is not just known for its great food, but also for its friendly service, further embodying the spirit of the Silver State. Patrons are often pleasantly surprised when Elvira herself greets them warmly at their table and takes their orders.

Throughout her years owning and operating the Overland Hotel, Elvira has demonstrated a commitment to preserving and sharing the Basque tradition. I am both humbled and honored by her many years of hard work and am proud to call her a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mrs. Cenoz on her much deserved retirement.●

CONGRATULATING JUAN GUZMAN

● Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I congratulate Juan Guzman on his retirement from his career as Carson City's open space manager. As a longtime resident of Carson City, I have had the pleasure of getting to know and work with Juan and have seen the impact his contributions have made within the Carson community. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him on his retirement after 14 years of hard work and dedication to the Silver State.

Juan, a native of Puerto Rico, earned his degree in geography from the University of Puerto Rico and then went on to complete his graduate studies in the geography department with an emphasis on urban studies at the University of California. Upon the completion of his studies, Juan began his career as a planner in California. After a trip to the Sierra Nevadas, Juan decided to make the move to Nevada, where he became an associate planner in the community development department. He worked in Douglas County for 5 years before eventually settling in Carson City, where he began work in a similar capacity. His diligent work and commitment to the betterment of the Carson community did not go without public recognition, and when the position of open space manager was created in 2000, he transitioned from the community development's planning division to open space within the parks and recreation department.

During his tenure, Juan is credited with opening up 14 areas for recreational purposes and for natural preservation as well as acquiring several land transfers from the Federal government. I had the privilege of working closely with Juan on the Carson City Community Vital Act, public lands legislation I introduced while serving in the U.S. House of Representatives that enhanced open space opportunities, strengthened flood control

measures, and ensured easy public access to Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service lands surrounding Carson City. That bill, which became law in 2009, still serves as an example in Congress on how an intensive collaborative process between the public and officials at the local and Federal levels can yield positive results for an entire region. Without Juan, this legislation would have never come together, let alone become law.

While we will all miss Juan, his impact in the Carson City community will live on. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Juan on his retirement, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that Juan has done to make the great State of Nevada an even better place. I offer my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT JOHN A. CARROLL

● Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my honor to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SGT John A. Carroll, of Ponca City, OK who died on September 6, 2006, of injuries sustained when he came in contact with enemy forces using small-arms fire during a dismounted security patrol while serving his Nation in Ramadi, Iraq.

John was born September 1, 1980 in Greene County, PA and moved to Lawrenceville when he was 8 years old. In his mid-teens he left to live with his father in Georgia where he earned his general education development degree. While traveling from State to State in search of employment, he was approached by an Army recruiter in Oklahoma promising a chance to continue his education and a large signing bonus. He was sold and enlisted in 1999.

John met his wife Jessica Carroll in Florida while on leave from the 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment, 1st Armored Division, Baumholder, Germany. He was on his third tour of Iraq and was due to be discharged in October 2006. After completing his service, they planned to live in Tennessee because they loved the mountains and the scenic surroundings.

A graveside service was held on September 17, 2006 at Mount View Cemetery, McMinnville, TN. Full military honors were administered by the Fort Campbell Honor Guard.

John is survived by his wife Jessica; mother Dawn Petrakovits; father Roger Carroll; two brothers Micah Carroll and Ben Beardsley; two sisters Liz Carroll and Rebecca Petrakovits; and mother-in-law Nancy Hicks and father-in-law Jerry Hicks.

Today we remember Army SGT John A. Carroll, a young man who loved his

family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL WILFRED FLORES, JR.

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army CPL Wilfred Flores, Jr., of Lawton, OK, who died on March 31, 2007, of injuries sustained after an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle while serving his Nation in Ramadi, Iraq. He was 11 days short of his 21st birthday.

The son of retired Army Sergeants First Class Wilfred Sr. and Vicky, he was born April 10, 1986, at Fort Sill, OK. A member of the Jr. ROTC program, he graduated from Eisenhower High School in Lawton in 2004 and entered the Army Delayed Entry Program.

While waiting for his enlistment time, he volunteered at Giddy Up & Go, a non-profit therapeutic horse riding program for disabled children and adults. Wilfred joined the Army as an infantryman after completing basic and advanced individual training at Fort Benning, GA. After training he was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 14th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY. He was on his second deployment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

A memorial service was held on April 15, 2007, at Frontier Chapel on Fort Sill, OK. Burial with full military honors followed on April 16, 2007, in the new Fort Sill National Cemetery near Elgin, OK.

Wilfred is survived by his parents Wilfred Sr. and Vicky Flores; sister Theresa Siegrist; grandfather retired Air Force SSG Modesto Flores, Jr.; three nieces; and numerous aunts, uncles and cousins.

Vicky Flores said her son was very religious, very generous and believed "God had a hand in everything. He loved his job," she said. "He was there because he wanted to be there. He died doing what he loved the most."

Today we remember Army CPL Wilfred Flores, Jr., a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT BUDDY J. HUGHIE

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Buddy J. Hughie, of Poteau, OK, who died while serving his Nation in Kamdesh, Afghanistan on February 19, 2007.

Born October 23, 1981 in Carlsbad, NM, and a 2005 graduate of Poteau High School, Buddy and his unit were conducting a joint mission with the Afghan National Army and the U.S. Army's 10th Mountain Division in the country's Nuristan province when the group came under enemy small-arms and rocket-propelled-grenade fire. After two Afghan soldiers in the group were wounded, he left his position to provide medical assistance when he was shot and killed.

"Sgt. Buddy Hughie was a great American," said LTC Bobby Yandell, commander of the 1st Battalion, 180th Infantry. "Sgt. Hughie was one of those soldiers that you did not have to worry about; he always did the right thing. We mourn his loss, but celebrate the life of a great soldier." Buddy, who previously deployed to Afghanistan in 2002-2003, volunteered to return to the country, Yandell said.

More than 600 people filled Poteau High School's Sherman Floyd Fieldhouse to honor Buddy's life. Burial was conducted on February 28, 2007, in Live Oak Memorial Gardens in Charleston, SC.

"He didn't have to be in Afghanistan, he didn't have to serve that 45 days in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina. He was there because he believed in what he was doing. More importantly, he backed those beliefs by action" said BG Myles L. Deering, the commander of the Oklahoma National Guard's 45th Infantry Brigade.

He is survived by his wife Alexis Hughie; son Cooper; grandparents Kenneth and Delores Hughie; his mother Julie Hicks; a sister Jennifer Claiborn; a brother Dennis Hicks; and his great-grandparents Andrew "Buddy" and Dimple Rogers.

Today we remember Army SGT Buddy J. Hughie, a remarkable young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT JUSTIN L. NOYES

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Marine Sgt Justin L. Noyes, of Vinita, OK, who died on July 2, 2006, of injuries sustained while attempting to disarm an improvised explosive device in Al Anbar Province, Fallujah, Iraq.

Born August 8, 1982 in Tulsa, OK, Justin played football and baseball at Vinita High School where he graduated in 2002.

Just 1 day before his 18th birthday and shortly after graduating from high school, Justin enlisted in the Marine Corps. He and his brother, Jeremy were first deployed to Iraq for the start of the war in 2003 and were there when Saddam Hussein's statue came tumbling down.

While conducting training in North Carolina, he met his wife Sarah and they were married on May 15, 2005, in Florida in a ceremony overlooking the Gulf of Mexico.

In August 2005, Justin was reassigned as an explosive ordnance disposal technician with the 9th Engineer Support Battalion, 3rd Marine Logistics Group, III Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa, Japan.

A memorial service was held on July 17, 2006 at Cowboy Junction Church in Vinita, OK. As the hearse carrying his body made its way to the church, it passed more than 500 American Legion members lined along the road, each

holding an American flag. Justin's death apparently touched the Craig County community to its core. Hundreds of residents, some saluting, some with their hands over their hearts, and all waving flags of every size, poured out of homes, offices, department stores and convenience stores to line the funeral route, which flowed through downtown Vinita. As the funeral procession traveled through neighborhoods, young boys with flags on their bicycles stopped out of respect. Full military honors were rendered for the burial at Fairview Cemetery in Vinita, OK.

Justin is survived by his wife Sarah; his mother Stacey Noyes; father and stepmother Mark and Karen Noyes; brothers Jeremy Norsworthy and Chris Barnes; and sisters Hannah and Rachel Noyes.

Today we remember Marine Sgt Justin L. Noyes, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

LANCE CORPORAL TREVOR A. ROBERTS

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Marine Corps LCpl Trevor A. Roberts, of Oklahoma City, OK, who died on March 24, 2007, of injuries sustained after an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle while serving his Nation in Anbar province, Iraq.

Trevor was born October 6, 1985 in Moore, OK. He joined the Marine Forces Reserve's 2nd Battalion, 14th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division, Oklahoma City in his senior year before graduating from Westmoore High School in 2004. After graduation he attended 1 year at Oklahoma City Community College before being one of 30 people from his unit who volunteered to go to Iraq as an artillery specialist.

Nearly 1,000 people attended a memorial service at Eagle Heights Church with burial in Heritage Burial Park in Oklahoma City, OK.

At the memorial service, the Rev. Rob Olmstead recalled Trevor going on numerous mission trips, including one to Bangkok to work with orphaned children the summer before he attended boot camp. Trevor felt "God is calling me to go work for these children in the foreign mission field," said his father, Chuck. While in Iraq, seeing the plight of the people solidified in his mind that he wanted to be a missionary, Roberts' parents said. "He saw some stuff he did not want to have to see," Chuck Roberts said. "It hurt him. He could look at the Iraqi people and see their hurt and their pain, and he could also see their joy. He could look in their eyes and just see."

Trevor was preceded in death by his grandfather Carl Roberts. He is survived by his parents Chuck and Twyla Roberts; brother Nathan Roberts; maternal grandmother Helen JoAn Hey and her husband Lester; grandfather Willis Ferguson; paternal grandmother

Rita Roberts; uncles Andy Ferguson and his wife Angie, Barry Ferguson and his wife Amy, and Mike Roberts and his wife Sandra; aunts Susan Hall, Linda Roberts, and Patty Bratton and her husband Mark; and numerous extended family, friends, and his beloved Corp.

Joey Ware, who knew Trevor more than 10 years, said his friend always looked out for those around him. "Trevor would do anything for anybody no matter what it cost him," Ware recalled.

Shortly before his death he wrote on his web page about his faith and the dangers he faced: "Sometimes I'm awakened at night, and I can not go back to sleep for hours because something is heavy on my heart. For some reason, this is one such thing. How fast life can change on us. Over here, it might be a fire or a roadside bomb that makes a normal drive a stir of chaos. Things most definitely don't always work out the way we dream and hope, but we have to keep going, for you never know what tomorrow might bring."

Today we remember Marine Corps LCpl Trevor A. Roberts, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST JOSHUA D. SHEPPARD

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SPC Joshua D. Sheppard, of Quinton, OK, who died on December 22, 2006 of wounds sustained when his patrol came in contact with enemy forces using small arms fire while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born July 10, 1984 and a 2003 graduate of Quinton High School, Josh enlisted in the Army in July 2003 at the age of 19. After completing basic combat training at Fort Benning, GA, and advanced individual training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, he was assigned to the 642nd Engineer Support Company, 7th Engineer Battalion, 10th Mountain Division, Light Infantry, Fort Drum, NY, in December 2003. He deployed to Iraq in September 2006.

An avid outdoorsman, Josh enjoyed fishing and working with wood. He was hoping to use his GI bill for an education and to learn skills that would allow him to come back to his community and work as a contractor with heavy equipment, his mother said. He wanted to become a contractor and open a saw mill. "It was his love. He loved the outside," said his mother, Julie Young. "If he got too claustrophobic sitting inside, he would go down to the woodshop."

Funeral services and burial were conducted at Lona Valley Cemetery in Kinta, OK.

"He would have done great things," said his brother Reuben, an Army private. "When we were in school, he was my best friend, and he was my best friend when he was in the service."

He is survived by his mother Julie Young; stepfather Marty Young; and four brothers.

Today we remember Army SPC Joshua D. Sheppard, a remarkable young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL JARED M. SHOEMAKER

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Marine Corps Cpl Jared M. Shoemaker, of Tulsa, OK, who died on September 4, 2006, of injuries sustained after an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle while serving his Nation in Al Anbar Province, Fallujah, Iraq.

The second son of Ken and Linda Shoemaker, Jared was born April 22, 1977. He graduated from Edison High School in 1995, a 3-year letterman in football, with area coaches naming him to the Oklahoma All-State team. He continued his football career, earned a degree in psychology and a minor in criminal justice and met his future wife Kari at Northeastern State University.

In January 2003, Jared joined the Marine Corps Reserve. After graduating from basic training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego, CA, he reported to the Infantry Training Battalion at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, CA, where he graduated as a machine gunner. He was then assigned to Company I, 3rd Battalion, 23rd Marine Regiment and later reassigned to the 1st Battalion, 25th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division, Marine Forces Reserve, Broken Arrow, OK.

In January 2005 he was hired by the Tulsa Police Department. In June of that year he graduated from the police academy and served as a patrol officer until he was mobilized to active duty status in December 2005. His friends recalled that he excelled as a police officer in every capacity, graduating at the top of his class academically. He also excelled in military service, earning the Albert Schwab Award for Marine of the Year in 2005.

A memorial service was held on September 15, 2006 at First United Methodist Church in Tulsa, OK. Full military honors were rendered for the burial at Floral Haven Cemetery in Broken Arrow, OK.

Jared is survived by his wife Kari; his parents Ken and Linda Shoemaker; brother Steve Shoemaker; brother and sister-in-law Ben and Kristen Shoemaker and their daughter Ellie; grandparents Forrest and Gloria Shoemaker; Betty Ellsworth; Howard and Christa Ellsworth; uncle Stephen F. Shoemaker and family; mother-in-law Darla Harrison; and numerous aunts, uncles, and cousins.

Today we remember Marine Corps Cpl Jared M. Shoemaker, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

CORPORAL DEREK A. STANLEY

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army CPL Derek A. Stanley, of Tulsa, OK, who died on June 5, 2006, of noncombat injuries while serving his Nation at Forward Operating Base Salerno in Khowst province, Afghanistan.

Derek was born November 25, 1985, in Claremore, OK. After attending a Tulsa high school, he enrolled in Thunderbird Youth Academy in Pryor, OK, and graduated in December 2003 in the top quarter of his class with his general education development degree.

After enlisting in the Army in March 2004, he received training at Fort Leonardwood, MO. Upon completing basic training, he remained at Fort Leonardwood for 19 additional weeks of Chemical Brigade training before being assigned to the 710th Brigade Support Battalion, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, Light Infantry, Fort Drum, NY. His unit deployed to Afghanistan on March 15, 2006.

About 100 friends and relatives filled Millsap Funeral Service Chapel in Fort Gibson, OK, on June 15, 2006, to remember Derek. Burial services were conducted at Fort Gibson National Cemetery where BG James E. Chambers presented a flag to Derek's mother.

Derek is survived by his mother Darlyn Smith; father Faron Stanley; brother Aaron Stanley; grandparents Winnie Young, R.C. Smith, and Leona Weesner; great-grandfather Otto Smith; and numerous aunts, uncles, cousins and friends.

Today we remember Army CPL Derek A. Stanley, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

STAFF SERGEANT CLINT J. STOREY

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SSG Clint J. Storey, of Enid, OK, who died on August 4, 2006, of injuries sustained after an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle while serving his Nation in Ramadi, Iraq.

Born February 27, 1976, Clint's life crumbled around him in 1993, quitting school as he struggled to come to terms with the death of his father. However, he found his purpose a few years later when he earned his general education development degree and enlisted in the Army in February 1998.

After completing training at Ft Knox, KY, Clint reported to HHC 1/5 Infantry Battalion at Ft Hood, TX, where he served as a scout platoon driver and gunner and deployed to Bosnia-Herzegovina. In September 2000, he reported to HHC 2-34 Armor Battalion in Ft Riley, KS, as a Squad Leader and Section Sergeant before volunteering to serve as a recruiter in Los Angeles, CA, from September 2002 to 2005.

In September 2005, Clint was assigned to 1st Cavalry Regiment, 1st Armored

Division, Friedberg, Germany, where he served as the Headquarters Platoon Sergeant and later as the senior scout in 2nd Platoon. From there he deployed to Biaj and later to Ar Ramadi, Iraq in January 2006.

Dozens of flags lined the streets as funeral services were held at Central Christian Church in Enid, OK, on August 16, 2006. About 100 people held flags as family and friends gathered around Storey's casket at Enid Cemetery, where he was buried with full military honors. While home on leave from Iraq, Clint and his wife Melissa became pregnant with the couple's second child. Melissa was presented with the folded flag that had laid atop her husband's casket. Military officials then presented another folded flag to his mother.

On August 27, 2006, close to 200 mourners gathered in the garden outside St. Thomas the Apostle Church in Palmer, MA, as a second memorial service was held in his wife's hometown. The Vietnam Veterans of America Western MA Chapter 111 organized military honors at the service, which included an honor guard, a 21-gun salute, a recording of "Taps" and a carefully folded American flag offered to Adela the couple's 4-year-old daughter.

Clint is survived by his wife Melissa; daughter Adela; mother Carolyn Inherst; stepfather Bill Inherst; sisters Charlene Phillips, Tammy Divine and Tonja Whitehead; and numerous other family members and friends.

Today we remember Army SSG Clint J. Storey, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SERGEANT CLINT E. WILLIAMS

Madam President, it is my honor also to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Clint E. Williams, of Kingston, OK, who died on September 14, 2006, of injuries sustained after an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle while serving his Nation in Baghdad, Iraq.

Born August 6, 1982, in Durant, OK, Clint graduated from Kingston High School in 2001 where he was the senior class president and a member of the baseball team.

He joined the Army in April 2003 and was assigned to the 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry Regiment, 2nd Brigade, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, TX. He previously deployed to Iraq from October 2003 through November 2004 and returned in November 2005.

In June 2006, he was seriously wounded after a bomb exploded near him outside of Hawr Rajab south of Baghdad. Although the explosion killed a fellow soldier, Clint kept firing on enemy positions, held his ground and ran more than 300 meters to get additional fire support despite receiving wounds to his legs and hand. A fearless man, his favorite quote was "All one really needs in life is a few good pals and together

they can take on anything in life." Even after being injured in that battle, he volunteered for dangerous duty on raids rather than sit and wait for battle.

A memorial service was held on September 23, 2006 at Jerald Barton Memorial Gymnasium in Kingston, OK.

At the memorial service, his friend B.J. Bush recalled Clint as "a good ol' boy with a knife in his front pocket and a can of snuff in the back. He was happiest with his gun and bow sighted in and his pole rigged with hook and line." He was laid to rest in Willis Cemetery, overlooking his beloved Lake Texoma.

Clint is survived by his father Lavoyed Williams; mother Marci Sprouse; three brothers Duron Williams, Dalton Williams and Daniel Williams; sister Jessica Williams; grandmothers Jean Williams and Nancy Sprouse; grandfather Jack Sprouse; and two nephews Jarren Williams and Devin Williams.

Today we remember Army SGT Clint E. Williams, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.●

CONGRATULATING TASSO DE CASTRO LUGON

● Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I wish to extend warm wishes and gratitude to my dear friend, Tasso de Castro Lugon, who is retiring after a lifetime of outstanding public service as a southwestern Brazilian judge in his State of Espirito Santo and as a member and former chairman of the Partners of the Americas.

I first met Tasso when I served as Secretary of State of West Virginia and have had the pleasure of working with him continuously as Governor and now as a Senator. We immediately established a friendship over shared philosophies, including the importance of forging meaningful relationships, working together for the common good, and creating lasting connections with the people we represent—something I also like to call retail government.

In West Virginia we value hard work, loyalty, and our cultural practice of neighbors helping neighbors. These values depict who we are as West Virginians and as Americans, which is why I am so very honored to congratulate Tasso on not only his countless achievements throughout his professional career but also his devotion to always staying true to those defining principles.

Always committed to the rule of law, Tasso served as a judge in the Brazilian court throughout his career. But true to his staunch dedication to building long-lasting relationships with local communities and those abroad, Tasso also became a member of the Partners of the Americas for 36 years before

reaching the pinnacle of his career serving as chairman of the board.

Throughout his tenure, Tasso has upheld an unflinching devotion to the friendship between the sister States of Espirito Santo and West Virginia. From the shores and peaks of Espirito Santo to the mountains, valleys, and rivers of the Mountain State, our friendship grew out of a common bond of respect to strengthening the relationship between our sister States. I cannot thank Tasso enough for cultivating that respect through a lifetime of unwavering service and dedication.

West Virginians will continue to advance in many endeavors based on the new relationships and contacts that Tasso has formed, and our State will continue to benefit from his promotion of cultural, economic, and educational development between North and South America.

I join my fellow West Virginians in sending our warmest regards to Tasso and his family for a happy and healthy retirement. We are deeply grateful for his loving and carefree spirit that he has dedicated to a lifetime of public service.●

TRIBUTE TO EDITH MESSINA

● Mrs. McCASKILL. Madam President, today I congratulate Judge Edith Messina on her retirement from the 16th Circuit Judicial Court of Jackson County and to thank her for her many years of leadership and service. For over 30 years, Judge Messina demonstrated exceptional litigation skills, judicial integrity, and professionalism while serving the State of Missouri. I am pleased to recognize her outstanding career today.

Judge Messina, a native of Kansas City, MO, received her bachelor's degree in English Literature and her master of science in counseling psychology from Avila University. Upon graduation, Judge Messina served in the Peace Corps in northern Nigeria where she taught and worked to advance community development. She returned to Kansas City and obtained her juris doctor degree from the University of Missouri-Kansas City in 1974.

Prior to her appointment by Governor Bond in 1984, Judge Messina worked in private practice and as an assistant public defender. She became the first female circuit judge in Jackson County, and in January 1998 the first woman to serve as the 16th Circuit Court's presiding judge. As an administrative judge for the Criminal Court and Family Court, she played an instrumental role in establishing the Family Court Division, which remains in place today.

In 2008, Judge Messina was honored by the Kansas City Metropolitan Bar Association, KCMB, with the "Dean of the Trial Bar" award for her long-standing commitment to law, legal

knowledge and professionalism. She is well-known and admired for guiding and helping young lawyers develop their skills and pursue their passions which has made a positive impact in the legal community. Beyond the courtroom, Judge Messina is an adjunct instructor for Avila University's MBA program.

Judge Messina's dedication to Missouri's judiciary for over 30 years has helped improve the way our courts function today. Judge Messina is a much-loved member of the Kansas City community and has left a lasting legacy of public service.

I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating and honoring Judge Edith Messina.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2678. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

H.R. 4751. An act to make technical corrections to Public Law 110-229 to reflect the renaming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2678. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5078. An act to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6890. A communication from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's 2014 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6891. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2012"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6892. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost, and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization (QIO) Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6893. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of the Expiration Date for State Disability Examiner Authority to Make Fully Favorable Quick Disability Determinations and Compassionate Allowances" (RIN0960-AH69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6894. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Regarding Dispositions of Tangible Depreciable Property" ((RIN1545-BL52) (TD 9689)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6895. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Automatic Change in Method of Accounting under the Retail Inventory Method" (Rev. Proc. 2014-48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6896. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health Insurance Providers Fee" (Notice 2014-47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6897. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Retail Inventory Method" ((RIN1545-BJ64) (TD 9688)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6898. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Debt That Is a Position in Personal Property That Is Part of a Straddle" ((RIN1545-BL24) (TD 9691)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6899. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—September 2014" (Rev. Rul. 2014-22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6900. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic Disaster Relief under Section 142(d)" (Rev. Proc. 2014-50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6901. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; FY 2015 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update; Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements and Process and Appeals for Part D Payment for Drugs for Beneficiaries Enrolled in Hospice" ((RIN0938-AS10) (CMS-1609-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6902. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Modifications to the Medicare and Medicaid Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Program for 2014 and Other Changes to the EHR Incentive Program; and Health Information Technology: Revisions to the Certified EHR Technology Definition and EHR Certification Changes Related to Standards" ((RIN0991-AB89 and RIN0991-AB97) (CMS-0046-F and CMS-0052-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6903. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System for Acute Care Hospitals and the Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System and Fiscal Year 2015 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements for Specific Providers; Reasonable Compensation Equivalents for Physician Services in Excluded Hospitals and Certain Teaching Hospitals; Provider Administrative Appeals and Judicial Review; Enforcement Provisions for Organ Transplant Centers; and Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Program" ((RIN0938-AS11; RIN0938-AR12; RIN0938-AR53) (CMS-1607-F and CMS-1599-F3)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6904. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 14-3948); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6905. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-072); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6906. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-065); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6907. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-032); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6908. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to activities under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6909. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6910. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of an agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6911. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Corrections, Clarifications, and Movement of Definitions" (RIN1400-AD64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6912. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-073); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6913. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102-1) for the April 16, 2014–June 14, 2014 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6914. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2014 through May 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6915. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0095-2014-0112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6916. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2014 Annual Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6917. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" (RIN1210-AB67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6918. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" ((RIN0938-AR42) (CMS-9939-IFC)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6919. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Regulations" (RIN0991-AB87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6920. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Specifications for Medical Examinations of Coal Miners" (RIN0920-AA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6921. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2014-N-0011) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6922. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" ((RIN1545-BM38) (TD 9690)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6923. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priorities. Rehabilitation Services Administration—Capacity Building Program for Traditionally Underserved Populations—Vocational Rehabilitation Training Institute for the Preparation of Personnel in American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Projects" (CFDA No. 84.315C.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6924. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priority. Technical Assistance on State Data Collection—Idea Fiscal Data Center" (CFDA No. 84.373F.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6925. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education

and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priority. Rehabilitation Services Administration—Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program" (CFDA No. 84.224D.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6926. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priority. Rehabilitation Training: Job-Driven Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center" (CFDA No. 84.264A.) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6927. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems in January 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6928. A communication from the General Manager and Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6929. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal years 2012 and 2013 annual reports relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6930. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Rescheduling of Hydrocodone Combination Products From Schedule III to Schedule II" (Docket No. DEA-389) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6931. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, Criminal Division, and the nationwide federal law enforcement effort against public corruption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6932. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Community Relations Service for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6933. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substitution in Case of Death of Claimant" (RIN2900-AN91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate

on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-6934. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the deployment of certain U.S. forces to the Central African Republic, received during adjournment of the Senate on September 11, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-321. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to begin the process of amending the United States Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 24

Whereas, In 2010 the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, holding that independent spending on elections by corporations and other groups could not be limited by government regulations; and

Whereas, This decision rolled back the legal restrictions on corporate spending in the electoral process, allowing for the unlimited corporate spending to influence elections, candidate selection and policy decisions; and

Whereas, In reaching this decision, a narrow majority of the Supreme Court, relying on and expanding prior decisions, interpreted the First Amendment of the Constitution to afford corporations the same free speech protections as natural persons; and

Whereas, The Supreme Court relied on other prior decisions which afforded the spending of money to influence elections the full protection of the First Amendment and disregarded the distorting and corrupting effects of unlimited money in elections; and

Whereas, In his eloquent dissent, Justice John Paul Stevens rightly recognized that, "corporations have no consciences, no beliefs, no feelings, no thoughts, no desires. Corporations help structure and facilitate the activities of human beings, to be sure, and their 'personhood' often observes as a useful legal fiction; But they are not themselves members of 'We the People' by whom and for whom our Constitution was established"; and

Whereas, The court's decision in *Citizens United* severely hampers the ability of federal, state and local governments to enact reasonable campaign finance reforms and regulations regarding corporate political activity; and

Whereas, Corporations should not be afforded the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, such that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is a form of constitutionally protected speech; and

Whereas, In 2012 the same narrow majority of the Supreme Court voted to strike down longstanding campaign finance laws in the State of Montana without hearing any evidence or argument on that state's own his-

tory and experience with corporate spending and corruption; and

Whereas, Several proposed amendments to the Constitution have been introduced in Congress that would allow government to regulate the raising and spending of Money by corporations to influence elections; and

Whereas, On Election Day, 2012, over six million voters across the United States, including the states of Colorado and Montana, had the opportunity to vote on state and local ballot measures, calling for a constitutional amendment to limit money in politics, and all proposed initiatives passed overwhelmingly, averaging, seventy-five percent support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Senate opposes the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* regarding the constitutional rights of corporations; supports an amendment to the Constitution to provide that corporations are not entitled to the entirety of protections or rights of natural persons, specifically so that the expenditure of corporate money to influence the electoral process is no longer a form of constitutionally protected speech; and calls on Congress to begin the process of amending the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully opposes the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* and related cases allowing unlimited corporate election spending; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations are not entitled to the same rights and protection as natural persons under the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state and local governments to limit, regulate and require disclosure of sources of all Money spent to influence elections; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate charges the West Virginia Congressional Delegation with the duty to support such an amendment, to work diligently towards its passage and to vote at all stages to advance such legislation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate declares its intention to ratify such an amendment if and when the Congress shall submit it to the states; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk is hereby directed to deliver a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of both houses of Congress and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 24

(By Senators Snyder, Kessler (Mr. President), Beach, Cann, Edgell, Fitzsimmons, Green, Laird, McCabe, Miller, Tucker, Unger, Wells, Yost, Plymale, Palumbo and Williams)

[Originating in the Committee on the Judiciary]

Whereas, In 2010, the United States Supreme Court issued its ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* that enabled corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts of money in support of or in opposition to candidates for election; and

Whereas, The people of West Virginia and all other states should have the power to

limit by law the extent to which money can be spent in their political systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Senate hereby calls upon the United States Congress to propose a constitutional amendment addressing the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia Senate supports an amendment to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations and unions are not entitled to the same rights and protections as natural persons under the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That such an amendment should assure the power of the federal, state and local governments to limit, regulate and require disclosure of sources of all money spent in the course of political elections; and be it further

Resolved, That the West Virginia Senate requests that the West Virginia Congressional Delegation support such an amendment, work diligently towards its passage and vote at all stages to advance such legislation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and the President pro Tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority leaders of both houses of Congress and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

POM-322. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the Congress of the United States, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states for the sole and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would provide for a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 70

Whereas, the failure of the federal budget process has produced an enormous federal budget deficit, and growing national debt presently burdens the American people and threatens to burden their descendants for generations to come; and

Whereas, the congressional practice of deficit spending and repeated raising of the ceiling on the federal debt has had the effect of endangering the jobs, incomes, retirement security, welfare, and future of American citizens; and

Whereas, such debt diverts scarce resources from crucial programs to pay interest on the national debt, constricts the ability of the federal government to address long-standing national problems and to respond to new needs, and increases pressures to raise taxes on the American people; and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that an amendment to the constitution may be proposed by congress, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, congress is required to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment, which, in either case, shall become part of the constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the several states: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States of America for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, for submission to the states for ratification, to require that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal outlays made by congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints; and be it further

Resolved, That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states, including but not limited to previously adopted applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas; and that this application shall be aggregated with such applications for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds of states necessary to require the calling of a convention but shall not be aggregated with applications on any other subject; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the president and the secretary of the United States Senate, to the speaker and clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of this state's delegation to the congress, and to the presiding officer of each house of each state legislature in the United States, requesting their cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That this application by this legislature supersedes all previous applications by this legislature on this same subject matter and that this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made application for a similar convention pursuant to Article V.

POM-323. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida applying to the United States Congress to call a convention of the states, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution to provide for a balanced federal budget and limit the ability of Congress to dictate to states requirements for the expenditure of federal funds, and rescinding all previous applications of the State of Florida for the calling of a federal constitutional convention to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

Whereas, fiscal discipline and economic integrity have been core principles of American governance, and

Whereas, the American people have historically demanded the same prudent, responsible, and intellectually honest financial behavior from their elected representatives as ultimately compels individual behavior, and

Whereas, it is the firm conviction of the Legislature of the State of Florida that it is wrong to fund the prosperity of the present generation by robbing future Americans of their own, and

Whereas, mortgaging the birthright of our children and grandchildren is a dangerous departure from traditional American values which threatens to permanently undermine the strength of our nation, and

Whereas, the national debt has nearly doubled over the past 8 years and Florida's share

of that debt is \$727 billion, more than all Floridians make in wages and salaries in 2 years, and

Whereas, for the nation to pay off the entire federal debt by 2015, Congress would have to triple the federal income taxes of every American and devote the increase exclusively to debt payments, and

Whereas, our debt is increasingly owed to the governments of foreign nations, not to the citizens of the United States; therefore, our wealth is transferred to others and will not be available to supply the means for America's future growth and prosperity, and

Whereas, this generation will bequeath to its children one of the world's most indebted industrial democracies, and

Whereas, high federal deficits cause increasingly high payments for debt interest in the future, make future borrowing more costly, reduce investment activity, and thus reduce the size of the future economy, and

Whereas, the people of Florida recognized the wisdom of fiscal discipline and enshrined in its State Constitution the requirement for a balanced budget to place a prudent limit on the tendencies of government, and

Whereas, the Florida Legislature has made fiscally responsible decisions, maintaining a balanced budget and saving the citizens of this State from crippling deficits, massive debt burdens, and bankruptcy, and

Whereas, we the Legislature of the State of Florida call for the Constitution of the United States to be amended to require the Federal Government to operate with fiscal responsibility, common sense, and the revenues granted to it by the people, and

Whereas, the Federal Government has for too long relied on revenue increases and borrowing against our future rather than on prudent spending decisions within the limits of current revenues, and

Whereas, lasting resolution of this nation's budget deficit can be achieved only by addressing the spending habits of our Federal Government, not by increasing the tax burden under which our citizens already labor, and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States makes provision for amending the Constitution on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, calling a convention for proposing amendments that shall be valid to all intents and purposes if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida, the House of Representatives Concurring:

That the Legislature of the State of Florida, with all due respect and great reluctance, does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call an Article V amendments convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States:

(1) To achieve and maintain a balanced budget by:

(a) Requiring that such balanced budget account for all obligations of the Federal Government;

(b) Allowing flexibility in federal balanced budget requirements by providing exceptions related to exigencies such as national emergencies or threats to the nation's security;

(c) Imposing spending limits on the Federal Government;

(d) Setting extraordinary vote requirements for new or increased federal taxes and other revenues; and

(e) Prohibiting federal mandates on states to impose taxes or fees.

(2) To control the ability of the Congress and the various federal executive agencies to require states to expend funds by:

(a) Limiting the ability of Congress and the various federal executive agencies to pass legislation requiring states to spend money or to take actions requiring the expenditure of money unless federal funds are provided in ongoing amounts sufficient to offset the full costs of such requirements; and

(b) Limiting the ability of Congress to dictate to states requirements for the expenditure of federal funds other than such requirements as may be necessary to measure outcomes to be achieved through the expenditure of the federal funds, leaving to the several states the ability to decide how to best accomplish those outcomes; and be it further

Resolved, That this concurrent resolution supersedes all previous memorials applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, including Senate Memorial 234 and House Memorial 2801, both passed in 1976, and superseded, revoked, and withdrawn in 1988 by Senate Memorial 302, and that such previous memorials are hereby revoked and withdrawn, nullified, and superseded to the same effect as if they had never been passed; and be it further

Resolved, That this concurrent resolution is revoked and withdrawn, nullified, and superseded to the same effect as if it had never been passed, and retroactive to the date of passage, if it is used for the purpose of calling a convention or used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States for any purpose other than requiring a balanced federal budget or limiting the ability of the Federal Government to require states to spend money; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be dispatched to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress, and to the presiding officers of each house of the several state legislatures.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2015.

*Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2792. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2793. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2794. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of overseas excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2795. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand the definition of eligible program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2796. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income protection allowances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2797. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to update a program to provide assistance for the planning, design, and construction of treatment works to intercept, transport, control, or treat municipal combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows, and to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to update certain guidance used to develop and determine the financial capability of communities to implement clean water infrastructure programs; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2798. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to create an electronic database of research and information on the causes of, and corrective actions being taken with regard to, algal blooms in the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and other surface fresh waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2799. A bill to extend the authority of satellite carriers to retransmit certain television broadcast station signals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2800. A bill to create a patient-centered quality of care initiative for seriously ill patients through the establishment of a stakeholder strategic summit, quality of life education and awareness initiative, health care workforce training, an advisory committee, and palliative care focused research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2801. A bill to provide for conditions on the renewal of health insurance plans purchased through Exchanges; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 542. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHANNES):

S. Res. 543. A resolution designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 403

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 851

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to establish programs with respect to childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses,

increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1417

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1417, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent human trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of human trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 2089

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2089, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2094

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2094, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 2258

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 2258, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2329

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2329, a bill to prevent Hezbollah from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to

make improvements to the Medicare Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2694, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 2695

At the request of Mr. KAINE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2695, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response.

S. 2781

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2781, a bill to improve student and exchange visitor visa programs.

S. 2789

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2789, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 541, a resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly con-

tained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2794. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of overseas excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO OVERSEAS EXCESS OR SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES.

Section 32(c)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) providing access to and managing the distribution of excess or surplus property located outside the United States that is owned by the United States to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between the task force and the head of the applicable state agency (as defined in section 549 of title 40, United States Code).”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 542—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK, INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES AND INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 542

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in

the United States, only approximately 3% of workers or their spouses are saving for retirement, and the amount that workers have saved for retirement is much less than the amount they need to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important to their understanding of the need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not be aware of their options in saving for retirement or may not have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement;

Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist them in preparing for retirement, many of those employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles; and

Whereas the week of October 19 through October 25, 2014 has been designated as "National Save for Retirement Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement Week, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;

(2) acknowledges the need to raise public awareness of a variety of ways to save for retirement that are favored under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which are utilized by many people in the United States but could be utilized by more; and

(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Save for Retirement Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 543—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 1, 2014, AS NATIONAL BISON DAY

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHANNES) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 543

Whereas bison are considered a historical symbol of the United States;

Whereas bison were integrally linked with the economic and spiritual lives of many Indian tribes through trade and sacred ceremonies;

Whereas there are more than 60 Indian tribes participating in the Intertribal Buffalo Council;

Whereas numerous members of Indian tribes are involved in bison restoration on tribal land;

Whereas members of Indian tribes have a combined herd on more than 1,000,000 acres of tribal land;

Whereas the Intertribal Buffalo Council is a tribal organization incorporated pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as "Indian Reorganization Act") (25 U.S.C. 477);

Whereas bison can play an important role in improving the types of grasses found in landscapes to the benefit of grasslands;

Whereas a bison has been depicted on the official seal of the Department of the Interior since 1912;

Whereas bison hold significant economic value for private producers and rural communities;

Whereas, as of 2012, the United States Department of Agriculture estimates that 162,110 head of bison were under the stewardship of private producers, creating jobs and contributing to the food security of the United States by providing a sustainable and healthy meat source;

Whereas a bison is portrayed on 2 State flags;

Whereas the bison has been adopted by 3 States as the official mammal or animal of those States;

Whereas the buffalo nickel played an important role in modernizing the currency of the United States;

Whereas several sports teams have the bison as a mascot, which highlights the iconic significance of bison in the United States;

Whereas on December 8, 1905, William Hornaday, Theodore Roosevelt, and others formed the American Bison Society in response to the near extinction of bison in the United States;

Whereas on October 11, 1907, the American Bison Society sent 15 bison to the first big game refuge in the United States, which was known as the "Wichita Reserve Bison Refuge";

Whereas in 2005, the American Bison Society was reestablished, bringing together bison ranchers, managers from Indian tribes, Federal and State agencies, conservation organizations, and natural and social scientists from the United States, Canada, and Mexico to create a vision for the North American bison in the 21st century;

Whereas there are bison herds in National Wildlife Refuges and National Parks;

Whereas there are bison in State-managed herds across 11 States;

Whereas there is a growing effort to celebrate and officially recognize the historical, cultural, and economic significance of the North American bison to the heritage of the United States; and

Whereas members of Indian tribes, bison producers, conservationists, sportsmen, educators, and other public and private partners have participated in the annual National Bison Day since 2012 and are committed to continuing this tradition annually on the first Saturday of November: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 1, 2014, the first Saturday of November, as National Bison Day; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3800. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

SA 3801. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3800 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, *supra*.

SA 3802. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2199, *supra*.

SA 3803. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3802 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, *supra*.

SA 3804. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3803 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3802 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, *supra*.

SA 3805. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3806. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3807. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3808. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3809. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3800. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 20, line 4, strike "6 months" and insert "7 months".

SA 3801. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3800 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "7" and insert "8".

SA 3802. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2199, to

amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 20, line 4, strike “6 months after the date of enactment” and insert “7 months after the date of enactment”.

SA 3803. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3802 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “7 months” and insert “8 months”.

SA 3804. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3803 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “8” and insert “9”.

SA 3805. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 3A. NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.—

(1) RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.—Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 157) is amended by striking “except to” and all that follows through “authorized in section 8(a)(3)”.

(2) UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.—Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “: *Provided*, That” and all that follows through “retaining membership”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or to discriminate” and all that follows through “retaining membership”; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a)(3) of this section”; and

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) by striking clause (2); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (3) and (4) as clauses (2) and (3), respectively.

(b) AMENDMENT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT.—Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152) is amended by striking paragraph Eleven.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 11(a), this section, and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3806. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PAYMENT OF HIGHER WAGES.

Section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding a labor organization’s exclusive representation of employees in a unit, or the terms and conditions of any collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect, nothing in either—

“(A) section 8(a)(1) or 8(a)(5), or

“(B) a collective bargaining contract or agreement renewed or entered into after the date of enactment of this paragraph,

shall prohibit an employer from paying an employee in the unit greater wages, pay, or other compensation for, or by reason of, his or her services as an employee of such employer, than provided for in such contract or agreement.”.

SA 3807. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 715, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 2842. BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.—The term “National Heritage Corridor” means the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor.

(2) PARK.—The term “Park” means the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park established by subsection (b).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATES.—The term “States” means—

(A) the State of Massachusetts; and

(B) the State of Rhode Island.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the States a unit of the National Park System, to be known as the “Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park”.

(c) HISTORIC SITES AND DISTRICTS.—The Park shall include—

(1) Blackstone River State Park; and

(2) the following resources, as described in Management Option 3 of the study entitled “Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study-Study Report 2011”:

(A) Old Slater Mill National Historic Landmark District.

(B) Slatersville Historic District.

(C) Ashton Historic District.

(D) Whitinsville Historic District.

(E) Hopedale Village Historic District.

(F) Blackstone River and the tributaries of Blackstone River.

(G) Blackstone Canal.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND; PARK BOUNDARY.—

(1) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land that are

considered contributing historic resources in the historic sites and districts described in subsection (c)(2) for inclusion in the Park boundary by donation, purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(2) PARK BOUNDARY.—On a determination by the Secretary that a sufficient quantity of land or interests in land has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit, the Secretary shall establish a boundary for the Park by publishing a boundary map in the Federal Register.

(3) OTHER RESOURCES.—The Secretary may include in the Park boundary any resources that are the subject of an agreement with the States or a subdivision of the States entered into under subsection (e)(4).

(4) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On the acquisition of additional land or interests in land under paragraph (1), or on entering an agreement under paragraph (3), the boundary of the Park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition or agreement by publishing a Park boundary map in the Federal Register.

(5) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The maps referred to in this paragraph shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES.—The Secretary may acquire not more than 10 acres in Woonsocket, Rhode Island for the development of administrative, curatorial, maintenance, or visitor facilities for the Park.

(7) LIMITATION.—Land owned by the States or a political subdivision of the States may be acquired under this paragraph only by donation.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer land within the boundary of the Park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the Park—

(i) in consultation with the States and other interested parties; and

(ii) in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall consider ways to use preexisting or planned visitor facilities and recreational opportunities developed in the National Heritage Corridor, including—

(i) the Blackstone Valley Visitor Center, Pawtucket, Rhode Island;

(ii) the Captain Wilbur Kelly House, Blackstone River State Park, Lincoln, Rhode Island;

(iii) the Museum of Work and Culture, Woonsocket, Rhode Island;

(iv) the River Bend Farm/Blackstone River and Canal Heritage State Park, Uxbridge, Massachusetts;

(v) the Worcester Blackstone Visitor Center, located at the former Washburn & Moen wire mill facility, Worcester, Massachusetts;

(vi) the Route 295 Visitor Center adjacent to Blackstone River State Park; and

(vii) the Blackstone River Bikeway.

(3) RELATED SITES.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, visitor services, interpretive tours, and educational programs

to sites and resources in the National Heritage Corridor that are located outside the boundary of the Park and associated with the purposes for which the Park is established.

(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To further the purposes of this section and notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the States, political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations (including Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Inc.), and other interested parties—

(i) to provide technical assistance, interpretation, and educational programs in the historic sites and districts described in subsection (c)(2); and

(ii) subject to the availability of appropriations and subparagraphs (B) and (C), to provide not more than 50 percent of the cost of any natural, historic, or cultural resource protection project in the Park that is consistent with the general management plan prepared under paragraph (2).

(B) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of the receipt of funds under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall require that any Federal funds made available under a cooperative agreement entered into under this paragraph are to be matched on a 1-to-1 basis by non-Federal funds.

(C) REIMBURSEMENT.—Any payment made by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be subject to an agreement that the conversion, use, or disposal of the project for purposes that are inconsistent with the purposes of this section, as determined by the Secretary, shall result in a right of the United States to reimbursement of the greater of—

(i) the amount provided by the Secretary to the project under subparagraph (A)(ii); or

(ii) an amount equal to the increase in the value of the project that is attributable to the funds, as determined by the Secretary at the time of the conversion, use, or disposal.

(D) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Any cooperative agreement entered into under this subparagraph shall provide for reasonable public access to the resources covered by the cooperative agreement.

(f) DEDICATION; MEMORIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress dedicates the Park to John H. Chafee, the former United States Senator from Rhode Island, in recognition of—

(A) the role of John H. Chafee in the preservation of the resources of the Blackstone River Valley and the heritage corridor that bears the name of John H. Chafee; and

(B) the decades of the service of John H. Chafee to the people of Rhode Island and the United States.

(2) MEMORIAL.—The Secretary shall display a memorial at an appropriate location in the Park that recognizes the role of John H. Chafee in preserving the resources of the Blackstone River Valley for the people of the United States.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 2843. JOHN H. CHAFEE BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR AMENDMENTS.

Public Law 99-647 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 100 Stat. 3625) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of section 2 (110 Stat. 4202), by striking “the map entitled ‘Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Boundary Map’, numbered BRV-80-

80,011, and dated May 2, 1993” and inserting “the map entitled ‘John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor—Proposed Boundary’, numbered 022/11530, and dated November 10, 2011”;

(2) in section 7 (120 Stat. 1858, 125 Stat. 155)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “termination of commission” and inserting “termination of commission; designation of local coordinating entity”;

(B) by striking “The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Inc., shall be the local coordinating entity for the Corridor (referred to in this section as the ‘local coordinating entity’).

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The local coordinating entity shall assume the duties of the Commission for the implementation of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan developed and approved under section 6.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—For the purposes of carrying out the management plan, the local coordinating entity may use amounts made available under this Act—

“(1) to make grants to the States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island (referred to in this section as the ‘States’), political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

“(2) to enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the States, political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

“(3) to hire and compensate staff, including individuals with expertise in—

“(A) natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resource conservation;

“(B) economic and community development; or

“(C) heritage planning;

“(4) to obtain funds or services from any source, including funds and services provided under any other Federal law or program;

“(5) to contract for goods or services; and

“(6) to support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of the Corridor and are consistent with the approved management plan.”;

(3) in section 8 (120 Stat. 1858)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the local coordinating entity designated by paragraph (1) and other public or private entities for the purpose of—

“(A) providing technical assistance; or

“(B) implementing the plan under section 6(c).”;

(B) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) TRANSITION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the local coordinating entity to ensure—

“(1) the appropriate transition of management of the Corridor from the Commission to the local coordinating entity; and

“(2) coordination regarding the implementation of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan.”;

(4) in section 10 (104 Stat. 1018, 120 Stat. 1858), by striking subsection (c); and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 11. REFERENCES TO THE CORRIDOR, INC.

“For purposes of sections 6, 8 (other than section 8(d)(1)), 9, and 10, a reference to the ‘Commission’ shall be considered to be a reference to the local coordinating entity.”.

SA 3808. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2199, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ensuring Fairness in Pay Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON WAGE DISCRIMINATION.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “(1)” and inserting “(1)(A)”;

(B) by striking “made pursuant to” and all that follows and inserting the following: “made—

“(i) pursuant to a seniority system;

“(ii) pursuant to a merit or performance-based system;

“(iii) pursuant to a system which measures earnings by quantity or quality of production;

“(iv) on the basis of work-related expertise;

“(v) due to a shift differential, if the shift with the higher wage rate requires more work, or work that is more difficult or dangerous; or

“(vi) on the basis of a demonstrable factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.

“(B) An employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this subsection shall not, in order to comply to comply with the provisions of this subsection, reduce the wage rate of any employee.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted, a notice to be prepared or approved by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that sets forth excerpts from, or summaries of, the pertinent provisions of this Act (relating to section 6(d)) and of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), and information pertinent to the filing of a complaint.”.

SEC. 3. NONRETALIATION.

Section 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “employee has filed” and all that follows and inserting “employee—

“(A) has made a charge or filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under or related to this Act, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or has testified or is planning to

testify or has assisted or participated in any manner in any such investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action, or has served or is planning to serve on an industry committee; or

“(B) has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed the wages of the employee or another employee;” and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) Subsection (a)(3)(B) shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee’s essential job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to an individual who does not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a charge or complaint or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employer.

“(2) Any employer who requires an employee to sign a contract or waiver that would prohibit the employee from disclosing information about the employee’s pay shall be considered to have committed an unlawful act under subsection (a)(3)(B).

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.”.

SEC. 4. CIVIL PENALTY.

Section 16(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “(2)” and inserting “(2)(A)” and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Any person who violates section 6(d) shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each employee affected (less the amount of any penalty the person has paid under State law for the wage differential involved), in addition to any penalty that may apply under subparagraph (A).” and

(2) in paragraph (3), in the first sentence, by striking “this subsection” and inserting “this subsection (other than paragraph (2)(B))”.

SEC. 5. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) An action brought under this section, alleging a violation of section 6(d), shall be brought—

“(1) not later than 4 years after the date on which the alleged violation occurred; and

“(2) not later than 3 years after the date on which the employee involved became aware of the wage differential that is the basis for the alleged violation.”.

SEC. 6. INFORMATION ON WAGE RATE DIFFERENTIALS.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after section 18C (29 U.S.C. 218c) the following:

“SEC. 218D. INFORMATION ON WAGE RATE DIFFERENTIALS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective July 1, 2015, the Secretary of Labor may reserve a portion of the funds available under section 169 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3224), and use the portion to award grants to States that collect and disseminate information on wage rate differentials in their States.

“(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a State shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including information demonstrating that the State has collected and disseminated on the Web site of the relevant

State agency and by any other means the State may determine to be appropriate—

“(1) accurate information, including statistics, on differentials in the State in wage rates on the basis of sex;

“(2) historical analyses of differentials described in paragraph (1);

“(3) an explanation of employee rights related to wage rate differentials;

“(4) instructions for employers on compliance with laws related to wage rate differentials; and

“(5) any other information that will assist the public in understanding such differentials.”.

SA 3809. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 626. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS’ DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) RESTATEMENT OF CURRENT CONCURRENT PAYMENT AUTHORITY WITH EXTENSION OF PAYMENT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and subsection (b), a member or former member of the uniformed services who is entitled for any month to retired pay and who is also entitled for that month to veterans’ disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (hereinafter in this section referred to as ‘qualified retiree’) is entitled to be paid both for that month without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38.

“(2) ONE-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH TOTAL DISABILITIES.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2004, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is any of the following:

“(A) A qualified retiree receiving veterans’ disability compensation for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(B) A qualified retiree receiving veterans’ disability compensation at the rate payable for a disability rated as 100 percent disabling by reason of a determination of individual unemployability.

“(3) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2004, and ending on December 31, 2013, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (c) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans’ disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of serv-

ice-connected disabilities that is rated not less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(4) 10-YEAR PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, payment of retired pay to a qualified retiree is subject to subsection (d) if the qualified retiree is entitled to veterans’ disability compensation for a service-connected disability or combination of service-connected disabilities that is rated less than 50 percent disabling by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs but is compensable under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.”.

(b) PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) PHASE-IN OF FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT DISABLING.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2025, retired pay payable to a qualified retiree that pursuant to subsection (a)(4) is subject to this subsection shall be determined as follows:

“(1) CALENDAR YEAR 2016.—For a month during 2016, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the amount (if any) of retired pay in excess of the current baseline offset, plus \$100.

“(2) CALENDAR YEAR 2017.—For a month during 2017, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 10 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount specified in paragraph (1) for that member’s disability.

“(3) CALENDAR YEAR 2018.—For a month during 2018, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 20 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (2) for that qualified retiree.

“(4) CALENDAR YEAR 2019.—For a month during 2019, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 30 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (3) for that qualified retiree.

“(5) CALENDAR YEAR 2020.—For a month during 2020, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 40 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (4) for that qualified retiree.

“(6) CALENDAR YEAR 2021.—For a month during 2021, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 50 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (5) for that qualified retiree.

“(7) CALENDAR YEAR 2022.—For a month during 2022, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 60 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (6) for that qualified retiree.

“(8) CALENDAR YEAR 2023.—For a month during 2023, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 70 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (7) for that qualified retiree.

“(9) CALENDAR YEAR 2024.—For a month during 2024, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 80 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (8) for that qualified retiree.

“(10) CALENDAR YEAR 2025.—For a month during 2025, the amount of retired pay payable to a qualified retiree is the sum of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree; and

“(B) 90 percent of the difference between (i) the current baseline offset, and (ii) the amount determined under paragraph (9) for that qualified retiree.

“(11) GENERAL LIMITATION.—Retired pay determined under this subsection for a qualified retiree, if greater than the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree, shall be reduced to the amount of retired pay otherwise applicable to that qualified retiree.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PHASE-IN FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the subsection caption, by inserting “FOR QUALIFIED RETIREES WITH DISABILITIES RATED 50 PERCENT DISABLING OR HIGHER” after “FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT”; and

(2) by striking “the second sentence of subsection (a)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a)(3)”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation”.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans’ disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 627. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1414(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired

under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

“(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

“(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member’s retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member’s years of creditable service multiplied by the member’s retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on July 1, 2015, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on September 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Ebola in West Africa: A Global Challenge and Public Health Threat.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Emily Schlichting of the committee staff on (202) 224-6840.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark-up S. 2141, The Sunscreen Innovation Act; H.R. 4366, The Strengthening Education through Research Act; S. 2154, Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014; and Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to serve as a Member of the National Labor Relations Board; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on September 18, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Fulfilling the Promise: Overcoming Persistent Barriers to Economic Self-Sufficiency for People with Disabilities.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Zoe Gross of the committee staff on (202) 224-5484.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Per-

manent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has scheduled a hearing entitled, “Tax Audits of Large Partnerships.” The Subcommittee hearing will examine IRS audits of large partnerships, including trends and audit issues identified in a Government Accountability Office report to be released at the hearing. Witnesses will include representatives of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, and U.S. Government Accountability Office. A witness list will be available Tuesday, September 16, 2014.

The Subcommittee hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, September 18, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Elise Bean of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations at (202) 224-9505.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2014, at 3:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 11, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on September 11, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALL CIRCUIT REVIEW EXTENSION ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 506, H.R. 4197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4197) to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4197) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2258 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2258) to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, today, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I applaud my colleagues for their support and Senate passage of S. 2258, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014.

All of my colleagues on the committee, including Ranking Member BURR and Senators ROCKEFELLER, MURRAY, BROWN, TESTER, BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, ISAKSON, JOHANNES, MORAN, BOOZMAN, and HELLER, joined me in supporting this important legislation, introduced by Senator BEGICH. I look forward to continuing our bipartisan efforts to improve the lives of our Nation's veterans.

This important measure directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the rates of veterans' compensation to keep pace with the increasing cost-of-living in this country. The rate adjustment is equal to that provided on an annual basis to Social Security recipients and is based on the Consumer Price Index. Last year's cost-of-living adjustment of 1.5 percent affected so many important benefits, including veterans' disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children. VA has projected that more than 4.5 million veterans and survivors will receive these benefits in fiscal year 2015.

I have been chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee for nearly 2 years, but during that period I have learned several very important lessons. First and foremost, the cost of war is much greater than most Americans realize, and the cost of war does not end when the last shots are fired or the last missiles are launched. The cost of war continues until the last veteran receives all of the care and all of the benefits that he or she has earned. With this in mind, for those who claim that taking care of veterans is too expensive, if you are not prepared to properly provide the health care and other benefits that veterans have earned, then do not send them to war in the first place. Taking care of veterans is a cost of war.

As part of Congress's important responsibility of ensuring veterans and survivors receive all of the benefits to which they are entitled, we take steps to prevent these benefits from being diminished by the effects of inflation. Over the last several years there has been a lot of discussion about so-called entitlement reform. When people talk about entitlement reform what they really mean, in English, is cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. The cuts to Social Security benefits were going to come in the form of a so-called chained CPI, which would have meant significant cuts in the cost-of-living adjustments that seniors received, that people with disabilities received, and, if you can believe it, that disabled veterans received.

The bottom line is that at a time when the wealthiest people in this country and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well and enjoy many, many tax breaks, we should not balance the budget on the backs of some of the most vulnerable people in this country—including disabled veterans. I will continue to strongly oppose any proposal to adopt the chained CPI. Moving to a chained CPI would cut the benefits of more than 4 million disabled veterans and surviving spouses.

Congress's responsibility to ensure veterans and survivors receive all of the benefits to which they are entitled also requires that we ensure they re-

ceive their complete cost-of-living adjustment. For a number of years, VA rounded down cost-of-living adjustments. The negative impacts of the round-down were just one of the issues that were brought to my attention by the veterans service organizations. I am proud to say that passage of last year's cost-of-living adjustment ended this practice. This year's bill, sponsored by Senator BEGICH, would continue to ensure veterans receive the full adjustment to which they are entitled. To some, this is mere pennies, but I know these small amounts of money add up over time and make a significant contribution to the financial stability of millions of veterans and their survivors.

We have an obligation to ensure the benefits we provide veterans and their survivors do not erode over time. As the debate over spending and the national debt continues, we cannot forget the debt we owe to veterans and their families—after sacrificing for our well-being, the least we can do is ensure theirs. I commend the Senate's passage of S. 2258, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014. It is another important step as we continue to work to honor our obligation to America's veterans and their surviving family members.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2258) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2014, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2014, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2014, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2015.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAVE FOR RETIREMENT WEEK

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 542.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 542) supporting the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and

laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 542) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until 5 p.m. today for the purpose of submitting statements and introducing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, September 15, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2199, as provided under the previous order; finally, that the filing deadlines for first-degree amendments to S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act, be 3 p.m. Monday and second-degree amendments be 4:30 p.m. Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Senators should expect three rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. on Mon-

day on cloture on the Paycheck Fairness Act and cloture on the Baran and Burns nominations to be members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 15, 2014, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 11, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN HOOVER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

DAVID RADZANOWSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

DAVID J. ARROYO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MIRANDA A.A. BALLENTINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JUDITH M. DAVENPORT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020.

ELIZABETH SEMBLER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JOSEPH L. NIMMICH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ANNE E. RUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 3670, ANTI-SPOOFING ACT OF 2013 AND H.R. 5161, E-LABEL ACT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act and H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

H.R. 3670 updates the Truth in Caller ID Act of 2009 to combat against fraudulent phone calls and text messages received by millions of Americans, including seniors, veterans and the disabled. According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), "caller ID spoofing" is defined as the deliberate falsification of caller ID information, including a telephone number and/or name for the purpose of disguising the identity of the calling party.

Just last month, the San Diego County Sheriff's Department reported a series of spoofing incidents in which San Diegans received calls purported to be from the Sheriff's office, indicating a warrant for their arrest. With similar reports of fraudulent behavior around the country, this bipartisan, pro-consumer bill will better protect Americans from becoming victims of scammers. I commend Representative MENG for her leadership and I urge the House to pass this commonsense bill.

I also urge House colleagues to support H.R. 5161, a bipartisan bill which I introduced with Representatives LATTA, WELCH and BLACKBURN in July. Following on the E-Labeling guidance issued by the FCC this summer, H.R. 5161 would promote electronic labeling for FCC certified devices such as phones, computers, smart watches and other consumer electronics products.

As the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) described in a July op-ed, "etching 17 characters into a phone might not seem like a Herculean feat, but as wireless devices have proliferated and shrunk in size, many manufacturers have been forced to buy increasingly expensive equipment and invest more design time into placing the label." Electronic labeling thus provides manufacturers with a more practical solution to existing FCC labeling requirements and does so while lowering device costs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3670 and H.R. 5161.

ELBRA WEDGEWORTH

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud the Honorable

Elbra Wedgeworth on the dedication of the Elbra M. Wedgeworth Municipal Building.

Elbra Wedgeworth was elected to Denver City Council in 1999 representing District 8. Serving a second term in 2003 her City Council peers unanimously elected her the Council President, serving 2003 to 2005. Through her leadership and perseverance Elbra was instrumental in the revitalization of District 8 through improvements to City Park Golf Course, the redevelopment of East Village Housing project, Mercy Hospital redevelopment, Colorado Convention Center expansion and the Blair Caldwell African-American Research Library, only to name a few. Elbra also served as the President and Chair of the Denver 2008 Convention Host Committee; her participation was instrumental in Denver being chosen to host the Democratic National Convention. The Convention itself generated over \$266 million dollars in economic benefit to the State of Colorado.

Elbra currently serves as the Chief Government and Community Relations Officer at Denver Health and Hospital Authority.

I extend my deepest congratulations and gratitude to the Honorable Elbra Wedgeworth for her countless hours of dedication to the citizens of Colorado. Elbra's continued commitment has made our community a better place for all of us.

GENOCIDAL ATTACKS AGAINST CHRISTIAN AND OTHER RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN SYRIA AND IRAQ

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I convened a subcommittee hearing on the desperate plight of Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq and Syria.

As images of beheaded American journalists James Foley and Steven Sotloff are seared into our consciousness, we would do well to honor their memories by recalling that they saw it as their mission to alert the world to the horrors committed by the fanatical Islamist terrorist group ISIS in Syria and Iraq: Children forced to view crucifixions and beheadings; women bartered, sold, and raped; prisoners lined up on their knees to be shot—this is ISIS' legacy.

Today Christians and other religious minorities, such as Yezidis, Shabaks, and Turkmen Shiites are not just facing a long winter without homes. They are not just hungry and thirsty and wandering from village to village in Northern Iraq and Kurdistan.

They are facing annihilation—genocide—by fanatics who see anyone who does not subscribe to its draconian and violent interpreta-

tion of Islam as fair game for enslavement, forced conversion or death.

If the phrase "Never Again" is to be more than well moving sentiment we simply give lip service to, then we must be prepared to act when we see genocide unfold before our very eyes.

After the U.S. pulled out of Iraq in March 2011 we left in charge a prime minister hostile to political inclusion of all Iraqis beyond simply Shiites. The Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL—also known as the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham, or ISIS—saw an opportunity to exploit Sunni resentment at this treatment, and surged to fill the gap.

We withdrew, they surged.

This is not the "Junior Varsity" team of terrorists, as the President dismissively asserted earlier this year. Deputy Assistant Secretary for Iraq and Iran Brett McGurk has described ISIL as having "unprecedented" resources in terms of funds, weapons, and personnel.

We have seen what ISIS is doing in Syria, beheading and crucifying Christians and political opponents, taking hostages and kidnapping religious leaders, blowing up churches and mosques, and forcing religious minorities to convert, flee with the clothes on their backs, pay an exorbitant tax for infidels—or die.

When ISIS overran Mosul in June, Mosul's 35,000 inhabitants not too old or sick fled for their lives. At checkpoints leaving the city, ISIS took the Christians' wedding rings, money, travel papers, and medicines—even their cars. Families walked carrying their children, pushing wheelchairs with elderly parents, mile after mile into the hot, barren, Nineveh Plain. As ISIS continued to gain territory in July and August, the Christians fled further north, joining Yezidi and many other minorities trying to find safety in the Iraqi Kurdistan Region.

More than 1.7 million people have been displaced in Iraq this year. Many were Christians who fled the brutal Syrian civil war, now on the run again.

Where will they be safe?

Kurdistan, a region of 8.35 million people currently hosts nearly 750,000 refugees. The Kurdish Peshmerga militias are underfunded and under-armed, now that ISIS has captured U.S. heavy weaponry across Iraq. Yet they soldier on.

I have received emails from Bishops and nuns chronicling the dire needs of their flocks who are being "exterminated" and "expelled" from regions their people have occupied for millennia.

The U.S. has in the last few weeks geared up for the humanitarian crisis. As of September 5, the U.S. had dedicated nearly \$140 million in humanitarian assistance to Iraq—and USAID airlifted more than 60 metric tons of humanitarian aid into Kurdistan's capital of Erbil.

We need, however, to make sure that aid gets to people who need it most. This means working with religious leaders who are closest to those in need.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

We may also need to invest more in our relationship with the Kurdish Regional Government—a regional government which has taken on the aspects of a de facto national government, and one whose brave militia men have stood up against ISIS while members of the Iraqi Armed Forces have folded and fled.

It must also be remarked and remembered with gratitude that the Kurdish Regional Government has extended protection to Christians and other victims of religious persecution. While their record has not been perfect, the Kurds appear to be more tolerant of diversity of thought and belief than many of their neighbors.

But aid alone is not the solution. The U.S. has already spent \$2.4 billion on the Syria humanitarian crisis that rages on.

We need shrewd power—a strategy for action that is in touch with reality on the ground. A strategy born of thinking ahead and preparing in advance for contingencies so that we are not playing catch-up while the enemy rapes, pillages, kidnaps, massacres—and amasses wealth and weapons.

The reality for religious minorities is that their very lives are at risk as long as ISIS controls territory and continues to gather strength on the ground, drawing funds and fighters from around the globe.

As Pope Francis has noted with regard to this crisis, “where there is unjust aggression . . . it is licit to stop the unjust aggressor.”

This may indeed require the use of force, but it also requires using other means at our disposal. I have called for the establishment of a Syrian War Crimes Tribunal, and introduced H. Con. Res. 51 to hold all sides accountable for the heinous atrocities they have committed.

H. Con. Res. 51, introduced last September, calls for the creation of an international tribunal that would be more flexible and more efficient than the International Criminal Court to ensure accountability for human rights violations committed by all sides.

With a Herculean diplomatic push by the United States and other interested nations, past success in creating war crimes courts can indeed be prologue. Such a tribunal would also draw upon past experience, creating a justice mechanism robust enough to right the most egregious wrongs, yet nimble enough not to derail chances for peace due to rigidity.

The Foreign Affairs Committee approved H. Con. Res. 51 on April 30, and I hope this measure will come before the House for a vote at the earliest possible time.

As ISIS does not respect borders, committing atrocities in both Iraq and Syria, the jurisdiction of such a tribunal could and should be expanded to hold ISIS accountable for its evil acts on either side of the border.

Today the Black Flag of ISIS flies over vast swaths of northern Iraq and even cities such as Fallujah, which we had won at such great cost. Indeed, ISIS says that they intend to see the Black Flag fly over the White House. Where the Black Flag flies, there is death and misery.

IN APPRECIATION OF COLONEL
PATRICK T. “SMACK” MCKENZIE

HON. HOWARD P. “BUCK” McKEON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to Colonel Patrick T. “Smack” McKenzie, on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Air Force after 26 years of service.

I have had the pleasure of working with Smack on a number of occasions during his tenure in the Air Force House Liaison Office. I greatly appreciate and admire his professionalism, knowledge, and dedication, which has benefited me, and numerous other Members and staff.

Colonel McKenzie has given a great deal to this Nation through his distinguished and selfless service. He began his Air Force career as an ROTC Cadet and a “Jayhawk” at the University of Kansas—an allegiance he maintains to this day, as evidenced by the Jayhawk lanyard you will always see around his neck. Upon graduating in May 1988, he was competitively selected for pilot training at Reese AFB, Texas. He was the envy of Class 90–06, not only because of his perfectly restored red 1965 Pontiac GTO affectionately known as “The Goat”, but also because as one of the top graduates, he was awarded the only F–16 training slot for the class. He was assigned to the 70th Fighter Squadron at Moody AFB, where he was certified as combat-ready and qualified for air-to-surface, air-to-air, and nuclear missions. He quickly caught the eye of his leadership, and was handpicked as one of only 15 squadron pilots qualified to operate the new LANTIRN system (Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night). He also caught the eye of his future wife, Jennifer, and they have been married now for 21 years. Col. McKenzie’s skill as a fighter pilot was quickly recognized during his first deployment, patrolling the skies over Iraq for Operation Southern Watch. His leadership ability earned him a Regular commission and selection for Squadron Officer School, where he was a Distinguished Graduate.

Capt. McKenzie was then assigned to the 51st Operations Support Squadron at Osan Air Base in the Republic of Korea. He continued to impress as a Wing Plans Officer, maintaining critical operational plans for wartime taskings. He again rose above his peers as a pilot, winning the 51st Fighter Wing’s Low Angle Strafe Top Gun award and selection as the Chief of Standardization and Evaluation for the 51st Operations Group—a position reserved for the Group’s most skilled and trusted pilot. In this position, he was responsible for assessments and maintaining operational standards not only in his F–16 squadron, but also in the HH–60 rescue flight, and a C–12 flight, a job essential to deliver wartime capability. He so impressed his leadership, that even as a Captain he was identified as a “future squadron commander” and was selected for USAF Weapons School, the premier advanced weapons and tactics school for our Air Force Pilots. While there, he was praised for his research on F–16 Night Close Air Support

and Targeting Aids, advancing our operational capabilities in this critical capacity. Captain McKenzie’s training was put to immediate use with his assignment to the 510th Fighter Squadron at Aviano Air Base, Italy. He flew dozens of combat sorties during Operations Southern Watch, Decisive Edge, and Deliberate Guard, enforcing no-fly zones over Iraq and Bosnia-Herzegovina. He was also a Mission Commander for more than six large force packages in NATO’s Operation Allied Force in Kosovo, for which he garnered praise for his skills, leadership, mission execution, and most importantly ensuring zero combat losses.

Additionally, Smack was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for extraordinary achievement, planning the first NATO strike of Operation Allied Force to cross the Kosovo/Serbian border, defeating surface to air missiles, and executing the first-ever F–16 night attack utilizing Night Vision Goggles and the LANTIRN system to destroy an ammunition storage facility. As a Flight Commander, Weapons Officer, and Instructor Pilot he was recognized by his superiors as an “exceptional leader with unlimited potential”, the “#1 Captain in the Group”, the “Wing’s top flight commander”, and the USAFE Fighter Pilot of the Year. Smack was sent to Air Command and Staff College, where his tremendous leadership and team building skills led his peers to recognize him as the “Outstanding Team Member” for his class. Following school, he became the Assignments Officer for nearly 1,500 Air Force F–16 pilots, single-handedly managing the Air Force’s largest group of pilots and maintaining 100 percent manning level despite historic shortages just after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Lt. Col. McKenzie then moved to Luke AFB for a short period as the 56th Operations Support Squadron Operations Officer before being entrusted with his first command—the 310th Fighter Squadron “Top Hats”—the largest fighter squadron at Luke, responsible for the only formal Forward Air Controller-Airborne course, which has been a vital capability in the War on Terror. He was heralded as the “top warrior and leader of 618 officers” and led his unit to the 56th Operations Group “Top Squadron” award. Following this highly successful command, Lt. Col. McKenzie attended National War College at Fort McNair and received a Master of Science in National Security Strategy. He then went to U.S. Joint Forces Command in Norfolk, VA where he provided readiness analysis on current operations, and was a liaison with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Government Accountability Office, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all readiness related issues. He provided critical data and assessments for the planning of Operation Enduring Freedom which were influential in leadership decisions. Col. McKenzie then Commanded the 455th Expeditionary Operations Group at Bagram Air Base, Afghanistan. There he profoundly impacted the Global War on Terror, directing air operations and leading over 830 troops to execute over 24,000 missions, dropping 1.1 million pounds of ordnance, and delivering 37,000 tons of cargo—the busiest operation in the CENTCOM area of responsibility. Following this tremendous performance, Col. McKenzie was challenged with a new role as

the SECAF's legislative liaison to Congress for all USAF air and space weapon systems, ensuring the Air Force message and priorities were consistently and convincingly articulated to directly ensure the full authorization of their \$120 billion budget. Smack was then sent back to Osan Air Base, Republic of Korea to command the 51st Fighter Wing "Mustangs" where he previously spent time as a Captain. He was the Joint installation commander for over 10,200 personnel, executing the Combat Air Force's largest and most highly-utilized A-10 and F-16 operation in a tense location, just 6 minutes flight time to North Korea. "A+", "inspiring", and "superb" were just a few words used to describe his tenure there. After his highly successful tour as a Wing Commander, the Air Force returned Smack to legislative liaison work by assigning him to one of the most demanding positions within the Air Force, his current job as the Chief of Air Force House Liaison. Since July 2013, Smack has advised the Secretary of the Air Force, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Director of Legislative Liaison, and numerous other senior military and civilian leaders on issues of the greatest concern to the Air Force and Congress. He has been more than a liaison between the Pentagon and the Hill, he developed and improved key relationships to enable the Congress to make better decisions about the future of the Air Force and our national defense. He is extremely intelligent and articulate, and has helped shape my thinking and influenced many Members of Congress. Simply put, we trust him and will miss him!

Col. McKenzie is a command pilot with over 3,200 flying hours and 630 combat hours in the F-16. He is the recipient of numerous major medals and decorations for his service and accomplishments. The most significant of these include the Defense Superior Service medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star, and Meritorious Service medal.

Throughout his distinguished career he has represented our country and the Air Force with dignity and honor, and this is why I'm so privileged to pay tribute to this fine Airman. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Colonel Patrick T. "Smack" McKenzie, his wife Jennifer, and their daughter Ashley, for their service and sacrifices of the past 26 years. I wish them Godspeed, and continued happiness as they start this new chapter in their lives.

TOM NEUMANN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my close friend Tom Neumann, a thoughtful, dedicated and respected leader who served as an example for all those who wish to make a meaningful, positive change in our world. Sadly, Tom passed away this week, on September 9, at the age of 69. I extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Agnes, and his entire family.

For more than 30 years, Tom served to help end anti-Semitism, to safeguard democratic

principles and to build understanding and support for Israel. He previously served as the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL) Southwest Regional Director, ADL's National Director of Community Services and its National Director of the Intergroup Relations Division. At ADL, Tom worked to build friendships and working relationships between Christian and Jewish clergy under the Christian-Jewish Committee for Israel. It was during this time that I traveled to Israel with Tom and when I observed firsthand about the challenges that Israel faces each day and why America must always stand with this ally.

Tom later joined B'nai B'rith International as Executive Vice President where he created a presence for the organization in the USSR and Eastern Europe, an important feat and the first to happen since World War II. In 1991, he served as the Executive Director of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), where he worked until his retirement in 2012. As Executive Director, Tom helped establish JINSA as a prominent voice for U.S. national security ties as well as U.S.-Israel security ties. Through his leadership, he helped JINSA grow its membership to over 20,000 individuals. His writings on the U.S.-Israel bilateral relationship were published in outlets across the world. For his work, he was recognized as the "6th Most Influential Jewish Leader" by *The Forward* in 1999. Locally, Tom founded The Houston Center for International Affairs, a business form that focused on international and economic issues, created the Christian/Jewish Committee for Israel, a coalition of inter-denominational clergy who support Israel, and Texas 1990, a dinner discussion group of religious, business and community leaders.

Tom was someone who believed that "people, even more than causes and things, have to be restored, renewed and reclaimed." To those he worked with, he was a friend and mentor. Always kind, always sincere, always focused. To our entire community in Houston, he will be greatly missed. My deepest sympathies to the entire Neumann family.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit an explanation for my absence during legislative business on the evening of Monday, September 8 and Tuesday, September 9. On these two days, I was in my district hosting the United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Secretary Julian Castro during their visit to the 7th Congressional District of Alabama. I hosted Secretary Duncan for a stop in Birmingham on his 5th Annual Back-to-School Bus Tour. We met with community leaders, educators, parents, and other education advocates in Alabama to showcase reforms and investments the Department has made in Birmingham and across the State of Alabama. Secretary Castro joined

me on his first visit to the 7th District since being sworn in as the HUD Secretary. During their visit, the cabinet secretaries and I participated in a "My Brother's Keeper" panel discussion at Phillips Academy which was attended by community leaders, educators, and many bright young students from throughout Birmingham.

Considered and passed by the House during my absence was H. Res. 644, a resolution condemning President Obama for the exchange of five Guantanamo Bay prisoners for the release of Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl. I would like to state for the record that I supported President Obama's decision to act swiftly and exercise his constitutional responsibility as Commander-in-Chief to protect the lives of U.S. service members. Furthermore, I agree with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who unanimously supported the exchange, along with Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel. The United States has a sacred obligation when sending our service men and women onto the field of battle with the assurance that we will honor their sacrifice by leaving no one behind. Army General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said the swap was "likely our last, best opportunity" to free Sergeant Bergdahl.

The timing of this condemnation was also particularly poor. The debate and vote coincided with a meeting in which the President discussed his strategy to confront ISIS with House and Senate leaders at the White House and a day before his address to the nation. At a time when the President needs Congressional support in rallying international support to combat the rising threat of Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria, I believe the timing of this vote was counter to our national interests. I am disappointed that House Republicans chose such inappropriate timing to conduct their political gamesmanship.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF OFFICER ROBERT BUENDIA

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Robert Buendia of the Bothell Police Department. Officer Buendia was recently awarded the prestigious 2014 Crisis Intervention Team Officer of the Year Award, which recognizes outstanding work by police officers in the safe and effective use of crisis intervention techniques in response to mental health crises.

Officer Buendia received this award in part because of his quick and skilled response to a situation involving a suicidal woman. This woman was a recent victim of sexual assault who became upset after learning that the court case against her attacker did not have sufficient evidence for prosecution. When this woman threatened to end her own life, Officer Buendia used his training, intelligence and quick thinking to defuse this potentially tragic situation. He was able to open a dialogue with the woman, and was eventually able to convince her to come out of her apartment.

The outstanding actions of Officer Buendia are emblematic of the heroism that the members of the Bothell Police Department, and all our first responders in the 1st Congressional District, exhibit every day while serving our communities. I am incredibly thankful for the dedication of these public servants.

I want to thank Officer Robert Buendia for his commitment to serving the people of Bothell, and offer my congratulations on this recognition of his work.

DR. ISRAEL ZOBERMAN

HON. E. SCOTT RIGELL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from an extraordinary experience in July, 2014 in Israel, the land I first came to in 1949 at the tender age of three and a half, already a refugee, from post-World War II Europe. Yet nothing could have prepared me for the surrealistic reality of approaching rockets and wailing sirens, a frightful scenario that Israeli citizens of all ages in its south have had to contend with for fourteen long years, with only fifteen seconds to find protective shelter. I will long remember being awakened by the sirens' piercing sounds of war alert at 3:15 a.m. in Haifa, Israel's northern city, far away from Gaza or as proven rather close, and moving quickly with my mom, a ninety-two year old remarkably resilient Polish Holocaust survivor, to the best possible room in her apartment to await whatever might happen with our hearts pounding. Luckily the rocket was intercepted by an Iron Dome installation that the United States has gratefully financed.

No nation would have done less than Israel to fulfill a basic mandate of protecting one's population and all nations would have done more early on. Restrained by its legacy of Jewish and humanitarian values, ever conscious of the double standard applied to its conduct, Israel has exercised an admirable measure of caution to save lives even from the midst of a firing hostile territory controlled by Hamas, a recognized terrorist organization whose covenant unabashedly calls for Israel's destruction and criminally has used children, women and men as human shields; it shot 3500 rockets and also mortars from schools, hospitals, mosques, homes and U.N. facilities with the clear goal of indiscriminately killing and maiming Israelis.

When Hamas and the host of other Arab terrorist organizations will care more for their children than the death of its "enemy's" children, will there emerge new hope for the long-awaited to be transformed Middle East. When Israel's insistence on the sacredness of human life—all human life—will become the inheritance of the entire troubled region, replacing pagan human sacrifice, will the yearning of modern Israel and its biblical prophets for that essential though elusive Shalom, Salaam, Peace, reemerge as a potent force for the sake of all. How could Hamas, tragically and ironically elected into power by Gaza's misguided and long-suffering people, following Israel's 2005 withdrawal from Gaza at an

enormous cost, squander its donated material resources away from the declared purpose of creating a supportive and necessary infrastructure toward establishing a terrorizing war machine with attack tunnels reaching into Israel with a goal of surprising Israel someday with mortal death blows? We are duty-bound to remember that Iran supplied Hamas with the smuggled weaponry and that Hamas is but Iran's proxy, alerted by Iran's stubborn search for a nuclear capability that will make all the difference. Sadly Qatar is not an innocent bystander, offering Hamas vast financial support.

I was deeply touched by Israel's courageous people coming together in a heart-warming display of national unity in the face of a mighty and unique challenge, while maintaining its enviable democratic impulse of cherished freedom to express a variety of views that could not take place in Gaza. Israel is weeping for its heroic defenders as well as the innocent victims on the other side held hostage by an ideology alien to what we in the West will never willingly give up.

Make no mistake. Israel represents the American democratic heritage with common purpose and interest, in a part of the world disdaining it and in which Radical Islam increasingly makes disastrous inroads as the shameful slaughter in Syria and Iraq continues while self-righteous and callous Europe with its growing anti-Semitism fueled by Islamist forces looks aside, expecting the Israelis to be like past Jews who could not defend themselves and paid such a high price for it. Let all Americans say with one voice for the sake of all that is sacred and sane in a triumphant message that dare not be misunderstood, "Never Again!"

Rabbi Israel Zoberman is the spiritual leader of Congregation Beth Chaverim in Virginia Beach.

RECOGNIZING BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS OF GREATER FLINT FOR 70 YEARS OF SERVICE TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint as they celebrate 70 years of dedication and service to children and families in Genesee County. Since 1944, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint has provided a no-cost mentoring program to thousands of youth and families facing adversity.

To celebrate 70 years of service, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint will hold a Platinium Jubilee—Royal Gala. The anniversary celebration will honor the volunteers that have helped shape this institution throughout the past 70 years and highlight the future direction of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint as they provide life-changing relationships through mentorship. Chris Broussard, American sports analyst for ESPN will also join in the celebration as a celebrity guest.

For 70 years, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint has operated under the belief

that inherent in every child is the ability to succeed and thrive in life. As the nation's largest donor and volunteer supported mentoring network, Big Brothers Big Sisters makes meaningful, one-to-one, monitored matches between adult volunteers ("Bigs") and children ("Littles"), ages 6 through 18, in communities across our great country. Their presence in our community is invaluable. Genesee County, as well as the entire State of Michigan, is better because of this agency.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Flint for 70 years of quality mentoring services, fulfilling their mission of creating relationships that change lives for the better, forever.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY HEALY AND HER CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Ms. Mary Healy, a valued community leader who recently passed away. Ms. Healy was the director and chief executive officer of the Sacramento Zoo as well as a leading advocate for engaging the community in the preservation and understanding of animals in their natural habitat. As her family, colleagues and friends gather to honor and remember her wonderful life, I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting one of Sacramento's most respected figures.

Ms. Healy began her career in 1975 as a bird keeper at the Riverbanks Zoo and Garden in Columbia, South Carolina. Following a stint at the San Antonio Zoo and Walt Disney World's Discovery Island in Orlando, Ms. Healy came to Sacramento in 1999. Under Ms. Healy's leadership, the Sacramento Zoo saw growth in attendance and improvements to its physical setting. During her tenure, a full-scale veterinary hospital was built and new habitats were constructed and old structures renovated for a number of animals including giraffes and North American river otters. She focused on improving quality of life for the animals and advancing the experience for zoo guests.

Ms. Healy's passion and commitment resonated in her work and will not be forgotten by the Sacramento community. Her dedication to advocating for animals is unmatched and she took pride in educating our youth. She knew each animal's name and background and was often found teaching zoo guests about the animal's unique features or the exhibit's purpose at the zoo.

In addition to her work in Sacramento, Ms. Healy was a well-respected board member and former chair of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums and served on its accreditation commission. She was president of the California Association of Zoos and Aquariums and was one of nine international council members of the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums. Her vision to make Sacramento the best small zoo in America was highlighted in 2013, when she was recognized with a Women Who

Mean Business Award by the Sacramento Business Journal.

Mr. Speaker, as Ms. Healy's husband, Steve, and her colleagues, family and friends gather to celebrate her wonderful contributions to our community, I am honored to pay tribute to her. I ask all my colleagues to pause and join me in paying respect to an extraordinary woman, Ms. Mary Healy.

CELEBRATING BRENNON MOBLEY,
JAMES RICHFIELD, AND J.D.
HARTWIG

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, changing the world is no small feat. Many feel the call, but not many set out, put feet to their prayers and dreams, and actually change the world for the better. Three collegiate men from Belmont University have spent the summer putting more than their good wishes into motion. I rise today to honor Brennon Mobley, James Richfield, and J.D. Hartwig as they work to complete their heroic cross-country cycling tour.

Cycling across the county is certainly a noble endeavor. Nobler still are the 147 million reasons these three men are offering up their summer with blood, sweat, tears, and bike tires. By teaming up with 147 Million Orphans, a nonprofit founding in 2009 by two Middle Tennessee mothers seeking to meet the critical needs of orphans, the three will raise money to build a school in Honduras as they cycle the 3,300 miles from Oceanside, Oregon to Washington, DC.

Whether participant, parent, friend, supporter, or community member, those who have offered their time, talents, and treasures to this incredible summer ride bear witness to the power of coming together, in the name of the Almighty, for a common good. I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the loving-kindness of Brennon Mobley, James Richfield, and J.D. Hartwig as we all continue the sacred work of protecting and serving the least among us.

TRIBUTE TO LOU MUMFORD

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a much beloved member of our community and a well-respected journalist, Lou Mumford, on the occasion of his retirement from the South Bend Tribune newspaper.

For the past 43 years, Lou has reported the news as it unfolded in Greater Michiana. He is an excellent writer with a trusted, familiar voice, gentle humor, and a strong sense of integrity. He was a true journalist's journalist, exemplifying the newspaper industry's gold standard.

During his many decades at work, Lou has seen it all, both good and bad. From covering

everything from the high school football team to the courthouse; providing eyewitness accounts to presidential visits; to reporting on the grand national scene and sharing the stories of individuals living right within our community.

When Lou was covering local politics or breaking news out of Washington, you always knew what to expect. His questions were fair, unbiased, and intuitive. You were never going to get a free pass, but you would always be treated with the utmost courtesy and respect. It is impossible to not develop a deep professional respect and admiration for a man of Lou's character. And despite our unbridgeable differences—he roots for the White Sox and I am a dyed-in-the-wool Cubs fan—I am grateful for the warm personal rapport we developed over the years.

Lou has a knack for reading the political field—the history, personalities, issues, and all their nuances—because he understands people and what makes them tick. He also empathizes and brings the reader along with him on an emotional journey. This is where Lou showed his true strengths.

His columns shared the lives of ordinary folks in our own community, touching upon the full range of human emotions. His stories about everyday lives could warm the heart, bring a smile to our face, or a tear to our eye. Sometimes both in the same story. They reminded us all of what is really important in life—our own experiences, family, friends, and community.

The great journalist Bob Schieffer once remarked that "journalism is a great way to do public service, to have an impact on your community." While the dawn of each day unveiled new stories on the pages of the South Bend Tribune, one thing remained constant through the years, and that was the steady voice of Lou Mumford. Our community is grateful for Lou's dedicated years of service to our community. We wish him all the best in his retirement, and do hope his story telling will continue.

HONORING JOSHUA KATZ AND THE
POW-MIA-OREE PROJECT

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Joshua Katz, Boy Scouts of America Troop 215, for his work honoring our deceased and missing veterans. As a public servant and the son of a World War II veteran whose bravery motivated me to serve in Congress, I am so proud of Joshua's dedication to our soldiers.

In honor of POW-MIA National Remembrance Day, which is celebrated on the 3rd Friday of every September, Joshua created the POW-MIA-OREE Project to encourage Boy Scouts nationally to become more involved in veteran recognition. The project calls for the reading of the names of every soldier laid to rest in the South Florida National Cemetery and the placement of a commemorative marker on each headstone. Ensuring that this event took place was so important to Joshua

that he funded the project out of his own savings. This heartfelt act of advocacy will ensure that no soldier becomes a forgotten hero.

Representing a district home to veterans of every major conflict since World War II, I know very well the sacrifices that our military men and women and their families have made for our country. Joshua Katz's commitment to honor our men and women in uniform should serve as an inspiration for us all, and I have no doubt that he has a bright future in store.

HONORING FATHER DEXTER
SUTTON BREWER

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are souls so magnificent and so dedicated to the service of others, that when the opportunity comes to offer them our gratitude, our words feel small in comparison. I rise today to celebrate one of Middle Tennessee's true servants, Father Dexter Sutton Brewer, on his 25th anniversary of ordination to the priesthood.

Father encountered the Almighty first in the Baptist church as a child and later in the Catholic faith as a student at Yale. He earned his law degree in 1982 and was ordained into the priesthood in 1989. From clerking for the Tennessee Supreme Court to teaching at Father Ryan High School, from shepherding the souls at Christ the King Parish to tending the flock as both judicial vicar and vicar general for the Diocese of Nashville, Father Dexter offers his life in the pursuit of wisdom, beauty, and justice.

A prayer written at America's birth calls on the most gracious God "to replenish His servant with the truth of doctrine, and endue him with innocence of life, that he may faithfully serve before God, to the glory of His great Name and the benefit of the holy Church." Throughout the past 25 years, these words have been fulfilled through the humble and grand service of Father Dexter Sutton Brewer. I join with Father Dexter's family, parish, and all those gathered to celebrate his Silver Anniversary in offering thanks to the Almighty for His servant.

REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS
ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 AND
BENGHAZI ON SEPTEMBER 11,
2012

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today, we bow our heads in solemn remembrance of the victims lost in the terror attacks on this country on September 11, 2001 and in Benghazi on September 11, 2012.

On September 11, 2001, America changed. Terrorists who despise all that is good and true about America killed thousands of innocent citizens.

On September 11, 2012, more Americans were killed at the consulate in Benghazi. We were reminded the fight is not over, and that America still has enemies.

We reflect with gratitude on all of the men and women who have bravely fought to defend us from anyone seeking to harm the United States and her citizens.

We pray for all those still fighting, and for those who answer the call of duty in years to come.

On this somber day in our nation's history, we stand united as Americans and steadfast in our resolve to ensure that our sacred ideals of freedom, justice, and prosperity continue to shine as a beacon of hope for future generations around the world.

May God continue to bless the United States of America.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,764,720,406,589.08. We've added \$7,137,843,357,676.00 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MR. ROBERT JORDAN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, to honor the extraordinary life of Mr. Robert Jordan. Mr. Jordan was a beloved brother, uncle, and friend. With his passing on August 7, 2014, we look to Mr. Jordan's personal legacy of community service, the joy he inspired in others through his passion and commitment to political advocacy, and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born on September 7, 1965 in Chicopee, Massachusetts, Mr. Jordan grew up in Fairfield, California. After graduating from Armijo High School in 1983, he attended college at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Mr. Jordan went on to graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from California State University, Sacramento.

It was during Mr. Jordan's undergraduate studies at Sacramento State University that he began to get involved in politics. He joined the Sacramento State Young Democrats and the River City Democratic Club. From there, Mr. Jordan became engaged in field work on numerous political campaigns, most notably Barbara Boxer's 1992 "Year of the Woman" campaign.

After working on many campaigns, Mr. Jordan went on to join the staff of the California Democratic Party. He continued to serve selflessly as a staffer there for 22 years and under four different administrations. During his time at the California Democratic Party, Mr. Jordan became an expert on technology development and planning for state conventions and executive board meetings. He was also well known for his meticulous institutional memory and his ability to recall party rules, procedures, and history on issues both large and small. He acted as the Party's unofficial historian and was a key member of the staff, sharing his knowledge and experience, and mentoring his colleagues.

In addition to his work for the California Democratic Party, Mr. Jordan was actively involved in his community. He was passionate about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender rights and was a supporter of The Trevor Project, a national organization that provides crisis and suicide intervention services to LGBTQ youth. He was also a supporter of the Lymphoma Research Foundation and a part of the fight against lymphoma.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding Californian individual, Mr. Robert Jordan. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the state of California. I join all of Robert's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN AT THE SOUTHWEST BORDER

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, every so often, we have the chance to take action that affects how the world as a whole sees the United States.

We have the chance to decide what our country stands for, and what we want to mean to the world.

Today is one of those chances.

The United States has long stood with those who are fleeing persecution and violence.

We've stood alongside them, so they know they're not alone.

We've stood behind them, to give them the ability to make a new life here.

And we've stood up for them, to make it clear that there is no place in this world for the atrocities that drive people to leave their homes.

That's who we are and what we do.

We don't put all our efforts into making it easier to send people back.

We don't say, "Sorry, we'd rather score political points than try to help you."

So why would we start now?

Why would we turn our backs on people—children—who have endured unimaginable struggle and danger to come here for the chance at not just a better life, but a chance at life at all?

That's what this is about—it's a life or death situation for these children.

We need to look beyond politics and partisanship to something bigger—principles.

And let one of those guiding principles be that we will be there when we are needed.

We will respond not with hatred and vitriol, or with inaction and delay, but with empathy and support.

To do anything less is beneath us—not only as Americans, but as human beings.

RECOGNIZING THE PENNRIDGE COMMUNITY CENTER ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Pennridge Community Center on its 50th anniversary. The Upper Bucks Branch of the Bucks County Association for Retired and Senior Citizens was established in 1964 for the purpose of creating a senior center. Located in Perkasie, PA, the Center has served as a place for personal growth for the constituents of Bucks County, offering opportunities to its thousands of members that have passed through its doors. With the help of its strong leaders and associates, the center has become a model of high-quality service, reliability, and integrity and has contributed greatly to the community of the 8th District of Pennsylvania. I commend the Pennridge Community Center for its hard work and its achievements in Bucks County, PA and offer my sincere congratulations on its anniversary.

HONORING THE EXOTICS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, music finds a home in Middle Tennessee. It settles in and we build it a foundation that withstands the weathered seasons of our lives. Various styles, compositions, and genius are found here in various artists, songwriters, and musicians. Some find their favorites on the Billboard Top 40 and others hear them at local gatherings. We are a community that celebrates all the notes of life and particularly enjoys celebrating together the drumbeats and rhythms of life. I rise today to congratulate one such gathering of musical excellence, The Exotics, as they continue 50 years of making great music in Franklin, Tennessee.

Billy Adair, Jeff Cook, Glenn Crowell, and Loy Hardcastle met in high school, formed a band, and began playing the great sound of the 60s: rock 'n roll. Shortly after, they were joined by Robert Early and Steve Smartt. The Exotics never played for a record deal or to book large stadiums. These men of music chased and found the love of their craft at high school dances, pool parties, and fraternity events. As they chased, a loving community came alongside them. Fifty years later, members of The Exotics will play once more to their fans of Franklin.

I join with all of those celebrating The Exotics' 50 years of magnificent rock 'n roll. I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating these mighty men of music on half a century of making a home for great music in Middle Tennessee.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SCAN CONTAINERS ABSOLUTELY NOW (SCAN) ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, after the tragic attacks on 9/11, Congress strengthened aviation security, which was the nature of the attacks against our country. While our aviation system is more secure—13 years later—we have not secured our nation's ports. Our ports are vulnerable to attacks.

I represent the Port of Los Angeles and the communities that surround the port; I have the personal responsibility of keeping the people of my district safe.

Top security experts recommend that shipping containers entering our nation's ports be scanned for radiological and nuclear materials and other potentially dangerous cargo. In addition, Congress passed laws requiring that 100 percent of all cargo be scanned by 2012. Today, two years after the deadline, we are scanning only 3 percent of incoming cargo.

I firmly believe that responding to ongoing terrorist threats and the risk of nuclear proliferation should remain top national security priorities.

The detonation of a nuclear device or "dirty bomb" at a port such as the Port of Los Angeles could cause a staggering loss of life. In addition, it could result in a West Coast or nationwide shutdown of all ports, which would cost the United States economy billions of dollars each day. The economic impact of port closure on supply chains was clearly demonstrated in 2002 when port workers were locked out for 8 days at the West Coast Ports. That cost \$1 billion per day.

For these reasons, I am introducing the Scan Containers Absolutely Now (SCAN) Act. This bill would create a one-year pilot program at two United States ports to evaluate the process of 100 percent scanning of cargo containers and its potential use at all domestic ports.

We must take our responsibility to protect the nation seriously. We cannot allow inconvenience or shortsighted economic expediency to get in the way of keeping our nation's ports and citizens safe.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ZION LUTHERAN SCHOOL

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th anniversary of Zion Lutheran

School. I would like to recognize them for their service to the Lutheran community of South Florida and our local community as a whole.

Founded in 1964 with nine kindergarten students, Zion Lutheran Christian School has served as a center of Lutheran identity and education for the North Broward County community. I want to particularly acknowledge Headmaster Dr. Philippe Dupont and Principal Joann Halem for their dedication to the school and its emphasis on service and study.

I would like to congratulate Zion Lutheran School on its 50th anniversary. Through their example, Zion Lutheran's commitment to education can extend far beyond South Florida.

CONGRATULATING CLEATS MANUFACTURING ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cleats Manufacturing, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Cleats Manufacturing is a union premier fabricator of HVAC sheet metal products. Since its incorporation in 1964 by Ernie DeLord, Cleats has been located in Chicago providing jobs for our hard-working constituents.

Over the last 50 years, their product line has expanded rapidly. Beginning with slip and drive cleats, Cleats' product line soon included rectangular duct and fitting, spiral pipe, CleatSeal gasketed round fittings, welded duct, and other sheet metal products.

Cleats Manufacturing not only provides an excellent American made product but also prides itself in its employees. Their union trained team are tradesmen in the industry and will work with customers on any job from start to finish no matter how big or small.

The company would not be where it is today without the vision of Ernie DeLord's nephew Steve Passannante who began working for the company in 1974. When Steve began, the product line consisted only of sheet metal connectors. He had the vision of the company growing from a connector manufacturer to a full service HVAC fabrication shop. Steve expanded the company and built relationships with some of the largest contractors in Chicago.

Cleats is now one of the largest HVAC fabricators in the Chicagoland area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Cleats Manufacturing on their 50th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE ALAN BLANKENSHIP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Judge Alan Blankenship for being

awarded the Agency for Science, Technology, and Research (ASTAR) fellowship distinction by the Missouri Supreme Court.

Judge Alan Blankenship has served as Associate Circuit Judge in Stone County since 2002. Aside from presiding over civil and criminal general jurisdiction cases, Judge Blankenship presides over the successful Stone County Drug and DWI court programs and serves on the Missouri Trial Judge Education Committee and Missouri Association of Drug Court Professionals Board of Directors.

ASTAR is the lead agency responsible for conducting a program whereby judges from around the country undergo advanced training in science and technology to better equip the courts to handle issues dealing with science and technology. ASTAR judges may be assigned to handle cases or consult with judges with complex scientific matters and help develop training programs for trial judges.

On August 27, 2014, Missouri Supreme Court Judge Zel Fischer presented Judge Blankenship with his ASTAR fellowship award. The ASTAR fellowship award was given to him after completing over 120 hours of court-related science and technology training given by experts in fields such as computer forensics and cybercrime.

I am honored to recognize Judge Alan Blankenship for his service and leadership to the Stone County community.

RECOGNIZING MRS. HENRIETTA HATTON CLARK ON OCCASION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mrs. Henrietta Hatton Clark, a beloved and respected constituent from Vance County, North Carolina who will celebrate her 100th birthday on Sunday, September 14, 2014. Mrs. Clark is a pillar of her community and is highly respected by all those who know her because of her unwavering commitments to God, her family, her church and the community and state she has called home her entire life.

Mrs. Clark was born on a farm in Vance County, North Carolina on September 14, 1914. She was the youngest of six children and was adventurous at an early age. She attended elementary school in Vance County and went on to graduate from Henderson Institute which was operated by the Northern Presbyterian Church. Following Henderson Institute, Mrs. Clark attended what was then Winston-Salem State Teachers College, now Winston-Salem State University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Equipped with her teaching degree, Mrs. Clark set out to make the world a better place one child and one classroom at a time by inspiring children to dream big and work hard. She taught in Vance County, North Carolina Schools for several decades and shaped generations of young minds. She often told her students, "You can achieve any position if you study, work hard, and believe in yourself."

Mrs. Clark's passion and drive did not stop when the school day ended. She was incredibly active in her community. She led voter registration initiatives and was an inspirational leader during the Civil Rights Movement. She served on important committees that made recommendations for state judicial appointments which empowered her to help diversify the Bench. She also served as a Board Member for several community organizations and was a longtime member of the Vance-Granville Community College Board of Trustees.

Mrs. Clark remains a very active member of Cotton Memorial Presbyterian Church in Henderson, North Carolina. The church and its members have been a persistent source of joy, peace, and happiness throughout Mrs. Clark's truly remarkable life. Likewise, members of her Church and residents of the Henderson and Vance County community hold Mrs. Clark in high esteem and are honored to know her.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my House colleagues to join me in sending warm regards and in wishing Mrs. Henrietta Hatton Clark a very happy birthday.

HONORING BUFORD PUSSEY

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee 7th Congressional District has its share of men, myths, and legends. We are thankful to have giants of music, industry, public service, and community become our neighbors and friends. I rise today to honor the legacy of one such mighty man of the Tennessee 7th on the 40th anniversary of the day he left us.

Buford Pussey's legacy isn't just one of taking on moonshining and ridding McNairy County of prostitution. His short time on Earth is marked by his continued service to others. From joining the United States Marine Corps to becoming Adamsville's police chief and constable after he was given a medical discharge from the military, Pussey's dedication served well the citizens of McNairy County. Elected to three consecutive terms as Sheriff, Pussey continued to protect and defend his beloved community.

It is fitting to remember Buford Pussey on the day his life ended, to remember the dedication and determination for justice that shaped his life. His impact on McNairy County cannot be measured in simple numbers, or in long bats, but only in the legacy he left behind. I ask my colleagues to join with me in remembering one of McNairy County's greatest men.

IN HONOR OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICORPS ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2014

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of twenty years of service to our communities from AmeriCorps members. I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating with AmeriCorps members past and present the many lives changed and neighborhoods improved through the immensely important work of these volunteers.

On September 12, 1994, the first class of 20,000 AmeriCorps members was sworn-in and began serving in 1,000 communities across the country. President Clinton signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 to create AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National and Community Service, and participated by swearing-in the first AmeriCorps members in the Oval Office twenty years ago tomorrow.

Since 1994, more than 900,000 AmeriCorps members have contributed more than 1 billion hours in service across the country. In my hometown of Sacramento, I have met AmeriCorps members serving in places like Pacific Elementary, the Sacramento Food Bank, and at Volunteer Income Tax Assistance sites. In total, we have 796 AmeriCorps positions in Sacramento for the 2013-2014 program year. I am grateful for the outstanding service this group of volunteers has performed in the Sacramento community, making Sacramento a better place to live, work and learn.

Today, September 11th, we honor the fallen in the terrorist attacks by designating September 11th as the National Day of Service and Remembrance. I thank the AmeriCorps volunteers, and all volunteers across the country, who join together to make our country better, stronger and more united through service.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank the past, present and future members of AmeriCorps for their tremendous service to our country. This twenty year anniversary marks a successful milestone for the program, and I look forward to seeing the accomplishments of AmeriCorps over the next twenty years and beyond.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JAZZ MASTER GERALD WILSON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, losing a great jazz artist is always hard for those of us who love the art form. The joy these musicians bring into our lives—the technical skill and virtuosity they allow each of us to witness—is never easily replaced. But it is especially hard when we lose someone who we not only admired as an artist, but who we were fortunate enough to call our friend. This past week we lost Mr. Gerald Wilson, who I had known for

many years, and who had just turned 96 on September 4, 2014.

Mr. Gerald Wilson was to me not only an icon in the Jazz community—having served as a National Endowment for the Arts Jazz Master—he was a fellow Detroit. His penultimate masterpiece, *Detroit*, captured in all its glory the vibrant spirit of the town that made the 20th Century possible, as well as the promise the future holds for our great city.

For seven decades, Gerald Wilson was a force on the jazz circuit where he played, conducted, and arranged with his own band and with names we all know: Duke Ellington, Dizzy Gillespie, Benny Carter, and Ella Fitzgerald. In addition to his talent as a performer and composer, he served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, taught for many years at universities in California, and most importantly—was a loving husband and father.

Just a few years ago, he was the headliner at a concert I promoted as part of an annual leadership conference held in Washington, D.C., where we celebrated his 92nd birthday. Though I am heartbroken to see him go, I know that I am—and we all are—fortunate to have had the chance to know him, see him, and hear him.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOS CHANGUITOS FEOS DE TUCSON

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize an Arizona youth mariachi group, Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Established in Tucson in 1964 by a Catholic priest to learn mariachi music as a means to keep parish youth occupied over the summer, Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson has grown to be a cultural icon—not only in the Southwest, but all over the world. The group was the first of its kind and has become a youth mariachi model for dozens of similar groups created since.

In 1971, Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson incorporated as a secular nonprofit organization with a community board of directors.

Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson has had the distinguished honor of performing at three presidential inaugurations and has also accompanied many internationally known celebrities and entertainers. The Changuitos have recorded five albums and have had the privilege to play on network television.

Young Latino musicians in middle and high school dedicate themselves to perfecting their talent under the guidance of skilled music teachers to learn the intricacies of the mariachi musical form, a type of music referred to as a world cultural treasure by UNESCO.

While they hone their musical skills and provide entertainment to the larger community, mariachi performers with Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson are eligible for college scholarships to the school of their choice. More than \$480,000 in scholarships has been disbursed to former Changuitos who are pursuing a post-

secondary degree to this day. Often former members of Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson are the first in their family to receive a college degree.

Former Changuitos who have sought careers in the music industry have won Grammy Awards, while others have used the scholarships to become physicians, lawyers, engineers, business owners, entrepreneurs, and community leaders.

Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson is the quintessential example of the impact discipline and dedication could have on deepening cultural appreciation by perfecting local talent, while encouraging leadership growth and youth empowerment through community service.

And finally, we must acknowledge the dedicated parents of the Changuitos who support their childrens' efforts. Without them, Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson could never have become the respected and revered cultural and musical icon that it is today.

Congratulations and best wishes to Los Changuitos Feos de Tucson as we join them to celebrate on August 23, 2014 for its 50th Anniversary with a reunion and concert. I thank this youth organization for their longstanding tradition of perseverance and setting an example to all Tucson youth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 485, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall Nos. 486, 487, and 488, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on all three.

On rollcall No. 489, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RECOGNIZING THE DESIGNATION OF NEPHROLOGY NURSES WEEK

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Nephrology Nurses Association, an organization that works to advance quality care to Americans with kidney disease. These nurses function as educators,

direct caregivers, and coordinators to help patients manage their lives while effectively dealing with their health issues. The number of new patients diagnosed with kidney disease has doubled in each of the last two decades; as a result, the demand for nephrology nurses continues to expand. The Keystone Chapter 110 of The American Nephrology Nurses' Association has declared the week of September 14th through the 20th as Nephrology Nurses Week with the theme "Cherishing the Treasures of Our Specialty" to celebrate and honor the unselfish work that each nurse performs each day to maintain the health of thousands. Today I honor these nephrology nurses from Bensalem and congratulate them for their dedicated service to the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 481–489.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on No. 481, "yes" on No. 482, "yes" on No. 483, "no" on No. 484, "no" on No. 485, "yes" on No. 486, "yes" on No. 487, "yes" on No. 488, and "no" on No. 489.

HONORING EAGLES LANDING MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Eagles Landing Middle School, which has been named a National PTA School of Excellence for its achievement in building effective family-school partnerships. As a parent and a congressman, I understand the need for a strong family commitment to ensure the educational success of our children and am so proud of Eagles Landing for receiving this prestigious award.

The National PTA School of Excellence program recognizes schools whose families feel welcomed and empowered to support student success. Eagles Landing Middle School is a community-based school that engages families through programming that brings them together for a common purpose. Through constant communication between parents and teachers, structured family nights like STEM

Night and Literacy Night, and a centrally-located community garden that is incorporated into the curriculum as an outdoor learning center, families are encouraged to work and have fun together with other members of their school and community. Eagles Landing is the only middle school in the state of Florida and only one of ten schools in the state to receive this designation.

I would like to recognize Eagles Landing Principal Cindy Chiapetta and PTSA President Kendra Palumbo for their hard work in putting in place strong practices that involve families in the education of their children. The partnership between Eagles Landing School and Eagles Landing Middle School PTSA is an inspiring example of what can be accomplished when schools and families work together.

TRIBUTE TO THE TRIPLE NICKELS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 11, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are those who offer their vocations to their community, their family, and their country. Then there are those who blaze such a trail of dedication and service that all who follow behind cannot help but to offer gratitude and great thanks. I rise today to celebrate and honor the men of the 555th Parachute Infantry Company as they are remembered in a ceremony fitting their legacy.

The men who comprised the Triple Nickels broke through barriers, jumped out of planes, and showed up for battle. What began with 20 young African-American enlisted men in 1943 ended, in name only, in 1947. The 555th would become the 3rd Battalion, 505th Infantry regiment, 82nd Airborne Division and would be the first African-American unit in history to become a part of an American combat division. The legacy of mighty soldiers that began with these men continued into the 188th Airborne Infantry Regiment, the 11th Airborne Division, and the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team.

I join with all those gathered to dedicate a monument to the Triple Nickels Association in offering my profound thanks. In overcoming great obstacles, the men of the 555th became more than paratroopers. Their legacy lives on today in a military free of racial barriers and in the hearts and minds of all who seek freedom. I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating and remembering the men of the 555th Parachute Infantry Company.

SENATE—Monday, September 15, 2014

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God almighty, ruler of all nature, thank You for not leaving us solely to our own resources. Continue to provide our lawmakers with the wisdom they need to accomplish Your purposes. Protect them and their loved ones from dangers seen and unseen, empowering them to run and not become weary. Lead them through these confused and troubled times to Your desired destination.

Today fill this Chamber with Your presence. May Your kingdom come and may Your will be done. Enable us all to live our lives in the spirit of unselfish service.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

REMEMBERING THOMAS HALE BOGGS, JR.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn just a few minutes ago of the passing of—I know the President pro tempore's friend and a friend to so many people in Washington—Tommy Boggs.

Tom Boggs was an institution in this city. I had the good fortune to hear about the Boggs family when I worked here as a policeman for a number of years and going to law school. Then for

a short period I went to the post office, and it was there where his cousin Gabe worked. That is when I first started hearing about the Boggs family.

During that period of time Hale Boggs was the House whip, and, of course, he and Congressman Begich were in Alaska. He was campaigning for Congressman Begich when the plane went down, and after many decades the plane has never been recovered.

I also had the good fortune of serving with his mom in the House of Representatives. She was a sweet and very accomplished woman. She became the Ambassador to the Vatican. Then, of course, his sister Cokie Roberts is a famous journalist here.

Without belaboring the point, I extend my sympathy to the entire family, and I want them to know that our country and Washington, DC, in particular, is a much better place because of Tommy Boggs' passing through here.

SCHEDULE

Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m. this afternoon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

At 5:30 p.m. there will be three roll-call votes: cloture on S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act and cloture on the Baran and Burns nominations to be members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the Paycheck Fairness Act is 3 p.m., and the filing deadline for second-degree amendments is 4:30 p.m.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. President, all one needs to do is pick up any newspaper or watch a television show or listen to the radio and you will know that we have many miles to travel before women in America are treated fairly.

Unfortunately, there are some in our Nation who don't see a problem. But when women continue to make less than men for performing the exact same work, it is clear we still have a problem. I see it, and the Senate Democrats see it. The Democrats in the Senate stand for women's equality because when women are empowered, we are all empowered.

Today, the Senate will vote on one important aspect of the unfair treatment of American women. Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI's Paycheck Fairness Act addresses the issue of gender-based discrimination.

In America today more than 50 years after passage of the Equal Pay Act, women who are doing the exact same

work as a man make 77 cents for every dollar that a man makes. This is not just a woman's issue, it is a family issue and it is an economic issue.

For most Americans the answer is very simple. A woman who performs the same work as a man should be paid the same as that man. Women and men support equal pay for equal work regardless of gender because it is fair; that is, everyone except the Senate Republicans.

Senate Republicans simply cannot accept that simple notion that they should be paid the same for doing the exact same work. Senate Republicans believe it is fair for men to be paid more than women for doing the exact same thing. It is hard to comprehend, but that is obviously what they believe. On three separate occasions over the last 4 years, Senate Republicans have filibustered the Paycheck Fairness Act. They prevented a vote on this issue—this issue of basic fairness.

Today is a new opportunity for Senate Republicans to do what is right for America's working women and families. The Paycheck Fairness Act would help close a wage disparity by empowering women to negotiate for equal pay.

Shouldn't a woman be able to negotiate for equal pay?

This bill would also give workers stronger tools to combat wage discrimination and bar retaliation against employees for discussing salary information. Shouldn't a woman be able to talk about wage disparity without fear of reprisal?

One of the first things we passed in the Obama administration was the Lilly Ledbetter legislation, and that is one reason we are doing this today. Lilly Ledbetter worked for many years doing the same work as men in her position. She learned she was being paid a lot less, but the U.S. Supreme Court said: Too bad—you should have discovered this a lot earlier. If she had discovered it earlier, she would have been fired. This bill would give workers stronger tools to combat wage discrimination and bar retaliation against employees for discussing salary information. That is why we passed the Lilly Ledbetter legislation.

I repeat: Shouldn't a woman be able to talk about wage disparity without fear of reprisal?

This legislation would help secure adequate compensation for victims of gender-based pay discrimination. Shouldn't a woman be able to recoup wages that are illegally withheld? The answer, of course, is yes.

These are commonsense proposals that are supported by the vast majority of Americans. Why is there even a debate on the issue of equal pay? It is because Senate Republicans continue to stifle debate on this issue. They are filibustering yet another piece of important legislation.

Instead of doing what is right for working women and families and our economy, Republicans are saying: We will not even let the Senate vote on this issue.

Republicans say there really is no issue and the pay gap between men and women is exaggerated, and if there is one, it is OK. Republicans say that there are already strong Federal laws that prevent gender-based pay discrimination. I wish it were so. Some Republicans say—as one did here in the Senate last week—that equal pay for women is nothing more than a political show vote. But when all their excuses and explanations have been exhausted, their wives, their daughters, and their granddaughters are still making 77 cents for every dollar their male counterparts make for doing the exact same work—and that is not fair.

If Republicans will not stand up for the women in their homes and communities and all across this Nation, we Senate Democrats will.

American women deserve better. They deserve fair wages. They deserve a fair shot at providing for their families. American women deserve equality.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Vermont.

REMEMBERING THOMAS HALE BOGGS, JR.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind, heartfelt words of the distinguished majority leader when speaking about Tommy Boggs—Thomas Hale Boggs, Jr. Many of us knew him well.

I was at Georgetown law school with Tommy, and we often talked about those days and the friendships we had, and so many people who we knew are still in this town. I think of him walking down the hall, and we would see each other and start grinning or laughing. Whoever his client was would wonder what we were laughing about. It

was usually something that happened in our law school class from 30, 40 or 50 years ago.

He was very, very effective. He was very good. He had an easygoing attitude that somehow cloaked the fact that he had a first-class mind. He had an encyclopedic knowledge for facts.

As someone who deals with Members of Congress, he had one unfailing attribute that made him successful. He always told the truth even if it was something one didn't want to hear, and he always kept his word. He was a good friend.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as one who had the privilege of being a prosecutor, I have great faith in our criminal justice system and the men and women who have dedicated their lives to making it work. Sometimes mistakes are made, and those mistakes have catastrophic consequences. They can mean an innocent person spends his or her life in prison, or worse, is executed. They mean a guilty person remains free—able to victimize again. When mistakes are made, lives are destroyed.

We would like to think these kinds of mistakes are few and far between, but they happen all the time. Just this month we saw that two innocent men in North Carolina were exonerated. They had served 30 years behind bars for a crime they did not commit. One of those men had been sentenced to death.

Can you imagine being in a prison and having those steel doors close every day all the while knowing you are there—perhaps never to leave until you die—for a crime you never committed? But even worse, you know that the person who committed the crime is out free.

Can you imagine that? I know some of these people. I have talked with them. I know it and can just begin to understand what gnaws at them when they are behind bars for a crime they didn't commit, knowing that the person who committed the crime is out free to do it again.

Henry Lee McCollum and his half brother Leon Brown were teenagers. They were arrested in 1983 for a heinous crime—the rape and murder of an 11-year-old girl. They were interrogated for hours, and then these two mentally disabled teens gave false confessions. They were ultimately convicted of a crime they did not commit. While these innocent men sat behind bars, the unthinkable happened—the real offender went on to rape and murder another young girl.

These men have lost so much. They were not there when their mother or grandmother died. They have never married or had children. Mr. McCollum

had to be placed in isolation every time another inmate was taken to the execution chamber to keep him from harming himself in his distress. It was only this year when a cigarette butt left at the crime scene was finally tested for DNA that their names were cleared and the real perpetrator identified.

That critical DNA test was made possible by the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, which is part of the Innocence Protection Act that I wrote more than 14 years ago. I was proud to be there with President Bush when he signed it into law as part of the Justice for All Act of 2004. The program was named for a man whom I consider my friend, Kirk Bloodsworth. Kirk was a young man just out of the Marines when he was arrested, convicted, and sentenced to death for a heinous crime he did not commit. He was the first person on death row to be exonerated by DNA evidence. He had been convicted on eye witness identification, even though he made it very clear he wasn't anywhere near where this happened. Do my colleagues know that when they finally exonerated him and identified who the real person was, there was someone at the prison who said, Oh, yeah, we have that guy locked up for another crime. Boy, they do look alike, don't they?

Unfortunately, hundreds of others have gone through the same hell Kirk lived through. Well over 300 Americans have been exonerated using DNA testing. But then I wonder how many others are going to have to suffer before we act. The U.S. attorney in Washington, DC, announced last Thursday he will launch a conviction integrity unit following five recent exonerations. Similar programs exist in Dallas, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Jose, and Detroit.

This underscores the fact that mistakes can happen all too often. Any good prosecutor fears the possibility of a mistake happening because usually prosecutors are going to get convictions. They want to make sure they prosecute the right person. Unfortunately, though, there are some who have been willing to accept less than adequate evidence or ignore the fact that no real effort was made to find all of the adequate evidence.

For example, we are just beginning to understand the scope of the systemic errors committed by hair and fiber analysts at the FBI crime lab in the 1980s and the 1990s. I know as a young prosecutor I relied on that FBI crime lab. Now we find there were errors and they were hidden and covered up—errors involving the question of the convictions of 2,600 defendants, including 45 on death row.

In a separate inquiry involving the same FBI unit, more than 60 death row convictions were potentially tainted by agent misconduct.

Those statistics are bad enough, but according to the Justice Department's inspector general, three of those defendants were executed before their attorneys were notified of the misconduct. One of them would not have been eligible for the death penalty without the FBI's flawed work. Whether someone is for or against the death penalty, it should shock our conscience. It is unacceptable. We may have executed an innocent man. I will hold the FBI accountable. I will demand they take the necessary steps to ensure that such a systemic failure never occurs again. I know the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, shares my outrage about this situation.

So it is against this backdrop of these shocking cases that I come to the floor and urge the Senate to take swift action. Let us reauthorize the Justice for All Act, which includes the post-conviction DNA testing program that is a lifeline to the wrongfully convicted.

There is nothing partisan or political about ensuring we have the right person behind bars and we are not locking up an innocent person. That is an issue both Republicans and Democrats agree on, and that is why the Justice for All Act has the support of the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, and the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and as I said cosponsored by me and Senator CORNYN.

Justice is the bedrock of our great country. Our Founders understood that a government's legitimacy is eroded every time an innocent person is sent to prison for a crime he did not commit. They sought to protect against this erosion by enshrining fundamental protections for the accused in our Bill of Rights. While those protections are critical, they are not fail-safe. We have to do more. Lives are in the balance. Lives are in the balance.

The dozens of exonerations made possible by the Justice for All Act are testament enough to its value. Henry Lee McCollum and Leon Brown are just the latest examples. The injustice they survived—and the fact that North Carolina nearly executed an innocent man—should dispel any doubt this legislation is needed. It is time for the Senate to pass this bipartisan Justice for All Reauthorization Act. First giving appropriate notice to both leaders, I will be asking unanimous consent that we take it up and pass it.

I see my distinguished colleague and friend on the floor, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the distinguished President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ISIS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few moments speaking about national defense.

As we all know, last week, in a much anticipated address to the Nation, President Obama outlined a plan to defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. I want my colleagues to know I intend to do my part to make this plan a success.

I am not alone in hoping this goal to defeat—not contain—ISIS will replace the half measures and disengagement that has defined the President's foreign policy to date. The President's previous comment that “we don't have a strategy yet” sent the wrong signal to our allies and to our adversaries.

In response to the President's address last week, Congress and the American people are now seeking specifics about the new strategy. I am hopeful the new plan is strong enough and broad enough to be successful long term. U.S. leadership and the projection of military might are critical to defeating the ISIS extremists.

Thirteen years after September 11, 2001, Americans need to send a unified message that we remain resolved to fight the scourge of global terrorism. ISIS is part of that scourge, reeking havoc in Iraq and Syria, with torture, mass executions, crucifixions, and plans for a seventh century-style Islamic caliphate. As we all know, ISIS broadcasts its savagery through gruesome propaganda online, including the horrific murders of two Americans and a British aid worker.

It is clear our efforts to date have been insufficient to overthrow this well-funded, well-equipped, and sophisticated army. It will take more than limited air strikes and the modest deployment of military advisers to curb the rapid spread of ISIS across northern Iraq and Syria. The United States must be committed to building a coalition that fosters regional cooperation, dismantles the group's considerable financial network, and assists the Iraqi, Kurdish, and Free Syrian forces. I wish to help the President in his request for authorization to train and equip these forces.

This coalition needs to include Muslim-majority nations that are all in with a demonstrated resolve to defeat the Islamic terrorists in their own neighborhood.

The cost of inaction is already high. The rise of ISIS in northern Iraq and its operations in Syria have threatened regional stability and the security of our allies in Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon, and Kuwait. The involvement of foreign fighters raises fears of potential terrorist plots here at home. Earlier this month, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel said there are more than 100 U.S. citizens with passports fighting for the terrorist group. He went on to say, “There may be more. We don't know.”

Secretary of Defense Hagel, who will testify tomorrow before the Armed Services Committee, has called ISIS, “An imminent threat to every interest we have, whether it's in Iraq or anywhere else.” Secretary of State John Kerry has expressed similar alarm, saying, “The wickedness it represents must be destroyed.” I agree. But if these statements are true, then we should respond to them aggressively.

Similar to Secretary Hagel and Secretary Kerry, the American public is concerned about the threat of ISIS to the United States. A new report by the Wall Street Journal and NBC News says nearly 7 in 10 Americans believe military action against ISIS in Iraq and Syria is in our national interest.

Americans are ready for a bold international strategy to confront these extremists whose ruthless campaign of terror and ethnic cleansing has survived for too long. These radicals have driven tens of thousands of Iraq's Yazidi and Christian minorities from their homes in fear. According to news reports, thousands of civilians have been slaughtered across northwestern Iraq.

GEN Jack Keane, former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, and Danielle Pletka, a senior vice president at the American Enterprise Institute, put it this way in a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed:

A U.S.-led international coalition can provide the military capability, including air interdiction to deny ISIS freedom of movement, take away its initiative to attack at will in Iraq, and dramatically reduce its sanctuary in Syria.

In other words, with U.S. leadership and international cooperation, we can defeat this enemy, and we ought to get about the business of doing it.

I believe Congress should support our Commander in Chief in the fight against ISIS, a fight that can result in a victory and a peace that can be sustained. I look forward to hearing more details about the President's plans when Secretary Hagel and GEN Martin Dempsey testify before the Armed Services Committee tomorrow.

There are still questions to be answered. For example, if public opinion turns, will the administration lose its resolve? How long will it take to win? How long will it take to crush ISIS? What is the definition of success? What is the definition of victory in this case? If we accomplish our objectives, will we once again abandon our gains, as we did after the surge in Iraq? What is the plan to eliminate the terrorist group's financial network? Are the President and congressional leaders willing to find a solution to defense sequestration in order to fulfill the mission if more resources are required? And more resources will be required.

Addressing these questions is important to understanding the specific goals and aims of the President's strategy, which are yet to be fleshed out.

Americans and Congress deserve this clarity.

Congress has the responsibility to provide for the resources our U.S. military needs for its missions. We do this through appropriations, through the power of the purse, and the National Defense Authorization Act, which has garnered bipartisan support for the past 52 years.

Under the capable leadership of Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member INHOFE, the Armed Services Committee approved a bill more than 3 months ago. So has the full House of Representatives. It has passed its authorization act. I hope that even at this late date, Majority Leader REID will allow our country's major defense policy bill to come to the Senate floor for consideration soon. An annual blueprint of the military priorities is vital to making sure that our troops have what they need to protect our national security interests at home and abroad.

This year's bill, for example, includes a provision to stave off drastic cuts to the U.S. Army which would put troop strength at levels not seen before World War II. Well-trained units such as the 155th Heavy Brigade Combat Team in my home State of Mississippi should not be jeopardized by short-sighted and ill-considered proposals by the Obama administration. Instead, under the committee bill, an independent commission would have the opportunity to make recommendations on force structure and size before the National Guard personnel could be cut or the Apache attack helicopters could be transferred.

Another provision of the bill would allow for the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps to modernize their amphibious warships. These incredibly versatile ships signal to the world that America's fighting forces can respond to threats rapidly. Currently our fleet is significantly smaller than the number needed to perform required missions, and many of the ships are near the end of their service lives. The Defense authorization bill as passed on a bipartisan basis by the committee would authorize the construction of a 12th LPD 17 warship ensuring that the men and women who defend us in perilous corners of the globe have world-class hardware for their missions.

I believe it would be a fitting tribute to Senator LEVIN, who is retiring at the end of this year after decades of distinguished service in the Senate, to take up this bill in regular order and pass it as a tribute to our retiring chair.

In conclusion, we have work to do. The Senate Armed Services Committee and the House of Representatives have passed the Defense authorization bill. It is time for the Senate to follow suit. America has the most formidable fighting force in the world and this presence must remain resilient as dangerous

groups such as ISIS put our interests at risk. The rapid rise of the barbaric terrorists is a wake-up call for U.S. leadership. Now that the President has declared his intention to degrade and destroy ISIS militants, we must ensure that the mission is fulfilled.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today for the 78th time in my "Time to Wake Up" series to urge my Republican colleagues that it is long past time to wake up to the growing threat of global climate change.

For those who still deny the science—and believe it or not, that is where some of our colleagues still are—I remind them that virtually every credible scientific authority—and, no, the ones funded by the big carbon polluters don't count—virtually every credible scientific authority has moved beyond the question of whether our climate is changing or whether human carbon pollution drives these changes to now how it is happening and where it is happening.

Climate change is no longer a forecast; it is happening before our eyes, all around us. The latest reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—made up of the world's top climate scientists—call the fact that our Earth is warming "unequivocal." Just last week the Secretary General of the World Meteorological Organization said: "We know without any doubt that our climate is changing and our weather is becoming more extreme due to human activities such as the burning of fossil fuels." I repeat—he said "without any doubt."

It is actually evident to our own eyes now from observations and measurements—not projections or predictions—of increases in global warming air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and a rising global average sea level—a phenomenon that means a lot to my coastal State of Rhode Island and to the Presiding Officer's State of Maine. Back home our constituents, our neighbors, get it. On our coasts they brace against the unrelenting rise of the seas and watch mystifying changes in fisheries they have been familiar with for generations. On the Plains they toil to raise crops under unprecedented drought. In the mountains they watch as ancient acres of forest are killed by the spread of

invasive pests. Yet here in Washington we do nothing.

In Rhode Island the waters of Narragansett Bay are getting warmer—3 to 4 degrees Fahrenheit warmer in the winter just since the 1960s. Long-term data from the tide gauges in Newport, RI, just off Naval Station Newport, show an increase in average sea level of nearly 10 inches since 1930 and accelerating. Sea level rise is contributing to erosion and brings storm surges and waves farther inland.

While Washington fiddles, Rhode Islanders act. Early this month more than 200 Rhode Islanders came together in Providence for my annual Rhode Island Energy and Environmental Leaders Day. The event brings together Rhode Islanders in renewable energy and sustainable development businesses, in community development nonprofits; it brings together State and local officials, advocates, and academics to share ideas with each other and with national leaders and Federal agencies on promoting green energy, improving resiliency, and combating climate change.

The innovation taking place in my Ocean State was on full display this year. Rhode Islanders are leading the effort to improve our environment and develop clean technology and energy and prepare for the changes carbon pollution has looming over us. Sheila Dormody, the director of sustainability of Providence was there to discuss the recently released Sustainable Providence plan for making our comparable city cleaner and greener. The plan covers everything from reducing food waste to improving energy efficiency to increasing alternative transportation options. These actions benefit public health and the environment, and they create economic opportunity. These aren't job killers. These are job builders. You cannot send efficiency upgrades or solar panel installation jobs overseas. Those are Rhode Island jobs, American jobs.

Grover Fugate, executive director of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Council, was there to discuss the collaboration they have with the Rhode Island Realtors Association to create a Rhode Island coastal property guide. We need a Rhode Island coastal property guide because climate change loads the dice for more frequent and more severe storms and hurricanes that put businesses and homeowners along the shore at risk from flooding, erosion, and wind damage.

Superstorm Sandy was a harsh warning. This property guide helps residents and business owners understand the risks and the costs they now face both today and in the future because of the carbon pollution we are doing nothing about. Extreme precipitation, rain bursts, heavy rains or snows have increased 74 percent in the Northeast between 1958 and 2010.

Rhode Islanders have always cared a lot about our Narragansett Bay. We love our bay. We want to protect it. These heavy rains, these sudden rains, these rain bursts, what they do is they drive polluted and nutrient-rich runoff that might otherwise be filtered or captured straight into the bay where it can close beaches and harm the bay's marine life.

Climate change and the carbon pollution mean we will have to work harder in Rhode Island and invest more dollars in a storm water and wastewater infrastructure, and it is not cheap. Our Rhode Island Narragansett Bay Commission, our wastewater utility, is overhauling its sewer and storm water collection to address that overflow during big storms. When big storms hit now, the underground storage tunnel that was completed in 2008 stores up the sewer and storm water until the extra water can be processed and until the capacity in the treatment plant is there to pump it out and process it.

As a result of the first phase of what is called the combined sewer overflow project, the commission estimates that through 2012, 4.6 billion gallons of mixed storm and wastewater that would have been dumped directly into Narragansett Bay untreated were instead processed at the Field's Point Wastewater Treatment Facility at one of our small towns. The town of Tiverton, RI, received funding through the USDA to help pay for upgrades to the town's water system, connecting thousands of residents on inefficient old septic tank systems to a town sewer. Leroy Kendricks, the chair of the Tiverton Wastewater District, told our group that these improvements will protect the Sakonnet River and Mount Hope Bay from mounting levels of pollution.

Julia Gold is the climate change program manager at the Rhode Island Department of Health. Julia explained how the department of health has teamed up with the division of elderly affairs to focus on the effects of climate change on the elderly, collaborating with the departments of environmental management and transportation to pilot a Lyme disease prevention training program for outdoor workers—those ticks spread more widely in warmer weather—and partnered with the Brown School of Public Health to examine correlations between rising temperatures and rising hospital admissions.

You may have seen a segment in the documentary series "Years Of Living Dangerously" on the deaths in Los Angeles from heat-related conditions worsened by climate change. This work with Brown University is similar and showing similar results.

These were just a few of the many stories told in Rhode Island at the Energy and Environmental Leaders Day. Not only do Rhode Islanders connect

with one another there, but we also have the chance to share our important work with national leaders and hear their perspective on regional and national leaders, as well as get their perspective on regional and national trends.

The first of three keynote addresses came from renowned marine scientist and National Geographic Explorer-in-residence Sylvia Earle. Sylvia is truly a remarkable woman and a legend in oceanography circles. Her passion for our living oceans is just about as deep as those oceans. She reminded us that the oceans are the cornerstone of our human life support system, that indeed the oceans are the life support system for all creatures on our planet, not just the aquatic ones, and that our oceans bear witness to the unprecedented changes carbon pollution is causing. Her bad news was that these threats are grave. Her good news was that never before have we, as humans, been as well equipped with knowledge about our earth and our climate. The oceans indeed are sick but we have the power simply by changing our behavior to help them heal.

In a happy coincidence Sylvia's new documentary called "Mission Blue," which lays out the perilous condition of earth's oceans, was playing the night before at the Newport Film Festival. Sylvia went there and said:

Think of a film about oceans 50 years from now. It will be based on what we do now.

Our possibilities are terrific. Here is another thing that she said. I will quote her.

The good news sounds like bad news but the good news is that we know that it is happening. We are the only creatures on earth with the capacity to dive back into time, put ourselves into perspective and plan a future based on evidence, based on knowledge.

So what are we doing now? While Congress snoozes in the snug embrace of the big polluted interests, President Obama has stepped into the vacuum. His chief lieutenant in this effort is EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy. She delivered our second keynote.

Climate change, she told our assembled group, is perhaps the most difficult, complex, and necessary issue for us to face. She reminded us that EPA is at its heart a public health agency. So when it comes to the carbon pollution that increases smog and asthma or increases the storms and floods that batter our communities, she says this: "EPA's job is to protect those that are most vulnerable from this pollution, so it is our job to take action on climate. Period. Full stop."

Administrator McCarthy led an extraordinary effort to put out the EPA's proposed rule, for the first time limiting carbon pollution from our country's largest source—our powerplants. The rule is revolutionary in many ways, particularly in its adaptability, allowing States and regions to reach

their own goals their own way. It is the product of an intensely collaborative process and an enormous amount of give and take. The rollout has been viewed by those outside fossil fuel board rooms as a real achievement.

I commend Administrator McCarthy on moving that rule forward with so much energy. I wish her and that rule Godspeed.

The road ahead offers many obstacles as our third and final keynote speaker reminded us. Jeff Goodell has reported on the energy industry and the changing climate for *Rolling Stone* magazine, where he is a contributing editor. His many books have explored the inner workings of the fossil fuel industry and the most far-reaching proposals for avoiding catastrophic global warming, among other topics.

Jeff has firsthand knowledge of the complex apparatus of denial supported by the big polluters. The fossil fuel producers are bankrolling entire political campaigns and phony front organizations peddling scientific misinformation.

As Jeff pointed out, these misinformation efforts even involve not just the same strategies but the very same scientists who were involved working for the tobacco industry—the scientists-for-hire who worked for the tobacco industry in its decades-long venture to hide the dangers of tobacco from regulators and the public. They are still at it, but now it is denying climate change, not denying that tobacco is harmful.

Not only do these polluters stall tactics stand in the way of responsible action to cure climate change, Jeff reported they also hold back progress in our energy sector and in our economy, particularly in States and regions that have long relied on fossil fuel jobs. He called on us—he called on his home country—to finally take steps to move these communities into the 21st century economy.

The environmental and energy challenges facing our Nation can seem daunting. When we join together to share ideas and experiences, as we do each year in the Rhode Island Energy and Environment Leaders Day, it is clear that there is a path forward.

Rhode Islanders understand this. They see the challenge, and we are up to it. We are all up to it as Americans. One thing Rhode Islanders will be doing is later this month hundreds of us will board buses and head down to New York City for what will be known as the People's Climate March. Organizers expect as many as a half million people will take part in the historic citizen action to call attention to the global crisis of climate change. Marchers from Rhode Island, from California, from all across our country, from different organizations, from different industries—a patchwork of America—will

be there to demand responsible leadership in the fight against carbon pollution. I will be among them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the current business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in just a few minutes we are going to have a procedural vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. If we truly believe women and men are equal and should be paid equally, this ought to be an overwhelming vote.

The Senate women held a press conference after the last vote. The Republicans gave the first procedural vote so we were able to get to this point, but now we have to have 60 votes in order to move forward with an actual vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act.

We all know what this vote is about. It is very simple. It is about women in America having the same opportunity for success as their male counterparts. No one should be paid less just for being a woman.

This issue was brought to us front and center by Lilly Ledbetter, who was a manager at a Goodyear tire plant in the South and who discovered just by happenstance that although there were five managers doing the same job—she and four men—she was getting considerably less money.

To make a long story short, the courts were stacked against her. At the end of the day, Lilly Ledbetter was told by the Supreme Court that she was too late—she didn't know about this; it took her a long time to know about it—therefore she had no case. We fixed that problem, and we said: No more. We are not going to put a statute of limitations because someone may never find out about this unfair situation for many years and they shouldn't be disqualified from justice.

But now we have more problems. We have testimony of people being harassed simply because they want to know whether they are getting paid fairly. I am so grateful to our colleague Senator MIKULSKI from Maryland for introducing the Paycheck Fairness Act which will help close the wage gap.

We may say: Is there truly a wage gap? Yes, there is. Women get paid 77 cents for every dollar made by a man for the same work. That is not every woman. But when we average it all,

that is what she gets. In terms of a yearly pay, it is \$11,000. I think we ought to look at this \$11,000 less a year. What could we buy for \$11,000? One year of groceries, in many places a year of rent, in many places a year of daycare or a used car or community college.

What does this mean? It means that because the woman is not getting paid fairly, her family suffers, whether in the quality of housing or their food or the quality of daycare, the quality of their car, and certainly the ability of that woman to get an education and move up the scale.

Looking at it from a yearly standpoint I think is important, but I asked my staff: Let's look at it over a lifetime and what is the loss to this woman and her family in a lifetime. Almost one-half million dollars—\$443,000—in a woman's lifetime if she gets 77 cents instead of a full dollar. What could she do with that? She could pay off one or two mortgages for that, send three kids to the University of California or buy 8,000 tanks of gas. What we don't say here is you need more security, and economic security today, which is so critical. Thanks to science, we are living longer and we know it gets more expensive to live.

If I were to tell one of my Republican friends on the other side that somebody came up to a woman, knocked her on the head and took half a million dollars from her and stole it, they would be horrified and they would remedy it. They would bring in the law. Well, I am asking them to simply vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act. Just vote for it. Make sure women in this country earn what they deserve to earn.

The wage gap not only hurts our families, it hurts our economy. If you add it all up, it is \$200 billion a year in income that would be spent at the grocery, that would be spent at the gas station, that would be spent on vacation, that would be spent on local restaurants or in better housing.

In the history of our Nation we have had a lot of fights before over the issue of discrimination. We know you cannot discriminate on pay because of race, disability, or age. What we are saying is you shouldn't be able to discriminate based on your gender. It is wrong. I would say if it were reversed, I would be standing here fighting for the men. It is not right. People have to be paid based on the work they do, and if the work they do is similar to the work of a man, as in the case of Lilly Ledbetter, they should be paid the same.

What the Mikulski legislation does is it prohibits employers from retaliating against an employee who shares information with their coworkers. Right now if you are around the cooler of your corporation and somebody says: Oh, my God, I cannot afford to get a babysitter for my child, I need a raise,

and somebody says: Well, what do you make? And they say: I make X. Believe me, you can be fired for asking those questions. It is wrong. We have seen it happen. We want to make sure if there is a disparity in pay that it is warranted. Sure, if a woman is doing less than a man in a different job, of course that is not the same. We are saying if you do the same work, you have got to get paid the same.

We have hundreds of personal stories from all over this great Nation from people who have faced pay discrimination. I have many of these stories from California. One of them is a woman from my State who had an identical advanced degree as her husband, and she landed the exact job as her husband, but they were paid at different work-sites. Her husband was offered \$5,000 more in starting salary for the same job with the exact same resume—same job, the woman gets paid \$5,000 less.

Then there is a health care worker in Long Island. She discovered she had been earning \$10 an hour less than her colleagues with the exact experience. When she brought this up to her superiors, which you would expect her to do—you have got to fight for yourself. Don't we tell people that? Stand up, have respect, but ask the right questions. So she brought it up to her superiors. She was reprimanded. She was reprimanded and told not to discuss any type of wage gap.

Then there is a female employee from a major corporation in Florida. She was told when she was hired that if she disclosed her salary to other workers, that was grounds for dismissal. So you have somebody who is well trained. She is great. Then you are talking to your friends in the workplace, you mention your salary. She was told in advance that this is grounds for dismissal.

This bill is a major step in the right direction. I call on my Republican friends—we don't need many of you—five, is that right—six, if everyone is here. We need a handful. Stand with women, stand with families, stand for children, stand for equality, stand for justice, stand for what is right. Don't play games with this. Don't take the side of a boss who is exerting all kinds of pressure on a woman to tamp down her salary. I think clearly if we do this together tonight—and I always remain hopeful—if we do this together tonight, what we are going to see is an America that is fair, an America that is just when it comes to our women.

I am really glad one of our colleagues is here to discuss this from her perspective. You know, my kids would say to me, "Mom, this is a no-brainer."

This is not complicated, equal pay for equal work. We stand for that as Democrats, and we are going to keep on fighting for it. Tonight is that moment in time when we will see whether our Republican friends stand with us to

give a fair shot to the women in this country—a fair shot—or they will block us as they have done before. I hope maybe they will see the light tonight. I don't think anything I have said will influence them, but I hope it might, because I do think it is in their interests as well as the interests of the women in this Nation to stand united with the Democrats on this: equal pay for equal work, fairness and justice to the women in this Nation. They deserve it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the importance of closing the pay gap for women, and I thank my colleague from California, Senator BOXER, who has been working on this issue on the front line for so long as a leader on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to help us get that done and as a leader again.

I am a cosponsor on this bill and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act. People deserve a fair shot at the American dream. People deserve a fair working wage. That is why we need to raise the minimum wage. Equal work should get equal pay, and that is why we need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I wish to thank the dean of the Senate women, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, for leading this effort for equal pay for equal work in the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and keeping the focus on the need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

In 2009, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to make sure that workers who face pay discrimination based on gender, race, age, disability, religion, or national origin have access to the courts. In doing so we restored the original intent of the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Pay Act. Now it is time to prevent that pay discrimination from happening in the first place.

Women have made big strides in this economy. Women are getting advanced degrees. They are starting new businesses. They are leading major corporations. The Fortune 500 now has 24 women CEOs. Twenty-four out of five hundred there is still a lot of work to do, but that is so much better than where we were decades ago. Now we have a record 20 women in the Senate. Yet despite the progress we have made and all the gaps we have closed, women still make less money than men do.

The pay gap has real consequences for American families in our entire economy. Two-thirds of today's families rely on the mother's income entirely or in part, and in more than one-third of families the mother is the main breadwinner. But women only earn more than men in exactly 7 of the 534 occupations listed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That is only seven occupations, and I know there is dis-

agreement about what the pay disparity is, if it is just based on other factors. But the truth is when you look at the list of the occupations, in only seven do women make more than men.

As Senate Chair of the Joint Economic Committee, I released a report showing how this pay disparity affects women's financial security, because I think a lot of times people are very focused on the here and now, what that means the wage differential, and what that means in the workplace. This report shows that lower wages impact women all throughout their working lives, and these lower lifetime earnings translate into less security and retirement.

You have the fact that women live longer but yet they have less money to begin with. Women live longer than men on average and are more likely to spend part of their retirement on their own because they live longer. So women actually need to have more money for their years in retirement. According to our report, the average annual income—this is average annual income for women aged 65 and older—is about \$11,000 less than it is for men. That is \$11,000 less each year to buy groceries, to pay heating bills, to be able to see grandchildren.

Lower lifetime earnings result in lower retirement benefits. Retirement security is often described as the three-legged stool—Social Security, pension benefits, and personal savings. A woman's Social Security check is 78 percent of a man's check on average. Those are the facts. Again, it is about 80 percent of that of a man. The median income from company or union pension for women is 53 percent lower than for men. Finally, lower earnings also affect the ability of women to contribute to their own retirement plan. Women have less income to put aside and are less able to save money for their own retirement. They have smaller paychecks, they have smaller Social Security checks, smaller pension checks, and less savings in their retirement plans. They live longer and they worry all the time that they are going to outlive their savings. All this contributes to less retirement security.

The pay gap is an especially large burden on women in the sandwich generation, juggling jobs, juggling their kids, and looking out for their aging parents at the same time. When two-thirds of the caregivers for aging parents are women, we need to make sure they have financial security.

So make no mistake, the pay gap impacts women. But my point today is that it impacts women through the entire arc of their lives, and, if anything, it impacts older women who for now decades have been making less money in an even greater way than it impacts them when they are younger.

Around 70 percent of our economy is consumer-based. If we don't have fair

pay, if we don't have enough pay for middle-income families, then they are not going to buy things whether they are younger or older. That is yet another argument for not only having adequate minimum wages but also for addressing this pay gap. This legislation builds on the promises of the Equal Pay Act and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and gives women new tools and protections they need to guard against pay discrimination.

I want to get this done, but I also want to work on the issue of long-term savings and how we can make it easier for women and men to save their money when they are working at jobs so they can help themselves. As we move forward, as we are living longer—which is great—we know it is going to get harder and harder.

It was the late Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota who famously said, "We all do better when we all do better." I still believe that is true, and so do my colleagues who have joined me today. We need to be focused on how we can help more women share in the economic dream because if we do, we will all be doing better.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Mazie Hirono, Kay R. Hagan, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Barbara Boxer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Charles E. Schumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Reid
Begich	Hirono	Reid
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Boxer	Landrieu	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Levin	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Hagan	Nelson	
Heinrich	Pryor	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeben	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	King	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—8

Barrasso	Donnelly	Moran
Blunt	Harkin	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the next two rollcall votes be 10 minutes in duration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tom Udall, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Thomas R. Carper.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Do I have a minute to speak in favor of this nominee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided.

BARAN AND BURNS NOMINATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the two nominees who are coming back to back. I thank Senator VITTER for allowing us to move these forward. I thank the majority leader for bringing them up.

We are down on the membership of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We need to fill these positions. One of the nominees is Jeffery Baran. I will be very quick.

Mr. Baran has had more than 10 years of experience, including his current role as staff director of energy and commerce on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, where he actually oversaw the NRC and he staffed 13 hearings overseeing the NRC.

The other nominee is Mr. Stephen Burns, who has served in many roles, most recently as general counsel for the NRC from 2009 to 2012. He has a wide range of experience in policy and enforcement issues.

As long as I have been around, I have not seen two more qualified nominees. I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture and then, when we vote tomorrow, yes on the nominations themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—52 yeas, 39 nays, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 263 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Reid
Begich	Hirono	Reid
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall (CO)
Casey	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Hagan	Nelson	
Heinrich	Pryor	

NAYS—39

Alexander	Fischer	McCain
Ayotte	Flake	McConnell
Boozman	Graham	Murkowski
Burr	Grassley	Paul
Coats	Heller	Portman
Coburn	Hoeben	Risch
Cochran	Inhofe	Rubio
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	Manchin	Wicker

NOT VOTING—9

Barrasso	Donnelly	Moran
Blunt	Harkin	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 39. The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tom Udall, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Thomas R. Carper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mrs. BOXER. I urge an "aye" vote. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "Nay".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Rockefeller
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Landrieu	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—37

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—9

Barrasso	Donnelly	Moran
Blunt	Harkin	Roberts
Chambliss	Hatch	Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 54, the nays are 37.

The motion is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I regret having missed today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2199, the Paycheck Fairness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2199.

In addition, had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 1004, Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 1003, Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. •

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN G. BURNS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. May I ask a question? Has the Senate returned to legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in executive session postcloture on the Burns nomination.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, there is the Senate. There they go again. Whenever we women fight for fair pay, we are either sidelined, redlined, or pushed aside.

We, moving for paycheck fairness, feel the way women feel every single day in the workplace. When they are trying to get equal pay for equal work, they are either not listened to or there

is some kind of reason to make sure the discussion never comes up. Once again, because of eight votes separating, we could not debate paycheck fairness.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a bill that would finish the job we started with Lilly Ledbetter.

This is not right. When women are out there trying to earn equal pay for equal work, they should have the opportunity to do so. Now they feel stymied. In Lilly Ledbetter, we took the first step to right this wrong, but it was not the only step.

Paycheck fairness closes the innumerable loopholes that prevent women from being able to get equal pay for equal work. All we wanted to do was bring up the bill to debate it, to amend it, and then vote on final passage. We could not get cloture on the filibuster. Those are wonky parliamentary words that said we could have unlimited debate.

If we had gotten cloture under our rules, that would have been 30 hours of debate. I think that is enough time. There could have been amendments but, guess what, they had to be germane; that is, pertinent to the bill, or they had to be relevant or pertinent to the bill. What is wrong with that? That is not a gag rule. That is not muzzling anybody.

No, no, it wasn't good enough. Do you know why we didn't get cloture? They didn't want to bring up this bill for a final vote or amendments. They are hiding behind parliamentary procedure.

Do you know what. Our paycheck fairness bill was so simple and stayed straightforward. Do you know what it would have done? It would have prevented retaliation against workers for sharing information about their wages. Right now, the most secret thing in our country is not only our national security, but what you make. You can't discuss your wages with the person next to you. So if a woman was trying to figure out what the guy next to her was making, and he wanted to tell her—men of quality always support us women as we seek equality. If he wanted to tell her, both could have been fired—her for asking and him for telling. We wanted to close that loophole.

The other thing the bill would do, it would prevent employers from being able to use almost any reason to justify paying a woman less. For years, employers have exploited loopholes in the Equal Pay Act, inventing any number of reasons why a woman should be paid less. It would also prevent women from being limited to just back pay when they are discriminated against. Those are the three major issues.

In the United States of America, when we said all men and women were created equal, we have to be able to be equal, and one of the most important places you are equal is in the workplace. So if women are doing the same

job, we ought to get the same pay. That is the American way. But once again we were stymied. Once again they tried to push us back.

I am going to say this today on behalf of myself, the majority of the women in the Senate, and many of the great guys in the Senate: They want to make sure that today's vote doesn't say we are stopping this fight. Once again, we are going to reach out to the grassroots, particularly to the women of America, to join in the fight to change the Federal law books so women can get change in the family checkbooks. They can try to stop us on the floor, but they cannot stop our movement.

Once again, as I have said before, when we have had a setback, we are going to fight. We are going to fight on the Senate floor, we are going to take this to the people in the country, we are going to fight it through the elections, and we are going to fight it through the community. I am going to say to every single person in the United States of America: Be part of this movement.

A special message to the women: Let's suit up. Let's square our shoulders. Let's put our lipstick on and fight for equal pay that won't be stopped. We are going to do it. We are going to fight today, and we are going to fight tomorrow, and I am combat ready.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TESLA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a week ago last Thursday, Tesla, a major company in America, announced that Nevada would be the new home to its gigafactory, which would produce lithium batteries for Tesla's electric cars. Just a few days later, Nevada's State legislature unanimously approved the incentive package to finalize a new economic boost for Nevada.

Tesla's gigafactory will spur economic development in Nevada. All told, the state-of-the-art manufacturing center is expected to pump \$100 billion into Nevada's economy and create up to 22,000 jobs.

This development is good news for Nevada, but it didn't happen by accident. It is the direct result of public-private partnerships and smart Federal and State policies. It is the result of Nevada being seen as a hub for renewable energy and innovative technologies. This project, as big as it is, will be powered with solar and geothermal. Nothing else will power this big project.

I have worked here in the Senate to promote legislation that encourages investment in clean energy and transportation innovation at all levels. In 2007, we passed the Energy Independence and Security Act, which created the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Program. Under this program, the Department of Energy awarded a \$465 million loan guarantee to Tesla for the construction of a manufacturing facility in California. The question everyone has is: Was that loan a successful investment in Tesla?

The facts speak for themselves. Tesla repaid the loan in full 9 years early. Tesla is the company it is today because of this loan.

The availability of lithium, which ultimately helped attract Tesla to Nevada, also has its roots in Federal legislation. In 2009, with the economy in a deep recession and thousands of Nevadans losing their jobs, we passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—better known as the stimulus. There were many good things for Nevada and the country in that stimulus legislation. For example, millions for education, millions for renewable energy development, and tax breaks for the middle class.

Also in the stimulus was a program to incentivize advanced battery manufacturing. Through this program, a \$28.4 million grant was awarded to Rockwood Lithium of Nevada, which would help to expand and improve the only operating domestic lithium facility in the country. It is located near the historic mining town of Goldfield, a place called Silver Peak. Nevada only has 17 counties. Esmeralda County, where this is located, has less than 1,000 people. So this mine is really important for our country. We are the only lithium mining facility in America.

Because of the stimulus, Tesla will have access to lithium mined in Nevada, as I indicated, for production of these batteries. But in order to truly promote innovation, we must as a Congress create opportunities for consumers to invest in new, advanced technologies, and we haven't done that. We need more tax incentives for that.

In 2008, we encouraged Americans to invest in the growth of the electric car industry through a tax credit of up to \$7,500 for the purchase of qualified electric vehicles. We expanded that credit in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in 2009 to ensure that while Americans recovered from the recession, we did so by investing in new technology that would produce lasting economic growth.

Tesla's investment in Nevada shows what is possible when public-private partnerships and smart Federal and State policies are encouraged. In the 21st century, this is how public-private partnerships should work, and it is so important to realize that through

these grants, loans, and the private sector, working with States such as Nevada and California and the Federal Government, we were able to accomplish this.

This is a blueprint for success. Federal, State, and local leaders must clear obstacles that stymie innovation and incentivize cleaner technologies. We must make it easier for industry to invest in our communities, not just in Nevada but all across America.

As Elon Musk, the genius who has done SpaceX, PayPal, Tesla, and so many other things, said just the other day:

What the people of Nevada created is a state where you can; where you are very agile, where you can do things quickly and get things done. It's a real get-things-done state.

I want the RECORD to be spread with my public appreciation on behalf of all Nevadans to Governor Sandoval. His patience and diligence made this possible. I congratulate him because the work he did here was terrific.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, and that during this period of time Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNLV'S TAKE BACK THE NIGHT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 21st annual Take Back the Night event at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV.

The event is one of UNLV's oldest traditions. Hosted by the wonderful Jean Nidetch Women's Center, this event has done an amazing job of raising awareness about sexual assault and other forms of interpersonal violence including dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking. Take Back the Night is a worldwide event, and UNLV's branch has received numerous awards over the years. For instance, 2 years ago, as well as this year, the UNLV branch won the "Outstanding Collaborative Program" award; and in 2008, it won the "Outstanding Annual Program/Tradition" award.

Research has shown that college age women are at the highest risk for all forms of violence. According to the recent report released by the White

House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, the risk of sexual assault is 4 times higher for women ages 16 to 24 than any other population group. One assessment showed that more than one-half of the campus population knows at least two people who have been victims of sexual assault, domestic/dating violence, or stalking. Programs and events such as Take Back the Night importantly help provide survivors and victims with information about the services and options available to them.

The Jean Nidetch Women's Center has made Take Back the Night a capstone annual event at UNLV to give victims and survivors a place to seek advocacy and assistance. The center hosts public events in hopes of engaging students who may not otherwise seek help. It is an exceptional resource for a crucial issue that harms our society and campuses not only in Nevada, but around the country.

I commend the Jean Nidetch Women's Center and the entire UNLV campus for their commitment and dedication, and I look forward to learning about their future contributions to this important issue.

APPRENTICESHIP AND JOBS TRAINING ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the Apprenticeship and Jobs Training Act, legislation that I have introduced with my colleague Senator CANTWELL. Few issues are as important to the American people as the availability of good jobs in our communities. Unemployment in Maine and across the country remains unacceptably high. We must continue working together to identify ways to improve job training initiatives to help people find jobs in fields where jobs exist.

I have met with many business owners in Maine who have jobs available but cannot find qualified and trained workers to fill these vacant positions. One way for employees to acquire the skills needed to thrive in in-demand fields is through apprenticeship programs. Apprentices get hands-on experience that is invaluable to employers and can help workers secure a good-paying job.

According to the Congressional Research Service, approximately 44,000 individuals graduated from apprenticeship programs in 2013 nearly 1,000 of those individuals were from Maine. However, that number is likely insufficient to meet tomorrow's needs. One manufacturer in Maine estimates that nearly 2.7 million manufacturing employees are expected to retire in the next decade. We must do all we can to ensure that an adequate pool of skilled workers is available to fill these good-paying jobs.

Our bill helps achieve this goal by giving tax credits to businesses that

hire apprentices. To ensure that workers are given adequate time to prove their value, the apprentice must be employed for 7 months in order for a business to claim the credit. Our bill also provides incentives for experienced workers who spend at least 20 percent of their time passing their hard-earned knowledge on to the next generation. These workers would be allowed to receive some retirement income early, without facing tax penalties. Finally, our bill ensures that the brave men and women who defend our country are given credit for the skills they learn while serving. Training received while serving in the Armed Forces would count toward an apprentice's training requirement.

This bill would help better align the needs of our Nation's employers with potential employees to promote hiring and the creation of new jobs. I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill, and I am pleased to join Senator CANTWELL in introducing it.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKIE MUSE FREEMAN

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a noble Missourian, the spirited and courageous Mrs. Frankie Muse Freeman. Fifty years ago today, this body confirmed Mrs. Freeman as President Lyndon B. Johnson's choice to be the first female Commissioner to serve on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. She served honorably in this capacity for 16 years, having been reappointed by Presidents Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter.

By the time President Johnson first nominated Mrs. Freeman to the Civil Rights Commission, she had worked tirelessly to end racial discrimination and secure equality, justice and fairness for every citizen. Born Marie Frankie Muse on November 24, 1916 in Danville, VA to parents who experienced the benefits of formal education and who in turn supported their daughter's educational pursuits, Frankie was educated in Virginia and attended college at the distinguished and well-known historically black college Hampton University. Almost 10 years after she started college, Frankie began her law school career at Howard University School of Law, where she graduated second in her class. Soon afterward, Frankie settled in St. Louis, MO, and began her successful career as a civil rights attorney. She worked on a variety of important civil rights issues ranging from education to hiring practices. Most notably in 1954, Frankie argued and won the fight against racial discrimination in public housing in the landmark NAACP case Davis et al. v. St. Louis Housing Authority. The following year, Frankie became the first associate general counsel of the St. Louis Housing Au-

thority and Land Clearance Authority. Three years later in 1958, she joined the Missouri advisory committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The quality and breadth of her work combined with her passion for advocacy eventually led to her selection as a U.S. Civil Rights commissioner.

In the five decades since her historic appointment, Frankie's energy and devotion to justice has not diminished. She has received appointments from former Presidents to serve on other service-related commissions. In addition, she worked as a municipal court judge for many years and was instrumental in the formation of the Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, an organization that seeks to ensure the Federal Government's vigilance in its enforcement of anti-discrimination laws. In addition to this public service, Frankie wrote a book about her storied life and career. Just 6 years ago at the age of 92, she retired after spending the latter part of her career in private practice. Not surprisingly, even retirement has not slowed Frankie down. She remains active on a number of urban and community service-based social welfare boards.

To countless residents of my State and across the country, Frankie Muse Freeman is a hero. She is a woman who grew up in Jim Crow-era South when racial segregation was legal. Growing up, if Frankie wanted to go somewhere, her options were to either walk or take the segregated streetcar. She witnessed first hand the harsh consequences of racial inequality and she chose to devote her entire career to ending that injustice. Frankie is an inspiration to so many Americans, across all racial lines, and to me personally. She is a public servant whom my children and grandchildren can look up to. Because of leaders like her, who fought and sacrificed but ultimately believed in our country's ability to empathize and change, we are all better off and our lives more enriched.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Frankie Muse Freeman on the 50th anniversary of her Senate confirmation to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. In addition, I ask my colleagues to recognize Frankie's distinguished service to the people of this country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NEAL'S CAFÉ 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. BOOZMAN. I wish to celebrate 70 years of down-home cooking at Neal's Café in Springdale, AR.

Opened in 1944 by Toy and Bertha Neal, the restaurant is currently run by the family's fourth generation. Over the last 70 years, Neal's Café has been one of the most popular dining spots in northwest Arkansas.

Neal's is not just known for its menu of delicious comfort food. It is also a popular gathering spot for locals to catch-up and discuss family life, politics and the Razorbacks chances on the football field this week.

It is hard to miss the pink exterior of Neal's Café as you drive down N. Thompson Street. When you park your vehicle and step inside Neal's, the unique décor of the restaurant and the aroma of fried chicken immediately hit you. While fried chicken is among the most popular dishes at Neal's Café, visitors come from far and wide for the homemade pies as well.

Neal's Café is so much more than a restaurant. It is an integral part of the Springdale community. The Neal family has worked relentlessly to make it that way.

As someone who has experience starting a family business, I know how challenging of an endeavor it is to get off the ground, much less be successful to the level that the Neal family has been for the past 70 years. It is a testament to the family's commitment to quality, service and dedication to the community.

As the Neal family celebrates 70 years of operating Neal's Café, I would like to extend my wishes for many more years of serving food and fellowship at their Springdale institution.

I look forward to stopping by for some fried chicken and a slice of coconut cream pie very soon.●

TRIBUTE TO JAY AND MARY SAUNDERS

● Mr. JOHANNES. Mr. President, each year, I have the honor of recognizing outstanding parents who have chosen to adopt as Angels in Adoption. I am continually inspired by the number of families in Nebraska who have selflessly and lovingly opened their hearts to children without a permanent place to call home. Selecting just one family is always a difficult task, but this year Jay and Mary Saunders of Bellevue stood out from the others. I am pleased to announce Jay and Mary Saunders of Bellevue as 2014 "Angels in Adoption."

The Saunders have one biological son and have adopted six children: Nick, Ian, Nathan, Haylee, Mara, Christian, and Kevin. Nick, the eldest, is their biological child and born with special needs. Providing his specialized care moved the Saunders to open their home and hearts to adopting other children with disabilities.

Mary always knew she was meant to adopt and have a big family. When Nick was 4, 2-year-old Ian entered their lives. He suffered from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, ADHD. But the moment they laid eyes on Ian, the Saunders knew he was meant to be part of their growing family.

Mara was adopted soon afterward. When she came to the Saunders

through a private adoption, she required special needs that resulted from abuse she previously suffered. Today, Mary calls Mara her "lifes work" and "little guru."

It wasn't long before siblings Nathan, Haylee, Christian and Kevin were adopted together in March 2013, and were welcomed into the Saunders' growing family.

Throughout the past 15 years, the Saunders have worked to integrate immediate and extended families. This includes the birth families of some of the children. Mary often tells her children you can never have too many people "loving you."

Through hard work, compassion and a lot of love, Nick continues to defy his learning disabilities—excelling in high school and planning to enroll in college. Ian no longer has attachment issues or suffers from ADHD. Mara has learned to deal with her emotions without medication. Nathan recently won a best athlete award for the Omaha-area. Haylee and Christian's education has improved leaps and bounds since becoming part of the Saunders family. The youngest, Kevin, continues to relish in the footsteps of his older siblings. Together, the seven children continue to thrive and grow, thanks to Mary and Jay.

Each of the Saunders has been an inspiration to me. It is my hope and theirs that their family will serve as an inspiration to others who may be interested in pursuing foster care and adoption.

I want to again thank Mary and Jay for their work to improve the lives of their children and congratulate them once again on being selected as 2014 Angels in Adoption.●

RECOGNIZING THE CANYON LAKE ALL STARS

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the coaches and players of the Canyon Lake All-Stars of Rapid City, SD. The Canyon Lake All-Stars represented the Midwest Region in this year's Little League World Series.

It was only the third time in the 75-year history of the Little League World Series that a team from South Dakota made it to the tournament. This year's team joins the 2008 Canyon Lake All-Stars and the 2011 Harney All-Stars in representing South Dakota as the Midwest Region champions and becomes the first South Dakota team to win a Little League World Series game.

I wish to congratulate and recognize the hard-work of the 2014 Canyon Lake All-Stars. They represented South Dakota well in the national spotlight. Players on the team are Jake Kostenbauer, Logan Miller, Bridger Nesbit, Daniel Vigoren, Colton Hartford, Cooper Voorhees, Adam Salter, True Synhorst, Mason Litz, Matthew

Hegre, Blake Weaver, and Dylan Richey. The manager is Rich Hegre, and assistant coaches are Steve Richey and Scott Spencer. Their efforts produced lasting memories and the entire state of South Dakota is proud of their accomplishments.●

RECOGNIZING LINDA LEA VIKEN

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a South Dakota attorney who has distinguished herself on the local, State, and national level. Linda Lea Viken has been a successful practicing attorney in South Dakota since 1978. She was recently presented with the Trial Lawyer of the Year Award by the South Dakota Trial Lawyers Association during the association's annual meeting.

Specializing in family law for over 35 years, Linda Lea is the first family law specialist to receive the honor. She is a past president of the prestigious American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers and is also a diplomate of the American College of Family Trial Lawyers and is a certified family law trial attorney by the National Board of Trial Advocacy.

She has served twice in the South Dakota State Legislature and is a steadfast advocate for women, especially in the area of domestic violence and working to establish and maintain rights for women who need legal protection and services. She has significantly increased the awareness and education of the general public and the media on legal issues affecting women. She has served on a number of boards and in advisory capacities for organizations assisting women, children and families, including the South Dakota Coalition for Children, South Dakota Voices for Children, South Dakota Advocacy Network for Women, AAUW, Zonta, the West River Mental Health Board, Black Hills Legal Services, and the Black Hills Regional Food Bank.

Ms. Viken is well known for her presentations, advocacy, insight, and work in developing laws, guidelines, and policies governing custody, child support, alimony, divorce, visitation, and protection.

I wish to recognize and congratulate Linda Lea Viken on her latest and well-deserved recognition as South Dakota Trial Lawyer of the Year.●

TRIBUTE TO BOB KERR

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Islanders have opinions. Life in Rhode Island is a conversation, and in Rhode Island's ongoing public conversation about who we are as a community and as a nation, a thoughtful voice is suddenly missing. Bob Kerr, the long time metro columnist for the Providence Journal, has been let go from the paper.

Bob wrote for Rhode Island's largest paper for 43 years. He spent that time

seeking out the people and the stories that made up the fabric of our State and told those stories with empathy, humor, and blunt honesty. One of his fellow ProJo alumni described him as “the Providence Journal’s eloquent everyman.”

When then-executive editor Joel Rawson first asked Bob to write a column, he had one simple instruction: “I want to hear Rhode Island talking.” And that is just what Bob gave us, 3 mornings a week for more than 20 years.

Bob Kerr told the story of Rhode Island through the eyes of Rhode Islanders. He found people whose voices were not heard and gave them a giant microphone. He wrote about neighbors. He wrote about poor people. He wrote about musicians. He wrote about people looking for jobs and the people helping them find jobs. He even wrote about politicians. He wrote a lot about veterans. Bob served his country as a marine in Vietnam, and he paid close attention to the way we treat our servicemembers. He reminded us to keep fighting for those who fought for us.

Like an adopted conscience, Bob also kept us honest. One of his most popular features was the “Clemency Coach,” an imaginary broken-down bus with duct-taped seats and stuck windows that Bob cooked up to, as he put it, “give people who have done publicly embarrassing things the time to get away and consider ways to make everything OK again.”

“It is a bus bound for nowhere in particular.”

Once a season, Bob would roll out the latest Clemency Coach passenger list, a who’s-who of people whose behavior warranted a slap on the wrist or worse. Bob called out public figures and private citizens alike, local notables and national celebrities. I myself was dispatched on the summer run of the Clemency Coach a year or two ago for putting my foot in my mouth here in the Senate.

Bob’s columns were a mirror that sometimes reflected our shortcomings but also our shared values—our decency, integrity and compassion for one another.

Like his thousands of loyal readers, I am grateful for Bob Kerr’s contribution to our Rhode Island community, and I wish him great luck and success in whatever is to come. For years, I have enjoyed, been informed by, been moved by, and learned from Bob’s columns. They have helped make Rhode Island a better State and reminded us how good a State we are and can be. I hope he finds some way to keep doing them. He will have at least one reader.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3522. An act to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5057. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5161. An act to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 4:35 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 6:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1086. An act to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5057. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5161. An act to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6935. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2015”; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-6936. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Bovine Tuberculosis Status of Michigan; Advance Counties From Modified Accredited Advanced to Accredited-Free” (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0058) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6937. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Importation of Litchi and Longan Fruit From Vietnam Into the Continental United States” ((RIN0579-AD51) (Docket No. APHIS-2010-0116)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6938. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Margin Protection Program for Dairy and Dairy Product Donation Program” ((RIN0560-AI23) (7 CFR Part 1430)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6939. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9912-91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6940. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances”

(FRL No. 9915-32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6941. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfuric Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9914-18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6942. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9915-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6943. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9911-57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6944. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly exception Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of June 30, 2014 (DCN OSS 2014-1244); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6945. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2013 Report to Congress on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6946. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Peter M. Vangjel, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6947. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management), Department of the Air Force, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6948. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6949. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6950. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management

Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Principal Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6951. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6952. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6953. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency period pertaining to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, for an additional year; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6954. A communication from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2013 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6955. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations" (RIN3235-AL15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6956. A communication from the Executive Director of the Southeast Compact Commission for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2012-2013 Annual Report, including the Annual Commission Audit; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6957. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Strategic Plan for fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6958. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Environmental Issues Associated with New Reactors" (NRC-2013-0212) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6959. A communication from the Acting Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Specific Environmental Guidance for Light Water Small Modular Reactor Reviews" (NRC-2013-0211) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6960. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Texas: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision" (FRL No. 9915-99-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9915-69)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6962. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Pinal County and Gila County; Pb" (FRL No. 9916-11-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6963. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks" (FRL No. 9916-32-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6964. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska" (FRL No. 9916-14-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6965. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Control of Gasoline Reid Vapor Pressure" (FRL No. 9916-10-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6966. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; 111(d)/129 Revised State Plan for Large and Small Municipal Waste Combustors" (FRL No. 9915-71-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6967. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Finding of Failure to Submit a Prevention of Significant Deterioration State Implementation Plan Revision for Particulate Matter Less Than 2.5 Micrometers

(PM2.5); California; North Coast Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9916-04-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6968. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast 1-Hour and 8-Hour Ozone” (FRL No. 9915-86-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6969. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plan Revisions; State of California; South Coast VMT Emissions Offset Demonstrations” (FRL No. 9915-85-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6970. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances” ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9914-19)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6971. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision” (FRL No. 9915-97-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6972. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of tax liability” (Rev. Proc. 2014-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6973. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-067); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6974. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-038); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6975. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0113—2014-0122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6976. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. in

Fort Wayne, Indiana, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6977. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits” (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6978. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Contractor Selection and Quality Assurance for Select DDOT Road Projects”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6979. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of Inspector General’s budget request for the fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6980. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-385, “Sustainable DC Omnibus Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6981. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-386, “Board of Elections Nominating Petition Circulator Affidavit Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6982. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-387, “Party Officer Elections Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6983. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-388, “Driver’s Safety Clarification Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6984. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-389, “Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System Conformity Temporary Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6985. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-415, “Tenant Bill of Rights Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6986. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-416, “Prohibition of the Harm of Police Animals Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6987. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-417, “Marriage License Issuance Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6988. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-418, “Child Development Home License Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6989. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-419, “Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6990. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-420, “Post-Arrest Process Clarification Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6991. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-421, “Other Post-Employment Benefits Fund Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6992. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-422, “Fair Criminal Record Screening Amendment Act of 2014”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6993. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Suvorexant into Schedule IV” (Docket No. DEA-381) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6994. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Disposal of Controlled Substances” ((RIN1117-AB18) (Docket No. DEA-316)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6995. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office on National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of National Drug Control Policy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6996. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Repair Stations” ((RIN2120-AJ61) (Docket No. FAA-2006-26408; Amdt. No. 145-30)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6997. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Departing IFR/VFR When Weather Reporting Is Not Available” ((RIN2120-AK49) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0502;

Amdt. No. 135-131)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6998. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Orders of Compliance, Cease and Desist Orders, Orders of Denial, and Other Orders" ((RIN2120-AK43) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0505; Amdt. No. 13-36)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6999. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (73); Amdt. No. 3597" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7000. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (63); Amdt. No. 3598" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7001. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (48); Amdt. No. 3595" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7002. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (326); Amdt. No. 3596" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7003. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (51); Amdt. No. 3599" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7004. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (40); Amdt. No. 3601" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7005. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (267); Amdt. No. 3602" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7006. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (63); Amdt. No. 3600" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 921. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-253).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1406. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-254).

S. 1925. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders (Rept. No. 113-255).

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2521. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security (Rept. No. 113-256).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1535. A bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted on September 11, 2014:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Arthur Lee Bentley III, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. REED:

S. 2802. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

S. 2803. A bill to remove a use restriction on land formerly a part of Acadia National Park that was transferred to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2804. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with regard to research on asthma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2805. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs clinic in Billings, Montana, as the "Bear Root Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for dependent care savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2807. A bill to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2808. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHANNES (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 2809. A bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to obtain a court order to garnish wages to pay a nontax debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2810. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures to share certain information with State veterans agencies to facilitate the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2811. A bill to prohibit the distribution in commerce of children's products and upholstered furniture containing certain flame

retardants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. Res. 544. A resolution designating the year of 2014 as the "International Year of Family Farming"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 545. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 132

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include human trafficking as a part 1 violent crime for purposes of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

S. 429

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington

(Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1562, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 2520

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2520, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2684

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2684, a bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey certain Federal property located in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska to the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

S. 2737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2737, a bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2738

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2738, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

S. 2742

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to provide for public notice and input prior to the closure, consolidation, or public access limitation of field or hearing offices of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2782

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2782, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to improve the Federal charter for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2786

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2786, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent earnings stripping of domestic corporations which are members of a worldwide group of corporations which includes an inverted corporation and to require agreements with respect to certain related party transactions with those members.

S. 2795

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2795, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand the definition of eligible program.

S. RES. 524

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 524, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding global climate change.

S. RES. 543

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 543, a resolution designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 2967

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2967 intended to be proposed to S. 2199, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED:

S. 2802. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act. The recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act recognized that the adult education field has evolved from a literacy skills program to a more comprehensive college and career readiness initiative to ensure that adult learners have the foundational skills to fully participate in the community and compete for jobs that provide family sustaining wages. We need to ensure that there is a strong re-

search base to support this vital transition.

For 2012, data from the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies show that an estimated 52 percent of adults ages 16-65 in the United States lack the literacy skills necessary to identify, interpret, or evaluate one or more pieces of information. These are essential skills for post-secondary education and the workplace. Beyond their value in the labor market, these skills are also correlated with health and civic participation. Clearly, improving adult education is critically important to the health and well-being of our people, our economy, and our democracy.

In Rhode Island, it is estimated that nearly 130,000 adults have less than a high school education. Over 45,000 have limited English proficiency. Yet, we are reaching less than 6,000 through the current adult education program. Clearly, we need more resources and innovative, research-based ways to reach more people.

The Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act will support the key reforms to adult education in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act by ensuring that adult education is included in our national education research priorities. Specifically, the Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act will amend the Education Sciences Reform Act to require the Institute for Education Sciences and the National Center for Education Statistics to collect data and carry out research on: successful state and local adult education and literacy activities, the characteristics and academic achievement of adult learners, and access to and opportunity for adult education in communities across the country. It will also ensure that the Institute of Education Sciences draws on the expertise of adult educators when developing policies and priorities. Finally, the legislation would require that at least one research center would focus on adult education.

These straightforward amendments to the Education Sciences Reform Act will go a long way to strengthening the research base that will support the improvement of adult education across the country. I was pleased to work with the adult education community, and particularly, the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education in developing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act and to work with me to ensure that its provisions are included in the reauthorization of the Education Sciences Reform Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 544—DESIGNATING THE YEAR OF 2014 AS THE “INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF FAMILY FARMING”

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 544

Whereas United Nations Resolution A/Res/66/222, adopted by the General Assembly on December 22, 2011, designates the year 2014 as the “International Year of Family Farming”;

Whereas the International Year of Family Farming recognizes the important contribution of family farming in food security and eradicating poverty around the world;

Whereas in the United States, family farms constitute 96 percent of all farms;

Whereas the agriculture sector contributes more than \$130,000,000,000 to the United States economy, employs approximately 14 percent of the total workforce in the United States, and accounts for nearly 5 percent of the United States gross domestic product;

Whereas 45 percent of individuals around the world make a living directly by farming;

Whereas family farming is the predominant form of agriculture in both developing and developed countries;

Whereas family farming serves as a means of organizing agricultural, forestry, fishery, pastoral, and aquaculture production;

Whereas family farming plays important socioeconomic, environmental, and cultural roles;

Whereas family farmers grow high-quality food, are active participants in civil society, and are stewards of the land;

Whereas 75 percent of the poorest individuals around the world live in rural areas;

Whereas family farms are linked to most areas of rural development and have invested significantly in local communities;

Whereas the majority of farmers around the world are women who produce up to 80 percent of food around the world; and

Whereas 870,000,000 individuals are suffering from chronic undernourishment and a disproportionate number of such individuals are farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the year 2014 as the “International Year of Family Farming”;

(2) congratulates family farmers in the United States and around the world;

(3) recognizes the vital role family farms play in the economic and social well-being of the United States and the world;

(4) recognizes the importance of raising the profile of family farming by focusing the attention of individuals around the world on the significant role of family farming in alleviating hunger and poverty, providing food security and nutrition, improving livelihoods, managing natural resources, protecting the environment, and achieving sustainable development in rural areas;

(5) encourages countries, national organizations, and States to undertake activities to support the International Year of Family Farming;

(6) recognizes the role and importance of women in family farming;

(7) emphasizes the positive impact of family farms and developing new programs for

domestic and international family agricultural development; and

(8) advocates for the protection of the viability of family farms, which serve as the foundation of rural society and social stability.

SENATE RESOLUTION 545—RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 545

Whereas from September 15, 2014 through October 15, 2014, the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month;

Whereas the Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at over 54,000,000 people, making Hispanic Americans 17 percent of the population of the United States and the largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are also the largest racial or ethnic minority group in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and 22 individual States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming;

Whereas in 2013, there were 1,000,000 or more Latino residents in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and each of the following 8 States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Texas;

Whereas Latinos grew the United States population by 1,100,000 between July 1, 2012 and July 1, 2013, accounting for nearly half of all population growth during this period;

Whereas the Latino population in the United States is projected to grow to 128,800,000 by 2060, at which point the Latino population will comprise 31 percent of the total United States population;

Whereas the Latino population in the United States is currently the second-largest worldwide, exceeding the size of the Latino population in every country except Mexico;

Whereas there were 11,900,000 Latino family households in the United States in 2013, and Latino children under the age of 18 represent approximately $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total Latino population in the United States;

Whereas 1 in 4 public school students in the United States is Latino, and the total number of school-age Latino children in the United States is expected to reach 28,000,000 by 2050;

Whereas 18 percent of all college students between the ages of 18 and 24 years old are Latino, making Latinos the largest racial or ethnic minority group on college campuses in the United States, including both 2-year

community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities;

Whereas a record 11,200,000 Latinos voted in the 2012 presidential election, representing a record 8.4 percent of the electorate in the United States;

Whereas an estimated 23,500,000 Latinos are eligible to vote in the 2014 midterm elections, and the number of eligible Latino voters is expected to rise to 40,000,000 by 2030;

Whereas more than 2,000 Latino citizens turn 18 and become eligible to vote every day, and an average of 900,000 Latino citizens will turn 18 and become eligible to vote every year between 2014 and 2028;

Whereas the annual purchasing power of Hispanic Americans is an estimated \$1,200,000,000,000 and is expected to grow to \$1,500,000,000,000 by 2015;

Whereas there are more than 3,200,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and contributing more than \$468,000,000,000 in revenue to the economy of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-owned businesses represent the fastest-growing segment of small businesses in the United States, with Latino entrepreneurs starting businesses at more than twice the national rate;

Whereas as of August 2014, more than 25,000,000 Latino workers represented 16.3 percent of the total civilian labor force in the United States, and the share of Latino labor force participation is expected to grow to 19.1 percent by 2022;

Whereas Latinos have the highest labor force participation rate of any racial or ethnic group at 66 percent, compared to 62.8 percent overall;

Whereas in 2013, there were 298,000 Latino elementary and middle school teachers, 65,000 Latino chief executives of businesses, 55,000 Latino lawyers, and 35,000 Latino physicians and surgeons contributing to the United States through their professions;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas as of July 31, 2014, 163,636 Hispanic active duty service members served with distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas as of July 31, 2014, a total of 88,709 Hispanics had served in Afghanistan;

Whereas as of September 2014, 675 United States military fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan were Hispanic;

Whereas more than 80,000 Hispanics served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States in the conflict, even though Hispanics comprised only 4.5 percent of the population of the United States at the time;

Whereas 140,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War;

Whereas as of September 2014, there are an estimated 1,386,000 Hispanic veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas 61 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed on an individual serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court, 3 seats in the Senate, 33 seats in the House of Representatives, and 3 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an

enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2014 through October 15, 2014;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that celebrate the contributions of Latinos to American life.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3810. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3811. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3810. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) **THIRTY-YEAR LIMIT ON CIVIL NUCLEAR ENGAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be used to implement any aspect of an agreement for civil nuclear cooperation pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) after the date that is 30 years after the date of entry into force of such agreement unless—

(A) the President, within the final five years of the agreement, has certified to the appropriate congressional committees that the party to such agreement has continued to fulfill the terms and conditions of the agreement and that the agreement continues to be in the interest of the United States; and

(B) Congress enacts a joint resolution permitting the continuation of the agreement for an additional period of not more than 30 years.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The restriction in paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) any agreement that had entered into force as of August 1, 2014;

(B) any agreement with the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) or the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); or

(C) any amendment to an agreement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(b) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Each proposed nuclear export pursuant to an agreement for civil nuclear cooperation shall be subject to United States laws and regulations in effect at the time of each such export.

(c) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION ASSESSMENT STATEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement required to be submitted by the Secretary State to the President pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) shall also be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and shall be accompanied by a classified annex, prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, identifying and explaining all classified information related to the agreement to which such Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement applies, and shall, in addition to any other requirements pursuant to law, include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the consistency of the text of the proposed agreement for cooperation with all the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and this Act, with specific attention to whether the proposed agreement is consistent with each criterion set forth in subsection a. of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(B) An assessment of the adequacy of safeguards and other control mechanisms and the peaceful use assurances contained in the agreement for cooperation to ensure that any assistance furnished thereunder will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose.

(C) A historical review and assessment of past proliferation activity of the cooperating party, or suspect activity identified by any element of the intelligence community in its review of raw or processed intelligence information, including all activities that are potentially inconsistent with a peaceful nuclear program and any potential delivery mechanisms of concern.

(D) A list of all the treaties and agreements related to non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to which the cooperating party is also a party.

(E) An assessment of the cooperating party's current national laws that govern the non-proliferation of materials or equipment related to weapons of mass destruction, including any chemical, biological, or nuclear material, plutonium, uranium-233, high enriched uranium, or irradiated source material or special fissionable material.

(F) An explanation for the negotiated duration of the agreement, including an explanation of the renewal and termination procedures.

(G) A comparison of the agreement to other existing civil nuclear cooperation agreements between the United States and other states in the region.

(H) An assessment of the strategic, security, stability, and regional considerations throughout the negotiation of this agreement.

(I) An assessment of the physical and environmental security of the waste-cycle, ensuring the agreement addresses international concerns, including international and local response.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **COOPERATING PARTY.**—The term “cooperating party” means an entity with which the United States proposes to enter into an agreement for cooperation under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and shall include—

(A) the government of such cooperating party;

(B) any person authorized by or who acts with the knowledge of the government of such cooperating party; or

(C) any person who acts within the territory of the cooperating party.

SA 3811. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 737. REPORTS ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND OTHER COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) **SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REPORT.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces on active duty and other covered beneficiaries under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries, including access to care, scope of available care, and availability of specialty care, and with a particular emphasis on maternity care.

(B) An assessment whether the quality measures used by the military health system with respect to women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries facilitate expected outcomes, and an assessment whether another, or additional, evidence-based quality measures would improve outcomes in the military health system.

(C) A description and assessment of recommendations to improve access to health services and better health outcomes for women members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries proposed by the Women's Health Research Interest Group, the Comptroller General of the United States, and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate for purposes of the report.

(D) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to improve women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries.

(E) Such other matters relating to women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days

after the submittal under subsection (a) of the report required by that subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the assessment of the Comptroller General of such report. The report shall include, in particular, an assessment of the recommendations of the Secretary for actions to improve the delivery of women's health care services to members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 15, 2014, at 3 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Equality for the District of Columbia: Discussing the Implications of S. 132, the New Columbia Admission Act of 2013.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 1004, the Senate consider Calendar Nos. 594, 546, 958, 960, 963, 784, and 870; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; and that the President of the United States be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENDING THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY AND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5134 and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5134) to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5134) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF FAMILY FARMING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 544, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 544) designating the year of 2014 as the "International Year of Family Farming."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 544) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 16, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next rollcall votes will be at 2:15 p.m. on confirmation of the Baran and Burns nominations as provided for under the previous order.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 16, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT M. SCHER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MADELYN R. CREEDON, RESIGNED.

UNITED NATIONS

BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

RONALD H. JOHNSON, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

ISOBEL COLEMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOR U.N. MANAGEMENT AND REFORM, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ISOBEL COLEMAN, OF NEW YORK, AS AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOR U.N. MANAGEMENT AND REFORM.

CAROL LESLIE HAMILTON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

LESLIE BERGER KIERNAN, OF MARYLAND, AS AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TO THE SIXTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2019, VICE JACQUELINE A. BERRIEN, RESIGNED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES G. FOGGO III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

GEORGE W. CLIFFORD III
ROBERT C. STANKEWITZ

To be major

BENJAMIN BERZINIS
MARIE A. DANLEY
YOUNG J. JUN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

LAMAR D. ADAMS
MICHAEL C. ADAMS
KEVIN C. BALISKY
JOSEPH D. BARBER III

DAVID M. BARNES
JOHN T. BATSON, JR.
RALPHAEAL R. BELL, JR.
RICHARD C. BELL, JR.
ERIC J. BENEFIELD
STEVEN R. BERGER
WILLIAM H. BESTERMANN III
SCOTT A. BIRD
DEVON M. BLAKE
ERIC C. BLOOM
EDWARD F. BOROWIEC, JR.
STACY L. BOUCHARDEGERBER
SCHAWN L. BRANCH
MICHAEL L. BRANNEN
SCOTT D. BROOKS
JOSEPH A. BURGER
KENNETH W. BURKMAN
FRED J. BURPO
JAMES T. BUSHONG
KEVIN P. BUTLER
MICHAEL A. CARDENAS
JAVIER E. CARDONA
LONNIE CARLSON
JASON B. CHAMNESS
MARK R. CHEADLE
JOHN S. CHU
LIAM S. COLLINS
DAVID P. CONNOLLY
JASON P. CONROY
KEITHON R. CORPENING
RHETT R. COX
JAMES W. CROSSLEY
MASON W. CROW
BRADFORD J. DAVIS
RICHARD S. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER M. DICICCO
DAVID P. DOHERTY
RUSSELL G. DRAPER
EDWARD J. DUPONT
JAMES D. DZWONCHYK
JON E. ELLIS
DENNIS J. EMMERT II
JEFFREY M. ERICKSON
ROBERT A. FAGO
MICHAEL L. FAZEN
PETER H. FECHTEL
SAMUEL E. FIOL
DARYL L. FULLERTON
STEPHEN E. GAUTHER
DAVID M. GERCKEN
BRYAN R. GIBBY
WILLIAM R. GLASER
CHRISTIAN S. GRIGGS
DERRICK M. GRIMES
MICHAEL L. HAGGARD
JASON C. HENNEKE
JAMES R. HOGAN
TERANCE L. HUSTON
CURTIS F. IDEN
MICHAEL J. INDOVINA
STEVEN L. ISENHOUR
JOHN C. JACKSON
JOHN D. JOHNSON
MARK E. JOHNSON
JOSEPH T. KEMMER, JR.
JOHN D. KENKEL
NEIL K. KHATOD
CHARLIE H. KIM
TIMOTHY R. KING
DAVID M. KNYCH
DAVID M. KOBS
JOSEPH M. KUSHNER
SCOTT R. LAMPRIDES
GROVER J. LAPORTE, JR.
BARTON L. LAWRENCE, JR.
KENNETH L. LAWRENCE
DERRICK S. W. LEE
SANG K. LEE
JASON LERNER
LEONARD L. LIRA
ERIC D. LITTLE
ANDREW D. LOHMAN
KENNETH S. LUTHER
STANLEY A. MALLOY
CARL W. MAROTTO
VINCENT G. MARTINELLI
REMSON J. MARTINEZ
KEVIN A. MCANINCH
JAMES D. MCCALLISTER
KEVIN J. MCCANN
MICHAEL S. MCDERMOTT
HOWARD D. MCINVALE
KENNETH D. MCRAE
DAVID C. MENSER
AARON J. MERRILL
RONALD J. MILLER
BILLY M. MIRANDA
BRIAN M. MOORE
NICOLE R. MORRIS
DANIEL E. MOUTON
BRUCE A. MUMFORD
KARL D. NEAL
THOMAS P. NELSON III
MICHAEL T. H. NGO
CHARLES W. NOLAN II
JOSEPH M. NOLAN
EDDIE W. ORTIZ
MARK S. PARKER
ALLEN J. PEPPER
ANDREW PETRETTI
JOHNNY J. POWERS
JAMES D. PRINGLE

JEFFREY D. RAMSEY
GENE L. RICHARDS
KAREN J. ROE
WILLIE R. ROSEMAN
DARRYL A. RUPP
JAMES L. SADLER
JOSEPH A. SCHAFER
GEORGE R. SHATZER
DAVID J. SLIVKA, JR.
ALPRENTICE SMITH
FRANK A. SMITH
MICHAEL R. SNOOK
MARC A. SPINUZZI
PAUL T. STANTON
MICHAEL B. STEPHENSON
ALLISON L. STEWART
THOMAS STYNER
THEODORE M. THOMAS II
CLIFTON B. TROUT
RENEE M. UNDERWOOD
THOMAS F. VEALE
KENNETH M. WANLESS, JR.
KENNETH M. WEILAND II
HOLLY F. WEST
JAMES E. WHITE, JR.
RANDY E. WHITE
JASON A. WOODFORD
TODD D. WOODRUFF
D004316
D011344
D012191
G001317

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ERIC C. ANDERSON
JOSEPH S. ANDERSON
STEVEN R. ANSLEY, JR.
PATRICK J. BADAR
ANDRE J. BALDANZA
ROY D. BANZON
DALLIS L. BARNES
SCOTT T. BEALL
LAMONICA BELL
CHARLES H. BLUMENFELD III
ANGELA L. BOWIE
JAMES T. BRADY II
ROBERT A. BROGAN
JOSHUA R. BURRIS
CHRIS A. BYLER
WILLIAM J. CAIN, JR.
LAWRENCE N. CANNON
YONG S. CASSLE
BRIAN P. CLARKE
STEVE E. CORNELIUS
ELWARD P. CORTEZ
FREDERICK L. CRIST
TROY W. CROSBY
THOMAS J. CUNNINGHAM
MICHAEL D. DANIELS
SEAN P. DAVIS
JACK E. DILLS
TIMOTHY DOMKE
MICHELLE K. DONAHUE
WILLIAM L. ELLIS
BRAD J. EUNGARD
MARK R. FARIA
NORBERT A. FOCHS
CHRISTOPHER M. FORD
CHRISTOPHER R. FORSYTHE
ERIC C. FRUTCHEY
MICHAEL P. GARLINGTON
THOMAS M. GASTON, JR.
STEVEN M. GEORGE
SPENCER C. GUIDA
EDWARD J. HAUSKNECHT
RAY D. HENRY
DELISA L. HERNANDEZ
THOMAS J. HIPSKIND
JOSEPH A. HOECHERL
PAUL T. HOPKINS, JR.
KAREN S. HUBBARD
ERIC L. JACKSON
DEREK K. JANSEN
BRIAN K. JENKINS
DAVID G. JONES
MICHAEL B. LALOR
KELLY D. LAUGHLIN
JOHN D. LAWRENCE
STEPHEN W. LEDBETTER
DENNIS H. LEVESQUE
CYNTHIA LIGHTNER
ALAN T. LINDLEY
FRANCISCO J. LOZANO
TOMMIE J. LUCIUS
BRIAN J. LYTTLE
DONALD A. MACCUISH III
CHERYL L. MARTINEZ
ERIC A. MARTINEZACOSTA
PAUL D. MAZURE
MICHAEL D. MCGREGOR
MICHAEL W. MCNEILL
KEITH J. MCVEIGH
AMEED D. MICKO
JAMES C. MILLS
GRANT L. MORRIS
RICHARD W. NELSON
SCOTT P. NOON
MOLLIE A. PEARSON
BRYAN K. PHILLIPS

DAVID C. PHILLIPS
HOPE C. RAMPY
CRAIG M. RAVENELL
JASON G. RILEY
LYNDA R. ROYSE
MICHAEL E. RUTKOWSKI
THOMAS I. SALTYSIAK
AARON B. SANDER
DAVID L. SCHMITT
CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER
PAUL D. SHERMAN, JR.
MAKALENA Y. SHIBATA
SCOTT A. SHORE
CRAIG M. SHORT
MARK S. SNYDER
JOSE E. SOLIS
CHARLES A. STAMM
AARON M. STANEK
BRIAN C. STEHLE
CURT L. STEWART
JOYCE B. STEWART
PAUL M. STRUCK
GRANT S. SULLIVAN
MARK E. TALBOT
MICHELLE M. TOMALLETCHER
KEVIN A. VANYO
MARCUS L. VARNADORE
RONALD S. VOLKIN
JOEL E. WARHURST
DAVID A. WARNICK
THEODORE O. WHITE
STEVEN M. WILKE
JEFFREY D. WITT
KAREN M. WRANCHER
STEPHEN M. YORK
D011466

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND
3064:

To be colonel

RANDY L. BRANDT
CLAUDE A. CRISP
KEITH N. CROOM
BARTH G. F. EDISON
WILLIAM E. GODWINSTREMLER
BILLY N. HAWKINS, JR.
YVONNE C. HUDSON
HARRY C. HUEY, JR.
JAY S. JOHNS III
JOHN L. KALLERSON
RANDALL D. KIRBY
MICHAEL T. KLEIN
SAMUEL S. LEE
JOHN J. MURPHY
KIM M. NORWOOD
JOHN S. PECK
GREGORY B. WALKER
KENNETH R. WILLIAMS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RACHEL S. THEISEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL D. ACORD
MICHAEL A. ADAMS
STEVEN J. ADAMS
ERIK N. ANDERSON
THOMAS E. ANDERSON
CHARLES S. ARMSTRONG
THOMAS E. AUSTIN
CLINTON J. BAKER
JOHN K. BAKER
LAWRENCE J. BAKER, JR.
PHILLIP C. BAKER
ANDRE P. BALYOZ
CHRISTOPHER M. BARNWELL
GILBERTO J. BARRERA
JAMES B. BARTHOLOMEES
STEVEN P. BASILICI
GREGORY B. BEAUDOIN
GUILLAUME N. BEAURPERE
JEFFREY A. BECKER
GREGORY R. BELL
TREAYOR J. BELLANDI
WILLIAM J. BENNER
ROBERT S. BERG
CHARLES K. BERGMAN
JOHN A. BEST
GLENN R. BOLLINGER III
JOE D. BOOKARD
JOHN K. BOWMAN
ALAN J. BOYER
CHARLES E. BRANSON
KEVIN M. BRILL
DOUGLAS E. BROWN
JOHN C. BROWN
KEVIN S. BROWN
RONNIE F. BROWN
THOMAS E. BURKE
KEVIN J. BUTLER
SAMUEL L. CALKINS
EDWIN J. CALLAHAN

LANCE K. CALVERT
ANTHONY D. CAMPBELL
MARION C. CARRINGTON
TIMOTHY W. CHAMBERS
MICHAEL N. CLANCY
JOSEPH D. CLARK, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. COGLIANESE
ROBERT C. CONNELL
BLAKESLEE A. CONNORS
NEAL A. CORSON
ERIC S. CRIDER
RORY A. CROOKS
GARY L. CUNNINGHAM
SHAWN B. CZEHOWSKI
PETER E. DARGLE
ROBERT A. DAVEL
MICHAEL L. DAVIDSON
JOSEPH F. DECOSTA
MICHAEL E. DEMIRJIAN
JASON S. DENNEY
JOSE A. DEVARONA
LARRY F. DILLARD, JR.
ROBERT G. DIXON
MICHAEL P. DOHERTY
ADRIAN A. DONAHOE
JAMES K. DOOGHAN
DANIEL J. DUDEK
PATRICK M. DUGGAN
WILLIAM H. DUNBAR
JAMES K. DUNIVAN
JAMES M. EFAW
MICHAEL A. ELLICOTT, JR.
RONALD L. ELLS
CHRISTOPHER H. ENGEN
REED G. ERICKSON
DONALD C. EVANS
THERESA L. FARRELL
PRESCOTT R. FARRIS
THOMAS M. FELTEY
EDWARD J. FISHER
SEAN N. FISHER
RONALD P. FITCH, JR.
RANDY R. FREEMAN
ROBERT L. FRUEHWALD
STUART D. FURNER
STEPHEN E. GABAVICS
DAVID W. GARDNER
JAY C. GARDNER
JASON T. GARKEY
ALBERTO GARNICA, JR.
MARK A. GERALDI
ANDREW D. GIGNILLIAT
CLAIR A. GILL
THOMAS GOLDNER
MARVIN L. GRIFFIN
JONATHAN D. HAIGHT, JR.
VICTOR S. HAMILTON
ANDREW S. HANSON
MICHAEL D. HARVEY
THOMAS C. HAWN
JASON M. HAYES
GLEN E. HEAPE
LAWRENCE W. HENRY
DELBERT L. HICKS, JR.
MICHAEL D. HIGGINBOTHAM
JOHN D. HIGHFILL
JOSEPH E. HILBERT
ELMER S. HIMES
BRIAN K. HIRSCHHEY
MARK A. B. HOLLIS
HAROLD D. HOOKS, JR.
KELSO C. HORNE III
ROBERT M. HORNEY
BRANT D. HOSKINS
ROBERT P. HUBER
BRIAN T. HUGHES
BEAVER L. HUH
JAMES W. HUNT
COLLIN T. HUNTON
CHRISTOPHER A. HUSSIN
FRANK P. INTINI III
MICHAEL E. JAMES
MICHAEL D. JASON
THOMAS G. JAUQUET
WILLIAM T. JOHNSON
MARCUS A. JONES
ERNEST J. KARLBERG
CHRISTOPHER J. KELLER
MICHAEL T. KELLY
KELLY D. KENDRICK
MICHAEL D. KEPNER II
PATRICK V. KINSMAN
DANIEL K. KIRK III
MICHAEL P. KIRKPATRICK
THOMAS B. KOKES
MICHAEL A. KONCZEY
EDWARD A. KOVALESKI
NELSON G. KRAFT
PHILIP G. LABASI, JR.
KEVIN J. LAMBERT
MARK A. LANDIS
JONATHAN C. LARSEN
DANIEL B. LASERIA
WILLIAM D. LINN II
JOHN P. LLOYD
CHARLES T. LOMBARDO
JOE A. LOPEZ
SHANNON M. LUCAS
ANTHONY LUGO
ROBERT E. L. MAGEE
THAMAR A. MAIN
MARK W. MANNS

STEVEN M. MARKS
 STEPHEN C. MARR
 THOMAS M. MCCARDELL
 CHRISTOPHER M. MCGOWAN
 KEITH A. MCKINLEY
 JOSE F. MELGAREJO
 DANIEL S. METTLING
 TERRY A. MEYER
 CARL L. MICHAUD, JR.
 BRADLEY D. MOSES
 SCOTT M. NAUMANN
 DANIELLE J. NGO
 TERRY M. NIHART
 SCOTT P. NOLAN
 GEOFFREY A. NORMAN
 JESUS J. T. NUFABLE
 DONOVAN D. J. OLLAR
 LEE T. OVERBY
 DONALD L. PAQUIN
 CARL L. PARSONS
 RAFAEL F. PAZOS
 JESSE T. PEARSON
 KIMBERLY A. PEEPLES
 GERALD J. PERKINS, JR.
 JOSEPH S. PETERSON
 KEVIN J. PETRO
 CHRISTOPHER J. PFLANZ
 DAVID S. PIERCE
 JOHN E. PIROG
 JOSEPH W. POWER IV
 MICHAEL G. PRATT
 MICHAEL S. QUINN
 JEFFREY S. RAMSEY
 MARK R. READ
 CHRISTOPHER N. REICHART
 MICHAEL RICHARDSON
 CHARLES H. ROEDE
 PAUL D. ROGERS
 WILLIAM D. ROSE
 DANIEL M. RUIZ
 ANTHONY W. RUSH
 KEVIN M. RUSSELL
 STEPHEN G. RUTH
 WILSON R. RUTHERFORD IV
 ROBERT M. RYAN
 PAUL F. SCHMIDT
 JEREMY J. SCHROEDER
 PETER C. SHULL
 JASON C. SLIDER
 MICHAEL J. SLOCUM
 JOEL A. SMITH
 THOMAS L. SNEAD
 MARTIN D. SNIDER
 DAVID C. SNOW
 MATTHEW N. STADER

JOHN C. STAHL
 MICHAEL L. STANDISH
 JASON M. STODDARD
 GREGORY V. STOKES
 JOHN J. STRANGE, JR.
 ANDREW P. SULLIVAN
 BRIAN P. SULLIVAN
 THOMAS T. SUTTON
 JOHN C. SZCZEPANSKI
 PAUL J. TAYLOR, JR.
 SCOTT L. TAYLOR
 BRANDON R. TEGTMEIER
 TONY L. THACKER
 GLENN R. THOMAS
 KURT T. THOMPSON
 JOEL T. TURNER
 LANCE C. VARNEY
 THOMAS J. VERELL, JR.
 BRUCE A. VITOR
 MITCHELL O. WATKINS
 KELLY L. WEBSTER
 ADOLPHUS WEEMS III
 PAUL C. WEYTRAUCH
 JONATHAN P. WHITE
 JAMES E. WILLARD
 SEAN C. WILLIAMS
 TARPON S. WISEMAN
 RYAN B. WOLFGRAM
 JOHN K. WOODWARD
 JAMES P. WORK
 JAMES W. WRIGHT
 JASON M. WRIGHT
 BRIAN P. ZARCHIN
 LARS N. ZETTERSTROM
 D004635
 D006516

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DARRELL R. V. TRAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GEORGE W. MASON III
 JESSE M. MOREHOUSE
 JAMES A. PLEASANT
 DAVID A. ROSE
 ALVIN D. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JOHN W. BOZICEVIC
 KEVIN L. HITTLE
 BRADLEY O. MARTSCHING
 ROBERT E. POWERS
 JAMES E. SCALF

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ANGELA M. ROWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

GREGORY L. KOONTZ

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TIMOTHY E. ROBERTSON

WITHDRAWALS

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 15, 2014 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE THOMAS E. PEREZ, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 6, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN G. FOGARTY, TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 1, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 15, 2014

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

23 IN 1—FABENS, TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today as we continue our journey through the 23rd District in which I take viewers and listeners on a 1-minute journey through the district, through its towns, its cities, its cultures, and its people, this morning I have the great privilege of highlighting Fabens, Texas.

Fabens is located in the Mission Valley south of El Paso and, as of the 2010 census, had a population of 8,257 people. It is about 30 miles southeast of El Paso, located along the Rio Grande River and I-10.

Known as the home of the Wildcats, Fabens has long been a fierce competitor and a rival of my own Alpine Bucks. In fact, I still remember rather vividly when Alpine lost the district championship in football to Fabens my senior year of high school in 1980. I don't think anyone in either Alpine or Fabens has ever forgotten that football game. Kids in Fabens are competitors, whether in sports or academic competitions, and their prowess is known far and wide.

The history of the community itself dates from the late 19th century, though in 1665 a mission branch known as San Francisco de los Sumas was established just southeast of the future site of Fabens. A stagecoach station called San Felipe was in operation about 3 miles northeast of the site before 1870.

In the 1870s, Teodoro and Epitacia Alvarez owned a small farm on the actual site of what is now Fabens. That farm was known as the Mezquital. In 1887, the town site was sold to E.S. Newman, and the first permanent settler in what is now Fabens became Eugenio Perez, who came from San Elizario around 1900.

Mr. Perez himself owned a small farm, opened a small store; and shortly thereafter, when the Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio Railway built through the area and established a water-pumping station, the community began to grow. In 1906, this store became the very first Fabens post office.

The town of Fabens itself, when you think about the name "Fabens," where did that come from? It was named for George Fabens, an officer with the Southern Pacific Railroad.

In 1910, Fabens had just a few section houses for the railroad employees and two stores; and in 1914, the estimated population was only about 100, but the next few years brought many to the area as people began fleeing the Mexican Revolution.

The town site was laid out in 1911, but the development didn't really happen until the Fabens Townsite and Improvement Company bought it in 1915. The completion in 1956 of the Franklin Canal and the subsequent rise in cotton prices during World War I attracted a number of wealthy visitors to the area.

The rolling fields of the area, nestled in the shadow of the mountains to the west and immediately adjacent to the Rio Grande, were and still are perfect for farming.

The estimated population rose from 50 in 1925 to 2,000 2 years later, despite a major flood at that time. The price of cotton dropping and going up has all impacted Fabens. During the Great Depression, the estimated population of Fabens fell to 1,600. But in the early 1930s, as the Depression took hold, it fell and fell; but at the end of the 1930s, by about 1939, it had started an upward trend again.

In April of 1972, Fabens served as the location for the filming of the Sam Peckinpah film, "The Getaway." The crime drama starred Steve McQueen

and Ali MacGraw. Movie scenes were shot in the area and included explosions and car chases and shootouts. The film became a success and earned a big sum for those days of \$25 million at the box office.

Today Fabens is also home to one of west Texas' most popular and famous restaurants, the Cattleman's Steakhouse. The steakhouse serves delicious food, and it too has played a role in several movies.

Fabens is also the home of jockey Bill Shoemaker.

As I indicated earlier, kids in Fabens are served by the Fabens Independent School District and are known as the Wildcats. Many teachers in the Fabens ISD got their degrees from my own alma mater, my college alma mater, Sul Ross State University. Perhaps that is part of the reason I always feel so at home in visiting Fabens.

The next time you are in the 23rd District of Texas, I invite you too to visit Fabens, to enjoy the hospitality, to see the sights, and to learn the history of Fabens and all of west Texas.

UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF OBAMACARE CONTINUE TO PILE UP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer half a cheer for the recent news that the benchmark price for a "silver" level ObamaCare plan will drop very slightly in FY 2015. Why only half a cheer? As economics writer Megan McArdle recently noted:

Contrary to optimistic early reports, that doesn't mean that everyone's costs are falling. Consumers will have to be attentive to make sure that their costs don't go up. The worse news: we won't actually know what effect the Affordable Care Act is having on insurance prices until 2017, when a bunch of temporary subsidies for insurers expire.

She goes on to note that the various "risk corridors" and other incentives which the Obama administration created to get insurers to participate in ObamaCare are preventing us from knowing the real cost of the President's disastrous health care law. McArdle writes:

Right now, it's just not very risky for insurers to write a policy that loses a bunch of money because your losses are capped at a few percent. Starting in 2017, all that changes. Insurers are going to need to price policies with the expectation of making money and the fear of losing it.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I will pause for a moment to note that socialized losses combined with private profits are a hallmark of the crony capitalism of the ObamaCare era. Sadly, even in these heavily subsidized years, Americans are still suffering from price shock on their health insurance plan. As a constituent recently wrote to me:

Virginia, here we go again. I just received a letter from my health insurance carrier that my policy will no longer be available after December 31, 2014, due to not being ACA compliant. I will now be looking at \$600-a-month premiums as I am not eligible for a subsidy because I could go on my wife's policy for \$650 a month. \$600 would be over 20 percent of my take-home pay. We need your help to keep our current plan as promised or change the ACA.

ObamaCare's problems extend beyond high prices. I recently received a letter from a constituent—a middle-aged woman recovering from breast cancer—who was simultaneously dealing with the consequences of ObamaCare and the Obama economy.

In 2013, I was laid off from a job I had for almost 8 years. I opened a business instead of drawing unemployment. This year, the building I was leasing was sold and the new owners would not let me stay. My life savings went into building this and now it was gone. No money to start over about the same time I find I had breast cancer. I had tried to sign up for ObamaCare months before, but because my husband and I file our taxes separately, I did not qualify for subsidies regardless of my income. So here I am, no insurance, no income, with breast cancer. I do not qualify for disability because I don't expect to be disabled for at least 12 months. I do not qualify for Medicaid because of the guidelines for that.

I have paid my taxes and worked hard all my life and my government does not care about that.

Is this messed up or what?

Mr. Speaker, the law is messed up. The unintended consequences of ObamaCare continue to pile up for hardworking Americans across the country. When will this administration learn that it does not have the knowledge or ability to effectively, efficiently, and fairly manage the economic and health care choices of over 300 million Americans from Washington?

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's House who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace the opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

As another election approaches, Members are understandably focused on their campaigns. Give them the energy and courage to remain focused as well on the demands of office facing them now. This is difficult, but our Nation and our world have many issues calling for attention, and these few have the privilege of addressing them with some hope of bringing resolution that may be of benefit to us all.

May all they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ELKS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Lancaster Elks Lodge on their 125 years of service to our community.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks was founded in 1868, and just over 2 decades later, the Lancaster branch first met, growing from 24 members at the beginning to more than 600 today.

For nearly 150 years now, Elks have engaged in service to their communities, focused on veterans, youth, and our Nation.

The Elks count among their past members a number of distinguished Americans, including five men who served as Speaker of this House.

Nationwide, the organization donates \$3.65 million to send kids to college. Locally, the Lancaster Elks are known for their children's sports leagues and events.

The Elks support our local veterans and servicemembers, making sure that they are honored for their dedication to our country.

Thank you again to the Lancaster Elks for their contributions to our community. I am looking forward to celebrating this great anniversary with them on November 1.

THE AUGUST JOBS REPORT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the August jobs report is out, and it contains more bad news. The 6-month trend creating 200,000-plus jobs is over.

Consider that in order to return to its previous pre-recession levels, the economy needs to add more than 380,000 private sector jobs every month. 200,000 is barely half of the needed number, and this month we dropped to 142,000 new jobs.

This "new normal" might be okay for Washington and the booming public sector, but it is not okay with the millions of Americans struggling to find work and the millions more who have given up looking altogether.

The House has passed more than 40 bills that would address our struggling economy and help create jobs. These bills are now sitting in the Senate while that body debates whether or not to gut the First Amendment.

Maybe if the Senators acted on some of these House-passed bills they wouldn't have to spend so much time worrying about what people are saying about them.

GOSPEL MUSIC HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we have the opportunity to come and to share some of the joys of America. This month is gospel music history month, and I am delighted to be able to say that we are celebrating the history of gospel music.

In 2008, former Senator Blanche Lincoln and myself introduced a resolution to name September gospel music heritage month, and we are doing that to be able to reflect upon the writers and singers and musicians of gospel music throughout the country, in different areas around, in Appalachia and the Deep South and Midwest and the

Far West and the east coast where people sing it in their own way, where soldiers sing the music and people sing it for comfort and joy.

Tonight at the Kennedy Center, we will be honoring the former Senator, Blanche Lincoln, of Arkansas with Yolanda Adams and Kirk Franklin. These are individuals who represent a long trend of history in gospel music, but the real idea is to say that America is such a free and wonderful country that we can reflect upon the goodness of so many, singing songs of joy and praise, without the degradation and the trepidation of government interference, gospel music heritage, simply to say thank you—thank you for the music over the years.

From the 1700s and 1800s and 1900s, through war and peace, gospel music has been a comfort to many Americans. I am delighted to celebrate and thank all of those who have contributed to the great history of America, gospel music history month.

TRIBUTE TO KEVIE NILAND ON HER RETIREMENT

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of my constituent Kevie Niland who recently retired after 34 years of service to the United States House of Representatives.

Kevie came to the House in 1980 to be a constituent service coordinator for Congressman Miller, beginning a long career of service to the American people. She later moved to the Clerk's office, starting as an administrative assistant before becoming Assistant Clerk to the Official Reporters in 1995. Four years later, she was named Reading Clerk, and then, in 2009, she took the office of Deputy Chief of Legislative Operations for the House of Representatives.

Kevie served under seven Speakers of the House, from Tip O'Neill to JOHN BOEHNER, and has had a front seat for many historic and spirited debates in this Chamber. I have encouraged her to write a book, but she has responded, "No one would believe it." Her extraordinary efforts to record and support the work of the House makes our actions open and transparent to all American citizens and holds each of us accountable to the constituents we serve.

I know Kevie plans to take a well-deserved vacation, but I expect that she will continue to find ways to serve her community. I know we all feel very lucky to have benefited from her work here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kevie Niland on her outstanding and productive service to this body and to our country

and wish her the very best in her well-earned retirement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 11, 2014 at 4:44 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2258.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4197.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DESIGNER ANABOLIC STEROID CONTROL ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4771) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102(41) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(41)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (xlix), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (xlix) as clause (lxxv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (xlix) the following:

"(l) 5 α -Androstan-3,6,17-trione;

"(li) 6-bromo-androstan-3,17-dione;

"(lii) 6-bromo-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17-dione;

"(liii) 4-chloro-17 α -methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17 β -diol;

"(liv) 4-chloro-17 α -methyl-androst-4-ene-3 β ,17 β -diol;

"(lv) 4-chloro-17 α -methyl-17 β -hydroxy-androst-4-en-3-one;

"(lvi) 4-chloro-17 α -methyl-17 β -hydroxy-androst-4-ene-3,11-dione;

"(lvii) 4-chloro-17 α -methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17 β -diol;

"(lviii) 2 α ,17 α -dimethyl-17 β -hydroxy-5 α -androstan-3-one;

"(lix) 2 α ,17 α -dimethyl-17 β -hydroxy-5 β -androstan-3-one;

"(lx) 2 α ,3 α -epithio-17 α -methyl-5 α -androstan-17 β -ol;

"(lxi) [3,2-c]-furan-5 α -androstan-17 β -ol;

"(lxii) 3 β -hydroxy-estra-4,9,11-trien-17-one;

"(lxiii) 17 α -methyl-androst-2-ene-3,17 β -diol;

"(lxiv) 17 α -methyl-androsta-1,4-diene-3,17 β -diol;

"(lxv) Estra-4,9,11-triene-3,17-dione;

"(lxvi) 18 α -Homo-3-hydroxy-estra-2,5(10)-dien-17-one;

"(lxvii) 6 α -Methyl-androst-4-ene-3,17-dione;

"(lxviii) 17 α -Methyl-androstan-3-hydroxyimine-17 β -ol;

"(lxix) 17 α -Methyl-5 α -androstan-17 β -ol;

"(lxx) 17 β -Hydroxy-androstano[2,3-d]isoxazole;

"(lxxi) 17 β -Hydroxy-androstano[3,2-c]isoxazole;

"(lxxii) 4-Hydroxy-androst-4-ene-3,17-dione[3,2-c]pyrazole-5 α -androstan-17 β -ol;

"(lxxiii) [3,2-c]pyrazole-androst-4-en-17 β -ol;

"(lxxiv) [3,2-c]pyrazole-5 α -androstan-17 β -ol; and"

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(C)(i) Subject to clause (ii), a drug or hormonal substance (other than estrogens, progestins, corticosteroids, and dehydroepiandrosterone) that is not listed in subparagraph (A) and is derived from, or has a chemical structure substantially similar to, 1 or more anabolic steroids listed in subparagraph (A) shall be considered to be an anabolic steroid for purposes of this Act if—

"(I) the drug or substance has been created or manufactured with the intent of producing a drug or other substance that either—

"(aa) promotes muscle growth; or

"(bb) otherwise causes a pharmacological effect similar to that of testosterone; or

"(II) the drug or substance has been, or is intended to be, marketed or otherwise promoted in any manner suggesting that consuming it will promote muscle growth or any other pharmacological effect similar to that of testosterone.

"(ii) A substance shall not be considered to be a drug or hormonal substance for purposes of this subparagraph if it—

"(I) is—

"(aa) an herb or other botanical;

"(bb) a concentrate, metabolite, or extract of, or a constituent isolated directly from, an herb or other botanical; or

"(cc) a combination of 2 or more substances described in item (aa) or (bb);

“(II) is a dietary ingredient for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.); and

“(III) is not anabolic or androgenic.

“(iii) In accordance with section 515(a), any person claiming the benefit of an exemption or exception under clause (ii) shall bear the burden of going forward with the evidence with respect to such exemption or exception.”.

(b) **CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY.**—Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT SCHEDULING OF RECENTLY EMERGED ANABOLIC STEROIDS.**—

“(1) The Attorney General may issue a temporary order adding a drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids if the Attorney General finds that—

“(A) the drug or other substance satisfies the criteria for being considered an anabolic steroid under section 102(41) but is not listed in that section or by regulation of the Attorney General as being an anabolic steroid; and

“(B) adding such drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids will assist in preventing abuse or misuse of the drug or other substance.

“(2) An order issued under paragraph (1) shall not take effect until 30 days after the date of the publication by the Attorney General of a notice in the Federal Register of the intention to issue such order and the grounds upon which such order is to be issued. The order shall expire not later than 24 months after the date it becomes effective, except that the Attorney General may, during the pendency of proceedings under paragraph (6), extend the temporary scheduling order for up to 6 months.

“(3) The Attorney General shall transmit notice of an order proposed to be issued under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In issuing an order under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall take into consideration any comments submitted by the Secretary in response to a notice transmitted pursuant to this paragraph.

“(4) A temporary scheduling order issued under paragraph (1) shall be vacated upon the issuance of a permanent scheduling order under paragraph (6).

“(5) An order issued under paragraph (1) is not subject to judicial review.

“(6) The Attorney General may, by rule, issue a permanent order adding a drug or other substance to the definition of anabolic steroids if such drug or other substance satisfies the criteria for being considered an anabolic steroid under section 102(41). Such rulemaking may be commenced simultaneously with the issuance of the temporary order issued under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 3. LABELING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 305 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 825) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **FALSE LABELING OF ANABOLIC STEROIDS.**—

“(1) It shall be unlawful to import, export, manufacture, distribute, dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute, or dispense, an anabolic steroid or product containing an anabolic steroid, unless the steroid or product bears a label clearly identifying an anabolic steroid or product containing an anabolic steroid by the nomenclature used by the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

“(2)(A) A product described in subparagraph (B) is exempt from the International

Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry nomenclature requirement of this subsection if such product is labeled in the manner required under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

“(B) A product is described in this subparagraph if the product—

“(i) is the subject of an approved application as described in section 505(b) or (j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

“(ii) is exempt from the provisions of section 505 of such Act relating to new drugs because—

“(I) it is intended solely for investigational use as described in section 505(i) of such Act; and

“(II) such product is being used exclusively for purposes of a clinical trial that is the subject of an effective investigational new drug application.”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION TO IMPORT AND EXPORT STATUTE.**—Section 1010 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960) is amended, in subsection (a)(1), by inserting “305,” before “1002”.

(c) **CIVIL PENALTIES.**—Section 402 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 842) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (14), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (15), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting, after paragraph (15), the following:

“(16) to violate subsection (e) of section 825 of this title.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting, in subparagraph (A), after “subparagraph (B)” the following: “; (C), or (D)”; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) In the case of a violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a) of this section by an importer, exporter, manufacturer, or distributor (other than as provided in subparagraph (D)), up to \$500,000 per violation. For purposes of this subparagraph, a violation is defined as each instance of importation, exportation, manufacturing, distribution, or possession with intent to manufacture or distribute, in violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a).

“(D) In the case of a distribution, dispensing, or possession with intent to distribute or dispense in violation of paragraph (16) of subsection (a) of this section at the retail level, up to \$1000 per violation. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘at the retail level’ refers to products sold, or held for sale, directly to the consumer for personal use. Each package, container or other separate unit containing an anabolic steroid that is distributed, dispensed, or possessed with intent to distribute or dispense at the retail level in violation of such paragraph (16) of subsection (a) shall be considered a separate violation.”.

SEC. 4. IDENTIFICATION AND PUBLICATION OF LIST OF PRODUCTS CONTAINING ANABOLIC STEROIDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may, in the Attorney General’s discretion, collect data and analyze products to determine whether they contain anabolic steroids and are properly labeled in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act. The Attorney General may publish in the Federal Register or on the website of the Drug Enforcement Administration a list of products which the Attorney General has determined, based on substantial evidence, contain an anabolic steroid and are not la-

beled in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **ABSENCE FROM LIST.**—The absence of a product from the list referred to in subsection (a) shall not constitute evidence that the product does not contain an anabolic steroid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Health Subcommittee ranking member, FRANK PALLONE, and I introduced H.R. 4771, the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act, DASCA, to end a loophole that allows designer anabolic steroids to easily be found online, in gyms, and even in retail stores.

When taken by consumers, designer steroids, which are class III controlled substances, can cause serious medical harm, including liver injury, increased risk of heart attack, and stroke. They may also lead to aggression, hostility, and addiction.

Designer steroids are produced by reverse engineering existing illegal steroids and then slightly modifying their chemical composition so the resulting product is not on the DEA’s list of controlled substances.

DASCA will help protect consumers from these harmful products by giving the DEA the tools and authority to properly classify designer steroids as controlled substances and increase criminal penalties for importing, manufacturing, or distributing them under false labels.

DASCA would:

Immediately place a number of known designer anabolic steroids on the list of controlled substances;

Grant the DEA authority to temporarily schedule new designer steroids on the controlled substances list for 24 months, with the possibility of a 6-month extension so that if bad actors develop new variations, these products can be removed from the market immediately;

Create new penalties for importing, manufacturing, or distributing anabolic steroids under false labels; and

Authorize the Attorney General to publish a list of products containing an anabolic steroid that are not properly labeled.

DASCA is supported by the American Herbal Products Association, AHPA; the Consumer Healthcare Products Association, CHPA; the Council for Responsible Nutrition, CRN; the Natural Products Association, NPA; and the United Natural Products Alliance, UNPA.

I would urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation. It is bipartisan. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4771, the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014.

H.R. 4771 would amend the Controlled Substances Act to expand the definition of "anabolic steroids" to include 25 additional chemicals, thereby facilitating their control by the Drug Enforcement Agency. The CSA contains a list of chemicals defined as anabolic steroids. However, chemists, as you have heard, are able to design around the list, creating new anabolic steroids that are not on the CSA list. The DEA, therefore, has a more difficult time making enforcement actions against people using them.

The bill will also make it easier for the Drug Enforcement Agency to add subsequent designer chemicals to the list of anabolic steroids and increases civil and criminal penalties for offenses pertaining to anabolic steroids.

Anabolic steroids are synthetic variants of the male sex hormone testosterone. They have a number of therapeutic uses but are also used by muscle builders and athletes to improve performance. Long-term or high-dosage use can cause adverse health effects, including damage to the liver and heart, and testicular atrophy.

H.R. 4771 will go a long way toward removing dangerous steroids from the market. We have seen the harm these drugs have caused, particularly in our youth and in professional sports, particularly baseball. The bill will give DEA an important tool to fight the use of hard-to-detect designer steroids.

I want to commend Chairman JOE PITTS and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE for their sponsorship of this bipartisan legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting today's legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support passage of the Designer Anabolic Steroid Control Act of 2014.

This legislation will amend the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, to include 25 additional chemicals as anabolic steroids. It also will make it easier for the Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, to add additional chemicals to the CSA list of anabolic steroids. And it in-

creases civil and criminal penalties for offenses pertaining to anabolic steroids.

Anabolic steroids have legitimate therapeutic uses, but they also can cause severe adverse effects when used inappropriately. I have been concerned for many years about the harms they have caused in young people and professional athletes, who take them to improve athletic and body building performance.

One challenge our nation has faced in stopping steroid abuse is that chemists are continually finding ways to design new versions of these drugs that can escape detection or evade the law. This bill helps address this problem. It will give DEA new tools to control the abuse of designer steroids and will help get them off the market.

I commend Chairman JOE PITTS and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE for their sponsorship of this bipartisan legislation.

I urge all members to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4771, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2154

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1910(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300w-9(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$30,387,656" and inserting "\$30,387,656"; and

(2) by inserting before the period "and \$20,213,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to

insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014, introduced by Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania and Senator HATCH of Utah and championed in the House by Mr. MATHESON of Utah and Mr. KING of New York.

A child's health care necessities are not the same as their parents. Children have special health care needs, and the emergency and trauma care system has been slow to develop an adequate response. Fragmentation and poor coordination among pre-hospital services, hospitals, and public health are problems that involve emergency services in general. The gravity of the problem is worse for children when hospitals lack the appropriate medical personnel, pediatric supplies, or transfer agreements that lead to better care within the "golden hour," when chances for survival are higher.

In 1984, Congress passed the Emergency Medical Services for Children, EMSC, as part of the Preventive Health Amendments of 1984. The program was last reauthorized in 2010 and aims to reduce child and youth mortality and morbidity caused by severe illness or trauma. EMSC was designed to ensure that pediatric service is well integrated into an emergency medical service system and that the entire spectrum of emergency services is provided to children and adolescents, as well as adults.

The bill is almost identical to H.R. 4290, which the House passed last week. Voting for S. 2154 would send the bill to the President so we can continue this important program that helps our Nation's children.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation, which is bipartisan, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Established 30 years ago this year, the Emergency Medical Services for Children program has supported improvements to pediatric emergency care in all U.S. States, territories, and freely associated States. EMSC grant programs help assess emergency systems and implement quality improvement measures, improve services in rural and tribal communities, and support a research network that facilitates studies in pediatric emergency care.

Last week, as the chairman said, the House approved a similar bill to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program by voice vote. By advancing the Senate's companion legislation today, the EMSC program will be able to continue for another 5 years at its currently appropriated funding level.

I want to thank Senators HATCH and CASEY for sponsoring this bill in the Senate, Congressmen MATHESON and KING for sponsoring the House companion bill, and leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee for making it possible to have a consensus bill before us today—Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman HARKIN, and Ranking Member ALEXANDER.

I urge Members to support S. 2154 so we can send this bill to the President for his signature.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2154, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014.

The Emergency Medical Services for Children (EMSC) program aims to reduce the number of deaths of children and adolescents due to severe illness or trauma. This program supports a number of grant programs to advance pediatric emergency care. It is the only federal program that specifically focuses on improving emergency services for children and adolescents.

The House of Representatives approved legislation reauthorizing the EMSC program last week. The Senate bill before us today reauthorizes the program for another five years at the level of funding it received in fiscal year 2014.

I want to commend the sponsors of this bill and of the House companion legislation—Senators CASEY and HATCH and Congressmen MATHESON and KING—for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their work on this legislation in the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Chairman HARKIN and Ranking Member ALEXANDER for their work in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

I support S. 2154 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2154.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this motion will be postponed.

INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 83) to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 83

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PLAN.—The term “comprehensive energy plan” means a comprehensive energy plan prepared and updated under subsections (c) and (e) of section 604 of the Act entitled “An Act to authorize appropriations for certain insular areas of the United States, and for other purposes”, approved December 24, 1980 (48 U.S.C. 1492).

(2) ENERGY ACTION PLAN.—The term “energy action plan” means the plan required by subsection (d).

(3) FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.—The term “Freely Associated States” means the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.

(4) INSULAR AREAS.—The term “insular areas” means American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) TEAM.—The term “team” means the team established by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a team of technical, policy, and financial experts—

(1) to develop energy action plans addressing the immediate, near-term, and long-term energy and environmental needs of each of the insular areas and Freely Associated States; and

(2) to assist each of the insular areas and Freely Associated States in implementing an energy action plan.

(c) PARTICIPATION OF REGIONAL UTILITY ORGANIZATIONS.—In establishing the team, the Secretary shall consider including regional utility organizations.

(d) ENERGY ACTION PLANS.—In accordance with subsection (b), the energy action plans shall include—

(1) recommendations, based on the comprehensive energy plan where applicable, to—

(A) promote access to affordable, reliable energy;

(B) develop indigenous, nonfossil fuel energy resources; and

(C) improve performance of energy infrastructure and overall energy efficiency;

(2) a schedule for implementation of such recommendations and identification and prioritization of specific projects;

(3) a financial and engineering plan for implementing and sustaining projects; and

(4) benchmarks for measuring progress toward implementation.

(e) REPORTS TO SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary establishes the team and annually thereafter, the team shall submit to the Secretary a report detailing progress made in fulfilling its charge and in implementing the energy action plans.

(f) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a report submitted by the team under subsection (e), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a summary of the report of the team.

(g) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this section, and this section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, DC, June 19, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write in regard to H.R. 83. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, but the Committee on Natural Resources has a jurisdictional interest in the bill and has requested a sequential referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I agree not to insist on a referral of H.R. 83. I do so with the understanding that by foregoing such a referral, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional

Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 83, to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes. As you noted, H.R. 83 was referred to both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

I appreciate your willingness to discharge the H.R. 83 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources preserves its right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

Finally, I would be pleased to insert a copy of our exchange into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Dr. CHRISTENSEN for being the primary author of this important legislation.

H.R. 83 requires the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the freely associated states of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable and reliable energy.

□ 1615

These U.S. territories have few conventional energy resources, and they are dependent upon imports to meet a significant portion of their energy needs. As a result the resident of those areas pay unusually high electricity bills. In addition, because these areas are isolated from areas that provide their energy fuels, as well as the added cost of transporting these fuels, they face higher energy costs and greater threat of supply interruption than areas that are energy independent or have a more convenient source of energy fuels.

Dr. CHRISTENSEN has done a great job of bringing to the attention of our committee the unique challenges faced in those areas. H.R. 83 will assist these important U.S. territories in addressing their energy needs by establishing a team of energy experts to help develop and implement an energy action plan for each of these areas.

Congress certainly has an ongoing interest in the energy needs of the Nation, as well as the insular areas of the U.S. and the freely associated states. Helping these territories develop affordable and reliable sources of energy are hallmarks of a thriving economy that can improve the quality of life for all.

H.R. 83 will not entirely solve these issues, but it will help facilitate the efforts.

I would urge all Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 83, a bill which I introduced on the very first day of this Congress. This legislation, as you have heard, would require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address our energy needs through the development of action plans to promote access to affordable, reliable energy all while increasing the use of indigenous clean-energy resources in the insular areas of American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the freely associated states.

Before I go any further, I want to take this opportunity to thank Subcommittee Chairman WHITFIELD and Ranking Member RUSH and Committee Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN who, on hearing the high cost of electricity in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, immediately offered to support my efforts to bring relief.

I recall the very first time I shared how much we paid for electricity during one of our earlier Energy and Power Subcommittee meetings. Chairman WHITFIELD actually followed me outside of the room to confirm that he had heard the right figure and then pledged to do whatever he could as chairman to help on this issue.

We thank you for your help and your support. With their support Energy and Commerce actually passed this bill in July of last year, and we have been trying to bring it to the floor for passage since then.

I also want to thank Natural Resources Chair DOC HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFazio for releasing the bill from their jurisdiction so that we could bring it to the floor today.

We have come a long way since 2008 when the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, which I chaired at that time, and

the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, chaired then by Congressman JIM COSTA, held an official hearing in Frederiksted, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands.

Its specific purpose was to highlight the high cost of energy in the Virgin Islands and other territories and to explore and offer alternative and renewable sources. It was at that hearing that we first called for a project like the Energy Development for Island Nations which then only existed in Hawaii.

Within a year the Department of the Interior and the Governor brought this project to the Virgin Islands. This initiative is what assisted our water and power authority to plan and implement the transition to propane and solar which will begin to lower costs later this year or earlier next year. It has also prepared the way for wind energy.

Today EDIN is no more, and we still have miles to go before we can see the significant reductions in cost that our families and our businesses must bear, and that is why we are here asking this body to pass H.R. 83 today.

This measure will help my district and our Nation's other insular areas become less reliant on expensive foreign-imported fuel and address our longstanding energy challenges which have become increasingly complicated by price shocks and instability in the oil markets over the past few years.

The bill requires that the energy action plans identify and offer remedies to our immediate, near-term, long-term, and environmental needs along with recommendations on how to improve the performance of energy infrastructure, how to improve overall energy efficiency, and how to set a schedule for implementation of those recommendations.

Just to give you a little more context to our ongoing dilemma, on every occasion when I am in my district, I hear business owners tell me that they are not sure how much longer they can hold on before closing. In fact, many have closed, and the high electricity costs make it very difficult to attract new ones at a time when our economy needs the stimulus.

At one social event I recall a mother of five pleading with me to keep seeking help as her almost \$500 a month bill is making it difficult for her to provide for the needs of her family. Our seniors are foregoing medicine and basic essentials. Many are living in darkness.

In some communities it would appear as though many have moved away when in actuality they are simply turning to candles and kerosene lamps because they simply cannot afford to turn on the lights. This presents risks to health and safety that are just unacceptable.

According to the Energy Information Administration, the national average cost of energy is 9.94 cents per kilowatt

hour in the United States. Residential ratepayers in my district pay around 51.2 cents per kilowatt hour while commercial ratepayers incur a charge of approximately 54.3 cents.

This is nearly 500 times the national average, a cost that is unsustainable and crippling to our economy and the health and safety of our families. Residents in other territories and the State of Hawaii pay rates that vary from 26 cents in Puerto Rico to over 40 cents in the smaller islands of Hawaii, costs which are still unacceptable and unsustainably high.

Despite our challenges and obstacles, our territories are steadfastly working to identify opportunities to adopt a diverse portfolio of energy options. This bill remains extremely necessary to support us in those endeavors because it recognizes the need for immediate short-term action.

H.R. 83 also recognizes the crisis that the current 30th legislature of the Virgin Islands has declared for energy in our territory and directs focus to the short-term needs of our community as well as to ensuring that, when the transactions are made, we will be putting together the right mix of fuel sources that will provide the most efficient electricity at the lowest possible cost.

As all of these factors converge, we know there is no better time than the present to aggressively pursue the deployment of solar, wind, LNG, LPG, geothermal, ocean wave, and thermal energy as well as storage systems. I am encouraged that this can be made a reality with the guidance of a team of experts dedicated solely to mitigating and resolving these issues.

Given our geographic locations, we don't have the privilege of tapping into nearby grid systems in times of crisis. This bill will arm us with the tools necessary to help us to transition along with the rest of our country to resources that are much more affordable, reliable, efficient, and clean.

President Obama has led the way. Many States have enacted strong energy plans that chart a way forward. Considering all of the options available to them, it is only fair that our territories also join in the race for energy independence and clean energy leadership.

On behalf of my district and all of the other territories and insular areas, I would like to also thank the Democratic leadership for helping me with H.R. 83, a bill that is critically important to the energy future of the U.S. Virgin Islands and all of our Nation's territories and freely associated states.

I also want to thank my colleagues for their support as we work through these challenges and issues. My constituents are encouraged and heartened by the support that we have received thus far.

I ask all of my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 83, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would once again urge everyone to support H.R. 83. I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN and staff on both sides of the aisle for working to bring this important legislation to the floor. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 83, and commend my colleague, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for her leadership in sponsoring this legislation. I am a cosponsor of this bill, and want to express my support for its passage by the full House of Representatives. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to establish a team of experts to develop, and help implement, a plan for each territory to reduce reliance on imported oil and to transition to cleaner energy sources that will improve the environment and lower electricity costs.

A typical territory resident pays two to four times more for electricity than the U.S. national average. As an island that does not produce oil, coal or natural gas, Puerto Rico faces inherent energy challenges. Notwithstanding the progress that was made under the last administration in San Juan, which oversaw a nearly 15 percent increase in the use of natural gas and a doubling of the use of renewable sources, Puerto Rico still generates most of its electricity from imported oil.

Burning oil pollutes the air and explains why Puerto Rico has the highest rate of asthma and other respiratory illnesses in the nation. Oil is expensive and subject to sudden price shocks. The high cost of electricity strains family budgets and harms businesses.

The plan called for by H.R. 83 will help the governments of Puerto Rico and the other territories diversify their energy portfolios and reduce electricity rates. It is for these reasons that I urge passage of this bill. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce for working with us to advance this bill.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, lowering the cost of electricity is extremely important to the people I represent in the Northern Mariana Islands. Residential customers in my district pay 40 cents per kilowatt-hour—three times the U.S. average. And those electricity bills are eating away at families' paychecks.

That's why I support H.R. 83.

H.R. 83 will help local governments develop and implement plans to reduce reliance on the expensive fossil fuels that make electricity so expensive in America's insular areas, including the Northern Mariana Islands.

The plans will propose technical, financial, and policy actions that island governments and local utilities can take to move the islands towards alternative sources of energy—especially renewables. The plans will show how to improve efficiency beginning with production, through distribution, and at the point of use, so that every kilowatt generated in the islands goes unwasted.

Last year, Congresswomen DONNA CHRISTENSEN and MADELINE BORDALLO, Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, Resident Commissioner PEDRO PIERLUISI and I were suc-

cessful in convincing Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius to increase funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program in our islands. About 120 families were added to the rolls in the Northern Marianas and the assistance that all 420 families now receive is as much as double the previous amount.

But helping some families with the high cost of energy is only a partial fix. We need to lower costs for everyone. That's what Ms. CHRISTENSEN's bill promises to do.

I want to thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for her years of work to move this important bill forward and congratulate her for bringing the bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 83.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 83 to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of action plans aimed at reducing reliance on imported fossil fuels and increasing use of indigenous clean energy resources, and for other purposes.

This bill was introduced by my good friend, Congresswoman DONNA CHRISTENSEN, and I thank her for her leadership. I also commend my fellow Territorial Delegates for their support. I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I commend Chairman FRED UPTON and Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

H.R. 83 is critical in order to provide a comprehensive approach in addressing the high cost of energy in our island Territories and in the Freely Associated States. Given our remote locations, we rely solely on imported fuel has an adverse effect on our local economies.

As discussed at 3rd International Conference of Small Island Developing States that was held in Apia, Samoa a few weeks ago, we should also be concerned about the effects of climate change on our communities. It is crucial that we develop action plans aimed at reducing our reliance on imported fossil fuels.

H.R. 83 is an important first step in addressing our challenges and I urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 83.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 83, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

TRANSFER OF YELLOW CREEK PORT PROPERTIES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3044) to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF YELLOW CREEK PORT PROPERTIES.

In accordance with section 4(k) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831c(k)), Congress approves the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority, on behalf of the United States, to the State of Mississippi of the Yellow Creek Port properties owned by the United States and in the custody of the Authority at Iuka, Mississippi, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3044.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority was created by Congress in 1933 to provide wholesale electric power and create economic development opportunities for those States in the Tennessee Valley region.

The State of Mississippi initiated development of Yellow Creek Port in 1971 on 116 acres purchased from the TVA. Industrial growth, high-paying jobs, associated spinoff companies, and increased traffic on the Nation's inland waterway system have occurred because of the development of Yellow Creek Port.

I would like to thank Congressman ALAN NUNNELEE for introducing H.R. 3044, legislation that will convey land from TVA to the State of Mississippi to provide economic development opportunities in the region. NUNNELEE has been a leader on these types of activities since he was elected to Congress in 2010.

The land being conveyed through this legislation will be used solely for industrial purposes and allow the State of Mississippi to expand the Yellow Creek Port to meet increasing demand.

H.R. 3044 will execute the conveyance of the remaining 173 acres of property from TVA to the State of Mississippi to complete the development of Yellow Creek Port and fulfill one of TVA's missions of ensuring economic development opportunities in the TVA service area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 3044, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3044 will allow the transfer of 173 acres of Tennessee Valley Authority lands to the State of Mississippi for industrial and economic development.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 withdrew lands from the Tennessee River System to provide for future development of power plants, industrial sites, ports, and supporting infrastructure.

In 1971 at the confluence of the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers, the Yellow Creek Port project was initiated. The purpose of the Yellow Creek Port project was to support economic development and local jobs in northeast Mississippi. The TVA and the State of Mississippi have jointly supported the development and growth of the port.

TVA initially transferred 289 acres of land to the Yellow Creek Port to facilitate development back in 1971. H.R. 3044 would transfer an additional 173 acres of the land to the State of Mississippi.

The acreage includes industrial, highway, and railroad easements and 54 acres of undeveloped land. The TVA has attempted to sell this land since 1984, with no interested buyers.

Mr. Speaker, the TVA Act allows TVA, with appropriate congressional approvals, to dispose of property for particular uses. According to TVA, the agency places reversionary interest clauses in transfers and sales to ensure that those uses specified by Congress in the TVA Act are carried out. TVA then retains the right to retake possession of the property if the use condition is breached.

In February the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee considered and passed S. 212, by a voice vote, which supported the transfer of these same 173 acres. The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that the net impact of the transfer would be insignificant and would not affect direct spending. TVA has confirmed that the transferred lands would be used for industrial development; and again, if for some reason the lands are instead proposed for some nonindustrial purpose, the TVA can legally have the lands returned to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any opposition to H.R. 3044, and as we have heard, the construction of the Yellow Creek Port in 1971 initially involved approximately 289 acres.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of H.R. 3044.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for her support. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3044.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1086) to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1086

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

Section 658A of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9801 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 658A. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSES.

"(a) SHORT TITLE.—This subchapter may be cited as the 'Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990'.

"(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subchapter are—

"(1) to allow each State maximum flexibility in developing child care programs and policies that best suit the needs of children and parents within that State;

"(2) to promote parental choice to empower working parents to make their own decisions regarding the child care services that best suit their family's needs;

"(3) to encourage States to provide consumer education information to help parents make informed choices about child care services and to promote involvement by parents and family members in the development of their children in child care settings;

"(4) to assist States in delivering high-quality, coordinated early childhood care and education services to maximize parents' options and support parents trying to achieve independence from public assistance;

"(5) to assist States in improving the overall quality of child care services and programs by implementing the health, safety,

licensing, training, and oversight standards established in this subchapter and in State law (including State regulations);

“(6) to improve child care and development of participating children; and

“(7) to increase the number and percentage of low-income children in high-quality child care settings.”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 658B of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858) is amended by striking “subchapter” and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting “subchapter \$2,360,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, \$2,478,000,000 for fiscal year 2016, \$2,539,950,000 for fiscal year 2017, \$2,603,448,750 for fiscal year 2018, \$2,668,534,969 for fiscal year 2019, and \$2,748,591,018 for fiscal year 2020.”.

SEC. 4. LEAD AGENCY.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 658D(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “chief executive officer” and inserting “Governor”; and

(2) by striking “designate” and all that follows and inserting “designate an agency (which may be an appropriate collaborative agency), or establish a joint interagency office, that complies with the requirements of subsection (b) to serve as the lead agency for the State under this subchapter.”.

(b) COLLABORATION WITH TRIBES.—Section 658D(b)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858b(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) at the option of an Indian tribe or tribal organization in the State, collaborate and coordinate with such Indian tribe or tribal organization in the development of the State plan in a timely manner.”.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION AND PLAN.

(a) PERIOD.—Section 658E(b) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(b)) is amended by striking “2-year” and inserting “3-year”.

(b) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Section 658E(c) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or established” after “designated”;;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting a comma after “care of such providers”;;

(B) by striking subparagraphs (D) through (H); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) MONITORING AND INSPECTION REPORTS.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 1 year after the State has in effect the policies and practices described in subparagraph (K)(i), will make public by electronic means, in a consumer-friendly and easily accessible format, organized by provider, the results of monitoring and inspection reports, including those due to major substantiated complaints about failure to comply with this subchapter and State child care policies, as well as the number of deaths, serious injuries, and instances of substantiated child abuse that occurred in child care settings each year, for eligible child care providers within the State. The results shall also include information on the date of such an inspection, and, where applicable, information on corrective action taken.

“(E) CONSUMER AND PROVIDER EDUCATION INFORMATION.—The plan shall include a cer-

tification that the State will collect and disseminate (which dissemination may be done, except as otherwise specified in this subparagraph, through resource and referral organizations or other means as determined by the State) to parents of eligible children, the general public, and, where applicable, providers—

“(i) information about the availability of the full diversity of child care services that will promote informed child care choices and that concerns—

“(I) the availability of child care services provided through programs authorized by this subchapter and, if feasible, other child care services and other programs provided in the State for which the family may be eligible, as well as the availability of financial assistance to obtain child care services in the State;

“(II) if available, information about the quality of providers, as determined by the State, that can be provided through a Quality Rating and Improvement System;

“(III) information, made available through a State Web site, describing the State process for licensing child care providers, the State processes for conducting background checks, and monitoring and inspections, of child care providers, and the offenses that prevent individuals and entities from serving as child care providers in the State;

“(IV) other programs for which families that receive child care services for which financial assistance is provided under this subchapter may be eligible, including the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), Head Start and Early Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), the program carried out under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), the child and adult care food program established under section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), and the Medicaid and State children's health insurance programs under titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq., 1397aa et seq.);

“(V) programs carried out under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.);

“(VI) research and best practices concerning children's development, including social and emotional development, early childhood development, and meaningful parent and family engagement, and physical health and development (particularly healthy eating and physical activity); and

“(VII) the State policies regarding the social-emotional behavioral health of young children, which may include positive behavioral intervention and support models, and policies on expulsion of preschool-aged children, in early childhood programs receiving assistance under this subchapter; and

“(ii) information on developmental screenings, including—

“(I) information on existing (as of the date of submission of the application containing the plan) resources and services the State can deploy, including the coordinated use of the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program under the Medicaid

program carried out under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and developmental screening services available under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1419, 1431 et seq.), in conducting developmental screenings and providing referrals to services, when appropriate, for children who receive assistance under this subchapter; and

“(II) a description of how a family or eligible child care provider may utilize the resources and services described in subclause (I) to obtain developmental screenings for children who receive assistance under this subchapter who may be at risk for cognitive or other developmental delays, which may include social, emotional, physical, or linguistic delays.

“(F) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include a certification that the State involved has in effect licensing requirements applicable to child care services provided within the State, and provide a detailed description of such requirements and of how such requirements are effectively enforced.

“(ii) LICENSE EXEMPTION.—If the State uses funds received under this subchapter to support a child care provider that is exempt from the corresponding licensing requirements described in clause (i), the plan shall include a description stating why such licensing exemption does not endanger the health, safety, or development of children who receive services from child care providers who are exempt from such requirements.

“(G) TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe the training and professional development requirements that are in effect within the State designed to enable child care providers to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children and to improve the knowledge and skills of the child care workforce. Such requirements shall be applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall provide an assurance that such training and professional development—

“(I) shall be conducted on an ongoing basis, provide for a progression of professional development (which may include encouraging the pursuit of postsecondary education), reflect current research and best practices relating to the skills necessary for the child care workforce to meet the developmental needs of participating children, and improve the quality of, and stability within, the child care workforce;

“(II) shall be developed in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i))), and may engage training providers in aligning training opportunities with the State's training framework;

“(III) incorporates knowledge and application of the State's early learning and developmental guidelines (where applicable), the State's health and safety standards, and incorporates social-emotional behavior intervention models, which may include positive behavior intervention and support models;

“(IV) shall be accessible to providers supported through Indian tribes or tribal organizations that receive assistance under this subchapter; and

“(V) to the extent practicable, are appropriate for a population of children that includes—

“(aa) different age groups;

“(bb) English learners;

“(cc) children with disabilities; and

“(dd) Native Americans, including Indians, as the term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b) (including Alaska Natives within the meaning of that term), and Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 7207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517)).

“(iii) INFORMATION.—The plan shall include the number of hours of training required for eligible providers and caregivers to engage in annually, as determined by the State.

“(iv) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary shall not require an individual or entity that provides child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter to acquire a credential to provide such services. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a State from requiring a credential.

“(H) CHILD-TO-PROVIDER RATIO STANDARDS.—

“(i) STANDARDS.—The plan shall describe child care standards for child care services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, appropriate to the type of child care setting involved, to provide for the safety and developmental needs of the children served, that address—

“(I) group size limits for specific age populations, as determined by the State;

“(II) the appropriate ratio between the number of children and the number of providers, in terms of the age of the children in child care, as determined by the State; and

“(III) required qualifications for such providers, as determined by the State.

“(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to States on child-to-provider ratios described in clause (i) according to setting and age group, but shall not require that the State maintain specific group size limits for specific age populations or child-to-provider ratios for providers who receive assistance in accordance with subchapter.

“(I) HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that there are in effect within the State, under State or local law, requirements designed to protect the health and safety of children that are applicable to child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter. Such requirements—

“(i) shall relate to matters including health and safety topics consisting of—

“(I) the prevention and control of infectious diseases (including immunization) and the establishment of a grace period that allows homeless children and children in foster care to receive services under this subchapter while their families (including foster families) are taking any necessary action to comply with immunization and other health and safety requirements;

“(II) prevention of sudden infant death syndrome and use of safe sleeping practices;

“(III) the administration of medication, consistent with standards for parental consent;

“(IV) the prevention of and response to emergencies due to food and allergic reactions;

“(V) building and physical premises safety, including identification of and protection from hazards that can cause bodily injury such as electrical hazards, bodies of water, and vehicular traffic;

“(VI) prevention of shaken baby syndrome and abusive head trauma;

“(VII) emergency preparedness and response planning for emergencies resulting from a natural disaster, or a man-caused event (such as violence at a child care facility), within the meaning of those terms under section 602(a)(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5195a(a)(1));

“(VIII) the handling and storage of hazardous materials and the appropriate disposal of biocontaminants;

“(IX) for providers that offer transportation, if applicable, appropriate precautions in transporting children;

“(X) first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and

“(XI) minimum health and safety training, to be completed pre-service or during an orientation period in addition to ongoing training, appropriate to the provider setting involved that addresses each of the requirements relating to matters described in subclauses (I) through (X); and

“(ii) may include requirements relating to nutrition, access to physical activity, or any other subject area determined by the State to be necessary to promote child development or to protect children's health and safety.

“(J) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that procedures are in effect to ensure that child care providers within the State, that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter, comply with all applicable State and local health and safety requirements as described in subparagraph (I).

“(K) ENFORCEMENT OF LICENSING AND OTHER REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) CERTIFICATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, shall have in effect policies and practices, applicable to licensing or regulating child care providers that provide services for which assistance is made available in accordance with this subchapter and the facilities of those providers, that—

“(I) ensure that individuals who are hired as licensing inspectors in the State are qualified to inspect those child care providers and facilities and have received training in related health and safety requirements, and are trained in all aspects of the State's licensure requirements;

“(II) require licensing inspectors (or qualified inspectors designated by the lead agency) of those child care providers and facilities to perform inspections, with—

“(aa) not less than 1 prelicensure inspection, for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards, of each such child care provider and facility in the State; and

“(bb) not less than annually, an inspection (which shall be unannounced) of each such child care provider and facility in the State for compliance with all child care licensing standards, which shall include an inspection for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards (inspectors may inspect for compliance with all 3 standards at the same time);

“(iii) require the ratio of licensing inspectors to such child care providers and facilities in the State to be maintained at a level sufficient to enable the State to conduct inspections of such child care providers and facilities on a timely basis in accordance with Federal, State, and local law; and

“(IV) require licensing inspectors (or qualified inspectors designated by the lead agency) of child care providers and facilities to perform an annual inspection of each license-exempt provider in the State receiving funds under this subchapter (unless the provider is an eligible child care provider as described in section 658P(6)(B)) for compliance with health, safety, and fire standards, at a time to be determined by the State.

“(ii) CONSTRUCTION.—The Secretary may offer guidance to a State, if requested by the State, on a research-based minimum standard regarding ratios described in clause (i)(III) and provide technical assistance to the State on meeting the minimum standard within a reasonable time period, but shall not prescribe a particular ratio.

“(L) COMPLIANCE WITH CHILD ABUSE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall include a certification that child care providers within the State will comply with the child abuse reporting requirements of section 106(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(i)).

“(M) MEETING THE NEEDS OF CERTAIN POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe how the State will develop and implement strategies (which may include alternative reimbursement rates to child care providers, the provision of direct contracts or grants to community-based organizations, offering child care certificates to parents, or other means determined by the State) to increase the supply and improve the quality of child care services for—

“(i) children in underserved areas;

“(ii) infants and toddlers;

“(iii) children with disabilities, as defined by the State; and

“(iv) children who receive care during non-traditional hours.

“(N) PROTECTION FOR WORKING PARENTS.—

“(i) MINIMUM PERIOD.—

“(I) 12-MONTH PERIOD.—The plan shall demonstrate that each child who receives assistance under this subchapter in the State will be considered to meet all eligibility requirements for such assistance and will receive such assistance, for not less than 12 months before the State or designated local entity redetermines the eligibility of the child under this subchapter, regardless of a temporary change in the ongoing status of the child's parent as working or attending a job training or educational program or a change in family income for the child's family, if that family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

“(II) FLUCTUATIONS IN EARNINGS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State's or designated local entity's processes for initial determination and redetermination of such eligibility take into account irregular fluctuations in earnings.

“(ii) REDETERMINATION PROCESS.—The plan shall describe the procedures and policies that are in place to ensure that working parents (especially parents in families receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)) are not required to unduly disrupt their employment in order to comply with the State's or designated local entity's requirements for redetermination of eligibility for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter.

“(iii) PERIOD BEFORE TERMINATION.—At the option of the State, the plan shall demonstrate that the State will not terminate

assistance provided to carry out this subchapter based on a factor consisting of a parent's loss of work or cessation of attendance at a job training or educational program for which the family was receiving the assistance, without continuing the assistance for a reasonable period of time, of not less than 3 months, after such loss or cessation in order for the parent to engage in a job search and resume work, or resume attendance at a job training or educational program, as soon as possible.

“(iv) GRADUATED PHASEOUT OF CARE.—The plan shall describe the policies and procedures that are in place to allow for provision of continued assistance to carry out this subchapter, at the beginning of a new eligibility period under clause (i)(I), for children of parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program and whose family income exceeds the State's income limit to initially qualify for such assistance, if the family income for the family involved does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size.

“(O) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall describe how the State, in order to expand accessibility and continuity of care, and assist children enrolled in early childhood programs to receive full-day services, will efficiently, and to the extent practicable, coordinate the services supported to carry out this subchapter with programs operating at the Federal, State, and local levels for children in preschool programs, tribal early childhood programs, and other early childhood programs, including those serving infants and toddlers with disabilities, homeless children, and children in foster care.

“(ii) OPTIONAL USE OF COMBINED FUNDS.—If the State elects to combine funding for the services supported to carry out this subchapter with funding for any program described in clause (i), the plan shall describe how the State will combine the multiple sets of funding and use the combined funding.

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to affect the priority of children prekindergarten or Head Start program services.

“(P) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—The plan shall demonstrate how the State encourages partnerships among State agencies, other public agencies, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and private entities, including faith-based and community-based organizations, to leverage existing service delivery systems (as of the date of the submission of the application containing the plan) for child care and development services and to increase the supply and quality of child care services for children who are less than 13 years of age, such as by implementing voluntary shared services alliance models.

“(Q) PRIORITY FOR LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.—The plan shall describe the process the State proposes to use, with respect to investments made to increase access to programs providing high-quality child care and development services, to give priority for those investments to children of families in areas that have significant concentrations of poverty and unemployment and that do not have such programs.

“(R) CONSULTATION.—The plan shall include a certification that the State has developed the plan in consultation with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)).

“(S) PAYMENT PRACTICES.—The plan shall include—

“(i) a certification that the payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter reflect generally accepted payment practices of child care providers in the State that serve children who do not receive assistance under this subchapter, so as to provide stability of funding and encourage more child care providers to serve children who receive assistance under this subchapter; and

“(ii) an assurance that the State will, to the extent practicable, implement enrollment and eligibility policies that support the fixed costs of providing child care services by delinking provider reimbursement rates from an eligible child's occasional absences due to holidays or unforeseen circumstances such as illness.

“(T) EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall include an assurance that the State will maintain or implement early learning and developmental guidelines (or develop such guidelines if the State does not have such guidelines as of the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014) that are appropriate for children from birth to kindergarten entry, describing what such children should know and be able to do, and covering the essential domains of early childhood development for use statewide by child care providers. Such guidelines shall—

“(I) be research-based, developmentally appropriate, and aligned with entry to kindergarten;

“(II) be implemented in consultation with the state educational agency and the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (designated or established pursuant to section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)); and

“(III) be updated as determined by the State.

“(ii) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The plan shall include an assurance that funds received by the State to carry out this subchapter will not be used to develop or implement an assessment for children that—

“(I) will be the sole basis for a child care provider being determined to be ineligible to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter;

“(II) will be used as the primary or sole basis to provide a reward or sanction for an individual provider;

“(III) will be used as the primary or sole method for assessing program effectiveness; or

“(IV) will be used to deny children eligibility to participate in the program carried out under this subchapter.

“(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall preclude the State from using a single assessment as determined by the State for children for—

“(I) supporting learning or improving a classroom environment;

“(II) targeting professional development to a provider;

“(III) determining the need for health, mental health, disability, developmental delay, or family support services;

“(IV) obtaining information for the quality improvement process at the State level; or

“(V) conducting a program evaluation for the purposes of providing program improvement and parent information.

“(iv) NO FEDERAL CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize

an officer or employee of the Federal Government to—

“(I) mandate, direct, control, or place conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) around adopting a State's early learning and developmental guidelines developed in accordance with this section;

“(II) establish any criterion that specifies, defines, prescribes, or places conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) on a State adopting standards or measures that a State uses to establish, implement, or improve such guidelines, related accountability systems, or alignment of such guidelines with education standards; or

“(III) require a State to submit such guidelines for review.

“(U) DISASTER PREPAREDNESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The plan shall demonstrate the manner in which the State will address the needs of children in child care services provided through programs authorized under this subchapter, including the need for safe child care, for the period before, during, and after a state of emergency declared by the Governor or a major disaster or emergency (as such terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)).

“(ii) STATEWIDE CHILD CARE DISASTER PLAN.—Such plan shall include a statewide child care disaster plan for coordination of activities and collaboration, in the event of an emergency or disaster described in clause (i), among the State agency with jurisdiction over human services, the agency with jurisdiction over State emergency planning, the State lead agency, the State agency with jurisdiction over licensing of child care providers, the local resource and referral organizations, the State resource and referral system, and the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care as provided for under section 642B(b) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)).

“(iii) DISASTER PLAN COMPONENTS.—The components of the disaster plan, for such an emergency or disaster, shall include—

“(I) evacuation, relocation, shelter-in-place, and lock-down procedures, and procedures for communication and reunification with families, continuity of operations, and accommodation of infants and toddlers, children with disabilities, and children with chronic medical conditions;

“(II) guidelines for the continuation of child care services in the period following the emergency or disaster, which may include the provision of emergency and temporary child care services, and temporary operating standards for child care providers during that period; and

“(III) procedures for staff and volunteer emergency preparedness training and practice drills.

“(V) BUSINESS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The plan shall describe how the State will develop and implement strategies to strengthen the business practices of child care providers to expand the supply, and improve the quality of, child care services.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “as required under” and inserting “in accordance with”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “The State” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The State”;

(ii) by striking “and any other activity that the State deems appropriate to realize any of the goals specified in paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 658A(b)” and inserting

“activities that improve access to child care services, including the use of procedures to permit enrollment (after an initial eligibility determination) of homeless children while required documentation is obtained, training and technical assistance on identifying and serving homeless children and their families, and specific outreach to homeless families, and any other activity that the State determines to be appropriate to meet the purposes of this subchapter (which may include an activity described in clause (ii))”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30 of the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and September 30 of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary (acting through the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services) shall prepare a report that contains a determination about whether each State uses amounts provided to such State for the fiscal year involved under this subchapter in accordance with the priority for services described in clause (i).

“(II) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year that the report of the Secretary described in subclause (I) indicates that a State has failed to give priority for services in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) inform the State that the State has until the date that is 6 months after the Secretary has issued such report to fully comply with clause (i);

“(bb) provide the State an opportunity to modify the State plan of such State, to make the plan consistent with the requirements of clause (i), and resubmit such State plan to the Secretary not later than the date described in item (aa); and

“(cc) if the State does not fully comply with clause (i) and item (bb), by the date described in item (aa), withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the first full fiscal year after that date.

“(III) WAIVER FOR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding subclause (II) the Secretary may grant a waiver to a State for one year to the penalty applied in subclause (II) if the Secretary determines there are extraordinary circumstances, such as a natural disaster, that prevent the State from complying with clause (i). If the Secretary does grant a waiver to a State under this section, the Secretary shall, within 30 days of granting such waiver, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the circumstances of the waiver including the stated reason from the State on the need for a waiver, the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program, and any such other relevant information the Secretary deems necessary.

“(iii) CHILD CARE RESOURCE AND REFERRAL SYSTEM.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A State may use amounts described in clause (i) to establish or support a system of local or regional child care resource and referral organizations that is coordinated, to the extent determined appropriate by the State, by a statewide public or private nonprofit, community-based or regionally based, lead child care resource and referral organization.

“(II) LOCAL OR REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The local or regional child care resource and

referral organizations supported as described in subclause (I) shall—

“(aa) provide parents in the State with consumer education information referred to in paragraph (2)(E) (except as otherwise provided in that paragraph), concerning the full range of child care options (including faith-based and community-based child care providers), analyzed by provider, including child care provided during nontraditional hours and through emergency child care centers, in their political subdivisions or regions;

“(bb) to the extent practicable, work directly with families who receive assistance under this subchapter to offer the families support and assistance, using information described in item (aa), to make an informed decision about which child care providers they will use, in an effort to ensure that the families are enrolling their children in the most appropriate child care setting to suit their needs and one that is of high quality (as determined by the State);

“(cc) collect data and provide information on the coordination of services and supports, including services under section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431, et seq.), for children with disabilities (as defined in section 602 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1401));

“(dd) collect data and provide information on the supply of and demand for child care services in political subdivisions or regions within the State and submit such information to the State;

“(ee) work to establish partnerships with public agencies and private entities, including faith-based and community-based child care providers, to increase the supply and quality of child care services in the State; and

“(ff) as appropriate, coordinate their activities with the activities of the State lead agency and local agencies that administer funds made available in accordance with this subchapter.”;

(C) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by striking “1997 through 2002” and inserting “2015 through 2020”; and

(ii) by striking “other than families described in paragraph (2)(H)” and inserting “including or in addition to families with children described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (2)(M)”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) DIRECT SERVICES.—From amounts provided to a State for a fiscal year to carry out this subchapter, the State shall—

“(i) reserve the minimum amount required to be reserved under section 658G, and the funds for costs described in subparagraph (C); and

“(ii) from the remainder, use not less than 70 percent to fund direct services (provided by the State) in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).”;

(4) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) PAYMENT RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State plan shall certify that payment rates for the provision of child care services for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children to child care services that are comparable to child care services in the State or substate area involved that are provided to children whose parents are not eligible to receive assistance under this subchapter or to receive child care assistance under any other Federal or State program, and shall provide a summary of the facts relied on by the State to determine that such rates are sufficient to ensure such access.

“(B) SURVEY.—The State plan shall—

“(i) demonstrate that the State has, after consulting with the State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care designated or established in section 642B(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9837b(b)(1)(A)(i)), local child care program administrators, local child care resource and referral agencies, and other appropriate entities, developed and conducted (not earlier than 2 years before the date of the submission of the application containing the State plan) a statistically valid and reliable survey of the market rates for child care services in the State (that reflects variations in the cost of child care services by geographic area, type of provider, and age of child) or an alternative methodology, such as a cost estimation model, that has been developed by the State lead agency;

“(ii) demonstrate that the State prepared a detailed report containing the results of the State market rates survey or alternative methodology conducted pursuant to clause (i), and made the results of the survey or alternative methodology widely available (not later than 30 days after the completion of such survey or alternative methodology) through periodic means, including posting the results on the Internet;

“(iii) describe how the State will set payment rates for child care services, for which assistance is provided in accordance with this subchapter—

“(I) in accordance with the results of the market rates survey or alternative methodology conducted pursuant to clause (i);

“(II) taking into consideration the cost of providing higher quality child care services than were provided under this subchapter before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014; and

“(III) without, to the extent practicable, reducing the number of families in the State receiving such assistance to carry out this subchapter, relative to the number of such families on the date of enactment of that Act; and

“(iv) describe how the State will provide for timely payment for child care services provided under this subchapter.

“(C) CONSTRUCTION.—

“(i) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to create a private right of action if the State acted in accordance with this paragraph.

“(ii) NO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DIFFERENT RATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to prevent a State from differentiating the payment rates described in subparagraph (B)(iii) on the basis of such factors as—

“(I) geographic location of child care providers (such as location in an urban or rural area);

“(II) the age or particular needs of children (such as the needs of children with disabilities and children served by child protective services);

“(III) whether the providers provide child care services during weekend and other non-traditional hours; or

“(IV) the State’s determination that such differentiated payment rates may enable a parent to choose high-quality child care that best fits the parent’s needs.”; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by inserting “(that is not a barrier to families receiving assistance under this subchapter)” after “cost sharing”.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 658F(b)(2) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858d(b)(2)) is amended by striking “section

658E(c)(2)(F))” and inserting “section 658E(c)(2)(I)”.

SEC. 6. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858e) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 658G. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

“(a) RESERVATION.—

“(1) RESERVATION FOR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE SERVICES.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter for a fiscal year referred to in paragraph (2) shall reserve and use a portion of such funds, in accordance with paragraph (2), for activities provided directly, or through grants or contracts with local child care resource and referral organizations or other appropriate entities, that are designed to improve the quality of child care services and increase parental options for, and access to, high-quality child care, and is in alignment with a Statewide assessment of the State’s needs to carry out such services and care, provided in accordance with this subchapter.

“(2) AMOUNT OF RESERVATIONS.—Such State shall reserve and use—

“(A) to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1), not less than—

“(i) 7 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1), for the first and second full fiscal years after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014;

“(ii) 8 percent of such funds for the third and fourth full fiscal years after the date of enactment; and

“(iii) 9 percent of such funds for the fifth and each succeeding full fiscal year after the date of enactment; and

“(B) in addition to the funds reserved under subparagraph (A), 3 percent of the funds described in paragraph (1) received not later than the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment and received for each succeeding full fiscal year, to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (b)(4), as such activities relate to the quality of care for infants and toddlers.

“(3) STATE RESERVATION AMOUNT.—Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the State from reserving a larger percentage of funds to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (b).

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to carry out no fewer than one of the following activities that will improve the quality of child care services provided in the State:

“(1) Supporting the training and professional development of the child care workforce through activities such as those included under section 658E(c)(2)(G), in addition to—

“(A) offering training and professional development opportunities for child care providers that relate to the use of scientifically-based, developmentally-appropriate and age-appropriate strategies to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children, including those related to nutrition and physical activity, and offering specialized training for child care providers caring for those populations prioritized in section 658E(c)(2)(Q), and children with disabilities;

“(B) incorporating the effective use of data to guide program improvement;

“(C) including effective behavior management strategies and training, including positive behavior interventions and support models, that promote positive social and emo-

tional development and reduce challenging behaviors, including reducing expulsions of preschool-aged children for such behaviors;

“(E) providing training and outreach on engaging parents and families in culturally and linguistically appropriate ways to expand their knowledge, skills, and capacity to become meaningful partners in supporting their children’s positive development;

“(F) providing training corresponding to the nutritional and physical activity needs of children to promote healthy development;

“(G) providing training or professional development for child care providers regarding the early neurological development of children; and

“(H) connecting child care staff members of child care providers with available Federal and State financial aid, or other resources, that would assist child care staff members in pursuing relevant postsecondary training.

“(2) Improving upon the development or implementation of the early learning and developmental guidelines described in section 658E(c)(2)(T) by providing technical assistance to eligible child care providers that enhances the cognitive, physical, social and emotional development, including early childhood development, of participating preschool and school-aged children and supports their overall well-being.

“(3) Developing, implementing, or enhancing a tiered quality rating system for child care providers and services, which may—

“(A) support and assess the quality of child care providers in the State;

“(B) build on State licensing standards and other State regulatory standards for such providers;

“(C) be designed to improve the quality of different types of child care providers and services;

“(D) describe the safety of child care facilities;

“(E) build the capacity of State early childhood programs and communities to promote parents’ and families’ understanding of the State’s early childhood system and the ratings of the programs in which the child is enrolled;

“(F) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, financial incentives and other supports designed to expand the full diversity of child care options and help child care providers improve the quality of services; and

“(G) accommodate a variety of distinctive approaches to early childhood education and care, including but not limited to, those practiced in faith-based settings, community-based settings, child-centered settings, or similar settings that offer a distinctive approach to early childhood development.

“(4) Improving the supply and quality of child care programs and services for infants and toddlers through activities, which may include—

“(A) establishing or expanding high-quality community or neighborhood-based family and child development centers, which may serve as resources to child care providers in order to improve the quality of early childhood services provided to infants and toddlers from low-income families and to help eligible child care providers improve their capacity to offer high-quality, age-appropriate care to infants and toddlers from low-income families;

“(B) establishing or expanding the operation of community or neighborhood-based family child care networks;

“(C) promoting and expanding child care providers’ ability to provide developmentally appropriate services for infants and toddlers

through training and professional development; coaching and technical assistance on this age group’s unique needs from statewide networks of qualified infant-toddler specialists; and improved coordination with early intervention specialists who provide services for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

“(D) if applicable, developing infant and toddler components within the State’s quality rating system described in paragraph (3) for child care providers for infants and toddlers, or the development of infant and toddler components in a State’s child care licensing regulations or early learning and development guidelines;

“(E) improving the ability of parents to access transparent and easy to understand consumer information about high-quality infant and toddler care; and

“(F) carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of infant and toddler care provided in the State, and for which there is evidence that the activities will lead to improved infant and toddler health and safety, infant and toddler cognitive and physical development, or infant and toddler well-being, including providing health and safety training (including training in safe sleep practices, first aid, and cardiopulmonary resuscitation) for providers and caregivers.

“(5) Establishing or expanding a statewide system of child care resource and referral services.

“(6) Facilitating compliance with State requirements for inspection, monitoring, training, and health and safety, and with State licensing standards.

“(7) Evaluating and assessing the quality and effectiveness of child care programs and services offered in the State, including evaluating how such programs positively impact children.

“(8) Supporting child care providers in the voluntary pursuit of accreditation by a national accrediting body with demonstrated, valid, and reliable program standards of high quality.

“(9) Supporting State or local efforts to develop or adopt high-quality program standards relating to health, mental health, nutrition, physical activity, and physical development.

“(10) Carrying out other activities determined by the State to improve the quality of child care services provided in the State, and for which measurement of outcomes relating to improved provider preparedness, child safety, child well-being, or entry to kindergarten is possible.

“(c) CERTIFICATION.—Beginning with fiscal year 2016, at the beginning of each fiscal year, the State shall annually submit to the Secretary a certification containing an assurance that the State was in compliance with subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year and a description of how the State used funds received under this subchapter to comply with subsection (a) during that preceding fiscal year.

“(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Each State receiving funds under this subchapter shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Secretary, which shall include information about—

“(1) the amount of funds that are reserved under subsection (a);

“(2) the activities carried out under this section; and

“(3) the measures that the State will use to evaluate the State’s progress in improving the quality of child care programs and services in the State.

“(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall offer technical assistance, in accordance with section 658I(a)(3), which may include technical assistance through the use of grants or cooperative agreements, to States for the activities described in subsection (b) at the request of the State.

“(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to regulate, direct, dictate, or place conditions (outside of what is required by this subchapter) on a State adopting specific State child care quality activities or progress in implementing those activities.”.

SEC. 7. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 658G the following:

“SEC. 658H. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds to carry out this subchapter shall have in effect—

“(1) requirements, policies, and procedures to require and conduct criminal background checks for child care staff members (including prospective child care staff members) of child care providers described in subsection (c)(1); and

“(2) licensing, regulation, and registration requirements, as applicable, that prohibit the employment of child care staff members as described in subsection (c).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A criminal background check for a child care staff member under subsection (a) shall include—

“(1) a search of the State criminal and sex offender registry or repository in the State where the child care staff member resides, and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 5 years;

“(2) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases in the State where the child care staff member resides, and each State where such staff member resided during the preceding 5 years;

“(3) a search of the National Crime Information Center;

“(4) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

“(5) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.).

“(c) PROHIBITIONS.—

“(1) CHILD CARE STAFF MEMBERS.—A child care staff member shall be ineligible for employment by a child care provider that is receiving assistance under this subchapter if such individual—

“(A) refuses to consent to the criminal background check described in subsection (b);

“(B) knowingly makes a materially false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

“(C) is registered, or is required to be registered, on a State sex offender registry or repository or the National Sex Offender Registry established under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); or

“(D) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

“(i) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

“(ii) child abuse or neglect;

“(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

“(iv) spousal abuse;

“(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

“(vi) kidnapping;

“(vii) arson;

“(viii) physical assault or battery; or

“(ix) subject to subsection (e)(4), a drug-related offense committed during the preceding 5 years; or

“(E) has been convicted of a violent misdemeanor committed as an adult against a child, including the following crimes: child abuse, child endangerment, sexual assault, or of a misdemeanor involving child pornography.

“(2) CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—A child care provider described in subsection (i)(1) shall be ineligible for assistance provided in accordance with this subchapter if the provider employs a staff member who is ineligible for employment under paragraph (1).

“(d) SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A child care provider covered by subsection (c) shall submit a request, to the appropriate State agency designated by a State, for a criminal background check described in subsection (b), for each child care staff member (including prospective child care staff members) of the provider.

“(2) STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who became a child care staff member before the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, the provider shall submit such a request—

“(A) prior to the last day described in subsection (j)(1); and

“(B) not less often than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

“(3) PROSPECTIVE STAFF MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (4), in the case of an individual who is a prospective child care staff member on or after that date of enactment, the provider shall submit such a request—

“(A) prior to the date the individual becomes a child care staff member of the provider; and

“(B) not less than once during each 5-year period following the first submission date under this paragraph for that staff member.

“(4) BACKGROUND CHECK FOR ANOTHER CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—A child care provider shall not be required to submit a request under paragraph (2) or (3) for a child care staff member if—

“(A) the staff member received a background check described in subsection (b)—

“(i) within 5 years before the latest date on which such a submission may be made; and

“(ii) while employed by or seeking employment by another child care provider within the State;

“(B) the State provided to the first provider a qualifying background check result, consistent with this subchapter, for the staff member; and

“(C) the staff member is employed by a child care provider within the State, or has been separated from employment from a child care provider within the State for a period of not more than 180 consecutive days.

“(e) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS AND APPEALS.—

“(1) BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS.—The State shall carry out the request of a child care provider for a criminal background check as expeditiously as possible, but not to exceed 45 days after the date on which such request was submitted, and shall provide the results of the criminal background check to such provider and to the current or prospective staff member.

“(2) PRIVACY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide the results of the criminal background check to the provider in a statement that indicates whether a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) is eligible or ineligible for employment described in subsection (c), without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual.

“(B) INELIGIBLE STAFF MEMBER.—If the child care staff member is ineligible for such employment due to the background check, the State will, when providing the results of the background check, include information related to each disqualifying crime, in a report to the staff member or prospective staff member.

“(C) PUBLIC RELEASE OF RESULTS.—No State shall publicly release or share the results of individual background checks, except States may release aggregated data by crime as listed under subsection (c)(1)(D) from background check results, as long as such data is not personally identifiable information.

“(3) APPEALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The State shall provide for a process by which a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) may appeal the results of a criminal background check conducted under this section to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report.

“(B) APPEALS PROCESS.—The State shall ensure that—

“(i) each child care staff member shall be given notice of the opportunity to appeal;

“(ii) a child care staff member will receive instructions about how to complete the appeals process if the child care staff member wishes to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in such member's criminal background report; and

“(iii) the appeals process is completed in a timely manner for each child care staff member.

“(4) REVIEW.—The State may allow for a review process through which the State may determine that a child care staff member (including a prospective child care staff member) disqualified for a crime specified in subsection (c)(1)(D)(ix) is eligible for employment described in subsection (c)(1), notwithstanding subsection (c). The review process shall be consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

“(5) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a private right of action if a provider has acted in accordance with this section.

“(f) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Fees that a State may charge for the costs of processing applications and administering a criminal background check as required by this section shall not exceed the actual costs to the State for the processing and administration.

“(g) TRANSPARENCY.—The State must ensure that the policies and procedures under section 658H are published on the Web site (or otherwise publicly available venue in the absence of a Web site) of the State and the Web sites of local lead agencies.

“(h) CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) DISQUALIFICATION FOR OTHER CRIMES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a State from disqualifying individuals as child care staff members based on their conviction for crimes not specifically listed in this section that bear upon the fitness of an individual to provide care for and

have responsibility for the safety and well-being of children.

“(2) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights and remedies provided for child care staff members residing in a State that disqualifies individuals as child care staff members for crimes not specifically provided for under this section.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child care provider’ means a center-based child care provider, a family child care provider, or another provider of child care services for compensation and on a regular basis that—

“(A) is not an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided; and

“(B) is licensed, regulated, or registered under State law or receives assistance provided under this subchapter; and

“(2) the term ‘child care staff member’ means an individual (other than an individual who is related to all children for whom child care services are provided)—

“(A) who is employed by a child care provider for compensation; or

“(B) whose activities involve the care or supervision of children for a child care provider or unsupervised access to children who are cared for or supervised by a child care provider.

“(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds under this subchapter shall meet the requirements of this section for the provision of criminal background checks for child care staff members described in subsection (d)(1) not later than the last day of the second full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

“(2) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may grant a State an extension of time, of not more than 1 fiscal year, to meet the requirements of this section if the State demonstrates a good faith effort to comply with the requirements of this section.

“(3) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), for any fiscal year that a State fails to comply substantially with the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the funds that would otherwise be allocated to that State in accordance with this subchapter for the following fiscal year.”.

SEC. 8. REPORTS AND INFORMATION.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 658I(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858g(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting a comma after “publish”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) provide technical assistance, such as business technical assistance, as described in section 658E(c)(2)(V), to States (which may include providing assistance on a reimbursable basis) which shall be provided by qualified experts on practices grounded in scientifically valid research, where appropriate, to carry out this subchapter;”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) disseminate, for voluntary informational purposes, information on practices that scientifically valid research indicates are most successful in improving the quality of programs that receive assistance with this subchapter; and

“(5) after consultation with the heads of any other Federal agencies involved, issue guidance and disseminate information on

best practices regarding the use of funding combined by States as described in section 658E(c)(2)(O)(ii), consistent with laws other than this subchapter.”.

(b) REQUEST FOR RELIEF.—Section 658I of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858g), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end of the following:

“(c) REQUEST FOR RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may waive for a period of not more than three years any provision under this subchapter or sanctions imposed upon a State in accordance with subsection (b)(2) upon the State’s request for such a waiver if the Secretary finds that—

“(A) the request describes one or more conflicting or duplicative requirements preventing the effective delivery of child care services to justify a waiver, extraordinary circumstances, such as natural disaster or financial crisis, or an extended period of time for a State legislature to enact legislation to implement the provisions of this subchapter;

“(B) such circumstances included in the request prevent the State from complying with any statutory or regulatory requirements of this subchapter;

“(C) the waiver will, by itself, contribute to or enhance the State’s ability to carry out the purposes of this subchapter; and,

“(D) the waiver will not contribute to inconsistency with the objectives of this law.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Such request shall be provided to the Secretary in writing and will—

“(A) detail each sanction or provision within this subchapter that the State seeks relief from;

“(B) describe how a waiver from that sanction or provision of this subchapter will, by itself, improve delivery of child care services for children in the State; and

“(C) certify that the health, safety, and well-being of children served through assistance received under this subchapter will not be compromised as a result of the waiver.

“(3) APPROVAL.—Within 90 days after the receipt of a State’s request under this subsection, the Secretary shall inform the State of approval or disapproval of the request. If the plan is disapproved, the Secretary shall, at this time, inform the State, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate of the reasons for the disapproval and give the State the opportunity to amend the request. In the case of approval, the Secretary shall, within 30 days of granting such waiver, notify and submit a report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate on the circumstances of the waiver including each specific sanction or provision waived, the reason as given by the State of the need for a waiver, and the expected impact of the waiver on children served under this program.

“(4) EXTERNAL CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall not require or impose any new or additional requirements in exchange for receipt of a waiver if such requirements are not specified in this subchapter.

“(5) DURATION.—The Secretary may approve a request under this subsection for a period not to exceed three years, unless a renewal is granted under paragraph (7).

“(6) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate approval of a request for a waiver authorized under this subsection if the Secretary determines, after notice and oppor-

tunity for a hearing, that the performance of a State granted relief under this subsection has been inadequate, or if such relief is no longer necessary to achieve its original purposes.

“(7) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may approve or disapprove a request from a State for renewal of an existing waiver under this subchapter for a period no longer than one year. A State seeking to renew their waiver approval must inform the Secretary of this intent no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date of the waiver. The State shall recertify in its extension request the provisions in paragraph (2) of this subchapter, and shall also explain the need for additional time of relief from such sanction(s) or provisions approved under this law as provided in this subchapter.

“(8) RESTRICTIONS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as providing the Secretary the authority to permit States to alter the eligibility requirements for eligible children, including work requirements, job training, or educational program participation, that apply to the parents of eligible children under this subchapter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to waive anything related to his or her authority under this subchapter.”.

(c) REPORTS.—Section 658K(a) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) in clause (ix), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (x), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(xi) whether the children receiving assistance under this subchapter are homeless children;”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “December 31, 1997” and all that follows through “thereafter”, and inserting “1 year after the date of the enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, and annually thereafter;”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 658P(5)” and inserting “section 658P(6)”;

(C) in subparagraph (E) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) the number of child fatalities occurring among children while in the care and facility of child care providers receiving assistance under this subchapter, listed by type of child care provider and indicating whether the providers (excluding child care providers described in section 658P(6)(B)) are licensed or license-exempt.”.

(d) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Section 658L of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858j) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“SEC. 658L. REPORTS, HOTLINE, AND WEB SITE.”;

(2) by striking “Not later” and inserting the following:

“(a) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later”;

(3) by striking “1998” and inserting “2016”;

(4) by striking “to the Committee” and all that follows through “of the Senate” and inserting “to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate”;

(5) by inserting after “States.” the following:

“Such report shall contain a determination around whether each State that uses amounts provided under this subchapter has

complied with the priority for services described in sections 658E(c)(2)(Q) and 658E(c)(3)(B)."; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, directly or through the use of grants or contracts, a national toll-free hotline and Web site, to—

"(A) develop and disseminate publicly available child care consumer education information for parents and help parents access safe and quality child care services in their community, with a range of price options, that best suits their family's needs; and

"(B) to allow persons to report (anonymously if desired) suspected child abuse or neglect, or violations of health and safety requirements, by an eligible child care provider that receives assistance under this subchapter or a member of the provider's staff.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the hotline and Web site meet the following requirements:

"(A) REFERRAL TO LOCAL CHILD CARE PROVIDERS.—The Web site shall be hosted by 'childcare.gov'. The Web site shall enable a child care consumer to enter a zip code and obtain a referral to local child care providers described in subparagraph (B) within a specified search radius.

"(B) INFORMATION.—The Web site shall provide to consumers, directly or through linkages to State databases, at a minimum—

"(i) a localized list of all eligible child care providers, differentiating between licensed and license-exempt providers;

"(ii) any provider-specific information from a Quality Rating and Improvement System or information about other quality indicators, to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

"(iii) any other provider-specific information about compliance with licensing, and health and safety requirements to the extent the information is publicly available and to the extent practicable;

"(iv) referrals to local resource and referral organizations from which consumers can find more information about child care providers; and

"(v) State information about child care subsidy programs and other financial supports available to families.

"(C) NATIONWIDE CAPACITY.—The Web site and hotline shall have the capacity to help families in every State and community in the Nation.

"(D) INFORMATION AT ALL HOURS.—The Web site shall provide, to parents and families, access to information about child care services 24 hours a day.

"(E) SERVICES IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure the widest possible access to services for families who speak languages other than English.

"(F) HIGH-QUALITY CONSUMER EDUCATION AND REFERRAL.—The Web site and hotline shall ensure that families have access to easy-to-understand child care consumer education and referral services.

"(3) PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to compel States to provide additional data and information that is currently (as of the date of enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014) not publicly available, or is not required by this subchapter, unless such additional data are related to the purposes and scope of this subchapter, and are subject to

a notice and comment period of no less than 90 days."

(e) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 658K(a)(1) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858i(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) PROHIBITION.—Reports submitted to the Secretary under subparagraph (C) shall not contain personally identifiable information."

SEC. 9. RESERVATION FOR TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE; PAYMENTS TO BENEFIT INDIAN CHILDREN; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND EVALUATION.

Section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary";

(ii) by striking "1 percent, and not more than 2 percent," and inserting "2 percent"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall only reserve an amount that is greater than 2 percent of the amount appropriated under section 658B, for payments described in subparagraph (A), for a fiscal year (referred to in this subparagraph as the 'reservation year') if—

"(i) the amount appropriated under section 658B for the reservation year is greater than the amount appropriated under section 658B for fiscal year 2014; and

"(ii) the Secretary ensures that the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for the reservation year is not less than the amount allotted to States under subsection (b) for fiscal year 2014.""; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) NATIONAL TOLL-FREE HOTLINE AND WEB SITE.—The Secretary shall reserve up to \$1,500,000 of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year for the operation of a national toll-free hotline and Web site, under section 658L(b).

"(4) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall reserve up to ½ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year to support technical assistance and dissemination activities under paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 658I(a).

"(5) RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary may reserve ½ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under this subchapter for each fiscal year to conduct research and demonstration activities, as well as periodic external, independent evaluations of the impact of the program described by this subchapter on increasing access to child care services and improving the safety and quality of child care services, using scientifically valid research methodologies, and to disseminate the key findings of those evaluations widely and on a timely basis.""; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

"(D) LICENSING AND STANDARDS.—In lieu of any licensing and regulatory requirements applicable under State or local law, the Secretary, in consultation with Indian tribes and tribal organizations, shall develop minimum child care standards that shall be applicable to Indian tribes and tribal organizations receiving assistance under this subchapter. Such standards shall appropriately reflect Indian tribe and tribal organization needs and available resources, and shall in-

clude standards requiring a publicly available application, health and safety standards, and standards requiring a reservation of funds for activities to improve the quality of child care services provided to Indian children.""; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

"(C) LIMITATION.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may not permit an Indian tribe or tribal organization to use amounts provided under this subsection for construction or renovation if the use will result in a decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization as compared to the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization in the fiscal year preceding the year for which the determination under subparagraph (B) is being made.

"(ii) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive the limitation described in clause (i) if—

"(I) the Secretary determines that the decrease in the level of child care services provided by the Indian tribe or tribal organization is temporary; and

"(II) the Indian tribe or tribal organization submits to the Secretary a plan that demonstrates that after the date on which the construction or renovation is completed—

"(aa) the level of child care services will increase; or

"(bb) the quality of child care services will improve."";

SEC. 10. DEFINITIONS.

Section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

"(3) CHILD WITH A DISABILITY.—The term 'child with a disability' means—

"(A) a child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401);

"(B) a child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

"(C) a child who is less than 13 years of age and who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794); and

"(D) a child with a disability, as defined by the State involved.

"(4) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—The term 'eligible child' means an individual—

"(A) who is less than 13 years of age;

"(B) whose family income does not exceed 85 percent of the State median income for a family of the same size, and whose family assets do not exceed \$1,000,000 (as certified by a member of such family); and

"(C) who—

"(i) resides with a parent or parents who are working or attending a job training or educational program; or

"(ii) is receiving, or needs to receive, protective services and resides with a parent or parents not described in clause (i).";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

"(5) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term 'English learner' means an individual who is limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) or section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832).";

(4) in paragraph (6)(A), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “section 658E(c)(2)(E)” and inserting “section 658E(c)(2)(F)”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “section 658E(c)(2)(F)” and inserting “section 658E(c)(2)(I)”;

(5) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “designated” and all that follows and inserting “designated or established under section 658D(a).”;

(6) in paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by inserting “, foster parent,” after “guardian”;

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (14) as paragraphs (12) through (15), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (10), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(11) SCIENTIFICALLY VALID RESEARCH.—The term ‘scientifically valid research’ includes applied research, basic research, and field-initiated research, for which the rationale, design, and interpretation are soundly developed in accordance with principles of scientific research.”.

SEC. 11. PARENTAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 658Q of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858o) is amended—

(1) by inserting before “Nothing” the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PARENTAL RIGHTS TO USE CHILD CARE CERTIFICATES.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed in a manner—

“(1) to favor or promote the use of grants and contracts for the receipt of child care services under this subchapter over the use of child care certificates; or

“(2) to disfavor or discourage the use of such certificates for the purchase of child care services, including those services provided by private or nonprofit entities, such as faith-based providers.”.

SEC. 12. STUDIES ON WAITING LISTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct studies to determine, for each State, the number of families that—

(1) are eligible to receive assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.);

(2) have applied for the assistance, identified by the type of assistance requested; and

(3) have been placed on a waiting list for the assistance.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall prepare a report containing the results of each study and shall submit the report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives—

(1) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) every 2 years thereafter.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n).

SEC. 13. REVIEW OF FEDERAL EARLY LEARNING AND CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the Secretary of Education, shall conduct an interdepartmental review of all early learning and care programs for children less than 6 years of age in order to—

(1) develop a plan for the elimination of overlapping programs, as identified by the Government Accountability Office’s 2012 annual report (GAO-12-342SP); and

(2) make recommendations to Congress for streamlining all such programs.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the heads of all Federal agencies that administer Federal early learning and care programs, shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a detailed report that outlines the efficiencies that can be achieved by, as well as specific recommendations for, eliminating overlap and fragmentation among all Federal early learning and care programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1086.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1086, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, across the country countless men and women are trying to build a better life for their families. Some are working more for less in order to make ends meet; others are pursuing a degree at a local university or improving their skills at a nearby community college.

Whether going to work or school, most parents face a difficult question: Who will care for my child? Is there a trusted child care provider who will keep my son or daughter safe? And if there is, can I afford it?

For nearly two decades, the Child Care and Development Block Grant program has helped low-income families answer these tough questions. The program funds State efforts to provide vulnerable families access to child care. Parents receive assistance in the form of a voucher or certificate to pay the child care provider of their choice.

Approximately 1.5 million children under the age of 13 are in a child care arrangement funded through the program, including over 25,000 children in my home State of Minnesota. It is a vital safety net for moms and dads trying to lift their families out of poverty.

At a hearing held earlier this year, one witness told the story of a woman named Rita. Speaking of the Child Care and Development Block Grant program, Rita said: “These Federal investments were quite a serious lifeline for me. I know where I came from, and I do not want to go back.”

Rita’s experience is shared by many Americans. Yet despite the importance of the program, it has been almost 20 years since Congress reformed the law. As with any Federal program left on autopilot, problems will emerge, and this program is no different.

Poor coordination across related services and a lack of information make it difficult for parents looking for the best provider to know the full range of options. Perhaps most troubling, a patchwork of State licensing, monitoring, and related safety requirements means some children aren’t protected like they should be.

These families deserve better, which is why I am proud to support this important legislation. The bill before us includes a number of commonsense reforms that will strengthen the program and our support of these at-risk families.

For example, the legislation requires all participating child care providers to undergo, at a minimum, an annual inspection to ensure compliance with health, safety, and fire standards. The bill enhances existing training for providers and their workers; so every child is under the care of a well-trained professional.

The legislation also reins in the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prevent this and future administrations from writing onerous rules that would limit access to this important service.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go before every American enjoys the opportunity and prosperity they and their family deserve. By supporting this bipartisan legislation, we have a chance to help these families succeed and set their children on the path to a bright future.

Before closing, I would like to recognize a number of my colleagues who helped make this legislative achievement possible, including Senators TOM HARKIN and LAMAR ALEXANDER, the chairman and senior Republican on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

I would also like to thank the senior Democrat on the Education and the Workforce Committee, GEORGE MILLER, and Representatives TODD ROKITA and DAVID LOEBACK.

Last, but certainly not least, Senators RICHARD BURR and BARBARA MIKULSKI laid the foundation for the bipartisan, bicameral agreement we are discussing today, and we are all grateful for their years of dedication to this really important issue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we would not be here today were it not for the hard work and dedication of our staff. I wish time permitted an opportunity to recognize each and every one of them. We are forever grateful for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to pass S. 1086, as amended. This bill represents a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant, or CCDBG, which is the largest funding source for child care programs. It has been almost 20 years since this CCDBG was reauthorized, and working families and young children should not have to wait any longer.

This block grant provides Federal resources to States to help low-income families pay for child care while a parent works or is in an educational or job training program. This program supports self-sufficiency and promotes workforce stability.

Just as important, this funding offers children vital early learning experiences that set them on a path toward success in school, in the workforce, and the rest of their lives. However, the current law, besides being outdated, has some limitations in ensuring low-income children access to this important program.

For example, the law currently has very few specific requirements on the quality of child care, and States have significant latitude to set quality standards. This results in a great deal of low-quality child care being funded. Recent research has found that about only one-third of child care programs funded by the block grant is actually of good quality.

□ 1645

Access is another concern. Only one in six children eligible for the program is actually enrolled.

This reauthorization seeks to address these problems by improving child care access, making critical new investments, and helping to ensure that children are safe and receive quality care.

For example, this bill increases the number of funds that States must spend on activities to improve the quality of child care, including care for infants and toddlers. It also requires States to conduct a statewide assessment of their needs for quality improvement and to align their quality initiatives with the results of that assessment.

The bill provides States with nearly a dozen proven initiatives that they can deploy to improve quality, ranging from training and professional development to quality rating systems and health and nutrition policies.

The bill also adds State requirements on training and professional development for child care providers, for child-to-staff ratios, annual inspections for providers that receive Federal assistance, coordination with other federally funded early childhood programs, the development and maintenance of early learning and development guidelines,

and background checks to keep violent and sexual offenders away from our Nation's children.

This bill expands the requirements for health and safety, and consumer education, including funding for a toll free hotline and a Web site to report suspected child abuse or safety violations.

This legislation also improves access to care by expanding the eligibility of participating families to at least a year, regardless of changes in their income or work schedules or training or educational status. It prioritizes services for families with the lowest incomes. It eases enrollment requirements for homeless children. It helps families connect with quality programs and reduces expulsions from early childhood learning programs by training providers about positive behavior supports and interventions with young children. Finally, it enhances the transparency of the cost of care.

This important legislative update to the CCDBG is long overdue. Improvements made by this legislation are critical for millions of children and their families, and for the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the chairwoman of the Republican Conference and a member of our leadership team.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the ranking members, and everyone on both sides for their tremendous work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, right before the August recess the Republican women of the House joined together to highlight a family empowerment package, of which this bill is a critical piece, and I am proud to stand here and say that we are passing another bill in that agenda that empowers women and families.

Women now make up nearly half of our workforce, and in many cases they are the primary breadwinners and the heads of their households. Yet so many of our labor laws and workplace laws were written at a different time—at a time when very few women worked. As moms and dads are seeking their way to get back to where they were after a stagnant economic time, work and job training programs are so important. Moms and dads across the country are still worried about paying their bills, affording the costs needed at home, and securing their kids' futures. They need help, and that is what this bill does.

It empowers and supports families who are seeking better lives for their families. It allows them peace of mind about their children's safety and well-being while they are at work, allowing parents to focus on securing a better future. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Chairman KLINE's amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 1086.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant, or the CCDBG, is an indispensable resource for millions of children and families nationwide. This enables parents to send their kids to safe, high-quality, and affordable child care so they can work or attend training programs or provide for their families. Meanwhile, the program helps place children in the sorts of environments they need for healthy growth and development.

However, it has been almost 20 years since last we updated this program. In that time, we have learned that we need to do more to ensure that children receive high-quality care in safe settings. That is why this vote is so very important. That is why I am so pleased to have reached bipartisan-bicameral consensus on this legislation.

I would like to thank all of the organizations for their support of this legislation in the process of finalizing this legislation, which has been done over the last several weeks. This bill is not on suspension because it is unimportant; it is on suspension because we recognize the urgency of getting this done this year, and we also recognize a growing national bipartisan consensus about the value of children being placed in high-quality, safe environments during their early learning years.

I would like to include letters from the following organizations: Save the Children; Child Care Aware of America; the National Women's Law Center; the Center For Law and Social Policy; Zero to Three; the Early Care and Education Consortium; the National Association for the Education of Young Children; the Children's Defense Fund; the National Education Association; and the American Federation of Teachers.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.6 million members of the American Federation of Teachers—including approximately 90,000 early childhood education professionals who work in diverse settings, such as preschool classrooms, family child care, child care centers, Head Start and Early Head Start—I urge you to support, as amended, S. 1086, the bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

The CCDBG helps low-income parents pay for child care so they can work or pursue an education. S. 1086 guarantees a family's child care eligibility for at least 12 months, regardless of any fluctuation in income, job or education. This offers a vital lifeline and a

path to the middle class for millions of families across the nation.

It has been nearly 20 years since the CCDBG was last reauthorized. Since that time, early childhood education and child care programs have been transformed by research on child development. This bill reflects the advancement of this knowledge and will truly modernize the program.

S. 1086 brings child care standards into this century by focusing on the health and safety of children, and by giving parents more confidence that their child is being well cared for while they are at work or school. In addition, the bill ensures our youngest and most vulnerable are safe by making inspections annual and requiring that all providers and employees obtain background checks and training before they care for children. S. 1086 also makes all this information more transparent and available to the public, especially to parents and family members.

This bill acknowledges that a component of a high-quality child care program includes having a workforce that is well-prepared and well-trained. This bill requires states to establish a professional development progression and dedicate more funding for training, professional development and advancement of the child care workforce. In particular, the bill, as amended, also addresses the latest data on expulsions from early education programs by requiring that part of the staff training focuses on child behavioral supports. The training and professional development requirements not only will benefit educators and staff working in child care, but also will have lasting, positive effects for the children in their care and those children's families.

However, while this bill is a significant first step toward providing every child in our nation with a high-quality early learning and care program, we know we can't do it right on the cheap. Without the necessary federal resources to implement these important health and safety standards and trainings, states either will be unable to increase the quality of child care and education or will simply have to cut access to high-quality child care to children and families that need it the most. States should not have to choose between quality and access. We look forward to working with Congress to pass this legislation and secure the resources needed for its successful implementation.

Finally, we are equally committed to partnering with Congress to expand high-quality early education for all children from birth to kindergarten.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter. The AFT urges you to vote yes when S. 1086 comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

—
SAVE THE CHILDREN,
September 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of Save the Children, the leading independent organization dedicated to creating real and lasting change in the lives of children in need in the United States and around the world, we are proud to support your efforts to improve the safety, health and quality of child care through the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. As you well know, Save the Chil-

dren has dedicated nearly a century of service in America to helping children affected by disasters. And we have valued our tremendous partnership with you to make sure children's safety in emergencies remains a priority—particularly in the child care setting.

We support the proposed CCDBG improvements focused on safety, health and quality improvements. In particular, with 69 million children separated from their parents every work day, we support and commend your inclusion of the disaster preparedness section and disaster plan components §5(u)(iii) which are in line with the recommendations from the National Commission on Children and Disasters which serve as the basis for Save the Children's annual report card on children and disasters, now in its seventh year.

We applaud your leadership on keeping children safe in emergencies and thank you for all you have done and continue to do to create lasting positive change in the lives of children.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BLAND,
*National Director, Policy & Advocacy,
U.S. Programs, Save the Children.*

—
CHILD CARE AWARE® OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BURR,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. TODD ROKITA,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVE LOEBSACK,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN, RANKING MEMBER ALEXANDER, SENATOR MIKULSKI, AND SENATOR BURR, CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE ROKITA, AND REPRESENTATIVE LOEBSACK: I am writing on behalf of Child Care Aware® of America (formerly the National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies, NACCRRA) to express support for your legislation, the Child Care & Development Block Grant Act of 2014, which would reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant and would better protect the health and improve safety of children in child care settings across America.

Families want their children to be safe in child care. They reasonably assume that a child care license means the state has approved some minimum level of protection for children and that the program will promote their healthy development. Our nationwide polling shows that parents also believe there is oversight by the state. However, most state licensing requirements are weak and oversight is weaker.

For over 15 years, reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant has been Child Care Aware® of America's top leg-

islative priority and we have been working on both the federal and state levels to improve the quality of child care.

Child Care Aware® of America has issued seven licensing studies that show state laws regarding child care settings vary greatly. The most recent report, *We Can Do Better: 2013 Update*, scored and ranked the states on their child care center program requirements and oversight policies. The average score was 92 out of a total possible score of 150—for a grade of 61 percent.

Children's early years are proven to be the most impactful time to create strong learners. This reauthorization bill is a huge step to move the nation forward ensuring children are safe and receiving the best early learning experiences while in child care. This bill sets the standard all families expect for their children by requiring providers to undergo comprehensive background checks, annual and pre-licensure inspections, and training.

This bill includes significant measures to improve the quality of child care and ensure that all children in child care settings are safe.

Child Care Aware® of America looks forward to working with you to pass this legislation into law. Thank you for your continued leadership in support of our nation's children.

Sincerely,

LYNETTE M. FRAGA, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

L. CAROL SCOTT, PH.D.,
President, Board of Directors.

MICHELLE NOTH
MCREADY,
Director of Policy.

NICHOLAS P. VUCIC,
Senior Government Affairs Associate.

—
CHILD CARE AWARE OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: As Executive Director of Child Care Aware of Virginia, a nonprofit statewide child care resource and referral network, I am writing to thank you and to express full support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

As an organization that works every day to assist parents in finding child care and to assist child care providers in offering quality child care settings, I see first-hand both the demand for and the need for quality child care. Over Labor Day weekend, the Washington Post ran several stories about the deaths of 60 children in child care in Virginia, 43 in unlicensed care over the past several years. When any child dies it is certainly a tragedy, but it is a double tragedy when you know that the deaths could be prevented by better training for child care providers and more oversight from states.

The bicameral, bipartisan, Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act will combine important safety protections for children in child care with more accountability for the expenditure of public dollars.

I commend your leadership and the efforts of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack as well as the leadership of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee for setting aside

partisan politics and reaching agreement on CCDBG reauthorization to ensure that children are safe in child care. Parents want quality child care. The reauthorization bill is the right policy to both ensure children's safety and strengthen the quality of the workforce.

Choices among quality child care settings is critical for working parents. This legislation is an important milestone in support of working families. Thank you for all that you do in support of working families with children.

Sincerely,

SHARON VEATCH,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER MILLER: The National Women's Law Center is pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives is moving forward with the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. Your leadership has resulted in a reauthorization bill that would improve the safety, quality, and accessibility of child care and after-school care for children from birth to age 13. High-quality, well-funded child care helps families work and children learn—both of which are important goals for the nation.

Since the last reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant in 1996, we have learned much about how to improve the quality of child care and after-school care and how to make child care assistance more accessible to families. Research on the importance of quality has spurred greater efforts to support providers in promoting children's positive development from birth. State initiatives have shown ways to encourage quality improvements through incentives and well-designed reimbursement policies. This bill incorporates these lessons from the research and state innovations in an effort to better protect the health and safety of children in care, improve the quality of care overall and for infants and toddlers in particular, facilitate children and families' sustained access to help in paying for care and more stable child care arrangements, and support providers serving families receiving child care assistance.

We strongly support the goals of this legislation. We will work with you to obtain the funding needed to make these improvements and to allow more children to benefit from these improvements. Between 2006 and 2012, 260,000 fewer eligible children received assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. In addition, most states' payment rates for child care providers are too low to support high-quality care. To reverse the decline in children served and to successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we urge Congress to increase mandatory and discretionary child care funding.

Thank you for all your work on this reauthorization, which is so important for our country's children and families.

Sincerely,

HELEN BLANK,
Director of Child Care
and Early Learning.

JOAN ENTMACHER,
Vice President for
Family Economic Security.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana

(Mr. ROKITA), the chairman of the Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Mr. ROKITA. Thank you, Chairman KLINE, for your leadership on this issue.

I also want to thank Ranking Member MILLER, Ranking Member LOEBACK, our colleagues across the rotunda, and, of course, the staff, who put so much effort into this pro-work, pro-family bill today.

Mr. Speaker, the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program is an example of what both parties and Houses of Congress can do when we are working together to find commonsense solutions to national issues.

I came to Congress to help all people build better lives for themselves and their families, and now, here with this bill, on this floor today, we get a chance to do that. We work together to protect children's early development and safety, as well as their parents' employment, by preserving State control over a Federal program that serves over a million and a half young Americans. This agreement prevents the administration from imposing early learning guidelines on our States, and it also limits the collection of unnecessary data on our children. At the same time, we have strengthened oversight and accountability at multiple levels of government.

Early childhood care quality will improve because we are enhancing families' access to provider information while maintaining choice of provider. Families can choose between public and private providers, including religious providers. They can choose larger institutional settings or smaller, or even in-home operations.

As a Member of Congress and as a parent, I know that parents, not the Federal Government, are best positioned to choose child care providers, and this legislation ensures parents will have power over Federal bureaucracies, which are no substitute for a family. We are holding providers to strict safety standards, making sure child care professionals have the most up-to-date training. Parents who must either be working or seeking employment in order to take advantages of this program will have better information to guide their decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly didn't learn about these improvements before working on the legislation from the ether. The day nursery in Avon, Indiana, was one of my first stops, and we were able to incorporate a lot of what we learned that day and every day after in our work and into this bill.

I thank those whom I met with in the Fourth District of Indiana, where com-

monsense solutions are part of everyday life, for their help in getting this legislation and the content of it crafted.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, it is not only my duty to vote for good legislation but for results. Mr. Speaker, I am simply here today to ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation because it will get results. It is one of the things that we can do around here in a bipartisan-bicameral way to show the American people that we are worth our paychecks.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I held a policy panel on Women's Economic Equality in my district, and when the audience was asked how many of you have worried about the cost of child care, nearly every hand shot up in the air.

While the skyrocketing cost of quality child care in Massachusetts is among the most expensive in the country, with an average annual cost above \$16,000, the problem is not limited to my home State. Across our country, millions of American families report child care as their highest expense—higher than rent or a college education for their children. Without a doubt, the cost of quality child care is now one of the biggest barriers to economic success facing women and families.

Knowing how critical child care is to American families, I am so heartened to see the House take action to reauthorize the Child Care Development Block Grant program, which provides grants to States to offer quality child care that is accessible to low- and moderate-income families. I am grateful that the quality child care provisions of my bill, the Infant and Toddler Care Improvement Act, have been incorporated into this reauthorization.

As a working mom of three, I understand that parents want nothing more than when their children are in child care they are happy, learning, safe, and healthy. Millions of moms and dads across the country, however, are faced with impossible choices because of the lack of access to quality child care. More than 6 million children under the age of 3 are in care of someone other than their parents each week, and 46 percent of the children under 3 live in low-income families.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant and the quality provisions of the Infant and Toddler Care Improvement Act offer a vital lifeline and a path to the middle class for millions of families across the Nation. It is a necessary step towards true economic equality for women, and it gives our kids a great start.

Today's compromised bill is a strong first step, and I look forward to working together to strengthen access to quality child care. This vote is not controversial, nor is it partisan. It is a win for American families. I urge my colleagues to support the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014, S. 1086, as amended, and I submit for the RECORD some support letters.

CLASP,
September 12, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KLINE AND REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) is pleased that the House is considering the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) seeks to improve the lives of low-income people by advocating for policies that deliver results that matter.

Child care assistance is an essential work support for low-income parents who struggle to find and keep employment to provide for their families. The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) is unique among many federal programs in that its two-generation focus has the ability to support both parents' economic success and children's healthy development.

The CCDBG Act of 2014 is an important step forward for improving the health and safety of child care. It also would make crucial improvements to the program that would allow children to have more sustained access to child care assistance, which helps parents stay in their jobs and move up and supports children's development by providing more continuity in their child care arrangement. The Act seeks to improve the quality of child care overall, with a particular focus on infants and toddlers. Quality infant-toddler child care is rare and particularly out of reach for low-income families. Given the robust body of research on the importance of the earliest years of life for children's growth and success, CLASP supports this effort to improve the quality and availability of infant-toddler care.

While we are pleased to lend our support to this legislation, we note that increasing resources for child care must also be a top Congressional priority. Our most recent analysis shows spending on child care assistance at a 10-year low. Insufficient federal funds have led states to make reductions in their child care programs, with the number of children served falling to a 14-year low. States will need additional resources to meet the goals of the legislation and to ensure that low-income families are able to retain access to this vital program. Expanding economic opportunity for low-income adults today and strengthening the foundation for their children's success in school and in life are worthy investments.

Thank you for your efforts in moving forward this important, bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

OLIVIA GOLDEN,
Executive Director.

ZERO TO THREE, NATIONAL CENTER
FOR INFANTS, TODDLERS, AND
FAMILIES,

September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and the
Workforce, Washington, DC.*

Hon. TODD ROKITA,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Early Childhood,
Elementary, and Secondary Education,
Committee on Education and the Workforce,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Education and
the Workforce, Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAVID LOEBSACK,
*Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Early Child-
hood, Elementary, and Secondary Edu-
cation, Committee on Education and the
Workforce, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEMBER MILLER, CHAIRMAN ROKITA, AND RANKING MEMBER LOEBSACK: ZERO TO THREE appreciates your leadership in forging a bipartisan agreement that will allow the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 to move forward in the House of Representatives and be enacted before the end of the 113th Congress. Your efforts will have a positive impact on a program critical not only to working parents but to the 6 million infants and toddlers who currently spend some portion of their days in child care.

I commend you for the attention paid to ensuring the health and safety of young children in child care as well as to improving providers' ability to support positive development of the children in their care. We know from research that the quality of child care—whether excellent or poor—is influential in shaping early brain development.

ZERO TO THREE lauds your inclusion of a statutory funding set-aside specifically directed toward improving the quality of care for infants and toddlers. Creating these targeted resources explicitly recognizes what we have long known: the first three years of life are of critical importance to preparing children for success in school and in life. Many of the infants and toddlers in families receiving child care subsidies are the same ones we speak of having a "word gap" and development undermined by toxic stress. High-quality care can help them overcome these obstacles. The set-aside will be a clear signal to states that quality services for infants and toddlers are an essential part of the early learning continuum needed to prevent children from falling behind long before they reach prekindergarten age.

ZERO TO THREE strongly supports the goals of this legislation to increase oversight, safety assurances, and quality initiatives for child care programs. To help realize the improvements in this bill, and in order to build the early learning system necessary to put our children on the path to school readiness, starting from birth, a greater infusion of resources is needed. As the real purchasing power of child care funding has eroded over the past few years, many fewer children have been served and provider payments have fallen to such levels that, in most states, high-quality care is largely out of reach of families whose children could most benefit.

We urge you to work with your colleagues in Congress to fulfill the promise of this bipartisan agreement by making additional investments in child care through both the annual appropriations process and through mandatory funding streams in order to provide stability in meeting the needs of the na-

tion's families today and in the years to come.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW MELMED,
Executive Director, ZERO TO THREE.

EARLY CARE AND
EDUCATION CONSORTIUM,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Representative JOHN KLINE,
Washington, DC.

Representative TODD ROKITA,
Washington, DC.

Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Washington, DC.

Senator TOM HARKIN,
Washington, DC.

Representative GEORGE MILLER,
Washington, DC.

Representative DAVID LOEBSACK,
Washington, DC.

Senator RICHARD BURR,
Washington, DC.

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES KLINE, MILLER, ROKITA, AND LOEBSACK, AND SENATORS MIKULSKI, BURR, HARKIN AND ALEXANDER, The Early Care and Education Consortium (ECEC) strongly supports the reauthorization of S. 1086, the Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDBG). We thank you for your leadership in this bipartisan effort to reauthorize the Act. Reauthorizing CCDBG this year will allow states to allocate increased FY2014 funding to improve access to high-quality early care and education programs for low-income children and families.

High-quality care and learning programs provide opportunities for healthy growth and development that produce positive educational achievement and high economic returns on investment through adulthood. Additionally, CCDBG serves as essential support to working families who need to ensure their children are cared for and learning in a safe and high-quality setting during parents' hours of employment, which often exceed the regular school day and extend into the evening.

As the nation's leading trade association of high-quality, non-profit and tax-paying, licensed child care centers, state child care associations, and educational services organizations, ECEC members share a commitment to high quality, meeting the needs of children from infants through school age, and supporting working families in communities across the country. Representing the voice of more than 8,200 centers operating in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, ECEC is also the largest organized alliance of licensed child care centers in the country. A substantial proportion of the children served by ECEC providers are able to access high-quality care because of the support of CCDBG subsidy dollars.

CCDBG has not been reauthorized since 1996. We strongly urge Congressional action to enact important reforms that will directly address quality improvement, affordability, continuity of care, and cost stabilization measures that will benefit families and support providers, including:

Stronger health and safety standards for all child care programs that receive federal funding, including required annual inspections of all licensed providers, and annual fire, health and safety inspections of license-exempt, non-family providers.

Technical assistance given to providers on effective business practices;

De-linking provider reimbursement from absence policies that destabilize the cost of care for both families and providers;

Extended subsidy eligibility redetermination periods (12 months);

A new emphasis on technical assistance to providers around effective business practices, and

Increased investment in program quality, with additional activities that include wage incentives, tiered reimbursement, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, accreditation, and focus on school readiness.

Additionally, this bill will help ensure that low income families can access high quality care by benefitting from a mixed delivery model, and choosing high-quality options within their own community.

We thank you for your leadership in this bipartisan effort to reauthorize the Act, which provides a critical pathway to the middle class for serving as a highly productive workforce of today and the becoming the prepared and productive workforce of tomorrow.

Sincerely,

M.-A. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

EARLY LEARNING POLICY GROUP, LLC,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President of the Early Learning Policy Group, I am writing to express my strong support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

The reality of today's economy is that working parents depend on child care in order to support their families. Nearly 11 million children under age 5 with working mothers spend time every week in some type of child care setting. Families, regardless of income, have trouble finding quality child care.

Child care policies vary greatly by state and until this legislation, there were no minimum health and safety protections for children. The CCDBG Reauthorization Act is truly historic. For the first time, federal policy will support the safety of children in child care by ensuring that licensed providers and those receiving a subsidy to care for low income children will be subject to a comprehensive background check, that programs will be inspected at least once a year, and that parents will have choices among quality settings through a stronger child care workforce and greater focus on activities that improve the quality of child care.

Children should be safe in child care. Parents should feel comfortable that when they choose child care for their children, providers have the training they need to offer settings that will promote the healthy development of children. The federal government should expect accountability from states that set child care policy so that federal money is not used to support unsafe or potentially harmful settings for low income children.

I wholeheartedly commend your efforts and dedication as well as the efforts of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack along with the efforts of the Senate HELP Committee leadership—Chairman Tom Harkin, Senator Lamar Alexander, Senator Barbara Mikulski, and Senator Richard Burr, for putting aside partisan ideology and politics to agree to common sense public policy improvements to support working families who need child care.

The CCDBG Reauthorization Act is a historic policy marker to enable parents to

have quality child care choices in their community. Thank you for supporting working families with children.

Sincerely,

GRACE REEF,
President, Early Learning Policy Group, LLC.

KNOWLEDGE UNIVERSE,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education & the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE: Knowledge Universe enthusiastically offers its support for The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 (S. 1086). The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) plays a critical role in ensuring working parents have access to a quality provider of their choice.

Knowledge Universe is honored to provide high-quality education and care to over 150,000 children across the United States who range in age from six weeks to 12 years of age. We are proud of the diverse group of children whom we serve. Approximately one-third of our children are from low-income working families who receive assistance under CCDBG. The core focus of Knowledge Universe is the quality of each child's educational experience. When parents choose our KinderCare centers, in addition to wanting their child to be safe and well-cared for, they also expect their child to receive the highest-quality educational experience possible.

In the almost two decades since Congress last reauthorized CCDBG, we as a nation have learned much more about the importance of health and safety and quality educational programming, especially for low-income children. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 makes important changes to the current CCDBG statute that support quality improvements in the early developmental and educational experiences children will receive through the program.

One of the most important changes The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 makes to current law relates to continuity of care. For children of low-income working families, the 12-month determination period for eligibility will serve as a critical element for ensuring greater consistency and better kindergarten readiness outcomes. Further, the legislation's health and safety standards requiring all programs, including those that are license-exempt, to undergo annual health, safety, and tire inspections are critical for raising the quality of care provided through CCDBG. Finally, the legislation's focus on the importance of teacher training and professional development to promote children's development and kindergarten readiness, as well as provisions that support Quality Rating and Improvement Systems, national accreditation, and tiered reimbursement are all essential elements for enabling working families to access a high-quality child care provider of their choice.

Knowledge Universe and the families whom we serve thank you for your hard work and dedication to this important CCDBG reauthorization. The quality improvements included in The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 will work to ensure that more children of low-income working families have access to a high-quality early care and learning experience that best meets their needs.

Sincerely,

CELIA HARTMAN SIMS,
Vice President, Government Relations.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President and Chief Executive Officer of First Children's Finance in Minneapolis, Minnesota, I am writing to express full support for the bipartisan, bicameral legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

Working families with young children depend on child care so that they can obtain and retain a job. At the same time, children need a safe place to be. In too many communities, quality child care is hard to find. The Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act will combine important safety protections for children in child care with more accountability for the expenditure of public dollars.

As you know, child care programs are small businesses. From my on the ground experience in working with child care programs, I know that many child care directors have experience in child development but have not had training in best business practices. The inclusion of business technical assistance in the reauthorization bill will lead to more programs operating in an efficient and cost effective manner. No program can offer families a quality setting unless it is fiscally sound.

I commend you as well as Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and Representative David Loebsack for your hard work and dedication on behalf of working families who need child care.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act is a giant step toward ensuring that parents have quality choices in their community. Thank you for supporting working families with children.

Sincerely,

GERALD M. CUTTS,
*President and CEO,
First Children's Finance.*

CHILDCARE RESOURCES,
September 15, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, U.S. House Education and the Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER, As President of Child Care Resources Inc. (CCRI), a nonprofit child care resource and referral agency in Charlotte, North Carolina, I am writing to express my strong support of the bicameral, bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Act.

On July 26, 2012, I testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee on Children about the need to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant. My testimony focused on the need to improve children's safety in child care programs (through both requiring fingerprint background checks for child care providers and requiring minimum health and safety protections for children), increasing the quality set-aside, strengthening the child care workforce, conducting at least annual inspections of child care programs, as well as addressing shortcomings of the market rate survey in setting subsidy rates. I am thrilled to see that the child care reauthorization bill addresses each of these areas!

I have been in the child care resource and referral field for 30 years. For more than half of that time, I have been working to reauthorize this measure. Your efforts, along with those of Chairman John Kline, Representative Todd Rokita, and David Loebsack, and your Senate counterparts—

Senate HELP Committee Chairman Tom Harkin, Ranking Member Lamar Alexander, Senator Barbara Mikulski, and Senator Richard Burr, to reach a bipartisan agreement on good policy for children in child care are truly to be commended.

Working families with young children need child care, and children need a place to be safe and a setting that promotes their healthy development. Thank you for your continuous efforts over many years on behalf of working families.

Sincerely,

JANET SINGERMAN,
President, Child Care Resources Inc.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before we close, I want to thank my colleagues in both the House and the Senate for their hard work on this legislation. In the Senate, I am particularly grateful to Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member ALEXANDER, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator BURR, and their staffs.

I want to thank Ranking Member MILLER and our committee staff members who have helped to steer the passage of this bill, particularly Scott Groginski, Jamie Fasteau, John Hammond, and Brian Levin.

I would like to thank Chairman KLINE and his staff members who worked hard on this bill, including Cristin Kumar, Mandy Shaumburg, and Kathryn Ehl.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, for his strong efforts to reduce early childhood expulsions, and the many advocates and stakeholders who weighed in on the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I enter for the RECORD additional letters of support.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA,
September 15, 2014.

RESULTS FOR AMERICA STATEMENT ON CCDBG REAUTHORIZATION

RFA'S MICHELE JOLIN HAILS EFFORT TO SET ASIDE FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION, BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR USING DATA, EVIDENCE AND EVALUATION TO IMPROVE OUTCOMES

WASHINGTON.—Today, following the passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act in the House of Representatives, Results for America managing partner Michele Jolin issued the following statement. Jolin praised a provision in the legislation that would set aside .5% of funds for evaluating programs to improve the access to, quality, and safety of childcare services, calling it a "Moneyball" approach to government that improves outcomes for young people, their families, and communities.

Results for America applauds the passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act by the House, following the passage of a similar bill in the Senate earlier this year. The inclusion of dedicated funds for research and evaluation will provide vital information for improving the effectiveness of childcare. The strong bipartisan support for this bill shows that lawmakers across the aisle support leveraging

less than a penny on the dollar to improve how the rest of the dollar is spent.

"Congress and the Administration are increasingly using data, evidence and evaluation to improve the lives of children, their families and communities, what we call a Moneyball approach to government. Today's reauthorization of CCDBG shows that investing in what works is clearly a bipartisan way to address long-term challenges and is another positive step toward improving outcomes," said Michele Jolin, Managing Partner, Results for America.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association and the students they serve, we urge you to vote YES on the Child Care and Development Block Grant (S. 1086 as amended), which is on the suspension calendar for today. Votes associated with this bill may be included in the NEA Legislative Report Card for the 113th Congress.

The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) program helps low-income working families and parents transitioning from welfare to work find safe, supportive, caring environments for their children. It is impossible to have successful early childhood education without good childcare options. Moreover, quality childcare options help ensure that children enter school ready to learn.

S. 1086 incorporates lessons learned from research and the states, improving the likelihood that more children will enter school ready to succeed, by:

Investing in the early childhood workforce. The bill promotes workforce competency, training, and a progression of professional development designed to promote the social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development of children.

Focusing on early learning. States would be required to develop or implement research-based, developmentally appropriate early learning and developmental guidelines for children.

Ensuring the health and safety of children served by the program. The bill strengthens health and safety guidelines for child care providers.

S. 1086 is a good first step towards providing more comprehensive early learning opportunities for low-income children. We urge you to support it.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,
Director, Government Relations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the nation's leading early childhood professional association for quality learning from birth through age 8, I want to thank you for the improvements for access and quality in the reauthorization legislation for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

When families look for child care for their children, they have two questions in mind:

What programs offer the high-quality approach best for my child, and what can we afford to pay? Each day, millions of families wonder how they will pay for child care and will their children be safe and learning in the child care that they select. Employers know that child care is important to a stable and productive workforce. Child care providers want training and professional development to serve children well, and a subsidy system that will support the cost of quality and continuity of care.

NAEYC is the nation's largest early childhood program accreditor, setting standards for high-quality programs. Many child care centers and schools seek NAEYC early childhood program accreditation and the U.S. military child care centers also strive to meet our standards. We are pleased to see more attention to the quality of children's experiences and ways to help providers meet and sustain standards for health, safety and children's learning. The promise of early childhood education depends on using the research we know about how children learn and develop and providing access to those early learning experiences for all young children. Your bill makes advances in delivering on that promise, and with the resources to implement these changes and to serve more children, we will come closer to our shared goal of healthy, learning children who are ready for success in school and life.

NAEYC is particularly pleased to see in the bill: Support for quality and compensation improvements for the early childhood workforce; more focus on quality care for infants and toddlers at that crucial period of neurological development; consistency of care and assistance over a 12-month period; the use of child assessments in appropriate ways and explicit prohibition on inappropriate uses; more attention to health and safety in licensed and legally exempt from licensing providers; and an explicit mention of the use of the quality set aside funds for helping programs meet national accreditation standards of quality.

We look forward to working with you for the additional discretionary and mandatory funding that will be needed to make high-quality programs affordable to a larger share of families and to help more early-childhood programs provide superior experiences.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely,

RHIAN EVANS ALLVIN,
Executive Director.

EASTER SEALS,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Easter Seals urges you to support the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act. Easter Seals believes this legislation includes many policies that will go a long way to help families of children with disabilities to contribute to their family's financial well-being by creating more opportunities for young children to access quality child care services.

The bill recognizes the national need to expand training supports to child care providers on how to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities. This training will increase the quality of services available to all children. The National Academy of Sciences, Institute of Medicine, From Neurons to Neighborhoods landmark report validated the overwhelming need in this area:

"Like all families with young children, those whose children have a disability or other special health care need are faced with the challenges of finding good-quality, affordable child care. But the inability or unwillingness of many child-care providers to

accept children with disabilities (Berk and Berk, 1982; Chang and Teramoto 1987), transportation and other logistical problems, difficulties with coordinating early intervention and child care services, and the scarcity of appropriately trained caregivers (Kelly and Booth, 1999; Klein and Sheehan, 1987, make the effort to find any child care a tremendous challenge for these families. One multisite student reported that 45 percent of mothers of an infant with a disability reported they were not planning to work because they could not find child care, and 31 percent indicated that they could not find affordable child care (Booth and Kelly 1998, 1999). The severity of the child's disability or illness greatly compounds these problems. (Breslau et al., 1982; Warfield and Hauser-Cram, 1996). Page 324''

Easter Seals affiliates across the country operate nearly 100 full-day, full-year child care programs that meet the needs of children with and without disabilities. These high quality programs are designed to foster the development of all children and support their families. There are simply too few quality choices available to working families. This bill will help increase their options.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

KATY BEH NEAS

Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.6 million members of the American Federation of Teachers—including approximately 90,000 early childhood education professionals who work in diverse settings, such as preschool classrooms, family child care, child care centers, Head Start and Early Head Start—I urge you to support, as amended, S. 1086, the bipartisan Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014.

The CCDBG helps low-income parents pay for child care so they can work or pursue an education. S. 1086 guarantees a family's child care eligibility for at least 12 months, regardless of any fluctuation in income, job or education. This offers a vital lifeline and a path to the middle class for millions of families across the nation.

It has been nearly 20 years since the CCDBG was last reauthorized. Since that time, early childhood education and child care programs have been transformed by research on child development. This bill reflects the advancement of this knowledge and will truly modernize the program.

S. 1086 brings child care standards into this century by focusing on the health and safety of children, and by giving parents more confidence that their child is being well cared for while they are at work or school. In addition, the bill ensures our youngest and most vulnerable are safe by making inspections annual and requiring that all providers and employees obtain background checks and training before they care for children. S. 1086 also makes all this information more transparent and available to the public, especially to parents and family members.

This bill acknowledges that a component of a high-quality child care program includes having a workforce that is well-prepared and well-trained. This bill requires states to establish a professional development progression and dedicate more funding for training, professional development and advancement of the child care workforce. In particular,

the bill, as amended, also addresses the latest data on expulsions from early education programs by requiring that part of the staff training focuses on child behavioral supports. The training and professional development requirements not only will benefit educators and staff working in child care, but also will have lasting, positive effects for the children in their care and those children's families.

However, while this bill is a significant first step toward providing every child in our nation with a high-quality early learning and care program, we know we can't do it right on the cheap. Without the necessary federal resources to implement these important health and safety standards and trainings, states either will be unable to increase the quality of child care and education or will simply have to cut access to high-quality child care to children and families that need it the most. States should not have to choose between quality and access. We look forward to working with Congress to pass this legislation and secure the resources needed for its successful implementation.

Finally, we are equally committed to partnering with Congress to expand high-quality early education for all children from birth to kindergarten.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter. The AFT urges you to vote yes when S. 1086 comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,

President.

—
SAVE THE CHILDREN,

September 14, 2014.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,

House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER MILLER: On behalf of Save the Children, the leading independent organization dedicated to creating real and lasting change in the lives of children in need in the United States and around the world, we are proud to support your efforts to improve the safety, health and quality of child care through the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. As you well know, Save the Children has dedicated nearly a century of service in America to helping children affected by disasters. And we have valued our tremendous partnership with you to make sure children's safety in emergencies remains a priority—particularly in the child care setting.

We support the proposed CCDBG improvements focused on safety, health and quality improvements. In particular, with 69 million children separated from their parents every work day, we support and commend your inclusion of the disaster preparedness section and disaster plan components §5(u)(iii) which are in line with the recommendations from the National Commission on Children and Disasters which serve as the basis for Save the Children's annual report card on children and disasters, now in its seventh year.

We applaud your leadership on keeping children safe in emergencies and thank you for all you have done and continue to do to create lasting positive change in the lives of children.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BLAND,

National Director, Policy & Advocacy,
U.S. Programs, Save the Children.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER

Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER MILLER: The National Women's Law Center is pleased that the U.S. House of Representatives is moving forward with the reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014. Your leadership has resulted in a reauthorization bill that would improve the safety, quality, and accessibility of child care and after-school care for children from birth to age 13. High-quality, well-funded child care helps families work and children learn—both of which are important goals for the nation.

Since the last reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant in 1996, we have learned much about how to improve the quality of child care and after-school care and how to make child care assistance more accessible to families. Research on the importance of quality has spurred greater efforts to support providers in promoting children's positive development from birth. State initiatives have shown ways to encourage quality improvements through incentives and well-designed reimbursement policies. This bill incorporates these lessons from the research and state innovations in an effort to better protect the health and safety of children in care, improve the quality of care overall and for infants and toddlers in particular, facilitate children and families' sustained access to help in paying for care and more stable child care arrangements, and support providers serving families receiving child care assistance.

We strongly support the goals of this legislation. We will work with you to obtain the funding needed to make these improvements and to allow more children to benefit from these improvements. Between 2006 and 2012, 260,000 fewer eligible children received assistance through the Child Care and Development Block Grant. In addition, most states' payment rates for child care providers are too low to support high-quality care. To reverse the decline in children served and to successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we urge Congress to increase mandatory and discretionary child care funding.

Thank you for all your work on this reauthorization, which is so important for our country's children and families.

Sincerely,

HELEN BLANK,

Director of Child Care
and Early Learning.

JOAN ENTMACHER,

Vice President for
Family Economic Security.

CHILD CARE AWARE® OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, September 15, 2014.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Health, Edu-
cation, Labor and Pensions, Washington,
DC.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Health,
Education, Labor and Pensions, Wash-
ington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BURR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, House Education and the Workforce
Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, House Education and the
Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. TODD ROKITA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVE LOEBSACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN, RANKING MEMBER
ALEXANDER, SENATOR MIKULSKI, AND SEN-
ATOR BURR, CHAIRMAN KLINE, RANKING MEM-
BER MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE ROKITA, AND
REPRESENTATIVE LOEBSACK: I am writing on
behalf of Child Care Aware® of America (for-
merly the National Association of Child Care
Resource & Referral Agencies, NACCRRA) to
express support for your legislation, the
Child Care & Development Block Grant Act
of 2014, which would reauthorize the Child
Care and Development Block Grant and
would better protect the health and improve
safety of children in child care settings
across America.

Families want their children to be safe in
child care. They reasonably assume that a
child care license means the state has ap-
proved some minimum level of protection for
children and that the program will promote
their healthy development. Our nationwide
polling shows that parents also believe there
is oversight by the state. However, most
state licensing requirements are weak and
oversight is weaker.

For over 15 years, reauthorization of the
Child Care and Development Block Grant has
been Child Care Aware® of America's top leg-
islative priority and we have been working
on both the federal and state levels to im-
prove the quality of child care.

Child Care Aware® of America has issued
seven licensing studies that show state laws
regarding child care settings vary greatly.
The most recent report, *We Can Do Better: 2013 Update*, scored and ranked the states on
their child care center program require-
ments and oversight policies. The average
score was 92 out of a total possible score of
150—for a grade of 61 percent.

Children's early years are proven to be the
most impactful time to create strong learn-
ers. This reauthorization bill is a huge step
to move the nation forward ensuring chil-
dren are safe and receiving the best early
learning experiences while in child care. This
bill sets the standard all families expect for
their children by requiring providers to un-
dergo comprehensive background checks, an-
nual and pre-licensure inspections, and
training.

This bill includes significant measures to
improve the quality of child care and ensure
that all children in child care settings are
safe.

Child Care Aware® of America looks for-
ward to working with you to pass this legis-

lation into law. Thank you for your contin-
ued leadership in support of our nation's
children.

Sincerely,

LYNETTE M. FRAGA, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

MICHELLE NOTH
MCCREADY,
Director of Policy.

L. CAROL SCOTT, PH.D.
President, Board of
Directors.

NICHOLAS P. VUCIC,
Senior Government Af-
fairs Associate.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Finally, I
would like to thank all of the Members
of the House Education and the Work-
force Committee and their staffs for
their continued commitment to the
well-being of American families.

Mr. Speaker, both Chambers and
both parties have come together on a
bipartisan basis to improve the Child
Care and Development Block Grant.
This bill is a strong example of what
Congress can achieve by working to-
gether. The critical updates in the pro-
gram will give American families the
more support that they need and will
better prepare our children for the fu-
ture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance
of my time.

Mr. KLINE. I yield myself such time
as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleagues here
on both sides of the aisle. It is not
every day on this floor that we get to
do that, but I thank them for their re-
marks and for the debate today.

I want to reiterate my appreciation
for the work done on the other side of
the Capitol. Again, it is not something
we get to talk about every day, but
this is an example of a time when we
saw a need. Some could argue that we
are a little overdue, since it has been 20
years since this has been reauthorized,
but as the ranking member, Mr. MIL-
LER, said, this is on the suspension cal-
endar because we recognize that it
needs to be done and because we have
come together in a bipartisan-bi-
cameral way to address this need.

So I urge my colleagues to support S.
1086, as amended, the Child Care and
Development Block Grant Act of 2014,
and I yield back the balance of my
time.

Mr. SABLON. Mr. Speaker, I support S.
1086, reauthorizing the Child Care and Devel-
opment Block Grant program.

We all talk about jobs bills.

Well, in my district, the Northern Mariana Is-
lands, mothers and fathers in 200 families can
go to their jobs every day because their chil-
dren are being cared for through this program.

That's why it is important to reauthorize
Child Care, because it helps people who want
to work.

Especially in the Northern Marianas, where
we are replacing foreign workers with U.S.
workers, we need good child care to make
that transition.

And the bill accounts for sudden changes of
income, so even when the minimum wage in-

creases in the Marianas this month—as I am
glad to say it will—families will keep getting
child care—and parents will keep working.

Lastly, S. 1086 improves standards, be-
cause all parents want to work without worry,
knowing their children are well cared for and
safe.

I urge passage of the bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sup-
port of S. 1086, the Child Care and Develop-
ment Block Grant Act of 2014. I would like to
thank Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member
MILLER for their work on this important legisla-
tion.

The Child Care and Development Block
Grant program is an investment in our future.
We know that quality care can set children up
for academic success, and helping families
cover the costs of child care enables parents
to keep working or train for new careers.

S. 1086 sets new requirements to strength-
en child care quality. These requirements,
which include background checks for federally-
funded providers and yearly safety inspections
for non-licensed providers, represent common-
sense measures to protect children.

The bill also takes several steps to improve
access to child care services. It will give fam-
ilies certainty that their children can receive
care for a full year, even if their income—and
thus their eligibility—changes. And the bill will
help providers budget for their businesses by
making sure unpredictable child absences don't
affect their funding.

Although I am pleased that the bill author-
izes increased appropriations for the Child
Care and Development Block Grant program,
far too many eligible families will continue to
go unserved. Supporting safe, high quality
child care requires resources, and I hope my
colleagues will join me in continuing to call for
increased funding for the Child Care and De-
velopment Block Grant program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the motion offered by
the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr.
KLINE) that the House suspend the
rules and pass the bill, S. 1086, as
amended.

The question was taken; and (two-
thirds being in the affirmative) the
rules were suspended and the bill, as
amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

□ 1700

LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFI- CATION PROGRAM ESTABLISH- MENT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to
suspend the rules and pass the bill
(H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School
Clinic Certification Program of the
United States Patent and Trademark
Office, and for other purposes, as
amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5108

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep-
resentatives of the United States of America in
Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. USPTO LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, as implemented by the Office, is established as a program entitled the “Law School Clinic Certification Program”. The Program shall allow students enrolled in a participating law school’s clinic to practice patent and trademark law before the Office by drafting, filing, and prosecuting patent or trademark applications, or both, on a pro-bono basis for clients that qualify for assistance from the law school’s clinic. The Director shall establish regulations and procedures for application to and participation in the Program. All law schools accredited by the American Bar Association are eligible for participation in the Program, and shall be examined for acceptance using identical criteria established by the Director. The Program shall be in effect for the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **REPORT ON THE PROGRAM.**—The Director shall, not later than the last day of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the Program, describing the number of law schools and law students participating in the Program, the work done through the Program, the benefits of the Program, and any recommendations of the Director for modifications to the Program.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **OFFICE.**—The term “Office” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(2) **PROGRAM.**—The term “Program” means the Law School Clinic Certification Program established in subsection (a).

(3) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5108, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5108, a bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

This bill has bipartisan support. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York, Congressman JEFFRIES, for his leadership on this issue, and I know that he will be speaking here on this matter shortly. It is my pleasure to be the principal Republican cosponsor of the bill which would make this successful pilot program available to law schools all across the country.

This program was first established by the Patent and Trademark Office in 2008 and has allowed law students at 45 participating schools to practice patent or trademark law before the Patent and Trademark Office under the guidance of a supervisor. This practical experience is invaluable and is a worthwhile investment in our Nation’s future attorneys.

Expanding this program will also benefit our Nation’s small businesses. Through this program inventors and entrepreneurs will gain access to quality legal services and protections that they otherwise often could not afford. Additionally, establishing this program will improve the quality of applications submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office thereby hopefully streamlining the review process.

I am pleased to say that several universities from Ohio, my home State, were already selected to participate in the current pilot program. Those are Case Western Reserve University School of Law in the Cleveland area and the University of Akron School of Law.

The CBO has examined and scored this bill finding that the costs are quite reasonable, about \$200,000 a year to operate in all 45 participating schools so we are really getting a bang for our buck with this program.

I look forward to following the successes of this worthwhile program as it unfolds, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for his leadership and the fact that this is a bipartisan bill. It is a good thing to see this type of bill move its way through the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5108 is legislation designed to enhance the education of law students interested in practicing patent and trademark law while simultaneously helping small businesses, inventors, and entrepreneurs secure patents and trademarks.

I am pleased to partner with my distinguished Judiciary Committee colleague, Representative CHABOT, and am thankful for his support and leadership as well as for the support of Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS on this meaningful, bipartisan legislation.

This bill will permanently establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Currently this program exists only in pilot form; however, it has already helped budding intellectual property law students and attorneys and the innovation sector throughout the country.

The pilot program began in 2008 with only six law schools. Over time it grew to approximately 45 schools. To date

more than 1,400 law students have participated in this program.

Since the pilot began, law students under the supervision of a skilled and experienced faculty adviser have submitted 220 patent applications and approximately 650 trademark applications for clients on a pro bono basis. Establishing this program in law will both ensure its continuation and permit law schools throughout the country that meet the PTO’s qualifications to participate.

Intellectual property, of course, is a highly technical field. Ordinarily, students do not have the opportunity to submit patent and trademark applications until they become practicing attorneys. This program will provide real-world professional training, and expanding it will enable law students throughout the country to obtain invaluable practical experience that will not only enhance their legal education but will give students who participate in these clinics an opportunity to more meaningfully engage in the job market upon their graduation.

Beyond the advantage to law students, however, this program also provides significant benefits to inventors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses that qualify for pro bono assistance. Some of these inventors or small businesses may not be able to afford patent or trademark attorneys.

In the absence of this program, they may be forced to navigate the complicated legal terrain without technical and professional assistance. The small inventor or start-up company of today may very well become the next major American business of tomorrow in part due to the assistance of the student practitioners and their faculty advisers who participate in the PTO Law School Clinic Certification Program.

This legislation has the support of key stakeholders in the field including the Association of American Universities as well as the International Trademark Association.

In conclusion, let me again thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation. H.R. 5108 will help students, small businesses, inventors, startups, law schools, as well as the innovation economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, meaningful legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5108, the “USPTO Law School Clinic Certification Program Act,” would make a law school clinic certification pilot program at the USPTO available to all law schools that provide an IP clinic program. I want to thank Rep. JEFFRIES and Rep. CHABOT and all the co-sponsors for putting forth this legislation.

Law school clinic programs provide practical hands on experience to law students, preparing them for the real world, and provide individuals and small business with an avenue

for legal representation they may otherwise be unable to afford.

I expect that as the USPTO implements this program that they will continue to maintain rigorous standards, to ensure that these clinic programs meet the highest requirements and that the students participating meet the standard educational and professional criteria for practice before the office.

These IP law clinics are an essential part of law school and they are an important way for schools to help innovators and small businesses and start-ups in their local communities. I think this is a good bill and I support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5108, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LAND EXCHANGE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3006) to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) MAP 1.—The term “Map 1” means the map entitled “Specified Parcel of Public Land in California” and dated July 18, 2014.

(2) MAP 2.—The term “Map 2” means the map entitled “River Bottom Farm Lands” and dated July 18, 2014.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ARIZONA, AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—In exchange for the land described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to River Bottom Farms of La Paz County, Arizona, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain Federal land administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management consisting of a total of approximately 80 acres in Riverside County, California, identified as “Parcel A” on Map 1. The conveyed land shall be subject to valid existing rights, including easements, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any

other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance under this section.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a), River Bottom Farms shall convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of River Bottom Farms in and to two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in La Paz County, Arizona, consisting of a total of approximately 40 acres in La Paz County, Arizona, identified as “Parcel 301-05-005B-9” and “Parcel 301-05-008-0” on Map 2.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or equalized by the payment of cash to the Secretary by River Bottom Farms, if appropriate, pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)). The value of the land shall be determined by the Secretary through an appraisal performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and River Bottom Farms and performed in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (U.S. Department of Justice, December 2000). If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land (“Parcel 301-05-005B-9” and “Parcel 301-05-008-0” on Map 2) exceeds the value of the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1), the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by River Bottom Farms to the United States.

(d) EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.—The Secretary shall complete the land exchange under this section not later than one year after the date of the expiration of any existing Bureau of Land Management lease agreement or agreements affecting the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1) to be exchanged under this section, unless the Secretary and River Bottom Farms mutually agree to extend such deadline.

(e) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall become part of the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge and be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006, introduced by our colleague from California (Mr. CALVERT), authorizes an equal value land exchange of private and Federal property. The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to convey 80 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands in California to River Bottom Farms.

In exchange, River Bottom Farms would be required to donate a 40-acre

parcel in Arizona to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge.

Both land transfers will be subject to valid existing rights, rights-of-way, and other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance. The transaction will be executed as an equal value exchange with values determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

In the event the exchange difference is a detriment to the United States, River Bottom Farms will be required to reimburse the Federal Government to ensure that there is no cost to the American taxpayers.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006 is common-sense legislation that directs a land exchange between the Federal Government and a private citizen. The land to be conveyed is 80 acres of BLM land in Riverside County, California, that has limited conservation value and is only suitable for farming.

In return, the exchange will add two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge that will improve the management efficiency of that refuge.

The refuge lies in the flood plain of the lower Colorado River and is surrounded by desert ridges and washes that serve as the lifeline for thousands of species of animals including the iconic bald eagle that call the refuge its home.

I am pleased to see this bill come to the floor under suspension. This is a bill I have worked on for many years when the refuge was in my district, and I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for taking the lead and seeing it through. Although the refuge is no longer in my district, the area is still important to the people of Arizona and my constituents.

H.R. 3006 is supported by a bipartisan congressional coalition that does not always see eye to eye on many issues, but I am glad to see that we can all agree on this.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the author of this legislation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the management of our vast amount of Federal lands in our West is a complex challenge that requires the constant attention of our Federal agencies and Congress.

□ 1715

The legislation before the House today, H.R. 3006, would transfer 40

acres of privately-owned land to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona, and in exchange, the Federal Government would transfer 80 acres of isolated Bureau of Land Management land into private ownership. The 80 acres of land being transferred by the BLM was identified for disposal in the 2010 Resource Management Plan by the Yuma Field Office.

Both the Fish and Wildlife Service and the BLM, in addition to the private landowner, support the exchange as proposed by my legislation.

Both land transfers will be subject to valid existing rights, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance. As was mentioned, furthermore, the value of the lands to be exchanged will be equalized so the Federal Government will not incur any expenses resulting from this exchange. The legislation represents a net reduction of lands managed by the Federal Government.

The congressional coalition supporting this bill speaks for itself. Its sponsor and three original cosponsors include one Republican and one Democrat from California, as well as one Republican and one Democrat from Arizona.

I am pleased that the House will be taking action on this bill, H.R. 3006, today, and I would encourage all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS and the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation Chairman ROB BISHOP for their continued leadership on public lands issues that are especially critical to those of us from the West.

I thank my friend from Arizona for leading his side on this bill and look forward to its passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3006, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (S. 476) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (referred to in this Act as the "Commission") is authorized in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act (16 U.S.C. 410y-4), except that the Commission shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 476 would extend the authorization of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission for another 10 years. The Commission advises the Secretary of the Interior on matters related to the park which stretches 185 miles through three States and the District of Columbia.

The Commission is intended to provide the diverse governmental jurisdictions a seat at the table on topics involving the canal.

I urge passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 476 will amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.

Extension of the authorization date will allow the continued involvement of the park advisory commission in the decisions that affect this National Historical Park. The advisory commission is now more than 40 years old and serves as an important link between the adjacent communities and the National Park Service.

S. 476 is the companion bill to H.R. 2255 introduced by Representative VAN

HOLLEN and is supported by a bipartisan group of Members. Representative VAN HOLLEN is to be commended for his leadership and dedication in seeing this bill through.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. With that, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland, Representative VAN HOLLEN, the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his assistance on this bill and his leadership on so many other important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in rising in strong support of S. 476, a bill to restore the authority of the C&O Canal National Historical Park Commission.

I joined with Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congressman JOHN DELANEY to introduce companion legislation to this bill in the House and appreciate the work of my friend Senator CARDIN in the Senate and Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFazio of the Natural Resources Committee in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park begins just a few miles from this Capitol and follows the old C&O Canal and towpath for about 185 miles to reach Cumberland, Maryland.

Along the way, as Congressman HASTINGS says, it passes through three States, and it passes through the District of Columbia and many cities and towns in rural areas. It is a treasure of the National Park System, providing a place for visitors to learn about the history of the canal and enjoy the scenic views from the towpath.

The C&O Canal National Historical Park Commission was established along with the park in 1971, an idea of my former boss, Senator Mac Mathias of Maryland, and former Congressman Gilbert Gude of Maryland.

They believed that a park spanning so many diverse communities should have a formal channel through which park management could seek advice and input on park policy from its many neighbors. For years, this model worked well, and then the authority for the Commission expired in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today would reestablish the Commission, allowing it to resume its critical service. While the Commission would have no authority to make binding park policy, it would serve an important advisory role and strengthen the relationship between the park and its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today and thank the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this to the floor in a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 476.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GUN LAKE TRUST LAND REAFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1603) to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1603

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act”.

SEC. 2. REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians and described in the final Notice of Determination of the Department of the Interior (70 Fed. Reg. 25596 (May 13, 2005)) is reaffirmed as trust land, and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) NO CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action (including an action pending in a Federal court as of the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the land described in subsection (a) shall not be filed or maintained in a Federal court and shall be promptly dismissed.

(c) RETENTION OF FUTURE RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act alters or diminishes the right of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians from seeking to have any additional land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Band.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1603 ratifies a decision of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land and place it in trust for the Gun Lake Tribe of Michigan.

The 147-acre parcel of land, often called the Bradley Property, is located south of the city of Grand Rapids and within the district of our colleague from Michigan, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON, who does support this legislation.

The Bradley Property is the site of a casino operated by the Gun Lake Tribe pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988. The Bradley Property must be held in Federal trust for the tribe to operate its casino.

This bill is necessary to confirm the trust status of the Gun Lake Tribe's land because the United States Supreme Court ruling holding in *Carcieri v. Salazar* casts doubt on the lawfulness of the Secretary's acquisition of the trust property.

The Gun Lake Tribe was recognized in 1999, but the Secretary acquired land for the tribe pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. This act was intended to benefit tribes recognized and under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and the Department of the Interior supports the bill. I urge passage of S. 1603, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's decision in 2009, the *Carcieri* decision, the status of Indian lands across the country have been undermined, and there has been an uptick in frivolous suits against tribal lands. One such lawsuit, the Patchak case, has put a Michigan tribe's trust land, upon which its casino supports approximately 1,000 much-needed jobs was constructed, very much in jeopardy.

S. 1603, the Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act, simply affirms that the land taken into trust for the Gun Lake Tribe in Michigan is Indian land and is rightfully held in trust by the United States for the tribe's benefit. The bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and it passed House committee markup without event.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation, as does the tribe, the entire Michigan delegation, and the administration, and I look forward to its passing the House and being signed into law.

I am glad this bill has passed through the legislative process so quickly. That said, I think unless and until we have a Carcieri-fix legislation enacted, these types of piecemeal bills will become routinely needed to protect tribal lands that are rightfully held in trust.

I call upon all of my colleagues in this body and in the Senate to work together to obtain that fix.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act, a bipartisan bill that will preserve 1,000 jobs in Michigan's 6th district. I would like to thank Chairman DOC HASTINGS for allowing this piece of legislation to move forward through the Natural Resources Committee.

This bill is really quite simple. It merely reaffirms the U.S. Department of Interior's action of taking this land into trust for the Gun Lake Tribe and prevents any future frivolous legal action on this matter.

On these lands, the Tribe opened a gaming and entertainment facility that has created over 1,000 jobs. For a small community, really for any community, 1,000 new jobs is an incredible feat. The local government and schools also benefit from the facility's revenues. This is quite the advantage in a time when municipalities are slashing services due to deficits. Reaffirmation of this land into trust has the utmost support of our local law enforcement, elected officials, and business leaders.

The Gun Lake Trust Land Reaffirmation Act is a good thing for the folks in my district and it is just the right thing to do. I urge you to help pass legislation that will allow jobs to flourish and provide resources for our schools and communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1603.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM ESTABLISHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 22, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—327

Aderholt	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Barber	Cole	Fudge
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Gabbard
Barr	Collins (NY)	Gallego
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Garamendi
Bass	Conyers	Garcia
Beatty	Cook	Garrett
Becerra	Cooper	Gibbs
Benishek	Costa	Gibson
Bentivolio	Courtney	Gohmert
Bera (CA)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Grayson
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Green, Al
Black	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bonamici	DeLauro	Grimm
Boustany	DelBene	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Hall
Braley (IA)	Deutch	Hanabusa
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Brooks (AL)	Dingell	Harper
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Bucshon	Doyle	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Duckworth	Heck (NV)
Byrne	Duffy	Heck (WA)
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Camp	Edwards	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Ellison	Himes
Capps	Elmers	Hinojosa
Capuano	Engel	Holding
Cardenas	Enyart	Holt
Carney	Eshoo	Honda
Carson (IN)	Esty	Horsford
Carter	Farenthold	Hoyer
Cartwright	Farr	Hudson
Chabot	Fattah	Huelskamp
Chaffetz	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Chu	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Cicilline	Fleischmann	Issa
Clark (MA)	Fleming	Jeffries
Clarke (NY)	Flores	Jenkins
Clawson (FL)	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Cleaver	Foster	Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Frankel (FL)	Jolly

Jordan	Messer	Schakowsky
Joyce	Michaud	Schneider
Kaptur	Miller (FL)	Schock
Keating	Miller (MI)	Schwartz
Kelly (IL)	Miller, George	Schweikert
Kelly (PA)	Mullin	Scott (VA)
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kildee	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Kilmer	Napolitano	Serrano
Kind	Neal	Sewell (AL)
King (IA)	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Sherman
Kirkpatrick	Noem	Shimkus
Kline	Nolan	Shuster
Kuster	Nugent	Sinema
Labrador	Nunes	Sires
LaMalfa	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Lamborn	Olson	Smith (MO)
Lance	Owens	Smith (NE)
Langevin	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Lankford	Paulsen	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Stutzman
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Latham	Perry	Takano
Latta	Peterson	Terry
Lee (CA)	Petri	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Lewis	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thornberry
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Tierney
Loeb	Pompeo	Tipton
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Titus
Long	Quigley	Tonko
Lowey	Rangel	Tsongas
Lucas	Reed	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Upton
Lujan Grisham	Renacci	Valadao
(NM)	Rice (SC)	Van Hollen
Maffei	Richmond	Vela
Maloney,	Rigell	Velázquez
Carolyn	Roby	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Matsui	Rogers (MI)	Walorski
McAllister	Rokita	Walz
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McClintock	Roskam	Webster (FL)
McCollum	Ross	Welch
McDermott	Rothfus	Wenstrup
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
McIntyre	Royce	Williams
McKeon	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
McKinley	Runyan	Wittman
McMorris	Ryan (OH)	Womack
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
McNerney	Salmon	Yoder
Meadows	Sarbanes	Young (AK)
Meehan	Scalise	Young (IN)
Meng		

NAYS—22

Amash	Kingston
Broun (GA)	Lummis
Conaway	Mica
Duncan (SC)	Mulvaney
Gosar	Palazzo
Griffith (VA)	Posey
Hurt	Sanford
Jones	Scott, Austin

NOT VOTING—82

Bachmann	Gardner	McGovern
Bachus	Gerlach	Meeks
Barton	Gingrey (GA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Granger	Moore
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	Moran
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Nadler
Buchanan	Hahn	Nunnelee
Bustos	Harris	Pascarell
Butterfield	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Capito	Higgins	Pearce
Cassidy	Huffman	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Hunter	Peters (CA)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Peters (MI)
Cotton	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Polis
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Price (GA)
Davis, Rodney	Lowenthal	Rahall
DeFazio	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ribble
DeGette	(NM)	Rohrabacher
Delaney	Lynch	Ruppersberger
Denham	Marchant	Rush
Dent	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
DesJarlais	McCaul	T.

Sanchez, Loretta	Southerland	Wasserman
Schiff	Stewart	Schultz
Schrader	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Simpson	Tiberi	Yarmuth
Smith (TX)	Vargas	
Smith (WA)	Veasey	

□ 1857

Messrs. PALAZZO, HURT, and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that today, September 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the one rollcall vote of the day. Had I been present I would have voted: “aye”—Rollcall vote 497—H.R. 5108—To establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast the recorded vote for rollcall 497. Had I been present I would have voted “yes” for this measure.

Bill: H.R. 5108—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended; Rollcall No. 497; Vote: “yes.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for documents in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY,
Chief Administrative Officer.

NORTHERN NEVADA LAND CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5205) to authorize certain land conveyances involving

public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Northern Nevada Land Conservation and Economic Development Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—PINE FOREST RANGE
RECREATION ENHANCEMENT ACT**

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Addition to National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sec. 104. Administration.

Sec. 105. Release of wilderness study areas.

Sec. 106. Wildlife management.

Sec. 107. Land exchanges.

Sec. 108. Native American cultural and religious uses.

**TITLE II—LYON COUNTY ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION ACT**

Sec. 201. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 202. Land conveyance to Yerington, Nevada.

Sec. 203. Addition to National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sec. 204. Withdrawal.

Sec. 205. Native American cultural and religious uses.

**TITLE III—CARLIN ECONOMIC SELF-
DETERMINATION ACT**

Sec. 301. Conveyance of certain Federal land to City of Carlin, Nevada.

**TITLE IV—FERNLEY ECONOMIC SELF-
DETERMINATION ACT**

Sec. 401. Definitions.

Sec. 402. Conveyance of certain Federal land to City of Fernley, Nevada.

Sec. 403. Release of United States.

**TITLE V—RESTORING STOREY COUNTY
ACT**

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Definitions.

Sec. 503. Conveyance of Federal land in Storey County, Nevada.

**TITLE VI—ELKO MOTOCROSS AND TRIBAL
CONVEYANCE ACT**

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Definition of Secretary.

Subtitle A—Elko Motocross Land Conveyance

Sec. 611. Definitions.

Sec. 612. Conveyance of land to Elko County.

Subtitle B—Trust Land for Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band)

Sec. 621. Land to be held in trust for the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band).

**TITLE VII—NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON
HOUSING AND SAFETY DEVELOPMENT
ACT**

Sec. 701. Short title.

Sec. 702. Transfer of Department of the Interior land.

Sec. 703. Water rights.

Sec. 704. Withdrawal.

**TITLE I—PINE FOREST RANGE
RECREATION ENHANCEMENT ACT**

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Pine Forest Range Recreation Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Humboldt County, Nevada.

(2) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Proposed Pine Forest Range Wilderness Area” and dated October 28, 2013.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(5) **WILDERNESS.**—The term “Wilderness” means the Pine Forest Range Wilderness designated by section 103(a).

**SEC. 103. ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS
PRESERVATION SYSTEM.**

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 26,000 acres of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the “Pine Forest Range Wilderness”.

(b) **BOUNDARY.**—

(1) **ROAD ACCESS.**—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 100 feet from the edge of the road.

(2) **ROAD ADJUSTMENTS.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) reroute the road running through Long Meadow to the west to remove the road from the riparian area;

(B) reroute the road currently running through Rodeo Flat/Corral Meadow to the east to remove the road from the riparian area;

(C) except for administrative use, close the road along Lower Alder Creek south of Bureau of Land Management road #2083;

(D) manage the access road, through Little Onion Basin, on the east side of the wet meadow to retain travel only on the road existing on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(E) permanently leave open the Cove Creek road to Little Onion Basin, but close connecting spur roads.

(3) **LITTLE ONION BASIN.**—Remove Little Onion Basin from the boundaries of the Wilderness and from wilderness designation.

(4) **RESERVOIR ACCESS.**—The access road to the Little Onion Reservoir dam will remain open and the boundary of the Wilderness shall be 160 feet downstream from the dam at Little Onion Reservoir to allow public access and dam maintenance.

(c) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(2) **EFFECT.**—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 104. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **MANAGEMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) **LIVESTOCK.**—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, is compatible with the Wilderness designation and shall continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405).

(c) **ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(2) **NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.**—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct or management of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(d) **MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act restricts or precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the Wilderness;

(2) flight testing and evaluation; or

(3) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(e) **WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take such measures in the Wilderness as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases (including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency).

(f) **WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude a Federal, State, or local agency from conducting wildfire management or prevention operations (including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment) or to interfere with the authority of the Secretary to authorize mechanical thinning of trees or underbrush to prevent or control the spread of wildfires or the use of mechanized equipment for wildfire pre-suppression and suppression.

(g) **WATER RIGHTS.**—

(1) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this subsection is to protect the wilderness recreation value of the land designated as wilderness by this title by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(2) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this title—

(A) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(B) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(C) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(D) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(E) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment

decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(3) **NEVADA WATER LAW.**—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(4) **NEW PROJECTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—In this paragraph, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(ii) **EXCLUSION.**—In this paragraph, the term “water resource facility” does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(B) **RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

SEC. 105. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Blue Lakes and Alder Creek wilderness study areas not designated as wilderness by section 103(a) have been adequately studied for wilderness character and wilderness designation pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) and are no longer subject to any requirement pertaining to the management of wilderness or wilderness study areas, including the approximately 990 acres in the following locations:

- (1) Lower Adler Creek Basin.
- (2) Little Onion Basin.
- (3) Lands east of Knott Creek reservoir.
- (4) Portions of Corral Meadow and the Blue Lakes trailhead.

(b) **RELEASE.**—Any public land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this Act—

- (1) is no longer subject to—
- (A) section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

(B) Secretarial Order 3310 issued on December 22, 2010;

(2) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) land management plans adopted under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); and

(B) cooperative conservation agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) shall be subject to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 106. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(b) **MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support those populations, if the activities are carried out—

- (1) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and
- (2) in accordance with—

(A) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(B) appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness recreation with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks, including but not limited to, the hunting or culling of wildlife and access for persons with disabilities.

(c) **EXISTING ACTIVITIES.**—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101–405), the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife in the Wilderness.

(d) **EMERGENCY CLOSURES.**—Nothing in this title prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes as authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time, but no longer than one year, unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with Federal statute.

(e) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled “Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Land Management and the Nevada Department of Wildlife Supplement No. 9” and signed November and December 2003, including any amendments to the cooperative agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **REFERENCES; CLARK COUNTY.**—For the purposes of this subsection, any reference to Clark County in the cooperative agreement described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be considered to be a reference to the Pine Forest Range Wilderness.

SEC. 107. LAND EXCHANGES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means Federal land in the County that is identified for disposal by the Secretary through the Winnemucca Resource Management Plan.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means land identified on the Map as “non-Federal lands for exchange”.

(b) **ACQUISITION OF LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.**—Consistent with applicable law and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary may exchange the Federal land for non-Federal land.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—Each land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to—

(1) the condition that the owner of the non-Federal land pay not less than 50 percent of all costs relating to the land exchange, including the costs of appraisals, surveys, and any necessary environmental clearances; and

(2) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(d) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.**—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchanges under this section be completed by not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe (as defined in section 204 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

TITLE II—LYON COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This title may be cited as the “Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act”.

SEC. 202. LAND CONVEYANCE TO YERINGTON, NEVADA.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the city of Yerington, Nevada.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the land located in Lyon County and Mineral County, Nevada, that is identified on the map as “City of Yerington Sustainable Development Conveyance Lands”.

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Yerington Land Conveyance” and dated December 19, 2012.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **CONVEYANCES OF LAND TO CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City, subject to the agreement of the City, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(2) **APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(A) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(B) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Beginning on the date on which the Federal land is conveyed to the City, the development of and conduct of activities on the Federal land shall be subject to all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

(5) **COSTS.**—As a condition of the conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the City shall pay—

(A) an amount equal to the appraised value determined in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(B) all costs related to the conveyance, including all surveys, appraisals, and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land to the City under paragraph (1).

SEC. 203. ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Lyon County, Nevada.

(2) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Wovoka Wilderness Area” and dated December 18, 2012.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(5) **WILDERNESS.**—The term “Wilderness” means the approximately 47,449 acres to be

known as the Wovoka Wilderness designated by subsection (b)(1).

(b) ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land managed by the Forest Service, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the “Wovoka Wilderness”.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 150 feet from the centerline of the road.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(B) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary, in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405).

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate, or determine the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(4) OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes—

(A) low-level overflights of aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the Wilderness;

(B) flight testing and evaluation; or

(C) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(5) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the

Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take any measures in the Wilderness that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency.

(6) WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this paragraph is to protect the wilderness values of the Wilderness by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(B) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph—

(i) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(ii) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(iii) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(iv) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(v) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(C) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(D) NEW PROJECTS.—

(i) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(II) EXCLUSION.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(ii) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

(II) EXCEPTION.—If a permittee within the Bald Mountain grazing allotment submits an application for the development of water resources for the purpose of livestock watering by the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a water development permit within the non-wilderness boundaries of the Bald Mountain grazing allotment for the purposes of carrying out activities under paragraph (2).

(d) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations, if the activities are carried out—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles and aircraft, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks, including but not limited to, the hunting or culling of wildlife and access for persons with disabilities.

(3) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101-405, the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations in the Wilderness.

(4) EMERGENCY CLOSURES.—Nothing in this title prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes as authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time, unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with Federal statute.

(5) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled “Memorandum of Understanding: Intermountain Region USDA Forest Service and the Nevada Department of Wildlife State of Nevada” and signed by the designee of the State on February 6, 1984, and by the designee of the Secretary on January 24, 1984, including any amendments, appendices, or additions to the agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State or a designee; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects (including guzzlers) in the Wilderness if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the Wilderness can reasonably be minimized.

SEC. 204. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) DEFINITION OF WITHDRAWAL AREA.—In this section, the term “Withdrawal Area” means the land administered by the Forest Service and identified as “Withdrawal Area” on the map described in section 203(a)(2).

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Withdrawal Area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral materials laws.

(c) **MOTORIZED AND MECHANICAL VEHICLES.**—
(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), use of motorized and mechanical vehicles in the Withdrawal Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for the use of those vehicles, unless the use of those vehicles is needed—

- (A) for administrative purposes; or
- (B) to respond to an emergency.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) does not apply to aircraft (including helicopters).

SEC. 205. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe (as defined in section 204 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

TITLE III—CARLIN ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 301. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF CARLIN, NEVADA.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title:

(1) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the City of Carlin, Nevada.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 1329 acres of land located in the City of Carlin, Nevada, that is identified on the map as “Carlin Selected Parcels”.

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Proposed Carlin, Nevada Land Sales” map dated October 25, 2013.

(b) **CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.**—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives a request from the City for the Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) **COSTS.**—At closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (b) the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(e) **RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.**—Upon making the conveyance under subsection (b), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

(f) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land identified for conveyance shall be withdrawn from all forms of—

- (1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials and geothermal leasing laws.

TITLE IV—FERNLEY ECONOMIC SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the City of Fernley, Nevada.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the land located in the City of Fernley, Nevada, that is identified as “Proposed Sale Parcels” on the map.

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Proposed Fernley, Nevada, Land Sales” and dated January 25, 2013.

SEC. 402. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF FERNLEY, NEVADA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior receives a request from the City for the Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) **RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—The City and the Bureau of Reclamation may retain easements or rights-of-way on the Federal land to be conveyed, including easements or rights-of-way that the Bureau of Reclamation determines are necessary to carry out—

- (1) the operation and maintenance of the Truckee Canal Irrigation District Canal; or
- (2) the Newlands Project.

(d) **COSTS.**—At closing for the conveyance authorized under subsection (a), the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such subsection, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

SEC. 403. RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 402, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

TITLE V—RESTORING STOREY COUNTY ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Restoring Storey County Act”.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Storey County, Nevada.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 1,745 acres of Federal land identified on the map as “BLM Owned - County Request Transfer”.

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map titled “Restoring Storey County Act” and dated November 20, 2012.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 503. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND IN STOREY COUNTY, NEVADA.

Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy

and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and if requested by the County, the Secretary shall convey to the County, by quitclaim deed, all surface rights of the United States in and to the Federal land, including any improvements thereon. All costs associated with the conveyance under this section shall be the responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management.

TITLE VI—ELKO MOTOCROSS AND TRIBAL CONVEYANCE ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Elko Motocross and Tribal Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 602. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this title, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

Subtitle A—Elko Motocross Land Conveyance

SEC. 611. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term “county” means the county of Elko, Nevada.

(2) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Elko Motocross Park” and dated April 19, 2013.

SEC. 612. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO ELKO COUNTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and the provisions of this section, if requested by the county the Secretary shall convey to the county, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b).

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) consists of approximately 275 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Elko District, Nevada, as generally depicted on the map as “Elko Motocross Park”.

(c) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(2) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary may correct any minor error in the map or the legal description.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) **USE OF CONVEYED LAND.**—The land conveyed under this subtitle shall be used only as a motocross, bicycle, off-highway vehicle, or stock car racing area, or for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The Secretary shall require the county to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in subsection (b).

Subtitle B—Trust Land for Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band)

SEC. 621. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE TE-MOAK TRIBE OF WESTERN SHOSHONE INDIANS OF NEVADA (ELKO BAND).

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b)—

- (1) shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit and use of the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko

Band) (referred to in this subtitle as the "Tribe"); and

(2) shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 373 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the map as "Expansion Area".

(c) **MAP.**—The term "map" means the map entitled "Te-moak Tribal Land Expansion", dated April 19, 2013. This map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(e) **USE OF TRUST LAND.**—

(1) **GAMING.**—Land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) **GENERAL USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Tribe shall use the land taken into trust under subsection (a) only for—

(i) traditional and customary uses;

(ii) stewardship conservation for the benefit of the Tribe; or

(iii) residential or recreational development.

(B) **OTHER USES.**—If the Tribe uses any portion of the land taken into trust under subsection (a) for a purpose other than a purpose described in subparagraph (A), the Tribe shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is equal to the fair market value of the portion of the land, as determined by an appraisal.

(3) **THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.**—With respect to the land taken into trust under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the Tribe, may carry out any fuels reduction and other landscape restoration activities on the land that is beneficial to the Tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

TITLE VII—NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON HOUSING AND SAFETY DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Naval Air Station Fallon Housing and Safety Development Act".

SEC. 702. TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR LAND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of the Navy, without reimbursement, the Federal land described in subsection (b).

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel of approximately 400 acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that—

(1) is adjacent to Naval Air Station Fallon in Churchill County, Nevada; and

(2) was withdrawn under Public Land Order 6834 (NV-943-4214-10; N-37875).

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—On transfer of the Federal land described under subsection (b) to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy shall have full jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Federal land.

SEC. 703. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to establish a reservation in favor of the United States with respect to any water or water right on lands transferred by this title; or

(2) to authorize the appropriation of water on lands transferred by this title except in accordance with applicable State law.

(b) **EFFECT ON PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED OR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.**—This section shall not be construed to affect any water rights acquired or reserved by the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 704. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land to be transferred under section 702 is withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws and the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, so long as the land remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5205 is a bill introduced by former Natural Resources Committee member MARK AMODEI of Nevada and is cosponsored by his three colleagues from Nevada: Mr. HECK, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5205 combines seven bills addressing Federal land issues in northern Nevada. This compilation prescribes the preferred or best use of these lands or addresses or resolves longstanding issues within the affected Federal areas.

It is the product of tireless negotiations with the stakeholders and the Nevada congressional delegation to reflect a broad compromise of ideas and solutions, and it provides a balanced or complementary approach to the proposed wilderness in the bill by advancing measures to create jobs and solve long-awaited problems for these northern Nevada communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Mr. AMODEI, for his tireless work in bringing this bill to the floor today. For him, I know this has been a labor of love, and the State of Nevada should be proud of his accomplishments today.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself, Mr. Speaker, as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5205 is a comprehensive package of bills that deals with several public lands issues in Nevada. We are pleased this package es-

tablishes nearly 40,000 acres of new wilderness and are happy to see that the majority worked across the aisle to eliminate language which concerned us.

Several of the management activities described in H.R. 5205 are limited to the existing purview of the managing agencies and as authorized by the Wilderness Act; however, this legislation contains ambiguous language that could be construed as an exception to authorize thinning in wilderness for other activities beyond wildfire mitigation.

As the West continues to dry up and the threat of wildfire increases, we recognize the importance of fire mitigation measures; nevertheless, it is the intent of Congress that any thinning activities conducted for the purpose of mitigating wildfires be carried out within the framework of the Wilderness Act in the Pine Forest Range and the Wovoka Wilderness.

It is encouraging to see the majority is willing to advance important conservation bills. I hope we can continue to work towards bipartisan conservation legislation which is of critical importance for all Americans.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend I have another speaker, but I don't see him on the floor. Pending his arrival, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), one of the supporters of the legislation.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership and the chairman for the House Natural Resources Committee.

It is my honor to be here in support of this legislation today. With this bill, the city of Yerington, which is one key provision of this bill within this measure, will be allowed to purchase at fair market value over 10,000 acres of land from the Bureau of Land Management.

It is a very technical bill but has tremendous impacts to the State of Nevada at large. This is a true benefit for Lyon County, and it is in no way a giveaway. This project will generate between \$15 to \$25 million in annual revenue for Lyon County, Lyon County schools, South Lyon Hospital District, the Mason Valley Fire Protection District, and the State of Nevada.

Nevada Copper, the relevant mining company, already owns roughly 95 percent of the minerals to be mined, and it is contained on 1,500 acres of privately-held land.

We expect that the total economic impact of this development will create approximately 3,000 to 4,000 jobs when you include indirect employment. The mine itself will directly employ approximately 800 to 900 people, providing

high-quality wages for nearly two decades. This is in addition to the more than 500 people who will be employed during the construction phase.

In this comprehensive development, up to 63 percent of the acquired Federal lands will be used for infrastructure, other economic development, and local recreation.

We further anticipate that the city of Yerington will be able to draw in additional economic activity due to these infrastructure investments which include power, roads, water, and sewer infrastructure; additionally, this project is environmentally sound.

In fact, the legislation includes the creation of the Wovoka Wilderness Act which will protect old growth pinyon pine and unique archeological sites and preserve this region for future generations of Nevada.

This is a commonsense bill that will create jobs for one of the most economically depressed counties in our country; and, while it took time for this legislation to move, it reminds me that with hard work, determination, and a little bipartisanship, we can get things done.

This is a bill that has unanimous support from the local community. It has unanimous support from the Federal delegation of the State of Nevada, and it passed without objection out of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Let's use the passage of a non-controversial bill out of the House as a lesson that there is a place for Congress to help the American people. There is good that government can do, and something that appears to be a small achievement in the constellation of national politics will mean a lot to Lyon County, particularly the city of Yerington.

In addition to moving this important job-creating bill, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues to move the Tule Springs national monument bill considered for action next.

On top of the national park designation, this bill would transfer land from the BLM to the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas for two 600-acre economic development zones.

It would also transfer land across the street from the southern Nevada veterans hospital. Mayor John Lee and I envision this as space for a new medical complex that could be the anchor for a new medical school in southern Nevada.

Let's keep working. We have great momentum right now. Nevadans today see that we can get things done here in Washington and Washington can solve problems; and, while today's bill is just a tiny crack in the dam of congressional gridlock, if we keep moving forward where we have consensus, we can achieve great things for our constituents.

I want to especially thank my colleague, Representative MARK AMODEI,

for all of his hard work on this important legislation. Our congressional districts both contain parts of Lyon County.

He fought hard for this bill during previous sessions of Congress. His support has been critical to getting this entire package of bills through this House, and I want to continue working with him and our entire Nevada delegation to put our State first.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. DEFazio, for helping make this bill a top priority for our side of the aisle, as well as to the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for advocating for this bill to move quickly through the process.

Last but not least I want to thank Chairman Doc HASTINGS and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BISHOP, for working across the aisle and making this bill a priority.

Since I have arrived in Congress, you both have been willing to work with me on important public lands issues for my home State, and I am grateful to you both for your service and for your stability in working together on the House Natural Resources Committee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill that would create jobs that are desperately needed in a portion of Nevada's Fourth District, and I would like to thank this body for their consideration in passage of this important legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), the author of this legislation.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that went before me on this measure.

I want to also say thank you to the House of Representatives for passing this bill again in the 113th Congress. It was passed in the 112th Congress.

There were concerns about not having a conservation element. It contained 75,000 acres of wilderness, 50 in Lyon County, 25,000—congratulations to the folks in Humboldt County who have worked on the pine forest bill for a long time—elements in Elko, elements in Fernley—it clears up some title problem for the folks in Virginia City dating back to the Comstock days.

I guess, now, it is appropriate since we have shown such unity on this bill in passing it out of the House twice for all eyes—for all eyes—to turn to our colleagues at the north end of the building and see what they can do with the bill that my colleague from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) has so eloquently described as nearly unanimous and overwhelmingly bipartisan.

Go, Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I advise my friend I have no more requests for time. If the gentleman is prepared

to yield back, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5205, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UPPER MISSISSQUOI AND TROUT WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2569) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Upper Missisquoi and Trout Wild and Scenic Rivers Act".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SEGMENTS.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(208) MISSISSQUOI RIVER AND TROUT RIVER, VERMONT.—The following segments in the State of Vermont, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a recreational river:

"(A) The 20.5-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Lowell/Westfield town line to the Canadian border in North Troy, excluding the property and project boundary of the Troy and North Troy hydroelectric facilities.

"(B) The 14.6-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Canadian border in Richford to the upstream project boundary of the Enosburg Falls hydroelectric facility in Sampsonville.

"(C) The 11-mile segment of the Trout River from the confluence of the Jay and Wade Brooks in Montgomery to where the Trout River joins the Missisquoi River in East Berkshire."

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT.

(a) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Management Plan developed during the study described in section 5(b)(19) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)(19)) (referred to in this section as the "management plan"); and

(B) such amendments to the management plan as the Secretary determines are consistent with this Act and as are approved by the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic Committee (referred to in this section as the "Committee").

(2) **COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The management plan, as finalized in March 2013, and as amended, shall be considered to satisfy the requirements for a comprehensive management plan pursuant to section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(b) **COMMITTEE.**—The Secretary shall coordinate management responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior under this Act with the Committee, as specified in the management plan.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1281(e), 1282(b)(1)) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act with—

(A) the State of Vermont;

(B) the municipalities of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield; and

(C) appropriate local, regional, statewide, or multi-state planning or recreational organizations consistent with the management plan.

(2) **CONSISTENCY.**—Each cooperative agreement entered into under this section shall be consistent with the management plan and may include provisions for financial or other assistance from the United States.

(d) **EFFECT ON EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The designation of the river segments by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), does not—

(A) preclude, prohibit, or restrict the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from licensing, relicensing, or otherwise authorizing the operation or continued operation of the Troy Hydroelectric, North Troy, or Enosburg Falls hydroelectric project under the terms of licenses or exemptions in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) limit modernization, upgrade, or other changes to the projects described in paragraph (1).

(2) **HYDROPOWER PROCEEDINGS.**—Resource protection, mitigation, or enhancement measures required by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydropower proceedings—

(A) shall not be considered to be project works for purposes of this Act; and

(B) may be located within the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)).

(e) **LAND MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **ZONING ORDINANCES.**—For the purpose of the segments designated in paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the zoning ordinances adopted by the towns of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield in the State of Vermont, including provisions for conservation of floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses associated with the segments, shall be considered to satisfy the standards and requirements of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)).

(2) **ACQUISITIONS OF LAND.**—The authority of the Secretary to acquire land for the purposes of the segments designated in paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be—

(A) limited to acquisition by donation or exchange; and

(B) subject to the additional criteria set forth in the management plan.

(3) **NO CONDEMNATION.**—The Secretary of the Interior may not acquire by condemnation any

land or interest in land within the boundaries of the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)).

(4) **WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER REQUIRED.**—No private property or non-Federal public property shall be included within the boundaries of the river segments designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) without the written consent of the owner of that property.

(f) **RELATION TO NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—Notwithstanding section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)), the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers shall not be administered as part of the National Park System or be subject to regulations that govern the National Park System.

(g) **NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.**—Nothing in this Act or the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Management Plan shall be construed to create buffer zones outside the designated river segment boundaries designated by paragraph (208) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)). That activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the designated river segments shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate or determine the conduct of management of activities or uses outside those designated river segments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2569 designates in the State of Vermont two segments of the upper Missisquoi River and the entire main stem of its tributary, the Trout River, as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

In 2009, Congress authorized an evaluation of these rivers; and, while the study endorses the designation proposed by H.R. 2569, it was very clear that the community does not want Federal management or ownership on or around the rivers; therefore, the river segments would be managed in accordance with the management plan prepared as a part of the study with the National Park Service being limited to coordinating administration and the management with the local community.

The management plan repeatedly emphasized that actions should be carried out on a voluntary basis down to the property owner level.

The Natural Resources Committee adopted an amendment to reinforce that this designation be voluntary in

nature by requiring that property may only be included into the boundaries with written consent of the owner; additionally, Federal land acquisition may occur only by donation or exchange with condemnation specifically prohibited.

If this proposal is, indeed, locally supported or managed, there is no need for Federal coercion.

□ 1915

H.R. 2569 also excludes several hydroelectric projects from the boundaries of the designation, and the committee-adopted amendment further limits the Secretary of the Interior's influence into the ongoing and future activities of these facilities.

So I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2569 would designate segments of the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers as recreational rivers under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

These river segments provide local Vermonters with opportunities to swim, fish, kayak, and hike and are dotted with scenic and historic sites like waterfalls and covered bridges. They would be first designated Wild and Scenic rivers. They would be the first designated Wild and Scenic rivers in Vermont. The designation is widely popular with landowners and local stakeholders.

H.R. 2569 authorizes the establishment of cooperative agreements, including financial assistance with the State of Vermont and other entities to further the long-term protection and preservation of the identified river segments.

Since much of the land along the river is private property, the designation will allow landowners to emphasize the ecological and recreational value of the river while upholding long-established property rights. Any land acquisition associated with the Wild and Scenic designation must be done by donation and accompanied by a written consent from the landowner. The bill also establishes that the river segments will not be managed as part of the National Park system.

I would like to thank and congratulate my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for his work on this bill and on behalf of his constituents.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the author of the legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2569, the Upper

Missisquoi and Trout Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. That bill would designate those two rivers as Wild and Scenic.

We are pretty excited about this in northern Vermont. As has been said, any landowner along the way is going to give permission in order for it to be part of it. Also, before this even was brought to a legislative committee, town meetings in all of the towns along the designation area had discussions in their town halls and, at town meeting, voted and requested that this designation be given.

So what we have to show that there really is excitement about this in Vermont is a town vote, and then we have got it built into the legislation that the landowner who is directly affected has to give permission. So those are good safeguards, and as the chairman said, it means that there is no Federal coercion. It is a reflection of local desire. So thank you for that.

These rivers are really beautiful. I hope in your time off, Mr. Chairman, when you don't have the burden of this committee and this duty, you might come on up and take a look.

As Mr. GRIJALVA said, these rivers flow through beautiful farm fields and valley floors in northern Vermont. They go under covered bridges and through small villages on the way to Lake Champlain, and they have served in Vermont as important routes of early trade, sources of water and food for local farming communities, and sites for some of the best recreational opportunities in the country.

The community members just love these rivers. They enjoy the recreational activity they provide, especially canoeing and kayaking. There is a lot of fishing and hunting, swimming and hiking, wildlife viewing. It is a place where folks bring their kids, teach them how to swim, teach them about nature, teach them about fishing.

So they also connect up to a canoe trail that spans the entire northern New England States. Having that web of rivers that flow one to the other accessible is enhanced with this legislation.

The Wild and Scenic designation, as has been mentioned, would recognize that these waterways do have exceptional recreational value, something that local proponents have known since they undertook the designation process 5 years ago.

And the folks involved—it is local farmers, town leaders, river enthusiasts—they have all had to work together, and they have had to talk and knock on doors to the folks who own property along the river. As I mentioned, voters in eight towns within the designation area strongly affirm the plan for their towns' participation in the Wild and Scenic Rivers program.

This designation is Vermont-based and locally grown. It requires no Fed-

eral land acquisition or management. It relies on those local and State and regional partnerships.

I want to thank the folks who have helped Mr. BISHOP, the chair of the subcommittee. Thank you so much for your work on this and for putting up with my pestering requests. Ranking Member DEFAZIO, thank you very much for hanging in there. Mr. GRIJALVA, thank you.

But I also want to especially thank, on behalf of the State of Vermont, the citizens of Berkshire, Enosburg, Enosburg Falls, Montgomery, Richford, Troy, North Troy, and Westfield. They worked hard in this, and it means a lot to them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not violating any rule of the House, but I want to say something personal about the man from Washington, my former colleague on the Rules Committee. I am going to accuse him of being a good guy. He worked hard on the Rules Committee when I was there. He worked hard in his responsibility as chairman of this committee.

You have worked hard for many years serving the people of your district and the people of this country over all your years in Congress, and I want to thank you that one of your last acts is a generous shepherding of this legislation that means so much to the folks in northern Vermont.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time and I am prepared to close now. I will have to close after those last remarks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my friend from Vermont for those nice words.

But let me speak to this legislation, because the gentleman correctly mentioned—and this has always been a concern of those of us that have been somewhat critical of Wild and Scenic designations—that it does impact local communities and local private property rights. And this legislation here, in working with you, the gentleman recognizes that. I think, at least from your debate on the floor, your citizens, your constituents, recognize that also at the town meetings. That is a win-win from my standpoint.

So I think this is good legislation. I hope the other body takes it up intact and we can pass it and sign it into law.

I do want to thank my friend from Vermont for his kind words, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2569, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLUSHING REMONSTRANCE STUDY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3222) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3222

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Flushing Remonstrance Study Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Dutch involvement in North America started with Henry Hudson's 1609 voyage on the ship, *Half Moon*, employed by the Dutch East India Company.

(2) After 1640, New Netherland gradually began to transform from a chain of trading posts into a settlement colony.

(3) As Dutch and English settlers moved closer to one another, they began to assimilate in what would later become Queens County.

(4) The Dutch and English settlements had not been without conflict. Although the Dutch Republic was well known for its toleration of other faiths, Director General Peter Stuyvesant and his council thought that liberty of worship should not be granted to Quakers.

(5) When Quakers began to arrive in Flushing, the colonial government issued an ordinance that formally banned the practice of all religions outside of the Dutch Reformed Church.

(6) On December 27, 1657, 30 Flushing residents signed what was later called the Flushing Remonstrance, objecting to this order. None of the remonstrance's authors were Quakers.

(7) Dutch colonial authorities proceeded to arrest the signers of the Flushing Remonstrance. In 1662, John Bowne defied the ban and allowed Quakers to hold services in his house. Bowne was fined and banished to the Dutch Republic for showing contempt for secular authority.

(8) Bowne was later exonerated after appealing to the guarantees of religious liberty before the Dutch West India Company and returned to Flushing in 1664. The colony later fell to British control on September 24, 1664.

(9) The Flushing Remonstrance is now considered by many to be instrumental in the development of religious liberty in the United States and a precursor to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(10) In 1957, the United States Postal Service released a 3-cent postage stamp commemorating the 300th Anniversary of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance which read, "Religious Freedom in America".

(11) Queens remained rural and agricultural through the 18th and 19th Centuries. Although

its Dutch identity diminished, the tolerance of diversity that has harbored Quakers and other religious sects in the Dutch Colonial period continues to this day. Queens is the most ethnically diverse urban area in the world, with a population of over 2,200,000 representing over 100 different nations and speaking over 138 different languages.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **STUDY AREA.**—The term “study area” means the John Bowne House located at 3701 Bowne Street, Queens, New York, the Friends Meeting House located at 137–17 Northern Boulevard, Queens, New York, and other resources in the vicinity of Flushing related to the history of religious freedom during the era of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the study area's resources based on their relationship to the history of religious freedom associated with the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating resources within the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) identify properties related to the John Bowne House that could potentially meet criteria for designation as a National Historic Landmark;

(5) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or any other interested individuals;

(6) evaluate the impact of the proposed action on the flow of commerce and commercial activity, job opportunities, and any adverse economic effects that could not be avoided if the proposal is implemented;

(7) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives;

(8) analyze the effect of the designation of the study area as a unit of the National Park System on—

(A) existing recreational activities, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and

(B) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities; and

(9) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the study area is designated a unit of the National Park System.

(c) **NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.**—Upon the commencement of the study, owners of private property in or adjacent to the study area shall be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(d) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8(c) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)).

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. **HASTINGS**) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. **GRIJALVA**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **HASTINGS** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HASTINGS** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3222 authorizes a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of creating a National Park unit in Queens, New York, from those resources associated with the history of religious freedom and the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

The Flushing Remonstrance was a 1657 petition to the director general of New Netherland in which several citizens requested an exemption to his ban on Quaker worship. It was recognized as a forerunner to the First Amendment to the Constitution and one of the earliest demands for freedom of religion in what became the United States.

The study would evaluate and provide different Federal, local, and non-governmental management proposals. The study is informational. Congress would still have to act on separate legislation to create such a designation.

I urge passage, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **GRIJALVA**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Let me associate myself with Chairman **HASTINGS'** comments and introduction and support for H.R. 3222. This legislation would acknowledge and begin the process of studying and protecting a valuable resource and a historic resource for this country, and I appreciate his comments.

I reserve the balance my time.

Mr. **HASTINGS** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **GRIJALVA**. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. **MENG**), the sponsor and author of the legislation.

Ms. **MENG**. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act, H.R. 3222. This bill directs the Secretary of the

Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Flushing Remonstrance and significant local resources.

The Flushing Remonstrance is not only an important part of my local history, but also a significant event in our Nation's history. The Flushing Remonstrance is recognized as a precursor to the First Amendment and our Nation's commitment to the freedom of religion. During these troubling times in which religious freedom is not a globally recognized right, it is especially important to remember the history of our great Nation and the heroic actions taken by those before us to ensure individual liberty.

In the mid-17th century, the Quakers residing in New Netherland, an area including parts of what is now New York State, were not allowed to observe their religious traditions and practices. In response to this injustice, a group of local non-Quaker activists wrote the Flushing Remonstrance as a declaration against religious persecution in an attempt to allow the free practice of one's religion. It was met with great opposition from the local government, and an effective ban on specific practices was enforced.

John Bowne arrived in New Netherland during this time and proceeded to hold Quaker meetings in his home despite the political repercussions. He was eventually arrested, fined, and deported. He made his way to Holland and appealed to the Dutch West India Company for the religious liberty granted to New Netherland in its charter. John's appeal was accepted, and the company demanded that religious persecution end in the colony.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Flushing Remonstrance is historically significant and will benefit from further study and that its associated location, such as the John Bowne home and the Quaker Meeting House, deserve more national recognition. If signed into law, the Park Service would work with all stakeholders to find the best path forward to include these important locations in the National Park system.

The story of the Flushing Remonstrance is not for New Yorkers alone. It was an early struggle to establish the fundamental right to practice one's religion, but each demand for tolerance ultimately paved the way for the First Amendment, which protects our religious freedom today.

I stand today in strong support of my bill, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act, and hope it will help us all remember the courage of John Bowne and the passion for religious freedom held by the authors of the Flushing Remonstrance.

I would also like to thank Chairman **HASTINGS** for his leadership and guidance, Ranking Member **DEFAZIO** and Congressman **GRIJALVA** for their support, Congressman **RUSH HOLT** for

cosponsoring the bill, and all the staff on their work and support of this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3222, the Flushing Remonstrance Study Act introduced by Representative GRACE MENG from New York, representing the borough of Queens.

H.R. 3222 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility of including sites associated with the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in 1657 as units of the National Park Service.

These sites include the John Bowne House and the Old Quaker Meetinghouse in Flushing, Queens which are associated with the history of religious freedom in America and the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

The Flushing Remonstrance was a 1657 petition to Director-General of New Netherland, in which several citizens requested an exemption to the Director-General's ban on Quaker worship.

While the signers of the Flushing Remonstrance didn't know it at the time, this petition is today recognized as a precursor of the First Amendment of the Constitution and one of the earliest demands for freedom of religion in what became the United States.

The Quaker's who chose to practice their religion as well as those who volunteered their homes for Quaker meetings, such as John Bowne, were jailed. Bowne, whose home had been the place where the Flushing Remonstrance was signed, was actually banished from the colony.

On his trip back to Europe, Bowne carried with him an account of the case which he eventually presented before the Dutch West India Company. The reply established religious liberty in the colony and stated that "The consciences of men at least ought ever to remain free and unshackled."

Located a few blocks away from the Old Quaker Meetinghouse, the Bowne house has changed little since 1680. However, the concepts of freedom of religion and freedom of speech that were established in the Flushing Remonstrance have continued to evolve as our country and our influence around the world has grown.

I think it is vital that citizens and politicians alike recognize the importance of freedom of speech and political activism in our country.

I hope that the continued preservation of these historic places will serve as a reminder to all Americans of the fights that resulted in the rights we enjoy in this country today, as well as those around the world that continue to fight for their own right to speak freely and practice their religion without fear of persecution or consequence.

I applaud Rep. MENG for her advocacy and urge support for H.R. 3222.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3222, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1930

WEST HUNTER STREET BAPTIST CHURCH STUDY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4119) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) *STUDY.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of the historic West Hunter Street Baptist Church, located at 775 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, SW., Atlanta, Georgia and the block on which the church is located.

(b) *CONTENTS.*—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) *evaluate the national significance of the site;*

(2) *determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the area as a unit of the National Park System;*

(3) *consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;*

(4) *consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals;*

(5) *identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives;*

(6) *consider the effect of the designation of the study area as a unit of the National Park System on—*

(A) *existing commercial and recreational activities, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, and on the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission infrastructure; and*

(B) *the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities.*

(7) *identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal lands if the study area is designated a unit of the National Park System.*

(c) *NOTIFICATION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS.*—Upon commencement of the study, owners of private property adjacent to the area will be notified of the study's commencement and scope.

(d) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)).

(e) *REPORT.*—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for

the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the civil rights movement, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church became a center for the movement. It was the site of many civil rights gatherings, strategy sessions, and nonviolent resolution trainings. The church was also the site of leadership meetings and doubled as a school for nonviolent protest during initiatives such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964.

H.R. 4119 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, to determine whether it meets the National Park Service's criteria for inclusion in the National Park System.

I urge its passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4119 will authorize the National Park Service to study the feasibility of including the West Hunter Street Baptist Church as a unit of the National Park Service.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as an important gathering center and site, an organizing, training, and strategy place where leaders met, and a leadership development area, all during the civil rights movement, and it became a place where many of the most important initiatives during the fight for equality, such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964, were born.

I want to applaud my colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHNSON, for his efforts to preserve this iconic building and hope the feasibility study is the first step in permanently preserving a landmark for future generations of Americans.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), the cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague from Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON, am pleased to offer H.R. 4119, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act.

During the civil rights movement, the church served as a headquarters for many workers and a meeting ground for leaders.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as a spiritual refuge for countless men and women, like our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who devoted their lives to the civil rights movement.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise to urge the House to adopt H.R. 4119, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial and bipartisan piece of legislation. I was proud to introduce this bill in partnership with my colleague and fellow Georgian, Congressman AUSTIN SCOTT.

My bill has the support of both of Georgia's Republican U.S. Senators and 77 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives.

This is an important piece of legislation for the people of Georgia's Fourth Congressional District, whom I represent, but also for the thousands of heroes who fought tirelessly during the civil rights movement for equality in the South and throughout the country.

The West Hunter Street Baptist Church Study Act authorizes the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, to determine if it meets the requirements to become part of our Nation's park system. According to the National Park Service, the site may be considered for designation as a national park if it is associated with significant events and people in our Nation's history and contributes to the understanding of these historic events and figures.

During the civil rights movement, the West Hunter Street Baptist Church served as the headquarters for many civil rights workers and organizers. It was the site of many important leadership meetings and doubled as a school for nonviolent protests during initiatives such as the Voter Education Project and the Freedom Summer of 1964. It was also a spiritual refuge for the countless men and women who devoted their lives to the cause.

Rev. Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, Sr., the church's pastor, was the best friend and a partner of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He helped lead the bus boycotts after Rosa Parks famously refused to give up her seat. Rev. Dr. Abernathy, Sr. assumed his position at the church at Dr. King's urging following the success of the Freedom Rides. He was the pastor at West Hunter Street Baptist Church until his death in 1990.

Passage of this bill will allow the Department of Interior to assess how to more fully preserve and honor the contributions of all who played significant roles in advancing freedom and human rights, including the Rev. Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, Sr.

I urge the House to remember the pivotal nature of the civil rights movement. When considering this bill, think of what the movement meant to our Nation and to the world. As Dr. King said, the struggle for civil rights "lifted our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood."

In addition to broad bipartisan support in the House, this bill enjoys the support of a number of prominent organizations, including the Coalition for the People's Agenda, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Subcommittee Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their support of this bill, and I thank them for moving this bill through the Natural Resources Committee.

Again, I want to thank my colleague and homeboy, AUSTIN SCOTT, for his work on this.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from Arizona I have no more requests for time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4119, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 5405) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5405

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

Sec. 101. Margin requirements.

Sec. 102. Implementation.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 201. Treatment of affiliate transactions.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

Sec. 301. Registration threshold for savings and loan holding companies.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 401. Registration exemption for merger and acquisition brokers.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

TITLE V—SMALL CAP LIQUIDITY REFORM ACT

Sec. 501. Liquidity pilot program for securities of certain emerging growth companies.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

Sec. 601. Filing requirement for public filing prior to public offering.

Sec. 602. Grace period for change of status of emerging growth companies.

Sec. 603. Simplified disclosure requirements for emerging growth companies.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 701. Exemption from XBRL requirements for emerging growth companies and other smaller companies.

Sec. 702. Analysis by the SEC.

Sec. 703. Report to Congress.

Sec. 704. Definitions.

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

Sec. 801. Rules of construction relating to collateralized loan obligations.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

Sec. 901. Advisers of SBICs and venture capital funds.

Sec. 902. Advisers of SBICs and private funds.

Sec. 903. Relationship to State law.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 1001. Summary page for form 10-K.

Sec. 1002. Improvement of regulation S-K.
 Sec. 1003. Study on modernization and simplification of regulation S-K.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

Sec. 1101. Increased threshold for disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

SEC. 101. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).”.

SEC. 102. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

- (1) without regard to—
- (A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and
- (B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;
- (2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and
- (3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the transfer of commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism is utilized.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the transfer of commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism is utilized.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding section 371 of this Act, the requirements in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

SEC. 301. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 12(g)—
- (A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after “is a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act);” and
- (B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “case of a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act);” and
- (2) in section 15(d), by striking “case of bank” and inserting the following: “case of a bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act).”.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 401. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

“(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

- “(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or se-

curities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

“(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CONTROL.—The term ‘control’ means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

“(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

“(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

“(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

“(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term ‘eligible privately held company’ means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

“(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

“(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

“(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

“(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term ‘M&A broker’ means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

“(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

“(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will,

prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner's equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

“(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2014, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

“(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

“(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

“(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—SMALL CAP LIQUIDITY REFORM ACT

SEC. 501. LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k–1(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) LIQUIDITY PILOT PROGRAM FOR SECURITIES OF CERTAIN EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

“(A) QUOTING INCREMENT.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of a covered emerging growth company shall be quoted using—

“(i) a minimum increment of \$0.05; or

“(ii) if, not later than 60 days after such date of enactment, the company so elects in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

“(I) a minimum increment of \$0.10; or

“(II) the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(B) TRADING INCREMENT.—In the case of a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph, the Commission shall determine the increment at which the securities of such company are traded.

“(C) FUTURE RIGHT TO OPT OUT OR CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—At any time beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph may elect in the manner described in subparagraph (D)—

“(I) for the securities of such company to be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph; or

“(II) to change the minimum increment at which the securities of such company are quoted from \$0.05 to \$0.10 or from \$0.10 to \$0.05.

“(ii) WHEN ELECTION EFFECTIVE.—An election under this subparagraph shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after such election is made.

“(iii) SINGLE ELECTION TO CHANGE MINIMUM INCREMENT.—A covered emerging growth company may not make more than one election under clause (i)(II).

“(D) MANNER OF ELECTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An election is made in the manner described in this subparagraph by informing the Commission of such election.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION OF EXCHANGES AND OTHER TRADING VENUES.—Upon being informed of an election under clause (i), the Commission shall notify each exchange or other trading venue where the securities of the covered emerging growth company are quoted or traded.

“(E) ISSUERS CEASING TO BE COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If an issuer the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph ceases to be a covered emerging growth company, the securities of such issuer shall be quoted at the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The Commission may by regulation, as the Commission considers appropriate, specify any circumstances under which an issuer shall continue to be considered a covered emerging growth company for purposes of this paragraph after the issuer ceases to meet the requirements of subparagraph (L)(i).

“(F) SECURITIES TRADING BELOW \$1.—

“(i) INITIAL PRICE.—

“(I) AT EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company is below \$1 at the close of the last trading day before the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(II) AT IPO.—If a covered emerging growth company makes an initial public offering after the day described in subclause (I) and the first share of the securities of such company is offered to the public at a price below \$1, the securities of such company shall be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(ii) AVERAGE TRADING PRICE.—If the average trading price of the securities of a covered emerging growth company falls below \$1 for any 90-day period beginning on or after the day before the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, the securities of such company shall, after the end of such period, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(G) FRAUD OR MANIPULATION.—If the Commission determines that a covered emerging

growth company has violated any provision of the securities laws prohibiting fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive acts or practices, the securities of such company shall, after the date of the determination, be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(H) INELIGIBILITY FOR INCREASED MINIMUM INCREMENT PERMANENT.—The securities of an issuer may not be quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph at any time after—

“(i) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II);

“(ii) such issuer makes an election under subparagraph (C)(i)(I), except during the period before such election takes effect; or

“(iii) the securities of such issuer are required by this paragraph to be quoted using the increment at which such securities would be quoted without regard to the minimum increments established under this paragraph.

“(I) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND DISCLOSURES.—The Commission shall require a covered emerging growth company the securities of which are quoted at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10 under this paragraph to make such reports and disclosures as the Commission considers necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

“(J) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—An issuer (or any officer, director, manager, or other agent of such issuer) shall not be liable to any person (other than such issuer) under any law or regulation of the United States, any constitution, law, or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any contract or other legally enforceable agreement (including any arbitration agreement) for any losses caused solely by the quoting of the securities of such issuer at a minimum increment of \$0.05 or \$0.10, by the trading of such securities at the increment determined by the Commission under subparagraph (B), or by both such quoting and trading, as provided in this paragraph.

“(K) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2014, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission, in coordination with each exchange on which the securities of covered emerging growth companies are quoted or traded, shall submit to Congress a report on the quoting and trading of securities in increments permitted by this paragraph and the extent to which such quoting and trading are increasing liquidity and active trading by incentivizing capital commitment, research coverage, and brokerage support, together with any legislative recommendations the Commission may have.

“(L) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) COVERED EMERGING GROWTH COMPANY.—The term ‘covered emerging growth company’ means an emerging growth company, as defined in the first paragraph (80) of section 3(a), except that—

“(I) such paragraph shall be applied by substituting ‘\$750,000,000’ for ‘\$1,000,000,000’ each place it appears; and

“(II) subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of such paragraph do not apply.

“(ii) SECURITY.—The term ‘security’ means an equity security.

“(M) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Commission may—

“(i) make such adjustments to the pilot program specified in this paragraph as the

Commission considers necessary or appropriate to ensure that such program can provide statistically meaningful or reliable results, including adjustments to eliminate selection bias among participants, expand the number of participants eligible to participate in such program, and change the duration of such program for one or more participants; and

“(ii) conduct any other study or pilot program, in conjunction with or separate from the pilot program specified in this paragraph (as such program may be adjusted pursuant to clause (i)), to evaluate quoting or trading in various minimum increments.”.

(b) SUNSET.—Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 11A(c)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78k–1(c)(6)) is repealed.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

SEC. 601. FILING REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC FILING PRIOR TO PUBLIC OFFERING.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is amended by striking “21 days” and inserting “15 days”.

SEC. 602. GRACE PERIOD FOR CHANGE OF STATUS OF EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is further amended by adding at the end the following: “An issuer that was an emerging growth company at the time it submitted a confidential registration statement or, in lieu thereof, a publicly filed registration statement for review under this subsection but ceases to be an emerging growth company thereafter shall continue to be treated as an emerging market growth company for the purposes of this subsection through the earlier of the date on which the issuer consummates its initial public offering pursuant to such registrations statement or the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the company ceases to be an emerging growth company.”

SEC. 603. SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 102 of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act (Public Law 112–106) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to an emerging growth company (as such term is defined under section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933):

“(1) REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE NOTICE ON FORM S–1.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise its general instructions on Form S–1 to indicate that a registration statement filed (or submitted for confidential review) by an issuer prior to an initial public offering may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S–X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S–1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S–X at the date of such amendment.

“(2) RELIANCE BY ISSUERS.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this sub-

section, an issuer filing a registration statement (or submitting the statement for confidential review) on Form S–1 may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S–X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S–1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S–X at the date of such amendment.”.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 701. EXEMPTION FROM XBRL REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES AND OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—Emerging growth companies are exempted from the requirements to use Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such companies may elect to use XBRL for such reporting.

(b) EXEMPTION FOR OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.—Issuers with total annual gross revenues of less than \$250,000,000 are exempt from the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such issuers may elect to use XBRL for such reporting. An exemption under this subsection shall continue in effect until—

(1) the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is two years after a determination by the Commission, by order after conducting the analysis required by section 702, that the benefits of such requirements to such issuers outweigh the costs, but no earlier than three years after enactment of this Act.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise its regulations under parts 229, 230, 232, 239, 240, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to reflect the exemptions set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 702. ANALYSIS BY THE SEC.

The Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits to issuers described in section 701(b) of the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such analysis shall include an assessment of—

(1) how such costs and benefits may differ from the costs and benefits identified by the Commission in the order relating to interactive data to improve financial reporting (dated January 30, 2009; 74 Fed. Reg. 6776) because of the size of such issuers;

(2) the effects on efficiency, competition, capital formation, and financing and on analyst coverage of such issuers (including any such effects resulting from use of XBRL by investors);

(3) the costs to such issuers of—

(A) submitting data to the Commission in XBRL;

(B) posting data on the website of the issuer in XBRL;

(C) software necessary to prepare, submit, or post data in XBRL; and

(D) any additional consulting services or filing agent services;

(4) the benefits to the Commission in terms of improved ability to monitor securities markets, assess the potential outcomes of regulatory alternatives, and enhance investor participation in corporate governance and promote capital formation; and

(5) the effectiveness of standards in the United States for interactive filing data relative to the standards of international counterparts.

SEC. 703. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall provide the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report regarding—

(1) the progress in implementing XBRL reporting within the Commission;

(2) the use of XBRL data by Commission officials;

(3) the use of XBRL data by investors;

(4) the results of the analysis required by section 702; and

(5) any additional information the Commission considers relevant for increasing transparency, decreasing costs, and increasing efficiency of regulatory filings with the Commission.

SEC. 704. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title, the terms “Commission”, “emerging growth company”, “issuer”, and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

SEC. 801. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(g) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

“(A) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the divestiture, prior to July 21, 2017, of any debt securities of collateralized loan obligations, if such debt securities were issued before January 31, 2014.

“(B) OWNERSHIP INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—A banking entity shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a collateralized loan obligation because it acquires, has acquired, or retains a debt security in such collateralized loan obligation if the debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right of the banking entity to participate in the removal for cause, or in the selection of a replacement after removal for cause or resignation, of an investment manager or investment adviser of the collateralized loan obligation.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—The term ‘collateralized loan obligation’ means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.

“(ii) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—An investment manager or investment adviser shall be

deemed to be removed 'for cause' if the investment manager or investment adviser is removed as a result of—

“(I) a breach of a material term of the applicable management or advisory agreement or the agreement governing the collateralized loan obligation;

“(II) the inability of the investment manager or investment adviser to continue to perform its obligations under any such agreement;

“(III) any other action or inaction by the investment manager or investment adviser that has or could reasonably be expected to have a materially adverse effect on the collateralized loan obligation, if the investment manager or investment adviser fails to cure or take reasonable steps to cure such effect within a reasonable time; or

“(IV) a comparable event or circumstance that threatens, or could reasonably be expected to threaten, the interests of holders of the debt securities.”.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

SEC. 901. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No investment adviser” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No investment adviser”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, a venture capital fund includes an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940).”.

SEC. 902. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND PRIVATE FUNDS.

Section 203(m) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, the assets under management of a private fund that is an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940) shall be excluded from the limit set forth in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 903. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Section 203A(b)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) that is not registered under section 203 because that person is exempt from registration as provided in subsection (b)(7) of such section, or is a supervised person of such person.”.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 1001. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

SEC. 1002. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 1003 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

SEC. 1003. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 1002 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

SEC. 1101. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and

Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5405, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am the proud sponsor, Mr. Speaker, of a package of bills we are considering this evening. This legislation contains the language of nearly a dozen jobs bills that have either passed the Financial Services Committee or have passed this House with broad bipartisan support. The Senate should immediately take up and pass this package, though recent history doesn't give us much hope. The Senate's Democratic leadership is already sitting on some 40 jobs bills, including several that we are considering here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this is a jobs bill. By repealing and reforming burdensome regulations we can set businesses and working capital free to invest in the economy and to create jobs. For example, Wegmans, a grocery store chain that employs 44,000 people, including 8,200 in my home State of Pennsylvania, needs this regulatory relief to retain their best employees while allowing workers to invest in the company and invest in their own futures.

Biotech is an extremely important and vibrant industry in southeast Pennsylvania employing thousands and working toward treatments and cures for devastating diseases like diabetes, Alzheimer's, cancer, and HIV/AIDS. Former Representative Jim Greenwood, current president of BIO, put it this way:

For far too long, small public companies have been hamstrung by one-size-fits-all regulations that stifle their growth. This legislation will foster innovation and stimulate

groundbreaking research and development at emerging companies in Pennsylvania and across our Nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are companies in and around Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that have the resources to invest right now in small businesses. This bill will allow them to invest more of their resources in advancing American workers instead of spending money complying with needless regulations in Washington.

These are just some of the examples of how this bill provides necessary relief to those that we are counting on to power our economy as it continues to recover.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the summer touring 100 businesses in my district, and, despite my frustrations with Washington, I remain optimistic, as I know our recovery is in the right hands as long as American workers and entrepreneurs are in the driver's seat.

I want to thank the Republican and Democrat authors of the underlying language, as well as the chairman for his leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I hold out hope that the Senate will take action on this bill and the dozens of other jobs bills that are stacking up in their Chamber like cordwood.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only in opposition to this legislation but to a process that has been conducted in secret and in bad faith.

Tonight, the House will debate two legislative packages that have been brought to the floor over the objections of the minority and without regard for due process or the opportunity for robust debate.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake: these measures are being advanced for no other reason than political gain.

The bill we consider presently is H.R. 5405, a newly created package that combines 11—11—separate Republican-authored bills. These complex and wide-ranging measures have been hastily merged together and rushed to the floor for a vote. The expedited process in which the Republicans have engaged, over my objections, have denied Members the opportunity to debate how these pieces will interact with each other and the problems that may occur as a result.

Keep in mind that H.R. 5405 is so far-reaching that it amends the Securities Act, the Commodity Exchange Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the JOBS Act, the Bank Holding Company Act, and the Investment Advisers Act, not to mention that many provisions interact with the Dodd-Frank Act.

With this omnibus proposal touching so many different aspects of our directives and securities laws, Members ought to have the chance to offer

amendments on the floor and debate whether this laundry list of provisions is the right approach.

□ 1945

Again, this is a substantial piece of legislation with the package requiring three separate reports by the SEC and another robust cost-benefit analysis.

Keep in mind that the majority is placing all these new rule-writing and reporting requirements on the SEC at the same time that they are denying the Commission the funding they need to do their job efficiently and be the tough sheriff for Wall Street that we need them to be.

I, for one, oppose this last-minute attempt to circumvent the legislative process. At the eleventh hour, it seems the majority is using all the tricks at their disposal to prove to the American people that they are more than the do-nothing Republican Congress. I think the American people are smarter than that.

Again, I think the American people would agree that Members of this House should be afforded the opportunity to discuss what is in these packages, offer amendments, and have a robust debate on these bills.

Tonight, in a mad dash for political victory, that fundamental element of democracy will be thwarted; furthermore, the chairman has broken with the tradition of a bipartisan suspension vote process by putting forth more than 15 pieces of legislation in exchange for one Democratic bill. This is just unacceptable.

Unfortunately, as with flood insurance legislation, the Export-Import Bank, and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, the ideological wing of the Republican Party is unable and unwilling to work together to get things done for our Nation's citizens. I am dismayed that they continue to put partisan interests ahead of job creation, certainty for our businesses, and the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, to preserve the principle of fairness for the minority and to ensure the democratic process continues as it has for centuries, I am, indeed, opposing this legislation as well as the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act that we will consider shortly.

I believe that if gone unchecked this type of legislating could increase and soon become commonplace. We must not circumvent our time-honored traditions for political gain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the author and sponsor of title XI in this jobs bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to speak in support of H.R. 5405, and I do want to thank Representative FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania for his important work on this bill.

Among other things, this bill will help encourage capital formation at small and emerging businesses. These tools help businesses expand their operation and, most importantly, hire more workers.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes my own legislation, the Encouraging Employee Ownership Act of 2014, or EEOA. This bipartisan provision would make it easier for companies in Illinois and nationwide to let hardworking employees own a stake in the business they are a part of.

I have learned firsthand from my constituents in the 14th Congressional District about the many benefits of employee ownership. When you walk into Scot Forge, an entirely employee-owned manufacturer in my district, there is a noticeable difference in the energy of the employees, from upper management on down to the shop floor.

When employees have a stake in the company they work for, their sense of ownership over details large and small makes a real difference to their bottom line and, more importantly, to their quality of life.

The business, in turn, receives a large boost in productivity, enabling them to expand their reach and invest in new technologies and equipment.

Unfortunately, some companies are shying away from offering employee ownership because of regulations that limit how much ownership they can safely offer.

SEC rule 701 mandates various disclosures for privately-held companies that sell more than \$5 million worth of securities for employee compensation. In 1999, the SEC arbitrarily set this threshold at \$5 million without a concrete explanation why.

For businesses who want to offer more stock to more employees, this rule forces those businesses to make confidential disclosures that could greatly damage future innovations if they fell into the wrong hands.

The SEC's original rulemaking acknowledged this, and some voiced their concern that a disgruntled employee could use this confidential information to harm their former employer; further, it is costly to prepare these disclosures just so a business can offer the benefits of ownership to their employees. My bill, included in H.R. 5405, would address this problem.

As the Chamber of Commerce, who supports this legislation, has explained, this legislation would "help give employees of American businesses a greater chance to participate in the success of their company."

I want to thank Representatives BACHUS, FITZPATRICK, GARRETT, HURT, MULVANEY, ROSS, and STIVERS for their support.

It is also worth noting that, in good faith, both sides agree to lower the threshold to \$10 million instead of the \$20 million the bill originally included.

I am glad we could iron out our differences and put forward a strong bill.

I want take thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including Representative JARED POLIS of Colorado, for his support, and Representative JOHN DELANEY of Maryland, for his hard work on this bill.

The question remains: Do we want businesses to reserve employee ownership only for senior-level executives because of concerns about costs or the dissemination of confidential information?

Under my bill, they will not be forced to make that decision because of this easier and safer method of offering ownership to more employees.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some Members will come to the floor, and they will support this legislation because they may have one bill in this package, and I understand that. Some Members may have cosponsored a bill or worked on one bill. These Members, no matter how well-intended they are, cannot speak to the other 10 bills in the package because they don't know what those other 10 bills are all about.

Many don't have a clue about these other bills. Members will not even remember how they voted for or against bills that have been placed in this package.

What is being asked of the Members of this House is to forget about what really works for all Members. What they are asking Members to do at the last minute, before we close down this session, is to vote for a bill where they have packaged this large number of bills without understanding what they are or what is in them.

Just vote for them because we want a political package that says, "We are doing something about jobs. We are going to present this as a jobs package. We are going to do more than anybody else for jobs."

This is unreasonable. It is actually unconscionable. They should not put this burden on the Members.

I am going to ask Members to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), vice chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HURT. I thank Mr. FITZPATRICK and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, all 11 bills in this package have been either voted on in full committee or on this floor with bipartisan support; so the idea that these have never been heard before and that no one knows what is in them is not accurate.

I rise in support of this good bill, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. With millions of Americans still out of work, our top focus must be enacting policies that help spur job growth throughout our country.

Unfortunately, I continue to hear from my constituents in Virginia's Fifth District about the impact of costly regulations on job creation, especially those regulations that disproportionately affect smaller public companies that wish to access capital in our public markets.

One such regulation is related to the use of eXtensible Business Reporting Language, or XBRL, which was mandated by the Securities and Exchange Commission in 2009. While the SEC's rule is well-intended, this regulation has become another example of a requirement where the costs outweigh the potential benefits.

These small companies spend tens of thousands of dollars or more complying with the regulation, yet there is substantial evidence that fewer than 10 percent of investors actually use XBRL, further diminishing its potential benefits.

That is why Representative TERRI SEWELL and I crafted the bipartisan Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act which is incorporated into title VII of the bill we are considering today.

This provision will provide an optional exemption for emerging growth companies and smaller public companies from the requirement to file their information in XBRL with the SEC, the same information which is already filed with the SEC in a readily accessible format; additionally, this bill requires the SEC to perform a cost-benefit analysis on the rule's impact on smaller public companies, something the SEC failed to adequately address in the original rule.

Whether a supporter or a skeptic of XBRL, these provisions will help provide a pathway for the SEC to focus on developing a system of disclosure for smaller companies that eliminate unnecessary costs while achieving greater benefits.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in voting on this good bill so that we can continue to promote capital access in our public markets and spur job growth for working Americans across our country.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of Congress is ever going to come down to the floor and tell you, "This bill that I'm offering is going to cut jobs, empower the most powerful, and weaken people who are already in precarious economic circumstances."

Nobody is going to come and offer you the anti-jobs bill. It is not just going to happen. Every Member who comes down here is going to proclaim, "Jobs, jobs, jobs and, if you do this right now, jobs"—chicken in every pot kind of talk—but we have a certain way that we do things here, and that is what the suspension calendar is for, noncontroversial legislation.

It is for things that nobody has a real point of opposing. It is not where you bring forth a bill of complicated derivatives legislation and where Members should offer and debate amendments, and there should be an open rule.

This bill actually combines a whole range of very complicated financial information. This is the kind of bill that people decry and why they are angry with Washington, D.C., when they hear that they are passing all types of bills that have sweeping implications for Americans all over this country and people don't even know about it.

The fact is that there are at least 15 separate pieces of legislation contained in what is being offered as, essentially, a noncontroversial bill. This bill is anything but noncontroversial.

I want to hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that there might be pieces of legislation contained in this megabill that they are offering that have merit. I am not even saying that it is 100 percent bad. I am simply saying that it is highly controversial and it is extremely complicated.

I happen to remember being on the floor when we debated the Affordable Care Act. My colleagues on the other side made a huge point of saying, "There are 2,000 pages, and there's five stacks." They made this case that there was this big, giant, voluminous bill and people didn't know what was in it and they were going to be called upon to pass this huge bill the public wouldn't really understand. They raised a policy point.

My point to them right now is that if passing a bill that is voluminous and that people don't understand is not a good thing, then don't do it. You can hardly put yourself in the position of doing exactly what you accuse your opponents of doing.

We should be taking these bills one by one and having amendments and debating them. I can tell you there are a number of bills in here that I personally am concerned about.

The Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act is a bill that I believe would diminish the protections to the public of derivatives trading. The Customer Protection End User Relief Act may not have merit, but it is a complicated piece of legislation, and anyone who wants to tune in and watch the debate so they can understand what their Congress is doing ought to be able to do so. We shouldn't just package it up and sweep it through on some big vote.

I am urging a very strong “no” vote because the process is all wrong. If these bills have merit, let them stand on their own two feet. Please don’t run this thing down our throat in the late evening hours or even in the morning.

Let’s deal with these bills in a careful way that this country deserves. Let’s say to the American people that this complicated financial legislation deserves debate, rebuttal, and amendment, and we need an open rule to do this thing right. There is no need to rush this thing through.

I just want to end the way that I started, Mr. Speaker. Everybody declares they are for jobs. Everybody says, “Do what I am asking you to do for jobs.” That will be the case whether it is some sort of big, giant loophole for a huge oil company who is just going to pocket the money, and it is going to be the case if somebody wants to get rid of health and safety regulations. It is going to be the case in nearly any case that we want to talk about here.

□ 2000

But good legislation stands scrutiny, withstands debate, and certainly wouldn’t be afraid of standing on its own, which is exactly what this piece of legislation does not offer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong “no” vote for this complicated bill that involves very, very serious financial legislation that really needs to be handled one bill at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose The Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, (H.R. 5405). This bill contains 11 separate bills some of which I support and some I oppose. This legislation contains a number of potentially significant deregulatory measures, many of which are being addressed by regulatory action by the Securities and Exchange Commission and Commodities Futures Trading Commission. These bills stop those productive efforts replacing them with sweeping deregulation which I think is worse for investors and the economy.

I specifically wish to draw attention to my concerns with The Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act (H.R. 4164)—Title VII of this bill. This bill would exempt nearly 60 percent of public companies from complying with the eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) requirement. XBRL is an improvement the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) started in 2009 to enable more efficient investing, especially investing in smaller firms. Instead of investors, the public and regulators reading and analyzing reams of paper filings, the market would be brought into the 21st Century with a searchable electronic database. Clearly, a searchable electronic database on companies’ financial statements is much more efficient than requiring investors read reams and reams of documents.

When this bill came before the Financial Services Committee on March 14, 2014, I voted yes on this bill. I was concerned that the SEC was not paying adequate attention to ensure the accuracy of the XBRL database. Since that vote, the SEC has started enforcing

the accuracy of the XBRL data format. The SEC sent out letters in July, 2014, to many firms urging they correct inaccurate reporting. The SEC action and my own research into the need for accessible corporate financial information to grow companies has made me oppose this broad exemption.

Congress should encourage, not discourage the move toward data-based financial reporting. An expansion of structured data enable investors to make better and faster decisions, especially related to smaller firms; strengthens the SEC’s oversight ability and makes it easier to discover fraud and simplifies compliance responsibilities for firms.

More progress is still needed at the SEC. The agency still collects the same financial statement from each public company twice—once as a document and again as XBRL data. And last July’s letters were only a start. To make disclosures more useful to investors and less burdensome to companies, the agency must continue to improve data quality and must combine the two submissions into one. The Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act would prevent the SEC from ever taking these steps. If the agency is legally required to collect only documents, not XBRL data, from a majority of public companies, it will be unable to continue, and complete, the transformation that it began in 2009.

I submit a blog post from the Data Transparency Coalition detailing the ramifications of H.R. 5405 on data transparency.

[From <http://datacoalition.blogspot.com/2014/09/new-proposal-includes-xbrl-exemption.html>]

NEW PROPOSAL INCLUDES XBRL EXEMPTION—AND MAJOR SETBACK FOR OPEN DATA
(Data Transparency Coalition; September 10, 2014)

The Data Transparency Coalition advocates on behalf of the private sector and the public interest for the publication of government information as standardized, machine-readable data.

UPDATE: ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2014, H.R. 5405 PASSED THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY A VOTE OF 320 TO 102.

A major setback for open government data may be on the agenda for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Despite the opposition of the tech industry, Rep Robert Hurt’s proposal to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to stop collecting financial data from most public companies has been included as part of a new legislative package—a new bill introduced on Monday, Sept. 8, by Rep. Mike Fitzpatrick and a number of other Republican members.

The new bill, H.R. 5405, brings together ten previous bills into a single one. One of those ten is Rep. Hurt’s previous proposal, included in the new bill verbatim. Judging from the urgency of the current House schedule, H.R. 5405 could see action by the House of Representatives as early as next week.

Nine out of the ten bills included in H.R. 5405 have already been approved, as stand-alone bills, by bipartisan majorities in either the Financial Services Committee or the full House. (The Financial Services Committee passed Rep. Hurt’s original bill in March 2014.) So it seems clear that the backers of H.R. 5405 want to craft a bill that will pass the House easily, without serious opposition.

H.R. 5405’s introduction conveys that the bill is non-controversial by stating three innocuous purposes:

To make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens. . . .

But H.R. 5405, if approved by the House, introduced and passed in the Senate, and signed into law by President Obama, will dramatically restrict the availability of searchable corporate financial data to investors—and to the tech companies building investment tools.

Supporters of open data in financial regulatory reporting will remember that the SEC collects an open data version of each financial statement in the eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) structured data format, alongside the old-fashioned plain-text version, from every public company registered in the United States. Investors, markets, and the public can use the XBRL version of each financial statement to create a fully searchable data set of all U.S. public company databases. XBRL data supports free tools for investors like RankandFiled.com. It is also used by infomediaries like Morningstar and Thomson Reuters to enrich the information they deliver to paying clients.

Rep. Hurt’s proposal, now incorporated into H.R. 5405, would direct the SEC to exempt all public companies with revenues below \$250 million—a majority of public companies—from the obligation to file an open data version. Supporters of the exemption claim that XBRL-formatted financial statements cost “tens of thousands of dollars” to create, but Financial Executive International found a median annual cost of \$2,000 for small companies (page 19) and some providers offer XBRL preparation services at even lower prices.

Supporters of the exemption had one valid point last spring: at that time, the SEC had not taken any steps to ensure the quality of the XBRL filings. Without assurance that the open data versions of financial statements were reliable, investors were reluctant to use them, and relied on the plain-text versions instead. But last summer, after a year of advocacy from open data allies in Congress, the SEC took its first public steps toward enforcing better data quality. As quality improves, investors and the tech companies serving them will make more use of the open data financial statements.

The companies themselves will benefit, too. Open, structured data delivers information more efficiently to the markets, which makes it easier for smaller companies to find eager investors and brings down their capital costs.

H.R. 5405 would cut off such progress by forcing the SEC to use documents, not open data, to collect corporate financial information.

Fans of open data should make their opposition to this portion of H.R. 5405 known.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You have heard from me and Congressman ELLISON why this process is a process that we cannot in any way allow to take place without the kind of criticism that we are putting forth about this. This rises to the point of being shameful. This rises to the point of being disrespectful. This rises to the point of placing all of our colleagues in a position where, if anybody asked

them about what is in this bill, if any of their constituents wanted to know what they voted on, they would not be able to tell them so.

They would not be able to tell them so because most of the Members, for the most part, that are going to come to this floor and vote on this bill just simply have not had the time, even if they had the background, to look into this bill. They have not had the time to ask others in their caucus about this bill. They have not had time to ask any of the advocacy organizations about this bill, for or against.

Now I understand again, and I want to repeat this, why some Members feel it absolutely necessary even though they don't like it. They have got one bill in here that they have worked on, that they have put a lot of time in and that they believe in, and they want desperately to have their bill passed.

So they are going to swallow what is being done to them in order to get, perhaps, an opportunity to get their bill, but they don't like it. And they will tell you, not on this floor, but behind the scenes, that they don't like it. They don't like the way they are being treated.

As a matter of fact, if we had the time for a real debate on this floor tonight and we asked any of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle to go down and debate these 11 bills that are in this first package, you wouldn't find two or three that would be able to do it. And the same thing on the second bill that is going to come up that talks about some issues in the insurance industry.

This should not happen. And the fact that the suspensions process has been hijacked is something that this floor and this Congress is going to have to deal with for the future. This should not happen.

We know why it was intended, why suspensions are necessary to expedite or when you have noncontroversial bills, but it was not intended for this kind of hijacking. It was not intended where you could take a whole bundle of bills, throw them into one, behind one bill that was hastily put together, that is going to do a lot of damage, and somehow call it a legitimate suspension bill.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members, let this be a lesson to all of us that we are going to have to pay attention to the rules of suspension; and if there needs to be a modification or change that will not allow this kind of thing to happen, some of us are going to have to take up leadership in doing that modification, coming forth with some new kind of ruling that will not allow this to happen.

And more than anything else, if my friends on the opposite side of the aisle get away with this, we can just throw our hands up because what they will do for the future is save all the difficult

bills, add to it a bill, and then package them all and put Members in the kind of position that they are trying to put them in tonight.

It is unfair. It should not happen, and I am going to ask for a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an objection raised by my friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON). He called this bill that is before us, H.R. 5405, a megabill.

I would like to note for the RECORD that the bill is 39 pages, as opposed to Dodd-Frank, which accumulated about 2,300 pages. This is a 39-page bill, and it is written in plain English; everybody understands it, composed of 11 bills, 11 sub-bills, subtitles. Each one of those bills had its own hearing in the Financial Services Committee, and those hearings had witnesses and those bills had markup hearings. At those markup hearings, there was opportunity for amendment and debate.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is each one of these 11 bills make up a 39-page bill, divided approximately four pages per bill, written in plain English everybody understands, all debated quite a bit already in this session. Those bills, when they were sponsored, they were bipartisan in sponsorship. They passed the House in bipartisan fashion. And before that, they were before the committee with their bipartisan cosponsors and passed the committee in bipartisan fashion.

So this is not a megabill, Mr. Speaker. This is actually just the opposite. This is a plain-English bill of bipartisan fashion that has already been debated and vetted fully in the committee and in this House.

So to take the idea that you could put 11 bills that are bipartisan and passed overwhelmingly together and it is going to produce results and, yes, Mr. ELLISON, jobs for the American people, unleash the power of the American economy to put people back to work, I am not sure how that becomes a bad thing. I think that is a very good thing, because my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about process and procedure and debate and amendments. We are talking about results.

Now Ms. WATERS of California, the ranking member, has raised two objections. First she called this a partisan effort. Eleven bipartisan bills, hardly partisan, all passed the House or committee with bipartisan support.

The second thing that Ms. WATERS has identified is an objection to this. She calls this a mad dash for political gain. Mr. Speaker, this is a mad dash for sensible regulation for small businesses in Bucks County, in Pennsyl-

vania, and across our Nation. This is a mad dash to get the Senate to do something, to do anything, to help American job creators. Mr. Speaker, this is a mad dash to get results.

As I said, there is a lot of talk on this floor and in this town about ending the partisan divide, about getting people to work together. These are bipartisan bills that produce results, that get things done. This is a good bill.

Of the 11 bills that make it up, 10 of them were supported by Ms. WATERS and voted for by Ms. WATERS. The 11th bill, that she objected to, her witness in the hearing identified some issues with that 11th bill, and we actually negotiated against ourselves. We made changes to the 11th bill to make it more palatable so that everybody could come together around a job-creation bill. That is the bill that is before the House. That is the one that we are asking the Members to support.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, a vote for this legislation is a vote to support emerging growth companies. It is a vote for small businesses. It is a vote for entrepreneurs. It is a vote for the American worker.

These are the people we are counting on to drive American progress and economic progress, to fuel the next American century. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and pass these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5405, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AMERICAN SAVINGS PROMOTION ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3374) to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Savings Promotion Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the annual savings rate in the United States was 4.1 percent in 2012;

(2) more than 40 percent of American households lack the savings to cover basic expenses for 3 months, if an unexpected event leads to a loss of stable income;

(3) personal savings provide Americans with the financial resources to meet future needs, including higher education and homeownership, while also providing a safety net to weather unexpected financial shocks;

(4) prize-linked savings products are typical savings products offered by financial institutions, like savings accounts, certificates of deposit, and savings bonds, with the added feature of offering chances to win prizes based on deposit activity;

(5) the State of Michigan was the first State to allow credit unions to offer prize-linked savings products, and in 2009 launched the first large-scale prize-linked savings product in the United States;

(6) the States of Connecticut, Michigan, Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and Washington all have laws that allow financial institutions to offer prize-linked savings products;

(7) in the States of Michigan and Nebraska, more than 42,000 individuals have opened prize-linked savings accounts and saved more than \$72,000,000;

(8) prize-linked savings products have been shown to successfully attract non-savers, the asset poor, and low-to-moderate income groups, providing individuals with a new tool to build personal savings; and

(9) encouraging personal savings is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITIONS OF “LOTTERY”.

(a) **NATIONAL BANKS.**—Section 5136B(c) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 25a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, other than a savings promotion raffle,” before “whereby”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

(b) **FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.**—Section 9A(c) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 339(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, other than a savings promotion raffle,” before “whereby”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

(c) **INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 20(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, other than a savings promotion raffle,” before “whereby”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

(d) **FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS.**—Section 4(e)(3) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1463(e)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, other than a savings promotion raffle,” after “arrangement”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **SAVINGS PROMOTION RAFFLE.**—The term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

SEC. 4. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1308. Limitation of applicability

“(a) **LIMITATION OF APPLICABILITY.**—Sections 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, and 1306 shall not apply—

“(1) to a savings promotion raffle conducted by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union; or

“(2) to any activity conducted in connection with any such savings promotion raffle, including, without limitation, to the—

“(A) transmission of any advertisement, list of prizes, or other information concerning the savings promotion raffle;

“(B) offering, facilitation, and acceptance of deposits, withdrawals, or other transactions in connection with the savings promotion raffle;

“(C) transmission of any information relating to the savings promotion raffle, including account balance and transaction information; and

“(D) deposit or transmission of prizes awarded in the savings promotion raffle as well as notification or publication thereof.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘insured credit union’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(2) the term ‘insured depository institution’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

“(3) the term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

lator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 61 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1307 the following:

“1308. Limitation of applicability.”

SEC. 5. RACKETEERING.

Chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1952, by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1) This section shall not apply to a savings promotion raffle conducted by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union.

“(2) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘insured credit union’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(B) the term ‘insured depository institution’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

“(C) the term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”

(2) in section 1953—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “or (5)” and inserting “(5) equipment, tickets, or materials used or designed for use in a savings promotion raffle operated by an insured depository institution or an insured credit union, or (6)”; and

(B) by striking subsections (d) and (e) and inserting the following:

“(d) For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘foreign country’ means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision thereof (other than the United States, its territories or possessions);

“(2) the term ‘insured credit union’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

“(3) the term ‘insured depository institution’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

“(4) the term ‘lottery’—

“(A) means the pooling of proceeds derived from the sale of tickets or chances and allotting those proceeds or parts thereof by chance to one or more chance takers or ticket purchasers; and

“(B) does not include the placing or accepting of bets or wagers on sporting events or contests;

“(5) the term ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)); and

“(6) the term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States.”; and

(3) in section 1955—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (6);

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) ‘insured credit union’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

“(3) ‘insured depository institution’ shall have the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).”; and

(iv) by inserting after paragraph (4), as redesignated, the following:

“(5) ‘savings promotion raffle’ means a contest in which the sole consideration required for a chance of winning designated prizes is obtained by the deposit of a specified amount of money in a savings account or other savings program, where each ticket or entry has an equal chance of being drawn, such contest being subject to regulations that may from time to time be promulgated by the appropriate prudential regulator (as defined in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481)).”; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking “shall not apply to any bingo” and inserting the following: “shall not apply to—

“(1) any bingo”;

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) any savings promotion raffle.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3374, as amended, and currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. KILMER, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. TSONGAS for their efforts in drafting the legislation that is before us this evening.

The American Savings Promotion Act is bipartisan legislation that would remove Federal barriers and allow financial institutions to offer savings promotion raffles.

Studies show that Americans are not saving enough, whether for an emergency or for their retirement. This

lack of savings is more pronounced among those with lower incomes. H.R. 3374 seeks to reverse this trend and encourage savings by offering depositors chances to win prizes based on their deposit activity.

This legislation would simply amend Federal law to allow depositors to enter into a lottery in lieu of accruing interest, with the number of raffle tickets based on the size of their deposit.

The American Savings Promotion Act is a commonsense bill that will provide consumers greater access to the financial services they want and need. Allowing financial institutions the ability to provide innovative products is a simple way to encourage consumers to open savings accounts, incentivize saving, and foster healthier financial habits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3374, the American Savings Promotion Act, which has been offered by my colleague from Washington (Mr. KILMER). This bill is an example of the innovation Democrats bring to addressing the concerns of the chronically unbanked.

Building on the success of credit unions offering such programs, this bill enables banks to offer similar products, vastly increasing the reach of this creative savings product.

Prize-linked savings accounts encourage customers to set aside savings by combining the more mundane task of setting aside money with the excitement of playing the lottery. Customers are always eligible to withdraw the principal of their savings account but forego accrued interest for the chance of winning all of the interest of participants in the program.

Such programs have been offered in South Africa, resulting in more than \$200 million being set aside in savings accounts by more than 750,000 individuals who had largely not set up a bank account. In Washington State, credit unions that offer such accounts have found that these accounts are helping to build an ethic of frugality.

Today, credit unions are permitted to offer such programs if State law permits them, which includes four States: Washington, Michigan, Nebraska, and North Carolina. However, even though these States permit prize-linked savings accounts, Federal banking laws prevent banks from offering them because of a decades-old prohibition on participation in a lottery.

□ 2015

Mr. KILMER's bill retains the general prohibition against lotteries but permits banks to offer prize-linked savings if the bank's State also allows them.

It is not a secret that this country does not save enough, that we are not preparing for the unexpected or even for how we will afford college tuition expenses or retirement. We also know that, once someone begins to pile on debt, it can be nearly impossible to dig out. Mr. KILMER's bill enables our constituents to say “no” to debt by encouraging good savings habits.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), the author of the bill.

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would also like to thank Chair CAPITO and Ranking Member MEEKS, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, for their efforts to move the American Savings Promotion Act to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would remove Federal barriers that today prevent some financial institutions from being able to offer innovative financial products, known as prize-linked savings accounts. These safe, regulated financial products are designed to make savings fun. The more you save, the more chances you have to win. As a Dire Straits fan, I called this idea the “Money for Nothing” concept. If you make deposits, you get more chances to win, and even if you don't win, you get to keep the money you saved.

Many families understand the importance of saving money to help them manage expected costs like college or retirement and unexpected costs that they might face, whether it is a trip to the emergency room or repairing their cars, but we know too many Americans struggle to set aside a little bit of cash every month. Nearly a quarter of Americans report they wouldn't be able to come up with at least \$2,000 in 30 days. Another 19 percent said they could, but they would have to begin pawning or selling their possessions or taking out payday loans.

The idea behind prize-linked savings accounts is based on the recognition that people are significantly motivated by rewards, and when it comes to saving money, the idea of earning pennies on the dollar just isn't all that attractive to a lot of folks, particularly those who don't have a lot to save in the first place. Prize-linked savings accounts seek to step into that gap and provide savers with a product that keeps folks excited about saving by offering cash prizes.

The research shows that prize-linked savings accounts are actually working to boost savings. The National Bureau of Economic Research recently published an analysis of these accounts,

finding that the data “demonstrate clearly” that individuals save at a higher rate when they are offered the use of prize-linked savings accounts. Unfortunately, under Federal law, only some financial institutions are able to offer these products.

My legislation, which I am proud to have worked on with Representative TOM COTTON, alongside Senators JERRY MORAN and SHERROD BROWN, would clear away the Federal obstacles so that more financial institutions can offer these products. It accomplishes this without establishing a new government program, without spending scarce Federal dollars, and without preempting State laws.

Over the past 4 years, an estimated 50,000 account holders have saved more than \$94 million using prize-linked savings accounts. Even if those members don't win a big cash prize, they are strengthening their financial cushions to withstand whatever life throws at them while developing a habit of saving.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the American Savings Promotion Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank Representative COTTON of Arkansas for his leadership on this bill and for the leadership of his cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to pass the bill as submitted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following correspondence between the Financial Services Committee and the Judiciary Committee on H.R. 3374, as amended.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING, I am writing concerning H.R. 3374, the “American Savings Promotion Act,” which was referred primarily to your Committee, and additionally to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As a result of your having consulted with the Judiciary Committee on the provisions in our jurisdiction and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3374, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration. The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by forgoing consideration of H.R. 3374 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this

letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding H.R. 3374, the American Savings Promotion Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forgo consideration of H.R. 3374 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill that falls within its jurisdiction.

In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 3374.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3374, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2866) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2866

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as “Boys Town”, was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, “Boys Town”;

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) \$5 GOLD COINS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 \$5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 8.359 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) \$1 SILVER COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

- (1) weigh 11.34 grams;
- (2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and
- (3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

- (1) a designation of the value of the coin;
- (2) an inscription of the year “2017”; and
- (3) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) **MINT FACILITY.**—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins; and
(2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) **DISTRIBUTION.**—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2866, the Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), and seek its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us commemorates the centennial, in 2017, of the founding of Boys Town, an almost mythic place that pioneered a method of caring for the youth of this country who had fallen by the wayside in one way or another. In a way, the coin commemorates the spirit of what was then still a young country and of Boys Town's founder, Father Edward Flanagan.

Irish-born, he had come to this country only a bit more than 100 years after the first Congress met, yet, by the time he had died, he had been sent by President Truman to all corners of the globe to teach others to care for kids as he had done. Ordained in 1912, Father Flanagan was assigned to the Diocese of Omaha and, after a stint of working with homeless men, decided to focus on youths, founding what later came to be called "The City of Little Men." He famously thought, as the Boys Town Web site points out, that every child could be a productive citizen if given love, a home, an education, and a trade. He accepted boys of every race, color, and religion, and he believed that there are no bad boys, there is only bad environment, bad training, bad example, bad thinking.

I am almost certain that every Member of this Chamber knows that famous line that became the motto of Boys Town: "He ain't heavy, Mister. He's my brother." That is what is said by an older lad, with a younger boy on his shoulders, in a logo adopted during the Second World War. All of us, surely, know the "Boys Town" movie, with Mickey Rooney, that won Spencer Tracy an Oscar for the role of Boys Town founder, Father Flanagan, but how many of us know that the organization that began in a rented, rundown Victorian mansion in central Omaha as Father Flanagan's Home for Boys has grown to be one of the country's largest nonprofit child care organizations, serving the emotional, behavioral, and physical problems of children and their families—as many as 2 million people each year? Or that it operates throughout the country, in 12 major sites, from California to south Florida to New England, and even here in the District of Columbia?

Boys Town maintains its national headquarters in the Nebraska village of

the same name, on the site of a farm Father Flanagan bought a few years after renting that first house for \$90. There he founded a community that, under the careful hands of those leaders following his death, expanded its services to help kids live in a family setting, with married couples carefully watching the units that included both boys and girls. In the 1970s, the Boys Town National Research Hospital opened. It has become a top treatment center for kids with speech and hearing disabilities, with outreach programs that touch as many as 60,000 deaf and hearing-impaired students each year.

The bill before us would allow the minting and issue in 2017 of no more than 50,000 gold coins and no more than 350,000 silver coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Boys Town. The coins would be sold at a price that covers all taxpayer costs, and a surcharge on the sale of the coins would go to Boys Town to continue its work after Boys Town has raised an equal amount from private sources. The legislation has 293 cosponsors, and a Senate companion bill, introduced by Senator JOHANNES, has 36 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Boys Town embodies the best of America. This bill would help recognize and continue to nurture that spirit. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for his hard work on this issue. I ask for the immediate passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2866, as amended, a bill which provides appropriate recognition for the outstanding work conducted by Boys Town, a nonprofit organization which selflessly promotes the interests of children and their families across the Nation.

Boys Town, which takes its name from Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, impacts the lives of more than 2 million families across America each year through its counseling services, outreach, and education. I am also pleased to report that, each year, Boys Town directly touches the lives of 45,000 Californians through its community support services and homes for troubled youths.

Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town, focused on the inherent good in children and built a world-class organization that emphasized the rehabilitation of troubled youths rather than punishment. It is this compassionate approach and commitment to love, training, and guidance, regardless of race, creed, or color, that has made Boys Town such a success story and a lifeline for countless children and their families.

In commemoration of the organization's centennial anniversary, the bill before us today will require the U.S. Treasury Department to mint and issue \$5 gold, \$1 silver, and half-dollar

clad commemorative coins. Surcharges associated with the sale of the coins will allow Boys Town to raise needed funds that will be dedicated to making a positive impact on the lives of children and families from underserved communities across America. I am also pleased to report that the passage of this bill entails no net cost to taxpayers.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in passing this commonsense, bipartisan bill without further delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you. I appreciate the support.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California for her support all the way from the beginning of this bill to today's passage. It means a lot to me and to the people of Omaha and Boys Town.

This bill will honor the significant contributions, Mr. Speaker, of Boys Town and how, in my district, it has impacted our community and our country with a fitting tribute to the legacy of Father Flanagan, who founded Boys Town.

A priest and an immigrant from Ireland, Father Flanagan was of modest means, but in 1917—about 5 years after becoming a priest—he borrowed \$90 from B'nai B'rith member Henry Monsky to open a boarding house because they both shared a love for the homeless boys, who had been abandoned or orphaned, living on the streets of our city. They created this boarding house, went out and recruited boys from the streets to come in, where he not only housed them and fed them but where he educated them and taught them a trade. He really felt that the education and the trade were necessary parts of making them into men who would be part of the community and be successful. Father Flanagan did not differentiate between race or religion, and by the spring of the next year, 100 boys found refuge in Father Flanagan's home. It is great seeing the pictures from that era of boys of all races who were eating together and playing together.

In 1921, Father Flanagan opened his doors further. He was able to purchase the Overlook Farm way on the outskirts. Now I have to drive about 50 blocks east to get to it, as it is surrounded by Omaha. That is the property that is now known, iconically, as "Boys Town."

□ 2030

It became an official village with its own post office in 1936.

Today, Boys Town serves more than 2 million children and families across our country each year. It provides parental counseling. The Boys Town national hotline provides counseling to

more than 150,000 children and families each year.

The Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher syndrome, and all of this is thanks to the vision of Father Flanagan when he borrowed \$90 to start a boys' home.

Now, also I should mention that it was probably around the seventies—I can't remember the date—when women—young girls were allowed in there. In fact, a couple of times, I have had the pleasure of being invited to dinner at one of the houses there where they have a host family, and there were eight girls in this house who were then ordered by the court or placed there by a family to help them with a variety of issues, mostly disciplinary, some health care.

In fact, Boys Town is now becoming the leader in research for pharmaceuticals for young children, for children, teenagers. Most of them have come to Boys Town with about four or five different prescriptions, and Boys Town, because of their way of counseling and dealing with it, can get most of them off of the prescription drugs.

This is what Boys Town stands for. As Father Flanagan once said, "I know, when the idea of a boys' home grew in my mind, I never thought of anything remarkable about taking in all of the races and all of the creeds. To me, they are all God's children. They are my brothers. They are children of God. I must protect them to the best of my ability."

Mr. Speaker, 97 years later, inspired by Father Flanagan, here we are, and that vision stands as true today as it did in 1917.

It is the inscription of the iconic statue of the two boys, one on the shoulder of the other, that stood as the centerpiece of the village for more than 70 years now. "He ain't heavy. He's my brother." That is the Boys Town way, to be full of compassion and to help our fellow man.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to, again, thank Mr. TERRY of Nebraska for his hard work on this issue and so many other issues.

The passage of this bill is an appropriate way to commemorate the great work and the legacy of Father Flanagan, of his home for boys, of the medical center that bears that name, and the great work of the boys and girls who come through the facilities of Boys Town throughout the country; so I urge my colleagues to support the bill and pass it under suspension.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2866, The Boys

Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act. This legislation will create a coin to honor Boys Town's longstanding commitment to the needs of at-risk children and struggling families in communities across America.

Driven by the belief that every child deserves the opportunity to succeed, Boys Town serves children of every race, color, and religion. In my district, South Florida Boys Town provides incredible opportunities to help children achieve success and pursue their dreams.

I am pleased to honor Boys Town and I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation and I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2866, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5461) to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5461

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.

TITLE I—INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Clarification of application of leverage and risk-based capital requirements.

TITLE II—COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Rules of construction relating to collateralized loan obligations.

TITLE III—DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES IN MORTGAGE TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definition of points and fees.

Sec. 303. Rulemaking.

TITLE IV—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Margin requirements.

Sec. 403. Implementation.

TITLE I—INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014".

SEC. 102. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LEVERAGE AND RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.

Section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.—The term ‘business of insurance’ has the same meaning as in section 1002(3).

“(5) PERSON REGULATED BY A STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR.—The term ‘person regulated by a State insurance regulator’ has the same meaning as in section 1002(22).

“(6) REGULATED FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY AND REGULATED FOREIGN AFFILIATE.—The terms ‘regulated foreign subsidiary’ and ‘regulated foreign affiliate’ mean a person engaged in the business of insurance in a foreign country that is regulated by a foreign insurance regulatory authority that is a member of the International Association of Insurance Supervisors or other comparable foreign insurance regulatory authority as determined by the Board of Governors following consultation with the State insurance regulators, including the lead State insurance commissioner (or similar State official) of the insurance holding company system as determined by the procedures within the Financial Analysis Handbook adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, where the person, or its principal United States insurance affiliate, has its principal place of business or is domiciled, but only to the extent that—

“(A) such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity; and

“(B) the Board of Governors does not determine that the capital requirements in a specific foreign jurisdiction are inadequate.

“(7) CAPACITY AS A REGULATED INSURANCE ENTITY.—The term ‘capacity as a regulated insurance entity’—

“(A) includes any action or activity undertaken by a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate of such person, as those actions relate to the provision of insurance, or other activities necessary to engage in the business of insurance; and

“(B) does not include any action or activity, including any financial activity, that is not regulated by a State insurance regulator or a foreign agency or authority and subject to State insurance capital requirements or, in the case of a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate, capital requirements imposed by a foreign insurance regulatory authority.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) CLARIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing the minimum leverage capital requirements and minimum risk-based capital requirements on a consolidated basis for a depository institution holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors as required under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall not be required to include, for any purpose of this section (including in any determination of consolidation), a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or a regulated foreign affiliate of such person engaged in the business of insurance, to the extent that such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON BOARD’S AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall not be construed to prohibit, modify, limit, or other-

wise supersede any other provision of Federal law that provides the Board of Governors authority to issue regulations and orders relating to capital requirements for depository institution holding companies or nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A depository institution holding company or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve that is also a person regulated by a State insurance regulator that is engaged in the business of insurance that files financial statements with a State insurance regulator or the National Association of Insurance Commissioners utilizing only Statutory Accounting Principles in accordance with State law, shall not be required by the Board under the authority of this section or the authority of the Home Owners’ Loan Act to prepare such financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

“(B) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall limit the authority of the Board under any other applicable provision of law to conduct any regulatory or supervisory activity of a depository institution holding company or non-bank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors, including the collection or reporting of any information on an entity or group-wide basis. Nothing in this paragraph shall excuse the Board from its obligations to comply with section 161(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5361(a)) and section 10(b)(2) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(b)(2)), as appropriate.”.

TITLE II—COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act”.

SEC. 202. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(g) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

“(A) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the divestiture, prior to July 21, 2017, of any debt securities of collateralized loan obligations, if such debt securities were issued before January 31, 2014.

“(B) OWNERSHIP INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—A banking entity shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a collateralized loan obligation because it acquires, has acquired, or retains a debt security in such collateralized loan obligation if the debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right of the banking entity to participate in the removal for cause, or in the selection of a replacement after removal for cause or resignation, of an investment manager or investment adviser of the collateralized loan obligation.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(1) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—The term ‘collateralized loan obligation’ means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C.

78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.

“(ii) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—An investment manager or investment adviser shall be deemed to be removed ‘for cause’ if the investment manager or investment adviser is removed as a result of—

“(I) a breach of a material term of the applicable management or advisory agreement or the agreement governing the collateralized loan obligation;

“(II) the inability of the investment manager or investment adviser to continue to perform its obligations under any such agreement;

“(III) any other action or inaction by the investment manager or investment adviser that has or could reasonably be expected to have a materially adverse effect on the collateralized loan obligation, if the investment manager or investment adviser fails to cure or take reasonable steps to cure such effect within a reasonable time; or

“(IV) a comparable event or circumstance that threatens, or could reasonably be expected to threaten, the interests of holders of the debt securities.”.

TITLE III—DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES IN MORTGAGE TRANSACTIONS

SECTION 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Mortgage Choice Act of 2014”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITION OF POINTS AND FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 103 OF TILA.—Section 103(bb)(4) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602(bb)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A) and section 129C”;

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “and insurance” after “taxes”;

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “, except as retained by a creditor or its affiliate as a result of their participation in an affiliated business arrangement (as defined in section 2(7) of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2602(7))” after “compensation”; and

(C) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) the charge is—

“(I) a bona fide third-party charge not retained by the mortgage originator, creditor, or an affiliate of the creditor or mortgage originator; or

“(II) a charge set forth in section 106(e)(1);”;

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking “accident,”; and

(B) by striking “or any payments” and inserting “and any payments”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 129C OF TILA.—Section 129C of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)(C), by striking “103” and all that follows through “or mortgage originator” and inserting “103(bb)(4)”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking “103” and all that follows through “or mortgage originator” and inserting “103(bb)(4)”.

SEC. 303. RULEMAKING.

Not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue final regulations to carry out the amendments made by this Act, and such regulations shall be effective upon issuance.

TITLE IV—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013”.

SEC. 402. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).”.

SEC. 403. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

- (1) without regard to—
 - (A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and
 - (B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;
- (2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and
- (3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5461 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5461, a bill authored by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my colleague on the Financial Services Committee, and cosponsored by Mr.

GARY G. MILLER of California and myself.

This bill contains four titles, three of which having already passed this House with overwhelming or unanimous support and one of which passed with only a dozen “no” votes.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that the Senate sends us meaningful legislation; and, frankly, it is even rarer when they send us legislation that amends and fixes the Dodd-Frank Act. As we on the Financial Services Committee have seen in our hearings and our markups, our friends on the other side of the aisle and the other side of the Capitol usually defend Dodd-Frank to the hilt, bestowing on it deference normally reserved for the sacred texts handed down from the heavens.

Well, we should agree that Congress doesn’t always get it right. When sweeping legislation is enacted—remember, Dodd-Frank is a 2,300-page bill—there are often areas that later need clarification, and that is exactly what we are talking about here today.

Whatever one’s position is on Dodd-Frank, we should all be able to agree that the text is not sacred and does need some fixing. That is why I am pleased that the Senate has sent us a bill to clarify that regulators should not impose regulatory capital requirements designed for banking institutions on insurance companies. That was not what was intended.

The Senate bill, S. 2270, passed the other body unanimously. There is broad support in the House for a companion measure, but there is equally broad support for three other Dodd-Frank technical correction amendments that have previously passed this House: Mr. BARR’s bill on the treatment of collateralized loan obligations under the Volcker rule, Mr. GRIMM’s bill to exempt end users from derivatives from Dodd-Frank’s overreaching margin requirements, and my own bill on how points and fees are treated under Dodd-Frank’s onerous qualified mortgage rule.

My legislation that is included in this package is a strong bipartisan provision that modifies and clarifies the way points and fees in a real estate transaction are calculated. This provision is narrowly focused to promote access to affordable mortgage credit without overturning the important consumer protections and sound underwriting requirements that Dodd-Frank’s ability to repay provisions has in place.

Homeownership has been a pillar of American life for generations, and this particular provision will help more Americans realize this portion of the American Dream.

This bill is a commonsense measure that should and, I believe, does have broad bipartisan support. I was puzzled, however, by a Dear Colleague letter produced by Ranking Member WATERS

circulated earlier today. In the letter, she writes that Mr. BARR has coupled the insurance capital bill with other “divisive legislation.”

Now, I would ask my friend the ranking member: What divisive legislation are you referring to? Is it the CLO bill which passed the House on voice vote? Is it the end user bill which passed the House on the ranking member’s “yes” vote herself and only a dozen “nay” votes? Or is it my bill that also passed the House by voice vote? I don’t see the divisiveness, and I don’t see where the problem is.

The reality is Americans don’t care about the parliamentary process so much as they want results.

We are pleased that the Senate has finally come to the table on Dodd-Frank reforms. This is legislation that represents a step forward in working with the other body to make sure that my constituents and your constituents can get mortgages to buy their first home, that farmers can access the financing that they need to buy tractors and work their land, and that Americans can buy insurance policies without severe premium increases.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5461, especially my Democrats friends who I believe support every component of the package.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I must correct the gentleman from Michigan when he talked about our unwillingness to look at Dodd-Frank in any critical way and our unwillingness to modify, amend, or do anything to Dodd-Frank. It is absolutely not true.

As a matter of fact, I am recorded time and time again—even in my speech before the Chamber of Commerce, where I have said and I have acted in this manner and in this fashion—that where there were complications, I was willing to work with the opposite side of the aisle to try to deal with those complications so that everybody would understand what was intended. Where there appeared to be conflicts, I would work to undo those conflicts.

I have no problem with changing or modifying or dealing with problems in Dodd-Frank, and I have acted that way time and time again.

Today, I rise to express my disappointment with a Republican Party that has politicized consensus legislation that would provide real, tangible regulatory relief.

When we began this Congress, Democrats on the House Financial Services Committee and Senate Banking Committee both agreed to support technical fixes to the Dodd-Frank Act that have broad bipartisan support.

In that spirit, the gentlewoman from New York, Representative CAROLYN

MCCARTHY, who is on this floor this evening, worked hard, provided leadership, helped to straighten out any confusion, and worked with both sides of the aisle to come together in a consensus around the legislation that we are going to hear so much about.

I worked with Mrs. MCCARTHY. I worked with both sides of the aisle also. We came up with targeted, bipartisan insurance capital standards, and we fixed it, and our hard work paid off.

After months of holding hearings and building consensus, we delivered to our chairman a bill with no opposition. Democrats and Republicans supported the measure, as did outside experts on financial reform and the financial services industry.

It was a bill that unanimously passed the Senate, a bill that represented the kind of work Congress should be doing. In other words, Mr. Speaker, virtually no one opposed these reasonable changes to insurance capital standards; but, instead of passing the measure, this noncontroversial technical change has been “repackaged” into a broader and more controversial bill by attaching provisions that make substantive changes to Dodd-Frank that, unlike the insurance capital standards fix, are nontechnical in nature and are not universally supported.

The reality is, by circumventing and politicizing the process, this commonsense legislation is going nowhere in the United States Senate. Countless Senate Democrats have made clear that any changes to Dodd-Frank must be targeted and have overwhelming bipartisan support; and Republicans, like Senator COLLINS, whose contributions to the Dodd-Frank Act we are fixing today, are opposed to it as well.

Her statement was unequivocal, saying, “I would hate for a bill, after many months to have achieved consensus, to get bogged down in unrelated issues.” She went on to say, “This isn’t reopening a major issue in Dodd-Frank. It is simply bringing clarity to a provision that I authored that the Fed has misinterpreted. I think, given how closely we’ve worked with everyone, it really is more of a technical correction.”

Senator JOHANNIS, another author of the “clean” Senate bill, also wants to see an up-or-down vote on the House side; and he said, “My hope is that we can do this in a straightforward way and get it done.” He went on to say, if changes were made to the bill, he has to “start all over.”

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been infamous for its inability to get anything done; but, on this one issue, we have managed to get the policy right and get incredibly broad support. We have a clear path to getting something done; but, unfortunately, the chairman has decided to throw a wrench in the works at the last minute for no reason.

Finally, it is clear that this is an exercise in political theater. It is well-

known and widely reported that Republican leadership has privately told insurance industry stakeholders that they would bring up a “clean” insurance capital standards bill after the midterm elections.

It simply shows the disgraceful nature of this debate and the partisan, dilatory tactics that create more distrust in the political process. Rather than do what is right and enact legislation that everyone has agreed on, the chairman has decided to create a fight where there was none.

Make no mistake, but for the chairman’s intransigence, the insurance capital fix bill could be on the President’s desk for a signature tomorrow.

I oppose this bill due to the particularly flagrant affront to bipartisan efforts to fix narrow issues in the Wall Street Reform Act, an important and complex bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wish I had actually asked if the gentlewoman would yield because I am confused. I am confused on a bill that she has voted three times—I am positive—three different bills, how that is divisive, how it is not targeted with significant Democrat support.

I personally with one of these bills—my bill has been sitting in the Senate since June. It has been targeted, it has had Democrat support, and it has had Republican support. We simply cannot get the Senate to move, and I am not sure why my colleague would support a Senate bill without any House input, but not expect the Senate to look at our material and to look at our bills.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield now as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) the author of this legislation.

Mr. BARR. Well, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on title III of this package and the Mortgage Choice Act, and I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding so that we can talk about why every Member of Congress should support this package of reforms.

Before I get to the substance, I do also want to thank the ranking member, thank her for voicing support for the underlying policies in this legislation. I want to thank her for expressing absolutely no concern about the substance of the policy in her remarks, and I would also like to thank the ranking member for her recognition that the Dodd-Frank law may very well have flaws, even for those who adamantly supported the passage of the bill, and for her acknowledgement that she would have no problem changing or dealing with some of the flaws of the Dodd-Frank law. Well, this is our chance, Mr. Speaker. This is the chance to deal with those flaws.

The legislation on the floor tonight is a package of four commonsense financial services bills that all share a common theme. They all have proven bipartisan support. They all have passed either the House or the Senate with unanimous or near-unanimous support, and, most importantly—put aside all of this procedure here—they all promote jobs.

They all promote durable economic growth in this country, and Members on both sides of the aisle and Members in both this Chamber and in the Senate agree about that. Let’s stop the games in Washington, and let’s get the American people back to work. That is what we have an opportunity to do here in a bipartisan way; so I call on my colleagues to support this bill.

This is a simple 14-page bill that is about fixing unintended consequences of the Dodd-Frank law. These fixes are technical corrections, and they are meant to clarify provisions in the law where, although congressional intent was clear, the authority provided by the statutory language led some regulators to enact or promulgate economically destructive regulations.

The four titles of this legislative package represent the hard work of a number of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Let me just go through those really quickly. Title I of the legislation is an important provision that clarifies the capital requirements applied to insurance companies subject to Federal Reserve Board supervision.

Mr. HUIZENGA did a good job explaining what this title does; but, just in summary, it is important that the capital rules for insurance companies are carefully tailored to the business of insurance rather than arbitrarily holding insurance companies to standards that are meant for banks.

I want to thank Congressman GARY MILLER, a Republican from California, Congresswoman MALONEY, a Democrat from New York, for their leadership—bipartisan leadership—for this Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act and for helping push this provision forward.

I would also like to further emphasize the bipartisan and noncontroversial nature of this title by noting that the Senate version of the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act passed the Senate by unanimous consent on June 3.

Then there is title II. Title II is the text of a bill that I introduced in March which passed the House by a voice vote. This was a bill that no one opposed. This was a bill that simply incorporates bipartisan provisions of the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act, and it is about jobs.

It is about restoring a robust and dependable commercial lending market

to U.S. companies so that they can obtain affordable financing to expand their businesses.

Collateralized loan obligations, known as CLOs, have proven to be a critical source of funding for U.S. businesses for over 20 years. Today's CLOs continue to provide \$300 billion in financing to U.S. companies on Main Street, including companies that are well-known to all of us in this room: Dunkin' Donuts, American Airlines, Burger King, Toys R Us, Delta Airlines, Goodyear Tire, and even a mattress company in Lexington, Kentucky, my home district, Tempur Sealy.

Because of this innovative source of financing, U.S. employers have expanded, jobs have been created, and our economy has grown; and, despite a proven track record with a default rate below even a half a percent, this valuable form of corporate finance is under assault because of the Volcker rule.

Further relief from the Volcker rule for these CLOs is necessary to prevent a fire sale in the CLO market that will cause significant losses for banks of all size. This defined, narrow fix which clarifies that the Volcker rule should not be construed to require the divestiture of any debt securities of CLOs prior to July 21, 2017, if such CLOs were issued before January 31, 2014, is a commonsense solution.

It clarifies that a bank shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a CLO if such debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right to participate in the removal for cause in the selection of a replacement investment manager or investment adviser of the CLO.

This title is a bipartisan commonsense fix to a real-world problem voiced by community banks and by companies on Main Street that want access to this affordable and reliable source of commercial credit. It prevents an unnecessary fire sale in the CLO market that would cause significant losses to banks currently holding these legacy CLOs, and it will help keep the cost of borrowing affordable in the future for Main Street U.S. businesses looking to expand, grow, and create much-needed jobs.

I want to personally thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Ranking Member WATERS for working with me to enact a CLO fix so that it could pass by a voice vote in April.

Then, also, title III, this is the fix that Congressman HUIZENGA helped pass, and Congressman HUIZENGA worked in a bipartisan way with Congressman MEEKS to support this Mortgage Choice Act, and it passed the House by a voice vote—not a single objection—on June 19, and I won't go over the details which Congressman HUIZENGA has done well, but I will say that this measure will greatly advance our efforts to help the housing market and our economy recover as Members

on both sides of the aisle have demonstrated with their support and supporting it by voice vote.

Finally, title IV, this is the fourth and final title of this package, and it is a provision that has broad support for Main Street and businesses of all sizes. Like other provisions of this package, title IV is meant to alleviate the unintended consequences created by Dodd-Frank. It is a technical fix that has proven bipartisan support and passed the House on June 12 with 411 votes in favor.

The provision simply clarifies and codifies congressional intent that Dodd-Frank was not supposed to impose margin requirements on end user derivative transactions. We are talking about nonfinancial companies that produce goods for the American people and simply use derivatives to hedge against commercial risk.

This provision is not about speculation. It is about promoting responsible risk-management practices among U.S. companies. In fact, failure to enact this provision could lead to more risk as companies may be deterred from engaging in hedging transactions.

It requires them to needlessly tie up capital that could otherwise be used to do more productive things like expand operating plants, perform research and product development, and ultimately create jobs. Again, this is a provision that previously passed the House with near unanimous support.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, what do we have here today? We have a package of four bills, 14 pages, unlike the 2,300 pages in Dodd-Frank—14 pages, each of which of these four bills—overwhelmingly bipartisan—each of which are vital to preserving and creating jobs, each of which are noncontroversial in nature, and two of these provisions previously passed the House by voice vote, a third passed with 411 votes, and the fourth is a commonsense critically important solution for the 75 million American families that rely on life insurance for financial and retirement security, a bill that passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

The substance and the policy behind these bills are bipartisan. It is solid. I would certainly expect that, if you would support the underlying policy, then you would support this commonsense package of bills to promote jobs and durable economic growth.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee. She is a woman that has worked hard to bring a clean bill to the floor.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Just for the record, when my colleague was speaking, my name is CAROLYN MCCARTHY, not CAROLYN MALONEY, just so we clarify that, and I want to thank Ms.

WATERS. I want to thank the ranking member on Financial Services.

I have a speech here, but I need to clarify a few things. I am not sure, my memory has not been good since I was sick, but I was on Financial Services when we did Dodd-Frank, and we worked very hard, bipartisanly, on that committee, and we saw the problems on some of the language, and we corrected them bipartisanly.

We made sure that when we were dealing with derivatives, that it didn't have the language that you are complaining about. That came from the Senate side.

When we are talking about the insurance companies and making it easier to make sure they could do their job and not be treated like a bank, we got the language here on the House side. Again, the Senate side misinterprets some and had the wrong language. GARY MILLER and I have been working a year—over a year—to make the corrections that are coming out today.

Now, I support everything that we are going to be voting on, but I am reluctant about it because talking to my colleagues on the Senate side, they have said that they will not do it; so something that you all want has a really good chance of never seeing the light of day. Maybe next year. That is fine. Whom are you hurting, and what are you proving? Mainly because, now, the insurance companies are going to be in limbo. We don't know what is going to happen; so you are putting off something again.

I am ending my career here in Congress. I will be retiring, and I have to say, for 18 years, I have worked bipartisanly, and I have gotten a lot of things done, and I hope to continue to get some things done between now and when I retire, but I also think what I have seen here is this politicking that words are said and people don't get to know each other.

Now, the audience might not understand everything that is going on here on the floor, but I do believe that what we have done on Dodd-Frank—and, now, yes, there are technical changes; but, to be very honest with you, in 18 years, I do not remember any bill—major bill—being passed here, going through the Senate, that didn't come back for technical changes.

We are not perfect. As many times as people want to think we are, we are not. We are human beings; and, unfortunately, we do not take the time to legislate and to work things out as we have done in the past. I am not blaming Republicans, and I am not blaming Democrats.

We have got good people on both sides of the aisle, and it hurts me terribly to see this going on when everybody should be working together for the country, not whether you are a Republican or a Democrat.

There are many of us who care very much about getting jobs. There are

many of us that care to get everybody forward, and I think that is something that people have to start realizing. We have so many members on your side of the aisle and members on our side of the aisle that have been friends for years and years, and you have got to learn to work together. You can have your opinions, and we have ours, but you have got to sit down and work together.

I know the big word around here is don't compromise. It is not compromising. It is trying to represent all of our constituents for the whole country.

□ 2100

And Ms. WATERS is absolutely right. She worked very hard during Dodd-Frank, as many of your Republican colleagues did. But it was GARY MILLER and I who have been working with the Senate for over a year and to see this bill come onto the floor, which is going to pass, and it will pass. What upsets me is it is not going to go anywhere in the Senate. Another bill will die. And there is no reason for it. 204 Members bipartisanship want to see the Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 passed.

I understand where you want to put everything together so you see it is efficient. Sometimes you have to know how the Senate works so that we can be efficient and work with them as we go forward because, if had you done that, you would hear Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and their aides who are saying, This is not the way it is done. That is why we are upset.

When you have so many people working on this, many of your colleagues, my colleagues signing on to having it done, and now we are going to see, most likely, it die or put off until next year, which is really a shame because the companies you are talking about, everything you are talking about as far as the jobs bills and everything else like that, I would like to see that signed by the President tomorrow. That ain't going to happen now, and it is not going to happen now.

So what I will say is Ms. WATERS is correct, but I will vote for this bill tomorrow. Many of my colleagues will vote for this bill tomorrow because we are hoping we will go forward. But in my heart of hearts, because I have been around here too long, I don't think the Senate is going to pass it, and that is a shame because that is what you are working for. That is what we are working for. But the Senate's procedures do not do it.

They will take a stand-alone bill. And from what I understand, Mr. MILLER and I will hopefully introduce a stand-alone bill in the next few days, because if this dies in the Senate, we will take up the Senate bill, which is our bill, and hopefully get a vote here and have the President sign it within a few days.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the House is considering the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 under suspension of the rules.

This bill contains four Financial Services Bills including S. 2270.

I am pleased to be the lead Democrat on H.R. 4510, the House companion to S. 2270, the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014. However, this is not the same bill that we will be voting on.

Though I will reluctantly support the bill, I am disappointed in the process and believe that S. 2270 should have been brought up as a stand-alone bill, rather than combined with three other bills which have already passed the House. The Senate has indicated they would need to start all over if changes were made to the original bill.

Ranking Member WATERS rightly objected to this procedure last week yet her concerns were ignored.

S. 2270 supports a more precise application of capital standards that furthers the interests of strong prudential supervision. This legislation grants the Federal Reserve the appropriate flexibility to apply accurate capital standards for insurers. This bill will help keep insurance products affordable and available by ensuring the correct capital standards are applied to insurance companies that fall under the supervision of the Federal Reserve.

This House version already has 204 bipartisan cosponsors and S. 2270 would easily pass under suspension. This bill has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent. Passing S. 2270 on its own in the House would have sent the bill directly to the president's desk.

Instead, the Financial Services committee majority leadership has insisted on combining four bills and using our title, even though this is different legislation. This creates uncertainty as to the future of the original bill.

I will support the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 on the floor tonight and urge my colleagues to do the same. However, I am disappointed in the process that has been used. Had S. 2270 been passed as a stand-alone bill, it would have been sent directly to the President's desk. Instead, we will likely have to vote on S. 2270 as a stand-alone bill during the lame duck session, which is already filled with a long list of remaining actions.

The House delay in passing this bill is causing uncertainty for insurance companies who cannot plan for the future of their businesses without knowing the appropriate capital standards. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4510, the House version of S. 2270, so that we can reach 218 cosponsors and bring this to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who would like to clarify.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I appreciate what she is saying about bipartisan-ship. Let me just make sure I clarify. I

was referring to Congresswoman MALONEY on the legislation that she and I worked on together, the CLO bill. So, in a very bipartisan way, I worked with her on that.

But to the substance of the gentlewoman's remarks, I appreciate what she is saying, absolutely, and that is what is such a shame about this whole situation because we have four bills that have been worked on in a bipartisan way. There shouldn't be any controversy about this whatsoever.

Let's do the business of the American people, get them back to work. Pass these bipartisan bills.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am curious why we are here. The House of Representatives is only going to pass Senate bills. I am curious why my colleagues would be willing to do that. I would love to hear from my colleagues, which overwhelmingly passed House bill does the Senate object to? We simply cannot get them to take our bills up.

I am glad to hear that my colleague, Mrs. MCCARTHY, is going to be supporting this bill package. I too am hopeful. But I do believe that this is not political theater, for the robust list of supporters, like credit unions, banks, insurers of all sizes, the entire real estate community and end-users strongly support the policies that are within this bill. And I do have that list available as well, which I will include for the RECORD.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned trade associations, representing job creators across the country of all shapes and sizes, write to urge your support for bipartisan legislation recently introduced by Reps. Andy Barr (R-KY), Gary Miller (R-CA), Bill Huizenga (R-MI), and David Scott (D-GA). H.R. 5461, currently scheduled for floor consideration on Monday, September 15th, includes important technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act that strengthen the underlying Act and provide critical clarifications to better oversee our financial system while allowing for economic growth.

The ongoing implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act has revealed unintended consequences that have adversely impacted job creation and economic growth. We believe that the Barr-Miller bill, comprised of a series of noncontroversial, thoroughly examined, bipartisan proposals will fix these unintended consequences and help make financial reform more workable and effective. Specifically, this legislation contains the text of three bills previously approved by the House (H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act; H.R. 3211, the Mortgage Choice Act; H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act) as well as one bill that recently passed the Senate (S. 2270, the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act) by unanimous consent. In fact, three of the four titles of this package have previously passed either

the House or Senate without one dissenting vote.

We urge your support for the Barr-Miller-Huizenga-Scott bill to help foster job creation and economic growth.

Signed,

American Bankers Association; American Bankers Insurance Association (ABIA); American Financial Services Association; American Insurance Association; Consumer Bankers Association; Consumer Mortgage Coalition; Community Mortgage Lenders of America; Credit Union National Association; The Financial Services Roundtable; The Financial Services Forum; Independent Community Bankers of America; Leading Builders of America; The Loan Syndications and Trading Association; Mortgage Bankers Association; National Association of Federal Credit Unions; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of Realtors; The Realty Alliance; Real Estate Services Providers Council, Inc. (RESPRO); Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association; U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Oh, very good. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the bill we took up before this one, on Father Flanagan, that is the kind of bill that we should be doing on suspension calendar. In fact, the heart of this particular bill is noncontroversial, and I think a lot of people would be looking forward to just voting up the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act.

I think a lot of people would like to just get this bill up, pass it, and send it right to the President. We could do that. Unfortunately, this bill, even if it does have bipartisan support, has been loaded up with other bills, and the Senate has indicated that they are not going to take it up.

So, to the gentleman's point from Michigan, we are not just here to pass Senate bills—that is a fair point of view to hold—but it is a matter of pragmatic legislative action. This is the bill we could have passed and could be passed into law and signed by the President. So to pack this bill up even with bipartisan legislation slows it up, which delays good outcomes for people who could have them.

In my opinion, that is unwise and ill-advised, and I am very sorry that the President is not going to get the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act on his desk because he certainly could if there was a spirit of cooperation.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. What I was trying to explain to you, it is not

that we are giving up our power from here to the Senate. The Senate will not accept everything as a package because they have to change all their language, and that is not going to happen.

They will send back here a standalone bill, probably pass the other package—that is fine—but they are not going to change or open it up. That is what I meant to tell you, that you have to understand how the Senate works, and the House is totally different. That is all I am saying, and that is why this bill might die, unfortunately, over in the Senate, because they are not going to get to it because, let's face it, we have too much to do between now and when we come back for a lameduck session.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, again, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I think the argument that we had a piece of legislation here authored by Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. MILLER that truly had bipartisan support, that had been worked on so long and so hard by the gentlewoman from New York, that could have passed, and it should have, not been placed in this controversial position. This bill should have been a clean bill that was put forth in a way that would allow the Senate to support it, and to place it—well, the Senate—we would put this on the President's desk if, in fact, we just passed this bill out as a clean bill. It is quite unfortunate.

My colleagues can say all that they want to say about jobs and creating jobs. They talked about bills that had been supported in the committee and bills that had even been supported on the floor. Why are you bringing them back again? Why are you repackaging them? Why are you taking bills that you are identifying as having had all this great support and passed off the floor, passed out of committee, why are you repackaging them? I will tell you why you are repackaging them: because you are trying to create this picture that somehow you have this great jobs bill, that somehow you have worked in some extraordinary ways to put together, despite the fact that you are just repackaging bills that, as you said, had support.

The gentleman from Michigan said he is confused. Yes, I think you are, and I think you are confusing others, and that is my point. My point is it doesn't matter whether or not we have bills that were jointly supported or passed out of committee or passed off the floor. This process and this procedure that you are employing is one that is not fair to the Members of this House.

You are putting forth a process that is complex, that is not easily understood, and now the Members who come

to the floor, if they have to take a vote, are going to try to decide did I support that or didn't I support that.

I think that the way that you are doing this is somewhat dangerous; and I can just envision that for the future that we may have a situation where you will hold all of the bills that perhaps do not have bipartisan support, and again you will package them with maybe one bill, as you are doing with this one, with support, and we will never have an opportunity to have the kind of debate and amendments that we should have.

It is about process. It is about procedure. It is about making sure the American people understand what we are doing and how we are doing it. It is not about being slick. It is not about being cute. It is not about trying to take the process and package it in such a way that you can get what you want with a big title of jobs to make people think you have done something new, creative, and extraordinary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will address my remarks to the Chair, but, again, this is not about parliamentary procedure. This is about results.

The only bill that we will see here that may bring confusion to this entire process is the one that my colleagues are advocating for, the Senate bill. It is the only bill that we haven't dealt with in committee. It is the only bill we haven't had a vote on in the Houses. The other three bills have passed, two of them unanimously by voice vote, and the other one had 12 people, out of a body of 435, vote against it. Sounds like it is overwhelming. If it is that confusing to my colleagues to figure out what bill and how they voted for it when they come to the floor to vote on this package, they maybe should reconsider their current line of work. This should not be that tough.

This is, again, something that we need to move forward on. The political theater that seems to be happening here is on the other side. I am not sure why, if it is about trying to play to a base for an election issue or what, but this is the one time I think in the history of my working career that the whole is worse than the sum of its parts. This doesn't make any sense.

So there has not been bipartisan work on the underlying bill, Dodd-Frank, which I might remind my colleagues passed with zero minority Republican votes when the bill was passed. This package of bills has passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they oppose the Senate.

And I guess I needed to clarify that my comments about people acting like this is holy writ from the heavens does tend to be concentrated with my colleagues over in the Senate who apparently don't want to touch this or others in the administration who oppose the nine-bill package on derivatives reform that passed overwhelmingly bipartisanly out of our committee as well.

That is the kind of holdup that we have that is frustrating Americans, that is frustrating me as a policymaker and my colleagues, that is frustrating, frankly, future generations as they look in on this process.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to pass this package of bills that includes three bills that this House has already dealt with, that the Senate should have absolutely no opposition to or excuse why they will not take up.

With that, I again ask my colleagues to pass this particular bill, H.R. 5461, and look forward to its passage here soon.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose The Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014 (H.R. 5461). While I support efforts to provide flexibility under the Dodd-Frank Act's Collins amendment by explicitly stating that regulators are not required to apply minimum leverage capital and risk-based capital requirements to firms with state-regulated insurance operations, this bill does more than that. It contains The Mortgage Choice Act of 2013, (H.R. 3211).

Mr. Speaker, as I stated during the hearing and the mark up on The Mortgage Choice Act of 2013 (H.R. 3211), there are serious concerns about steering consumers into buying title insurance with hidden commissions and inflated costs.

I bought two homes in my life. Like most homebuyers, I was asked to sign a bunch of papers with lots of fees such as origination charges, appraisal fees, scoring fees, recording charges, tax service fee and title insurance. Like most consumers, I chose my title insurance provider based on referral: I did not comparison shop.

For most of us, title insurance is the most expensive of the closing cost fees—sometimes running in the thousands of dollars. These fees are poorly understood by homebuyers. This can lead to paying higher fees than is necessary or appropriate.

When Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, we required the newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to do a better job at protecting consumers when buying a home.

We know that the housing finance system had too much predatory and discriminatory lending. African Americans and Latinos were frequently charged much higher interest rates than they qualified for. Homeowners were refinanced into high fee and interest rates they could not afford. The result was more than five million foreclosures and a colossal loss of wealth.

In response to the new law, the CFPB wrote rules to protect people buying homes from

products which would strip their wealth. One of those rules defined a Qualified Mortgage (QM) standard which was established in Dodd-Frank. As part of that QM standard, the CFPB established a "points and fees" bright line limit for mortgages that qualified under the Ability to Repay provision.

The CFPB established a limit on "points and fees"—which account for a loan's origination costs—that exceed 3 percent of the loan amount—although it can be up to 8 percent for lower cost homes. Because of concerns that the affiliated title insurance system was leading to higher costs for borrowers in a market based on reverse competition, the CFPB wisely chose to require title insurance charges from affiliated title agents be within the points and fees cap.

H.R. 3211 reverses the CFPB's decision.

By excluding affiliated title insurance firms from within the points and fees cap, H.R. 3211 restores an incentive to overcharge homebuyers.

We know how hard it is to get people into homes. Homebuyers need to save thousands of dollars for a downpayment. So why should we make it easier to let them get overcharged as much as a thousand or more dollars on title insurance? Some say that as much as half or more of a title insurance premium goes to the referral agent. Why would we want to preserve this practice of overpricing title insurance to fund referral commissions?

At the Financial Services hearing that included this bill, I requested that we hear from independent land title agents as well as from groups like the Consumer Federation of America, the Center for Responsible Lending, Americans for Financial Reform and its 100 affiliates and the AFL-CIO.

I requested that the National Association of Independent Land Title Agents be invited to testify. I have heard concerns directly from title agents in my state that some referral sources ask to share ownership of their business. Since title insurance is based on referrals, when realtors, homebuilders and mortgage brokers refuse to provide referrals to a title agent firm, the firm may not be able to survive financially. Unfortunately, these independent unaffiliated title agents were not invited to testify nor was there another hearing on the bill.

Many organizations opposed the bill including the AFL-CIO, Alliance for a Just Society, Americans for Financial Reform, Center for Economic Justice, Center for Responsible Lending, Connecticut Fair Housing Center, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Empire Justice Center, Home Defenders League, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Association of Independent Land Title Agents, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low income clients), National Council of La Raza, National Fair Housing Alliance, New Economic Project, Public Citizen, Woodstock Institute and Center for Responsible Lending.

These concerns about hidden referral commissions are not hypothetical. Last month, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) fined RealtySouth, the largest real estate firm in Alabama for violations of the Real Estate Settlement and Practices Act (RESPA).

RealtySouth improperly steered consumers to its affiliated firm, TitleSouth LLC. In addition, The CFPB has taken action against Borders & Borders PLC in Kentucky for funneling kickbacks to shell companies. In June, the CFPB fined Stonebridge Title Services in New Jersey for paying illegal kickbacks to referral sources.

Some who support H.R. 3211 say there are some fixed costs in lending that could result in lower valued mortgages to need to pay loans higher than the Qualified Mortgage guideline of points and fees established by smaller loans. However, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau already provided for flexible definitions based upon the amount of a borrower's mortgage:

3 percentage cap on a loan balance at \$100,000 or greater, 5 percentage cap on a loan balance from \$20,000.00 to \$60,000, or 8 percentage cap on loan balances of less than \$12,500.

Since the average mortgage origination fees are below one percent according to the Center for Responsible Lending, the caps set by the QM are appropriate. I have not seen any compelling evidence that shows that lenders will not make loans if the title premiums charged by their affiliates are included in the points and fees cap. Lenders are free to make loans outside the ability to repay rules as well.

I have also heard the proponents of H.R. 3211 arguing that the availability of affiliate service providers helps reduce the overall cost of obtaining a mortgage loan. I question their evidence. The 2010 Harris Interactive study paid by the National Association of Realtors is suspect. In that study, more than 70% of buyers "did not know" what an affiliate service provider provided or what benefit it allegedly gave.

By contrast, in 2013, The National Association of Independent Land Title Agents (NAILTA) commissioned the first-ever national settlement preference survey of American real estate consumers. More than 900 consumers participated in the nationwide survey. The results include:

93% of American real estate consumers surveyed said it was important that title insurance agents remain a neutral third party in the performance of title insurance-related services.

62% of American real estate consumers surveyed said that a title agency cannot remain objective if it is partially owned by a bank, real estate firm, mortgage company or homebuilder.

Only 1% of American real estate consumers surveyed prefer a "one stop shop".

For all the efficiencies that proponents assert existed prior to this new rule that provided a disincentive to refer homebuyers to controlled/affiliated title firms, settlement costs—exclusive of inflation—continue to rise. I believe the CFPB's rule could actually lower title insurance premiums and increase homeownership for Americans.

I have concerns about a market where people assert that half or more the cost of the product is a referral fee unlinked to the product itself. Consumers and independent title insurance agents say that title insurance premiums can provide remuneration to the referral source based on the capture rate such as lower desk rental fees, bonuses, gifts or higher commissions. This should not be permitted.

I urge members to stand with homebuyers who want to understand all the fees they are charged.

I urge members to support a market free of pressures for referral commissions.

□ 2115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5461.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 124, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. COLE (during consideration of H.R. 5461), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-600) on the resolution (H. Res. 722) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REVITALIZE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2996) to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2012, manufacturers contributed \$2.03 trillion to the economy, or 1/3 of United States Gross Domestic Product.

(2) For every \$1.00 spent in manufacturing, another \$1.32 is added to the economy, the highest multiplier effect of any economic sector.

(3) Manufacturing supports an estimated 17,400,000 jobs in the United States—about 1 in 6 private-sector jobs. More than 12,000,000 Americans (or 9 percent of the workforce) are employed directly in manufacturing.

(4) In 2012, the average manufacturing worker in the United States earned \$77,505 annually, including pay and benefits. The average worker in all industries earned \$62,063.

(5) Taken alone, manufacturing in the United States would be the 8th largest economy in the world.

(6) Manufacturers in the United States perform two-thirds of all private-sector research and development in the United States, driving more innovation than any other sector.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 34 as section 35; and

(2) by inserting after section 33 (15 U.S.C. 278r) the following:

“SEC. 34. NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the Institute a program to be known as the ‘Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Program’).

“(2) PURPOSES OF PROGRAM.—The purposes of the Program are—

“(A) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing and to increase the production of goods manufactured predominantly within the United States;

“(B) to stimulate United States leadership in advanced manufacturing research, innovation, and technology;

“(C) to facilitate the transition of innovative technologies into scalable, cost-effective, and high-performing manufacturing capabilities;

“(D) to facilitate access by manufacturing enterprises to capital-intensive infrastructure, including high-performance electronics and computing, and the supply chains that enable these technologies;

“(E) to accelerate the development of an advanced manufacturing workforce;

“(F) to facilitate peer exchange of and the documentation of best practices in addressing advanced manufacturing challenges;

“(G) to leverage non-Federal sources of support to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding; and

“(H) to create and preserve jobs.

“(3) SUPPORT.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall carry out the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) by supporting—

“(A) the Network for Manufacturing Innovation established under subsection (b); and

“(B) the establishment of centers for manufacturing innovation.

“(4) DIRECTOR.—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through the Director.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the Program, the Secretary shall establish a network of centers for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) DESIGNATION.—The network established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the ‘Network for Manufacturing Innovation’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Network’).

“(c) CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a ‘center for manufacturing innovation’ is a center that—

“(A) has been established by a person or group of persons to address challenges in advanced manufacturing and to assist manufacturers in retaining or expanding industrial production and jobs in the United States;

“(B) has a predominant focus on a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or another relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing, such as nanotechnology applications, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

“(C) as determined by the Secretary, has the potential—

“(i) to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing, including key advanced manufacturing technologies such as nanotechnology, advanced ceramics, photonics and optics, composites, biobased and advanced materials, flexible hybrid technologies, and tool development for microelectronics;

“(ii) to accelerate non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing production capacity in the United States; or

“(iii) to enable the commercial application of new technologies or industry-wide manufacturing processes; and

“(D) includes active participation among representatives from multiple industrial entities, research universities, community colleges, and such other entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, which may include industry-led consortia, career and technical education schools, Federal laboratories, State, local, and tribal governments, businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—Activities of a center for manufacturing innovation may include the following:

“(A) Research, development, and demonstration projects, including proof-of-concept development and prototyping, to reduce the cost, time, and risk of commercializing new technologies and improvements in existing technologies, processes, products, and research and development of materials to solve precompetitive industrial problems with economic or national security implications.

“(B) Development and implementation of education, training, and workforce recruitment courses, materials, and programs.

“(C) Development of innovative methodologies and practices for supply chain integration and introduction of new technologies into supply chains.

“(D) Outreach and engagement with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, including women and minority owned manufacturing enterprises, in addition to large manufacturing enterprises.

“(E) Such other activities as the Secretary, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, considers consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(3) ADDITIONAL CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute and other manufacturing centers formally recognized as manufacturing innovation centers pursuant to Federal law or executive actions, or under pending interagency review for such recognition as of the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, shall be considered centers for manufacturing innovation, but such centers shall not receive any financial assistance under subsection (d).

“(B) NETWORK PARTICIPATION.—A manufacturing center that is substantially similar to those established under this subsection but

that does not receive financial assistance under subsection (d) may, upon request of the center, be recognized as a center for manufacturing innovation by the Secretary for purposes of participation in the Network.

“(d) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH AND SUPPORT CENTERS FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall award financial assistance to a person or group of persons to assist the organization in planning, establishing, or supporting a center for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) APPLICATION.—A person or group of persons seeking financial assistance under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall, at a minimum, describe the specific sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support for the center on the date financial assistance is sought, as well as the anticipated sources and amounts of non-Federal financial support during the period for which the center could be eligible for continued Federal financial assistance under this section.

“(3) OPEN PROCESS.—In soliciting applications for financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure an open process that will allow for the consideration of all applications relevant to advanced manufacturing regardless of technology area.

“(4) SELECTION.—

“(A) COMPETITIVE, MERIT REVIEW.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use a competitive, merit review process that includes peer review by a diverse group of individuals with relevant expertise from both the private and public sectors.

“(B) PARTICIPATION IN PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—No political appointee may participate on a peer review panel. The Secretary shall implement a conflict of interest policy that ensures public transparency and accountability, and requires full disclosure of any real or potential conflicts of interest on the parts of individuals that participate in the merit selection process.

“(ii) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means any individual who—

“(I) is employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code, (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(II) is a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

“(III) is employed in a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

“(C) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—For each award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(i) make publicly available at the time of the award a description of the bases for the award, including an explanation of the relative merits of the winning applicant as compared to other applications received, if applicable; and

“(ii) develop and implement metrics-based performance measures to assess the effectiveness of the activities funded.

“(D) COLLABORATION.—In awarding financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Sec-

retary shall, acting through the National Program Office established under subsection (f)(1), collaborate with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing.

“(E) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting a person who submitted an application under paragraph (2) for an award of financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

“(i) The potential of the center for manufacturing innovation to advance domestic manufacturing and the likelihood of economic impact, including the creation or preservation of jobs, in the predominant focus areas of the center for manufacturing innovation.

“(ii) The commitment of continued financial support, advice, participation, and other contributions from non-Federal sources, to provide leverage and resources to promote a stable and sustainable business model without the need for long-term Federal funding.

“(iii) Whether the financial support provided to the center for manufacturing innovation from non-Federal sources significantly exceeds the requested Federal financial assistance.

“(iv) How the center for manufacturing innovation will increase the non-Federal investment in advanced manufacturing research in the United States.

“(v) How the center for manufacturing innovation will engage with small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, to improve the capacity of such enterprises to commercialize new processes and technologies.

“(vi) How the center for manufacturing innovation will carry out educational and workforce activities that meet industrial needs related to the predominant focus areas of the center.

“(vii) How the center for manufacturing innovation will advance economic competitiveness and generate substantial benefits to the Nation that extend beyond the direct return to participants in the Program.

“(viii) Whether the predominant focus of the center for manufacturing innovation is a manufacturing process, novel material, enabling technology, supply chain integration methodology, or other relevant aspect of advanced manufacturing that has not already been commercialized, marketed, distributed, or sold by another entity.

“(ix) How the center for manufacturing innovation will strengthen and leverage the assets of a region.

“(x) How the center for manufacturing will encourage the education and training of veterans and individuals with disabilities.

“(5) LIMITATIONS ON AWARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No award of financial assistance may be made under paragraph (1) to a center of manufacturing innovation after the 7-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary first awards financial assistance to that center under that paragraph.

“(B) MATCHING FUNDS AND PREFERENCES.—The total Federal financial assistance awarded to a center of manufacturing innovation, including the financial assistance under paragraph (1), in a given year shall not exceed 50 percent of the total funding of the center in that year, except that the Secretary may make an exception in the case of large capital facilities or equipment purchases. The Secretary shall give weighted preference to applicants seeking less than the maximum Federal share of funds allowed under this paragraph.

“(C) FUNDING DECREASE.—The amount of financial assistance provided to a center of

manufacturing innovation under paragraph (1) shall decrease after the second year of funding for the center, and shall continue to decrease thereafter in each year in which financial assistance is provided, unless the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the center is otherwise meeting its stated goals and metrics under this section;

“(ii) unforeseen circumstances have altered the center's anticipated funding; and

“(iii) the center can identify future non-Federal funding sources that would warrant a temporary exemption from the limitations established in this subparagraph.

“(e) FUNDING.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

“(2) AUTHORITY.—

“(A) NIST INDUSTRIAL TECHNICAL SERVICES ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2024 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated to the Institute for Industrial Technical Services.

“(B) ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary of Energy may transfer to the Institute not to exceed \$250,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Secretary to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for advanced manufacturing research and development within the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy account for the Department of Energy.

“(f) NATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish, within the Institute, the National Office of the Network for Manufacturing Innovation Program (referred to in this section as the ‘National Program Office’), which shall oversee and carry out the Program.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the National Program Office are—

“(A) to oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program;

“(B) to enter into memorandums of understanding with Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing, to carry out the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

“(C) to develop, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, and update not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, a strategic plan to guide the Program;

“(D) to establish such procedures, processes, and criteria as may be necessary and appropriate to maximize cooperation and coordinate the activities of the Program with programs and activities of other Federal departments and agencies whose missions contribute to or are affected by advanced manufacturing;

“(E) to establish a clearinghouse of public information related to the activities of the Program; and

“(F) to act as a convener of the Network.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing and updating the strategic plan under paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall solicit recommendations and advice from a wide range of stakeholders, including industry, small and medium-sized manufacturing enterprises, research universities, community colleges, and other relevant organizations and institutions on an ongoing basis.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion, the Secretary shall transmit the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(C) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

“(5) HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.—The Secretary shall ensure that the National Program Office incorporates the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership into Program planning to ensure that the results of the Program reach small and medium-sized entities.

“(6) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the National Program Office without reimbursement. Such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

“(g) REPORTING AND AUDITING.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require each recipient of financial assistance under subsection (d)(1) to annually submit a report to the Secretary that describes the finances and performance of the center for manufacturing innovation for which such assistance was awarded.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) an accounting of expenditures of amounts awarded to the recipient under subsection (d)(1); and

“(ii) consistent with the metrics-based performance measures developed and implemented by the Secretary under this section, a description of the performance of the center for manufacturing innovation with respect to—

“(I) its goals, plans, financial support, and accomplishments; and

“(II) how the center for manufacturing innovation has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(2) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year until December 31, 2024, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that describes the performance of the Program during the most recent 1-year period.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

“(i) a summary and assessment of the reports received by the Secretary under paragraph (1);

“(ii) an accounting of the funds expended by the Secretary under the Program, including any temporary exemptions provided from the requirements of subsection (d)(5)(C);

“(iii) an assessment of the participation in, and contributions to, the Network by any centers for manufacturing innovation not receiving financial assistance under subsection (d)(1); and

“(iv) an assessment of the Program with respect to meeting the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

“(3) ASSESSMENTS BY GAO.—

“(A) ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the operation of the Program during the most recent 2-year period.

“(B) FINAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2024, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a final report regarding the overall success of the Program.

“(C) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall include, for the period covered by the report—

“(i) a review of the management, coordination, and industry utility of the Program;

“(ii) an assessment of the extent to which the Program has furthered the purposes described in subsection (a)(2);

“(iii) such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General considers appropriate to improve the Program; and

“(iv) an assessment as to whether any prior recommendations for improvement made by the Comptroller General have been implemented or adopted.

“(h) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.—

“(1) APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may appoint such personnel and enter into such contracts, financial assistance agreements, and other agreements as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program, including support for research and development activities involving a center for manufacturing innovation.

“(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Of amounts available under the authority provided by subsection (e), the Secretary may transfer to other Federal agencies such sums as the Secretary considers necessary or appropriate to carry out the Program. No funds so transferred may be used to reimburse or otherwise pay for the costs of financial assistance incurred or commitments of financial assistance made prior to the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

“(3) AUTHORITY OF OTHER AGENCIES.—In the event that the Secretary exercises the authority to transfer funds to another agency under paragraph (2), such agency may accept such funds to award and administer, under the same conditions and constraints applicable to the Secretary, all aspects of financial assistance awards under this section.

“(4) USE OF RESOURCES.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Program, the Secretary may use, with the consent of a covered entity and with or without reimbursement, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of such covered entity.

“(5) ACCEPTANCE OF RESOURCES.—In addition to amounts appropriated to carry out the Program, the Secretary may accept funds, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities from any covered entity to carry out the Program, subject to the same conditions and constraints otherwise applicable to the Secretary under this section and such funds may only be obligated to the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts.

“(6) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection, a covered entity is any Federal department, Federal agency, instrumentality of the United States, State, local government, tribal government, territory, or possession of the United States, or of any political subdivision thereof, or international organization, or any public or private entity or individual.

“(i) PATENTS.—Chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code, shall apply to any funding agreement (as defined in section 201 of that title) awarded to new or existing centers for manufacturing innovation.”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.

Section 102 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “In furtherance of the Committee’s work, the Committee shall consult with the National Economic Council.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) develop and update a national strategic plan for advanced manufacturing in accordance with subsection (c).”; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) NATIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, the strategic plan developed under paragraph (2).

“(2) DEVELOPMENT.—The Committee shall develop, and update as required under paragraph (4), in coordination with the National Economic Council, a strategic plan to improve Government coordination and provide long-term guidance for Federal programs and activities in support of United States manufacturing competitiveness, including advanced manufacturing research and development.

“(3) CONTENTS.—The strategic plan described in paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) specify and prioritize near-term and long-term objectives, including research and development objectives, the anticipated time frame for achieving the objectives, and the metrics for use in assessing progress toward the objectives;

“(B) describe the progress made in achieving the objectives from prior strategic plans, including a discussion of why specific objectives were not met;

“(C) specify the role, including the programs and activities, of each relevant Federal agency in meeting the objectives of the strategic plan;

“(D) describe how the Federal agencies and Federally funded research and development centers supporting advanced manufacturing research and development will foster the transfer of research and development results into new manufacturing technologies and United States-based manufacturing of new products and processes for the benefit of society to ensure national, energy, and economic security;

“(E) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will strengthen all levels of manufacturing education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce;

“(F) describe how such Federal agencies and centers will assist small and medium-sized manufacturers in developing and implementing new products and processes;

“(G) analyze factors that impact innovation and competitiveness for United States advanced manufacturing, including—

“(i) technology transfer and commercialization activities;

“(ii) the adequacy of the national security industrial base;

“(iii) the capabilities of the domestic manufacturing workforce;

“(iv) export opportunities and trade policies;

“(v) financing, investment, and taxation policies and practices;

“(vi) emerging technologies and markets;

“(vii) advanced manufacturing research and development undertaken by competing nations; and

“(viii) the capabilities of the manufacturing workforce of competing nations; and

“(H) elicit and consider the recommendations of a wide range of stakeholders, including representatives from diverse manufacturing companies, academia, and other relevant organizations and institutions.

“(4) UPDATES.—Not later than May 1, 2018, and not less frequently than once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress, and publish on an Internet website that is accessible to the public, an update of the strategic plan submitted under

paragraph (1). Such updates shall be developed in accordance with the procedures set forth under this subsection.

“(5) REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER STRATEGY IN THE BUDGET.—In preparing the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the President shall include information regarding the consistency of the budget with the goals and recommendations included in the strategic plan developed under this subsection applying to that fiscal year.

“(6) AMP STEERING COMMITTEE INPUT.—The Advanced Manufacturing Partnership Steering Committee of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology shall provide input, perspective, and recommendations to assist in the development and updates of the strategic plan under this subsection.”.

SEC. 5. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

Section 27 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 27. REGIONAL INNOVATION PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a regional innovation program to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters.

“(b) CLUSTER GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary may award grants on a competitive basis to eligible recipients for activities relating to the formation and development of regional innovation clusters.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for activities determined appropriate by the Secretary, including the following:

“(A) Feasibility studies.

“(B) Planning activities.

“(C) Technical assistance.

“(D) Developing or strengthening communication and collaboration between and among participants of a regional innovation cluster.

“(E) Attracting additional participants to a regional innovation cluster.

“(F) Facilitating market development of products and services developed by a regional innovation cluster, including through demonstration, deployment, technology transfer, and commercialization activities.

“(G) Developing relationships between a regional innovation cluster and entities or clusters in other regions.

“(H) Interacting with the public and State and local governments to meet the goals of the cluster.

“(3) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible recipient’ means—

“(A) a State;

“(B) an Indian tribe;

“(C) a city or other political subdivision of a State;

“(D) an entity that—

“(i) is a nonprofit organization, an institution of higher education, a public-private partnership, a science or research park, a Federal laboratory, or an economic development organization or similar entity; and

“(ii) has an application that is supported by a State or a political subdivision of a State; or

“(E) a consortium of any of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

“(4) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible recipient shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

“(B) COMPONENTS.—The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of the regional innovation cluster supported by the proposed activity, including a description of—

“(i) whether the regional innovation cluster is supported by the private sector, State and local governments, and other relevant stakeholders;

“(ii) how the existing participants in the regional innovation cluster will encourage and solicit participation by all types of entities that might benefit from participation, including newly formed entities and those rival existing participants;

“(iii) the extent to which the regional innovation cluster is likely to stimulate innovation and have a positive impact on regional economic growth and development;

“(iv) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster have access to, or contribute to, a well-trained workforce;

“(v) whether the participants in the regional innovation cluster are capable of attracting additional funds from non-Federal sources; and

“(vi) the likelihood that the participants in the regional innovation cluster will be able to sustain activities once grant funds under this subsection have been expended.

“(C) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications from regions that contain communities negatively impacted by trade.

“(5) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to an eligible recipient who agrees to collaborate with local workforce investment area boards.

“(6) COST SHARE.—The Secretary may not provide more than 50 percent of the total cost of any activity funded under this subsection.

“(7) OUTREACH TO RURAL COMMUNITIES.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach to public and private sector entities in rural communities to encourage those entities to participate in regional innovation cluster activities under this subsection.

“(8) FUNDING.—The Secretary may accept funds from other Federal agencies to support grants and activities under this subsection.

“(c) REGIONAL INNOVATION RESEARCH AND INFORMATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish a regional innovation research and information program—

“(A) to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on best practices for regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including information relating to how innovation, productivity, and economic development can be maximized through such strategies;

“(B) to provide technical assistance, including through the development of technical assistance guides, for the development and implementation of regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters);

“(C) to support the development of relevant metrics and measurement standards to evaluate regional innovation strategies (including regional innovation clusters), including the extent to which such strategies stimulate innovation, productivity, and economic development; and

“(D) to collect and make available data on regional innovation cluster activity in the United States, including data on—

“(i) the size, specialization, and competitiveness of regional innovation clusters;

“(ii) the regional domestic product contribution, total jobs and earnings by key oc-

cupations, establishment size, nature of specialization, patents, Federal research and development spending, and other relevant information for regional innovation clusters; and

“(iii) supply chain product and service flows within and between regional innovation clusters.

“(2) RESEARCH GRANTS.—The Secretary may award research grants on a competitive basis to support and further the goals of the program established under this subsection.

“(3) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—Data and analysis compiled by the Secretary under the program established in this subsection shall be made available to other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and nonprofit and for-profit entities.

“(4) REGIONAL INNOVATION GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall incorporate data and analysis relating to any grant under subsection (b) into the program established under this subsection.

“(d) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that the activities carried out under this section are coordinated with, and do not duplicate the efforts of, other programs at the Department of Commerce or other Federal agencies.

“(2) COLLABORATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall explore and pursue collaboration with other Federal agencies, including through multi-agency funding opportunities, on regional innovation strategies.

“(B) SMALL BUSINESSES.—The Secretary shall ensure that such collaboration with Federal agencies prioritizes the needs and challenges of small businesses.

“(e) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with an independent entity, such as the National Academy of Sciences, to conduct an evaluation of the program established under subsection (a).

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The evaluation shall include—

“(A) whether the program is achieving its goals;

“(B) any recommendations for how the program may be improved; and

“(C) a recommendation as to whether the program should be continued or terminated.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) REGIONAL INNOVATION CLUSTER.—The term ‘regional innovation cluster’ means a geographically bounded network of similar, synergistic, or complementary entities that—

“(A) are engaged in or with a particular industry sector and its related sectors;

“(B) have active channels for business transactions and communication;

“(C) share specialized infrastructure, labor markets, and services; and

“(D) leverage the region’s unique competitive strengths to stimulate innovation and create jobs.

“(2) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means one of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(g) FUNDING.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds are authorized to be appropriated by the Revitalize American

Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014 for carrying out this section.

“(2) AUTHORITY.—To the extent provided for in advance by appropriations Acts, the Secretary may use not to exceed \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019 to carry out this section from amounts appropriated for economic development assistance programs.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2996, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014, or RAMI Act, strengthens a critical sector of America's economy: advanced manufacturing.

Thanks to Congressman TOM REED from New York for his diligent work on this legislation and to the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Science Committee Chairman LAMAR SMITH who worked with Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY and members on both sides of the aisle on our committee in order to reach a bipartisan consensus on this legislation.

A strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security.

Manufacturing supports more than 17 million direct and indirect American jobs. This includes 12 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the workforce—who work directly for small, medium, or large manufacturing companies.

For the millions of Americans who are employed in manufacturing fields, what matters most is that the manufacturing creates good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

Manufacturing is especially important to Indiana, as it makes up just over 28 percent of our gross State product, the highest in the country. Indiana also leads the Nation in manufacturing employment. In Indiana's Eighth Congressional District that I represent, I have seen firsthand the work being done at manufacturers such as Berry Plastics, Toyota Motor, and Alcoa.

The thriving manufacturing industry in the Eighth District is also thanks to universities like Vincennes University, the University of Evansville, and the

University of Southern Indiana producing a talented and well-trained workforce through degrees related to advanced manufacturing and working closely with the manufacturing employers in the district. Ivy Tech statewide also supports this effort.

My district is also home to every coal mine in Indiana. Affordable energy from sources such as coal and natural gas are vital components in boosting production for American manufacturers and attracting others from across the globe.

The United States continues to have one of the largest, strongest manufacturing sectors in the world and has demonstrated its ability to adapt and innovate time and time again. But our leading position is not guaranteed. Competing nations have been ramping up their investments in research and development and taking decisive steps to equal and surpass the United States. For instance, the World Bank reports that China already has forged ahead in high technology exports, with about 28 percent of the global market, compared to 18 percent for the United States.

We need to take steps now to emphasize the strengths of American industry and shore up its weaknesses. With a limited government role, we can help our manufacturers to be competitive and ensure that American workers and their families reap the benefits of high-paying advanced manufacturing jobs.

This bill will help our advanced manufacturers to accelerate the pace at which new technology is converted into better manufacturing processes and improved products.

This legislation will help America remain globally competitive in manufacturing. It will ensure that new and innovative projects come equipped with “Made in America” on their labels.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleague and friend, TOM REED, for being a partner as we built momentum and support for this bill from the very beginning.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for their leadership as we worked out this bill through our committee.

By many metrics the economic picture in this country continues to improve. Unemployment rates are down, businesses are growing, and innovation is occurring at a breathtaking pace. But there is a flip side to that coin that we cannot ignore: our economic recovery to date has left far too many behind.

In my district, proud industrial cities like Fall River, Taunton, and Attleboro are working tirelessly in the face of stubborn unemployment rates to

adapt their workforce, infrastructure, and industry to the realities of a modern, global economy.

Our manufacturing sector is a critical vehicle for bringing industrial cities and working-class communities across the country into the fold of the innovation economy, providing a critical link between our middle class workforce and fast-growing fields like biotech, robotics, or clean energy.

The resurgence in American manufacturing has already reaped enormous economic gains, currently supporting over 17 million jobs with an average annual salary of over \$77,500.

There is a lot more potential on that table, and that is the idea behind RAMI. This bill creates a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve our competitiveness, stimulate R&D, spread the risk of investment to bring new products and ideas to market, educate the next-generation workforce, and facilitate peer-to-peer exchange and best practices.

These public-private centers for manufacturing innovation will leverage limited and targeted government funding matched dollar for dollar with private sector investment and expertise.

Each center will be based on a new technology.

Partnerships will include large and small businesses, universities, community colleges, career and technical schools, Federal labs, and nonprofits.

Centers will leverage the regional assets to overcome communal challenges.

Groups will apply for funding, putting the reins back where they belong: in the hands of industry and researchers facing the next big manufacturing challenge.

Each application will go through an open, transparent peer and merit review process, minimizing conflicts of interest and ensuring the best practices and best proposals move forward.

It is a model that we have already seen proven successful across the country, where institutes are creating jobs and bringing products to market in diverse fields such as 3D printing, clean energy, semiconductors, and digital design.

I urge my colleagues to help propel this growth by supporting the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time for me to address you this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act that we have authored and submitted for consideration today.

But as we speak about the details and before we speak about the details,

I want to take a moment to thank a few people. I would like to thank my good friend from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY and I started on this effort many months ago. We went through the process, and we are here tonight after lengthy negotiations, deliberations, and input from many stakeholders from all across America. With his diligent hard work standing with us, I am proud to call him a friend this evening as we consider this legislation for passage.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH of the Science Committee for standing firm and leading on this issue, as well, as well as the subcommittee chairman, my good friend from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), as well as the ranking members, JOHNSON and LIPINSKI, of the Science Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman HAL ROGERS.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation. When I came here to Washington, D.C., in 2010, I came here to do something. This is the kind of legislation—bringing parties together, Democrats, Republicans standing together in a concerted, directed effort—to get policy adopted that will grow the American economy and put people back to work.

We hear the term many times, and heard it tonight again: jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will accomplish that. But on top of that, this legislation is designed to the heart of advanced manufacturing in the United States of America. These are the great innovations of tomorrow that we are taking from the concept phase and putting into the commercial phase.

And how are we doing that? With a united vision, a united plan, Democrats, Republicans, coming together to stand for workforce development, for identifying those technologies that are emerging that we can put as a priority on the national stage to create the jobs of today and tomorrow, because at the end of the day that is what this is all about. This is about building it here to sell it there. It is about building those products that generations before us envisioned but just couldn't get to the finish line. This is a concerted effort that will take that technology innovation from the shelf and put it in Main Street America so that hardworking taxpayers will have an opportunity for this generation and the generations to come.

I applaud this legislation, I applaud this effort. As we do this, let us recognize that we came together to pay for this legislation tonight, fully offset, the program and priority that we are putting together through this RAMI legislation.

Now, I look forward to the Senate and their efforts to hopefully take this legislation up. Things I hear today and tonight are very positive on that front. I encourage my colleagues in the Sen-

ate to act quickly to create and pass this legislation that will provide for generations to come.

We have created an opportunity here to create American jobs. It is time for us, as we did many times before, to come together, solve America's problems, and put this type of legislation on the President's desk—which all indications are that he will accept and sign—and get American manufacturing back on its feet so that it builds products for generations to come.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

When it comes to job-creating bills, many of our promises these days can seem empty. But the bill before us today will deliver results, not just rhetoric. This bill, if enacted and funded, will do more than any other measure this Congress has recently debated to revitalize American manufacturing and create high-skill, high-paying jobs in communities across the country.

The decline in U.S. manufacturing has been a threat to middle class jobs and to our entire economy for decades. Many of those jobs, however, were low-skilled jobs, never to return. But we have also seen a large number of higher-skilled jobs move offshore, along with the supply chain that supports manufacturing.

The good news is we experience a rebound in good-paying, high-skilled jobs as our economy continues to recover and manufacturers realize the advantages of remaining close to the world's greatest scientific and technological talent.

□ 2130

However, these gains remain modest. In the meantime, our international competitors are busy implementing and funding policies that will further threaten the American manufacturing base and send our best talents overseas.

I am deeply concerned that we could reach a tipping point beyond which it will be nearly impossible to rebuild a vibrant manufacturing sector here in the U.S. We must act now to ensure that American companies and factories maintain their capacity to be the most sophisticated in the world and that American colleges and universities graduate the workforce to fill advanced manufacturing jobs on our shores.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing Innovation Act, or RAMI, is a critical step toward this goal. This bill makes strategic investments in advanced manufacturing research, development, and education across our Nation. In keeping with our entire history

of innovation, this bill creates partnerships involving the public sector, the private sector, and our great research institutions for the benefit of Americans.

However, even if this bill gets enacted this month, our job is not done. Specifically, I am concerned about an unnecessary obstacle we have added to the bill that could make it difficult to stand up and sustain this program. To meet majority rules about offsetting all new authorizations, the bill that passed out of committee contained language that by some subsequent interpretations looked like appropriating on an authorization bill. I want to assure my appropriations colleagues that if I had my way, we would have written a straightforward authorization as we have always done throughout this committee's history.

Clarifying language has been added to the bill, but we now look to the appropriators to take the next step necessary of standing up for this program in fiscal year 2015. In that regard, I look forward to working with my appropriations colleagues to ensure that this program gets funded next year and for the duration of the authorization.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED, for their bipartisan work to develop this legislation and determination in moving it forward. I would also like to thank Chairman SMITH for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

Finally, I am also pleased that this legislation includes the manufacturing strategy introduced by Mr. LIPINSKI and the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program introduced by Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. KILMER. These are important steps in the right direction.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) and to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) that I appreciate all their time, effort, and work that has gone into this piece of legislation. It is because of their patience and diligence and persistence that we arrived at this particularly important place tonight and are considering this legislation.

I also wanted to point out that this bill will, with every expectation that we have, create thousands of manufacturing jobs in the United States. The fact that New York and Massachusetts will benefit from these jobs is an important consideration, but the jobs that are created are going to be across the country. And so the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts are

doing an immense favor to our economy and to our economic growth in America.

Mr. Speaker, advanced manufacturing is fundamental to future U.S. economic success and national security. America has led the world since World War II, but our global leadership is not guaranteed. Competing nations have increased their investments in advanced manufacturing to surpass the United States. The World Bank reports, for example, that China now leads the U.S. in high-tech exports with 28 percent of the global market versus 18 percent for the United States.

In order to be competitive, our advanced manufacturers, large, medium, and small, must accelerate R&D, develop next generation products, develop new manufacturing processes, retrain their workforce, and introduce new technology to supply chains.

This legislation, the Revitalize American Innovation Act of 2014, by Representatives REED and KENNEDY authorizes up to \$300 million for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for the Commerce Department, NIST, to develop the Network for Manufacturing Innovation, or NMI.

The NMI will not increase spending because \$250 million will come from annual appropriations from the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and \$50 million from annual appropriations for Industrial Technical Services. NMI will accelerate private investment, commercialization of technology, and cooperation among multiple industrial entities, research universities, and other stakeholders to increase competitiveness and innovation in U.S. advanced manufacturing.

Also included in the legislation is a bill developed by Mr. LIPINSKI which requires the President to submit a quadrennial advanced manufacturing strategic plan to Congress, a comprehensive assessment of the global competitive situation, and recommendations for strengthening the competitiveness of U.S. advanced manufacturing.

In the latter category, for instance, three obvious steps stand out right now. Two of these steps are highlighted by the just-released 2014 International Tax Competitiveness Index, which ranks the overall U.S. tax system as 32nd worst among the 34 developed nations. We would go a long way toward reinvigorating our economy and putting Americans back to work if we first reduce the U.S. corporate tax rate from highest in the developed world, and second, encourage more business investment in new technology by making the R&D tax credit permanent.

The third crucial step to bolster U.S. manufacturing is to recognize the importance and take advantage of abundant, affordable domestic natural gas. Shale gas is a major revolution con-

tributing to the manufacturing renaissance taking place in America.

Manufacturing accounts for 30 percent of natural gas consumption in the U.S. and represents more than one-third of some manufacturers' costs. Not only does affordable, abundant natural gas benefit our entire manufacturing sector, the coproducts of natural gas are primary feedstocks for the production of chemicals, fertilizers, and plastics.

An industry expert recently reported that U.S. chemical manufacturers have surpassed \$100 billion in investments related to shale gas, with an anticipated \$81 billion in new annual chemical industry output and more than 600,000 permanent new jobs in the U.S. In Texas alone, there have been nearly 30 projects announced in the petrochemical manufacturing sector.

Finally, included in the bill before us is a provision authored by Mr. HULTGREN and cosponsored by Mr. KILMER to support regional innovation efforts to make U.S. manufacturers and businesses more competitive. Funding for this 5-year program will come from annual appropriations for the Commerce Department's economic development programs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the bipartisan cooperation that has gone into moving this legislation through the Science Committee and to the House floor. To all of my colleagues on the committee, to the Research and Technology Subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LIPINSKI, and to the ranking member of the Science Committee, Ms. JOHNSON, the gentlewoman from Texas, thank you for your good work that has brought us to the point of passage of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2014.

Rhode Island, the birthplace of the industrial revolution, with a very strong and long manufacturing history, is seeing the benefits of investing in rebuilding manufacturing, and this bill will create exciting opportunities to do more.

This important legislation will establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation program and a grant program to support domestic production, drive innovation, and leverage private funding and commercialization to develop sustainable business strategies.

Across the United States, industry experts and economists are increasingly optimistic about a resurgence in American manufacturing. This is a critical time for Congress to help Federal, State, and local entities leverage

existing resources, spur regional collaboration, and support economic recovery and job creation in high-growth advanced manufacturing sectors.

In particular, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the entire committee for the inclusion of a provision to reauthorize the Regional Innovation program for 5 years. I particularly want to compliment both of my colleagues Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY for their work on this bill and for approaching this important issue with a spirit of real bipartisanship and genuine collaboration.

In an effort to promote innovation and regional collaboration, the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 established a Regional Innovation program within the Economic Development Administration. The program is designed to encourage and support the development of regional innovation strategies, including regional innovation clusters and science and research parks. Funding for the Regional Innovation program supports the EDA's interagency effort to build regional innovation clusters such as the Jobs and Innovation Accelerator Challenge and the Make it in America Challenge.

Through the Regional Innovation program local leaders are empowered to maximize existing assets and are provided resources to ensure that historically underrepresented communities, including those hardest hit by employment and economic decline, are able to participate and benefit from growth in a regional cluster.

To close, this bill recognizes that manufacturing and innovation are critically important to America's ability to compete in a 21st century global economy. To compete in the 21st century and win, America must invest in scaling up promising technology and innovative ideas. Supporting the development of regional innovation clusters strengthens our capacity to sustain and grow our economic recovery. This legislation will help do just that.

Again, I want to urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I compliment my friends Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. REED for their great work.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee. Mr. LIPINSKI has worked on this issue for many years, including the Manufacturing Competitiveness Act that is included in this bill.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, who is another sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Mr. BUCSHON from Indiana. I also want to recognize the important leadership of Chairman

SMITH. I want to thank him for his great work on this. I also want to thank the sponsors who really did so much of the heavy lifting on this. Congressman REED and Congressman KENNEDY did great work on a wonderful bill.

Manufacturing is a vital component of my district's economy. There are 554 manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District with 10 or more employees in them. Manufacturing facilities employ also more than 27,000 workers across my district alone.

The workers at manufacturing facilities in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois have felt the economic downturn disproportionately as Federal and State governments have failed to change outdated or unneeded policies that keep my constituents from regaining full employment. Later this week, the House will vote on a package of bills to help alleviate these problems, but there are more ways we must act to help ensure our manufacturers have the tools they need to remain competitive on the world stage.

This legislation gives needed direction to the administration for funding a national network for manufacturing innovation. These programs would bring together our country's vast research capabilities and help align our institutions with industry partners. Our universities and colleges must know what industry needs in order to provide valuable research as well as train our next workforce. This legislation would also help to remove some of the barriers that keep industry from working together and innovating in a 21st century economy.

I am also very glad to see authorization for the Regional Innovation program. This is a smart, targeted program that allows local regions to pool their resources and work together. Industry clusters are one of the most effective ways to compile and share best practices, and the fact that these programs give preference to bids involving Local Workforce Investment Boards is another reason to support this bill. These boards are doing all they can to help my constituents find work, and this is the cooperative federalism that will ensure taxpayer dollars are not wasted.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 2145

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representatives KENNEDY and REED for working across the aisle to develop legislation that will encourage the growth of innovative technologies and the creation of a manufacturing

workforce that will be able to compete on the global playing field.

I also want to thank the Representatives for working with Representative HULTGREN and myself to include the reauthorization of the Regional Innovation program.

The Regional Innovation program provides needed support to innovative initiatives that accelerate technology commercialization, job creation, and economic growth in the United States. It acknowledges something important, that innovation and job growth don't happen in large marble buildings in our Nation's Capitol; rather, it happens on the ground in communities throughout our Nation.

It happens in Tacoma where world-class research on clean water is happening in a collaboration between our companies and our university. It is happening on the Olympic Peninsula of Washington where innovative companies and innovative people are developing composite technology in partnership with the local college.

If the United States is going to be a global economic competitor in the 21st century, we need to focus on growing a high-skilled workforce in our communities.

I spent a decade working in economic development. We had a sign up on the wall in our office that said, "We are competing with everyone, everywhere, every day, forever."

Bills like this will help us compete. It will help us make things here in the United States; and, as the dad of two little girls, I am hopeful it will provide opportunity for future generations to make things here in America.

I think the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Bill is a sign we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quickly address an issue of future appropriations for the network of manufacturing innovation. As recently as the fiscal year 2014 omnibus appropriations act, Congress included language in the explanatory statement, pointing out that the appropriations bill did not address a manufacturing network as Congress had not considered or approved a legislative proposal.

Well, the bill before us today solves that problem. It would authorize agencies to use funds to spur innovation and boost domestic manufacturing.

Even more recently, the fiscal year 2015 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill that passed the House on May 30, 2014, included report language on this topic showing an openness to further funding. Congress had been waiting for this bill to come to the floor to formally authorize this important program.

After we pass this bill, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to provide

much-needed funding for the network of manufacturing innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds again to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude debate on this bill, I just wanted to thank senior staff who have worked long months in developing this legislation and in refining it and getting it to the point where it is bipartisan, and we believe that the prospects for passage in the Senate are good as well.

Now, the senior staff on our side, the majority side, include Chris Wydler, Cliff Shannon, and Katy Crooks; and, if I may be presumptuous to do so, on the minority side, they include Dahlia Sokolov and John Piazza. We appreciate their support and many other members of the staff who have contributed to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. The public-private partnerships created by this bill will help rebuild our Nation's manufacturing capacity and grow private sector investments in manufacturing.

I hail from Silicon Valley, the Nation's epicenter of technology and innovation. Right now, Silicon Valley is experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Companies see the benefit of locating their manufacturing in areas with R&D and a high-tech workforce. Nearly 18 percent of Silicon Valley jobs are in manufacturing, and these advanced manufacturing jobs are high paying.

This bill will replicate some of the important qualities of Silicon Valley across this Nation. It will build partnerships between government, academia, and industry to address targeted manufacturing challenges.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed a network of manufacturing innovation institutes, and I thank the cochairs of the Manufacturing Caucus, Mr. REED and Mr. KENNEDY, for authoring this legislation to authorize such a network.

I have worked with my Silicon Valley constituents to help build strong

bipartisan backing of this bill, and I am glad we are on the floor considering it tonight. Hopefully, once this bill is enacted, we can win one of these hubs for Silicon Valley to focus on important challenges like developing the next generation of semiconductor manufacturing tools.

This bill is an important step for countering the incentives that other countries are offering American innovators and manufacturers to relocate overseas. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2996 because it will help revitalize American manufacturing. It is a game-changer.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act. As a proud cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased that the House is considering it today.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act (RAMI) will help rebuild our nation's manufacturing capacity by creating public-private partnerships that will foster an environment in which the private sector is willing to invest in the strengths of our nation and American manufacturing will grow.

I applauded President Obama when he first proposed the creation of a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation to improve the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing, stimulate research and development, and increase domestic production. I supported his call for additional centers beyond those he initially proposed, worked in the Appropriations Committee to find funding for some centers, and have suggested to the President that at least one institute should be located in my Silicon Valley district.

Silicon Valley is known as the epicenter of technology and innovation in the United States. What is not as widely recognized is the extent to which Silicon Valley is also experiencing a manufacturing resurgence. Nearly 18 percent of Silicon Valley's jobs are in manufacturing, and that number is growing—the local manufacturing sector is projected to grow by 5 percent by 2018. These advanced manufacturing jobs are offering higher pay than nonmanufacturing jobs. By being co-located with the research and development Silicon Valley is known for, these manufacturers are both boosting R&D investments and experiencing the benefits of more control of their manufacturing processes, quicker turnaround from research to product realization, higher quality, and greater intellectual property security.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act seeks to replicate some of the important lessons from Silicon Valley around the nation. RAMI will build public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation between higher education institutions and community colleges, small and large manufacturers, and government to promote best practices and address targeted advanced manufacturing challenges. These advanced manufacturing hubs will also address the skills gap by producing a next generation talent pool of skilled production workers and engineers by focusing on education, workforce training, research and development, and commercialization.

Despite its manufacturing successes, Silicon Valley still continues to experience higher than average unemployment, partly a result of the past outsourcing of manufacturing jobs due to low wages overseas and incentives offered by foreign competitors. With the passage of the RAMI Act, we can look forward to hosting an advanced manufacturing hub, potentially focused on enabling the transition to the next-generation 450 mm silicon wafer semiconductor manufacturing tools, which would enable Silicon Valley to take advantage of its R&D excellence and bolster its manufacturing sector in new ways, helping us to recover some of those jobs lost to past outsourcing.

Over the past few years, I've been proud to work with House Manufacturing Caucus Co-chairs Reps. TOM REED and JOE KENNEDY on this authorization effort, along with Silicon Valley tech leaders and university stakeholders. I appreciate the willingness of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were key to building bipartisan support for this effort, particularly my Chairman on the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee FRANK WOLF, to talk with us about this legislation and to join as cosponsors of this important bill.

Our competitors around the world are offering American innovators and manufacturers a wide range of incentives to relocate overseas. The RAMI Act will ensure that American innovation and technology development remain at the top of the manufacturing sector, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with cosponsors and supporters in every corner of the country and each side of the aisle, we must pass this bill and move forward with a national manufacturing policy.

We are here today as part of a process that involved many, many people. Last month, we held a markup in the full Science Committee, adopting several amendments and addressing concerns from members on both sides of the aisle.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents how Congress is designed to work, ideas from across the country coming together in open, honest discussion to formulate policy that will move our country forward.

I would like to mention the significant staff work of the House leadership offices and the Science Committee for their tireless efforts for bringing us to this point and echo some of the names that Chairman SMITH already mentioned.

From the Science majority, if I may, Jamie Brown, Cliff Shannon, Kirsten Duncan, Chris Shank, Chris Weigel. From the minority staff, Dick Obermann, Dahlia Sokolov, Marcy Gallo, Kim Montgomery, John Piazza. From Congressman REED's office, former staffer Laura Ringdahl and Drew Wayne. From Senator BROWN's office, Chris Slevin and Nora Todd. From Senator BLUNT's office, John

Smedile and Tracy Henke. And from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Jim Schufreider.

Mr. Speaker, through the revitalization of our manufacturing industry, we can provide access to a modern economy for millions of Americans. Our manufacturing industries these days make far more than just the cheapest widget and Cheetos.

By supporting partnerships between the private sector, government, and academia, we can capitalize on the opportunity offered through growing industry such as life sciences, biotech, precision manufacturing, and many, many others.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, a strong manufacturing base is fundamental to U.S. economic success and national security. Again, manufacturing supports millions of good-paying American jobs; and, for the millions of Americans who are employed in the manufacturing field, that is what matters most, good-paying, family-supporting, community-sustaining jobs.

I urge my colleagues all to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2996, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, a bipartisan bill to boost American manufacturing, of which I am a cosponsor and original supporter.

Not only do I support the intent of H.R. 2996, which would establish a Network of Manufacturing Innovation and enable public-private partnerships through Centers for Manufacturing Innovation, but it also includes the text of a bill I introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act, H.R. 2447.

I believe that both measures are necessary to the continuing revitalization of manufacturing in the United States, and I'm pleased to see the House considering them today. Manufacturing is a linchpin of our Nation's economy. It provides the American middle class with a source of quality jobs making everything from the goods we rely on for everyday needs, to the equipment that we need for national security.

But in the first decade of the century, American manufacturing took a hard hit. Almost one-third of American manufacturing jobs disappeared. After over 110 years as the world's top manufacturing Nation, America got knocked off its perch by China.

I have seen the devastation in my district and across northeastern Illinois. And I get frustrated, just like countless other Americans do, when I go to the store and I cannot find the words "made in the U.S.A." on any product.

The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act would authorize a network of centers for manufacturing innovation, based upon the concept of the National Network of Manufacturing Innovation (NNMI) proposed

the Administration. I have been a strong supporter of the NNMI proposal from the outset, and am pleased Congress is taking action to authorize these centers.

In fact, just a few months ago I was pleased to join in the announcement of the Digital Manufacturing and Design Innovation Institute in Chicago. This public-private initiative, hosted by the University of Illinois offshoot UI Labs, has leveraged a \$70 million federal investment to achieve a commitment of \$250 million from industry, academia, government and community partners that will harness expertise and facilities to improve manufacturing processes and innovation and design capabilities to a wide range of stakeholders. One of the greatest attributes of these institutes will be the openness of the system, allowing small- and medium-sized enterprises the opportunity to use novel and often capital-intensive capabilities, such as 3D printing and high-performance computing, to improve their product lines, develop new innovations and make their factories more efficient.

More so, I believe that the deployment of these centers of manufacturing innovation will help improve the competitiveness of manufacturing across the nation. Using these high-tech facilities will help attract more students to manufacturing and STEM careers, enable a greater range of research and development on manufacturing processes and products, and improve commercialization opportunities for firms small and large. Other competing nations are making their own serious investments in next-generation institutions and facilities in support of their domestic industries, and it makes competitive sense for the U.S. to leverage our capabilities, in concert with private and other public entities, to make similar investments.

In addition and of particular note to me is Section 4 of this Act, which includes the text of a bill I had introduced, the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act. This legislation would establish a public-private process for assessing the current competitive state of manufacturing in the United States, compare this against the policies and status of manufacturing in competing nations, and propose measures for the government and stakeholders to take in order to promote manufacturing in the U.S. Based on the Quadrennial Defense Review, the Pentagon's policy planning process, the bill proposes that a group of manufacturing experts from the private and the public sectors would be convened every four years to reassess the progress of American manufacturing, and make new recommendations.

While I agree that manufacturing is by-and-large a private, market endeavor, few can disagree that manufacturing intersects with government policy in countless ways. From tax and trade, to regulation, to research, education, and workforce development, government policies have a significant effect on our manufacturers. It is essential that the U.S. join many of its competing nations in assessing these policies in a comprehensive fashion, rather than a silo-ed, piecemeal approach.

That is why we need a comprehensive, coordinated strategy promoting American manufacturing. While many other countries—China, India, Germany, to name a few—have devel-

oped and implemented manufacturing strategies, the United States manufacturing policy is uncoordinated and largely ad hoc. If we want American manufacturing to compete and succeed in a global economy, it is vital that we develop a strategy to coordinate our policies that impact manufacturers. And that is exactly what this bill does.

After a couple of tough decades, I still have a number of small- and medium-size manufacturers in my district in northeastern Illinois. One of these is Atlas Tool & Die of Lyons, Illinois, a 94-year-old family-owned business. The director of development for the company, Zach Mottl, said this about this legislation:

As a business owner, I know planning is critical. When an organization doesn't operate with a plan, what occurs is a plan to fail. Right now, the United States is operating without a manufacturing strategy in a world where other countries are intensely focused on helping their manufacturers to compete. The American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will bring all sides and stakeholders together to forge a strategy with broad support and the momentum needed to produce action?

I share Zach's view that we need an overarching plan, and I believe that that the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act will achieve that. This bill has garnered the endorsement of a wide range of industry, labor and manufacturing organizations, indicating to me that they share our view that a national manufacturing strategy will be essential to moving American manufacturing competitiveness forward.

I would like to thank the numerous colleagues who have helped shepherd my manufacturing strategy legislation along the way, helping it to pass by overwhelming margins in the House during two prior sessions. I appreciate the leadership of Congressmen REED and KENNEDY in introducing this bill, and I'm pleased to have worked with them on it. Congressman ADAM KINZINGER has been a great partner in introducing the manufacturing strategy legislation, while Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON were crucial to this bill moving through the Science, Space and Technology Committee.

I am hopeful that we'll be able to achieve House and Senate passage of H.R. 2996 before the end of this year, so that the Network of Manufacturing Innovation and the manufacturing strategy process will soon become reality. I strongly believe both will lead to greater success of manufacturing in America, and with it, a better outlook for our nation's middle class.

I thank my colleagues for the time and opportunity to speak on this important legislation, and urge Members to support the passage of H.R. 2996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2996, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HOUSE PASSED JOBS BILLS, BUT THE SENATE FAILED TO ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, the House of Representatives has advanced bill after bill to grow our economy.

The House has passed legislation to keep our small businesses growing through smarter regulations. We have passed legislation to increase wages and expand job opportunities. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to make energy more affordable for American families and to keep the country on a path to energy security. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed legislation to require the U.S. Forest Service to increase timber production on national forest lands and better manage those national treasures.

We have also advanced legislation to modernize the Endangered Species Act, promoting science-based decision-making and improving species recovery while protecting our economy. The Senate has failed to act.

The House has passed a series of reforms to improve the President's health care law, including a repeal of the harmful 2.3 percent medical device tax. The Senate has failed to act.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

THE COALITION OF THE UNWILLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the President had made a speech last Thursday night, and it is amazing that he is ready to go after ISIS or ISIL and that the Islamic State is not Islamic as they say they are.

It is amazing because, from what I have seen in the beheadings, those who were doing the beheadings always think that they are being religious; so, apparently, the President and his advisers are the only ones that think otherwise because they certainly believe it is a religion.

I wanted to hit some key facts very quickly here. President Obama talks about this great coalition. After all those criticisms of President George W. Bush and the 48 countries or so that actually did participate in the war in Iraq, President Obama's coalition of the unwilling is a better way to talk about his coalition.

NATO ally Turkey announced last week they will not allow the U.S. to conduct air strikes against ISIS from

Turkish air bases. So much for their real cooperation.

Germany said it is not going to join U.S. air strikes against ISIS. The United Kingdom has their Foreign Minister announce they will not join air strikes only to be later contradicted by Prime Minister Cameron.

Ten Arab countries signed a communique last week in Jeddah agreeing to qualified cooperation with the U.S. but without any specifics. The State Department claims the Arab nations will conduct air strikes against ISIS but refuses to identify which Arab nations will participate.

Top Islamic cleric Yusuf al-Qaradawi has criticized U.S. attacks on ISIS, and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood refuses to back any U.S. anti-ISIS efforts because it might circumvent Islamist-dominated structures of the Syrian National Council.

It is also important to note that this administration has admitted they are using back channels to cooperate with Iran. Gee, that would have been like, say, maybe Roosevelt saying we are working with Hitler because Japan attacked us when they all want to kill us.

Vetted moderates are losing U.S. weapons. It is important that people know, September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot taking small arms ammunition that the CIA provided.

In December 2013, the Free Syrian Army weapon warehouses in Bab al-Hawa—that is near the Syria-Turkey border—was seized by the Islamic Front, prompting the U.S. and the U.K. to stop weapons shipments to the FSA.

In April, the Syrian rebel groups began using heavy weapons including TOW antitank missiles provided by the United States. It is a good thing our southern border is not porous, or they might be bringing them to our border. June of 2014, the Syrian Military Council official expresses concern that the U.S. is providing weapons directly to the FSA, potentially creating Afghan-Somali-style warlords.

September, we see more reports.

For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, this is no time to be helping people who want to cooperate with ISIS to help us take out ISIS. We need better than that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of official business.

Ms. BROWN of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of prior commitment in district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LOWENTHAL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate the more than 5,000 slaves and free Black persons who fought for independence in the American Revolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 16, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7065. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Modification of Container Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0046; FV14-945-2 IR] received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7066. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Oil Industry Sanctions and Addition of Person to the Entity List [Docket No.: 140729634-4638-01] (RIN: 0694-AG25) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7067. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Revisions to the Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations; Ambient Standards for Particulate Matter and for Lead [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0006; FRL-9915-75-Region 8] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7068. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0476; FRL-9913-99] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7069. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District And Shasta County Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0417; FRL-9913-13-Region 9] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7070. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Rescheduling of Hydrocodone Combination Products From Schedule III to Schedule II [Docket No.: DEA-389] received August 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7071. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Maintenance Rule [NRC-2013-0179] received August 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7072. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Tri-mester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery and Possession Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 140106011-4338-02] (RIN: 0648-XD418) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7073. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; the Highly Migratory Species Fishery; Closure [Docket No.: 031125295-4091-02] (RIN: 0648-XD238) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7074. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan; Northern Red Hake Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 110816505-2184-03] (RIN: 0648-XD336) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7075. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 140417346-4575-02] (RIN: 0648-XD252) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7076. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Framework Adjustment 8 [Docket No.: 130726661-4551-02] (RIN: 0648-BD56) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7077. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of

Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XD386) received August 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7078. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska: Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 120926497-4576-02] (RIN: 0648-BC62) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7079. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Sunset Lake; Wildwood Crest, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0701] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7080. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Atlantic Ocean; Atlantic City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0703] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7081. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Mile 127.0; Clarksville, TN [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7082. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, U.S. Hydro-Drag Nationals, Lake Dora; Tavares, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0643] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7083. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; TAKE MARU 55 Vessel Salvage; Cocos Island, Merizo, Guam [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0721] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7084. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Aquarium Wedding, Delaware River; Camden, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0704] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7085. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Atlantic Ocean; Ocean City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7086. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special

Local Regulations for Marine Events, New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway; Atlantic City, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0702] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7087. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Labor Day Long Neck Style Fireworks, Indian River Bay; Long Neck, DE [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0696] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7088. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0515; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-036-AD; Amendment 39-17921; AD 2014-12-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7089. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0253; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-17908; AD 2014-15-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7090. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc., Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0514; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-17925; AD 2014-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7091. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fuji Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0311; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17927; AD 2014-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7092. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mooney International Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0513; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-17920; AD 2014-15-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7093. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0056; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-17906; AD 2014-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7094. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0790; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-061-AD; Amendment 39-17916; AD 2014-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7095. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Failure to Pay Civil Penalties [Docket No.: PHMSA-2012-0258 (HM-258A)] (RIN: 2137-AE97) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7096. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Departing IFR/VFR When Weather Reporting Is Not Available [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0502; Amdt. No. 135-131] (RIN: 2120-AK49) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7097. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30963 Amdt. No. 3595] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7098. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0268; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-17914; AD 2014-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7099. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0145; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-17899; AD 2014-14-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7100. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Hartford, CT [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0384; Airspace Docket No. 14-ANE-6] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7101. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Needles, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0987; Airspace Docket No.: 13-AWP-19] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7102. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendment [Docket No.: 30964; Amdt. No. 3596] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7103. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

[Docket No.: 30966; Amdt. No. 3598] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7104. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Transportation of Lithium Batteries [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0095 (HM-224F)] (RIN: 2137-AE44) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7105. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30965; Amdt. No. 3597] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7106. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Steele, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0154; Airspace Docket No. 14-ACE-1] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7107. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Truth or Consequences, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0995; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-30] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7108. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Memphis, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0224; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-15] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7109. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Time of Designation for Restricted Area R-3002G; Fort Benning, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0389; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7110. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class B Airspace; Salt Lake City, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0859; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7111. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Airbus Helicopter) (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0394; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-015-AD; Amendment 39-17875; AD 2014-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7112. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters

[Docket No.: FAA-2013-1090; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-017-AD; Amendment 39-17873; AD 2014-12-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7113. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Columbia Helicopters, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held By Boeing Defense & Space Group) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0385; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-079-AD; Amendment 39-17879; AD 2014-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0862; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-17863; AD 2014-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7115. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23809; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-52-AD; Amendment 39-17866; AD 2014-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7116. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0488; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-17919; AD 2014-15-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7117. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0187; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-17917; AD 2014-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7118. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0228; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-17911; AD 2014-15-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7119. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0486; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-17918; AD 2014-15-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7120. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0196; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-015-AD; Amend-

ment 39-17913; AD 2014-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7121. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1088; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-76-AD; Amendment 39-17872; AD 2014-12-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7122. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Phoenix, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0956; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-17] received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7123. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014-22) received August 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7124. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revenue Procedure: Rev. Proc. 2014-50 received August 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7125. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Health Insurance Providers Fee Notice 2014-47 received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3593. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; with an amendment (Rept. 113-587 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; with an amendment (Rept. 113-587 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5108. A bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 476. An act to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake

and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (Rept. 113-589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 1603. An act to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3006. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4119. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5205. A bill to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4182. A bill to provide that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways shall be administered in accordance with the general management plan for that unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3606. A bill to permit certain activities to be conducted on Federal land within the Emigrant Wilderness of Stanislaus National Forest in the State of California at the level at which such activities were conducted on such land before the wilderness designation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 113-595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2158. A bill to exempt from the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 the expedited removal from the United States of certain snake species, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4350. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take lands and mineral rights on the reservation of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Montana and other culturally important lands into trust, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4276. A bill to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury; with an amendment (Rept. 113-598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 2996. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-599 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 722. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-600). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Appropriations discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2996 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on September 12, 2014]

H.R. 1869. Referral to the Committee on Rules extended for a period ending not later than December 11, 2014.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2. A bill to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 4. A bill to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, Rules, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 5461. A bill to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5462. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COLLINS of GEORGIA:

H.R. 5463. A bill to suspend military assistance to countries that harbor persons that provide material or financial support to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DeLAURO (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 5464. A bill making appropriations for Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERA of CALIFORNIA:

H.R. 5465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5466. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 Sunny Isle Shopping Center in Christiansted, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, as the "Florence Louise Thomas Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of FLORIDA (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 5467. A bill to enhance the capabilities of metropolitan planning organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LaMALFA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr.

SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 5468. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the "Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5469. A bill to prevent future propane shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of MICHIGAN (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5470. A bill to clarify the grounds for ineligibility for travel to the United States regarding terrorism risk, to expand the criteria by which a country may be removed from the Visa Waiver Program, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on strengthening the Electronic System for Travel Authorization to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 5471. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service currently located at 16281 U.S. Highway 59 in Moscow, Texas, as the "Anna Stepanovna Politkovskaya Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5473. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a mileage-based user fee for mobile mounted concrete boom pumps in lieu of the tax on taxable fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS,

Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VELA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SIREN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 723. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H. Res. 724. A resolution recognizing the historical links and friendship between Scotland and the United States and respectfully supporting a truly democratic process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESTY:

H. Res. 725. A resolution commending the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs for their joint campaign to raise awareness during September, Suicide Prevention Month, to reduce suicide among members of the United States Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3, giving Congress the Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2; Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 5462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common

Defence and general Welfare of the United States..."

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 5465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to the Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 5467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 3, 7, and 18) of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes for the purpose of spending; to regulate commerce between the several states; and to establish post offices and post roads.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 5470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 5471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization"

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 279: Mr. ROKITA
 H.R. 292: Mr. WELCH and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 445: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 460: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 676: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 713: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 781: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 901: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 988: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 997: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 1015: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 1150: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
 H.R. 1199: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1249: Mr. BARBER and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 1331: Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 1429: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 1627: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1696: Mr. DAINES.
 H.R. 1761: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1893: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1979: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 1998: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2028: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2342: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2384: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2415: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2483: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 2536: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. BARTON.
 H.R. 2619: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 2692: Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 2737: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 2996: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 3043: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3367: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3382: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 3426: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3465: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3471: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 3482: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 3662: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 3708: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 3723: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 3877: Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 3955: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4030: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 4060: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 4091: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 4128: Ms. DELAULO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4137: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H.R. 4158: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 4190: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 4227: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 4276: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 4284: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 4351: Mr. FOSTER and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 4356: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4510: Mr. UPTON and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 4515: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 4551: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 4574: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4577: Mr. COBLE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 4659: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 4695: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 4714: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 4717: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 4727: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 4740: Mr. KLINE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 4814: Mr. COBLE and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 4833: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4837: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.R. 4920: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 4930: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
 H.R. 4960: Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 4969: Mr. YODER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 4986: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 5000: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 5063: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5069: Mr. COTTON and Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 5095: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 5098: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 5128: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 5145: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 5170: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 5183: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 5190: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 5226: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5228: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 5231: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 5233: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 5252: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 5267: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 5291: Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 5323: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5327: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 5328: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 5353: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5360: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5380: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 5392: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. HURT.
 H.R. 5403: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 5408: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 5417: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 5435: Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 5439: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 5441: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 5445: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H. Res. 428: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H. Res. 620: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCALLISTER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H. Res. 662: Mr. JOYCE.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KIND, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DENT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KLINE.
 H. Res. 711: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. MAFFEI.
 H. Res. 720: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4137, the Preserving Welfare for Needs Not Weeds Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ON CONGRESS' CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ADDRESS THE ONGOING CRISIS IN IRAQ INVOLVING THE ISLAMIC STATE IN IRAQ AND SYRIA (ISIS)

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support my colleague FREDERICA WILSON in the effort she has undertaken to #bringbackourgirls, addressing the horrors of Boko Haram having extracted these girls from their lives. We also, in addition to that responsibility, have an exacting responsibility with reference to ongoing circumstances that the President addressed last Wednesday evening. On August 14, nearly a month ago, I wrote to the President asking him to be mindful of a letter that I sent to Speaker BOEHNER. I include both my letter to President Obama and to Speaker BOEHNER for the RECORD. I said the following in my letter to Speaker BOEHNER:

I respectfully call upon you to bring Congress back into session so that we may meet our constitutional responsibility to address the ongoing crisis in Iraq. As you know, the situation there is becoming increasingly more complex and continues to defy easy resolution.

There is no doubt that the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) will continue to terrorize the people of Iraq, leading to an increase in the tens of thousands of Iraqi Christians, Yazidi and other refugees who have been driven from their homes. However, we in Congress have a responsibility to make sure that America is not dragged into another ongoing military endeavor in Iraq. Although the current airstrikes may have stopped ISIS momentarily, we still have a responsibility under Article I powers to delineate and impose a timeframe for these efforts as we move forward.

The situation in Iraq on a political, humanitarian and military level is increasingly dire, and we may very well have a duty to meet these difficulties with force along with any number of other strategic responses, but we certainly have a duty to meet as a body at the earliest possible date to discuss these issues and act accordingly under the United States Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

I thank you for your time and consideration of my request and ask for a prompt response.

My letter to the President stated the following:

AUGUST 14, 2014.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: I write to inform you that I sent the attached letter to Speaker Boehner today, calling on him to bring the U.S. House of Representatives back into session so that we may address the crisis in Iraq.

The situation in Iraq on a political, humanitarian and military level is increasingly dire, and we may very well have a duty to meet these difficulties with force along with any number of other strategic responses, but we certainly have a duty to meet as a body at the earliest possible date to discuss these issues and act accordingly under the United States Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

I certainly appreciate your timely attention to the complex and difficult situation unfolding in Iraq, and want you to know that I am eager to facilitate a resolution to the current crisis by making sure the Legislative and Executive branches of our government work in unison to achieve an acceptable outcome for the American and Iraqi people.

I thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

ALCEE L. HASTINGS,
Member of Congress.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,742,108,970,073.37. We've added \$7,115,231,921,160.29 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, America is a nation composed of individuals whose ancestors were once part of other nations. As they work for a better, brighter tomorrow for themselves and more importantly for their children, these individuals become Americans. I would like to take just a moment of this body's time to thank and congratulate a group of my constituents who are making sure that the story of how their ancestors helped build America is shared.

Today, I rise to recognize Hispanic Heritage of Odessa, which will begin a month-long celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month with a breakfast this morning at McKinney Park. Hispanic Heritage Month first began in 1968, and

each year, the celebration and tradition has grown as has our community.

This morning Hispanic Heritage of Odessa will continue their efforts to build a stronger community—one based upon hard work, integrity, and the importance of family—by recognizing the good work done by our fellow citizens. The breakfast will honor many influential members of the Hispanic community in Odessa who serve as an example to the younger generation to do good and re-invest in those around you.

It is important that these stories are shared, not only with the wider community in which they live, but also with young people, who will benefit by learning how to form the backbone of their community—one that places their families and neighbors above themselves. Each one of those stories is unique, but through each one of them, children will hear how hard their parents and grandparents worked to fashion a better life for future generations.

On behalf of the 11th District, it is an honor to recognize and represent Hispanic Heritage of Odessa and the thriving, vibrant Latino community it serves. As this event and celebration continues to grow, it is my hope that the values they celebrate today are transmitted to and embraced by the next generation of Hispanic leaders in Ector County.

TRIBUTE TO TOM MCLEMORE

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Tom McLemore, the clerk of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, who will be leaving the Committee staff after more than 13 years of service.

Tom joined the Appropriations Committee staff in 2001 and has worked on various subcommittees and for various chairmen since that time, ultimately becoming the clerk of the Defense Subcommittee in 2011.

As the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have had the honor and pleasure of working closely with Tom. He is professional, he is reliable, he is dedicated, and he gets every job done well, regardless of the circumstances.

Tom is a leader. He efficiently manages his staff, not by micromanaging but by empowering them to make informed recommendations. He is affable, he is thoughtful, and he is calm under pressure.

As we all know, congressional staff work countless hours and through countless holiday seasons in order to keep this esteemed institution running. This inevitably takes a toll on personal commitments, and nothing means more to Tom than his supportive and loving family. In his new employment, Tom will hopefully have more time to spend with his lovely

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

wife, Cory, and their two girls, Anna and Maggie.

I have said before, and I will say again, the Appropriations Committee has the best staff on Capitol Hill. And Tom McLemore is the epitome of that statement. Congress, and I, will surely miss this leader; but we thank him for his service and dedication and wish him well now and in the future.

HONORING LT. MATTHEW
STAPLETON

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Lt. Matthew Stapleton on the occasion of his retirement from the City of Petaluma Police Department.

Lt. Stapleton joined the Petaluma Police Department on April 4, 1988. Over the last 26 years, he has dedicated himself to ensuring the safety of our community. Through various specialized assignments, including SWAT, Investigations, Narcotics and Patrol, Lt. Stapleton has consistently demonstrated bravery in the line of duty. As an instructor, he has provided proper training to numerous law enforcement officers throughout Sonoma County. It is no surprise that Lt. Stapleton's outstanding supervisory and managerial skills have earned him many decorations throughout his career, such as Petaluma Police Officer of the Year, Petaluma City Employee of the Year, and the Medal of Bravery.

Lt. Stapleton's legacy is one of sincere passion for the most challenging police work and dedication to the community. Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Lt. Matthew Stapleton for his long and singularly exceptional career, and for his outstanding record of service to the people of the City of Petaluma and Sonoma County.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIF-
TIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
JOB CORPS PROGRAM

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Job Corps program, which was founded in 1965 as a key part of President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. Founded with the mission of empowering youth, ages 16 through 24, from disadvantaged backgrounds to improve their own quality of life, the Detroit Job Corps Center has been a vital part of the Southeast Michigan region by providing vocational and academic training.

Created under the administration of the U.S. Department of Labor under the Economic Opportunity Act, the dedicated staff of the Job Corps program have been working for half of a century to address the many different barriers that youth encounter in their efforts to ob-

tain employment and attain independence. By providing youth with a combination of academic, vocational, and work-based learning experiences, alongside assistance with resume writing and interview preparation, the Job Corps program helps its students develop the tools they need to find stable, long-term, and well-paying jobs. Today, 125 Job Corps centers across the United States serve more than 60,000 youth annually, ensuring that employment is a goal that can be obtained regardless of one's personal circumstances.

To carry out the mission of the Job Corps program locally, the Detroit Job Corps Center has engaged with an extensive network of community stakeholders in Southeast Michigan; which allows it to offer its students a wide array of experiences as they seek to build their skills and determine their future career path. Among its partners are Quicken Loans, the United Auto Workers, the NAACP, many local elected officials, Southwest Solutions and the Wayne County Department of Homeland Security. With these connections, the Detroit Job Corps Center has been able to offer its students internships and community service activities with organizations that are making a difference in the Southeast Michigan region, organizations like: the Greening of Detroit, the United Way of Southeast Michigan, Forgotten Harvest and the U.S. Veterans Administration.

The record of Detroit Job Corps Center is embodied in the success of its graduates, 95 percent of whom end up obtaining a college degree, pursuing advanced training, finding fulltime employment or serving our nation in the Armed Forces. Of the 125 Job Corps centers across the nation, the Detroit center ranks second in graduate ranking and sixth in overall program ranking for the 2013–2014 period. In recognition of its success, the Detroit Job Corps Center has received a National Job Corps Gold Star Award for outstanding achievement each year since 2010.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the remarkable impact the Job Corps program has made over the last 50 years and it is my pleasure to specifically recognize the Detroit Job Corps Center for the work it has done to empower youth in the Southeast Michigan community to build a better future for themselves. As our economy becomes increasingly knowledge-based, the value and power of an education takes on an ever-growing importance. The work of the Job Corps program and the Detroit Job Corps Center is vital to ensuring that a quality education is available to all youth in our communities, regardless of their background or circumstances. I congratulate the Detroit Job Corps Center on its many achievements and wish its staff continued success in fulfilling the mission of the Job Corps program and realizing President Lyndon Johnson's dream of an America free of poverty.

HONORING JERRY YOUNG

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Jerry

Young, who has been selected as President of the National Baptist Convention.

Rev. Jerry Young was born in Scott, Mississippi to Reverend E.L. and Elizabeth Young. He was raised in the Mississippi Delta in the heart of the Civil Rights Era, enduring the pains and struggles of several disappointments, and beating the odds of his predetermined failures. Throughout his life, it became increasingly clear why God called Pastor Young to the ministry at the young age of seventeen. Young's service began at Mt. Tenna Baptist Church in Lamont, Mississippi and led to him serving as pastor of St. John and Pilgrim Rest Baptist Churches, both in Greenville, Mississippi.

Young has faithfully led the congregation of New Hope Baptist Church since 1980. He is the founder and headmaster of New Hope Christian Pre-School and New Hope Christian Elementary School, serving over 300 students.

Pastor Young attended Nugent Center High School in Bolivar County, Mississippi and went on to attain an Associate of Arts in Social Science from Coahoma Junior College in Clarksdale, Mississippi. He received a Bachelor of Science in Sociology and Social Welfare from Rust College in Holly Springs, Mississippi, where he met and married the love of his life, Mrs. Helen Akins Young. With her support and encouragement, Pastor Young has earned a Master of Divinity and a Doctor of Ministry from Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Mississippi.

Instilling the values of faith, education, and love, they are the proud parents of two daughters, Dr. Jerlen Nelson and Kelli Elizabeth Hart. Adding to their life's joy are their two adorable granddaughters, one grandson, and one step-grandson.

Dr. Young makes history as the first Mississippi pastor chosen to lead the National Baptist Convention. He was elected amongst five candidates nominated for the seat.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pastor Jerry Young.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 494, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 495 and 496, I was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

IN APPRECIATION OF COLONEL
PATRICK T. "SMACK" MCKENZIE

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to Colonel Patrick T. "Smack" McKenzie, on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Air Force after 26 years of service.

I have had the pleasure of working with Smack on a number of occasions during his tenure in the Air Force House Liaison Office. I greatly appreciate and admire his professionalism, knowledge, and dedication, which has benefited me, and numerous other Members and staff.

Colonel McKenzie has given a great deal to this Nation through his distinguished and selfless service. He began his Air Force career as an ROTC Cadet and a "Jayhawk" at the University of Kansas—an allegiance he maintains to this day, as evidenced by the Jayhawk lanyard you will always see around his neck. Upon graduating in May 1988, he was competitively selected for pilot training at Reese AFB, Texas. He was the envy of Class 90-06, not only because of his perfectly restored red 1965 Pontiac GTO affectionately known as "The Goat", but also because as one of the top graduates, he was awarded the only F-16 training slot for the class. He was assigned to the 70th Fighter Squadron at Moody AFB, where he was certified as combat-ready and qualified for air-to-surface, air-to-air, and nuclear missions. He quickly caught the eye of his leadership, and was handpicked as one of only 15 squadron pilots qualified to operate the new LANTIRN system (Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night). He also caught the eye of his future wife, Jennifer, and they have been married now for 21 years. Col. McKenzie's skill as a fighter pilot was quickly recognized during his first deployment, patrolling the skies over Iraq for Operation Southern Watch. His leadership ability earned him a Regular commission and selection for Squadron Officer School, where he was a Distinguished Graduate.

Capt. McKenzie was then assigned to the 51st Operations Support Squadron at Osan Air Base in the Republic of Korea. He continued to impress as a Wing Plans Officer, maintaining critical operational plans for wartime taskings. He again rose above his peers as a pilot, winning the 51st Fighter Wing's Low Angle Strafe Top Gun award and selection as the Chief of Standardization and Evaluation for the 51st Operations Group—a position reserved for the Group's most skilled and trusted pilot. In this position, he was responsible for assessments and maintaining operational standards not only in his F-16 squadron, but also in the HH-60 rescue flight, and a C-12 flight, a job essential to deliver wartime capability. He so impressed his leadership, that even as a Captain he was identified as a "future squadron commander" and was selected for USAF Weapons School, the premier advanced weapons and tactics school for our Air Force Pilots. While there, he was praised for his research on F-16 Night Close Air Support and Targeting Aids, advancing our operational capabilities in this critical capacity. Captain McKenzie's training was put to immediate use with his assignment to the 510th Fighter Squadron at Aviano Air Base, Italy. He flew dozens of combat sorties during Operations Southern Watch, Decisive Edge, and Deliberate Guard, enforcing no-fly zones over Iraq and Bosnia-Herzegovina. He was also a Mission Commander for more than six large force packages in NATO's Operation Allied Force in Kosovo, for which he garnered praise for his skills, leadership, mission execution, and most

importantly ensuring zero combat losses. Additionally, Smack was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for extraordinary achievement, planning the first NATO strike of Operation Allied Force to cross the Kosovo/Serbian border, defeating surface-to-air missiles, and executing the first-ever F-16 night attack utilizing Night Vision Goggles and the LANTIRN system to destroy an ammunition storage facility. As a Flight Commander, Weapons Officer, and Instructor Pilot he was recognized by his superiors as an "exceptional leader with unlimited potential", the "#1 Captain in the Group", the "Wing's top flight commander", and the USAF Fighter Pilot of the Year. Smack was sent to Air Command and Staff College, where his tremendous leadership and team building skills led his peers to recognize him as the "Outstanding Team Member" for his class. Following school, he became the Assignments Officer for nearly 1,500 Air Force F-16 pilots, single-handedly managing the Air Force's largest group of pilots and maintaining 100 percent manning level despite historic shortages just after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Lt. Col. McKenzie then moved to Luke AFB for a short period as the 56th Operations Support Squadron Operations Officer before being entrusted with his first command—the 310th Fighter Squadron "Top Hats"—the largest fighter squadron at Luke, responsible for the only formal Forward Air Controller-Airborne course, which has been a vital capability in the War on Terror. He was heralded as the "top warrior and leader of 618 officers" and led his unit to the 56th Operations Group "Top Squadron" award. Following this highly successful command, Lt. Col. McKenzie attended National War College at Fort McNair and received a Master of Science in National Security Strategy. He then went to U.S. Joint Forces Command in Norfolk, VA where he provided readiness analysis on current operations, and was a liaison with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Government Accountability Office, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all readiness related issues. He provided critical data and assessments for the planning of Operation Enduring Freedom which were influential in leadership decisions. Col. McKenzie then Commanded the 455th Expeditionary Operations Group at Bagram Air Base, Afghanistan. There he profoundly impacted the Global War on Terror, directing air operations and leading over 830 troops to execute over 24,000 missions, dropping 1.1 million pounds of ordnance, and delivering 37,000 tons of cargo—the busiest operation in the CENTCOM area of responsibility. Following this tremendous performance, Col. McKenzie was challenged with a new role as the SECAF's legislative liaison to Congress for all USAF air and space weapon systems, ensuring the Air Force message and priorities were consistently and convincingly articulated to directly ensure the full authorization of their \$120 billion budget. Smack was then sent back to Osan Air Base, Republic of Korea to command the 51st Fighter Wing "Mustangs" where he previously spent time as a Captain. He was the Joint installation commander for over 10,200 personnel, executing the Combat Air Force's largest and most highly-utilized A-10 and F-16 operation in a tense location, just

6 minutes flight time to North Korea. "A+", "inspiring", and "superb" were just a few words used to describe his tenure there. After his highly successful tour as a Wing Commander, the Air Force returned Smack to legislative liaison work by assigning him to one of the most demanding positions within the Air Force, his current job as the Chief of Air Force House Liaison. Since July 2013, Smack has advised the Secretary of the Air Force, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Director of Legislative Liaison, and numerous other senior military and civilian leaders on issues of the greatest concern to the Air Force and Congress. He has been more than a liaison between the Pentagon and the Hill, he developed and improved key relationships to enable the Congress to make better decisions about the future of the Air Force and our national defense. He is extremely intelligent and articulate, and has helped shape my thinking and influenced many Members of Congress. Simply put, we trust him and will miss him!

Col. McKenzie is a command pilot with over 3,200 flying hours and 630 combat hours in the F-16. He is the recipient of numerous major medals and decorations for his service and accomplishments. The most significant of these include the Defense Superior Service medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star, and Meritorious Service medal.

Throughout his distinguished career he has represented our country and the Air Force with dignity and honor, and this is why I'm so privileged to pay tribute to this fine Airman. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congress and the United States of America, I thank Colonel Patrick McKenzie, his wife Jennifer, and their daughter Ashleigh, for their service and sacrifices of the past 26 years. I wish them Godspeed, and continued happiness as they start this new chapter in their lives.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, as the Republic of China, which is commonly called Taiwan, celebrates its National Day, Double Ten Day, or the tenth day of October, we in the Congress look back upon the many years of close cooperation with its leaders. Cemented by the Taiwan Relations Act, the relationship we have enjoyed over decades has given meaning to what friendship between two peoples is all about.

To complement this relationship in actively engaging with Mainland China is the constructive initiative taken by Taiwan's present leader, President Ma Ying-jeou. By doing this, President Ma is lessening tensions among those parties concerned and contributing to the peace and stability of the region. We are currently faced with many unsettling events of terrorism and conflict out of the Middle East and Europe.

Taiwan is a living example of how leadership can contribute to peaceful resolution if the

intent is well-meaning and balanced. On this auspicious day of Double Ten, we congratulate President Ma for continuing to redouble his efforts in tamping down the flames of conflict in Asia. I don't think the world can handle another conflict among nations right now. Thank you so much President Ma and Taiwan for creating a peaceful environment when there is so much strife in many other parts of the globe.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GLEN
MILLS SCHOOL

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th Anniversary of The Glen Mills School and to acknowledge the life-changing work it does for young men.

One hundred twenty five years ago the cornerstone was laid at the Glen Mills School. Today, the Glen Mills School is the oldest institution in the country of its kind. The Glen Mills School was established to give young men a second chance. The school provides a safe living and educational environment to encourage long-term behavioral changes.

The Glen Mills School has a long tradition of fostering the academic and emotional growth of young men whose potential might otherwise be lost. Young men ages 15 to 18 live at The Glen Mills School on a year-round academic and residence program, offering an escape from gangs, drugs and violence that they might encounter at home.

Students have the option to participate in clubs and athletics, which compete and excel against other schools in Delaware County. The beautiful campus and athletic facilities surrounding the school are a testament to both the staff and students. The golf course affiliated with the school, a place where many of the students work, is one of the nicest public courses in the Commonwealth.

I admire the dedication of the staff, who work around the clock to educate and counsel students. Their persistence has led to the character development of thousands of young men, as you can see in person by visiting the campus and meeting the students.

Mr. Speaker, The Glen Mills School has been changing the lives of young men for the past 125 years. I celebrate the school and look forward to seeing the excellent work it will continue to do in the years to come.

HONORING DALE ELBERT JONES

HON. TOM PRICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a constituent of the Sixth District of Georgia, Private First Class (retired) Dale Elbert Jones of the U.S. Army. Mr. Jones was born on November 2, 1914 to Callie Eudora Standcuff and James William Jones.

He was raised in a log farmhouse in the foothills of the Ozark Mountains in northern Arkansas. Soon after graduating high school, Mr. Jones moved to Longview, TX, where a sister was living. He married Fairy Lee Pettey in 1939 and had one son. His electrical supply experience led him into a supervisor's position on the "Big Inch Pipeline" being constructed from Longview to Bayonne, NJ. The "Big Inch" was an emergency effort in support of World War II.

As WWII progressed he was drafted into service by the United States Army. After completing basic training, Mr. Jones was sent to Germany and assigned to the 309th "lightning" Division of the 78th Infantry. He received three battle stars for combat participation in the Battle of the Bulge, Central Germany, and the Rhineland. He was awarded the Purple Heart after being seriously wounded in the Rhineland.

After the war, Mr. Jones built a successful career as a Sales and Marketing executive and entrepreneur in the greater east Texas area. He ultimately founded his own sales and marketing company, TICO Paint & Chemical Company. He continued to work well into his late eighties.

Mr. Jones currently resides in Marietta, GA, where his son Dale L. Jones also lives. He lives independently at the Parc at Piedmont, a senior residence community. He enjoys playing a game of cards, chess, and keeping up with current events.

In a few weeks, Mr. Jones will be celebrating his 100th birthday. He looks forward to dancing at his party. He has lived a remarkable life in service to his family and our nation. I know I speak for the people of the Sixth District in showing sincere gratitude for all he has done for our country and wishing him the happiest of birthdays.

HONORING LEO AND MARILYN
VALENZUELA

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Leo and Marilyn Valenzuela, two exemplary community leaders who have made remarkable contributions to the progress and prosperity of Ventura County.

Leo Valenzuela first began his service to his community more than 50 years ago, as an advocate on behalf of workers throughout the region. He began working for a local labor union in 1963 but left his duties to serve his country in the Vietnam War. After his honorable service to our nation, Leo returned to his work and entered into the area's political sphere as a successful labor organizer and activist. Leo played an active role in the political careers of former United States Senator Alan Cranston, former United States Senator Gary Hart and former California State Senator Jack O'Connell.

Leo has also played an instrumental part in the grassroots activism that comes with political campaigns. Leo has worked to organize

and mobilize our community to change people's lives for the better.

Similarly, for more than four decades, Marilyn Valenzuela has also been a tireless advocate for our community's labor force. Marilyn first began her career in 1964 when she joined the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW) Local 770. After raising a family, Marilyn began to work for the UFCW Local 1036 as a Member Assistance Program Director and Women's Network Regional Director. Within only a year, Marilyn was elected as the Executive Secretary Treasurer of the Tri-Counties Center Labor Council.

Marilyn's steadfast character and commitment to Ventura County's workforce have been vital to the strengthening of our community. During her tenure on the Tri-Counties Central Labor Council, Marilyn increased membership by 100 percent. She has also been a board member of the Ventura County Workforce Investment Board and the Executive Director of the Labor Foundation.

Leo and Marilyn are known as the tag team. Over the years, they have successfully worked hand in hand and together have accomplished and contributed so much to our community. I applaud Leo and Marilyn Valenzuela for their commendable commitment and dedication. They have both been staunch and unwavering leaders in the labor community and have dedicated their careers to working for our working families.

I extend my sincere appreciation for their tireless work. For their unrelenting activism, passion for public service and unwavering work ethic, I am pleased to join the Ventura County Democratic Party in honoring Leo and Marilyn Valenzuela with the Lifetime Achievement Award.

TRIBUTE TO DAISY ALSTON

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th birthday of Mrs. Daisy Alston, and to honor her many contributions to the communities she has proudly served.

Daisy was born on July 27, 1914 in Virginia. At the age of ten, her parents moved their family to Pittsburgh so that their children could attend public high school. Public education for African-American children stopped at eighth grade in the segregated South. In 1932, Daisy came to West Virginia to pursue higher education at West Virginia State College (now West Virginia State University). She took graduate courses at Atlanta University before returning to Pittsburgh to become a social worker. In 1939, she married the late Cheatham Alston, a Kanawha County educator, and briefly resided in Cabin Creek, until finally settling in Chesapeake, West Virginia.

After moving back to the Kanawha Valley, Mrs. Alston chose a career in education and worked as a teacher at many segregated schools throughout Kanawha County. When the United States Supreme Court declared

segregated schools as unconstitutional in 1954, Daisy was chosen as a test teacher in a two-part process to integrate Kanawha County Schools. In the years following school integration, Daisy continued to teach and later became a teaching principal at Institute Elementary. At the age of 68, Mrs. Daisy Alston was honored by Kanawha County Schools as "Teacher of the Year."

Though Daisy officially retired as a teacher, she never stopped teaching and working throughout her community. She has been active in the Upper Kanawha Valley as a civic volunteer and organizer for numerous activities and events. She is a member of Simpson Memorial United Methodist Church; United Methodist Women; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; and the Charleston Women's Improvement League. Daisy served as a board member for various organizations, including the Cabin Creek Clinic, which grew into the Cabin Creek Health Systems, a non-profit community health center with multiple locations. In 1998, she was recognized for her contributions by her hometown and named Chesapeake, West Virginia's "Citizen of the Year."

Daisy Alston still lives in Chesapeake, she is a mother of two children: Marian Alston (W.I. "Bill" Hairston) and Cheatham Alston, Jr., and has one grandchild, Bill Hairston.

Mr. Speaker, the state of West Virginia and indeed our nation owes Mrs. Daisy Alston our heartfelt congratulations on becoming a centenarian, as well as sincere gratitude for her many years of devotion to her community. It is people like Daisy who make serving West Virginia's Second Congressional District such a distinct honor.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CANADA/MICHIGAN JURISDICTION OF THE CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST, INC.

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Michigan/Ontario Council of Bishops of the Church of God in Christ, Inc. (COGIC), as they celebrate 100 years of fellowship.

Founded in 1897 by then-Elder Charles Harrison Mason, the COGIC arose from humble beginnings—holding its first meetings in the living room of one of its members. Driven by a desire to better fulfill the tenants of their beliefs in the Gospel, Bishop Mason and his followers embarked upon a spiritual journey to grow closer in fellowship through the teachings of Jesus Christ. Over the decades of the new century that soon followed, COGIC grew and prospered, with new congregations being formed across the United States. Among the many jurisdictions formed, was the jurisdiction for the State of Michigan.

Established in 1914, the COGIC jurisdiction for the State of Michigan was formed under the leadership of Elder W.G. Johnson. Under his leadership and the leadership of successors, the COGIC quickly expanded in Michi-

gan, with several jurisdictions being formed within the first decades of its founding. Over its 100-year history, the Canadian/Michigan Jurisdiction of the COGIC has grown to include 8 sub-jurisdictions within Michigan and Ontario comprised of nearly 90 congregations across the region—including many in Michigan's 14th Congressional District.

In the Greater Detroit region, COGIC congregations not only serve as houses of worship where members of the community can create a deeper connection with their faith, they bring together devoted community members in the tenants of service to our community. From food pantries to youth development and education, COGIC congregations are engaging communities in Greater Detroit, the State of Michigan and across North America to answer the calls of our friends and neighbors in their time of need. So many of these programs support families in times of crisis and afford them the opportunity to confront those crises and move forward to overcome those obstacles.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 100 years, the members of COGIC in Michigan have not only grown deeper in their covenant to their faith, but have channeled their faith into strengthening lives, families and communities across the State—much as their counterparts have done in others states across our nation. I congratulate the Michigan/Ontario Council of Bishops and the members of COGIC congregations across the Canada/Michigan Jurisdiction for achieving this great milestone in their fellowship and look forward to their continued efforts to strengthen the communities which they call home.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ORLANDO ROLÓN

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Orlando Rolón. Rolón was born in Bayamon, Puerto Rico and has lived in Orlando, Florida since 1977. After high school, he served in the United States Marines Reserves for four years. He was an assistant superintendent for a multi-housing developer until he was hired by the Orlando Police Department in 1992.

As an officer he worked in East Patrol, the community-oriented Neighborhood Patrol Unit, and a task force focused on juvenile gang activity. In December 1995, Rolón was selected to work in the Criminal Investigations Division's Assault and Battery Unit.

On June 1, 1997, Rolón was promoted to Sergeant. He supervised in West Patrol, and on March 8, 1998, he was selected as a supervisor for the Parramore Heritage Bike Unit. In January 1999, he was selected as the Orlando Police Department's first ever fulltime bilingual Public Information Officer.

On August 31, 2004, he was promoted to Lieutenant. He served as a Watch Commander in North Patrol and on January 8, 2006, Rolón was selected by Mayor Buddy

Dyer to work as the Mayor's assistant. During his assignment to the Mayor he was named the Liaison for Hispanic Affairs for the City of Orlando.

In December 2008, he was transferred to the Crime Prevention Division as the Midnight Downtown Bike Commander. On June 6, 2010, he was selected as the Special Operations Division's Motors Commander. During his assignment to Special Operations he served as the Planning Section Chief for the 2012 Orlando NBA All-Stars.

Rolón was a founding member of the National Latino Peace Officers Association, Central Florida Chapter, where he served as President. He also served as a member of the Emergency Response Team and as the Commander of the Crisis Negotiation Team.

In January 2013, Rolón was named as one of the 25 Most Influential Hispanics in Central Florida by Vision Magazine. That same month, Rolón was promoted to the rank of Captain. He served as the Commander for the West Patrol and Professional Standards Divisions.

On September 1, 2014, Mayor Buddy Dyer appointed Rolón as Deputy Chief for the Orlando Police Department.

Rolón is a graduate of the Southern Police Institute Command Officer Development Course and received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Columbia College. He is currently enrolled in the Columbia College Master's program for Criminal Justice. Rolón is married to Giorgina Pinedo-Rolón, he has two children and two grandchildren.

I am honored to recognize Orlando Rolón for his service to the United States and the Central Florida community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED MOLLY MARTIN

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Northwest Florida's beloved Molly Martin who passed away late August 15, 2014. Molly was a passionate and devoted wife, mother, and grandmother and matriarch of McGuire's Irish Pub, a staple in Northwest Florida frequented not only by locals but tourists from around the world. The Gulf Coast community and all of the lives she touched with her warm demeanor and radiant personality mourn her loss.

Born in Stamping Ground, Kentucky, on October 31, 1936, Molly eventually made her way to Pensacola, Florida, where she joined in marriage the love of her life, William "McGuire" Martin in 1977. In the same year, she and McGuire opened McGuire's Irish Pub in Pensacola, where McGuire served as the cook, bartender, and designer. Molly was the hostess, waitress and entertainer. McGuire and Molly's success only grew, and they expanded their franchise to Destin, Florida. They founded Flounders (Pensacola Beach) in 1982; McGuire's Irish Pub (Destin) in 1996; Crabs (Pensacola Beach) in 2000; and Vinny McGuire's Pizza (Destin) in 2011.

To some, Molly will be remembered for her passion for singing; to others, she was an accomplished business woman; and to many of the young servicemembers stationed throughout the Gulf Coast, she became a mother away from home. Those who knew Molly best, however, will remember her heart full of love and her devotion to family. Molly was a loving daughter to Ralph Lee Parker and Edith Clare Wright-Parker; sister to Lena, Edna, Jean, and Evelyn; mother to Charmaine McGowan, Nannette McGowan, John David McGowan, Joseph Parker McGowan, Suzannah Darling McGowan, William (Billy) Nathaniel Martin, James Edward Martin, and Amy Elizabeth Martin; grandmother to twenty-four; great-grandmother to eight; aunt; and a loving wife to McGuire.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to honor the life of Mrs. Molly Martin. My wife Vicki and I offer our prayers and sincerest condolences to McGuire, her children, grandchildren and her entire family and friends. Molly's impact on Northwest Florida will never be forgotten, and she will truly be missed.

IN HONOR OF AMBASSADOR RICK
BARTON

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of a distinguished public servant who I am proud to call a friend, Ambassador Rick Barton, Assistant Secretary for State Department's Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations. On September 30, Ambassador Barton will end this chapter of a long and venerable public service career. Without question, he leaves behind a legacy of diplomacy and peace.

Ambassador Barton has crisscrossed the world, going to the most neglected corners of the globe to promote stability and security. He led independent reviews of Iraq reconstruction; developed civilian strategies for Iraq, Sudan, and Sri Lanka; and initiated trail-blazing approaches to conflict resolution in Pakistan and Nigeria.

As the first Assistant Secretary of CSO, Ambassador Barton put a laser-sharp focus on innovation and locally-driven solutions to break cycles of violent conflict. Under his direction, CSO has harnessed the power of mass communications and advanced analytics to drive ground-up initiatives in Syria, Burma, Honduras, Bangladesh, Kenya, and Nigeria. Not surprisingly, he was honored in 2013 with a Distinguished Honor Award from the State Department "in recognition of [his] groundbreaking work to create the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, promote peacebuilding and empower women, youth and other change agents."

Prior to CSO, Ambassador Barton served as the U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, co-director of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Deputy High Commissioner of the

United Nations Refugee Agency, and founding Director of USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives. Ambassador Barton's diplomatic career began as an election trainer and observer in Latin America, a region that is dear to both our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, as war and conflict raged around the globe, Ambassador Barton has been a stalwart advocate for peace. Ambassador Barton, as you head off to the Great State of Maine—where you made your mark both in the Democratic Party and on the squash court—I honor your tremendous public service. The world is better for your work.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF GIORGINA PINEDO-
ROLON

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Giorgina Pinedo-Rolón. Born in Caracas, Venezuela, Giorgina obtained a degree in Business Administration from Andres Bello Catholic University in Venezuela. She also earned a Masters in TV Production and Journalism. Currently she is pursuing her PhD in Social Psychology.

Giorgina worked for Walt Disney World for nine years as a Merchandise Buyer, after which she began a new career in the field of media. She has extensive experience in television, print, and radio. Giorgina served as Director of Production and Public Relations, and TV host for Telemundo Orlando. After nine years with Telemundo, she became Chief Editor at Casiano Communications' Image magazine. Currently, she is the founder and President of Gio Communications, a communications agency focused on public relations, Hispanic outreach, media buys, government affairs and marketing.

Giorgina has been very involved with the business community and the local government of Central Florida. She has received several prestigious awards in recognition of her work including, HABLA Awards' Executive of the Year, Girl Scouts of Citrus' Women of Distinction Awards Visionary of the Year, the Orlando Business Journal's Forty under Forty Award, and the Orange County Sheriff's Office and Orlando Police Department's Good Citizen Award.

Giorgina serves as Chairman of the Board for Metro Orlando's Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Board Member of the Hispanic Heritage Scholarship Fund, Board Member of the Hispanic Business Initiative Fund, Chair of the Public Relations Committee for the Hispanic Heritage Scholarship Fund and Board Member of the Hope Community Center. She is also a former Board Member of the Orange County Membership and Mission Review Board, Coalition for the Homeless, and Easter Seals, and the former President of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists' Central Florida Chapter.

She is a member of the National Association of Professional Women, National Association

of Hispanic Journalists, the American Association of Marketing and Public Relations, Hispanic Public Relations Association, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Metro Orlando, National Association of Professional Women, and lifetime member of the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO).

Giorgina is married to Orlando Rolón. She has two step children and two granddaughters.

I am honored to recognize Giorgina Pinedo-Rolón, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her leadership and contributions to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAREY AND
BETTY MCCAIN

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Carey McCain who have been married 57 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Carey and Betty met at Hank's Drive-In in Alexander City, Alabama, in 1956 after Carey's return from serving in the Air Force. They were married in Jackson, Mississippi on July 22, 1957.

The McCains moved to Iowa, Texas, New York and Pennsylvania before moving back in Alabama in 1969. In 1970, Betty and Carey began spreading the gospel throughout Alabama and Georgia. Betty began her evangelistic ministry in 1977 serving for 22 years and then became a pastor for eight years.

Carey and Betty raised three children and are the proud grandparents of six grandchildren. Children include: Lisa McCain, Linda Lollar who passed away on May 5, 2012 and Susanne Boyd.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. and Mrs. McCain for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RON ANDERSON

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Ron Anderson, my dear friend, who passed away on September 11, 2014. I am humbled to have shared in his successes and to have been able to support his vision for transforming public health in Dallas County. Dr. Ron Anderson served as the CEO and President of Dallas' Parkland Memorial Hospital for twenty-nine years. I am deeply saddened by his passing, but I am honored to celebrate his legacy and contributions, not only to Dallas County, but to the global health community.

During my career as a psychiatric nurse with the Dallas Veterans Affairs Medical Center and as a state and federal legislator, I have never known a public health official who treated his patients with as much compassion

as Dr. Anderson. His passion and commitment to treating each and every individual who visited his hospital is unparalleled. He dedicated his life to healing people, regardless of their race, economic class, ethnic origin or immigration status. He was steadfast and visionary.

Through his years of service to Dallas County's only public hospital, Dr. Anderson's name has become synonymous with Parkland. Dr. Anderson's tenure at Parkland began in 1973 as an intern seeking training in a large city. He grew up in poverty in Chickasaw, Oklahoma and was able to connect with the high population of low-income patients who sought health care at Parkland. Not only did he help to treat the underserved in Dallas County, he led the charge in advocating for every individual to receive the best care possible.

After he became President and CEO in 1982, Dr. Anderson lobbied tirelessly to stop patient dumping, or the practice of transferring unstable patients from private to public hospitals because of the patient's inability to pay. In 1986, federal legislation was passed and signed into law prohibiting patient dumping. Dr. Anderson also fought to allow Parkland's physicians to treat every patient, no matter their citizenship status. In the mid-1990s, Dr. Anderson became a national spokesperson when welfare reform proposals threatened to force health care providers to report undocumented immigrants to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. He advocated for the preservation of the confidentiality of the physician-patient relationship.

Under Dr. Anderson's dynamic leadership, Parkland's system expanded to include twelve local primary care clinics and twelve school-based clinics. The Homeless Outreach Medical Services branch was also established, providing care in more than twenty homeless shelters in Dallas County. Hospital administrators travelled from all over the world to see Parkland and to learn from Dr. Anderson's visionary and compassionate leadership style.

In 2005, Dr. Anderson's colleagues recognized his leadership by awarding him the Dallas County Medical Society's Max Cole Leadership Award. He is responsible for the new \$1.8 billion Parkland facility across the street from the original campus.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, Dr. Ron Anderson, dedicated his life to improve the lives of countless thousands of people. He exemplified the virtues of a true care-giver and was an exemplary model for other physicians. I urge my colleagues to celebrate the life and legacy of Dr. Ron Anderson.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CARMEN BALASQUIDE

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Carmen Balasquide. Carmen was born in San Juan, Puerto Rico and is mother to three children Janpierre, Kiara, and Adriel.

Carmen moved to Florida in 1993. In 1996, Carmen first got involved in community orga-

nizing by volunteering for Osceola County Commissioner Robert Guevara's campaign in which the first Hispanic-American was elected to a local office. While volunteering on the campaign she organized community town halls and candidate meet-and-greets.

After spending time away from politics, Carmen had the opportunity to get back into community organizing in 2008 when she met State Senator Gary Siplin during his reelection campaign. She took a campaign coordinator job with the Florida Democratic Party to help reelect State Senator Siplin and to work on the presidential election.

In 2012, Carmen worked with Organize Now as a community organizer where she educated and developed Hispanic community leaders through their Earned Sick Time and Anti-Foreclosure campaigns. Carmen's work on the Earn Sick Time campaign helped collect over 52,000 signatures in support of earned sick time and was the first successful citizen-petition campaign in Orange County. In addition to her organizing work, Carmen arranged meetings and educated legislators on voting against sick time pre-emption.

In 2013, Carmen started working with National Council of La Raza (NCLR) to educate Members of Congress on the need to support comprehensive immigration reform (CIR). During the CIR campaign, she worked with community leaders and local elected officials in Orange, Osceola, and Polk counties by conducting local Hispanic media interviews, organizing public letters of support, and facilitating congressional legislative visits. Additionally, Carmen worked with state Hispanic legislators to pass S.R. 1722 a Florida Senate resolution in support of CIR. Carmen has been leading NCLR's vote-by-mail canvass campaign in Central Florida as well as educating voters on the need to vote in midterm elections and to support key issues like expanding healthcare access to all and increasing the minimum wage.

In addition to her professional work, Carmen has served as secretary to the Florida Democratic Hispanic Caucus and is currently a member of Congressman GRAYSON's Puerto Rican Advisory Board.

I am honored to recognize Carmen Balasquide, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service to the Central Florida Hispanic community.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BARRINEAU PARK 4-H CLUB

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the Barrineau Park 4-H Club. Located in Escambia County, Florida, Barrineau Park is the oldest continuous 4-H club in the State of Florida.

4-H began in 1909 with "corn clubs" for young men. At these clubs, youth learned how to prepare and plant their fields with hybrid corn seed, with cash prizes awarded to those

who produced the most corn. Two years later, in 1911, tomato clubs were established for young women to plant, harvest, and can tomatoes.

In 1914, the Barrineau Park 4-H Club was founded with an initial membership of about 10 local youth. Holding meetings in homes, church fellowship halls, and the Barrineau Park School and Community Center, the group learned a wide variety of skills, including how to grow corn and tomatoes, raise poultry and livestock, garden, and sew. Since then, the Barrineau Park 4-H Club has helped teach hundreds of young people in Escambia County invaluable life and leadership skills.

Today, there are 23 students participating in the Barrineau Park 4-H Club, taking part in events to develop leadership skills, learn the important values of citizenship, and practice public speaking. In addition, the group learns invaluable skills related to livestock and horses, shooting sports, food and nutrition, environmental education and marine science. In particular, the club has developed a strong reputation for raising and showing prize-winning hogs. In addition to these traditional programs, the Barrineau Park 4-H Club also gives its members experience in an array of technological areas vital to success in the future, including computers, robotics, and global-positioning satellite programs.

As a former 4-H participant, I can attest to the incredible leadership and educational opportunities that 4-H provides to our Nation's youth. The Barrineau Park 4-H Club's incredible 100 year history is a testament not only to the Barrineau Park and Escambia County community, but also to the entire 4-H program and its mission to "empower youth to reach their full potential, working and learning in partnership with caring adults."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the Barrineau Park 4-H Club. My wife Vicki and I congratulate everyone associated with the club and wish them another 100 years of success.

20 YEARS OF VAWA—THE PROGRESS WE HAVE MADE AND THE LONG ROAD AHEAD

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) changed the way we view domestic violence in the United States.

On the 20th anniversary of VAWA, we celebrate the progress we have made, but we also take this time to recognize how much further we have to go in ending this horrific crime.

20 years ago domestic violence was viewed as a "family issue."

Fortunately, in 2014, we educate men and women on this issue and have many more resources available for victims and tougher punishments for abusers.

As a society, we try to make victims feel comfortable coming forward so they can be protected and move forward with their lives, away from their abuser.

Sadly, though, many individuals and organizations still do not take domestic violence seriously enough.

The NFL had to be shamed into suspending Baltimore Ravens running back Ray Rice for two games for abusing his fiancée after a video surfaced of him dragging his unconscious fiancée out of an elevator by her hair.

And shamed even further for the Baltimore Ravens to finally terminate his contract and for the NFL to suspend him indefinitely.

That is, only after, the full, more graphic video was released making it beyond clear what happened inside of that elevator.

Ray Rice knocked his fiancée out cold.

Like it or not, professional athletes are role models. Is this the type of person we want our children looking up to?

This summer, the NFL did not care about intimate partner violence as a serious crime. They cared about saving face.

Not saving the faces and bodies and souls of women in this country, but protecting their own image and bottom line.

In the spirit of VAWA, we must continue to speak out against abusers and those that do not take criminal conduct seriously, and we must continue to stand up for victims.

Victims of abuse must come forward for their own safety and that of their children.

What kind of message are we sending these victims when we put men who abuse their partners on a pedestal? When we treat celebrities or professional athletes who commit the same crime differently because of their status?

I am proud of how much VAWA changed the landscape for victims in our country over the past 20 years, but this latest incident demonstrates there is more work to be done.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE VIC- TOR M. TORRES, JR.

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Victor "Vic" M. Torres, Jr., Florida State Representative for District 48. Vic is of Puerto Rican descent and was born and raised in New York, New York. Vic's lifetime of service began when he joined the U.S. Marine Corps during the Vietnam War. After his service in the U.S. Marine Corps, he served his community as a police officer for the New York City Transit Police. After twenty years, Victor retired from the New York City Transit Police as 2nd Grade Detective.

In 1993, Vic relocated his family to Florida and became a volunteer and leader with several community organizations, the labor movement, and grassroots efforts. He has established a strong reputation as a committed political activist and an effective leader. Vic has volunteered for various local, state and federal campaigns, including presidential, congressional, and state and local electoral campaigns.

In 2012, Vic was elected as State Representative for Florida House District 48 in Orange County. Vic currently serves on the Education Committee, Government Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, Rulemaking Oversight and Repeal Subcommittee, and the Transportation and Economic Development Appropriations Subcommittee.

Vic has served with organizations involved in the labor movement including Political Coordinator for the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1596 Orlando, Southeast Region Representative for the ATU Latino Caucus, and Trustee for the Central Florida Labor Council of Orange County (CLC).

Vic has also been a member of several political organizations including the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee, the Orange County Chapter of the Democratic Hispanic Caucus, the Florida Voters League, Inc., and the Steering Committee of the Marion County Democratic Executive Committee.

Vic has been married to Carmen L. Torres for over twenty years. Vic and Carmen are the proud parents of five children and eight grandchildren. They are faithful members of St. John's Episcopal Church in Kissimmee, Florida.

I am honored to recognize State Representative Victor M. Torres, Jr., during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his service to the United States and the Central Florida community.

DANIEL MCHENRY AND THE MCHENRY CHAPEL

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the McHenry Chapel for 200 years of serving the community in White County, Illinois. For 200 years, the McHenry Chapel has continually been a spiritual home for area residents.

Being almost as old as our country and older than the State of Illinois, the McHenry Chapel has a long history. It was formed by Daniel McHenry in 1814, two years after the War of 1812 with many immigrants flooding into the area from southern states. This gave McHenry the inspiration and devotion to preach the gospel to his neighbors. After forming the church, McHenry served in creating the town of Carmi.

The original log church was used from 1814-1870. And as the faith community continued to thrive, plans for a new, larger church were begun in 1914, during World War I. Completed in 1916, the existing church has continued to attract people from the area.

I would like to congratulate and thank the current pastor and his wife, Jon and Stephanie Carrell, for answering the call to serve their community and bring hope and faith to the people.

McHenry Chapel will hold a 200th anniversary celebration on October 19, 2014, with services in both the morning and afternoon. A lunch will be held after morning service at the fairgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the McHenry Chapel and offer my best wishes for another 200 years.

HONORING LAWRENCE BROOKS

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Lawrence Nathaniel Brooks, Sr. Mr. Brooks, a World War II veteran and Louisiana resident, celebrated his 105th birthday on September 12, 2014.

Mr. Brooks was born in 1909 in Norwood, Louisiana. He joined the United States Army in 1940 and did basic training at Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Serving our country was a family legacy for Mr. Brooks. He had three uncles who fought in World War I, and his brother, Chester, was a member of the United States Coast Guard.

The bombing of Pearl Harbor would change Mr. Brooks' life forever. Shortly thereafter he was called to duty. He served in the predominantly African-American 91st Engineer Battalion which was stationed in New Guinea and then the Philippines during World War II. He served three white officers in his battalion, and his daily routine included cleaning the officers' sheets, shining their shoes, making sure their uniforms were clean, and accomplishing any task these officers asked of him. Brooks attained the rank of Private 1st Class during the war. During his service, he had two alarming encounters. While he was stationed in New Guinea, the Japanese bombed the base where he was located. Additionally, Mr. Brooks was on a C-47 going from Australia to New Guinea, transporting a load of barbed wire when one of the engines went out. The crew had to work quickly to lighten up the load in order to make the plane light enough to continue on.

A true New Orleanian, even Hurricane Katrina couldn't keep Mr. Brooks away from the city he loves for too long. A few days after the levees failed and the city flooded, Mr. Brooks moved to Los Angeles. However, he returned to New Orleans a little more than a year later.

Mr. Brooks' most enduring legacy is his engagement and involvement with his community in New Orleans. He is widely known as a pillar of his community and regularly volunteers at his church, St. Luke's.

Mr. Brooks was married to the late Leona B. Brooks, and he is a father of five, grandfather of thirteen, great-grandfather of 19, and great-great grandfather of 2, and he is loved by even more. He is known for his love of dance, and has committed to enjoying and celebrating life.

The National World War II Museum, which I proudly represent, recently hosted a celebration for Mr. Brooks. During the celebration, he was honored by the Museum, the Veterans' Administration, and a host of national and local organizations. It is my honor to introduce Mr. Brooks to the country. I invite everyone to join me in congratulating Mr. Lawrence Brooks on a life well-lived, and wishing him the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF JIM AND EVA
DYKES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Jim Dykes who have been married 59 years and serve as clergy in Lee County, Alabama.

Jim and Eva met while Jim was still serving his country in the U.S. Army. They were married in Mannheim, Germany in 1955.

When Jim's tour of duty ended, the Dykes moved to Denver, Colorado. In 1970, they moved back to Lee County, Alabama where Jim served as a pastor.

The Dykes raised four children and are the proud grandparents of seven grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren. Their children include: Jimmy Dykes, Helene Sykes, Ernest Byron Dykes and Maryanne Pillgreen.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. and Mrs. Dykes for their tireless service in the Lee County community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MIGUEL ANTONIO NIEVES BOU

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 15, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Miguel Antonio Nieves Bou. Miguel was born in Puerto Rico to Miguel Angel Nieves Diaz and Iris Bou Cordova of Corozal on June 13, 1963. Miguel attended Catholic school and the American Military Academy in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico before moving to Sebring, Florida in 1977.

Miguel graduated from Sebring High School and received a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration from Gardner-Webb University in Boiling Springs, North Carolina. After graduating from college, he married Kathy Lynn Duckett and soon moved back to Central Florida. He began his career with the Western Auto Supply Company and rapidly rose within the organization to become the second youngest and first Hispanic District Manager in company history. While his career with Western Auto Supply Company began in Central Florida, job promotions took him to assignments throughout the state of Florida and then to Greensboro, North Carolina.

In 1990, Miguel and Kathy gave birth to their first of two sons, Michael Alexander Nieves. Looking to settle down, Miguel left Western Auto to join the Communications Industry as a Sales Executive for a radio station. Soon media became his passion. Within three years, he became Sales Manager for two English language radio stations in Greensboro, North Carolina. During this time Miguel and his wife Kathy welcomed their second son, Christian Andrew Nieves.

In 2001, Miguel moved his family back to Central Florida in order to be close to his im-

mediate family and the thriving Puerto Rican community. Miguel joined Bright House Networks in 2001 as the first Latino Sales Executive and led the department, in year-over-year percentage growth for eight consecutive years. He was promoted to Director of Multicultural Sales for Florida in order to develop a business model for a statewide Multicultural Sales initiative. He is currently President and CEO of a multicultural marketing firm based in Central Florida.

Miguel's work ethic and commitment to excellence have made him stand out among the best. His family is his main source of pride and joy in his life. His heroes are his parents and his mentor is Jesus Christ. Miguel lives by a credo from the baseball icon, Roberto Clemente Walker, who once said, "Anytime you have an opportunity to make a difference in this world and you don't, then you are wasting your time on earth."

I am happy to honor Miguel Antonio Nieves Bou, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Central Florida community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 16, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 17

Time to be announced

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to consider S. 2017, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that voters in elections for Federal office do not wait in long lines in order to vote, S. 85, to provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls and to simplify voter registration, and nominations of Matthew Vincent Masterson, of Ohio, and Christy A. McCormick, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission.

S-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Francis Cekuta, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Repub-

lic of Azerbaijan, Richard M. Mills, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia, Jess Lippincott Bailly, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, and Margaret Ann Uyebara, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to Montenegro, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2141, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes, H.R. 4366, to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement, the nomination of Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, and any pending nominations.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine reforming America's outdated energy tax code.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine why net neutrality matters, focusing on protecting consumers and competition through meaningful open Internet rules.

SH-216

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 2670, to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts.

SD-628

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine the impact of rising inequality on the American economy.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 2338, to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, S. 2482, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, S. 2484, to implement the Convention on the Conservation

and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Auckland on November 14, 2009, S. 2485, to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted at Lisbon on September 28, 2007, S. 2581, to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, S. 2583, to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission, S. 2759, to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport, S. 2777, to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, S. 2799, to extend the authority of satellite carriers to retransmit certain television broadcast station signals, and the nominations of Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, and Manson K. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the United States strategy to defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant.

SD-419

SEPTEMBER 18

Time to be announced

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider GSA resolutions.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine overcoming persistent barriers to economic self-sufficiency for people with disabilities.

SD-430

11 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine assessing and enhancing protections in consumer financial services.

SD-538

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Madeline Cox Arleo, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wendy Beetlestone, Mark A. Kearney, Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., and Gerald J. Pappert, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Victor Allen Bolden, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Armando Ormar Bonilla, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, Stephen R. Bough, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, David J. Hale, and Gregory N. Stivers, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, S. 1690, to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007, S. 2646, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, S. 2520, to improve the Freedom of Information Act, and H.R. 1447, to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled "Ukraine Freedom Support Act", S. 2778, to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards totaling up to \$10,000,000 for information on the kidnapping and murder of James Foley and Steven Sotloff, S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its

control over areas in northwestern Iraq, S. Res. 541, recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic, S. Res. 540, recognizing September 15, 2014, as the International Day of Democracy, affirming the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encouraging all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations, and the nominations of Donald L. Heflin, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cabo Verde, Craig B. Allen, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam, Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica, Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Earl Robert Miller, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana, William V. Roebuck, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu, Barbara A. Leaf, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, Pamela Leora Spratlen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan, and a list in the Foreign Service.

S-116

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine tax audits of large partnerships.

SD-342

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive closed briefings on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

SENATE—Tuesday, September 16, 2014

The Senate met at 10:02 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, the fountain of wisdom and strength, we praise You for the gift of this day. You sustain us with the strength we need to fulfill Your purposes for such a time as this. Lead our lawmakers to new levels of wisdom, providing them with faith for their perplexities, insights for their decisions, and light for the path ahead.

Lord, use our Senators this day as instruments of Your powerful providence. Replenish the wells of their spirit with Your peace that passes understanding. Hear our prayer, O Lord. Incline Your ears to us and give us Your peace.

We pray in Your faithful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY). The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 409, S. 2432, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. today. During that period of time, Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Following morning business, the Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., to allow for weekly caucus meetings. At 2:15 p.m. the Senate will proceed to rollcall votes on confirmation of the Baran and Burns nominations, followed by several voice votes on executive nominations.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. today be under the control of the majority and the time from 4 p.m. until 5 p.m. be under the control of the Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A FLAWED APPROACH

Mr. President, the 18th century French philosopher Voltaire once said:

One day everything will be well, that is our hope. Everything's fine today, that is our illusion.

There is no better portrayal of the Republican Party's flawed approach to governance than what Voltaire said. Senate Republicans deceive themselves by thinking their obstruction is good for the Nation, that the status quo is helping American families. Meanwhile, the Republicans are out stumping and promising the American people that if they just put Republicans in charge, everything will be better. What are those promises based on? Certainly not recent history.

Let's take a look at what Republicans in this body have done for American families: Republicans have blocked the Paycheck Fairness Act not once, not twice, not even three times but four times, thereby preventing American women from receiving a fair wage for their work. Remember, this is simply making it possible for a woman

who does the exact same work as a man to get paid the exact same amount of money. Republicans have blocked legislation to prevent companies from denying their workers specific health benefits, including birth control, as required by Federal law.

Republicans also blocked a bill allowing Americans with student debt to refinance their loans at lower interest rates. The student loan debt stands at \$1.3 trillion. It is higher than credit card debt. It is higher than any other debt.

Republicans rejected an increase in the minimum wage, essentially relegating millions of hard-working Americans to poverty. Republicans even refused to give unemployment benefits to the very long-term unemployed. Republicans rejected the Bring Jobs Home Act which would end the absurd practice of American workers bankrolling the outsourcing of their very own jobs.

Republicans even filibustered an extension of tax credits that help American families. The Republicans have repeatedly refused to pass commonsense immigration reform that keeps families together, spurs the economy, and reduces our national debt by \$1 trillion. Let's not forget, Republicans in Congress shut down the Federal Government. Too often Republicans have rebuffed Democrats' attempts to give American families a fair shot. Republicans must know their obstruction is hurting our country. The Republicans must know the status quo is not working.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

NAVY YARD TRAGEDY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 1 year ago today, just a few blocks from here, a lone gunman slipped into the Navy Yard and tragically took 12 lives. It was one of the deadliest such attacks on a U.S. military base in American history. We have not forgotten those who fell that day in Building 197, and all of us in the Senate send our condolences to their families and everyone who loved them. They are not forgotten.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. President, the Democrats who run Washington have had almost 6 years to fix the economy. They have already tried just about everything their ideology will allow to fix it. They raised taxes on everything from life-saving medical devices to personal medical expenses. They have piled up record debt and shoveled billions in

subsidies to the well connected, and they have empowered bureaucrats to cancel health care plans for the middle class, declared war on the jobs of vulnerable Kentucky families and—through EPA's Waters of the United States proposed rule—they are trying to regulate every last pond and ditch in our country. None of this has worked.

According to a recent Gallup survey, a solid majority of Americans believes the economy is actually getting worse, not better. Let's not forget that for several years the Democrats had supermajority control of Washington, could have passed anything they wanted, and all too often they did.

Since then, a Republican-led House of Representatives has tried to advance solutions on its own by passing dozens of jobs bills—many with strong bipartisan support over in the House. But the Democratic majority in the Senate simply refuses to take them up, and it is hard to understand why. It is hard to know if today's Washington Democratic Party is blinded by ideology or if they are so obsessed with the never-ending campaign that they cannot be bothered to govern.

Whatever the reason, the simple truth is this: Washington Democrats had a choice between helping the middle class and bowing to campaign pollsters and the left. It is obvious whom they chose.

The American people are worried about ISIL and the continuing threat of terrorism. They see a humanitarian crisis at the border. Many struggle every month to pay the bills. Millions still can't find work.

How do Democrats respond? They bring up a bill that would take an eraser to the First Amendment. So the hard left is clearly in the driver's seat on the other side. That is clear every time the Democratic majority ignores the concerns of our constituents to turn to yet another one of their so-called messaging bills, such as the recent one on eroding free speech, and it is truly a shame. That is not why the American people sent us.

It is long past time for Democrats to drop all the designed-to-fail bills and turn to serious job-creation ideas instead. There are literally dozens of House-passed jobs bills on the majority leader's desk. Why not pick up some of them and pass them. Let's get them to the President. Let's work together on a serious energy policy. Let's join hands to erase the strain on working moms and dads. Let's work toward sensible health care reform that doesn't hurt the middle class as ObamaCare does. Let's help college graduates find full-time work and start marching toward the careers they have always dreamed of. That is just a start.

If the Democratic Party is truly interested in getting serious, they should look at the many commonsense policy ideas advocated by Senators on my side of the aisle.

NLRB REFORM

Mr. President, my friend the senior Senator from Tennessee has always been a strong advocate for smart reform policies. He will discuss another one of those in just a moment. It is a bill that would go a long way toward remedying a serious problem that has been caused by the politics-at-all-cost mentality I have just described.

Here is the issue: Everybody is familiar with the President's unconstitutional effort to pack the National Labor Relations Board with liberal partisans back in early 2012. Some people are also familiar with the NLRB's more recent effort to undermine secret ballots for union elections, allow labor bosses access to sensitive employee information without their consent, and prevent companies from building factories in States with laws the President's picks don't like.

The NLRB is trying to destroy the franchisee model that has allowed so many Americans to own and operate their own businesses. They want to take away independence from small business men and women—such as decisions on whom to hire, how much to pay them, and how to run their business—and put it in the hands of corporate bosses. The so-called joint employer standard is all about politics and appeasing the left.

Big Labor bosses want it because it helps them expand and acquire more dues at the cost of small business owners who employ so many Americans. This is simply not right. For many in the middle class franchising represents a ticket to the dream of opening their own business. For many it may be their only chance to live that dream.

This is how one single mom and second-generation franchisee put it:

To have my franchiser take over greater control of my daily operations would not only change my relationship with them, but it would ruin the dream of small business ownership for many hardworking Americans.

This is what a hotel franchise in Lexington had to say:

My family came to the United States in search of the American dream and we found it as hoteliers and franchisees. The current franchise model has been instrumental in providing my family and me with opportunities for entrepreneurship and the ability to employ over 300 hardworking Kentuckians.

But this Kentuckian warned that this action by the NLRB could end his independence as a small business owner by ceding decisions to a far-off corporate headquarters. The NLRB action could have "devastating impacts on my ability to create jobs, grow my businesses and support my community," he said.

Extreme, politically motivated proposals such as these hurt our constituents.

It is time to restore the balance to the National Labor Relations Board. Let's take the politics out of it. That is just what the legislation of my friend from Tennessee seeks to do. I will let

him explain it, but here is the key: It would restore the NLRB to its proper role as an umpire instead of an advocate for the right or the left. It is the kind of thing our constituents want to see us doing—standing up for reform and against entrenched political interests.

I am asking our Democratic friends to please shelve the designed-to-fail playbook and work with Republicans on a designed-to-succeed agenda instead. Six years of failure is quite enough.

EBOLA EPIDEMIC

Today President Obama will visit the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to announce new efforts to contain the Ebola epidemic in West Africa. The U.S. Africa Command will stand up a Joint Force Command in Monrovia, Liberia, to provide command and control of U.S. military activities and help coordinate international relief efforts. Current estimates are that 3,000 military personnel will establish an intermediate staging base for supplies and equipment, set up a training site to prepare 500 health care workers per week to provide medical care to patients, and stand up a field Defense Department hospital to care for any of our health care workers who become ill. Also contributing to our national reaction to this epidemic is the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The CDC has deployed personnel to Africa, and the National Institute of Health is developing an investigational Ebola vaccine. CDC is also working with Customs and Border Patrol to identify travelers showing any signs of infectious disease.

I support these efforts to contain the Ebola epidemic and know we will monitor this humanitarian crisis in the weeks ahead.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Tennessee.

EBOLA EPIDEMIC

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, before discussing the legislation involving the National Labor Relations Board which the Republican leader mentioned, I wish to align myself with his comments on the Ebola epidemic. In my view, he is right to support the President's effort for a more urgent response to this epidemic.

I am not given to making overstatements—I think that would be a fair reputation in this body—but I believe we should treat the Ebola epidemic as

seriously as we treat the danger of ISIS. Why would I say that? Because the head of the Centers for Disease Control and our United Nations Ambassador, who is working with other countries to get them involved, say this: This is one of the most deadly, explosive epidemics in modern times. It moves rapidly. There is no vaccine, and there is no cure. One sick person can fairly quickly infect 20 other persons within a family in these West African countries where it is now a problem. One can see how quickly this could spread and become hundreds of thousands of cases or even millions of cases.

This is a case where Samantha Power said to me: We should be running toward burning flames with our fireproof suits on. In other words, we know how to control it. We know how to identify sick people and isolate them and treat them. Even though half of them die, we know how to do that. But the rate of growth of this epidemic is so rapid that we need to have a response that is as urgent as the problem.

I congratulate the Republican leader for supporting the President's effort today to call attention to this. So much is happening in the world, and there is a possibility that we would treat the Ebola epidemic as an important issue but not a major issue. As I said, I believe we must take the deadly, dangerous threat of Ebola as seriously as we take the threat of ISIS.

I support the administration's recommendation to spend \$30 million in the continuing resolution to upgrade the public health efforts there. I support the reprogramming of \$500 million to involve the military in a way to deal with this. I support the effort to spend \$58 million, which would be to fast track efforts to develop a treatment and cure, as well as vaccines to prevent it.

NLRB REFORM

Mr. President, the Republican leader spoke about legislation he and I are introducing today which we call the National Labor Relations Board Reform Act.

(The remarks of Senator ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2814 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Tennessee, having worked together on many issues, as politicians often throw those words around. He is a good person, a good Senator. I enjoy working with him. I do have to take exception to one thing, though.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. DURBIN. Yesterday we had a vote on a labor issue. This was a vote

as to whether men and women in the workplace working the same jobs get the same pay. Most people would say: Well, isn't that the law already? Yes.

Unfortunately, the law as written in 1963 with the Equal Pay Act isn't working very well. In a lot of workplaces women are paid less. In the State of Illinois, it is about 75 cents for every dollar paid to a man for most women unless you happen to be an African man and then it is 65 cents, or Hispanic, it is 65 cents. The actual working relationships in many businesses discriminate against women.

We offered a bill yesterday to the Equal Pay Act brought to the floor by Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland and Senator BOXER of California. We asked if we could now revisit the Equal Pay Act to make sure it is enforceable and that it works so that literally if my son or my daughter ended up with the same job and the same workplace and the same work record, they would get the same pay. Not a radical idea by any measure. That was what we brought up for a vote yesterday.

I took a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to refresh my memory and talked with the staff. Not one Republican Senator would vote for that bill—not one. There were 52 votes in favor of moving forward on this bill. All of them were from the Democratic side.

So when I listen to these calls for reform when it comes to labor laws and bipartisanship when it comes to labor laws, my obvious question to my friends on the other side of the aisle is: Where were you yesterday? We had a chance here on the floor of the Senate to do something on a bipartisan basis for pay equity, equal pay for men and women in the workplace.

This is not the first time we faced this issue. Lilly Ledbetter became somewhat legendary in America. This lady, whom I had the privilege to meet a few times, had a tough job. She worked at a tire manufacturing facility in Alabama. She worked hard for a long time. As she was nearing retirement, someone went up to her and said: Lilly, you have been a manager around here a lot of years, but they are paying you a heck of a lot less than the men who have the same job in this plant. She didn't quit.

They don't publish the wages of all coworkers so that you would know this. She was upset about it. She spent all those years working there and she was being discriminated against because she was a woman. She filed a lawsuit, as she was entitled to under the law, saying that this was discriminatory and she was entitled to back pay for this discrimination.

The Supreme Court, right across the street, threw out the lawsuit and said she didn't report this discrimination in a timely fashion. She didn't report that she was being paid less within a certain number of months, and her response

was: How would I even know that? I don't know what that man who was the manager next to me is being paid any more than he knows what I am being paid.

That is what the Supreme Court decided.

The first bill that was signed into law by President Obama, the Lilly Ledbetter Act, said that Lilly Ledbetter and people like her at a future time would be allowed to sue for back wages if they were discriminated against.

Very few, if any, Republicans supported this. When I hear speeches on the floor about reforming labor laws and the workplace laws in America, let's do it in a bipartisan fashion. When it got down to the real basics, S. 2199 yesterday, not a single Republican would join us, not one. I would think they would feel as we do. It is only fair. It is only fair that if you are in the workplace doing the same job, you get the same pay. Unfortunately, not one of them would. So when they call for reforming the National Labor Relations Board and they call for bipartisanship, I think it should start right here when it comes to legislation that comes before the Senate.

I also listened to the Republican Senate leader come to the floor today and talk about the state of our economy. I wonder sometimes if Members of the Senate, who are entitled to their own opinions, should also be entitled to their own facts because what the Senator from Kentucky failed to note was the economy which President Obama inherited when he took office in January 2009. It was in sad shape.

What a contrast from 8 years before when President Bill Clinton left office in January of 2001, 14 years ago. We had gone through a period of 4 straight years of Federal budget surplus. A Democratic President, 4 straight years of Federal budget surplus, and President Clinton left to the new President, George W. Bush, a surplus in the next year's budget of \$120 billion, if my memory serves me.

The last time that happened, 4 straight years of surplus, had been 40 years before. So here is Democratic President Clinton leaving office to President George W. Bush with a string of surpluses in the budget that we hadn't seen for four decades.

In addition, President Clinton was taking the surplus and investing it in Social Security so that it was stronger than it had been in years because of the surpluses.

During the period of the Clinton Presidency, 23 million new jobs were created in this country. Eight years, 23 million jobs, and government spending was still growing each year. Yet there were surpluses, job creation, and economic growth in the 8-year period of time.

When President Clinton left office, the national debt that had been accumulated over the entire history of the United States totaled \$5 trillion. That was January of 2001. He handed that economy and that budget to President George W. Bush.

Now fast forward 8 years. What did President George W. Bush hand to new President Barack Obama? One of the weakest economies America had seen since the Great Depression. The month President Obama took the oath of office in January of 2009, when he put his hand on the same Bible Abraham Lincoln used when he was sworn in as President, that month we lost nearly 800,000 jobs in America. That previous year, private employers had shed more than 4 million jobs. We know what happened to savings and retirement accounts. They were devastated by that recession. The economy was shrinking.

In just 8 years, President George W. Bush took one of the strongest, fastest growing economies in American history and, sadly, turned it into an economic recession. How did he do it? Tax breaks for wealthy people and wars that were not paid for. Those were the two things that drove us from a \$5 trillion debt when President Clinton left office—cumulative debt in the history of America.

When President George W. Bush left office, handing it over to President Obama, the national debt had broken \$5 trillion to \$12 trillion. It more than doubled in the 8-year period of time. So President Obama had a challenge. Get the economy back on its feet.

Right now, Public Television has a series on the Roosevelts. I have enjoyed it because Ken Burns is one of the best. He is telling the story of Teddy Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Eleanor Roosevelt.

We remember what happened when Franklin Roosevelt came to office at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933, facing the Great Depression in America. He said: We have to get America back to work. That is what President Obama says. The stimulus package. Let's get back to work here. Let's put people earning paychecks into a position where they can save their homes and keep their families together and rebuild the economy. He got almost no help from the other side of the aisle.

Remember the automobile industry. Remember what was happening in the automobile industry when President Obama took over office from President Bush. It was flat on its back. Two major companies, Chrysler and General Motors, were facing bankruptcy and even the prospect of going out of business.

President Obama said: We cannot let this happen. There are too many good-paying jobs across America. He stepped in and helped by loaning money to these automobile companies to get back on their feet.

Just last week I had some auto dealers from the Chicagoland area come to see me in my office. One said, Do you know what happened? We were selling about 9 million cars when the recession hit. Now we are back on our feet. We are up to 16 million a year. The automobile industry is coming back strong.

I look at Illinois and I can see it in Belvidere where the Fiat Chrysler plant is working three shifts. I see it at the Ford plant on the South Side of Chicago. They are working three shifts as well.

President Obama said: Let's get back to work. Let's save the auto industry. He did. Now they come to the floor and say: You know, it just hasn't been fast enough.

When it came to the stimulus package, we had little or no support from the other side of the aisle. When it came to rebuilding my State of Illinois and across the country, it was resistance.

Then comes the issue of health insurance. I want to say a word about that. I have voted for the Affordable Care Act. It may be one of the most important votes ever cast.

I did it for personal reasons because I personally experienced with my family a moment when we had no health insurance.

My wife and I got married very young. I was still in law school. God sent us a baby. She had some medical issues. We had no health insurance. I was going to school here at Georgetown Law School. I would leave class, pick up my wife and baby and go to the charity ward at Children's Hospital in Washington, DC.

We were sitting in there with a number in my hand waiting to see who would walk through that door to be the doctor to save my baby's life. I had no health insurance. I have never felt more helpless as a husband and father than at that moment.

I believe today, as I did then, that should never happen to any family. I believe this great Nation should provide basic health care for everyone living in this great Nation. That is why I voted for the Affordable Care Act.

What has happened since? Eight million Americans are now insured under the Affordable Care Act. We have seen an 8-percent decline in uninsured people in my home State and many States.

One of the most successful States when it comes to the Affordable Care Act happens to be the Commonwealth of Kentucky which the Republican Senate leader represents.

They have signed up in substantial numbers. Hundreds of thousands of people in his State now have health insurance because the Affordable Care Act, which some characterize in a friendly or derogatory way as ObamaCare, has worked.

What has it meant in Illinois? Some 640,000 people in Illinois now have in-

surance because of the Affordable Care Act. In a State of about 13 million people, that is a substantial number, and 400,000 of them were low-wage workers who had no benefits in their job and now qualify for Medicaid. They have health insurance.

I met one of them, Rich Romanowski. What a perfect Chicago name, right? Rich, a big barrel-chested Polish guy, is a musician. He has done part-time work all his life and he never had health insurance. Now he is in his sixties. Rich came to one of our press conferences, smacked his wallet, and said: I have a card in my wallet that says I have health insurance for the first time in my life.

He is not the only one. He is one of 400,000 in my State, which means when they get sick and go to the hospital, their bills are not passed on to the rest of us, to all the people with insurance, to those who use Medicare. They have their own insurance now, and it means they are going to be healthier.

I think of Judy. Judy works in Southern Illinois. She works in one of the motels that I stay in there, and she is a hospitality lady. When people go for breakfast, she is the one greeting us and showing us where to sit down. Judy is about 62 years old, a hard-working Southern Illinois lady and one of the sweetest people we would ever want to meet. Judy got health insurance for the first time because of the Affordable Care Act, and it is a good thing she did because she has just been diagnosed with diabetes. She needs good care because diabetes, if not treated right, can lead to serious complications: blindness, amputations. Judy has that health insurance.

Remember when the government shut down last year, Senator CRUZ of Texas came and read Dr. Seuss books to us. I came to the floor and said to him: You tell us you are shutting down the government to protest the Affordable Care Act. Well, what do you say about Judy? Judy, who has worked in Southern Illinois all her life, has no health insurance, needs it, and is now going to get it under Medicaid. Are you going to tell me we are going to do away with this law now and take away her health insurance? What would you say to her?

Senator CRUZ said on the record on the Senate floor: Judy needs to get a better job.

I think many times folks in the Senate need to get the heck out of the Capitol, get out, meet the rest of America, and come to understand they are working hard every day, they are not getting paid a whole lot of money, and basic health insurance is beyond their reach, beyond their grasp. Well, the Affordable Care Act changed that, and we are not going back.

The House has voted over 50 times to repeal that law, and I say that as long as Barack Obama is President, that is

not going to work. He is not going to let them do it. I am going to stand with him because I happen to be one of those persons who had a member of my family with a preexisting condition—the situation with my daughter.

I know the kind of discrimination that people with preexisting conditions used to face before the Affordable Care Act. We are not going back to those days. This Senator and this President for sure, we are going to fight all the way to make sure that health insurance is there for those who are struggling in their work and there for families that would otherwise not have a chance.

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN
REFINANCING ACT
STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Mr. DURBIN. I spent much of my time over the August recess visiting college campuses and talking to current students and graduates about their student debt.

I visited Northern Illinois University in De Kalb, Judson University in Elgin, and Lincoln Land Community College in Springfield, and University of Illinois at Chicago.

With an estimated 1.7 million Illinoisans holding a combined \$47 billion in student loan debt, it is no wonder that it was on the minds of nearly everyone I spoke with. On average, Illinois graduates of the Class of 2012 left with \$28,028 in debt—but individual debt is often much higher. I have had students contact me who have upwards of \$100,000 in debt and no chance to ever pay it off.

For too many young Illinoisans, and students across the country, the opportunity for a fair shot at an affordable college education has become a long shot. They do the right thing—they go to school to get ahead but end up with so much debt that it becomes impossible for them to ever pay it back let alone get ahead.

I recently met Jessica Ibares at NIU. Jessica graduated from Northern Illinois and is now working as a financial aid counselor.

How about that? She helps others figure out how to pay for their education, but struggles paying for her own.

She holds almost \$40,000 in Federal student loan debt that she'll have to start repaying in November. Working at a public institution, she makes a modest salary and will only be able to pay about \$50 a month on her loan—which may not even cover the interest.

How will she ever start repaying the principal? Jessica will find it difficult to get out of the debt she's in—and she went to a good, public school.

DAWN THOMPSON

Imagine what students who went to predatory for-profit schools face.

I recently met Dawn Thompson in Springfield. She is a 48 year old single mother of two.

Dawn thought she was doing the right thing getting a paralegal degree

from Everest College online. That is right, Everest College—one of the subsidiaries of the failed Corinthian Colleges chain.

This disgraced company was caught falsifying job placement rates and collapsed under the ensuing scrutiny. In the meantime, they left thousands of students in financial ruin with no real education to show for it, all the while making money hand over fist off of taxpayers.

Dawn could never find a job in her field with her degree from Everest. She was over \$100,000 in student loan debt, both Federal and private loans, and working a minimum wage job as a bank teller. Dawn tried to file for bankruptcy in 2013 and, you guessed it, her student loans were not dischargeable—one of the only debts that is not.

At that point, she felt like her only option was to go back to school to hopefully improve her chances of getting a good-paying job and to defer her loans. Unfortunately, she went back to Everest—she started her Master's in business administration at Everest. Regardless of what happens with Everest as they end their reign of fraud, Dawn is likely to be stuck with her \$100,000 plus student loan bill.

Perhaps the only thing more sickening than Dawn's story, is that it's not unique. While the schools I visited were different, the borrower's personal backgrounds varied, and the amount they owed unique—the refrain over and over from these Illinois students was the same: "Senator, Washington has to help us."

My guess is that my colleagues heard the same thing from some of the 40 million Americans in their States drowning in more than \$1.2 trillion in collective student loan debt.

Well, Democrats have an answer that will help many of these students—it's called the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. It would help an estimated 25 million current borrowers who are struggling to repay their Federal or private student loans refinance into lower federal interest rates—saving the average borrower \$2,000 over the life of the loan.

In Illinois, an estimated 1.1 million of the 1.7 million with student debt could lower their interest rates under our bill—nearly two-thirds of all borrowers in my home State.

Here is how it would work. Those with Federal loans could refinance into lower rates—the same rates available to students who took out loans last school year.

Those with private loans—many of which have sky-high interest rates and very few protections for borrowers—could refinance into Federal loans with lower rates and stronger consumer protections.

What's more, our bill is fully paid for.

It assesses a modest tax on millionaires to help borrowers refinance and

get back on a path of financial security—this is often referred to as the Buffet Rule.

I am hopeful we will have a chance to vote again on this bill to help student borrowers.

Earlier this summer, this bill was killed by 38 Republicans who voted against even moving to debate it. These Republicans were given a choice—side with working families and students seeking the American Dream or protect millionaires from paying a single penny more in taxes; side with 25 million Americans who could be helped by the bill or 22,000 or so millionaire households who might have to pay more in taxes under the bill.

Sadly, I don't have to tell you who those 38 Republican Senators picked.

Americans across the country are talking about this issue—I have heard them. But, even so, in June, 38 Republicans said: "The Senate can't talk about it."

It doesn't seem right to me.

Thankfully, though, there were three Republicans—Senators COLLINS, CORKER, MURKOWSKI—who joined every Democrat to support moving the bill forward.

But if the 38 Republicans who voted "no" have another chance, I hope they remember the struggling students and families they talked to back home over the August recess.

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

I hope they realize that if we don't give struggling borrowers another option besides default, this student debt will haunt them for the rest of their lives and will have a drag on our economy. It already is. Experts tell us it is stagnating growth in the housing market, preventing business creation, and jeopardizing future retirement security for a generation of young Americans.

CONCLUSION

I hope America's youth are paying close attention to this issue: how their Senators voted on this measure offers them the bare truth. I hope more of my Republican colleagues will join us to move forward this important piece of legislation if we get a chance to vote on it again.

But for now, it shows the stark difference between those Senators who believe hard-working students deserve a fair shot at the American Dream and those who will stand by and do nothing as America's next generation is sentenced to debt.

This afternoon my colleague Senator WARREN is coming to the floor. ELIZABETH WARREN of Massachusetts is a new Senator—and what a terrific addition to the Senate. She is the best. I have known her for years, and I encouraged her to run because I knew she would bring something special to the Senate.

She has done it. She came up with a way for college students and their families to renegotiate student loans. People can renegotiate their auto loans;

they can renegotiate the mortgages on their homes. Why shouldn't students, those who have graduated, and their families who face student loan debt be able to renegotiate to a lower interest rate? That is the Warren bill.

She is right. It is a big difference. It would bring down the interest rate on undergraduate loans, I think, to 3.8 percent. I run into students who are trying to pay off loans at 9 percent. Ask anybody who owns a home the difference between a 9-percent mortgage and a 3.8-percent mortgage. They will tell you it is big. When someone makes a payment under a 3.8-percent interest rate, a lot more goes to reduce principal and you finally put that loan to rest after so many years. So Senator WARREN is going to try again. We tried it once before but couldn't get the Republican support. I think we had three—maybe three—who voted with us on the Republican side. Under Senate rules we need 60.

In my State of about 13 million, there are about 1.7 million people carrying student loan debt. They aren't all young people. They include parents who signed up for PLUS loans and even grandparents who wanted to help a grandson or a granddaughter get into college and go forward. They are carrying this debt. If ELIZABETH WARREN's bill passes to renegotiate college loans, it is going to save them—on average—\$2,000 apiece and give them a chance to reduce and retire that loan at an earlier stage.

There is an interesting phenomena going on in Chicago now. I talked to some younger friends of mine and they said: If you have an apartment for rent in Chicago, and it is a good one, get there fast and sign up quickly.

There is a land rush on to rent apartments. Why? Because younger people cannot even consider buying a condo or a little house. Why? Too much student debt. Student debt in America, cumulatively, is greater than credit card debt in America, cumulatively.

More of these students graduating with the debt, paying it off, are making life decisions because of the debt. I have run into it: They studied to be a teacher but ended up with so much debt that they couldn't even consider it and had to take a better-paying job. We lost a good teacher because of student debt.

Students are putting off getting married, putting off going out on their own, buying a car, and, if married, starting a family. I have heard it all. That is what this student debt is all about.

When my colleagues come to the floor and say why don't we do something on a bipartisan basis, I say: This student debt isn't just a debt for Democratic students; it is a debt for all students.

So let's come together when ELIZABETH WARREN makes her unanimous

consent request this afternoon and finally do something for a change, for middle income and working families who want their kids to go to school but don't want them so deep in debt that their lives are changed or ruined. That is only reasonable.

If we want to make sure that America continues to be a leader in the world, we need to graduate the very best with the education and training they need to lead our Nation. Some of them are holding back, holding back because of a fear of college debt.

One other thing I will mention, college loans are different than other loans. I studied many years ago back in law school bankruptcy law, and we learn in bankruptcy law that most of the loans you take out in life are dischargeable in bankruptcy, which means if everything fails—you lose your job, you are in a situation where there is a serious pile of medical bills and you can't get back to work—in most cases you can go to bankruptcy court and through a long process those debts will be wiped out and give you a second chance in life. It is not an easy process. It is not something people rush to, but many people have no choice.

If you did that with a college loan, it wouldn't help you a bit. College loans are not dischargeable in bankruptcy. They are with you for a lifetime. That is a sad reality. This is all the more reason to make sure those loans are affordable, all the more reason to support ELIZABETH WARREN when she talks about reducing these interest rates.

FIRST AMENDMENT

The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, today talked about the vote we had on a constitutional amendment. It was an amendment which didn't get the necessary votes; it needed 67. It didn't get the necessary votes on the Senate floor.

Its sole purpose, offered by Senator UDALL from New Mexico, was to reverse the Citizens United decision. That decision by the Supreme Court basically took off the caps and limits when it came to individuals and corporations putting as much money as they wanted to into the political process. One of my colleagues, Senator KAY HAGAN of North Carolina, by her latest estimate has had more than \$20 million of negative ads run against her in her home State—not by her opponent, not even by the North Carolina Republican Party but by these outside interests such as the Koch brothers.

The Koch brothers in the last election cycle spent over \$250 million of their own money. They are a bigger deal than most political parties now—these two brothers who are billionaires—and they are putting more money into this system. Sadly, many of the beneficiaries of the Koch brothers are walking behind them on a leash. They are being led around by

them because you don't want to cross the Koch brothers.

The amendment of Senator UDALL of New Mexico would have finally given the States the authority to regulate the amount of money that could be spent on campaigns.

It comes to this: If we want mere mortals to run for public office—as opposed to multimillionaires—we have to get this playing field back under the control of the normal people. Maybe we won't have as many television ads to see—and I know how much people enjoy those—but at the end of the day we could still get our message across.

I supported and actually introduced public financing laws. I still stand by them. We would be a better country if we had public financing, took the special interests out of the campaigns, shortened the campaigns, and had actual debates. Those sorts of things would get us back to what the country is all about and maybe start to restore some confidence in Congress, in our political system, and in both political parties—and we are all pretty low at this moment.

So public financing is a right step but not likely to happen soon. Of this approach by Senator UDALL to basically reverse the Citizens United decision, the other side argues it inhibits freedom of speech. Well, there is only so much speech that individuals can claim. The Koch brothers, because of their multimillions—and there are folks on the left, incidentally, spending a lot of money too—left and right—don't deserve to pick up a microphone or have a bigger voice in our political process.

We have a lot of work to do. This week we are going to get down to business on a few things that are essential. I am sorry that yesterday the Republicans wouldn't help us when we wanted to pass pay equity and make sure that women were treated fairly in the workplace. We needed them, and they weren't there.

That is disappointing, but it is an indication of where the two parties are today on that issue. They didn't support our efforts to increase the minimum wage. I support increasing the minimum wage.

They haven't been able to help us when we come up with legislation to deal with college loans, but this afternoon they will have a second chance. I hope ELIZABETH WARREN's bill moves forward and that we end this week on a positive note for working families and their kids who want to go to school but don't want to be burdened with the debt that is going to change their lives.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FACING CHALLENGES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as we continue with what will likely be the final legislative week before the elections, it is a good time to take a look back at the year and take stock of where we are and what Congress has accomplished.

The House of Representatives, of course, has spent the past year legislating. Members of the House have sent literally hundreds of bills over to the Senate for consideration, including 40 jobs bills, many of which passed with bipartisan support in the House of Representatives.

Even now, in the final week before recessing for election season, the House is taking up two legislative packages, one focused on creating jobs and another focused on lowering the price of gas and groceries. Unfortunately, like so many other House bills, neither of these bills is likely to go anywhere in the Democratic leader's Senate because unlike the House, the Senate has not spent the past year taking up legislation to solve the many challenges facing American families. Instead, Senate Democrats have spent the past year taking up political gimmicks and designed-to-fail messaging bills they hope will win a few votes for them in November.

Back in March—earlier this year—the New York Times reported that Democrats planned to spend the spring and summer on messaging votes “timed to coincide with campaign-style trips by President Obama.”

The Times went on to say: “Democrats concede that making new laws is not really the point. Rather, they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them.” That is from the New York Times earlier this year, which was laying out and predicting what the Democrats' strategy was going to be for the balance of this year.

Unfortunately, Senate Democrats have followed that playbook pretty exactly. Again and again, Senate Democrats have bypassed serious legislation and chosen to bring up bills designed to win them votes with their far-left base or to smear Republicans in the November elections.

Take last week as an example. After an August recess beset by economic stagnation at home and crises abroad, including, I might add, the murder of two American journalists at the hands of ruthless terrorist group ISIS, you might think Senate Democrats would want to spend our first week back focused on the challenges our Nation is facing.

Well, Mr. President, you would be wrong. Instead of legislation to address some of these challenges, Democrats

chose to kick off this brief 2-week session with a bill to erase many of the speech protections of the First Amendment. That is right. Faced with crises abroad and a sluggish economy here at home, Democrats thought the most appropriate use of our time last week was legislation to erase parts of the First Amendment.

As with so many of the other bills they have brought up this year, Democrats knew this legislation did not have a chance of passing in the Senate. But they chose to bring it up anyway because they thought it might help get portions of their base out in November. And they swiftly followed it up with another designed-to-fail piece of legislation they hoped to use to criticize Republicans. In fact, the newspaper Roll Call reported earlier this week—this is from a story written about the Democrats' strategy: “Republicans should prepare to be criticized regardless of how they vote” on this particular bill. The article went on to quote an email that was sent to Democratic communicators which outlined plans, and again I quote, “to slam Republicans for either blocking the bill once again or for letting us on the bill only to slow down the rest of the Senate.”

So basically the message to Democratic communicators around here on Capitol Hill was to slam Republicans no matter how they voted. If they voted to get on the bill, slam them for slowing down the Senate so we cannot do other things. If they voted against getting on the bill, obviously, attack them for blocking the bill.

So here is the strategy, at this late hour of the game when we have so many big issues and challenges facing the country: It is simply to put bills on the floor that are designed to help Democrats in the fall elections and essentially to make Republicans look bad. That is a quote. That is a direct quote from an email that was sent out to Democratic communicators: “slam Republicans” no matter how they vote. Either way, take advantage of the situation. Try and play politics with it.

There is certainly a place for campaigning. There is certainly a place for politics. But the place for campaigning is not in the halls of Congress. Our job here in Washington is to pass legislation to address the challenges facing our country. And that job does not change if one party controls the House and the other party controls the Senate. The Senate and the House still have a responsibility to work together to get serious legislation to the President, and that is certainly what the House has tried to do.

The House has sent bill after bill to the Senate, many of them, as I mentioned earlier, bipartisan bills. They got strong bipartisan votes coming out of the House of Representatives. But again and again, Senate Democrat

leaders have said no—no to working together, no to bipartisan House legislation, no to developing bipartisan solutions.

Senate Republicans' efforts have met a similar response. Again and again Republicans here in the Senate have put forward legislation to help create jobs, grow the economy, and to provide help to working families struggling with the high price of everything—from groceries to health care. Several of our bills have even received support from rank-and-file Democrats—bills such as Senator COLLINS' Forty Hours Is Full Time Act, which would fix an ObamaCare provision that is reducing workers' hours and wages, or Senator BLUNT's Hire More Heroes Act, which would give employers an incentive to hire our Nation's veterans.

But the Senate Democratic leadership has refused to consider our proposals.

Senate Republicans have even been prevented from offering amendments to bills that come before the Senate. Since July of 2013, Senate Republicans have been allowed just 14 amendment votes—less than one a month in the world's greatest deliberative body known for unlimited debate and unlimited amendment. Less than one amendment per month, that is what Senate Republicans have been allowed in the last year. Compare that to the House of Representatives where the Democrat minority has been allowed 194 amendment votes over the same period.

When the minority party is denied a voice in the Senate, it is the American people—the people whom we represent—who are really being denied a voice.

Democrats may not control the House, but through the amendment process, they have been able to make their constituents' voices heard. Republicans in the Senate, on the other hand, have been prevented from bringing their constituents' voices to the legislative process.

American families are struggling. The economy continues to stagnate. Unemployment is still above 6 percent—way higher than that if you figure in the labor participation rate the number of people who have actually given up even looking for work.

Last month's job creation was the worst this year, and opportunities for advancement in this economy are few and far between. Health care costs, which were already high when the President took office, have continued to increase. Average health care deductibles have increased 50 percent, and health care premiums have risen by an average of \$3,459 since the President took office, despite—despite—the President's promise that his health care law would drive down premiums by \$2,500. Gas prices have increased by 87 percent over the course of the Obama administration.

A Politico poll released this week found that “strong majorities now say

that they lack the savings to grapple with an unforeseen job loss"—61 percent of the people in the poll said that—"and that the cost of basic household items like gas and groceries has strained their finances. . . ."—62 percent of the people polled had that response.

It is not surprising that a recent George Washington University/Battle-ground poll found that 70 percent of Americans think the country is "on the wrong track."

With these challenges facing the American people, our focus in the Senate this year should have been legislation to address our struggling economy and to repair the damage ObamaCare is doing to families and businesses. Instead, Senate Democrats have chosen to focus the Senate's efforts on politics. The Democrat-led Senate has failed in its most basic responsibility this year; and that is to pass solutions for the American people.

With just a few days left in the session, it is a little late for Democrats to do anything about that now.

I hope that when we return in November things will be different. I hope Democrats will spend less time trying to save their jobs and more time trying to create jobs for the American people. I hope they will spend less time campaigning and more time legislating. I hope they will be ready to work with Republicans to deliver solutions for the American people.

That is what we are here to do. That is what we ought to be focused on. All this using the floor of the Senate to conduct campaigns doesn't serve any constructive purpose when it comes to solving problems and meeting the challenges being faced by the American people every single day—chronic high employment, a sluggish economy, reduced take-home pay, higher costs for health care, groceries, fuel, college education, we go right down the list. These are the real and present impacts of this economy on the American people and middle-class families.

Congress can do better. The American people deserve better. I hope when the dust settles and the smoke clears from the November elections, we will come back with a renewed sense of purpose and focus on what is truly important to the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

SPENDING AND DEBT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, as we consider this continuing resolution to fund the Federal Government in fiscal year 2015, which begins October 1, I rise to voice concern about our Nation's spending and debt. At last count our country was more than \$17 trillion in debt, and that number increases every single day.

My parents told me you shouldn't just complain, you should have solutions, and I am going to talk about two solutions.

One is the Penny Plan, which would cut 1 cent out of every dollar we currently spend and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, balance the budget in just 3 years. If we continued it for another 7 years, we would reduce spending by \$7.6 trillion.

Another solution would be to do biennial budgeting. We obviously don't have time to look through the budget—we keep doing continuing resolutions and then we do an omnibus bill. We are supposed to do those through 12 separate bills—12 separate bills that get debated not just in committee but on the floor of the Senate with amendments. It has been a long time since we have done that. So biennial budgeting would allow us to get into this nerve center of spending and get something done.

For fiscal year 2014, we expect to pay \$231 billion in interest on the national debt according to the Congressional Budget Office. With our pattern of unsustainable spending, in 10 years we could pay close to \$800 billion in interest. That is not counting the interest rate going up. Now, \$231 billion this year at 1 percent is about what we are paying, but imagine if that went to 5 percent. That would put us over \$1 trillion. That is what we are talking about spending in this continuing resolution, and if we are doing it all on interest, that eliminates defense and all the other things we put our money into. That is more to our creditors than we currently spend on national defense.

Our future interest payments would be even higher if interest goes up more than CBO has predicted. The interest we pay on our debt doesn't buy anything. A large portion of that just pays other countries for loaning us money.

The Federal Government consistently spends billions more than it takes in, and the CBO reported in August that if current laws remain unchanged, growing budget deficits over the long term will push the debt even higher. Yet today we are considering legislation to continue discretionary funding on autopilot.

The continuing resolution funds Federal programs through December 11, 2014, at the current annual rate of \$1.012 trillion. We will not have any debate. We will have an up-or-down vote and spend another \$1 trillion. The legislation does nothing to address the CBO projection that our ratio of public debt to gross domestic product—that is everything our economy earns in the United States—will reach 74 percent by the end of this fiscal year, twice that of just 7 years ago and higher than any year since 1950.

We are doing nothing to reverse CBO's projection that in 25 years Federal debt held by our constituents will exceed 100 percent of gross domestic

product—again, everything we produce in the United States in 1 year. The CBO notes that this trend, which I view as perilous, cannot be sustained indefinitely.

I ask my Senate colleagues what would happen if we as individuals adopted the same spending habits held by the government. I can tell them with little doubt that over the long term we would each face bankruptcy, and that is the point. Sometimes it seems we have our heads buried in the sand. Are we in denial? Sometimes we act as if there are different sets of principles for the Federal budget and the outcome of excessive personal spending. But I am here to tell you, the same potentially dire consequences face the government that face individuals if we do not put our fiscal house in order.

Our President often frames issues in the context of how it would affect his daughters. Similar to the President, at times I am up at night with concerns about how our country's fiscal path will affect the lives of my children and grandchildren. I worry about how our debt will harm families and generations to come.

Sometimes as lawmakers we seem to act as if this problem is too big to solve, but it is not. Understanding how to reach and maintain financial health is not rocket science. It merely requires exercising common sense and commitment.

As individuals we learn to live within our means. If we spend too much, we tighten our belts and we work hard to ease our financial situation. The government should and could do the same. We can't wait longer. It is time for us to act.

I have introduced the Penny Plan as a simple and straightforward way to put our country back on the right fiscal path. It reduces discretionary and mandatory spending, less net interest payments, by 1 percent—or 1 penny for every dollar—for each year of 3 years until total spending has reached approximately 18 percent of gross domestic product. Based on figures from the CBO, reducing spending this way will result in a balanced budget within 3 years. Total spending would then be capped at 18 percent for subsequent years since that is the historic average level of government spending for the past several decades.

Importantly, the Penny Plan steers us away from some of the controversial and political traps we have seen for spending reductions. At the onset, it does not identify the specific cuts that are necessary to achieve this 1-percent reduction in savings. Instead, such decisions are left for us to make. Its beauty is it puts a broad plan into action and gives flexibility.

I have had a lot of grassroots interest in this. I have had a number of organizations that have done resolutions. I have a lot of individuals who have

signed up on my Web site as cosponsors of the action that is needed to be taken. I encourage people to go to my Web site and become a part of this movement to show there is interest in balancing the budget and in paying down the debt.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of one of the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ONE PERCENT
SPENDING REDUCTION ACT OF 2014

Whereas, the U.S. National debt currently exceeds \$17.5 trillion and continues to grow;

Whereas, the estimated population of the United States is 318,360,075, so each citizen's share of this debt is \$55,037.88.

Whereas, the National Debt has continued to increase an average of \$2.38 billion per day since September 30, 2012.

Whereas, the "One Percent Spending Reduction Act of 2014" reduces discretionary and mandatory spending (less interest payments) by 1 percent each year for 3 years until total spending has reached approximately 18 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).

Whereas, the Congressional Budget Office reports that reduced spending in this fashion would result in a balanced budget in FY2017.

Whereas, total spending would then be capped at 18 percent of GDP for FY2018 and subsequent fiscal years.

Whereas, over a 10-year budget window, the bill would cut spending by about \$7.6 trillion from currently projected levels.

Whereas, the bill amends the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to make it out of order in both chambers to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that would cause the most recently reported, current spending limit to be exceeded.

Whereas, the "One Percent Spending Reduction Act of 2014" is also referred to as the Penny Plan.

Whereas, upon passage by Congress and signature from the President of the United States, the Penny Plan would be effective in FY2015 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Whereas, the Penny Plan would quickly halt the nation's debt spiral and set our country on a fiscally responsible path.

Therefore, the Board of Directors of the Petroleum Association of Wyoming supports the One Percent Spending Reduction Act of 2014, on this 20th day, August 2014.

Mr. ENZI. Another step we can take to stop the autopilot spending path we are on, passing the CRs year after year, is to enact my Biennial Appropriations Act. The legislation we are considering illustrates once again why we need to pass my bill.

In less than 1 month the new Federal fiscal year begins. Yet once again we have not passed a single one of the 12 appropriations bills for the 2015 fiscal year which starts October 1. Our answer? Another short-term continuing resolution. What will come after that? One big omnibus bill put together by a couple people in the backroom and we will get to vote yes or no on it.

That is not responsible spending. We have to be able to look at the items in the bill. A short-term continuing reso-

lution is not the way the government should operate, nor does it meet the expectations of those who sent us to Washington to represent them. It is no wonder our approval rating is sinking perpetually lower.

Congress should debate each individual spending bill. It should vote on amendments and it should pass all 12 separate spending bills.

However, the last time we passed all the appropriations bills separately before the start of the fiscal year was 20 years ago, in 1994. That is a pretty poor record, especially since that is the main responsibility we are charged with overseeing spending for the United States. We ought to be starting on the spending bills April 15, right after the budget is required to be finished—which also doesn't get finished by then—and considering each of those until we have resolution on each of them. We could easily have that done before October 1.

When we don't follow that regular order, we can't adequately consider the detail including a line-by-line look at individual programs and an analysis of appropriate funding levels and duplication in government. Inevitably, we get the types of agreements reached in January in which Congress is given one chance to vote on \$1.1 trillion, up or down, with no amendments.

It is time for this chronic and debilitating pattern to stop. We have to start legislating and stop deal-making. My biennial appropriations bill would allow for each of the appropriations bills to be taken up over a 2-year period. That gives us a little more time to do it. It would also give the agencies 2 years' worth of time to use that money the most efficient way possible, instead of having to worry each year and then not receive the money until late.

The six most controversial bills—the six that are the toughest—we take up right after an election. The six that are the easiest we take up just before the election. That way we can get through both of them in some detail and not have to worry about the election. The Defense appropriations bill, however, would be taken up each year. Another one of our main charges is to ensure the defense of our country, and this would allow us to scrutinize the spending details and eliminate duplication and waste there as well.

Biennial budgeting is an idea both parties have endorsed.

In 2000, former OMB Director, now-Treasury Secretary, Jack Lew told the House Rules Committee that the budget process took so much time that there wasn't as much time to devote to making programs better. He said: "I think biennial budgeting, if it is properly designed, could very much help alleviate these pressures."

I think anybody who observes our appropriations process would agree we

need to do something different. If we keep on doing what we have always been doing, we are going to keep on getting what we have, which is an omnibus bill of \$1.1 trillion with little scrutiny. We can't keep doing that. Let's move our budget and appropriations process into the 21st century, providing the prudent oversight and judgment of our budget and appropriations while at the same time guaranteeing a more secure future for the generations to come.

We need to pass the Penny Plan and biennial budgeting, get our spending under control, and change our legislative process to where we actually make decisions on how government tax dollars are being spent.

As I have said before, one of the reasons government expands is we have this rule of RIFing people, which is, if someone is the last person hired, they are the first person fired.

Consequently, as soon as someone gets a government job, it is very important for them to expand their workload, because if they can expand their workload, they can show they need an assistant. Once they have an assistant on board, they are not the first one fired. I attribute a lot of the reports produced as a means to expand work so somebody has something to do so they can get an assistant. We can't keep doing that. That leads to duplication.

I hope we will pay attention to the Penny Plan and the biennial budgeting process. I will be giving more details on that as we go along.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Senator SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2832 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, thank you very much. With that, I would yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, last week the House of Representatives

voted for the 53rd time to repeal or undermine all of—or aspects of—the Affordable Care Act. This is beginning to sound like a broken record. I was in the House of Representatives for a period of time, so I had the privilege to vote on 30 or 40 of those different pieces of legislation.

Republicans, of course, shut down the government a year ago because of their pique over the health care law. There are those who still have a desire to shut down the government again.

The other day one of our colleagues said they were hopeful that among the Republicans priorities—should they increase their numbers in the Senate this fall—would be, once again, to repeal the health care bill. It is a story we have heard over and over despite an absolutely overwhelming array of data points which tell us only one story, and that is that the Affordable Care Act is working.

I don't deny that my colleagues can come down to the floor of the Senate or House and tell stories of people who have had poor interactions with the health care system. In fact, some people have had poor interactions with the Affordable Care Act. But those are stories. Data and information tell us something fundamentally different.

At the very least, I am glad that our Republican colleagues say they are still focused on this very vague idea of repeal and replace. But here is the problem: We have had 53 votes in the House of Representatives to repeal the law and not a single vote to replace it with anything of any substance. So it is one thing to just say you want to replace the health care law, and it is another to actually put together a plan to do it.

I wish to credit three of our Republican colleagues in the Senate. They are the only ones who have outlined an alternative. It is only an 8-page summary, but it is important for people to know what it would do. It would allow insurance companies to go back to their old ways of imposing annual limits on coverage, charge women more than men, provide little coverage for individuals with preexisting conditions, and effectively charge millions of Americans more by capping the tax exclusion for health care benefits. It is just an 8-page summary, but it is not pointing the way to a better health care reality for thousands of Americans.

Frankly, Republicans are not listening to what the American people are telling us. Over and over polls tell us that the American people don't want this law repealed. They want changes and so do Democrats and Republicans, but they don't want to repeal it.

A recent poll from Bloomberg, which I think is the most recent on this sub-

ject, found that two-thirds of Americans want the new law to either be left alone entirely or given the chance to work with small improvements. That is the reality of where people are in this country.

Why is there growing support for the law, and why is there diminishing support for repeal? Well, because 10.3 million uninsured Americans—as outlined by the New England Journal of Medicine—now have insurance thanks to this law. The uninsurance rate among 18-to 64-year-olds, which is our target audience, fell from 21 percent in September of 2013 to 16 percent in April of 2014. I will say that again. In a 6-month period of time, the uninsurance rate in this country dropped by 5 percentage points. That is an absolutely stunning achievement, and there is only one reason for it—the Affordable Care Act. The people who have this insurance are using it.

According to the Commonwealth Fund, nearly 2 in 3 newly covered consumers who went to the doctor or filled a prescription said they would not have been able to afford or access those services if it were not for the new coverage.

In a moment I will talk about what is happening when it comes to rates and health care expenditures. But the theory of the case is this: If you get people insurance, they are going to use it for preventable coverage rather than wait until their illness is so serious that they go to the emergency room, which would require much more expensive interventions. It is bad for them, and it is bad for the taxpayers and ratepayers as well.

We are seeing record low rates of increase in health care spending. Premiums—probably for the first time in my lifetime—are stable from year to year, and that is because the theory of the case is actually working out in practice. People are getting insurance, using preventive coverage, not getting as sick, and as a result health care is costing less.

The Kaiser Family Foundation said that in the 16 major cities they surveyed, families will pay less on average to enroll in a health care exchange in 2015 than they did in 2014. I don't mean they will have a premium increase in 2015. They will actually pay less. The cost of the plan in the exchange will be less in real dollars than they were in 2014.

I will talk about Connecticut in a second. We are an example of that trend line.

It is not just the exchange that has stabilized. Employer-sponsored coverage has stabilized as well.

I get it. There are outliers here. There are examples where health care insurers are still passing along big increases to employers. So the informa-

tion I am giving is the average across the country. There are always outliers on the high side—but also on the low side.

Kaiser's study also says that the average premium for family coverage through employer-sponsored coverage care increased by 3 percent in 2014, tying 2010 for the slowest rate of increase on record for employer-sponsored premiums. That is the reality of what is happening. More people have coverage, and the growth of health care spending is at a historic low. Medicare's 2019 budget is about \$95 billion less than it was projected to be 4 years ago.

We are saving \$100 billion a year on just Medicare alone, and that is on top of all the money that is being saved through relatively low rates of increase on exchanges. That \$100 billion—just to give you some perspective, because I know it is hard to get your head wrapped around what it means to save \$100 billion—is greater than the total amount of money we spend as a country on unemployment insurance, welfare programs, and Amtrak combined. It is a lot of money to save as a government.

The quality is getting better too—because that is what this is really about. It is about delivering a better quality of life and a longer life expectancy to consumers. Hospital readmissions—you go in for a surgery, you go back home, and then you have to come back in—are dropping like a stone. Hospital-acquired infections—one of the leading causes of death in this country—are dropping precipitously. Costs are getting lower, more people have insurance, and the quality is getting better.

Here is the Connecticut story. We have dropped the overall insurance rate in the country by about 25 percent—unbelievable news over the course of 6 months. Connecticut is double that. We cut our insurance rate in half in Connecticut. We are a small State with 3.5 million people and had about 285,000 uninsured individuals. Connecticut has taken the 250,000 people and put them into either the Medicaid expansion or the private health care exchanges and a little more than half of those people were previously uninsured.

A lot of my friends on the other side of the aisle say: That is great, but those numbers are illusory because over time people aren't going to pay those premiums; they are just going to drop off the plans. Well, here is Connecticut's experience: 80,000 people signed up for private plans on the health care exchanges, and 78,000 are still paying their premiums about 4 to 6 months in. Everybody is still paying their premiums. And we know why. Because it is largely affordable and because people need that health care.

People love the exchange and their interaction with the new plan in Connecticut. Tomorrow the Connecticut exchange will release data showing that about 83 percent of people who went through the exchange to buy private health care were satisfied with their experience. Of those who went through the program to get Medicaid expansion, over 90 percent were satisfied as well.

We are saving money. Medicaid in Connecticut is 2 percent lower this year than it was last year. We have cut our uninsured rate by half. We are spending less as a government. People are satisfied with it. Rates are stable.

Here are the three plans in Connecticut that submitted rate increases on the exchange, and, at least for our biggest insurer, they are also going to be the rates of increase outside the exchange. Our biggest insurer, Anthem, which is our Blue Cross Blue Shield: Rates are going down by an average of .1 percent. ConnectiCare is raising its rates by 3.1 percent. Our other insurer on the exchange, Healthy Connecticut, is reducing its rates by 8.5 percent.

Republicans have kind of moved the ball on this a little bit. They now say the way we judge a successful ACA is that health care rates go down from year to year—not that we are controlling the rate of increase but that the Affordable Care Act isn't succeeding unless rates are going down. I heard my colleague from Wyoming make this claim about Connecticut a few weeks ago in which I was talking about rates going up by 1 percent and the claim was made: Well, that is not good enough.

People have been used to 10-, 15-, 20-, 30-percent increases in premiums in Connecticut. They are pretty happy with a .1-percent reduction. Frankly, they are pretty happy with a 3.1-percent increase. That is because of the Affordable Care Act.

So there is all the data. There it is. That is just the tip of the iceberg. Costs are going down, more people have insurance, and quality is getting better. It seems as though we open the paper every week and there is some new piece of good information.

I get it. This needs to be better. This needs to be perfected. The law still has warts. The Senator sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair is leading the fight to make this law work even better for people. I look forward to being involved in that conversation. But that is where the conversation should be—perfection, not repeal. And we are reminded again that if Republicans were to win control of this body, at the top of their agenda would be this same old fight—53 different votes in the House of Representatives over the past several years—to repeal the law without any real tangible plan to improve it.

This morning I met with a good friend of mine whom I have spoken

about on this floor before, but because she is here in town I wish to speak about her one more time, and that is Betty Berger. Betty is here with the American Cancer Society. We will see them all over the Hill today in their light-blue shirts. Betty is arguing for a lot of things to happen here, with research funding increases at the top of the list, but she is also here to make a very personal case to protect the Affordable Care Act.

Years ago Betty's family was faced with a terrible choice when her son was diagnosed with cancer. In the 1-week period of time her family didn't have health care insurance—her husband had one job and he switched jobs—in the 1-week period of time between when he went from the first job to the second job, the diagnosis of cancer came down and it became a preexisting condition not covered by the new employer. Betty's family was left to pay for their son's cancer treatments on their own. They eventually lost their home, they lost their savings, and they had to declare bankruptcy.

Unfortunately, Betty's story is pretty familiar. Half of all bankruptcies in this country are due to stories very similar to Betty's. A mistimed illness at a point where the family didn't have insurance results in them losing everything.

The reality is that the Affordable Care Act makes sure that Betty's story never has to be told again, that no family ever has to make the choice between declaring bankruptcy, saving their home, protecting their savings, or choosing to care for a loved one.

Let's talk about making this bill better, but let's recognize that the data, the numbers tell only one story; that is, the Affordable Care Act is working. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, as Republicans have come to the floor week after week ever since the President's health care law was passed. I have many concerns about the way this health care law is impacting families in my home State of Wyoming as well as families all across the country. In one State after another, people are feeling the devastating side effects of the health care law.

President Obama says Democrats who voted for the health care law should, as he said, "forcefully defend and be proud of the law."

I heard earlier today the Kaiser Family Foundation's report being quoted. What they said is that premiums have gone up, on average, \$3,500 from 2009 for family workplace coverage, plus the deductibles are higher. So premiums are up \$3,500 since 2009 for family work-

place coverage, and the deductibles are higher—higher money paid out-of-pocket.

The President of the United States said they would go down by \$2,500 per family. NANCY PELOSI said they would go down for everyone. She was the Speaker of the House. She was the one who said: First you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it. Americans have found out what is in it, and they don't like it. People do not like what they see with the President's health care law. It continues to be very unpopular.

So I ask, is the President really proud that families all across the country are suffering because of his health care law and the many dangerous side effects they are now having to live with?

Let's look around the country a little bit and see what the new headlines are bringing, and there are new headlines every day. In Virginia a television station in Charlottesville, WVIR, reported on what is happening there. Last Wednesday they had a report which said that "nearly a quarter million Virginians will have to change their insurance plans this fall." The President said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. Not in Virginia. A quarter of a million Virginians will have to change their insurance plans this fall. It is because the plans don't include all of a very long list of things Washington mandates have to be offered.

Even if a person had an insurance plan that worked well for their family, that met their needs, the President and Democrats in this body say: Sorry, you can't keep it. The President said: If you like your plan, you can keep it. What happened there? At least 27 Democrats stood on the floor of the Senate and said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. That is what they said. What happened? Was this intentionally to deceive the American people? Why are nearly a quarter of a million Virginians losing their insurance plan?

The head of the Virginia Association of Health Plans says it is simple. He told the TV station: "We're not allowed to offer those plans anymore." The President said they could, and now these people are being told by the law they are not allowed to even offer the plans to people who want to buy them because it works for them.

Are the Democrats in the Senate willing to forcefully defend the fact that 250,000 people in Virginia will have to buy new plans that they don't want, don't need, and many can't afford, with all of these additional provisions Washington says have to be included? To me, that is a very expensive and unnecessary side effect of the President's health care law.

But it is not just people's health care plans. People are concerned about

keeping their doctors and keeping their hospitals that they go to in their own communities. Let's take a look at what happened in Connecticut, in a report that came out. Hartford Courant: "Five Connecticut Hospitals Could Leave Anthem's Network on October 1." What about the people who go to those hospitals and get their health care coverage that way? What are those people supposed to do? The President said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you like your hospital, you can keep your hospital. These people may be losing their hospital come October 1.

Here is another side effect of the law that is hitting middle-class Americans and their wallets. It is the part of the law that says the workweek is no longer 40 hours. Now it is just 30 hours. That is what the law says. People who are working part time have had their hours cut to below 30 hours, and they are getting lower take-home pay. I hear about this in Wyoming. I hear it from school district workers, from folks who have had their hours cut, who are having to get by with less pay because if they have their hours cut, their take-home pay goes down. It is another destructive side effect of this health care law.

It is not just Wyoming; it is happening all around the country. In Louisiana there was a report by KNOE television in Monroe last Thursday which said that 400 employees within Lincoln Parish schools—people who work within the school system—are getting their hours cut in half. Four hundred workers, one school district, Louisiana, half the hours, half the pay. Where did the school board put the blame? They put it directly on the President's health care law. They said they can't afford the Washington-mandated health insurance for all of their workers, so they are cutting back on the hours for substitute teachers, cutting the hours for cafeteria workers, cutting the hours for custodians, for paraprofessionals who work with the kids. Is that what the President envisioned? Is that what the President means when he says "forcefully defend and be proud"? Cutting back things for children in our schools, is that the President's solution for health care, making it harder for kids to get an education and making it harder for teachers to teach?

One custodian told the paper that it is depressing knowing his pay is about to be cut. He said, "It's rough the way it is. Why make it harder to survive?" That is my question to the President of the United States and to Senators on the floor who come to talk about the health care law.

Why make it harder to survive? Why, Mr. President? You said people should forcefully defend and be proud of this law. Are you proud of it, Mr. President? That is what I need to know.

That is what the American public wants to know.

Is the President proud that people are getting their hours cut in half specifically because of his law? And school districts are pointing to that as the cause. Is the President proud he is making it harder for Americans to survive?

Now, some people aren't just getting their hours cut; they can't get hired in the first place because of the health care law. That is what one business owner said in an op-ed for the Charlotte Observer newspaper in Charlotte, NC. It ran September 10 and was entitled "How ObamaCare jams a stick in my company's wheels." Rodney Pitts, who runs the Southern Elevator Company in North Carolina, says he wants to hire more elevator mechanics for his business, but he hasn't been able to hire anyone this year. Why? He says the main reason is because of the costs associated with the health care law and all of the requirements of the health care law. He said, "Thousands of businesses in Charlotte and in North Carolina are in the same holding pattern."

So people all across the country who want to work won't get that opportunity because businesses can't afford to take on all of the extra costs of the President's health care law. That is an extremely destructive side effect of the law. It is hurting American families.

This health care law is hurting our economy. Every Democrat in the Senate voted for this health care law—every one. Where are the Democrats willing to forcefully defend these alarming side effects of this health care law? Is the President ready to go to North Carolina and talk to this business owner? Is the President going to say he is proud his health care law is keeping the businesses from hiring more people in North Carolina and all across the country?

This isn't the kind of health care reform the American people needed. It is not the kind of health care reform the American people wanted. People didn't want a law that forced them to get rid of the insurance which they had and liked and which worked for them and for their families. They didn't want a law that forced their local schools to cut the hours of custodians and part-time teachers, cafeteria workers, and people who look after their children. That is not how to help people in a community.

These are the tragic side effects of the President's health care law. Republicans are going to continue to talk good patient-centered reforms, reforms that get patients across the country the care they need from a doctor they choose and at a lower cost.

We are going to talk about restoring people's freedom, freedom to buy health insurance that works for them, for their families because they know what works best for them, not Presi-

dent Obama. We are going to talk about giving people choices, not Washington mandates. Republicans are going to keep offering real solutions for better health care without all of these intrusive and intolerable side effects.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN G. BURNS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reported the nominations of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2015; and Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019.

VOTE ON BARAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Baran nomination.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2015?

The clerk will call the roll.
The legislative clerk called the roll.
The result was announced—yeas 56,
nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Heller	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Landrieu	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Walsh
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BURNS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Burns nomination.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, are we on the second nomination in this stack of nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on this stack of nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Stephen G. Burns, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2019?

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Begich	Blumenthal
Baldwin	Bennet	Booker

Boxer	Heller	Nelson
Brown	Hirono	Pryor
Cantwell	Inhofe	Reed
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Carper	Kaine	Rockefeller
Casey	King	Sanders
Collins	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Landrieu	Schumer
Donnelly	Leahy	Shaheen
Durbin	Levin	Stabenow
Feinstein	Manchin	Tester
Fischer	Markey	Udall (CO)
Franken	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Walsh
Hagan	Merkley	Warner
Harkin	Mikulski	Warren
Heinrich	Murphy	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—40

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Isakson	Scott
Coats	Johanns	Sessions
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	McCain	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	
Enzi	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF LINDA A. SCHWARTZ TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (POLICY AND PLANNING)

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW T. HARRINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO

NOMINATION OF TODD D. ROBINSON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

NOMINATION OF JANE D. HARTLEY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

NOMINATION OF JANE D. HARTLEY TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF MONACO

NOMINATION OF NINA HACHIGIAN TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

NOMINATION OF GORDON O. TANNER TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Linda A. Schwartz, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Policy and Planning); Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Lesotho; Todd D. Robinson, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala; Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the French Republic; Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Monaco; Nina Hachigian, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; and Gordon O. Tanner, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

VOTE ON SCHWARTZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Linda A. Schwartz, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Policy and Planning)?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HARRINGTON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Lesotho?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ROBINSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will

the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Todd D. Robinson, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guatemala?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HARTLEY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the French Republic?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HARTLEY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Monaco?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HACHIGIAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nina Hachigian, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON TANNER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gordon O. Tanner, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be controlled by the majority and the time from 4:00 to 5:00 will be controlled by the Republicans.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the Democrats be until 4:05 p.m. and the same with Republicans, 5:05 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am very pleased to join with a number of colleagues today representing all of those in our conference who are deeply concerned about the mound of debt that students incur when they are doing the right thing.

We say: Go to college, work hard, get skills for this new economy, come out so you can be successful. Having done that, too many of them are coming out with mounds of debt—crushing debt—that is stopping them from buying a house, starting a business, and moving forward with their future. There is something that can be done about that, and that is what we are here to talk about and invite our Republican colleagues to join us.

There was a filibuster a number of weeks ago against our student loan debt bill, the bank on students bill. We have an opportunity today to come together, rather than seeing a Republican filibuster, to join in a bipartisan way to provide incredibly important relief to millions of not only young people but older people across the country who are still struggling with student loan debt.

In every generation there are young Americans from middle-class families who have the grades to go to college but not the financial resources. They take out student loans because they know that before they can get the job they want to be able to get a fair shot at the American dream, they have got to have a degree, and that is what they are taught. That is what we all tell our children. That is what I was told as well. What they are looking for is a degree, not debt. Unfortunately, by the time students graduate, they are in fact saddled in today's world with mounds of debt.

To address this problem, Senator WARREN, Senator FRANKEN, and I and many Democratic colleagues have joined to introduce the bank on students emergency loan bill. It would allow responsible borrowers to refinance their loans at lower rates, the rates from last year, the lowest possible rates in place. These are rates that are currently only available to new borrowers. We think everyone ought to have an opportunity to do that. In fact, with lower interest rates, we have seen so many people, including many of us, refinancing their homes, taking advantage of lower interest rates, being able to use lower interest rates in other ways. But students have been prohibited—anyone with a student loan has been prohibited from re-

financing. That is plain wrong, and our bill addresses that.

Passing this bill would help more than 25 million Americans. I cannot think of any one single thing we could do that would immediately help 25 million people, including 1 million hard-working people in the State of Michigan.

A mother named Frances from Macomb County outside of Detroit wrote to me on September 6, and she talked about her children. She has two children. Both of them chose jobs that serve the public. One is a teacher and one is a nurse. Because of the loans they took out when they were working hard to get their way through college, their student loan debt now is nearly \$100,000—\$100,000.

In Michigan, 62 percent of college students have debt when they graduate. The average is about \$29,000, although I have talked to people with not only the \$100,000 debt I just mentioned but young professionals with \$185,000 or \$200,000 debt if they have gone to graduate school or medical school or law school, and it can be even higher.

On the other end of the spectrum, there are some Americans who worked all their adult lives and are now retired, and in fact they are on Medicare and they are still paying student loan debt. This is wrong. We need to act to change this.

The total student loan debt in this country right now is \$1.2 trillion. That is more than credit card debt—more than credit card debt, \$1.2 trillion. If you put it another way, after every one of the 7.2 billion people—men, women, and children in the world—if everybody in the world donated \$165 to pay off America's student loan debt, it still wouldn't be quite enough.

This is something with a great sense of urgency to it. This bill needs to pass. We need to pass it now. If this passes, it means parents can save for their children's education, for a home, can start a business, can afford their car, can begin saving for their own retirement instead of just paying off student loan debt. These aren't luxuries, these are basics, basics of the American dream.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that America isn't strong without a vibrant middle class, and, frankly, it is outrageous that we have allowed this situation to go on where the only way to do the right thing, to get the skills needed to get ahead, is to put yourself in such jeopardy with student loan debt. We can do better than that.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join us in helping millions of American workers to manage their student loan debt more effectively, saving thousands—tens of thousands—of dollars in interest payments. We can help right now.

This is something where we could jump-start the economy, as the Federal

Reserve Chairman said—jump-start the economy right now by passing this bill and being able to lower the cost of student loans.

It is now my great pleasure to turn to a champion not only on this issue but on the broader question of making sure that every American has a fair shot to make it so that we have a strong middle class in this country.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. It is a delight to join Senator STABENOW on the floor to talk about this critical issue that is a growing crisis here at home in America and threatens Americans' economic strength and competitiveness.

As you have heard, today there is a debt crisis in America. Student loan debt is more than \$1.2 trillion, and that is holding back an entire generation and creating a drag on our economy. It is a crisis that demands action from Washington.

Once again, Congress is failing the American people by refusing to work together to confront it. In June the Senate took a vote on the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which I am proud to cosponsor. While it received majority support in this body, a minority of Republicans obstructed the bill and prevented it from moving forward.

The choice was clear, and opponents addressing the student debt crisis chose to protect tax loopholes for millionaires and billionaires instead of helping give students a fair shot at getting ahead and providing relief to middle-class families struggling with student loan debt.

I believe every student in America deserves a fair shot at an affordable education, and I believe college education should be a path to the middle class and not a path to indebtedness.

Nearly 40 million students and graduates in America have outstanding student loans. The total amount of student debt in the United States has tripled in the past decade. According to new data from the Federal Reserve, student loan debt grew by \$31 billion from January to March of this year. In my home State of Wisconsin, almost 70 percent of the students graduating from 4-year institutions will have student loan debt and the average debt amount will be \$28,000. That is real money. That is real money that isn't going toward buying a car or a first home. It is real money that isn't going into growing our economy at a time when we so desperately need economic growth.

To help give Americans a fair shot at getting out from under that burden of student loan debt, we should let borrowers refinance at today's lower rates. That is why we are pushing for a vote

on the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. This legislation will allow those with outstanding student loan debt to refinance. It is pretty simple: It is paid for through the Buffett rule by making millionaires and billionaires pay their fair share of taxes to give our students a fair shot at a bright future, and it will help strengthen the economic security of the American families who are struggling with this debt.

The Department of Education estimates that 25 million borrowers in the United States could benefit from refinancing under this legislation, including just over half a million Wisconsinites.

I have traveled the State of Wisconsin and listened to students and graduates who are struggling with student loan debt. They shared their concerns and the burdens that the cost of a higher education puts on them and their families. They asked me to bring their stories and their messages to Washington, DC.

One graduate student said she lives with her fiancé's parents to save money. Another said her husband borrowed against his 401(k) so that the couple could afford daycare for their children while she attends school. Another woman said she owes about \$27,000 in loans. When she tried to buy a \$6,500 car, she needed her grandfather to cosign because she would not have been able to get the loan on her own. I heard from a woman in Green Bay, WI, who is strapped with \$600-a-month payments for her student loans.

The failure of Washington to hear these voices and take action is holding them back, and it is holding back our economy. This money isn't going to support small local businesses that are working so hard to move our economy forward. That is why we should seize this opportunity today to pass the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. By allowing student loan borrowers to transfer their loans into the Federal program and by closing costly tax loopholes for billionaires and millionaires, we are solving a major economic crisis in a meaningful and effective way. It is the least we can do to address the student loan debt crisis, but it is not all we can do.

Last week I had the opportunity to introduce two bills to help address the larger issue of student debt and college affordability. My legislation targets working students and students enrolled in career and technology education programs. My Working Student Act will allow students who must work while in college to complete their degrees more quickly and with less debt. The new legislation increases the amount working students can earn without that income counting against them in accessing need-based Federal financial aid, including Pell grants.

In addition, some career and technical education students cannot access

Federal student aid to help them advance their careers, and that is why I have introduced the Career and Technical Education Opportunity Act. This legislation simply allows CTE students enrolled in short-term programs that lead to industry-recognized credentials to also qualify for Federal student aid. CTE is one of the most effective vehicles to respond quickly to labor market changes and workforce readiness needs of business and industry.

My legislation will help ensure that Federal investments are supporting "ready-to-work" education.

One thing is clear: There is a lot more we can do in Washington to give a much needed break to people struggling to build a stronger future for themselves, their families, and for America. I am pleased that in a short while Senator WARREN will call for a vote on this important matter. We have a chance today to make a powerful difference in the lives of millions of students and graduates. Let's do so.

I yield back my time.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is now my great pleasure to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I have to say that Senator SHAHEEN's voice has been strong and clear. She has been one of our strongest advocates as far as what we need to do on student loan debt and also making sure middle-class families have a shot to get ahead. We are very pleased to have the Senator from New Hampshire, and I yield 5 minutes.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank Senator STABENOW and Senator BALDWIN.

I am pleased to be on the floor today joining the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Ms. WARREN, Senator FRANKEN, and all the other Senators who will be here to speak on the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. This is a critical piece of legislation, and it will allow eligible borrowers who took out student loans prior to January 1, 2013, to refinance those loans at a lower interest rate. You can refinance a car and you can refinance a mortgage, but you cannot refinance a student loan.

We have heard from literally hundreds of students and residents in New Hampshire who are no longer students but who are trying to pay back loans after years of having to try to pay back the loans and start their lives. Supporting this bill is a commonsense way we can come together to help the millions across this country who are struggling to pay back their student loans. This is especially important to New Hampshire because we rank second in the country in average debt per graduate—almost \$33,000 per graduate for student loans. According to recent estimates, almost 130,000 New Hampshire residents could benefit from this bill. These folks need some relief from their student debt burden because it often comes at interest rates that are

higher than they pay for a home or a car. It is unacceptable to leave these borrowers struggling with crippling debt when we have an opportunity to address this growing problem.

It is not just for those people who are affected because of their own student loans; this has a ripple effect through our economy. I met with a group of realtors over the summer, and one of the things they talked about was how they are seeing first-time home buyers delay buying a home because of the cost of student loans.

To put this issue into perspective, I wish to talk about some of the people I have met who have been burdened by their student loans.

I first met Calvin, a young soldier from New Hampshire, at Walter Reed Medical Center. He was recovering from losing his leg after stepping on an IED in Afghanistan. He was married and had a young child. We were talking about the challenges he was facing after he recovered from his injuries. What impressed me the most about our conversation—in addition to his commitment to this country—was that the issue he was most concerned about was not losing his leg or where he was going to get a job after he got out of the military, it was how he and his wife were going to pay back their student loans.

Another college graduate—a woman from Durham, NH—wrote to me recently. She has a master's degree and is employed in the public service field. She has been working for 12 years but has not been able to buy a home for her family because she still has \$90,000 in student loan debt.

I also heard from a woman in Stratham, NH, who has a \$150,000 student loan debt. She consolidated her loan but has a 7-percent interest rate, which accrues nearly \$900 per month in interest alone. A lower interest rate would make a critical difference to this woman and her young family.

Those three young people represent thousands—almost 130,000 people across New Hampshire—who would benefit from refinancing their student loans. This bill is important for New Hampshire, and it is important for the country.

We should take action today for the benefit of all Americans with student loan debt who deserve a fair shot at the American dream and opportunities for themselves and their families. I urge my colleagues to join me. As Senator BALDWIN and Senator STABENOW said, we have an opportunity this afternoon to make a huge step forward in addressing the student loan debt faced by too many Americans. I hope our colleagues will support the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I will yield 5 minutes to the distin-

guished Senator from Minnesota, and as one of the lead sponsors of this bill, I thank Senator FRANKEN for his passion and fight not only for people in Minnesota but for the 25 million people across the country who will benefit from the opportunity to be able to afford to go to college.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I thank the generous Senator from Michigan, and I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her remarks about the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

I have held college affordability roundtables around my State of Minnesota ever since I got to the Senate. It is astounding how hard students work while they are also in college. I remember speaking to the student governing body from MnSCU—the Minnesota colleges and universities student body—and I asked: How many of you work 20 hours a week? They all raised their hands. They were in the governing body. I said: How many of you work 30 hours a week? A few raised their hands. I said: How many of you work 40 hours a week? A couple raised their hands. These students work while going to college.

In Minnesota students graduate with more than \$30,000 in student loan debt. We are about fourth in the Nation. I heard Senator SHAHEEN say they are second in the Nation. This bill would help over 550,000 Minnesotans and 25 million Americans cut down their debt and keep more of their hard-earned checks.

A few months ago I had a roundtable at the University of Minnesota, and I met Joelle Stangler. She happened to be the student body president at the University of Minnesota. She was the valedictorian of Rogers High School in Minnesota with a 4.12 GPA. She doesn't lack motivation. Both of Joelle's parents were teachers. In fact, she comes from a long line of educators going back six generations.

You will see why I am telling this story.

A couple of years ago Joelle's mother Cassie Stangler made the tough decision to quit her job as a fifth grade teacher to go to work in the private sector because she could make more money in the private sector. She needed to do this because she had four kids in college. Among the fifth grade classes in Mrs. Stangler's school district, her students showed some of the highest rates of improvement in test scores. This is what I am talking about—we lost a great teacher because of the expense of postsecondary education.

Even with her mom's sacrifice, she has \$12,000 in student loans, and she estimates that her total debt will be around \$30,000 by the time she graduates.

There are so many students such as Joelle who are drowning in debt in

Minnesota and across the country. Student debt totals are over \$1.2 trillion, and it is a threat to our economy. We are seeing young people delay decisions to start a business, to start a family, to buy a home, or make other types of purchases that make an economy grow. But there are commonsense solutions, and they are contained in our Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

Our bill simply allows students and graduates to take advantage of lower interest rates and refinance their loans. That is what people with mortgages, car loans, and business loans can do. They can take advantage of lower interest rates and refinance their loans, but the government will not refinance student loans, and that is just not right.

In the summer of 2013 we came together in Congress to prevent the interest rate on new student loans from doubling. Thanks to that effort, undergraduate students taking out new loans now pay a lower rate. Our bill would enable students and graduates who are saddled with higher interest rates on their undergraduate loans to refinance at the same lower interest rate. The bill would similarly enable Americans with graduate student loans or PLUS loans to refinance at lower rates.

Student debt is holding Americans back, it is holding back our economy, and that is why we need to pass this bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, who not only is a leader on this issue and so many other issues but is the author of a major tax credit in our Tax Code that allows middle-class families to be able to get help for college. There is not a bigger champion for middle-class families than the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and dear friend from Michigan for the great work she has done as chair and vice chair of the DPCC. We have worked very hard on this "fair shot" agenda. We believe it is resonating with the American people.

When our colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose simple measures such as a fair shot at getting out of poverty if a person works 40 hours a week, a fair shot for a woman to get equal pay to a man, and a fair shot to prevent jobs from being sent overseas to get a tax break, they know what we are talking about. Perhaps no issue resonates more than a fair shot for people to be able to afford college and then repay their loans with a reasonable amount of money.

Probably the greatest problem America faces is the decline of middle-class incomes. They have been declining since 2001. If they continue to decline

for another decade, whoa is America, whoa is America.

America has been expanded—has grown to the greatest country in the world on the notion of opportunity. In my harbor sits a lady with a torch. That torch symbolizes the American dream to just about every American and most citizens in the world. What is the American dream? What does that torch symbolize? If we ask the average American, they wouldn't put it in fancy words or highfalutin language. They would say: It means if I work hard, I will be doing better 10 years from now than I am doing today, and my kids will be doing better than I.

Nothing keeps that American dream burning more brightly than the ability to afford a college education.

The bottom line is simple. The statistics show that in our new and technological world, those who have a college education, whether it is an A.A. degree or a B.A. degree or higher, do a lot better economically than everybody else. Amazingly enough, they do better in other ways in terms of how good their health is, in terms of their longevity, in terms of their happiness.

So college, which used to be a rare commodity 100 years ago, is now almost a necessity to millions of Americans. Yet it is so expensive. It is expensive in two ways. First, it is hard to get there. We have been working very hard on the American opportunity tax break, which my friend from Michigan mentioned, reducing the rate of student loans for those who are already in college, and many other ideas we have pursued to try to make college affordable for families who have someone in college or will enter college in future years.

There is another huge problem as well. Those who have been to college have huge amounts of debt and they are paying this government far more interest than would be paid on the market. We can refinance almost everything—mortgages, cars, loans on jewelry—but we cannot refinance college loans the government has given us. So people are paying 6, 7, 8 percent; whereas, if they went to a bank on their own, they would pay less.

How dare the Federal Government make money on the backs of young people who are struggling to pay back their debt. Boy, does it hurt those families. It prevents them from starting businesses, buying homes, going on vacation, and many delay their marriages. So there could be nothing that would make millions and millions of Americans happier economically. There could be nothing that would help people get a fair shot and a decent education, the ability to repay, than this simple bill put together largely by the Senator from Massachusetts, ELIZABETH WARREN, who has done a great job.

It is hard to figure why our colleagues oppose this. They have some

distrust in the Federal Government. In this area we do too. We think the Federal Government is demanding too much money to repay loans. Why don't they join us?

The cost of tuition goes up and up, the cost to repay goes up and up, and the burden on the backs of so many goes up and up.

So all we want is a fair shot for everyone to be able to afford college and to be able to repay. This should have been a bipartisan bill; it is not right now, but maybe there will be a change of heart. I will tell my colleagues this: This will become law, maybe not today but in the next months and next year. It has become an issue in campaigns throughout the country. This is an issue that resonates with voters—Democratic, Independent, Republican, liberal, conservative, North, South, East, and West, and we will keep fighting until every American has a fair shot at affording college and repaying their loans.

With that, I yield back to the Senator from Michigan, who has been kind enough to put together this hour of debate.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my friend from New York, who has been so passionate on the broad question of how do we have a fair shot as Americans to get ahead and particularly as it relates to affordability and college loan debt.

We are so pleased to have another champion with us from the great State of Maryland. I yield now to Senator CARDIN from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank Senator STABENOW for organizing this time to underscore the importance of a fair shot for everyone to afford a college education.

Earlier this month Senator MIKULSKI and I met with students. We met with students from the University of Maryland Baltimore County. We met with students from Bowie State College. We sat around a table and listened to their stories. Bowie State College is one of our historically Black colleges and universities in America with fairly reasonable tuition costs—much lower than most State colleges and certainly a lot lower than private schools. So Senator MIKULSKI and I were shocked to find that the average amount of debt today at a State college such as Bowie is over \$27,000 for a graduating senior. That affects their decisions.

We were there during the first week of school and we talked to the president, and the president said he still doesn't know the enrollment this year because there are a lot of students who have preenrolled, but until they have paid their costs, they are not fully enrolled, and a lot aren't fully enrolled because they didn't know how to pay for their costs. We also heard from students who said they showed up for class and several of the students didn't even

have textbooks because they couldn't afford to buy their textbooks. Then we heard from students who said: Look, it is difficult enough to afford a 4-year college education, but the average length of time to get a degree was 6 years. Why? Because they have to work in order to pay for part of their schooling to keep their debt down. They couldn't graduate earlier. The courses are only offered certain times of the year, and it took them 6 years to get the required amount.

We have heard the numbers. The amount of student debt outstanding is \$1.3 trillion—more than credit card debt. In the United States, of a family's income, it takes maybe half the income to afford a college education. For the rest of the industrialized world, it is between 5 and 10 percent. We can't be competitive with that rate. Education is a great equalizer in this country and we have outpriced ourselves.

We have a chance to do something about it today. I will give one more example, if I might. I was at a 4-year college this year and I was speaking to a student who was a second-year student going into her third year, and she said she was going to drop out. I asked her: Why are you going to drop out? Are you not doing well in school? She said: I get straight A's. I am dropping out because I can't justify to my family taking out more debt, knowing what the interest costs are going to be to my family.

It broke my heart. That is the situation.

We need to have greater budget support for public colleges and universities. We need to increase Pell grants. We need to make Pell grants 12 months a year because some of these courses are only offered in the summertime and that is when students can make it up. Senator HARKIN has a bill in to do that, and we need to do that. There are a lot of steps we need to take, but today we could take a giant step forward with interest costs.

My colleague Senator ELIZABETH WARREN will be making a request. We have a chance to pass this bill today in the Senate that would say it is wrong for the Federal Government to make \$66 billion on the interest flow. From 2007 to 2012 the Federal Government made \$66 billion on the difference between what they charge in interest and what the cost is to the government. To me, that is the worst tax on the most vulnerable in our community, and we should eliminate that. That is what the Warren bill does.

The bill says let our students refinance their loans. By the way, it is not just young people. There are several million Americans over the age of 50 who have student debt. This is a lifetime burden. Let them refinance so they can take advantage of the lower

interest rates and save several thousand dollars doing that. We have a chance to do that today.

I urge my colleagues to allow us to take up this legislation and let's pass it. Let's show the people of this Nation that we want a fair shot for everyone to afford a college education. I am proud to be a part of the Senators who are on the floor urging this to happen. Again, I thank my colleague Senator STABENOW for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues to urge the Senate to take up and pass the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act led by my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN.

This is about fairness, it is about values, and it is about what is best for our students and our shared economic future.

Earlier this month Senator WHITEHOUSE and I held a roundtable with Rhode Islanders about student loan debt. Rhode Island ranks in the top five for the amount of debt students incur to earn an undergraduate degree. We heard from a teacher who works a second job to help make his loan payments and a parent who worries how she will be able to help her son pay for college while she is still making loan payments. We heard from Rhode Island realtors about the impact student loan debt is having on the housing market.

This is an issue that strikes home for all of us. Even our Nation's seniors are impacted. GAO recently reported that from 2002 through 2013, the number of individuals whose Social Security benefits were offset to pay student loan debt increased fivefold. Think about it. These are senior citizens who are paying off student loans. Their actual Social Security benefit checks are being affected by student loan debt. That is something I find disturbing and completely unpredictable.

If you would have asked me 2 or 3 or 4 years ago—certainly if you asked me 30 years ago when I was in my thirties or so, I would have said, no, that wouldn't happen. That would have been impossible back then because we had a country that supported students through college. The Pell grant and Stafford loans were such that people had a chance to pay them off rather quickly and then go on to buy a home, establish a family, and then use their resources for their retirement or to help their grandchildren a little bit with their student loans.

When it comes to student loans, we are in this incredible situation. Since 2003, student loan debt has quadrupled to an estimated \$1.2 trillion, and the interest rate on undergraduate student loans was 3.86 percent for the last year. Yet many borrowers are locked into loans at 6.8 percent or higher with no way to refinance.

Just last year the GAO estimated that the Federal Government would

earn an estimated \$66 billion from student loans originated between 2007 and 2012. Again, in the 1950s and certainly in the 1960s—but particularly after the Pell Grants in the 1970s—we were investing in students. They were our future, not profit centers. We are now generating—over a 5-year period—\$66 billion. Student loans are supposed to be an investment to help individuals reach their potential and strengthen communities, not just a revenue generator. Approximately 25 million Americans could benefit from refinancing, including 88,000 in Rhode Island. They could lower their monthly payments if they could just refinance their student loans.

One of the ways we have been trying to help is by allowing borrowers with high fixed rates on their student loans to refinance at a lower rate. That is the simple premise behind the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act that I am proud to cosponsor with Senator WARREN and many of my colleagues.

In June the Senate fell just shy of the number of votes needed to move forward on this legislation. Today, once again, the Republicans will block us from taking up this legislation.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will reconsider their opposition because student loans should help people get ahead, not weigh them down with debt, thereby holding them and our economy back.

Looking forward we also need to work together to tackle the drivers of the student loan debt—rapidly rising college costs and a rollback of the State investment in higher education.

We need to get back to the idea that educating Americans is fundamentally in our national interest and that we have a shared responsibility—at the Federal, State, local, institutional, and individual levels—for investing in our future. We need to ensure that this generation and future generations have opportunities to develop their talents and pursue their dreams in order to secure a brighter future for them and our country.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing student loan debt relief to millions of Americans. Help us pass the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. Help us relieve this burden of debt on so many young, middle-aged, and remarkably so—based on recent studies—some senior citizens.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Let me stress what I think Senator CARDIN said so eloquently. We have the opportunity to vote today on a fair shot for everybody to go to college, so we will ask our colleagues to join us. The rules of the Senate are such that even though we have a majority—because our caucus is all supporting this effort we have a majority to get this done—if there is an objection, we go

into filibuster mode, which takes a supermajority. It is the way the rules are. We know we have a majority to pass this bill. If our colleagues don't want to vote for it, that is fine, but what we ought to be doing is having the vote.

If somebody wants to stand and say this is not important, it is not a priority to make sure everyone has a fair shot to be able to go to college and not be buried in student loan debt, if they want to say they would rather protect those we are asking to help chip in to pay for this, which are millionaires and billionaires who aren't paying their fair share in taxes right now as middle-class families are asked to do—we are paying for this refinancing by closing a loophole that, as Warren Buffett said, shouldn't be there when he as a billionaire has a lower tax rate than his secretary. So we are saying join us to close that loophole. Take those dollars and help 25 million people—25 million people—be able to cut thousands of dollars off of their payments. For me, I am laser focused on the 1 million people in Michigan this would help.

Let me share a few of those stories. Nathan Collison and his wife live in Saginaw. They are young professionals. They have a combined student loan debt of \$185,000. They have a 3-year-old little girl. I will never forget Nathan saying to me: When she is ready to go to college, I am still going to be paying off our student loan debt, and I can't afford to put money aside for my little girl to be able to go to college. That is not right. He and his wife both work and right now they are talking about \$600 a month on student loan debts. As Nathan pointed out to me, that is a house payment. That is a good house in Saginaw at \$600 a month. Yet it is only a fraction of the interest on Nathan's loans, which means his debt is going to keep growing and growing and growing. Just to make his debt stop growing, he would have to be paying \$2,200 a month. So if he was going to be paying the full amount and not deferring part of it, it would be \$2,200 a month, which is a very nice house in Michigan. He would like the ability to do more than just have a nice house. Nathan and his wife would like to put money aside for their little girl to be able to go to college and to be able to invest in their future.

So this legislation wouldn't automatically make Nathan's debt go away, but it would make it a whole lot easier. If we look at \$185,000 over a 20-year period, we are talking about tens of thousands—\$100,000 in savings.

So this is very much about having a vote today, the opportunity to vote. Our colleagues don't have to vote yes. They don't have to vote yes. We are confident we have enough votes to pass this. We just need to get through the procedural hurdle, the objections that trigger a filibuster. That is all we are

asking for. I think the 1 million families and the 1 million people in Michigan and their families, the 25 million people across the country who are buried in student loan debt deserve a vote. They deserve a vote today.

We also talk about a young woman from Lambertville, MI. She went to my alma mater, Michigan State University. She graduated in 2008 and was on the Dean's list.

Of course, 2008 was a disastrous year for the economy, nationally and certainly in Michigan, as we saw what happened to auto manufacturing. It was especially brutal for young people looking for work.

Even though she graduated among the top in her class, it ended up taking her 4 years to find a job in her field. Today she is only making slightly more than minimum wage and trying to figure out how in the world she is going to pay off her student loan debt, let alone proceed with her dreams for the future.

Last week I heard from a young man who was originally from Union City, MI. He was working in North Carolina when his father was diagnosed with a terminal illness—brain cancer. He came home—as I'm sure his family appreciated—to help care for his father. He was showing the right kind of family values to come home and help care for his dad.

During the recession he lost his job in Michigan and was out of work for 2 years, which is why he ended up in North Carolina and ended up in a low-wage job with no benefits. Now he is back trying to figure out how he can help take care of his dad, figure out a job, and not be totally buried in the debt that he already has.

His debt has been turned over to a collection agency and, counting the fees, he now owes \$90,000 and counting. He tried to do the right thing not only by going to college but for his family.

I think about how things have changed over the years—the kind of support we used to give. One of the great American strengths has been creating opportunity for people to be successful. A lot of that opportunity has been in relation to going to college and getting an education.

I remember growing up in Clare. When I was going to high school my dad was very ill. We didn't have any money for me to go to school. I worked very hard. I was at the top of my small class of 93 people, and I was in a position to get a tuition and fee scholarship that allowed me to go to college.

Somebody somewhere thought at that time it was important for some redheaded freckle-faced kid they did not know had a shot to make it. That has been what is best about America. Now we have tried. We have increased Pell grants, but certainly they need to be increased much more.

We have focused on other areas, and we certainly need to do more. What we

have seen over time is that more of what students have had to do is take student loans. There have been less opportunities for scholarships and less opportunities for grants.

I am very sorry to say my home State has cut K-12 and higher education. On higher education—and more than in most States—it is in the top ten in student-loan debt and certainly not something I am proud to see happen in my home State of Michigan because of what I think have been upside-down values.

What we have seen over time is that as the economy is changing, we are telling people who are going back to school who lost their job: You need to go back and get the education, the tools, and the skills for the jobs that are available in today's economy.

We have new opportunities and a new economy, but it means we have to have new skills. We have to have an education, so students are doing that. They are doing the right thing. They are doing what they have been told to do. Then they turn around and their only option is loans.

They take a look at the fact that somehow student loans are treated differently than student loan debt. You cannot get the lowest interest rates and refinance if you are in the unfortunate situation of going into bankruptcy and can't discharge those loans in bankruptcy such as you can other kinds of debt.

I don't understand how we got into a place where somehow student loan debt is with you forever and ever. We don't have the same ability to allow people to manage that debt as they do other kinds of debt. But that is where we are in this country. There are cuts at the State level and tuition goes up.

We then see a situation where more and more people have to turn to student loans.

We can do something about that today. There is a lot we can do. I support doing all that will allow us to get us back to right-size the situation in terms of our values and supporting opportunity for education in our country.

One thing we can do right now is to have a vote on this bill. We could immediately see change happen. Put more money back into the pockets of folks across our great country who have been doing the right thing and want a fair shot to make it and the opportunity to have some kind of help as they are paying off their student loans.

I am so pleased to see our leader and the main author of this legislation join us on the floor. She understands, as we all do, and is someone that has been dedicated to education and higher education her whole life, advocating for an opportunity for people to be successful and have a fair shot.

It is my pleasure at this point to turn to the distinguished Senator, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and

support her request as she moves forward this afternoon.

I yield for the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to commend all of the incredible work that the Senator from Michigan has done on the "fair shot" agenda, how she really has been out there working hard for families across this country. For middle-class families, for working families, for people who are just trying to get a fair shot, and on education she has been a tremendous leader. It has been a real privilege to have this opportunity to work with the Senator from Michigan. I know the Senator from Michigan and I are going to keep working on this set of issues.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to allow a debate and vote on the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. Some 40 million Americans are dealing with student loan debt, and many of them are drowning in it.

A quarter of all Federal student loan borrowers are behind on their payments. Student loan debt is dragging down our young people, and it is dragging down the economy. It is keeping borrowers from buying homes, moving out on their own, buying cars and opening small businesses.

In June the Senate voted on a proposal to allow borrowers to refinance their existing student loans down to the interest rates offered to new borrowers. These are the same rates that nearly every Republican in the House and the Senate voted just last summer to offer to new borrowers. This refinancing bill would not add a single dime to the deficit. It is fully paid for by closing the tax loophole that right now lets millionaires and billionaires pay less in taxes than middle-class families. The vote on our student loan refinancing proposal asks Senators to make a simple choice: protect billionaires from paying their fair share of taxes or protect student loan borrowers who work hard to get an education and are struggling to stay afloat; protect the billionaires who have already made it big or help young people who are still trying to build a future.

A majority of the Senate, including every Democrat, every Independent, and three Republicans sided with students in support of moving forward on this bill, but the rest of the Republicans blocked it. We heard a lot of excuses from those that oppose the bill.

Some Republicans suggested that the benefit for our young people on this bill is small. I disagree. Putting billions of dollars in Federal student loan profits back into the pockets of Americans who worked hard to get an education is not small. Saving millions of Americans hundreds or thousands of dollars a year in excessive student-loan interest payments is not small. If the Republicans think the benefit is too

small, then work with us to offer amendments to this bill and give students a bigger break but don't refuse to even debate the bill.

Some Republicans suggested that the \$1.2 trillion in outstanding debt just isn't a big deal, that we should focus on rising college costs instead. Yes, the rising cost of college is a terrible problem but so are the outstanding loans at 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, 12 percent, and even higher. We need to fix both problems and not play rope-a-dope politics and say we can't fix this because we haven't fixed that yet.

Millions of young people are just stuck. They can't buy homes, they can't buy cars, they can't save for retirement, they can't do the things that would help this economy grow—all because they are struggling under the weight of student loan debt.

If Senators think we should do more than just refinancing, more to improve college accountability and to reduce the future costs for students, then work with us to offer amendments, but don't refuse to even debate the bill.

Some Republicans don't like that this proposal is paid for by closing tax loopholes. If Senators don't like that, if they have other ideas, then they should offer amendments. But don't refuse to even debate this bill.

Some Republicans even suggested that Democrats don't want this bill to pass. That is just plain ridiculous. Only in Washington can you vote against something, and then when it doesn't pass, you blame the people who voted for it.

These excuses don't fool anyone. They don't fool the hundreds of thousands of people who have signed petitions, attended rallies, and called their Senators asking for a vote on this bill.

This is not complicated. Senators can make a choice. It is a choice that raises a fundamental question of who this place works for. Does it work for those who can hire armies of lawyers and lobbyists who want to protect loopholes in the Tax Code to get more advantages for millionaires and billionaires? Does it work for the big banks with their armies of lobbyists who just want to maximize student loan profits? Does it work for young people who worked hard, who played by the rules, who got an education, and who are trying to build a future for themselves and their families?

We are just a few votes away from breaking the Republican filibuster and moving forward to debate this bill. I urge my Republican colleagues to allow a vote and to let us debate and pass this bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2432

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 409, S. 2432, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, and the Senate immediately proceed to vote on passage of

the bill, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to say to my colleague from Massachusetts I appreciate her highlighting the importance of student debt in the lives of a lot of our young people who are struggling in this stagnant economy. The best thing we can do is to try to get the economy growing again. But the majority leader has chosen not to use the Senate floor for the purpose of legislating. This is the killing field for good bipartisan ideas that have come from the House of Representatives—now more than 380 bills. Unfortunately, the majority leader refuses to take up any of those. We stand ready to work with our colleagues across the aisle on serious legislation through an open and deliberative process that our constituents are demanding. There is a reason why the approval rating of the Congress is 14 percent. People look at Washington, DC, these days and realize it is completely broken and nowhere else is it more broken than in the Senate, where Senator REID has decided to grind what used to be known as the world's greatest deliberative body to a halt.

We will now pass a continuing resolution and adjourn with 47 days left—by the time we do it—until the election.

It is really beyond dismay.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request, and that it be in order for the minority leader or his designee to offer an amendment, and then for the majority leader or his designee to offer an amendment, and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion. In other words, we would ask for an open amendment process on the legislation that the Senator is proposing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts so modify her request?

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from Texas for his remarks. As I stated previously, there are 58 Senators who have supported moving forward to debate this bill. But it has not passed the Senate because of a Republican filibuster. I welcome Republican ideas to address the exploding student debt crisis. For months Senator STABENOW, others, and I have reached out to our colleagues to put ideas forward so that we could have a real debate. But allowing an unlimited number of amendments on any topic forever is not a reasonable way forward on a student loan debt refinancing bill.

We face a student debt crisis now. We need to act on it now. If my colleague from Texas is not willing to provide a reasonable path forward to debate, improve, and vote on this bill, then I ob-

ject to his request and ask that he agree to my original request that we take up and pass this piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to modify the request. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say that the best way to get this piece of legislation resolved on the Senate floor is what used to be called the old-fashioned way. That is where both sides of the aisle get to offer amendments and vote on them. But this is what has happened to the Senate. It has become completely dysfunctional. Frankly, the American people are disgusted with all of us because they see us unable, even when Republicans and Democrats would like to debate legislation and offer solutions, to be able to do so.

This is solely within the control of the majority leader, Senator REID. He has decided it is better to shut things down than to pass legislation which both sides of the aisle would like to see pass. So I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, what is dysfunctional is a Republican filibuster of a bill on which 58 Senators want to move forward and debate. Allowing an unlimited number of amendments on any topic, going on forever, is not a reasonable way forward. We want to be able to debate the student loan refinancing bill. We want to be able to do it now. Young people are struggling and are counting on us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the great talents and credentials that the Senator from Massachusetts brings to the Senate. Unfortunately, whether one is in the majority or in the minority, the Senate has not been able to function for the last 4 years. I have been fortunate to be in the Senate at a time when any Senator who wanted to could come to the floor and offer an amendment and get a vote on that amendment.

What to me is completely ironic is even if you are in the majority, you cannot get a vote on an amendment—if you are in the majority. How do you explain that to your constituents back home—that you were rendered completely ineffective because of the way the Senate is being operated under the current majority leader. I want to turn to another topic briefly, and that is the matter of the President's proposed strategy on the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Out of respect to my colleague, I realize we are going into the next hour that is controlled by the Republicans. But I did want to take 1 minute to wrap up, if that is acceptable to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. I just wanted to go on record to say there are thousands of excuses always on everything for reasons not to do things. We are talking about a very specific bill, a very specific vote that would put money in the pockets of 25 million Americans. We could do that right now. People can have lots of reasons. It reminds me a lot of hearing that my kids have hundreds of excuses about why they cannot do something, whether it is because of somebody else or this, that, and the other.

I think the American people just want us to get stuff done. We want to get things done. The motion that Senator WARREN put forward is about getting things done. A vast majority—58 Senators—has already said yes, they want to move forward. Yes, they will vote yes. We need to get this piece done to help 25 million people and then move on and work with each other across the aisle to do other work.

I greatly regret the objection and indicate that we will be back and back and back until we get the American people the relief they need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the frustration of the Senator from Michigan at the Senate not functioning the way it should. But really her complaint ought to be with the majority leader. Republicans are happy to have an open amendment process. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we are not talking about amendments ad infinitum. We are talking about a reasonable amount of amendments. We have been down this lane before. We know that the majority leader rules this body with an iron grip. In the waning days now of this session, there is going to be veritably nothing done, because, of course, that is the way the majority leader has chosen to use his authority. It would make sense if we had an opportunity to offer House legislation. As I said, there are 44 different jobs bills and more than 385 bipartisan pieces of legislation that have passed the House which would be great for us to take up and to work our way through in an orderly and deliberative sort of way.

I agree the American people want to see us get things done. But they cannot. We cannot get things done when the majority leader essentially says: You know what. It is my way or the highway. Those of you who are elected from red States, where you are elected by Republicans, you cannot participate in this process. So what is the use of being elected to the Senate? What is the use of States such as Texas having two Senators and not being able to participate or shape the legislative process? That is an unreasonable demand by the majority leader.

I know our colleagues on the Democratic side, many of them, are frus-

trated by that too. I will tell them that if this election in 49 days turns out the way I hope it does, we will have a new Senate where Republicans and Democrats can come to the floor, offer amendments, and get votes as long as they want to get votes on amendments. That used to be the way the Senate operated. That is not the way it operates now. It is really a disservice to the American people. I am saddened by the majority leader's choice to create such a situation in the Senate.

ISIL

We will be voting, along with the continuing resolution—I am told the House will add an authorization that has been requested by the President to train and arm some Syrian rebels, which we hope will be an effective force in defeating ISIS or ISIL, the Islamic State in the Levant. This is a group that Al Qaeda kicked out because they were so barbaric that they wanted nothing to do with them. They are now one of the best financed terrorist organizations in the world, now occupying vast swaths of Iraq and Syria, and virtually erasing the border between those two countries. This is a threat not only to the region and to the people of Iraq and Syria, but it is a threat to other countries in that region.

If you believe the King of Saudi Arabia, he said in a month they will export their terror to Europe, and they will then, a month later, export their terror to the United States. The biggest threat to the United States is there are—people who have gone from the United States and from the United Kingdom to the region and trained as fighters for ISIL.

The problem is that because of the Visa Waiver Program, many of them—if you are a passport holder from the United States or the United Kingdom, you can come back to the United States with just a passport and you do not even need a visa. So this is an opportunity for this terrorist organization to infiltrate the United States and threaten our national security and safety.

But in particular in Syria, it is ironic—indeed, it is tragic to note—that after refusing for 3½ years to provide even moderate assistance to opposition groups in Syria, President Obama is now asking Congress to give him the necessary authorization. Now, this is not an authorization to take the fight to degrade and destroy ISIL. The President said that is his military goal. That is an important goal. I agree with that. I think he would find a lot of support on a bipartisan basis for that kind of authorization. What the President has done is basically to ask for money for a very much more limited task; that is, to recruit and train so-called moderate Syrian opposition to fight ISIL in Syria.

But he has chosen to go it alone once again on this broader effort to degrade

and destroy ISIL. I know the President is famous for saying what he will not do. Of course, they always add: No American boots on the ground. But this morning the chief of the U.S. military, General Dempsey has said if the air campaign is unsuccessful in degrading or destroying ISIL, then we should not take the prospect of some limited number of American boots on the ground off the table. Military expert after military expert has said: Air strikes alone will not turn the tide on ISIL in Iraq and Syria.

But I am glad the President has at least made this limited request. We ought to have a broader debate about his authority to take the fight to ISIL in Syria and Iraq. I note with interest that our colleague Senator Kaine of Virginia wrote what I thought was a compelling piece, arguing that the President should come to the Congress for that authority. That was published in the New York Times today. I thought he made a very important case.

If the President is concerned that he will come to Congress and he will not get the authority, I think circumstances have changed to where he would get that sort of bipartisan vote to give him authority. There are prudential or practical reasons why he should do so. First of all, there is the Constitution which the President seems not to care most about. But assuming the President has the authority, I think if he came to Congress, it would provide a broader basis of support both in Congress and across the country.

Of course, you do not want to go to war without the support of the American people. If you believe the public opinion polls, I think they are pretty persuasive that the American people do support air strikes against ISIL, particularly in the wake of these barbaric beheadings of both British and American citizens. But as we know, the tide of war can turn very quickly. It is important that the President have broader support here in Congress and broad support from the American people in doing what we know we have to do regardless of how popular or unpopular it may be.

But I do have questions about how the different rebel groups will be vetted and how the U.S. military aid will advance our larger policy of destroying ISIL. While I still have those questions, I will support the authority and the money to train and equip the moderate groups as part of our broader strategy.

I remain deeply concerned, though, about President Obama's understanding—or lack of understanding—of just what has gone so wrong with his policies in the Middle East. After all, the first step in fixing a mistake is to admit you have made one—not for the purpose of embarrassing the President

but learning from those mistakes and then going on to correct them.

Last week he discussed his foreign policy record with a number of outside analysts at two separate meetings. According to one story in the New York Times by Peter Baker, the President “admitted no errors along the way.” It is pretty breathtaking. I do not know any human being, any mere mortal—certainly me—who has not made a mistake. These are enormously complex judgments, and I understand that, and we ought to cut the President some slack in trying to execute this war and this fight to degrade and dismantle ISIS. But to say “I have not made any mistakes. My judgments have been perfect” is not helpful. He said there are no errors. He has made no errors. There is nothing that needs correcting, no change of conditions because of misjudgments.

But we know that despite the creation of a massive terrorist enclave spanning Iraq and Syria, despite the explosion of a huge refugee crisis in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey—millions of Syrians have been displaced by the civil war there alone, along with about 200,000 Syrians who have lost their lives. As a result of the President's policies, we have also seen the emergence of a failed state in Libya, where in September 2012 four Americans were killed by Al Qaeda-related affiliates. We have seen the emergence of yet another failed state in Yemen, and we have seen the embarrassing decline of U.S. influence in countries such as Egypt and other gulf nations. Despite all that, the President says he had not made any mistakes and it is somebody else's fault and not his.

I would contrast that with the conduct of President George W. Bush when he announced the troop surge in Iraq and the counterinsurgency strategy in 2007. He was admirably forthright about the fact that his Iraq policy was not working—and, indeed, it was not. President Bush said at the time, “We need to change our strategy in Iraq.”

Boy, it would be a breath of fresh air if President Obama would say, “We need to change our strategy” rather than saying, “I have not made any mistakes. There have been no misjudgments. We don't need to reconsider any of our activities abroad.” I think people understand we do.

When we look at America's Middle East policy failures under President Obama, it is painfully clear that once again we need to change our strategy, but by refusing to acknowledge his mistakes, the President raises troubling questions about the credibility of his new policies.

Despite announcing that the military aid to the more moderate rebels will now be the centerpiece of U.S. policy in Syria, the President still publicly rejects the idea that arming those rebels a few years ago would have been a good

idea. And, oh, by the way, arming the rebels a few years ago was the recommendation of all of his most significant national security advisers, but the President rejected it.

If it is a good idea to arm the more moderate rebels today in hopes of countering ISIL, then surely it would have been a good idea to arm those rebels before ISIL took over large portions of eastern Syria and 200,000 Syrians lost their lives in that civil war. Likewise, if we are now sending U.S. military forces back to Iraq to conduct bombing raids against ISIL terrorists based there, then surely it was a mistake to withdraw all U.S. forces from Iraq back in 2011 without leaving a transitional force there to help be the glue in that famously sectarian-driven part of the world. But the President will admit no mistakes and no lessons learned in either Iraq or Syria.

Of course, the thing about acknowledging your mistakes, as I said earlier, is that you can learn from them, and President Obama's recent foreign policy failures are no different. The lessons we have learned can and should inform our strategy against ISIL. But first the President needs to accept, internalize, and then allow himself to be guided by those lessons. If he does that, America's military campaign against the Islamic State will have a much better chance of succeeding.

I would say again that we want the President's plan to be successful. I think it is virtually universal here in the Senate that we want our military, in conjunction with our coalition partners, to degrade and destroy ISIL because we believe it is a serious threat not just to the region but to the United States and our allies and our interests. But if the President will not learn from the lessons of the past, if he will not work with Congress to come up with an effective strategy, and if he will not listen to his own military leaders and experts, I am very concerned that strategy will end up being a failure, and that need not be.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from North Dakota on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes or as much time as I might need to discuss an important energy issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my esteemed colleague from Texas, and I want to share my agreement with the important points he made so well.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2823 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon tomorrow, Wednesday, September 17, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 956, 536, 548, 964, 965, 871, 924, and 912; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, we expect one rollcall vote on the Bass nomination and the other nominations listed in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBAL GENERAL WELFARE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. I am also pleased to see on the floor my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP. She and I have a legislative interest in a matter now pending before the House of Representatives, and it is at least my desire to see the Senate utilize this opportunity of a bill passing the House to also be considered by the Senate and hopefully be approved. While it has been a challenge throughout this year and throughout this session to get legislation to the floor and voted on, I would not want us to pass up the chance for this legislation to be approved and sent to the President for signature.

The legislation we are speaking about is the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act. The House of Representatives, as I said, is considering H.R. 3043 this week. This is legislation I am absolutely certain will enhance the economic opportunities and the quality of life for our Native Americans in this country.

The Constitution states that a core responsibility of the Federal Government is to promote the general welfare of the people. The Federal Government has a trust responsibility to protect tribal interests. These two objectives come together in this legislation. It certainly would be an understatement to say that the Federal Government over the years has fulfilled its trust responsibility. We know that to not be the case.

In an effort to fill that void, tribal governments have taken actions to meet their tribal members' needs with initiatives such as cultural programs and education and social services and health care.

Unfortunately, over a period of time, those benefits have been treated as income and those benefits have been subject to the Internal Revenue Service Code.

We need to make certain we don't add to the burden that tribes too often have encountered from the Federal Government and that these benefits would not be subject to income taxes and these benefits and the tribes will not be subject to IRS audits because of them.

The Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act extends to Native Americans the same tax privileges that are provided by our States; namely, that the value of government services provided by the tribes to their members, just like the services provided by a State to its citizens, would be excluded for tax purposes. Federal and State governments have enjoyed the privilege of having such services as education, social welfare, health care programs, housing, as well as cultural programs exempt from that taxation. Native Americans have not been as fortunate.

The House is close to correcting this problem, and it is my plea and hope that the Senate will follow suit this week. The IRS recently issued a notice that establishes the tribal general welfare exclusion. It is a matter of treasury policy, and this is appreciated. It is a step in the right direction, but we want to make certain that this policy is extended and codified.

The general welfare issue should be put into law to protect against future policy changes, and among other provisions this legislation establishes a tribal advisory committee within the Department of the Treasury to advise the Secretary on Indian tax policy and also declares that any ambiguities of the act will be resolved in favor of tribal governments. It directs the IRS field

agents to be educated and trained in matters of Federal Indian law and government trust responsibilities.

This is a reasonable commonsense, constitutional piece of legislation. It fosters fairness within our Tax Code and promotes better understanding of the Federal Government's trust relationships.

Four years ago similar exclusion rules for Native Americans' health benefits were passed. We have before us now the opportunity to clarify the exclusion as it should be. This legislation makes a lot of sense. It adheres to the Constitution which recognizes tribes as sovereign nations with the authority to provide for their peoples. This has been affirmed many times by Congress in the past. It is clearly part of our U.S. Constitution.

The economic benefits are obvious. Our tribal territories, reservations, our Native Americans need not be worrying about the onerous IRS audits and should not be paying taxes when no one else is required to pay taxes on similar benefits.

This legislation is revenue neutral, something that is very pleasing. The Joint Committee on Taxation has deemed any impact on the revenue of our Federal Government to be negligible.

As a person who cares a lot about the fiscal condition of our country, we ought to be reducing our deficit and boosting our economy. This piece of legislation does not increase the deficit, and it does boost the economy, particularly of tribes across the Nation. Here in the Senate, Senator HEITKAMP and I introduced S. 1507. It is a companion bill to the one the House is considering. This piece of legislation has broad bipartisan support, and more than 20 Senators from Alaska to Georgia have joined us in this effort.

I am grateful for the members of the Finance Committee and the Indian Affairs Committee who lent their support to this legislation. I am not a member of either one of those committees, but there are four tribes in Kansas and I have an interest in their well-being as well as that of all Native Americans.

Native Americans are not seeking to play here by different rules. In fact, it is quite the opposite. They simply want to enjoy the same benefits accorded any other government in our country. They emphasize to me the principle of tribal sovereignty and self-government. This legislation reinforces those principles.

More than 40 tribes in 24 states, nearly a dozen Indian organizations and a number of regional tribal organizations representing tens of thousands of Native Americans supported this legislation. It is not just Native Americans. In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has recognized this legislation as one that will foster economic development and supports its passage.

As we are preparing to depart Washington, DC, and take time away from the Nation's Capital, it would be a terrible mistake on our part and a missed opportunity if we don't take advantage of House action this week while the Senate is here in session this week to see that this legislation is approved.

My hope is that this could be accomplished by unanimous consent, and I know Senator HEITKAMP and others and I have been talking to members of the committees as well as the leadership of the Senate to see that we accomplish this.

It is a wrong that can be righted. It is a wrong that should be righted quickly and not at a later date. This certainly is one of those pieces of legislation that is a win-win for all.

If we see the House pass the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act, I urge my colleagues to join with me, Senator HEITKAMP, and Republican and Democrat Senators who are supportive of this legislation, to see that this legislation arrives on the President's desk in the most expedient manner possible.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask to speak as if in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, it is truly a great honor to stand with my colleague from Kansas as we are on the cusp of actually passing legislation that has consequences for a lot of our American citizens and especially our Native American citizens. I will tell you as someone who represents Indian Country in my State, this is the number one priority for our tribes.

It is interesting because a lot of people would look at this and say: Why this issue? I think it goes to the heart of Native American sovereignty. What has been happening, as it relates to 1099s and the potential of taxing services provided by tribal governments, basically begs the question: Do we really understand or do we really appreciate that these are sovereign governments—the same way the States are sovereign and the same way the counties and cities would be sovereign?

I think in many ways it has very real economic consequences, but a great value in this legislation is in the symbolic consequences of having this body recognize the importance of recognizing these treaty rights, recognizing the value of treaties and trust responsibilities. As a former attorney general and as a lawyer, I view treaty rights and trust responsibilities like a contract between the United States and our Native American tribes. As a U.S. citizen, I view these treaties as sacred obligations.

We have not done a good enough job living up to our commitments to tribal

nations. As a consequence tribal governments have been forced to supplement services that the Federal Government promised to provide. Yet for years the IRS has audited Indian tribes for providing health care, education or housing assistance for those in need.

Here are just some of the stories I have heard from Native Americans in North Dakota and across the country. I have heard about the IRS wanting the tribes to issue 1099s—basically saying you have something of taxable value—to tribal elders who received blankets as honoraria for performing traditional ceremonies.

I heard about the IRS questioning a tribal government's provision providing backpacks and school supplies to elementary school children as a taxable benefit to the families of the children.

I have heard about the IRS imposing a tax on the value of a handicap ramp—a value of \$2,000—erected by the tribal government to help a tribal elder access her home.

The stories go on. The status quo isn't fair and it isn't right. This practice certainly does not fully respect that tribes are governments. That is why I joined with Senator MORAN to introduce the bipartisan Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act last year.

The bill would fully recognize that Indian tribes, as sovereign nations, are responsible for making certain government programs and services best fit the needs of their citizens. Just as State and local governments are determined to decide what is in the best interest of their citizens, such as scholarships, elder or child care or housing assistance, we have to recognize that tribal governments have the right to make those decisions without tax consequences.

With this bill, we are supporting tribal self-determination and taking a step towards living up to our trust and treaty obligations. Indian tribes and their members should not be subject to heightened IRS scrutiny.

I think Senator MORAN outlined that issue so well because some people may see that what we are doing here is carving out an exception, creating an extra benefit for tribal members that is not enjoyed by the entire citizenry of this country.

Nothing could be further than the truth. In fact, we are leveling the playing field. The Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act will bring parity in the tax treatment of Indian governments. It will recognize the unique relationship with tribal governments that they have with their citizens and allow them the opportunity to craft programs which best fit their community need.

I want to take a moment and suggest to all of you that if you spent time in Indian Country and if you have looked at the benefits that tribal governments

provide and you think about the resources of the IRS and where you might go to actually collect dollars that would enhance revenue, the last place you should look in this country is in Indian Country.

I would like to address a few other really important reasons why this bill is so critical. The IRS recently issued helpful guidance, and we are very appreciative of that work. With that being said, we also must make sure that parity provided by that guidance is in statutory language. That way, we weighed in. There is certainty that no one can do a look-back and no one can change it without that change coming to this body and coming to the House of Representatives and being enacted into law.

In addition, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act includes two items that are critical to the advancement of a better relationship between tribal governments and the Federal Government.

First as a training requirement, we must make sure that IRS field agents are well versed in Federal Indian law and unique treaty and trust relationships that the Federal Government has with their tribes.

Second, as the training is taking place, our bill also suspends all audits of examination of tribal governments for one year to allow this education to take place.

It isn't rare for Congress to pass legislation that supports guidance issued by the Federal agencies to give more weight to the issues and make sure that there is no potential misinterpretation.

That is what we are doing this week with the help of a lot of our colleagues who believe in this legislation as well. We want to supplement the IRS guidance to expand rather than restrict the safe harbor provisions.

When I joined the Senate, I promised to be a partner—to honor and respect the sovereign rights of Native Americans just as I always have. This bill is a step in the right direction. I fully anticipate that as we move forward this week, we will, in fact, enact this legislation. I fully anticipate that we will send the right message to tribal governments that we see you the way you are.

You are a sovereign government entitled to make the decisions that you need to make to the benefit of your citizens without undue and irrational interference from the IRS.

I think the bipartisan nature of this bill is a tribute to my friend from Kansas who understands completely what we are attempting to do. It is one of those rare moments that I have had since I have been in the Senate, where you see a good bill being debated—a good bill being discussed—and then having an opportunity to actually do the right thing. I thank my friend from

Kansas for the opportunity to join with him as a cosponsor of this legislation.

It is critically important that this message get sent and that we have an opportunity in the future to continue to work with tribal governments to act in the best interests of tribal citizens and provide the services that are essential for a growing population of Native American citizens but also of a population that lives in a great deal of poverty.

I thank my friend from Kansas. I look forward to seeing this bill signed into law—which I think will happen. I think that the stars are aligning. It will be a great day and a very important step in securing a better relationship of all governments with the Native American people.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBSERVING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tomorrow we will mark Constitution Day—a day set aside to reflect on our Nation's charter and how it has shaped what it means to be American. On September 17, 1787, George Washington, James Madison, and their fellow Framers made the momentous decision to sign the Constitution and send it along to the American people for ratification marking a new beginning in our Nation's profound experiment in democracy.

As important as the original charter continues to be, the Founders did not design it to be immutable. One of its most notable features is article 5, which established the process for improvement in the form of constitutional amendments. This key provision rooted in both intellectual humility and constitutional faith—ensured that our Nation's constitutional journey would not conclude in Philadelphia in 1787. Instead, it would continue to unfold in the decades and centuries that followed, tasking each generation of

Americans with improving the charter in order to build “a more perfect Union.”

Since the ratification of the Bill of Rights in 1791, our Constitution has been amended 17 times. These changes have helped to make the Constitution the revered document it is today. As I have noted on previous Constitution Days, Americans must celebrate not just the original Constitution of Washington, Madison, and the founding generation, but the whole Constitution, including its 27 amendments. This is all the more important as we approach a key set of anniversaries—the 150th anniversaries of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, which many scholars have rightly described as our nation’s “Second Founding.”

Ratified by President Lincoln and his generation after the Civil War, these Second Founding amendments transformed our original charter—ending slavery, banning racial discrimination in voting, and elevating liberty and equality to a central place in our constitutional order. Perhaps most importantly, these amendments gave Congress the authority it needed to protect the civil rights of all Americans—authority that we have used to pass landmark civil rights laws such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Before our Nation marked the original Constitution’s bicentennial in 1987, Congress established a commission led by Chief Justice Burger to organize a national celebration. Americans from across the political spectrum came together in a spirit of unity and pride to honor the founding generation’s profound achievements. With the 150th anniversary of the second founding, President Lincoln and his generation deserve the same.

It is deeply saddening to me that the anniversary of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments coincides not with such a celebration, however, but with what can be called nothing short of an attack on the principles of equality and liberty they protect. The Supreme Court’s decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* and the wave of recent State laws undermining the right to vote demonstrate a dangerous erosion of these monumental Amendments that provide us the tools we need to build a fairer, freer, and more equal society.

Tomorrow, as we celebrate the signing of our Constitution 227 years ago, I hope we also reflect on the unfinished work ahead that is necessary to live up to the core principles enshrined in our Nation’s charter—including those of the second founding. The racial tensions exposed by the police shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO are not new, but they should serve as a clear reminder that our work is not done. I am heartened by the national dialogue that has been sparked by that young man’s tragic death, and it is my sincere hope that we can harness that energy, directing it not toward greater distrust and divide but toward meeting the challenge to build “a more perfect Union” left to us by our Founders.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

In the early 1900s, the populations of Nevada, southern California, and Arizona were beginning to grow. New communities were in need of water for irrigation, electrical power, and a way to control the seasonal flooding of the mighty Colorado River. On December 21, 1928, President Calvin Coolidge signed the Boulder Canyon Project Act, which authorized funds for three dam projects along the Lower Colorado River, the largest of which became the Hoover Dam, and this monumental dam created our Nation’s largest reservoir, Lake Mead.

On October 8, 1964, 18 years after the completion of the Hoover Dam, the Lake Mead national recreation area was established, making it the first National Recreation Area in the country. Since its founding, Lake Mead has become essential to Southern Nevada. The reservoir supplies local communities with drinking water, provides low-cost electricity throughout the Southwest, and is a beacon for outdoor recreation, which attracts millions of dollars annually to local and regional economies. In 2013, the Lake Mead National Recreation Area visitors contributed \$260 million to communities surrounding the lake, and this helped

support approximately 3,000 jobs in the area.

Today, Lake Mead is one of the most popular destinations in America, with more than 6 million visitors every year. Lake Mead boasts more than 900 plant and 500 animal species, 24 of which are threatened or endangered. Within the national recreation area, there are 9 wilderness areas that help support the rehabilitation of these important species and over 1,300 recorded archeological sites that tell the story of the region’s rich cultural heritage. In addition to the area’s many hiking trails, Lake Mead also has several boat marinas and the Black Canyon Water Trail, which was recently dedicated as Nevada’s first National Water Trail by the Secretary of the Interior.

I recognize Guy Edwards, Robert Rose, Ben Thompson, George Baggley, Charles Richey, Roger Allin, Glen Bean, William Briggie, Gary Bunney, Alan O’Neill, and William Dickinson, the past and current superintendents of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. These superintendents have provided strong leadership for the management of the reservoir since it was filled in 1936 and improved the park and recreational opportunities for visitors over the decades.

I commend the National Park Service on the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I previously revised the allocations, aggregates, and levels pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 for S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. The Senate passed S. 2244 on July 17th. Since there has been no further action on this legislation, I am reversing the adjustments I made in July. For the information of my colleagues, I will refile these adjustments should the Senate again consider legislation that fulfills the conditions of the deficit-neutral reserve fund.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the revisions be printed in the RECORD.

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	2015	2015-19	2015-24
Current Budgetary Aggregates:*				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		3,015,208	n/a	n/a
Outlays		3,035,761	n/a	n/a
Revenue		2,533,388	13,884,103	31,206,135
Adjustments Made Pursuant to Sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act:**				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		—120	n/a	n/a
Outlays		—120	n/a	n/a
Revenue		0	—1,770	—4,000
Revised Budgetary Aggregates:				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		3,015,088	n/a	n/a
Outlays		3,035,641	n/a	n/a

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974—Continued

	\$s in millions	2015	2015–19	2015–24
Revenue		2,533,388	13,882,333	31,202,135

n/a = Not applicable. Appropriations for fiscal years 2016–2024 will be determined by future sessions of Congress and enforced through future Congressional budget resolutions.

* The levels for “Current Budgetary Aggregates” include cap adjustments for the Committee on Appropriations and a prior reserve fund adjustment made for terrorism risk insurance.

** Reverse adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS PURSUANT TO SECTION 116 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs		
		Current Allocation	Adjustments *	Revised Allocation
Fiscal Year 2015:				
Budget Authority		24,657	– 120	24,537
Outlays		5,191	– 120	5,071
Fiscal Years 2015–2019:				
Budget Authority		116,185	– 1,690	114,495
Outlays		– 2,574	– 1,690	– 4,264
Fiscal Years 2015–2024:				
Budget		210,393	– 3,540	206,853
Outlays		– 52,689	– 3,540	– 56,229

* Reverse adjustments made pursuant to sections 114(d) and 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporate by reference section 319 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 319 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN JORGENSEN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to tell my colleagues about one of Wyoming’s distinguished citizens. John Jorgensen has devoted his life to promoting education, literacy, and the arts. This November he will be honored with the Benefactor Award from the Council for Resource Development. According to the CRD, the Benefactor Award “recognizes individuals . . . for outstanding contributions to community colleges. The CRD Benefactor Award embodies the ideals of philanthropy, leadership, and volunteerism in the service of community, technical, and junior colleges.” The Council only honors a handful of people each year, and I am delighted that John Jorgensen will receive this prestigious award.

John is no stranger to hard work. His ties to the community are numerous. In addition to serving as the president of Casper’s Hilltop National Bank, John is also the president of the Casper College Foundation. During 25 years in this important role, he has tripled the foundation’s assets. Under John’s leadership the foundation has provided more than \$70 million to the college for support of campus facilities, college programs, and student scholarships. The funds have provided a margin of excellence that ensures Casper College continues to be one of the finest community colleges in the country.

Casper College is just one of many organizations benefitting from John’s time and talents. He leads Wyoming Reads, an organization created in his late wife Sue’s memory that puts books into the hands of nearly every Wyoming first grader. He has served on the Natrona County Public Library Foundation and the Nicolaysen Art Museum board. John is a member of the Casper Rotary Club. He has a passion for the performing arts and has acted in a number of Casper College’s

plays, including the “Grapes of Wrath” and “Death of a Salesman.”

John Jorgensen is an example of what makes America great. He has channeled his blessings and his heartbreaks into organizations that help others. Casper and Wyoming are even greater because of his contributions. My wife Bobbi joins me in congratulating John on receiving this special award from the Council for Resource Development. We are blessed to call him our friend.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEXNER CENTER FOR THE ARTS

• Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the professionals at the Wexner Center for the Arts—the Wexner Center—for 25 years of committed service to The Ohio State University and to the greater central Ohio community. The mission of the Wexner Center is to act “as a forum where established and emerging artists can test ideas and where diverse audiences can participate in cultural experiences that enhance understanding of the art of our time.” The exhibits, performances, and educational programs at the Wexner Center achieve this mission and effectively promote the importance of art throughout our Columbus region.

On July 5, 1985, the architectural design by Peter Eisenman and Richard Trott was selected from a competition of six designs and paid homage to the Ohio State Armory, which formerly occupied the space. The Wexner Center opened its doors to the public on November 5, 1989 and over the past quarter century has served as an exhibition space for all types of art.

Today, the Wexner Center features many exhibits and programs each year and is home to The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library. The center welcomes visiting artists to Ohio State and Columbus from around the world.

More than 200,000 people visit the center annually and more than 400,000 patrons utilize the online resources.

The Wexner Center provides the central Ohio community with educational and cultural opportunities for all visitors. I congratulate all who were involved in making its first 25 years a success.●

225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

• Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to mark the 225th anniversary of the United States Marshals Service. As America’s oldest law enforcement agency, the U.S. Marshals Service has played a unique role in our history, serving our Nation in a variety of ways since 1789. In their 225 years of service, U.S. Marshals have been responsible for protecting the Federal judicial process, securing Federal facilities, and ensuring the safety of court officials: U.S. Marshals are also tasked with a number of law enforcement activities that keep our Nation safe and our judicial proceedings secure on a daily basis.

Operating in over 94 Federal court districts, U.S. Marshals serve with nearly 4,000 Deputy U.S. Marshals and criminal investigators to form the backbone of the agency. All of these individuals have provided a great service to our Nation by carrying out the dangerous and extraordinary missions asked of them by Congress, the President, and Governors.

The first U.S. Marshal for the Colorado Territory was appointed by President Lincoln and began his service on March 25, 1861. Today, the men and women of the U.S. Marshals Service for the District of Colorado maintain their core mission to serve and protect our Federal judiciary. In doing so, the Marshals ensure the survival of one of our Nation’s most fundamental democratic

principles—the Rule of Law. Marshals continually work together with other Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies to create safer cities and communities around the Nation.

On this anniversary, we must not forget to honor those Marshals who sacrificed their lives in pursuit of justice, integrity, and service. Their legacy of bravery continues with U.S. Marshals serving today. It is my privilege to mark this 225 year milestone with these outstanding and noble Americans. We are greatly indebted to all U.S. Marshals for their service to our Nation.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 160TH SOAR OF HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD

● Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 3rd Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Airborne, of Hunter Army Airfield, marking their 25th anniversary of service in support of this Nation.

Since 1989, the 160th SOAR has served in every major conflict and contingency operation supporting the special operations community and providing world-class special operations aviation support. Supporting Operation Just Cause in Panama, Desert Shield and Desert Storm in the Persian Gulf, and multiple operations in support of crisis management prepared them for their most challenging mission of all, the global war on terrorism.

Over the last 13 years, their battalion of MH-47 Chinooks and MH-60 Black Hawks have been continuously deployed in support of Operations Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn, and throughout the world on numerous unnamed and often unknown missions.

In 2013, the unit flew over 8,000 flying hours in support of ongoing combat operations and training missions to support the special operations community and our allies, including over 4,300 under night vision.

Through fiscal management and lean logistics, the battalion has continued to refine the processes enabling a leaner sustainment package while still maintaining effectiveness in every environment in which the battalion's aircraft operate.

The 160th continues to be at the forefront of Army aviation and foreign internal defense aviation support to our allies.

In tribute to its outstanding service during wartime, its important role in strengthening the security of this Nation, and its support to the special operations community, I am honored today to recognize the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment and its contributions to the United States of America.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE LONG AND THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish today to honor George Long of Vicksburg, MS, a World War II veteran to whom I had the pleasure of presenting the Congressional Gold Medal during the August recess.

Just months after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, 16-year-old George Long bravely volunteered to serve in the U.S. Marine Corps. He was one of the African-American recruits who volunteered for service after President Roosevelt signed an Executive order in 1942 lifting a prohibition against their enlistment.

Mr. Long is part of a group of American warriors known as the Montford Point Marines—those African-American recruits assigned to the segregated basic training facility at Montford Point, adjacent to Camp Lejeune, NC.

Given the magnitude of the threat our country faced in Europe and the Pacific, President Roosevelt recognized that the status quo of Jim Crow segregation, which at that time prohibited African Americans from serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, would not suffice. In 1941, he signed the historic Executive Order 8802, which required the military to accept recruits regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. This action would later become a crucial component of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and help bring an end to segregation in the United States.

Approximately 20,000 African-American marines received basic training at Montford Point, before the Marine Corps became fully integrated in 1949. Of those, about 13,000 would serve overseas during World War II. These marines fought valiantly in the fiercest battles of the Pacific island hopping campaign, as allied forces reversed the tide of Imperial expansion. Mr. Long notably served as a guard for Japanese prisoners of war during the legendary Battle of Iwo Jima, where “uncommon valor was a common virtue.”

On November 11, 2011, legislation was enacted granting the Congressional Gold Medal to the Montford Point Marines. This honor—the highest civilian award in the United States—was bestowed on these courageous veterans for their brave and honorable service to our country, despite segregation and other prejudices that were common at the time.

Due to his health, George Long was unable to attend a ceremony at the U.S. Capitol in June 2012 where the Congressional Gold Medal was presented to some 370 of the estimated 420 remaining Montford Point veterans. I am grateful that his daughter Felicia Hawkins and friend Steve Houston worked with my office to ensure that Mr. Long eventually received the medal.

It was an honor to present the Congressional Gold Medal to George Long on August 5 at the G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery Veterans Medical Center in Jackson in recognition of his contributions to our country. Mr. Long and all the Montford Point Marines will be remembered as trailblazers who bravely helped protect our Nation from foreign threats and helped improve our society by bringing about change within our military.●

REMEMBERING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS FISHER

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life of Medal of Honor recipient Col. Bernard Fisher, known as Bernie. He passed away in August after a meaningful and inspiring life, and he leaves behind a legacy of heroic and steady service.

Colonel Fisher, of Kuna, ID, earned the Medal of Honor for putting his life on the line to rescue a fellow pilot downed in enemy-controlled territory during the Vietnam war. According to an Air Force fact sheet, under enemy fire, he landed his airplane, pulled the pilot aboard, and escaped despite the airplane he piloted being hit with multiple rounds. He is known as an outstanding, steady pilot. In 1967 President Lyndon B. Johnson presented him with the award. His “conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty” was noted in his Medal of Honor citation.

Bernard Fisher joined the U.S. Navy and attended Boise State Junior College and the University of Utah before receiving a commission in the U.S. Air Force and serving as a fighter pilot. He married his wife Realla in 1948, and they had six sons. He went on to have a distinguished military career before retiring in Kuna, ID, as an Air Force colonel. Three of his sons and one grandson carried on his legacy of service in the Air Force.

In addition to his being known for his eminent military career, he is known as a loving husband, father, grandfather, generous friend, and committed member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. After his retirement from the military, he and Realla grew a number of crops, raised livestock, looked after their family, and were active members of the community. He served as a Boy Scout leader and mentored airmen at Mountain Home Air Force Base. Bernie and Realla also served as missionaries for the church.

Colonel Fisher truly lived the ideal of selfless service—risking his own life to save other lives. He inspired and encouraged others not only directly through his children, but also through the countless other servicemembers and Americans who have heard his

story and have had the thought of dedicated service awakened in them. Bernie embodied great leadership. He led by example. I join his family, including his sons and their families, which include 33 grandchildren and many great-grandchildren, and his numerous friends in mourning his passing. His legacy will endure.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMIE MIDDLEBROOK

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the extraordinary service and ultimate sacrifice of New Carlisle, IN, Assistant Fire Chief Jamie Middlebrook. Dedicated, loyal, and above all compassionate to those in need, Assistant Chief Middlebrook served with the New Carlisle Volunteer Fire Department for 22 years.

On Tuesday, August 5, 2014, Assistant Chief Middlebrook and firefighters from local fire departments battled a massive fire at an area business. While advancing a water hose inside the facility, the roof of the building collapsed on top of Middlebrook. Despite the best efforts of his fellow firefighters, EMTs, and medical personnel, Jamie Middlebrook, 41, succumbed to his injuries.

"He took me in, he taught me the right way to do things . . . He showed me how to be strong, be brave, and be there in somebody's time of need," said New Carlisle Fire Chief Josh Schweizer of Assistant Chief Middlebrook.

A native of South Bend, IN, Jamie Middlebrook lived in the nearby town of New Carlisle. As the son of a firefighter, Middlebrook learned the importance of serving his community at an early age, and he possessed a servant heart. In addition to Middlebrook's service with the New Carlisle Fire Department, he was the assistant chief of the New Carlisle EMS. Never shying from the responsibility of serving his community, Middlebrook continued to work full time with the New Carlisle EMS even after being diagnosed with cancer.

"He'd been a paramedic so long that many elderly people in town knew him. They would request him by name on medical calls," said his mother, Carol Middlebrook.

Assistant Fire Chief Middlebrook is survived and deeply missed by his wife Julie, parents Robert and Carol Middlebrook, brother Brook Middlebrook, as well as other relatives, friends, the New Carlisle Volunteer Fire Department, the New Carlisle EMS family, and Hoosiers across the State.

Assistant Fire Chief Jamie Middlebrook loved his work, and he gave his life in service and protection of the citizens of Indiana. Although he would have never thought of himself as a hero, Middlebrook demonstrated his character daily by conducting himself with courage, bravery, compassion, honor, and integrity. Thus, he was a

true American hero in his everyday life as an EMS worker, a firefighter, a husband, a son, and friend to so many—and in his final call to duty. Let us always remember and treasure the memory of this brave man and honor him for his selfless commitment to serving his fellow citizens. May God welcome him home and give comfort to his family and friends.●

TRIBUTE TO JACK ROSSI

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Jack Rossi, who is not only a truly remarkable West Virginian, but he is also one of my dearest friends and closest confidants. After tirelessly working his entire life, Jack has finally surrendered to a well-deserved retirement having stepped down as presiding member of West Virginia's largest accounting and consulting firm, Arnett Foster Toothman, and as chairman of the Charleston Area Alliance, a multi-faceted economic, business and community development organization. But these prominent titles just breach the tip of the iceberg since Jack's story is based on a lifetime of accomplishments and a lifetime of service that ceaselessly has helped our great State of West Virginia thrive and prosper.

A native of the small town of Coalton in Randolph County, WV, just a few counties away from my hometown area in Marion County, Jack learned at an early age the importance of hard work and embraced West Virginia's cultural practice of neighbors helping neighbors. As the son of an Italian coal miner who shared a roof with 13 siblings, Jack was no stranger to staying busy with chores and helping out around the neighborhood until he was old enough to work at Coalton's general store at the ripe age of 12. As he grew older and became intrigued by how to run a business, Jack watched the local accountant balance the store's numbers. Soon enough, Jack was finishing the accounting work himself until he set out to attain a higher education at West Virginia University, where it just so happened that our paths crossed.

I will never forget that day. I was hobbling down the hallway on crutches after I blew out my knee on the football field. Juggling books, bags and crutches on one leg, a fellow student approached me to offer assistance. His name was Jack. I will never forget his selfless act of kindness and how naturally it seemed for him to see a person in need and immediately want to help. But, as I learned quickly and throughout the years of a beautiful friendship, that is just who Jack is—amiable, loyal, and gracious.

We hear about lifetime achievers, but Jack is a lifetime giver. At every turn of the road, whether it be as a young boy, as an enthusiastic college student, a Vietnam veteran or as a professional,

Jack has devoted his time and his efforts to helping others and helping his surrounding communities. Jack's unwavering dedication to the Mountain State, accompanied by his innovative vision, inspirational spirit, and savvy aptitude, have helped countless West Virginians, their businesses and our communities statewide.

Because of his passion, discipline, and staunch work ethic, everyone who meets Jack immediately recognizes his aptitude for success and knows he will work day and night until the job is done. His loyalty, trustworthiness and dedication know no bounds.

Jack has not only played the roles of accomplished certified public accountant and savvy business and community developer, but he is a devoted volunteer who has always spent his free time joining organizations that impact our local communities. He has served as president of the Charleston Chapter of CPAs, the WV Society of CPAs and the WV Board of Accountancy. He has supported his profession through service on numerous committees on statewide and national levels.

Jack spends countless hours each year in service to West Virginia State government. He currently serves on the West Virginia Board of Treasury Investments and the West Virginia Racing Commission.

And of course, never forgetting his Mountaineer roots, Jack currently also serves on the Board of Directors of the West Virginia University Alumni Association as Immediate Past Chairman. He previously served 5 years as Treasurer and was heavily involved in the successful fundraising campaign to build a new Alumni Center at WVU.

Due to Jack's unwavering commitment to his community and the organizations in which he dedicated his time and energy toward year after year, he is also no stranger to receiving prestigious awards. To name a few, he has been the recipient of the State Journal's Who's Who award for making a difference in the business climate, the National Association of Athletic Development Directors 2009 "Volunteer of the Year" award for volunteering and fundraising for the WVU Mountaineer Athletic Club, the WVU Alumni "Most Loyal Mountaineer" award and the "Life Time Achievement" award, the highest honor given out to a West Virginia CPA by the West Virginia Society of CPAs.

Time and again, Jack has shown how greatly an individual can contribute to his community through passion, commitment and hard work.

Although Jack and his wife, Joy, temporarily left for a job opportunity in North Carolina right after college, they quickly returned to the place they call home and there has never been a doubt that Jack's roots are truly imbedded in the Mountain State. West Virginia is his home and I am forever grateful for his dedication to the state.

Jack's career and accomplishments are a testament to his hard work and commitment to the State of West Virginia. It is a privilege to know a man who has contributed so much of his life to strengthening our West Virginia communities. I am honored to call Jack my friend and I congratulate him on a long and happy retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO GABE GRIFFIN

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish today to honor a courageous young Alabamian Gabe Griffin. Gabe is a 9-year-old boy who lives with his family in Shelby County, AL.

Right now, Gabe lives like any other child, but that is expected to change soon. Without a cure, Gabe's doctors expect him to be in a wheelchair by the time he is 12 years old and lose his life around the age of 20. Gabe suffers from a fatal genetic mutation called Duchenne muscular dystrophy, DMD, which is caused by an absence of dystrophin, a protein that helps keep the body's muscles intact. The onset of this fatal disorder occurs during early childhood and causes generalized weakness and muscle wasting that increases over time. While medical advances have led to some very promising clinical trials, to date there is no cure and no one has survived. DMD affects approximately 1 in every 3,500 boys, which adds up to about 15,000 boys in America.

Symptoms usually appear in male children before age 6, and progressive proximal muscle weakness associated with a loss of muscle mass is observed first. This weakness eventually spreads to the arms, neck, and other areas, and most patients are wheelchair dependent by the age of 12.

Gabe can currently walk, breathe, and feed himself like any other child. Since his diagnosis, his family has been relentlessly striving to raise awareness and increase research funding for DMD. They play an active role in the fight against this devastating disease and are tireless in their efforts to find a cure.

Recently, a cross-country bicycle ride to raise awareness of DMD was completed. Wes Bates, a student at Indiana University; Michael Staley, chief of staff for U.S. Rep. BACHUS; and their support team rode 3,300 miles from Astoria, OR, on June 28 to Mobile, AL, on August 14. They worked to educate people across America about DMD, and the funds they raised will be used to raise awareness and advance current research.

Through his struggle, Gabe has continued to bring happiness and light to those around him. He is a wonderful and courageous boy. It is my honor to recognize Gabe Griffin and his family for their incredible efforts to defeat Duchenne muscular disorder. It is my hope that with their continued efforts, Gabe may live to see the cure of DMD.●

RECOGNIZING THE CANYON LAKE ALL STARS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Canyon Lake Little League all-star team for qualifying for the 68th Little League World Series in South Williamsport, PA.

The Canyon Lake Little League all-star team's journey to the World Series was drama filled. After a rough first two innings in the qualifying game, Canyon Lake scored six runs in the bottom of the third, capturing the lead and continued their rally into the fourth inning, where they scored another eight runs, defeating the Nebraska Little League team, 15 to 4. This final win in Indianapolis captured for the team the Midwest Regional title with an impressive 6-to-0 record. Previously, the Canyon Lake team gave equally impressive performances at the South Dakota/North Dakota district games, including a sixth inning comeback against Fargo to win 10 to 9 in the final. Once in Pennsylvania, the team rounded out their performance at the Little League World Series on a high note, as they captured South Dakota's first win at the world level. Canyon Lake defeated the Czech Republic 5 to 3 in the consolation round, ending their run on a high note.

Canyon Lake was led by manager Rich Hegre and assistant coaches Scott Spencer and Steve Richey. The athletes of the 2014 Canyon Lake all-star little league team, in alphabetical order, are as follows: Colton Hartford, Matthew Hegre, Jake Kostenbauer, Mason Litz, Logan Miller, Bridger Nesbit, Dylan Richey, Adam Salter, True Synhorst, Daniel Vigoren, Cooper Voorhees, and Blake Weaver.

I commend the players and coaches of the Canyon Lake all-star team for their efforts. These athletes should be incredibly proud of all their remarkable achievements. On behalf of the state of South Dakota, I am pleased to congratulate the Canyon Lake All-Stars on this impressive accomplishment.●

YELLOW RIBBON FUND FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a group of incredible individuals who are part of the Yellow Ribbon Fund Family Caregiver Program. The Yellow Ribbon Fund Family Caregiver Program is an outstanding organization that supports both wounded service members and veterans, and the extraordinary people who care for them. I would like to recognize the hard work, passion, and dedication of the following caregivers: Brian Vines, Sharon Roberts, Autumn Bailey, Margaret Jones, Stacey Kelley, Heather Miller, Dawna Barber, Helen Gooding, Kellene Cole, Alicia Lee, Joey Caswell, Vicki Boswell, Elizabeth Martin, Rose Haley and Jessica Allen.

The Yellow Ribbon Fund was founded in 2005, when several Washington-area business owners came together to help a mother struggling to take care of her son, a wounded Marine being treated in a hospital far from home.

These individuals have sacrificed much in order to care for their wounded loved ones, and their hard work often goes unnoticed and underappreciated. The Yellow Ribbon Fund Family Caregiver Program recognizes the challenges faced and sacrifices made by caregivers, and offers support programs, family-oriented activities, and retreats for caregivers and their families.

Our military men and women and their families serve and sacrifice for our country. I would like to thank the Yellow Ribbon Fund for the services they provide to our wounded veterans as well as the invaluable support they offer to caregivers.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 83. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2569. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Missisquoi River and the Trout River in the State of Vermont, as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 2866. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2996. An act to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes.

H.R. 3006. An act to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3044. An act to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi.

H.R. 3222. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of site associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3374. An act to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4119. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4771. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids.

H.R. 5108. An act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5205. An act to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

H.R. 4197. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2866. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3006. An act to authorize a land exchange involving the acquisition of private land adjacent to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in Arizona for inclusion in the refuge in exchange for certain Bureau of Land Management lands in Riverside County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3044. An act to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 3222. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of sites associated with the 1657 signing of the Flushing Remonstrance in Queens, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3374. An act to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4119. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4771. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5108. An act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5205. An act to authorize certain land conveyances involving public lands in northern Nevada to promote economic development and conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 16, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-324. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930, the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 69

Whereas, H.R. 3930 was introduced on January 27, 2014, and seeks to establish the National Commission on the Structure of the Army to undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army; and

Whereas, the focus of this study is to determine two factors, which include the proper force mixture of the active component and reserve component, and how the structure should be modified to best fulfill mission requirements in a manner that is consistent with available resources; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 also directs the commission to give careful consideration in evaluating a structure that meets current and anticipated requirements of combat commands, achieves a cost-efficient balance between the regular and reserve components with particular focus on fully burdened and lifestyle costs of Army personnel, and ensures that the regular and reserve components possess the capacity needed to support homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components could be recruited; maintains a peacetime rotation force to support operational tempo goals of a ratio of one to two for regular members and a ratio of one to five for members of the reserve components; and further maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further prohibits the use of any funds made available for the 2015 Fiscal Year for the Army to divest, retire, or transfer any aircraft of Army assigned units of the Army National Guard as of January 15, 2014, or to reduce personnel below the authorized and strength levels of three hundred fifty thousand members of the Army National Guard as of September 30, 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930,

which would, if enacted, be known as the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014, and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-325. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 28

Whereas, The magnitude 6.7 Northridge Earthquake in 1994 was the costliest natural disaster in the history of the State of California to date, with more than \$25 billion in property damage, and \$49 billion in economic losses to region and the state; and

Whereas, A major earthquake in the San Francisco Bay area or in southern California could have an even greater impact than Hurricane Katrina had in Louisiana and Mississippi; and

Whereas, Risk Management Solutions, Inc., estimated the potential cost of a repeat of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake at \$260 billion, and a magnitude 7.0 earthquake rupturing the southern and northern Hayward Fault between \$210 and \$235 billion; and

Whereas, The seven southern California counties that would be most affected by an earthquake on the southern San Andreas Fault are home to 621,000 businesses, 6.3 million employees, and an annual payroll of \$303.3 billion; and

Whereas, A magnitude 7.8 southern California earthquake modeled by the United States Geological Survey and the Southern California Earthquake Center at the University of Southern California in 2008 found that such an earthquake could cause more than \$213 billion in damage, and affect roughly 1 out of every 15 workers in the United States, and that the nationwide toll on unemployment and lost productivity could be severe; and

Whereas, Risks from flood and earthquake are generally not included in homeowners' insurance and must be purchased separately, but few homeowners purchase earthquake insurance for many reasons, including its high cost; and

Whereas, The National Flood Insurance Program makes federally backed flood insurance available to homeowners, renters, and business owners in exchange for state and community floodplain management regulations that reduce future flood damages; and

Whereas, Unlike flood insurance, there is no requirement at the federal or state level to obtain earthquake insurance for purposes of securing financing for real property located in high risk areas, leaving the mortgage industry, including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, effectively the insurer of last resort; and

Whereas, Under current federal law, earthquake insurance premiums that are collected and not used for claims arising within the year of collection are taxed and there is no ability to reserve profits or accumulate capital for future losses, leading to the need for higher premiums; and

Whereas, California Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer have introduced the Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act (EIAA) that would authorize a federal guarantee of limited postearthquake borrowing by actuarially sound state residential earthquake insurance programs; and

Whereas, The EIAA would lower the cost of earthquake insurance for homeowners who buy coverage from nonprofit, state earthquake insurance programs and direct funding to effective seismic-mitigation measures; and

Whereas, The EIAA would allow the California Earthquake Authority to sell postevent bonds in the private capital market, reducing the need to purchase reinsurance preevent and resulting in rate reductions and lower deductibles; and

Whereas, With more Californians insured, postevent disaster assistance would cost less to both the state and the federal government, and communities could recover more quickly; and

Whereas, A Congressional Budget Office analysis of a similar bill introduced in 2007 estimated that the cost to the federal government for loan guarantees and post disaster loans would be negligible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California jointly, That the Legislature memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the Earthquake Insurance Affordability Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-326. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 33

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, the intent of congress in enacting the GPO and the WEP provisions was to address concerns that a public employee who had worked primarily in federal, state, or local government employment might receive a public pension in addition to the same Social Security benefit as a worker who has worked only in employment covered by Social Security throughout his career; and

Whereas, congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though their spouses paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on hundreds of thousands of citizens and under-

mines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 614,644 individuals nationally were affected by the GPO; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 1,549,544 individuals nationally were affected by the WEP; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by GPO and WEP is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during this return to work can further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-327. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girls; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 138

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, three hundred twenty-nine girls were kidnapped from their school in Chibok, Nigeria, by dozens of gunmen who stormed the girls' dormitories while they were sleeping; and

Whereas, in a region where only four percent of girls complete secondary schooling, the kidnapped girls were the best and the brightest; looking forward to bright futures as global leaders, teachers, or lawyers; and

Whereas, the girls were abducted by a radical Islamic group called Boko Haram, which in English, means "Western education is sinful"; and

Whereas, on January 31, 2012, in testimony before United States Congress, the director of national intelligence, James Clapper, included Boko Haram in his worldwide threat assessment, stating, "There are also fears that Boko Haram, elements of which have engaged al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb, is interested in hitting Western targets, such as the United States Embassy and hotels frequented by Westerners"; and

Whereas, the United States has offered a seven million dollar bounty for the group's elusive leader, Abubakar Shekau; and

Whereas, the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group's large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against civilians, including women and children; and

Whereas, fifty-three girls were able to escape and have described their experiences as extremely distressing; and

Whereas, concern is growing about the safety of those who are still missing; and

Whereas, Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan has accepted offers from the United States of military personnel, law enforcement officials, and other experts; and

Whereas, Boko Haram's militant leader, Abubakar Shekau, released a video in which he expresses his abhorrence of Western education, saying that the girls should be married instead of being educated and further claims that he will sell the women as he has been commanded by Allah; and

Whereas, Abubakar Shekau referred to the girls as slaves and stated that he plans to kidnap more girls; and

Whereas, United Nations and the United States have both stressed an absolute prohibition against slavery and sexual slavery in international law, making these actions crimes against humanity; and

Whereas, the White House press secretary has said that appropriate action must be taken to locate and to free these young women before they are trafficked or killed; and

Whereas, Louisiana has taken a most aggressive stand to abolish and condemn slavery among women in Louisiana and worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girls; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-328. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of

Delaware memorializing a commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 37

Whereas, Taiwan and the United States are long-standing friends with a shared historical relationship and dearly cherished values of freedom, democracy, and human rights; and

Whereas, 2014 marks the 14th anniversary of the sister-state relationship between Delaware and Taiwan; and

Whereas, for the past 13 years, the sister-state relationship with Taiwan has been strengthened through the efforts of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO) resulting in better mutual understanding; and

Whereas, Taiwan is the world's eighteenth-largest economy and one of the key trading partners of the United States, with the two-way trade volume between the United States and Taiwan reaching sixty-three billion in 2013; and

Whereas, Taiwan is now a member of the U.S. Visa Waiver Program (effective November 1, 2012), reflecting the friendship, trust, and cooperation shared between our two countries and making travel between Taiwan and the United States for business and tourism even more convenient; and

Whereas, negotiations for a Bilateral Investment Agreement (BIA) between Taiwan and the United States are ongoing and are an important step towards strengthening bilateral trade and paving the way for entering into a Free Trade Agreement (FTA); and

Whereas, encouraging trade between the people of Delaware and the people of Taiwan helps to forge a closer relationship and is beneficial to both Delaware and Taiwan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 147th General Assembly of the State of Delaware that we hereby reaffirm our commitment to the strong and deepening relationship between Taiwan and Delaware; and be it further,

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate; and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

POM-329. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 95

Whereas, Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards established by federal regulation; and

Whereas, as our population ages and our veterans return home from overseas, there is a growing population who are unable to rise from the seated position without physical hands-on assistance from others, including strangers; and

Whereas, the need to require assistance from others to complete the task of rising from a seated position robs persons of their independence and dignity; and

Whereas, if seating accommodations were to be equipped with raised arms or parts from which a person could push when rising then this would eliminate the need for persons to obtain assistance from others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-330. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 122

Whereas, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act would allow Medicare to reimburse retail community pharmacies for delivery of diabetic testing supplies to Medicare recipients' homes; and

Whereas, seniors would be safe from entering hazardous circumstances, risking debilitating falls, or other comparable inconveniences to obtain diabetic testing supplies because of lack of supply delivery; and

Whereas, the cost of delivery of diabetic testing supplies may be equivalent regardless of whether they are delivered same-day by local pharmacies or through the mail; and

Whereas, the integrity of health care access to seniors in need of diabetic testing supply access would be increased; and

Whereas, in July 2013, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2013 was introduced as H.R. 2845 by United States Representative Peter Welch of Vermont; and

Whereas, in January 2014, Senator John Thune of South Dakota introduced the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2014 as S. 1935; and

Whereas, the percentage of people diagnosed with diabetes from 1980–2011 for those aged sixty-five to seventy-four years increased one hundred forty percent, and one hundred twenty-five percent for those age seventy-five years and older, and the overall prevalence of diagnosed diabetes has risen sharply among all groups for which data is available; and

Whereas, community pharmacies play a pivotal role in affordable and accessible health care within rural and other underserved communities by providing delivery services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-331. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana

memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 153

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, mental illness is defined as "health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired function"; and

Whereas, approximately sixty-one million five hundred thousand Americans experience mental illness in a given year; and

Whereas, approximately thirteen million six hundred thousand Americans live with a serious mental illness such as schizophrenia, major depression, or bipolar disorder; and

Whereas, more than eleven million Americans have severe schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression; and

Whereas, one-half of all chronic mental illness begins by the age of fourteen; and

Whereas, fewer than one-third of adults and one-half of children with a diagnosed mental disorder receive mental health services in a given year; and

Whereas, individuals living with mental health challenges and their families soon discover that the illness affects many aspects of their lives and that they need more than medical help; and

Whereas, many loved ones are left feeling hopeless in receiving effective and appropriate treatment for their family members who suffer from mental illness; and

Whereas, there is a need to better allocate current resources to focus on the most effective services and most severe mental illnesses; and

Whereas, it is prudent to promote stronger interagency coordination, increase data collection on treatment outcomes, and raise efforts to drive evidence-based care; and

Whereas, Congressman Tim Murphy of Pennsylvania has introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 as H.R. 3717; and

Whereas, the bill will create within the Department of Health and Human Services a new assistant secretary for mental health and substance-abuse disorders who would lead federal mental illness efforts, be responsible for promoting the medically oriented models of care adopted by the National Institute of Mental Health, and oversee the grant process while holding community centers accountable by ensuring they are meeting evidence-based standards; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would push states to efficiently allocate funds towards modernizing mental illness state laws and raise support for community mental health centers and hospital psychiatric care; and

Whereas, to address issues regarding the shortage of psychiatric professionals, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 would advance medical tools like telepsychiatry which links primary physicians in underserved areas to psychiatric professionals in order to decrease the average span of time between an initial episode of psychosis for a patient and his preliminary evaluation and treatment procedures; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would give physicians legal safe harbor to volunteer at understaffed mental health centers; and

Whereas, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 will adjust the federal privacy law known as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, by

allowing mental health professionals and families to share information about loved ones to promote more appropriate and effective treatment procedure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-332. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire expressing support for the right of residents of the District of Columbia to be fully represented in the Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 21

Whereas, over 600,000 citizens of the District of Columbia pay taxes to the federal government but are denied voting representation in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, over 194,000 citizens of the District of Columbia have fought in our armed forces in service to our nation; and

Whereas, the federal government has sent its armed forces, among them District of Columbia citizens, to fight on foreign soil in support and defense of democratic ideals while denying the residents of our own national capital the right of legislative representation; and

Whereas, those efforts to spread liberty and democracy to the far corners of the globe are undermined and diminished by the denial of democratic rights to over 600,000 citizens of the United States of America; and

Whereas, 9 service members from the District of Columbia have lost their lives in the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

Whereas, the United States is the only nation in the world with a representative, democratic constitution that denies voting representation in the national legislature to the citizens of the capital; and

Whereas, the District of Columbia is the only political and geographical entity within the United States whose citizens bear the full responsibilities of citizenship without sharing in the appropriate privileges of citizenship; and

Whereas, the New Hampshire house of representatives is a shining example of representational democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives, That the New Hampshire house of representatives declares its support for the right of residents of the District of Columbia to be fully represented in the Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the house of 41 representatives, be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States of America, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia and to each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

POM-333. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota rel-

ative to their ratification of the Twenty-Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas, on March 10, 1971, the Senate voted 94-0 in favor of proposing a Constitutional amendment to guarantee that the voting age could not be higher than eighteen; and

Whereas, on March 23, 1971, the House of Representatives voted 401-19 in favor of the proposed Constitutional amendment; and

Whereas, forty-two of the fifty states have ratified the 26th amendment to the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, both Houses of the Ninety-Second Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America as follows:

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens eighteen years of age or older.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE . . .

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Eighty-Ninth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the 26th Amendment of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; and be it further,

Resolved, That certified copies of this Joint Resolution be forwarded by a I the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to the Archivist of the United States.

POM-334. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to make any murder of a police officer or corrections officer while in the line of duty a federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 123

Whereas, Michigan law enforcement and corrections officers are highly-trained and courageous individuals, often finding themselves in dangerous situations in order to enforce and maintain the laws of the state and to protect the residents of Michigan; and

Whereas, The killing of a federal law enforcement or corrections officer is a federal offense. However, the killing of a state law enforcement or corrections officer is only considered a federal offense if the officer was working with federal agents in furtherance of a federal investigation. In addition, certain circumstances can elevate a state crime to a federal crime; and

Whereas, There should be a consistent national policy to protect our law enforcement and corrections officers. Law enforcement is a necessary and vital function of our government at all levels. All U.S. citizens rely on federal and state law enforcement and corrections officers to keep us safe in our home states and all states throughout the nation. Creating a uniform penalty for the crime of taking the life of a law enforcement or corrections officer while on duty will underscore the importance of all peace officers nationwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to make any murder of a police officer or corrections officer while in the line of duty a federal offense; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-335. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland relative to their ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Whereas, The 17th Amendment to the United States Constitution provides for the direct election of Senators of a state to the United States Congress rather than for their election or appointment by a state legislature; and

Whereas, The 17th Amendment passed the United States Senate on June 12, 1911, and then passed the United States House of Representatives on May 13, 1912; and

Whereas, The 17th Amendment thereafter was ratified to become part of the United States Constitution when on April 8, 1913, Connecticut became the 36th state to ratify its adoption, thereby satisfying the requirement of the United States Constitution that any proposed constitutional amendment be approved by at least three-fourths of the states; and

Whereas, Following its formal ratification, the 17th Amendment subsequently also was ratified by Louisiana on June 11, 1913, and Delaware on June 25, 2010; and

Whereas, By its vote on February 26, 1913, Utah was the only state to reject the 17th Amendment (although the Florida legislature, which also took up the amendment, failed to complete action as the amendment never reached the Florida Senate); and

Whereas, The General Assembly of Maryland has not taken action to either ratify or reject the 17th Amendment to be part of the United States Constitution, the State of Maryland now wishes formally to record its support for and also ratify the amendment, viz:

"ARTICLE

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of each State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the

vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the foregoing amendment to the United States Constitution is ratified by the State of Maryland to all intents and purposes as a part of the United States Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward authentic copies of this Resolution, under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, to: the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State of the United States, 2201 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20520; the Honorable Harry Reid, Majority Leader, United States Senate, 528 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510; the Honorable John Boehner, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, 1011 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515; and the Honorable Martha N. Johnson, Acting Administrator of General Services of the United States, 1800 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20405.

POM-336. A Senate joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland rescinding Maryland's ratification of the Corwin Amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Whereas, On February 27, 1861, in an attempt to avert the secession of Southern states, United States Representative Thomas Corwin of Ohio proposed an amendment to the United States Constitution that would prohibit the United States Constitution from being amended in a manner that authorizes Congress to abolish or interfere with the states' domestic institutions, including slavery; and

Whereas, On March 2, 1861, the Corwin Amendment passed the United States Congress and was submitted to the states for ratification; and

Whereas, With the enactment of Chapter 21 of the Acts of 1862, the General Assembly of Maryland ratified the Corwin Amendment; and

Whereas, The Corwin Amendment has not been ratified by three-fourths of the states and, therefore, is not part of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, With the end of the Civil War and the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution, the purposes of the Corwin Amendment have become moot: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the State of Maryland rescinds its ratification of the Corwin Amendment to the United States Constitution, viz:

"ARTICLE

No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State," and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward authentic copies of this Resolution, under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, to: the Honorable Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Vice President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, Suite S-212, United States

Capitol Building, Washington, DC 20510; the Honorable Harry Reid, Majority Leader, United States Senate, 528 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510; the Honorable John Boehner, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, 1011 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515; and the Honorable David S. Ferriero, Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, 709 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20408.

POM-337. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland relative to their ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Whereas, The 17th Amendment to the United States Constitution provides for the direct election of Senators of a state to the United States Congress rather than for their election or appointment by a state legislature;

Whereas, The 17th Amendment passed the United States Senate on June 12, 1911, and then passed the United States House of Representatives on May 13, 1912; and

Whereas, The 17th Amendment thereafter was ratified to become part of the United States Constitution when on April 8, 1913, Connecticut became the 36th state to ratify its adoption, thereby satisfying the requirement of the United States Constitution that any proposed constitutional amendment be approved by at least three-fourths of the states; and

Whereas, Following its formal ratification, the 17th Amendment subsequently also was ratified by Louisiana on June 11, 1913, and Delaware on June 25, 2010; and

Whereas, By its vote on February 26, 1913, Utah was the only state to reject the 17th Amendment (although the Florida legislature, which also took up the amendment, failed to complete action as the amendment never reached the Florida Senate); and

Whereas, The General Assembly of Maryland has not taken action to either ratify or reject the 17th Amendment to be part of the United States Constitution, the State of Maryland now wishes formally to record its support for and also ratify the amendment, viz:

"ARTICLE

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of each State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the foregoing amendment to the United States Constitution is ratified by the State of Maryland to all intents and purposes as a part of the United States Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward authentic

copies of this Resolution, under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, to: the Honorable Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State of the United States, 2201 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520; the Honorable Harry Reid, Majority Leader, United States Senate, 528 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; the Honorable John Boehner, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, 1011 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; and the Honorable Martha N. Johnson, Acting Administrator of General Services of the United States, 1800 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20405.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2061. A bill to prevent conflicts of interest relating to contractors providing background investigation fieldwork services and investigative support services (Rept. No. 113-257).

S. 1898. A bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2651. A bill to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Gustave F. Perna, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Kathleen M. Creighton, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Todd J. Squire, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Brian B. Brown and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Brett C. Heimburger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Steven L. Kwast, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Scott G. Perry, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Joseph J. Heck, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark S. Inch, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Philip S. Davidson, to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Dixon R. Smith, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Tod D. Wolters, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Veralinn Jamieson, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John W. Nicholson, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul M. Benenati, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael A. Calhoun, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Bret D. Daugherty, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Raul E. Escribano and ending with Colonel Jeffrey L. Milhorn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2014.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Lisa L. Adams, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Richard D. Mink, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with David L. Allison and ending with Kwani D. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Stephen R. Abrams and ending with G010257, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Isaiah C. Abbott and ending with D012187, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Jason K. Abbott and ending with D012084, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nomination of Claudia D. Henderson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jesse Abreu and ending with D011533, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Army nomination of Sun S. Macupa, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Brian S. Adams and ending with G010266, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Clark C. K. Adams II and ending with G010269, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Herbert J. Brock IV and ending with Gregory S. Phipps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Syed Ahmed and ending with Amy Zingalis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Bradley Aebi and ending with Kevyn Wetzel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2014.

Navy nomination of Edward J. Eder, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of William A. Burns, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Kevin L. Bell, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Clayton M. Pendergrass, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Casey D. Ferguson and ending with Anthony K. Tobias, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Crystal R. Aandahl and ending with Lina M. Yecpot, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Cynthia N. Abella and ending with Yu Zheng, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher A. Adams and ending with Marlin Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jesse D. Adams and ending with Nicholas B. Stampfli, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jon A. Angle and ending with Khalid J. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Todd A. Anderson and ending with Shevonne K. Wells, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Austin G. Aldridge and ending with Nathan T. Woodward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Alwin L. Albert and ending with Jack M. Zuckerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Navy nomination of Gregory E. Oxford, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Benjamin I. Abney, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Joel N. Peterson, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory C. Cathcart and ending with Michael D. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2014.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 2812. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2813. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a

national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2814. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2815. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the term of marketing assistance loans in cases in which a purchaser has bought the loan commodity subject to the loan and declared bankruptcy prior to paying for the loan commodity; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the specific exemption for professional football leagues and to provide a special rule for other professional sports leagues, and to provide an additional authorization of appropriations for the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2817. A bill to assign the Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis of the Federal Communications Commission the responsibility of bringing institutional focus to the important function of approving new technologies and improving regulatory certainty at the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2818. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MARKKEY):

S. 2819. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2820. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain Federal land in Garden Valley, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2821. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide a grant to assist Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2822. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on matters relating to the burial of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2823. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or

maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2824. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to promote sustainable conservation and management for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries and the communities that rely on them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2825. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to treat as dispensing the delivery of a controlled substance by a pharmacy to a practitioner, pursuant to a patient-specific prescription of the practitioner, under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2826. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2827. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude Federal student aid from taxable gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2828. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2829. A bill to require certain financial regulators to determine whether new regulations or orders are duplicative or inconsistent with existing Federal regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2830. A bill to permanently reauthorize the special diabetes programs for Indians; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2831. A bill to direct the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate United States development programs and private sector investment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2832. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 546. A resolution congratulating Indonesia's President-elect Joko Widodo on his electoral victory and commending the people of Indonesia on their commitment to democracy and free and fair elections; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 547. A resolution designating the week beginning September 14, 2014, as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. RISC, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HAGAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. KING, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 548. A resolution designating November 29, 2014, as "Small Business Saturday" and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 549. A resolution designating October 26, 2014, as Day of the Deployed; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 550. A resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of "The Star-Spangled Banner"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal distributions for medicine qualified only if for prescribed drug or insulin.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide greater flexibility in offering health insurance coverage across State lines.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2210, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 2348

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 2481

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2481, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide authority for sole source contracts for certain small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program.

S. 2527

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2527, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2543

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2543, a bill to support afterschool and out-of-school-time science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2599

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Mi-

gratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2746

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2746, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 2782

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2782, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to improve the Federal charter for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2793

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2793, a bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson.

S. 2796

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2796, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income protection allowances.

S. 2802

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2802, a bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education.

S. 2809

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2809, a bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to obtain a court order to garnish wages to pay a nontax debt.

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 541, a resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic.

S. RES. 543

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 543, a resolution designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2813. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the National Prostate Cancer Council Act with my colleague, Senator SESSIONS. This bipartisan legislation addresses the urgent need for a national strategy for the accelerated creation, advancement, and testing of diagnostic tools to be used in the fight against prostate cancer.

Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer in the United States, and the second-leading cause of cancer-

related death in men. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 2014, 233,000 new cases of prostate cancer will be diagnosed and almost 30,000 men will die from the disease.

Early detection of prostate cancer saves lives. Unfortunately, current screening techniques result in numerous false-negatives, leaving men at risk to wrongly believe they are cancer-free, and false-positive alarms, which often lead to painful, costly, and unnecessary procedures. In addition, the prostate is one of the few organs in the human body where biopsies are performed blindly, which can miss cancer even when multiple samples are taken.

The National Prostate Cancer Council Act mirrors the commitment the Federal government has made to fight Alzheimer's disease under the National Alzheimer's Project Act, which was signed into law in 2011. Similarly, this bill will bring together federal agencies, medical and scientific experts, advocacy organizations, and patient survivors to create a clear national plan for achieving the ultimate goal developing reliable tests that can detect prostate cancer and diagnose its severity.

The National Prostate Cancer Council will evaluate our current efforts across all Federal agencies, and it will coordinate those efforts to be more effective. Congress and the Department of Health and Human Services will receive a report from the Council each year detailing the progress made toward fulfilling the national plan.

A national strategy and commitment can be the key to diagnosing prostate cancer earlier and more accurately. It will help us identify the best use of our resources and focus on the most pressing needs, ultimately saving lives and reducing unnecessary procedures. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this effort, and to cosponsor this legislation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2814. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am introducing the NLRB Reform Act with Senator MCCONNELL. Our legislation is very simple. It will change the NLRB from an advocate to an umpire. That is the role the National Labor Relations Board was always supposed to have. The Board was created 79 years ago to act as an impartial umpire in labor disputes that threaten the free flow of commerce. The Board's decisions affect millions of private sector workers. But over time the Board has become an advocate for

one interest group or the other, changing positions with each new administration.

There are three significant problems the Board faces today:

No. 1, the biggest problem is partisan advocacy. Today the majority of the five-member Board is made up of appointees who follow President Obama's political leanings. President Obama has appointed three labor union leaders to the Board.

No. 2, the Board also has a free-wheeling advocate for its general counsel. The Board's most recent general counsels have been exceeding their statutory authority and bringing questionable cases that threaten American jobs and threaten sending overseas manufacturing jobs that we need to keep here.

No. 3, the National Labor Relations Board has been slow to resolve disputes. Last year 109 cases—that is 30 percent of the Board's caseload—were pending for more than a year.

Occasionally someone will say to me: If Republicans were to win the Senate, what would Republicans do?

What we would do is try to come up with sensible proposals that lead us in the right direction, proposals that have so much commonsense that they attract the support of enough Democrats and the House of Representatives and the President to become law. This is one such proposal.

Our bill provides three solutions to the problems I identified:

No. 1, it would end partisan advocacy on the National Labor Relations Board. The Board would become a six-member board of three Republicans and three Democrats, and a required majority of four will force both sides to find a middle ground.

No. 2, it reins in the general counsel. Businesses and unions would be able to challenge complaints filed by the general counsel by taking them to the Federal district court, and they will have greater transparency about the basis and legal reasoning for the charges brought by the general counsel.

No. 3, our legislation would encourage timely decisions. First, either party in a case before the Board may appeal to a Federal court of appeals if the Board fails to reach a decision in 1 year. Second, funding for the entire NLRB would be reduced by 20 percent if the Board is not able to decide 90 percent of its cases within 1 year over the first 2-year period following reform.

Our bill would offer these solutions without taking away one single right, one single remedy from any employee, business, or union.

With each new administration, the pendulum at the NLRB has swung further from the middle, further away from being an umpire. The result is that labor policy whipsaws back and forth, taking employees and employers

for a wild ride. This has happened under most administrations, but it has been worse under the current administration. The minority leader mentioned several of those examples.

Under the partisan advocacy of today's National Labor Relations Board, workers are losing their right to privacy. The Board is embarking on a regulatory effort to expand requirements that employers give employees' names and addresses to union organizers. The Board wants more personal information about these employees to be given to the organizing union, including telephone numbers, email addresses, the employee's work location, the employee's shift, the job classifications. They propose doing everything but attaching a GPS to the lapel of each employee.

In my State of Tennessee, for example, we have had an ongoing organizing effort in the Volkswagen plant in Chattanooga. In a secret ballot election last February, employees at the Volkswagen plant said: We don't want a union; we don't need a union. So 712 to 626 they rejected the United Auto Workers' bid to unionize the plant. Imagine if you were one of those 712 employees who voted against unionizing. Now organizers can get your private email address and all of this other personal information.

Here is another example. Factions of employees within single stores now have a path to forming their own unions. In 2011 the Board suddenly adopted a new way to define what makes a local union bargaining unit. The Board changed the law so that any group of employees with an overwhelming community of interest could become a bargaining unit and therefore a union. At the same time, the Board is moving a regulation to limit the employer's ability to question which employees should be in a bargaining unit. This allows a union to cherry-pick employees who will be most likely to support forming a union.

How has this worked in the real world? Here is an example. The Board just approved a bargaining unit for cosmetic and fragrance employees in a Macy's department store—not the shoe salespeople, not the lady's fashion employees, not the junior's department, just cosmetic and fragrance. Imagine if every department of Macy's decided to form a union. The employer would have dozens of different groups to negotiate with, and the different unions would be fighting each other over who got the better raises and break rooms in terms of employment.

During this administration the NLRB has ruled that common employment policies are unfair labor practices, such as—and Senator SCOTT brought this up at a hearing the other day—the NLRB has said that an employer may not have a policy that requires employees to be courteous to customers and fellow employees, or

prohibiting employees from making negative comments about the business that employs them on social media or selecting arbitration for employment disputes.

Our solution: Senator McCONNELL and I would solve this by requiring a six-member board of three Republicans and three Democrats. Like the Federal Election Commission, a majority of four will require both sides to find a middle ground.

Here is the second problem. The Board's general counsel is acting like a freewheeling advocate, stretching labor law to its limits and sometimes beyond its limits. For example, in 2011 the general counsel moved to stop Boeing from building new airplanes at a nonunion plant in South Carolina. The general counsel to the NLRB jeopardized a \$1 billion factory and hundreds of jobs with this move, but even worse, he tried to make the case that a unionized American company can't expand its operations into one of the 24 States, such as Tennessee, with right-to-work laws which protect a worker's right to join or not to join a union. The general counsel eventually withdrew this outrageous complaint against Boeing, but if it had set a precedent, jobs would have fled overseas as manufacturers look to find a competitive environment in which to make and sell cars around the world.

We want to make sure manufacturers such as Boeing, Nissan, and General Motors can have a competitive environment in the United States in which they can make airplanes and cars and other goods and sell them around the world. We do not want them making them in Mexico or Japan or Europe or somewhere else because we have undermined right-to-work laws. Our solution would allow employers and unions to challenge complaints filed against them by the general counsel in Federal court and give employers and unions new rights to learn the basis and legal reasoning of charges filed against them by the general counsel.

Finally, the NLRB is taking too long to resolve cases. For example, one case has been pending at the Board for more than 7 years. The case involves the question of whether an employer has to allow labor union organizers access to private property.

Our solution—Senator McCONNELL and I encourage a timely resolution of cases, first, by allowing either party to appeal to a Federal court of appeals for a *de novo*, or fresh, review if the Board fails to reach a decision on the case within 1 year. To further incentivize timely resolution, we include the threat of a 20-percent budget cut with the Board if 90 percent of the cases are not decided within a year.

In conclusion, while the increasing partisanship of the Board has appeared in Republican administrations as well as Democratic administrations, it has

reached a climax in this administration. Three of this President's recent nominees came from major labor unions' leadership. One law professor at a major university said she can't use the most recent labor law textbook. The decisions changing the law are coming out so rapidly and the NLRB is venturing into new territory with these efforts at rulemaking. This is no way to maintain a national labor law policy.

Our plan, the NLRB Reform Act, will, first, end partisan advocacy; second, rein in the general counsel; third, it will encourage timely decisions. Our bill would offer these solutions without taking away one right or one remedy from one employee, one business, or one union. I hope my colleagues will carefully review this proposal and consider cosponsoring the NLRB Reform Act.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 2817. A bill to assign the Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis of the Federal Communications Commission the responsibility of bringing institutional focus to the important function of approving new technologies and improving regulatory certainty at the Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I introduced the Helping Innovation and Revitalizing Innovation Act. It is a Federal Communications Commission, FCC, process reform idea called the HIRE Act. This measure seeks to make the FCC more efficient and accountable in processing new technology applications.

Section 7 of the Communications Act requires the FCC to review new technologies and determine whether or not approval is in the public interest within one year of application—a deadline Congress imposed on the FCC in 1982. Part of Section 7 reads, "The Commission shall determine whether any new technology or service proposed in a petition or application is in the public interest within one year after such petition or application is filed."

The HIRE Act would complement Section 7. Specifically, it would: require the FCC Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis to help facilitate attention and response to pending technology applications and licenses and it would require the FCC to report to Congress any time it fails to comply with the 1-year deadline for review of such applications.

Right now when the FCC misses its 1 year deadline nothing happens. The notification clause in this bill would provide a backstop for the FCC to enhance regulatory certainty for innovators and consumers alike.

Specifically, the HIRE Act would bring institutional focus to the important function of approving new tech-

nologies. FCC delays stall new opportunities for investment and job creation that are critical at this time in our Nation's history. FCC delays also deprive consumers from the benefits of accessing new technologies at lower prices.

The senior Republican Commissioner at the FCC, Ajit Pai, has identified assisting new technology applications as a high priority. In a July 18, 2012, speech at Carnegie Mellon University, he said, "Bureaucratic inertia should not be a barrier to the deployment of new services or capital investment. Rather, the Commission should facilitate economic growth and job creation by making decisions in a timely manner . . . Entrepreneurs need an advocate at the FCC—one that will hold us accountable if we delay, rather than decide." Additionally, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, IEEE, has encouraged the FCC improve its decision-making process for spectrum management.

The HIRE Act is about improving the FCC's decision-making process and supporting job creation. It is a small, common-sense reform that increases government efficiency without increasing spending. I look forward to working with consumers, businesses, and those in the Federal Government who want to make our government more effective, efficient, and responsive. The HIRE Act is one proposal that would do that, and I welcome a conversation with others about this important issue.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2820. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain Federal land in Garden Valley, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Garden Valley Withdrawal Act".

SEC. 2. GARDEN VALLEY, NEVADA, WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the approximately 805,100 acres of Federal land generally depicted on the map entitled "Garden Valley Withdrawal Area" and dated July 11, 2014, is withdrawn from—

- (1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2823. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural

gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to present the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation that I think is very important to helping our country build the infrastructure we need to truly become energy independent or energy self-sufficient—energy secure, if you will.

This is bipartisan legislation. It is legislation that has already passed the House. It was sponsored in the House by Representative FRED UPTON, who is the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. It was cosponsored on the Democratic side by GENE GREEN, a Congressman from Texas. I have bipartisan sponsors for this legislation in the Senate as well—on the Republican side, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, who is the ranking member on the energy committee; and then I have two other members of the energy committee who are Democrats cosponsoring this legislation as well, Senator JOE DONNELLY from Indiana and Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia. Certainly Senator MANCHIN is recognized as one of the leaders in the Senate on important energy issues. I am very appreciative of having him join me on this legislation as well. I am introducing this legislation now.

This is the sixth anniversary of the application by TransCanada for a permit to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. They applied for approval of a pipeline project—the Keystone XL Pipeline project—6 years ago as of Friday of this week. Can you imagine that? Americans fought and won World War II in less time than this application has been pending before the President of the United States, yet still no decision from this administration after 6 years.

This is vital infrastructure we need to truly make this country energy secure. Working with Canada, we can truly produce more energy than we consume and make our country energy secure, but we cannot do it without the necessary infrastructure—the roads, the pipelines, the rail, the transmission lines—the energy infrastructure we need to get energy from where it is produced, places such as my State of North Dakota, which is now the second largest producer of oil in this country, second only to Texas. We produce more than 1 million barrels a day of oil, but we have to get it to market. It is getting loaded and overloaded on rail. We have tremendous congestion on rail. Our farmers cannot get their ag products to market anymore because we have so much congestion on the rail. Yet here we have an application that

has been held for 6 years by the President of the United States without a decision. That is after last year when he came to the Republican caucus and told us point blank that he would have a decision before the end of 2013. No decision. Here we are in 2014, the sixth anniversary.

Well, look, we cannot continue to have that problem.

We have to find a way to build this infrastructure. Even though we are working on Keystone on a separate track—and I believe we will have the votes next year to pass it. We will have the 60 votes in the Senate we need to pass it. We are at 57 right now. We are very close. I think by next year we will have those 60 votes to pass Keystone, and we will work to do that and attach it to legislation the President will not veto. So we will continue to work on Keystone on that track, but at the same time we have to avoid this problem in the future with oil pipelines, with gas pipelines, and with transmission lines.

We have to be able to build that infrastructure not only in this country, but we have to be able to cross the border with Canada. Canada is a huge producer of energy. So working together, we have this incredible opportunity if we can build the infrastructure to do it. It is not just for fossil fuels. It is not just for oil. It is not just for gas. It is for renewables as well. Canada produces an incredible amount of hydro, which, of course, is electricity. We need transmission lines to bring that renewable hydro across the border.

So this is about all forms of energy, and this is about working with our closest friend and ally to truly address that energy issue. It is a job-creation issue. It is a national security issue.

What does this legislation do, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act? What it does is it expedites, streamlines the approval process for cross-border construction of oil pipelines, gas pipelines, and electric transmission lines.

How does it work? First, oil pipelines. Right now, a Presidential national interest determination is needed for approval or authority to build an oil pipeline across the Canadian border. Of course, that is the problem we see with Keystone. That has been held up now for 6 years. So this changes that process for future projects. As I said, it has already passed the House overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly. I think it had pretty much all of the Republican votes and I think more than 50 votes on the Democratic side. They had very strong bipartisan support in the House.

What it does is it changes that approval process for crossing the border with an oil pipeline, moving it to the State Department. So the State Department will make that determination approving a cross-border transfer.

It will still be subject to the NEPA process. You will still have to do an environmental impact statement. But the focus of that EIS—environmental impact statement—or the NEPA process, will be on the border section, not on the entire length of the project throughout all the States that pipeline may cross. It will focus on the border section. And the State Department has to come up with reasonable rules to determine what that distance is that constitutes crossing the border with Canada.

Then the rest of the NEPA process will continue just as it does today for any other project that does not come across the border. Right now States have their jurisdiction in some cases and the Federal Government has its jurisdiction in some cases, depending on whether it is private land or it is public land or Federal land. Maybe it is a body of water. Whatever. So the NEPA process continues as before, driven by the States or the Federal Government depending on what particular part of the country or the type of land or the body of water you are crossing.

I think that is why it garnered such strong bipartisan support. We continue that process and those protections, but we do not allow the determination on the cross-border process or the cross-border piece to be held up by all of the NEPA process and all of the sitings that may be covered in all the respective States that pipeline crosses. Those processes are already in place. Do not use crossing the border as an excuse to tie up all these other processes and basically usurp the authority of the States that are affected by that project.

I think it is a very reasonable process, and it is one that I think we should be able to come together on in a bipartisan way to say: It is open. It is fair. That is why we have bipartisan support in the sponsorship—Senator DONNELLY, Senator MANCHIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, myself, all people who work on energy—because we have struck that balance. It is about creating a good business climate that will encourage that investment to create the infrastructure we need to move the energy from where it is produced to where it is consumed in the safest way possible—in the most economic way possible.

That is what it is about, the best environmental stewardship. Isn't that what we all want? Obviously it is. But if we don't do this, where are we? Well, right now we are waiting 6 years for a determination on the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Here is another example I will give, the Bakken North pipeline, a pipeline that goes from North Dakota to Cushing, and they have been waiting for 1½ years on an ownership name change from the Department of State, 1½ years to change the name. Really?

Does that make sense to anybody? If it takes that long for something that simple, what do we do when we actually need to build this infrastructure that is so important to the energy future of our country?

What about gas pipelines? Gas pipelines will be covered by FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. What we say is: Look, they will go through the NEPA process too. Just as we describe with the Department of State on an oil pipeline, they will take that cross-border piece and do the same thing, do a NEPA process so you have an environmental impact statement and cover all the bases. But then 30 days after, they have to make a decision. They can't just sit on it, and the rest of the NEPA process continues as we described on an oil pipeline. Again, very simple, very straightforward, and it comports with the free trade agreements we have with Canada and with Mexico.

On the third piece, electric transmission lines, that process will be overseen by the Department of Energy. We simply streamline the process. Right now there are two permits required, one that is driven by the administration, one that is congressionally driven. We combine those and make it one process; again, cover all the bases, as I have described, with an oil pipeline or a gas pipeline, but we make it one process instead of a duplicative process.

When we look at what is going on in the world today, we see why this legislation is so important. Look at ISIL. Look at ISIL in the Middle East and what is happening there. We are right now confronting how we need to address this very significant challenge, how we need to work with allies in the region to take out ISIL. Do we really want to continue to be dependent on oil from the Middle East? I think we could ask every single American that question and the answer would be a resounding no. There is no way we want to have to get oil from the Middle East. But we still are today. Yet we can produce more oil and gas in this country, particularly with Canada, than we can consume.

Why would we continue to want to be dependent on the Middle East or Venezuela or any other place that is antagonistic or hostile toward our interests? We don't. This is a national security issue. It is an energy issue. It is a job creation issue. It is an economic growth issue. And it is for darned sure a national security issue. Which is why every time we ask the public about it, more than two-thirds say: Yes, build that infrastructure. Build that Keystone Pipeline. Let's work with Canada, our closest friend and ally in the world, to get our energy.

Look what is going on in Europe. Look what is going on with Russia and Ukraine. Look at the situation a coun-

try such as Ukraine or the European Union is in because of Russian aggression. Where do they get their energy? Where does Ukraine get its energy? Where does the European Union get their energy? They get a third or more—from Russia. Russia, the same country that is invading Ukraine, the same country occupying Crimea and the eastern part of Ukraine.

Then when we try to get the European Union to join with us to push back, what do they say? Geez, I don't know. We can't, because Russia is going to cut off the gas and it is fall and it is getting colder.

Does that make sense to anybody? Is that the situation we want to be in? I think it is pretty compelling. Do we want to be in a situation where we have to try to get oil out of the Middle East with ISIL over there operating the way they are? I don't think so.

These issues are all interrelated, and they are not short-term issues. We can't start building that infrastructure today and have it done tomorrow. These are billion-dollar investments. They don't cost the government a single penny, but they are billion-dollar investments that private enterprise is willing to make and put people to work, provide that energy more safely, more securely, with better environmental stewardship, and address our national security challenges. That type of energy plan is a long-term plan for this country, and it is one we need to start now.

For six years we have been waiting for a decision from the President on a multibillion dollar pipeline project that will not only bring oil from Canada to the United States but will move 100,000 barrels a day of oil from my home State to refineries in this country, that by the State Department's own admission will create more than 40,000 jobs, that will create hundreds of millions in tax revenue, that will help us create energy security for our country, that will allow us to work with our closest friend and ally, Canada, rather than telling them: No, we are not going to work with you. Send that oil to China. It is something the American people overwhelmingly want by about 70 percent in most of the polls that I guess is being held up by special interest groups.

This is about how we run this country. This is about who we work for. This is about having a long-term plan to build the kind of energy future for America that I believe the American people very much want.

Let's go to work and pass this bipartisan legislation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2832. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if you talk to the people in Vermont, and I suspect in any other State in America, they will say the most serious crisis facing this country is the lack of decent-paying jobs, particularly when it comes to young Americans. This is an issue we do not talk enough about, and this is an issue on which we have to focus.

Yes, we are better off today than we were 6 years ago when we were hemorrhaging 700,000 jobs a month and the Nation's financial system was on the verge of collapse, but the truth is that the economy for working families and lower income families today remains in very difficult straits. The middle class of this country—the backbone of this country—continues to disappear and more and more people are living in poverty. In fact, we have almost more people living in poverty today than at any time in the history of this country, and all the while we are seeing more wealth and income inequality, such that 95 percent of all new income generated in America since the Wall Street crash is going to the top 1 percent.

The fact is that real unemployment in this country is not the "official" 6.1 percent we see on the front pages of newspapers. The truth is that if you count those people who have given up looking for work because they live in high-unemployment areas or the people—and there are many of these—who are working part time when they want to work full time, real unemployment is 12 percent. That is a crisis situation.

As bad as that is, the unemployment rate is far worse for young Americans. Today the youth unemployment rate is 20 percent—20 percent. We all paid a lot of attention to the tragedy in Ferguson, MO, a few weeks ago, but what was not discussed is that African-American youth unemployment is 33 percent, and in many areas of the country it is even higher than that. Today over 5.5 million young people have either dropped out of high school or have graduated high school. And do you know what they are doing? Nothing. They have no jobs. Many of them in Vermont and throughout this country are hanging out on street corners and many of them are getting into trouble. Maybe they are doing drugs, maybe they are involved in crime, but this I will tell you, and the statistics are very clear on this: If you leave school—either you drop out or you graduate high school—and you don't get a job in your first year, you don't get a job in your second year, you don't get a job in your third year, there is a strong likelihood you will never get a job, never get a career, never make it to the middle class, never be part of mainstream America.

Youth unemployment at 20 percent is clearly one of the reasons why in the United States of America we have more

people in jail today than any other country on Earth. A lot of people don't know that. China's a great big country, a Communist authoritarian country. Doesn't China have more people in jail than we do? No. We have more people in jail than China.

I think the time is long overdue for us to start investing in our young people, helping them get the jobs they need, helping them get the education they need, helping them get the job training they need so they can be part of our economy, part of the middle class, and not end up in jail or dead from overdoses of drugs. The situation is so dire that there are studies out there that tell us now that one out of every three African-American males born today, if we do not change this, will go to prison in his lifetime—one out of three. This is a crisis situation, and it is one that cannot be ignored.

The legislation I have introduced today, along with Congressman JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, is called the Employ Young Americans Now Act. This legislation will provide \$5.5 billion in immediate funding to States and localities throughout the country to employ 1 million young Americans between the ages of 16 and 24 and provide job training to hundreds of thousands of other young Americans. Under our bill the U.S. Department of Labor would provide \$4 billion in grants to States and local governments to provide summer jobs and year-round employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth, with direct links to academic and occupational learning. There is another \$1.5 billion in there to provide such services as transportation or childcare, which would be necessary to enable young Americans to participate in job opportunities.

I am very grateful this legislation has already been endorsed by the AFL-CIO, which is the largest labor union in the country, representing some 13 million workers; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the United Auto Workers; the United Steel Workers of America; the Campaign for America's Future; and the National Employment Law Project.

I thank Senator DEBBIE STABENOW of Michigan for her support on this legislation as well.

We cannot continue to ignore the crisis of youth unemployment in America. We are talking about the future of an entire generation. We are talking about the future of the United States of America. Let's start focusing on this issue. Let's give millions of young people the opportunity to earn a paycheck and to make it into the middle class.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 546—CONGRATULATING INDONESIA'S PRESIDENT-ELECT JOKO WIDODO ON HIS ELECTORAL VICTORY AND COMMENDING THE PEOPLE OF INDONESIA ON THEIR COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY AND FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 546

Whereas the United States and Indonesia are the world's second and third largest democracies, respectively;

Whereas the United States and Indonesia share many common values, including respect for human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas in November 2010, the United States and Indonesia launched the U.S.-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership, which solidified a long-term commitment to cooperation on key bilateral, regional and global issues;

Whereas the U.S.-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership's Democracy and Civil Society Working Group promotes enhanced cooperation on parliamentary and electoral processes and political empowerment for women;

Whereas Indonesia, a regional and global leader, has undergone a remarkable democratic transformation over the last 2 decades;

Whereas on July 9, 2014, approximately 135,000,000 votes were cast in Indonesia's presidential election, which was the largest single day election in the world to date;

Whereas on July 22, 2014, Joko Widodo was declared the winner in Indonesia's presidential election; and

Whereas Indonesia, with its vast geography, large multi-ethnic population, and largest Muslim majority population in the world, is a powerful model for a peaceful, democratic transition of power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Indonesia's President-elect Joko Widodo on his electoral victory;

(2) commends the people of Indonesia on their commitment to democracy and free and fair elections;

(3) affirms the commitment of the United States to strengthening our bilateral relationship with Indonesia;

(4) supports the advancement of an inclusive democracy and an active role for civil society in Indonesia; and

(5) recognizes Indonesia's 2014 presidential election as an example of a peaceful, democratic transition of power for other transformational democracies throughout the world to follow.

SENATE RESOLUTION 547—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 14, 2014, AS NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY,

Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 547

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are degree-granting institutions that have a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment of at least 25 percent Hispanic students;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions play an important role in educating many underprivileged students and helping those students attain their full potential through higher education;

Whereas 370 Hispanic-Serving Institutions operate in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions represent just 11 percent of all institutions of higher learning, yet serve nearly 60 percent of all Hispanic students, enrolling more than 1,500,000 Hispanic students in 2012;

Whereas the number of "emerging Hispanic-Serving Institutions," defined as institutions that do not yet meet the threshold of 25 percent Hispanic enrollment but serve a Hispanic student population of between 15 and 24 percent, grew to 270 colleges and universities in 2012;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are actively involved in stabilizing and improving the communities in which the institutions are located;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-Serving Institutions to the United States strengthens the culture of the United States; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the United States;

(2) designates the week beginning September 14, 2014, as "National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week"; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 548—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 29, 2014, AS "SMALL BUSINESS SATURDAY" AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO INCREASE AWARENESS OF THE VALUE OF LOCALLY OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HAGAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. KING, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Ms. HEITKAMP,

and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 548

Whereas there are 28,200,000 small businesses in the United States;

Whereas small businesses represent 99.7 percent of all businesses with employees in the United States;

Whereas small businesses employ over 48 percent of the employees in the private sector in the United States;

Whereas small businesses pay over 42 percent of the total payroll of the employees in the private sector in the United States;

Whereas small businesses constitute 98 percent of firms exporting goods;

Whereas small businesses are responsible for more than 46 percent of private sector output;

Whereas small businesses generated 63 percent of net new jobs created from 1993 through 2013;

Whereas 87 percent of consumers in the United States agree that the success of small businesses is critical to the overall economic health of the United States;

Whereas 89 percent of consumers in the United States agree that small businesses contribute positively to local communities by supplying jobs and generating tax revenue;

Whereas 93 percent of consumers in the United States agree that it is important to support the small businesses in their communities; and

Whereas November 29, 2014, is an appropriate day to designate as “Small Business Saturday”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 29, 2014, as “Small Business Saturday”; and

(2) supports efforts—

(A) to encourage consumers to shop locally; and

(B) to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses and the impact of locally owned small businesses on the economy of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 549—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2014, AS DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 549

Whereas more than 2,500,000 individuals serve as members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,500,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central Command since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the total force (the regular components and the National Guard and the Reserves), who protect the precious heritage of the country through their positive declaration and actions;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend

the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States; and

Whereas the Senate designated October 26 as “Day of the Deployed” in 2011, 2012, and 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2014, as “Day of the Deployed”;;

(2) honors the deployed members of the United States Armed Forces and their families;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever they serve, past, present, and future; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 550—COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF “THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 550

Whereas during the War of 1812, Great Britain turned its full attention to the war effort in North America following its defeat of Napoleon's armies on the European continent in April 1814;

Whereas British forces dealt a devastating blow to the forces of the United States at the Battle of Bladensburg and were, as a consequence, able to march into Washington, D.C. unopposed and, on August 24, 1814, burn the United States Capitol Building, the Executive Mansion, now known as the White House, and other government buildings;

Whereas on September 13, 1814, with the fate of the Nation uncertain, Fort McHenry in Baltimore, Maryland, withstood 25 hours of bombardment by the British Royal Navy;

Whereas on the following morning, the soldiers of Fort McHenry hoisted an enormous American flag, the sight of which inspired Francis Scott Key to write a poem he titled “The Star-Spangled Banner”;

Whereas on December 24, 1814, American and British commissioners signed the Treaty of Ghent, which would be ratified the following February, bringing the War of 1812 to an end and firmly establishing the United States of America as a sovereign nation within the family of nations;

Whereas on March 3, 1931, President Herbert Hoover signed Public Law 71–823, designating “The Star-Spangled Banner” as the national anthem of the United States;

Whereas “The Star-Spangled Banner” was written to celebrate American courage at a time when the torch of liberty looked as if it were about to be extinguished;

Whereas singing the national anthem at large public gatherings, such as sporting events, brings patriotic unity to the great melting pot known as the United States of America;

Whereas our national anthem has become an enduring symbol of “the land of the free and the home of the brave”;

Whereas the people of the United States are celebrating the bicentennial of “The

Star-Spangled Banner” with a variety of commemorative events nationwide during the week of September 10 through 16, 2014, including the “O Say Can You See! Star-Spangled Spectacular” festival in Baltimore on September 13, 2014, which included concerts and an extraordinary fireworks display over Fort McHenry and the Baltimore harbor; and

Whereas it is especially important to educate young people and new citizens of the United States about the history and meaning of the national anthem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate designates the period from September 2014 through September 2015 as the “Year of National Thanksgiving for ‘The Star-Spangled Banner’”;

(2) the Senate encourages all State and local governments and the people of the United States to observe this period of thanksgiving with appropriate ceremonies, activities, educational outreach, and reflection; and

(3) it is the sense of the Senate that “The Star-Spangled Banner” shall retain all current verses and remain our national anthem in perpetuity.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3812. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3813. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3814. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3816. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3817. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3818. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3819. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3820. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WARNER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4194, to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

SA 3821. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. TESTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2117, to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

SA 3822. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) proposed an amendment to the

bill S. 2440, to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3812. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 562. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO WILLIAM SHEMIN FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING WORLD WAR I.

(a) **WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.**—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President may award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to William Shemin for the acts of valor during World War I described in subsection (b).

(b) **ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.**—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of William Shemin while serving as a Rifleman with G Company, 2d Battalion, 47th Infantry Regiment, 4th Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in connection with combat operations against an armed enemy on the Vesle River, near Bazoches, France, from August 7 to August 9, 1918, during World War I for which he was originally awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

SA 3813. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XXXV, add the following:

SEC. 3502. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT A GIFT FROM THE USMMA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AND FOUNDATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to section 51315 of title 46, United States Code, the Maritime Administrator may accept a gift of money from the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Foundation, Inc. (also known as the USMMA Alumni Association and Foundation) for the purpose of renovating Melville Hall on the campus of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(b) **CONTRACT.**—If the Maritime Administrator accepts a gift authorized by subsection (a), the Administrator shall enter into a contract with the United States Merchant Marine Alumni Foundation, Inc. for the operation of Melville Hall and for the purpose of official academy functions, third party catering functions, industry events, and conferences.

SA 3814. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. INTEGRATED PLAN ON SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly, in coordination with the National Security Council, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the heads of other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, develop a plan (to be known as the “Integrated Federal Space Launch Plan”) to achieve the effective planning, coordination, and execution of the civilian and national security space launch activities of the Federal Government in order to ensure that the mission needs of the Federal Government for reliable, timely, and affordable access to space are met in a cost-effective manner.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF PLAN.**—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An estimate of the anticipated annual space launch demand of the Federal Government during the 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning in the year in which the plan is developed.

(2) A description of the capabilities required to meet the demand estimated for purposes of paragraph (1).

(3) A description of the acquisition plans of each Federal agency covered by the plan for purposes of meeting the demand estimated for purposes of paragraph (1).

(4) An identification and assessment of opportunities for coordination among Federal agencies in space launch acquisition efforts, and a summary of the lessons learned by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding their launch service programs.

(5) An assessment whether the Department of Defense is currently achieving assured access to space with its space launch in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 2273 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) **SUBMITTAL OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit the plan developed under subsection (a) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(2) **FORM.**—The plan shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ASSESSMENT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the adequacy of the plan developed under subsection (a), including the extent to which the plan includes the launch needs and capabilities of the civilian agencies and the national security agencies of the Federal Government.

(e) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and

Transportation, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 3815. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 343. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FIREFIGHTING PROPERTY TO FIREFIGHTING AGENCIES.

(a) **COMPLIANCE OF PROPERTY WITH EMISSION REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 2576b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) the recipient firefighting agency accepts full responsibility for compliance of the property after transfer with all applicable emission requirements and regulations;”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subsection (b)(4)” and inserting “subsection (b)(5)”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **NO PROHIBITION OR DELAY IN TRANSFER FOR NONCOMPLIANCE WITH EMISSION REQUIREMENTS.**—The transfer of personal property under this section shall not be prohibited or delayed by reason of the failure of such property to comply with applicable emission requirements or regulations at the time of transfer.”.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN AIRPORTS AS FIREFIGHTING AGENCIES.**—Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3) of this section, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including an airport or airport authority that is required by law to maintain firefighting assets on site”.

SA 3816. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. ARMY NATIONAL GUARD UH-60A MODERNIZATION.

(a) **PLAN FOR MODERNIZATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment

of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a prioritized plan for modernizing the Army National Guard's entire fleet of UH-60A Black Hawk helicopters.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A detailed timeline for the modernization of the Army National Guard's entire fleet of UH-60A helicopters.

(2) A description of the number of UH-60L, UH-60L Digital, and UH-60M aircraft that the Army National Guard will possess upon completion of the modernization plan.

(3) A description of the cost, by year, associated with the modernization plan.

SA 3817. Mr. RISCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1268. ASSESSMENT OF THE DEPLOYMENT OF A NEW AIRCRAFT OR SENSOR BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDER THE TREATY ON OPEN SKIES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence, in conjunction with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commander of each appropriate combatant command, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment of all potential intelligence collection implications of any new aircraft or sensor proposed to be deployed by the Russian Federation under the Open Skies Treaty not later than 30 days prior to the date of the intended approval of such aircraft or sensor by the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) OPEN SKIES TREATY.—The term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

SA 3818. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS STUDY ON MATTERS RELATING TO BURIAL OF UNCLAIMED REMAINS OF VETERANS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the en-

actment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) complete a study on matters relating to the interring of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study required under paragraph (1).

(b) MATTERS STUDIED.—The matters studied under subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) Determining the scope of issues relating to unclaimed remains of veterans, including an estimate of the number of unclaimed remains of veterans.

(2) Assessing the effectiveness of the procedures of the Department of Veterans Affairs for working with persons or entities having custody of unclaimed remains to facilitate interment of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration.

(3) Assessing State and local laws that affect the ability of the Secretary to inter unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration.

(4) Developing recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) METHODOLOGY.—

(1) NUMBER OF UNCLAIMED REMAINS.—In estimating the number of unclaimed remains of veterans under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary may review such subset of applicable entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, including a subset of funeral homes and coroner offices that possess unclaimed veterans remains.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL LAWS.—In assessing State and local laws under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary may assess such sample of applicable State and local laws as the Secretary considers appropriate in lieu of reviewing all applicable State and local laws.

SA 3819. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE XVII—UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE

SEC. 1701. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Utah.

(3) UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Utah Test and Training Range” means the portions of the military operating area of the Utah Test and Training Area that are located in the State.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “Utah Test and Training Range” includes the Dugway Proving Ground.

Subtitle A—Withdrawal and Overflights

SEC. 1711. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land (including the inter-

ests in Federal land) described in subsection (b) is withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land (including the interests in land) referred to in subsection (a) is the Bureau of Land Management land comprising approximately 625,643 acres in the State, as generally depicted on the map entitled [], numbered [], and dated [].

(c) RESERVATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE; SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The land withdrawn by subsection (a) is reserved—

(1) for use by the Secretary of the Air Force for—

(A) the enhancement of the Utah Test and Training Range;

(B) the testing of—

(i) 5th generation weapon systems; and

(ii) the standoff distance for weapons;

(C) the testing and evaluation of hypersonic weapons;

(D) other purposes related to meeting national security needs; and

(2) for use by the Secretary for—

(A) public recreation—

(i) during any period in which the land is not being used for military training; and

(ii) as determined to be suitable for public use; and

(B) the conservation of natural resources.

(d) GRAZING.—

(1) NO NEW GRAZING LEASES OR PERMITS.—

The Secretary shall not issue any new grazing lease or permit on the land withdrawn by subsection (a).

(2) EXISTING GRAZING LEASES OR PERMITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any grazing of livestock on the land withdrawn by subsection (a) that commenced before the date of enactment of this Act shall be allowed to continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary.

(B) LEVEL.—As the Secretary determines to be necessary to allow the appropriate use of resources, the Secretary may adjust the level of grazing authorized under subparagraph (A), as measured in animal unit months.

(3) MITIGATION.—To mitigate the loss of new grazing leases or permits on the land withdrawn by subsection (a), the Secretary may issue new grazing leases or permits on other Federal land not withdrawn by that subsection.

(e) PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.—The land withdrawn by subsection (a) shall remain eligible as entitlement land under section 6901 of title 31, United States Code.

(f) TEMPORARY CLOSURE TO PUBLIC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Air Force determines that military operations, public safety, or national security require the temporary closure to public use of any road, trail, or other portion of the land withdrawn by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Air Force may take such action as the Secretary of the Air Force determines necessary to carry out the temporary closure.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—Any temporary closure under paragraph (1) shall be limited to the minimum areas and periods during which the Secretary of the Air Force determines are required to carry out a closure under this subsection.

(3) NOTICE.—Before and during any temporary closure under this subsection, the Secretary of the Air Force shall—

(A) keep appropriate warning notices posted; and

(B) take appropriate steps to notify the public concerning the temporary closure.

(g) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—The boundary of the land withdrawn by subsection (a) shall be adjusted as necessary to ensure access to the Secretary for the purposes described in subsection (c)(2).

(h) **WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION.**—The withdrawal and reservation made by this section shall not terminate—

(1) other than by an election and determination of the Secretary of the Air Force; or

(2) until such time as the Secretary can permanently transfer administrative jurisdiction of the land withdrawn and reserved by this section to the Secretary of the Air Force.

SEC. 1712. MILITARY OPERATIONS AND OVERFLIGHTS IN UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the testing and development of military weapons systems and the training of military forces are critical to ensuring the national security of the United States;

(2) the Utah Test and Training Range is a unique and irreplaceable national asset at the core of the test and training mission of the Department of Defense; and

(3) continued access to the special use airspace and land that comprise the Utah Test and Training Range, under the terms and conditions described in this section—

(A) is a national security priority; and

(B) is compatible with the protection and proper management of the natural, environmental, cultural, and other resources of the land.

(b) **SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE AND TRAINING ROUTES.**—Nothing in this subtitle precludes—

(1) the designation of new units of special use airspace; or

(2) the expansion of existing units of special use airspace.

(c) **EMERGENCY ACCESS AND RESPONSE.**—Nothing in this section precludes the continuation of the memorandum of understanding that is between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Air Force with respect to emergency access and response, as in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **EFFECT ON LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects the limitation established under section 2815(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 852).

SEC. 1713. ANALYSIS OF MILITARY READINESS AND OPERATIONAL IMPACTS IN LAND USE PLANS FOR FEDERAL LAND IN UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall develop, maintain, and revise land use plans under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) with respect to Federal land located in the Utah Test and Training Range.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later 180 days after receiving a request from the Secretary of the Interior relating to a revision to a land use plan under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense, as part of the required consultation with respect to land use plans, shall submit to the Secretary an analysis of the military readiness and operational impacts of the proposed revision to the applicable land use plan.

Subtitle B—Land Exchange

SEC. 1721. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the State owns approximately 68,057 acres of land and approximately []

acres of mineral interests located within the Utah Test and Training Range in Box Elder, Tooele, and Juab Counties, Utah;

(2) the State owns approximately 68,057 acres of land and approximately 4,520 acres of mineral interests located wholly or partially within the Cedar Mountains Wilderness in Tooele County, Utah;

(3) the parcels of State land described in paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) were granted by Congress to the State pursuant to the Act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107, chapter 138), to be held in trust for the benefit of the public school system and other public institutions of the State; and

(B) are largely scattered in checkerboard fashion among Federal land;

(4) continued State ownership and development of State trust land within the Utah Test and Training Range and the Cedar Mountains Wilderness is incompatible with—

(A) the critical national defense uses of the Utah Test and Training Range; and

(B) the Federal management of the Cedar Mountains Wilderness; and

(5) it is in the public interest of the United States to acquire in a timely manner all State trust land within the Utah Test and Training Range and the Cedar Mountains Wilderness, in exchange for the conveyance of the Federal land to the State, in accordance with the terms and conditions described in this subtitle.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this subtitle to direct, facilitate, and expedite the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land between the United States and the State.

SEC. 1722. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **EXCHANGE MAP.**—The term “Exchange Map” means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Utah Test and Training Range Enhancement/Cedar Mountains Wilderness Land Exchange” and dated [], 2014[].

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the Bureau of Land Management land located in Millard, Juab, Tooele, and Beaver Counties, Utah, that is identified on the Exchange Map as “BLM Lands Proposed for Transfer to State Trust Lands”.

(3) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means the land owned by the State in Box Elder, Tooele, and Juab Counties, Utah, that is identified on the Exchange Map as—

(A) “State Trust Land Proposed for Transfer to BLM”; and

(B) “State Trust Minerals Proposed for Transfer to BLM”.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Utah, acting through the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration.

SEC. 1723. EXCHANGE OF FEDERAL LAND AND NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the State offers to convey to the United States title to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall—

(1) accept the offer; and

(2) on receipt of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, convey to the State all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) **VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.**—The exchange authorized under subsection (a) shall be subject to valid existing rights.

(c) **TITLE APPROVAL.**—Title to the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the State.

(d) **APPRAISALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by appraisals conducted by 1 or more independent appraisers retained by the State, with the consent of the Secretary.

(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The appraisals under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including, as appropriate, the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.

(3) **MINERAL LAND.**—

(A) **MINERAL REPORTS.**—The appraisals under paragraph (1) shall take into account mineral and technical reports provided by the Secretary and the State in the evaluation of mineral deposits in the Federal land and non-Federal land.

(B) **MINING CLAIMS.**—An appraisal of any parcel of Federal land that is encumbered by a mining or millsite claim located under sections 2318 through 2352 of the Revised Statutes (commonly known as the “Mining Law of 1872”) (30 U.S.C. 21 et seq.) shall take into account the encumbrance created by the claim for purposes of determining the value of the parcel of the Federal land.

(4) **APPROVAL.**—The appraisals conducted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Secretary and the State for approval.

(5) **DISPUTE RESOLUTION.**—If, by the date that is 90 days after the date of submission of an appraisal for review and approval under this subsection, the Secretary or State do not agree to accept the findings of the appraisals with respect to 1 or more parcels of Federal land or non-Federal land, the dispute shall be resolved in accordance with section 206(d)(2) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(d)(2)).

(6) **DURATION.**—The appraisals conducted under paragraph (1) shall remain valid until the date of the completion of the exchange authorized under this subtitle.

(e) **CONVEYANCE OF TITLE.**—The land exchange authorized under this subtitle shall be completed by the later of—

(1) the date that is 180 days after the date of final approval by the Secretary and the State of the appraisals conducted under subsection (d); or

(2) the date that is 180 days after the date of completion of the dispute resolution process authorized under subsection (d)(5).

(f) **PUBLIC INSPECTION AND NOTICE.**—

(1) **PUBLIC INSPECTION.**—At least 30 days before the date of conveyance of the Federal land and non-Federal land, all final appraisals and appraisal reviews for land to be exchanged under this section shall be available for public review at the office of the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Utah.

(2) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary or the State, as applicable, shall publish in a newspaper of general circulation in Salt Lake County, Utah, a notice that the appraisals conducted under subsection (d) are available for public inspection.

(g) **EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section—

(A) shall be equal; or

(B) shall be made equal in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) **EQUALIZATION.**—

(A) **SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the value of the Federal land exceeds the value of the non-Federal land, the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be equalized by the State conveying to the United States State trust

land located within any of the wilderness areas or national conservation areas in Washington County, Utah, established under subtitle O of title I of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1075) that has an appraised value equal to the difference between—

- (I) the value of the Federal land; and
- (II) the value of the non-Federal land.

(ii) ORDER OF CONVEYANCES.—Any non-Federal land required to be conveyed to the United States under clause (i) shall be conveyed until the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land is equalized, in the following order:

(I) State trust land parcels located in the Dots Pass Wilderness.

(II) State trust land parcels located in the Beaver Dam Wash National Conservation Area.

(III) State trust land parcels located in the Red Cliffs National Conservation Area.

(B) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.—If the value of the non-Federal land exceeds the value of the Federal land, the value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land shall be equalized by the Secretary making a cash equalization payment to the State, in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy Management (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(h) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND FROM MINERAL ENTRY PRIOR TO EXCHANGE.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land to be conveyed to the State under this section is withdrawn from mineral location, entry, and patent under the mining laws pending conveyance of the Federal land to the State.

SEC. 1724. STATUS AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL LAND AFTER EXCHANGE.

(a) NON-FEDERAL LAND WITHIN THE UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE.—On conveyance to the United States under this subtitle, the non-Federal land located within the Utah Test and Training Range shall be withdrawn in accordance with section 1711.

(b) NON-FEDERAL LAND WITHIN THE CEDAR MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.—On conveyance to the United States under this subtitle, the non-Federal land located within the Cedar Mountains Wilderness shall, in accordance with section 206(c) of the Federal Land Policy Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(c)), be added to, and administered as part of, the Cedar Mountains Wilderness.

SEC. 1725. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

(a) COSTS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the costs of remedial actions relating to hazardous materials on land acquired under this subtitle shall be paid by those entities responsible for the costs under applicable law.

(b) REMEDIATION OF PRIOR TESTING AND TRAINING ACTIVITY.—The United States shall bear all costs of evaluation, management, and remediation caused by the previous testing of military weapons systems and the training of military forces on non-Federal land to be conveyed to the United States under this subtitle.

Subtitle C—Amendments to the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999

SEC. 1731. AMENDMENTS.

(a) TERMINATION.—Section 3015 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 892) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) TERMINATION.—The withdrawal and reservation of land by section 3011 shall not terminate other than by an election and determination of the Secretary of the military department concerned or until such time as

the Secretary of the Interior may permanently transfer administrative jurisdiction of the land withdrawn and reserved by that section to the Secretary of the military department concerned.”.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 3016 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 893) is repealed.

SA 3820. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WARNER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4194, to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Sec. 101. Reports eliminated.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sec. 201. Reports eliminated.

TITLE III—CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Sec. 301. Reports eliminated.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sec. 401. Reports eliminated.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Sec. 501. Report on Impact Aid construction justifying discretionary grant awards eliminated.

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Sec. 601. Reports eliminated.

TITLE VII—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Sec. 701. Great Lakes management comprehensive report eliminated.

TITLE VIII—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Sec. 801. Report relating to waiver of certain sanctions against North Korea eliminated.

TITLE IX—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Sec. 901. Reports eliminated.

Sec. 902. Reports modified.

TITLE X—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Sec. 1001. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 1101. Royalties in-kind report eliminated.

TITLE XII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Sec. 1201. Report eliminated.

TITLE XIII—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Sec. 1301. Report eliminated.

TITLE XIV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Sec. 1401. Report eliminated.

TITLE XV—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Sec. 1501. Reports eliminated.

Sec. 1502. Report modified.

TITLE XVI—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Sec. 1601. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Sec. 1701. Report eliminated.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 101. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) PEANUT BASE ACRES DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION.—Section 1302(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8752(d)) is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (3);
- (2) in paragraph (4), by striking “Paragraphs (1) through (3)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2)”; and
- (3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) REPORT ON EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES TO EMERGING MARKETS.—Section 1542(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking “(1) EFFECT OF CREDITS.—”; and

- (2) by striking paragraph (2).

(c) EVALUATION OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM FINANCING OF LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED FOOD PRODUCTS.—Section 310B(g)(9)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)) is amended—

- (1) by striking clause (iv); and
- (2) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (iv).

(d) QUARTERLY EXPORT ASSISTANCE REPORTS.—Section 603 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5713) is repealed.

(e) RURAL COLLABORATIVE INVESTMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) SECRETARIAL REPORT ON REGIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARDS.—Section 385C(b)(7) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009dd-2(b)(7)) is amended—

- (A) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end;

- (B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

- (C) by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) REPORT BY REGIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARD TO NATIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARD AND THE SECRETARY.—Section 385D(a)(7) of Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009dd-3(a)(7)) is amended—

- (A) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

- (B) by striking subparagraph (D); and
- (C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

(f) STATUS REPORT FOR FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT.—Section 702 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5722) is amended by striking subsection (c).

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 201. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) EFFORTS AND PROGRESS IN BECOMING DESIGNATED AS SEA GRANT COLLEGE OR INSTITUTE.—Section 207 of the National Sea Grant Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1126) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION STANDARDIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 3 of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 278g-5) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(c) ENSURING EQUAL ACCESS TO SEA GRANT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 208(a) of the National Sea Grant Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(a)) is amended by striking the fourth sentence.

(d) TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);
 (2) by redesignating subsections (h) through (l) as subsections (g) through (k), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (k)(5), as redesignated, by striking “under subsection (k)” and inserting “under subsection (j)”.

(e) TIP ADVISORY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is further amended in subsection (j), as redesignated by subsection (d), by striking paragraph (5).

(f) NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACTIVITIES.—Section 212 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5611) is repealed.

TITLE III—CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

SEC. 301. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) SERVICE-LEARNING IMPACT STUDY.—The National and Community Service Act of 1990 is amended by repealing part IV of subtitle B of title I (42 U.S.C. 12565).

(b) REPORTS BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES TO THE CORPORATION.—Section 182 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12642) is amended—

- (1) by striking the following:
 “(a) DESIGN OF PROGRAMS.—”; and
- (2) by striking subsection (b).

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 401. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) DISPLAY OF ANNUAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR SOVEREIGNTY ALERT MISSION.—Section 354 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) is hereby repealed.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON RELIABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsections (a) and (b); and
- (2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “(b) or”.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SEC. 501. REPORT ON IMPACT AID CONSTRUCTION JUSTIFYING DISCRETIONARY GRANT AWARDS ELIMINATED.

Section 8007(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7707(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (7).

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 601. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 983 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16323) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) STRATEGIC UNCONVENTIONAL FUELS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 369(i) of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15927(i)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS FOR INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT.—Section 342(a)(6)(C) of Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6313(a)(6)(C)) is amended—

- (1) by striking clause (v); and
- (2) by redesignating clause (vi) (as added by section 310(a)(4) of Public Law 112-110; 126 Stat. 1524) as clause (v).

TITLE VII—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 701. GREAT LAKES MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 118(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)) is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (10); and
- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (13) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively.

TITLE VIII—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 801. REPORT RELATING TO WAIVER OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREA ELIMINATED.

Section 1405 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa-1 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

TITLE IX—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SEC. 901. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) EXPENDITURES OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Section 1904 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6574) is repealed.

(b) USE OF RECOVERY ACT FUNDS BY STATES AND LOCALITIES REPORT.—Section 901 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 191) is repealed.

(c) HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT FUNDS AUDIT.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF AUDIT.—Section 902(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15542(b)) is amended—

- (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;
 (B) by striking paragraph (3); and
 (C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (5).

(2) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY TO RECOVER FUNDS RESULTING FROM PRIOR AUDITS.—Section 902(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15542(c)) is amended by inserting after “subsection (b)” the following: “prior to the date of the enactment of the Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014”.

(d) STATE SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT INITIATIVE AUDIT AND REPORT.—Section 3011 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5710) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (b); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(e) SMALL BUSINESS LENDING FUND PROGRAM AUDIT AND REPORT.—Section 4107 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 4741 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(f) HOUSING ASSISTANCE COUNCIL FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT REPORT.—Section 6303(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 1490e note) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 902. REPORTS MODIFIED.

(a) NATIONAL PREVENTION, HEALTH PROMOTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH COUNCIL.—Subsection (i) of section 4001 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-10) is amended by striking “The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States shall jointly conduct periodic reviews” and inserting “The Secretary shall conduct periodic reviews”.

(b) POSTCARD MANDATE.—Section 719(g)(2) of title 31, United States Code is amended—

- (1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “The Comptroller General shall make each list available through the public website of the Government Accountability Office.”; and
- (2) in the second sentence, by inserting “of Congress” after “committee or member”.

(c) ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD FOUNDATION.—

(1) USE OF PRIVATE INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT.—Section 107 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 807) is amended to read as follows:

“AUDITS

“SEC. 107. (a) CONTRACTS WITH INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an independent public accountant to conduct an annual audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, of the financial records of the Board and of any corporation established under section 106(i), and shall ensure that the independent public accountant has access for the purpose of the audit to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Board or such corporation (or any agent of the Board or such corporation) which the independent public accountant reasonably determines to be pertinent to the Congressional Award Program.

“(b) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON AUDIT RESULTS.—Not later than May 15 of each calendar year, the Board shall submit to appropriate officers, committees, and subcommittees of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on the results of the most recent audit conducted pursuant to this section, and shall include in the report information on any such additional areas as the independent public accountant who conducted the audit determines deserve or require evaluation.

“(c) REVIEW BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF ANNUAL AUDIT.—

“(1) The Comptroller General of the United States shall review each annual audit conducted under subsection (a).

“(2) For purposes of a review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General, or any duly authorized representative of the Comptroller General, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Board or such corporation, or any agent of the Board or such corporation, including the independent external auditor designated under subsection (a), which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, may be pertinent.

“(3) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Comptroller General receives a report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) with respect to the preceding year.”.

(2) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COMPLIANCE WITH FISCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Section 104(c) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 804(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by—

- (i) inserting “policies and” before “procedures”; and

(ii) striking “fund”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “The Comptroller General of the United States” and inserting “The independent public accountant conducting the annual audit of the financial records of the Board pursuant to section 107(a)”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “the Comptroller General” and inserting “the independent public accountant”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(d) ANNUAL GAO REVIEW OF PROPOSED HHS RECOVERY THRESHOLD.—The third sentence of section 1862(b)(9)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(b)(9)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “for a year” and inserting “for 2014”.

TITLE X—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SEC. 1001. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF PRODUCTS MADE WITH DOG OR CAT FUR.—Section

308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT STUDY AND NATIONAL LAND BORDER SECURITY PLAN.—The Border Infrastructure and Technology Modernization Act of 2007 (title VI of division E of Public Law 110-161; 6 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 603 and 604.

(c) FEES FOR CERTAIN CUSTOMS SERVICES.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-272; 19 U.S.C. 58c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(9), by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C); and

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D);

(ii) by striking paragraph (4); and

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)””; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”.”

(d) MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL DISTRESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 346 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-295; 14 U.S.C. 88 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 346.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 1101. ROYALTIES IN-KIND REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15902) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively.

TITLE XII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SEC. 1201. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 207 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3205) is repealed.

TITLE XIII—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

SEC. 1301. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 2(5)(E) of the Senate resolution advising and consenting to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) of November 19, 1990, adopted at Vienna May 31, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105-5) (commonly referred to as the “CFE Flank Document”), 105th Congress, agreed to May 14, 1997, is repealed.

TITLE XIV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 1401. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 620F of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2376) is amended by striking subsection (c).

TITLE XV—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 1501. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) REPORTS OF AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES COMMITTEE.—Section 106(p)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (H); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H).

(b) ANNUAL SUMMARIES OF AIRPORT FINANCIAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (l) through (t) as subsections (k) through (s), respectively;

(ii) in paragraph (5) of subsection (k), as redesignated by clause (i)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (n)(7)” and inserting “subsection (m)(7)””; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (n)” and inserting “subsection (m)””;

(iii) in subsection (m), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “subsections (b) and (l)” each place it appears and inserting “subsections (b) and (k)””; and

(II) by striking “subsection (o)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (n)””;

(iv) in subsection (n), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (n)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (m)””;

(v) in subsection (o), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (o)” and inserting “subsection (n)””;

(vi) in subsection (p), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections (a) through (p)” and inserting “subsections (a) through (o)””; and

(vii) in subsection (q), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections (q)(1) through (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (p)”.”

(B) Section 46301(d)(2) of such title is amended by striking “section 47107(l)” and inserting “section 47107(k)”.”

(C) Section 47111(e) of such title is amended by striking “section 47107(l)” and inserting “section 47107(k)”.”

(D) Section 9502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “section 47107(n)” each place it appears and inserting “section 47107(m)”.”

(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON PIPELINE SAFETY INFORMATION GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES.—Section 60130 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM FOR INNOVATIVE FINANCING OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT.—Section 182 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2515; 49 U.S.C. 44502 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(e) REPORTS ON JUSTIFICATIONS FOR AIR DEFENSE IDENTIFICATION ZONES.—Section 602 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2563), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON STANDARDS FOR AIRCRAFT AND AIRCRAFT ENGINES TO REDUCE NOISE LEVELS.—Section 726 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (114 Stat. 167; 49 U.S.C. 47508 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 1502. REPORT MODIFIED.

Section 1138(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “at least annually, but may be conducted”.

TITLE XVI—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SEC. 1601. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON THE NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK.—Section 2 of Public Law 108-215 (22 U.S.C. 290m-6) is repealed.

(b) REPORT ON VOTING ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS LOAN PROPOSALS.—Section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d) is amended by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) through subsection (g) (as added by section 501(g) of Public Law 96-259) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

(c) REPORT ON NEW IMF ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING RATES AND MATURITIES.—Section 605 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681-222), as enacted into law by section 101(d) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277), is amended by striking subsection (d).

(d) REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS.—The Government Securities Act Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103-202; 31 U.S.C. 3121 note) is amended—

(1) by striking section 203; and

(2) in the table of contents for such Act, by striking the item relating to section 203.

TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SEC. 1701. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 8125 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SA 3821. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. TESTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2117, to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Smart Savings Act”.

SEC. 2. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN DEFAULT INVESTMENT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8438(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if an election has not been made with respect to any sums available for investment in the Thrift Savings Fund, the Executive Director shall invest such sums in an age-appropriate target date asset allocation portfolio of the funds described in subsection (b), as determined by the Executive Director.

“(B) If an election has not been made by a member (as defined in section 211 of title 37) contributing to the Thrift Savings Fund under section 8440e with respect to any sums available for investment in such member's Thrift Savings Fund account, the Executive Director shall invest such sums in the Government Securities Investment Fund.”.

(b) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RISK.—Section 8439(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “Each employee”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Before the date on which an individual is enrolled to make contributions to the

Thrift Savings Fund, or as soon as practical thereafter, an individual who is automatically enrolled under section 8432(b)(2) shall receive the risk acknowledgment information described in paragraph (1)."

(c) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 8472(g)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "required by section 8438 of this title to be invested in securities of the Government" and inserting "under section 8438(c)(2)(B)".

(d) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Director (as that term is defined under section 8401(13) of title 5, United States Code) shall develop and issue guidance implementing the amendments made by this section.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.**—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date on which the Executive Director issues guidance under subsection (d); and

(2) apply to individuals who enroll in the Thrift Savings Plan on or after such date.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF FIDUCIARY PROTECTIONS.

Section 8477(e)(1)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subclause (II)—

(A) by inserting "or beneficiary" after "participant"; and

(B) by inserting "or option" after "fund"; and

(2) in subclause (III)—

(A) by inserting "or beneficiary" after "participant"; and

(B) by inserting "or beneficiaries" after "participants".

SA 3822. Ms. HEITKAMP (for Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2440, to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 5, line 13, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

On page 6, line 5, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

On page 7, line 11, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 17, 2014, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to consider the following bill: S. 2670, a bill to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts. Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be author-

ized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the State of Small Depository Institutions."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight of and Policy Considerations for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Retirement Savings 2.0: Updating Savings Policy for the Modern Economy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Ebola in West Africa: A Global Challenge and Public Health Threat."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2014, at 2:45 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Children's Health Insurance Program: Protecting America's Children and Families".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 483, S. 2539.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2539) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. CDC PROGRAMS FOR PREVENTION AND SURVEILLANCE OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) **PREVENTION OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.**—Section 393B(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1c(b)(3)) is amended by striking "2010, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2010" and inserting "2020, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2020".

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-3) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through "For the purpose" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 394A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose";

(2) by striking the second period; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) **TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.**—To carry out sections 393B and 393C, there are authorized to be appropriated \$6,564,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019."

SEC. 3. STATE GRANTS FOR PROJECTS REGARDING TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-52) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration,";

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A)(i) and (3)(E) of subsection (f), by striking "brain injury" and inserting "traumatic brain injury";

(3) in subsection (h), by striking "under this section, and section 1253 including" and inserting "under this section and section 1253, including"; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking "such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2012" and inserting "\$5,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019".

SEC. 4. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

Section 1253 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-53) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (referred to in this section as the ‘Administrator’),”;

(2) in subsections (c), (d)(1), (e)(1), (e)(4), (g), (h), and (j)(1), by striking “Administrator” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”;

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting “**REPORTING**”;

(B) by striking “Each protection and advocacy system” and inserting the following:

“(1) **REPORTS BY SYSTEMS.**—Each protection and advocacy system”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **REPORT BY SECRETARY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the services and activities carried out under this section during the period for which the report is being prepared.”;

(4) in subsection (i), by striking “The Administrator of the Health Resources” and all that follows through “regarding” and inserting “The Secretary shall facilitate agreements to coordinate the collection of data by agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services regarding”;

(5) in subsection (k), by striking “subtitle C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000” and inserting “subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)”;

(6) in subsection (l), by striking “\$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for each the fiscal years 2009 through 2012” and inserting “\$3,100,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019”;

(7) in subsection (m)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.)” and inserting “subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “part C of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6042 et seq.)” and inserting “subtitle C of title I of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15041 et seq.)”.

SEC. 5. TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY COORDINATION PLAN.

(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall develop a plan for improved coordination of Federal activities with respect to traumatic brain injury. Such plan shall—

(1) review existing interagency coordination efforts with respect to Federal activities related to traumatic brain injury, including services for individuals with traumatic brain injury;

(2) identify areas for improved coordination between relevant Federal agencies and programs, including agencies and programs with a focus on serving individuals with disabilities;

(3) identify each recommendation in the report required by section 393C(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1d(b)) that has been adopted and each such recommendation that has not been adopted, and describe any planned activities to address each such recommendation that has not been adopted; and

(4) incorporate, as appropriate, stakeholder feedback, including feedback from individuals with traumatic brain injury and their caregivers.

(b) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit the plan developed under subsection (a) to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6. REVIEW OF BRAIN INJURY MANAGEMENT IN CHILDREN.

The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall conduct a review of the scientific evidence related to brain injury management in children, such as the restriction or prohibition of children from attending school or participating in athletic activities following a head injury, and identify ongoing and potential further opportunities for research. Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives the results of such review.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2539), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG ACT

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 504, S. 1214.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1214) to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1214) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1214

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “All-American Flag Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS FOR USE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under subsection (b), only such flags of the United States of America, regardless of size, that are 100 percent manufactured in the United States, from articles, materials, or supplies 100 percent of which are grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States, may be acquired for use by the Federal Government.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the requirement under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis upon a determination that—

(1) the application of the limitation would cause unreasonable costs or delays to be incurred; or

(2) application of the limitation would adversely affect a United States company.

(c) **AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council established under section 1302 of title 41, United States Code, shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement this section.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **EXECUTIVE AGENCY.**—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) **FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.**—The term “Federal Acquisition Regulation” has the meaning given the term in section 106 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 shall apply to purchases of flags made on or after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.

This Act shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

**GOVERNMENT REPORTS
ELIMINATION ACT OF 2014**

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 505, H.R. 4194.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4194) to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Sec. 101. Reports eliminated.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Sec. 201. Reports eliminated.

TITLE III—CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Sec. 301. Reports eliminated.

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sec. 401. Reports eliminated.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Sec. 501. Report on Impact Aid construction justifying discretionary grant awards eliminated.

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Sec. 601. Reports eliminated.

TITLE VII—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Sec. 701. Great Lakes management comprehensive report eliminated.

TITLE VIII—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Sec. 801. Report relating to waiver of certain sanctions against North Korea eliminated.

TITLE IX—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Sec. 901. Reports eliminated.

Sec. 902. Reports modified.

TITLE X—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Sec. 1001. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Sec. 1101. Royalties in-kind report eliminated.

TITLE XII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Sec. 1201. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XIII—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Sec. 1301. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XIV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Sec. 1401. Report eliminated.

TITLE XV—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Sec. 1501. Reports eliminated.

Sec. 1502. Reports modified.

TITLE XVI—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Sec. 1601. Reports eliminated.

TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Sec. 1701. Reports eliminated.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SEC. 101. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) INFORMATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ON COMMODITY PROMOTION PROGRAMS.—Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);
(2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and
(3) in paragraph (4) of subsection (d) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsection (e)”.

(b) UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES REPORT AND RELATED MEETING.—Section 108 of the Act of August 28, 1954 (commonly known as the “Agricultural Act of 1954”) (7 U.S.C. 1748), is repealed.

(c) FARMLAND PROTECTION POLICY ACT ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 1546 of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4207) is repealed.

(d) PEANUT BASE ACRES DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION.—Section 1302(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8752(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);
(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “Paragraphs (1) through (3)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2)”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(e) OTHER BASE ACRES DATA COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION.—Section 1101(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);
(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “Paragraphs (1) through (3)” and inserting “Paragraphs (1) and (2)”;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(f) BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 333B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (h) as subsections (e) through (g), respectively.

(g) RURAL BROADBAND ACCESS PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking “(k)” and inserting “(j)”;

(2) by striking subsection (j); and
(3) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively.

(h) REPORT ON EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES TO EMERGING MARKETS.—Section 1542(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “(1) EFFECT OF CREDITS.—”;

and
(2) by striking paragraph (2).

(i) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION QUARTERLY REPORT.—Section 13 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714k) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(j) EVALUATION OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM FINANCING OF LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED FOOD PRODUCTS.—Section 310B(g)(9)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (iv); and
(2) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (iv).

(k) UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REPORTS.—Section 17B of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87f-2) is repealed.

(l) NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS ON RELEASE OF NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PRODUCERS OPERATING UNDER MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS.—Section 8d(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608d(2)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking the third sentence.

(m) PLANT PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT AND DISASTER PREVENTION ACTION PLANS REPORTS.—Section 420(c) of the Plant Protect Act (7 U.S.C. 7721(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(n) QUARTERLY EXPORT ASSISTANCE REPORTS.—Section 603 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5713) is repealed.

(o) RURAL COLLABORATIVE INVESTMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) SECRETARIAL REPORT ON REGIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARDS.—Section 385C(b)(7) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009dd-2(b)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D).

(2) REPORT BY REGIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARD TO NATIONAL RURAL INVESTMENT BOARD AND THE SECRETARY.—Section 385D(a)(7) of Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009dd-3(a)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) by striking subparagraph (D); and
(C) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

(p) STATUS REPORT FOR FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT.—Section 702 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5722) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(q) SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA TIMBER REPORTS.—Section 706 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 539e) is repealed.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 201. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) EFFORTS AND PROGRESS IN BECOMING DESIGNATED AS SEA GRANT COLLEGE OR INSTITUTE.—Section 207 of the National Sea Grant Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1126) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION STANDARDIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 3 of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 278g-5) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(c) ENSURING EQUAL ACCESS TO SEA GRANT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 208(a) of the National Sea Grant Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(a)) is amended by striking the fourth sentence.

(d) TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);
(2) by redesignating subsections (h) through (l) as subsections (g) through (k), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (k)(5), as redesignated, by striking “under subsection (k)” and inserting “under subsection (j)”.

(e) TIP ADVISORY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is further amended in subsection (j), as redesignated by subsection (d), by striking paragraph (5).

(f) NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACTIVITIES.—Section 212 of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 5611) is repealed.

TITLE III—CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

SEC. 301. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) SERVICE-LEARNING IMPACT STUDY.—The National and Community Service Act of 1990 is amended by repealing part IV of subtitle B of title I (42 U.S.C. 12565).

(b) REPORTS BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES TO THE CORPORATION.—Section 182 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12642) is amended—

(1) by striking the following:
“(a) DESIGN OF PROGRAMS.—”;

(2) by striking subsection (b).

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 401. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) DISPLAY OF ANNUAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR SOVEREIGNTY ALERT MISSION.—Section 354 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) is hereby repealed.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON RELIABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b); and
(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “(b) or”.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SEC. 501. REPORT ON IMPACT AID CONSTRUCTION JUSTIFYING DISCRETIONARY GRANT AWARDS ELIMINATED.

Section 8007(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7707(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (7).

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
SEC. 601. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 983 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16323) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(b) STRATEGIC UNCONVENTIONAL FUELS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—Section 369(i) of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15927(i)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS FOR INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT.—Section 342(a)(6)(C) of Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6313(a)(6)(C)) is amended—

- (1) by striking clause (v); and
- (2) by redesignating clause (vi) (as added by section 310(a)(4) of Public Law 112–110; 126 Stat. 1524) as clause (v).

TITLE VII—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SEC. 701. GREAT LAKES MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 118(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)) is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (10); and
- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (13) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively.

TITLE VIII—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
SEC. 801. REPORT RELATING TO WAIVER OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST NORTH KOREA ELIMINATED.

Section 1405 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

TITLE IX—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE
SEC. 901. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) EXPENDITURES OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Section 1904 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6574) is repealed.

(b) USE OF RECOVERY ACT FUNDS BY STATES AND LOCALITIES REPORT.—Section 901 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5; 123 Stat. 191) is repealed.

(c) HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT FUNDS AUDIT.—(1) ELIMINATION OF AUDIT.—Section 902(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15542(b)) is amended—

- (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”; and
- (B) by striking paragraph (3); and
- (C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (5).

(2) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY TO RECOVER FUNDS RESULTING FROM PRIOR AUDITS.—Section 902(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15542(c)) is amended by inserting after “subsection (b)” the following: “prior to the date of the enactment of the Government Reports Elimination Act of 2014”.

(d) STATE SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT INITIATIVE AUDIT AND REPORT.—Section 3011 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5710) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (b); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(e) SMALL BUSINESS LENDING FUND PROGRAM AUDIT AND REPORT.—Section 4107 of the Small

Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 4741 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(f) HOUSING ASSISTANCE COUNCIL FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT REPORT.—Section 6303(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 1490e note) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 902. REPORTS MODIFIED.

(a) NATIONAL PREVENTION, HEALTH PROMOTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH COUNCIL.—Subsection (i) of section 4001 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–10) is amended by striking “The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States shall jointly conduct periodic reviews” and inserting “The Secretary shall conduct periodic reviews”.

(b) POSTCARD MANDATE.—Section 719(g)(2) of title 31, United States Code is amended—

- (1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “The Comptroller General shall make each list available through the public website of the Government Accountability Office.”; and
- (2) in the second sentence, by inserting “of Congress” after “committee or member”.

(c) ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD FOUNDATION.—

(1) USE OF PRIVATE INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT.—Section 107 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 807) is amended to read as follows:

“AUDITS

“SEC. 107. (a) CONTRACTS WITH INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT.—The Board shall enter into a contract with an independent public accountant to conduct an annual audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, of the financial records of the Board and of any corporation established under section 106(i), and shall ensure that the independent public accountant has access for the purpose of the audit to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Board or such corporation (or any agent of the Board or such corporation) which the independent public accountant reasonably determines to be pertinent to the Congressional Award Program.

“(b) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON AUDIT RESULTS.—Not later than May 15 of each calendar year, the Board shall submit to appropriate officers, committees, and subcommittees of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on the results of the most recent audit conducted pursuant to this section, and shall include in the report information on any such additional areas as the independent public accountant who conducted the audit determines deserve or require evaluation.

“(c) REVIEW BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF ANNUAL AUDIT.—

“(1) The Comptroller General of the United States shall review each annual audit conducted under subsection (a).

“(2) For purposes of a review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General, or any duly authorized representative of the Comptroller General, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Board or such corporation, or any agent of the Board or such corporation, including the independent external auditor designated under subsection (a), which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, may be pertinent.

“(3) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Comptroller General receives a report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) with respect to the preceding year.”.

(2) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COMPLIANCE WITH FISCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING POLICIES

AND PROCEDURES.—Section 104(c) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 804(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by—

- (i) inserting “policies and” before “procedures”; and
- (ii) striking “fund”; and
- (B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “The Comptroller General of the United States” and inserting “The independent public accountant conducting the annual audit of the financial records of the Board pursuant to section 107(a)”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “the Comptroller General” and inserting “the independent public accountant”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(d) ANNUAL GAO REVIEW OF PROPOSED HHS RECOVERY THRESHOLD.—The third sentence of section 1862(b)(9)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395y(b)(9)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “for a year” and inserting “for 2014”.

TITLE X—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SEC. 1001. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF PRODUCTS MADE WITH DOG OR CAT FUR.—Section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) PORT OF ENTRY INFRASTRUCTURE ASSESSMENT STUDY AND NATIONAL LAND BORDER SECURITY PLAN.—The Border Infrastructure and Technology Modernization Act of 2007 (title VI of division E of Public Law 110–161; 6 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 603 and 604.

(c) FEES FOR CERTAIN CUSTOMS SERVICES.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 13031 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–272; 19 U.S.C. 58c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(9), by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C); and

(B) in subsection (f)—

- (i) in paragraph (3)—
- (I) by striking subparagraph (D); and
- (II) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D);

(ii) by striking paragraph (4); and

(iii) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”.

(d) MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL DISTRESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 346 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–295; 14 U.S.C. 88 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 346.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
SEC. 1101. ROYALTIES IN-KIND REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15902) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (e); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively.

TITLE XII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
SEC. 1201. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965.—Section 515 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056m) is repealed.

(b) ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT.—Section 207 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3205) is repealed.

TITLE XIII—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

SEC. 1301. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) TREATY ON CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE.—Section 2(5)(E) of the Senate resolution advising and consenting to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) of November 19, 1990, adopted at Vienna May 31, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105–5) (commonly referred to as the “CFE Flank Document”), 105th Congress, agreed to May 14, 1997, is repealed.

(b) REPORTS ON COMMERCE WITH, AND ASSISTANCE TO, CUBA FROM OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 108 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 6038) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 108.

TITLE XIV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 1401. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 620F of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2376) is amended by striking subsection (c).

TITLE XV—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 1501. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) REPORTS OF AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES COMMITTEE.—Section 106(p)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (H); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H).

(b) ANNUAL SUMMARIES OF AIRPORT FINANCIAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (k).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (l) through (t) as subsections (k) through (s), respectively;

(ii) in paragraph (5) of subsection (k), as redesignated by clause (i)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (n)(7)” and inserting “subsection (m)(7)”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (n)” and inserting “subsection (m)”;;

(iii) in subsection (m), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “subsections (b) and (l)” each place it appears and inserting “subsections (b) and (k)”; and

(II) by striking “subsection (o)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (n)”;;

(iv) in subsection (n), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (n)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (m)”;;

(v) in subsection (o), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (o)” and inserting “subsection (n)”;;

(vi) in subsection (p), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections (a) through (p)” and inserting “subsections (a) through (o)”; and

(vii) in subsection (q), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections (q)(1) through (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (p)”.

(B) Section 46301(d)(2) of such title is amended by striking “section 47107(l)” and inserting “section 47107(k)”.

(C) Section 47111(e) of such title is amended by striking “section 47107(l)” and inserting “section 47107(k)”.

(D) Section 9502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “section

47107(n)” each place it appears and inserting “section 47107(m)”.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT ON PIPELINE SAFETY INFORMATION GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES.—Section 60130 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM FOR INNOVATIVE FINANCING OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT.—Section 182 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2515; 49 U.S.C. 44502 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(e) REPORTS ON JUSTIFICATIONS FOR AIR DEFENSE IDENTIFICATION ZONES.—Section 602 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2563), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON STANDARDS FOR AIRCRAFT AND AIRCRAFT ENGINES TO REDUCE NOISE LEVELS.—Section 726 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (114 Stat. 167; 49 U.S.C. 47508 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

SEC. 1502. REPORT MODIFIED.

Section 1138(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “at least annually, but may be conducted”.

TITLE XVI—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SEC. 1601. REPORTS ELIMINATED.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON THE NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK.—Section 2 of Public Law 108–215 (22 U.S.C. 290m–6) is repealed.

(b) REPORT ON VOTING ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS LOAN PROPOSALS.—Section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d) is amended by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) through subsection (g) (as added by section 501(g) of Public Law 96–259) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively.

(c) REPORT ON NEW IMF ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING RATES AND MATURITIES.—Section 605 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–222), as enacted into law by section 101(d) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277), is amended by striking subsection (d).

(d) REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS.—The Government Securities Act Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103–202; 31 U.S.C. 3121 note) is amended—

(1) by striking section 203; and

(2) in the table of contents for such Act, by striking the item relating to section 203.

TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SEC. 1701. REPORT ELIMINATED.

Section 8125 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the passage of the Government Reports Elimination Act—a bill that will eliminate or modify 53 Congressionally mandated reports.

In 2010, we passed the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act, which added several new reporting requirements for Federal agencies. Too often, we add these new re-

porting requirements without looking back to see if there are any outdated reports that could be eliminated.

So we asked Federal agencies to identify any duplicative or outdated reports that we could cut. In response, the administration published its first list of more than 300 reports from about 30 agencies and we turned this list into the Government Reports Elimination Act.

Senator AYOTTE and I introduced this bill in the Senate and Congressmen DARRELL ISSA and GERRY CONNOLLY introduced the companion in the House. The final bill will eliminate or modify 53. In doing so, we are removing real barriers to productivity across the government. This represents a real step, albeit a modest one, toward making our government work better.

If these reports are not being used—and are simply collecting dust on a shelf—then they are wasteful, and we cannot afford that kind of waste. Eliminating a handful of reports won't solve our budget challenges—but every hour and dollar saved helps. This bill helps free up time for our Federal employees to focus on priorities.

The passage of the Government Reports Elimination Act makes a small down payment on the broader problem, which is why I'm also working on another bill to make further reductions in Congressionally mandated reports.

In June, the administration sent over the second list of outdated reports for elimination and our new bill will include their recommendations and reflects my ongoing commitment to eliminating these outdated reports.

I wish to thank Senator AYOTTE for being my partner on this work. It has been an honor to work with her on our Budget Committee Government Performance Task Force.

I also want to thank Senators CARPER and COBURN for their leadership on this issue and advancing this bill through their Committee. Additionally, I would like to thank our other cosponsors, Senators FEINSTEIN and MCCASKILL for their support.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered; the Carper amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3820) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 4194), as amended, was passed.

SMART SAVINGS ACT

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 522, S. 2117.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2117) to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Warren substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3821) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Smart Savings Act".

SEC. 2. THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN DEFAULT INVESTMENT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8438(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if an election has not been made with respect to any sums available for investment in the Thrift Savings Fund, the Executive Director shall invest such sums in an age-appropriate target date asset allocation portfolio of the funds described in subsection (b), as determined by the Executive Director.

"(B) If an election has not been made by a member (as defined in section 211 of title 37) contributing to the Thrift Savings Fund under section 8440e with respect to any sums available for investment in such member's Thrift Savings Fund account, the Executive Director shall invest such sums in the Government Securities Investment Fund."

(b) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RISK.—Section 8439(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" before "Each employee"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) Before the date on which an individual is enrolled to make contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund, or as soon as practical thereafter, an individual who is automatically enrolled under section 8432(b)(2) shall receive the risk acknowledgment information described in paragraph (1)."

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8472(g)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "re-

quired by section 8438 of this title to be invested in securities of the Government" and inserting "under section 8438(c)(2)(B)".

(d) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive Director (as that term is defined under section 8401(13) of title 5, United States Code) shall develop and issue guidance implementing the amendments made by this section.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date on which the Executive Director issues guidance under subsection (d); and

(2) apply to individuals who enroll in the Thrift Savings Plan on or after such date.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF FIDUCIARY PROTECTIONS.

Section 8477(e)(1)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subclause (II)—

(A) by inserting "or beneficiary" after "participant"; and

(B) by inserting "or option" after "fund"; and

(2) in subclause (III)—

(A) by inserting "or beneficiary" after "participant"; and

(B) by inserting "or beneficiaries" after "participants".

The bill (S. 2117), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 552, S. 2511.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2511) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SUBSTANTIAL CESSATION OF OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 4062 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1362) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) TREATMENT OF SUBSTANTIAL CESSATION OF OPERATIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), if there is a substantial cessation of operations at a facility in any location, the employer shall be treated with respect to any single employer plan established and maintained by the employer covering participants at such facility as if the employer were a substantial employer under a plan under which more than one employer makes contributions and the provisions of sections 4063, 4064, and 4065 shall apply.

"(2) SUBSTANTIAL CESSATION OF OPERATIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'substantial cessation of operations' means a permanent cessation of operations at a facility which results in a workforce reduction of a number of eligible employees at the facility equivalent to more than 15 percent of the number of all eligible employees of the employer, determined immediately before the earlier of—

"(i) the date of the employer's decision to implement such cessation, or

"(ii) in the case of a workforce reduction which includes 1 or more eligible employees described in paragraph (6)(B), the earliest date on which any such eligible employee was separated from employment.

"(B) WORKFORCE REDUCTION.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), the term 'workforce reduction' means the number of eligible employees at a facility who are separated from employment by reason of the permanent cessation of operations of the employer at the facility.

"(C) RELOCATION OF WORKFORCE.—An eligible employee separated from employment at a facility shall not be taken into account in computing a workforce reduction if, within a reasonable period of time, the employee is replaced by the employer, at the same or another facility located in the United States, by an employee who is a citizen or resident of the United States.

"(D) DISPOSITIONS.—If, whether by reason of a sale or other disposition of the assets or stock of a contributing sponsor (or any member of the same controlled group as such a sponsor) of the plan relating to operations at a facility or otherwise, an employer (the 'transferee employer') other than the employer which experiences the substantial cessation of operations (the 'transferor employer') conducts any portion of such operations, then—

"(i) an eligible employee separated from employment with the transferor employer at the facility shall not be taken into account in computing a workforce reduction if—

"(I) within a reasonable period of time, the employee is replaced by the transferee employer by an employee who is a citizen or resident of the United States; and

"(II) in the case of an eligible employee who is a participant in a single employer plan maintained by the transferor employer, the transferee employer, within a reasonable period of time, maintains a single employer plan which includes the assets and liabilities attributable to the accrued benefit of the eligible employee at the time of separation from employment with the transferor employer; and

"(ii) an eligible employee who continues to be employed at the facility by the transferee employer shall not be taken into account in computing a workforce reduction if—

"(I) the eligible employee is not a participant in a single employer plan maintained by the transferor employer, or

"(II) in any other case, the transferee employer, within a reasonable period of time, maintains a single employer plan which includes the assets and liabilities attributable to the accrued benefit of the eligible employee at the time of separation from employment with the transferor employer.

"(3) EXEMPTION FOR PLANS WITH LIMITED UNDERFUNDING.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a single employer plan if, for the plan year preceding the plan year in which the cessation occurred—

"(A) there were fewer than 100 participants with accrued benefits under the plan as of the valuation date of the plan for the plan year (as determined under section 303(g)(2)); or

"(B) the ratio of the market value of the assets of the plan to the funding target of the plan for the plan year was 90 percent or greater.

"(4) ELECTION TO MAKE ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO SATISFY LIABILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer may elect to satisfy the employer’s liability with respect to a plan by reason of paragraph (1) by making additional contributions to the plan in the amount determined under subparagraph (B) for each plan year in the 7-plan-year period beginning with the plan year in which the cessation occurred. Any such additional contribution for a plan year shall be in addition to any minimum required contribution under section 303 for such plan year and shall be paid not later than the earlier of—

“(i) the due date for the minimum required contribution for such year under section 303(j); or

“(ii) in the case of the first such contribution, the date that is 1 year after the date on which the employer notifies the Corporation of the substantial cessation of operations or the date the Corporation determines a substantial cessation of operations has occurred, and in the case of subsequent contributions, the same date in each succeeding year.

“(B) AMOUNT DETERMINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the amount determined under this subparagraph with respect to each plan year in the 7-plan-year period is the product of—

“(I) $\frac{1}{2}$ of the unfunded vested benefits determined under section 4006(a)(3)(E) as of the valuation date of the plan (as determined under section 303(g)(2)) for the plan year preceding the plan year in which the cessation occurred; and

“(II) the reduction fraction.

“(ii) REDUCTION FRACTION.—For purposes of clause (i), the reduction fraction of a single employer plan is equal to—

“(I) the number of participants with accrued benefits in the plan who were included in computing the workforce reduction under paragraph (2)(B) as a result of the cessation of operations at the facility; divided by

“(II) the number of eligible employees of the employer who are participants with accrued benefits in the plan, determined as of the same date the determination under paragraph (2)(A) is made.

“(iii) LIMITATION.—The additional contribution under this subparagraph for any plan year shall not exceed the excess, if any, of—

“(I) 25 percent of the difference between the market value of the assets of the plan and the funding target of the plan for the preceding plan year; over

“(II) the minimum required contribution under section 303 for the plan year.

“(C) PERMITTED CESSATION OF ANNUAL INSTALLMENTS WHEN PLAN BECOMES SUFFICIENTLY FUNDED.—An employer’s obligation to make additional contributions under this paragraph shall not apply to—

“(i) the first plan year (beginning on or after the first day of the plan year in which the cessation occurs) for which the ratio of the market value of the assets of the plan to the funding target of the plan for the plan year is 90 percent or greater; or

“(ii) any plan year following such first plan year.

“(D) COORDINATION WITH FUNDING WAIVERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of the Treasury issues a funding waiver under section 302(c) with respect to the plan for a plan year in the 7-plan-year period under subparagraph (A), the additional contribution with respect to such plan year shall be permanently waived.

“(ii) NOTICE.—An employer maintaining a plan with respect to which such a funding waiver has been issued or a request for such a funding waiver is pending shall provide notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, in such form and at such time as the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide, of a cessation of operations to which paragraph (1) applies.

“(E) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(i) NOTICE.—An employer making the election under this paragraph shall provide notice to the Corporation, in accordance with rules prescribed by the Corporation, of—

“(I) such election, not later than 30 days after the earlier of the date the employer notifies the Corporation of the substantial cessation of operations or the date the Corporation determines a substantial cessation of operations has occurred;

“(II) the payment of each additional contribution, not later than 10 days after such payment;

“(III) any failure to pay the additional contribution in the full amount for any year in the 7-plan-year period, not later than 10 days after the due date for such payment;

“(IV) the waiver under subparagraph (D)(i) of the obligation to make an additional contribution for any year, not later than 30 days after the funding waiver described in such subparagraph is granted; and

“(V) the cessation of any obligation to make additional contributions under subparagraph (C), not later than 10 days after the due date for payment of the additional contribution for the first plan year to which such cessation applies.

“(ii) ACCELERATION OF LIABILITY TO THE PLAN FOR FAILURE TO PAY.—If an employer fails to pay the additional contribution in the full amount for any year in the 7-plan-year period by the due date for such payment, the employer shall, as of such date, be liable to the plan in an amount equal to the balance which remains unpaid as of such date of the aggregate amount of additional contributions required to be paid by the employer during such 7-year-plan period. The Corporation may waive or settle the liability described in the preceding sentence, at the discretion of the Corporation.

“(iii) CIVIL ACTION.—The Corporation may bring a civil action in the district courts of the United States in accordance with section 4003(e) to compel an employer making such election to pay the additional contributions required under this paragraph.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘eligible employee’ means an employee who is eligible to participate in an employee pension benefit plan (as defined in section 3(2)) established and maintained by the employer.

“(B) FUNDING TARGET.—The term ‘funding target’ means, with respect to any plan year, the funding target as determined under section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii)(I) for purposes of determining the premium paid to the Corporation under section 4007 for the plan year.

“(C) MARKET VALUE.—The market value of the assets of a plan shall be determined in the same manner as for purposes of section 4006(a)(3)(E).

“(6) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(A) CHANGE IN OPERATION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AND PROPERTY.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), an employer shall not be treated as ceasing operations at a qualified lodging facility (as defined in section 856(d)(9)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if such operations are continued by an eligible independent contractor (as defined in section 856(d)(9)(A) of such Code) pursuant to an agreement with the employer.

“(B) AGGREGATION OF PRIOR SEPARATIONS.—The workforce reduction under paragraph (2) with respect to any cessation of operations shall be determined by taking into account any separation from employment of any eligible employee at the facility (other than a separation which is not taken into account as workforce reduction by reason of subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (2)) which—

“(i) is related to the permanent cessation of operations of the employer at the facility, and

“(ii) occurs during the 3-year period preceding such cessation.

“(C) NO ADDITION TO PREFUNDING BALANCE.—For purposes of section 303(f)(6)(B) and section 430(f)(6)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, any additional contribution made under paragraph (4) shall be treated in the same manner as a contribution an employer is required to make in order to avoid a benefit reduction under paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of section 206(g) or subsection (b), (c), or (e) of section 436 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the plan year.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to a cessation of operations or other event at a facility occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—An employer that had a cessation of operations before the date of enactment of this Act (as determined under subsection 4062(e) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as in effect before the amendment made by this section), but did not enter into an arrangement with the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to satisfy the requirements of such subsection (as so in effect) before such date of enactment, shall be permitted to make the election under section 4062(e)(4) of such Act (as in effect after the amendment made by this section) as if such cessation had occurred on such date of enactment. Such election shall be made not later than 30 days after such Corporation issues, on or after such date of the enactment, a final administrative determination that a substantial cessation of operations has occurred.

(c) DIRECTION TO THE CORPORATION.—The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation shall not take any enforcement, administrative, or other action pursuant to section 4062(e) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or in connection with an agreement settling liability arising under such section, that is inconsistent with the amendment made by this section, without regard to whether the action relates to a cessation or other event that occurs before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless such action is in connection with a settlement agreement that is in place before June 1, 2014. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation shall not initiate a new enforcement action with respect to section 4062(e) of such Act that is inconsistent with its enforcement policy in effect on June 1, 2014.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2511), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BLM PERMIT PROCESSING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Energy Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2440 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2440) to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Udall of New Mexico amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3822) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the uses of the BLM Permit Processing Improvement Fund)

On page 5, line 13, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

On page 6, line 5, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

On page 7, line 11, insert "and Indian trust mineral estate" after "Federal".

The bill (S. 2440), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "BLM Permit Processing Improvement Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. PROGRAM TO IMPROVE FEDERAL PERMIT COORDINATION.

Section 365 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15924) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "PILOT";

(2) by striking "Pilot Project" each place it appears and inserting "Project";

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico" and inserting "the States in which Project offices are located";

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "PILOT"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) Any other State, district, or field office of the Bureau of Land Management determined by the Secretary.";

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

"(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than February 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of the BLM Permit Processing Improvement Act of 2014 and each February 1 thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, which shall include—

"(1) the allocation of funds to each Project office for the previous fiscal year; and

"(2) the accomplishments of each Project office relating to the coordination and proc-

essing of oil and gas use authorizations during that fiscal year.";

(6) in subsection (h), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

"(6) the States in which Project offices are located.";

(7) by striking subsection (i); and

(8) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

SEC. 3. BLM OIL AND GAS PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.

Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) BLM OIL AND GAS PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2026, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall collect a fee for each new application for a permit to drill that is submitted to the Secretary.

"(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of the fee shall be \$9,500 for each new application, as indexed for United States dollar inflation from October 1, 2015 (as measured by the Consumer Price Index).

"(3) USE.—Of the fees collected under this subsection for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall transfer—

"(A) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019—

"(i) 15 percent to the field offices that collected the fees and used to process protests, leases, and permits under this Act, subject to appropriation; and

"(ii) 85 percent to the BLM Permit Processing Improvement Fund established under subsection (c)(2)(B) (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fund'); and

"(B) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2026, all of the fees to the Fund.

"(4) ADDITIONAL COSTS.—During each of fiscal years of 2016 through 2026, the Secretary shall not implement a rulemaking that would enable an increase in fees to recover additional costs related to processing applications for permits to drill."

SEC. 4. BLM PERMIT PROCESSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 35(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) USE OF FUND.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Fund shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure, without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation, for the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land.

"(B) ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary shall divide the Fund into—

"(i) a Rental Account (referred to in this subsection as the 'Rental Account') comprised of rental receipts collected under this section; and

"(ii) a Fee Account (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fee Account') comprised of fees collected under subsection (d).

"(4) RENTAL ACCOUNT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the Rental Account for—

"(i) the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land under the jurisdiction of the Project offices identified under section 365(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15924(d)); and

"(ii) training programs for development of expertise related to coordinating and processing oil and gas use authorizations.

"(B) ALLOCATION.—In determining the allocation of the Rental Account among Project offices for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall consider—

"(i) the number of applications for permit to drill received in a Project office during the previous fiscal year;

"(ii) the backlog of applications described in clause (i) in a Project office;

"(iii) publicly available industry forecasts for development of oil and gas resources under the jurisdiction of a Project office; and

"(iv) any opportunities for partnership with local industry organizations and educational institutions in developing training programs to facilitate the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations.

"(5) FEE ACCOUNT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the Fee Account for the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land.

"(B) ALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall transfer not less than 75 percent of the revenues collected by an office for the processing of applications for permits to the State office of the State in which the fees were collected."

(b) INTEREST ON OVERPAYMENT ADJUSTMENT.—Section 111(h) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1721(h)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "the rate" and all that follows through the period at the end of the sentence and inserting "a rate equal to the sum of the Federal short-term rate determined under section 6621(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 plus 1 percentage point."

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

RECOGNIZING AUXILIARIES OF VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 506, and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 506) recognizing the patriotism and contributions of auxiliaries of veterans service organizations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 506) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 17, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration en bloc of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 547, S. Res. 548, S. Res. 549, and S. Res. 550.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the

majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, reappoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable KAY R. HAGAN of North Carolina.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2014

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 17, 2014; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. The next rollcall vote will be at 12 noon on the Bass nomination, as provided for under the previous order.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. HEITKAMP. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:04 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 16, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW T. HARRINGTON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LINDA A. SCHWARTZ, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (POLICY AND PLANNING).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NINA HACHIGIAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GORDON O. TANNER, OF ALABAMA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TODD D. ROBINSON, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

JANE D. HARTLEY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

JANE D. HARTLEY, OF NEW YORK, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PRINCIPALITY OF MONACO.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2015.

STEPHEN G. BURNS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 16, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, standing in this hallowed chamber of democracy where laws are debated, amended, and passed, one must stand in awe of our courageous forefathers who created this institution. In fact, 227 years ago when our Constitution was created and signed by 39 brave men, it created the first government of its kind, a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

These men, well aware of the consequences of all-powerful European monarchies, created a democratic system of three coequal branches of government each with its own unique role. The brilliance that these men instilled in this document is still alive and well to this day as we watch each branch of the government perform its role, keeping checks and balances on the others to make sure that the will of the people is obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, this Constitution Day, let us give thanks to these wise and brave men who birthed our constitutional republic and our Nation.

JOURNEYING THROUGH THE 23RD DISTRICT OF TEXAS, THE TOWN OF SANDERSON, TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I would like to highlight one of the really interesting towns of west Texas as we continue to journey through the 23rd District, which encompasses nearly 24 percent of the land area of Texas, some 800 miles from one end of the district to the other.

With a population of over 800 people, Sanderson, Texas, is known as the Cactus Capital of Texas. It was originally named Strawbridge or Strobridge, and Sanderson was founded as a switching point for the Southern Pacific Railroad.

In 1882, a roundhouse was built there, and the name of the town was changed to Sanderson, after Thomas P. Sanderson, who was the engineer in charge of construction. In the following year, in 1883, a post office opened in Sanderson.

In Texas lore, there is a very famous person by the name of Roy Bean who was known as the Law West of the Pecos. Judge Roy Bean, wanting to capitalize on the new town with a lot of promise, opened a saloon in Sanderson in the early 1880s, but he couldn't compete with Charlie Wilson's Cottage Bar Saloon.

After Bean opened his saloon, Wilson allegedly spiked the whiskey with coal oil. Judge Bean soon had to move eastward to Vinegarroon and Langtry, and Sanderson was dubbed as being "too mean for Bean." Those were the years of railroad workers and cowboys which filled the area.

At the turn of the century, in 1905, the once unruly Sanderson became the county seat of the newly-created Terrell County, and it remains the county seat even to this day.

Shortly after becoming the county seat, Sanderson started looking more and more like a town on the move, but, as time passed, Sanderson left behind its Wild West origins and became a crossroad—the midpoint, if you will—between San Antonio and El Paso.

The courthouse was built in 1906. Near the courthouse some years later, in 1931, an art deco-style high school was built, and Sanderson's population continued to grow to about 3,000 people during the first half of the 20th century.

Sheep and goats became the main goods as part of the livestock industry,

and they are still main commodities of the area today. For example, in 1970, over 1 million pounds—over 1 million pounds—of wool and mohair were shipped out of Sanderson.

In 1965, Sanderson was devastated by a flash flood. The usually dry Sanderson Creek overflowed and claimed 24 lives. After the tragic event, 11 flood control dams were built around Sanderson by the Army Corps of Engineers to make sure that that would never happen again.

Sanderson was built around the railroad, and its fate has largely been determined by the railroad. A series of decisions altered, decisively, Sanderson's growth. During the 1970s, the new construction of Interstate 10, I-10, bypassed Highway 90, and it bypassed Sanderson. It left Sanderson out of its path.

In addition, Union Pacific later moved its crew from Sanderson to Alpine. These had a detrimental effect on the community; but today, Sanderson remains a small but proud community which fights to maintain its rich history and its tradition of railroads, cowboys, and west Texas culture.

Sanderson High School, known as the Sanderson Eagles, produce a lot of incredibly talented kids who go to universities from Rice to my own alma mater, Sul Ross State University in Alpine. In fact, many of the kids that I went to Sul Ross with were from Sanderson, Texas, and many of their teachers have degrees from Sul Ross.

In more recent times, Sanderson has put out a number of people. My immediate predecessor in the legislature, Judge Dudley Harrison, was from Sanderson, and "Chago" Flores, who is the first Latino elected county judge in the history of Terrell County, is serving even now.

If visiting that area, I want you to know that you will have access to an extensive variety of memorabilia at the Terrell County Memorial Museum, and I want you to know that Sanderson is still the Cactus Capital of Texas and the East Gate to the Big Bend Wilderness Area.

I invite you to stop by Sanderson if you are ever visiting the 23rd District of Texas.

HONORING COACH JACK CRABTREE OF SALINE HIGH SCHOOL IN SALINE, MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has dedicated over 40 years of his life to mentoring and educating thousands of young men and women in Saline, Michigan.

Coach Jack Crabtree has long been admired for his fighting spirit, dedication, loyalty, and integrity. Throughout the last four decades at Saline High School, Coach Crabtree has left lasting impressions on his students, his players, and his staff.

In the classroom, he taught students the importance of civic engagement through his American government, history, and economics classes. In fact, my staff has been blessed by the impact of one of his former students.

As head of the physical education department, Coach Crabtree emphasized the value of working hard until the whistle blows, but he certainly is most well-known in the community for dedicating a large part of his life to football and, under his leadership, created the storied football tradition which exists today at Saline High School.

In 1988, Coach Crabtree's success on the field was affirmed when he was inducted into the Michigan High School Football Coaches Hall of Fame; however, Jack Crabtree has been more than just "the football coach" to the community of Saline, Michigan.

He always knew the most important play on the football field was the next one, and he passed along his focus and persevering spirit to young people in Saline throughout his four decades as a teacher, coach, and mentor.

His dedication to hard work, discipline, and integrity has shaped and motivated thousands of his students and players to achieve great things in their personal and professional careers.

Jack Crabtree embodied his personal credo that, in the long run, a man's dedication is the only true measure of his greatness.

I am grateful to Coach Crabtree for his continued commitment to the community of Saline, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his many years of service.

CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM AROUND THE GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the alarming surge of anti-Semitic demonstrations across the globe. Sparked by the latest confrontation between our greatest ally, Israel, and Hamas terrorists, synagogues and Holocaust memorials have been vandalized, Jewish stores have been attacked, Israeli products have been boycotted, and the Israeli and American flags have been desecrated and emblazoned with swastikas. These cowardly acts

are in direct contrast to our democratic values of freedom, liberty, and equal justice under the law.

With a frightening number of such despicable acts being reported across Europe and Latin America, our Nation must continue to speak out in condemnation of these demonstrations.

We must also be a global leader in stopping the surge of anti-Semitism, making it clear to other nations that such intolerance and hatred have no place in our global community.

By allowing anti-Semitism to flourish, nations risk fostering an environment in which violence and escalating tensions can grow and impact not only Jews but all religious, ethnic, and other minority groups.

That is why I am proud to be working with my good friends, Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DEUTCH of Florida and Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia, in leading a bipartisan coalition of over two dozen Members of Congress and calling on the United States to continue its efforts in combating anti-Semitism, especially in the wake of this troubling rise in such demonstrations.

I also want to commend our local Jewish community relations council for their leadership on this crucial issue which remains at the forefront of our community.

Partnering with several other local and national organizations, all well-respected for their work on combating anti-Semitism, they will be hosting a forum in the district I am so proud to represent regarding this growing crisis. I applaud their continued work standing up against bigotry and raising awareness, both at home and abroad, of the threat of rising anti-Semitism.

Madam Speaker, we must continue to work together to stem the rise of anti-Semitism wherever it occurs and help foster an environment more conducive to long-term peace throughout our global community.

PROTECTING THE CLEAN WATER PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Clean Water Act, which was passed in 1972 and was designed as a State and Federal partnership.

The law's success can be attributed to the recognition that States have the primary responsibility of regulating and protecting waters within their individual boundaries. For the past four decades, this framework has served to improve pollution control and continues to be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Unfortunately, a recent proposal by the Environmental Protection Agency, commonly known as the Waters of the

United States, would undermine this partnership and intrude upon State and local prerogatives related to land use and planning, environmental stewardship, and economic growth.

This past week, the House passed with bipartisan support H.R. 5078, the Waters of the United States Regulatory Overreach Protection Act. Now, this legislation prohibits the Federal Government from moving forward with this misguided proposal and protects our farmers, our landowners, and local municipalities by upholding the Federal-State partnership that has yielded success in protecting our environment and enhancing water quality.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, as we prepare to debate and vote on the continuing resolution to fund the government through December, I rise to urge that the House stay in session until we can also take up several issues that are not resolved in the legislation we will be voting on, things our constituents are struggling with every day: unemployment, adequate support for our seniors, college affordability, and climate change.

□ 1015

These issues deserve our attention, and the toll they take on Americans is very real, both in Oregon and in districts across the country.

For the millions of men and women who are still struggling to find a job, emergency unemployment insurance was their lifeline. After numerous pleas to call for a vote went unanswered, millions of Americans are now unable to fill up their gas tank or pay their rent. For some on the precipice of homelessness, this is the tipping point. These people can't move on without the support provided by unemployment insurance. So let's send a signal that we haven't abandoned them and take up a bill to extend these critical benefits.

And let's not forget how many people could get back to work if we would set aside our differences and pass a long-term transportation bill and a comprehensive overhaul of our Tax Code. Enough of these policies that incentivize businesses to go overseas; we need policies that keep them bringing jobs back home.

We should also think of our seniors. The Older Americans Act changed the way our seniors age in this country. It contains social and nutritional programs that help them live full, independent lives, but the act expired more than 3 years ago. Meanwhile, the number of Americans turning 60 continues to grow.

I introduced a bill to reauthorize and update the Older Americans Act so seniors can age with dignity and not in

poverty. However, the House has yet to consider this important bill to renew critical safety net programs like Meals on Wheels, home health care, and protection from elder abuse. My bill is closely aligned with a bipartisan compromise introduced in the Senate, and it deserves consideration.

And let's not forget the millions of students who are returning to college campuses across the country this fall. The cost of college is leaving too many of them with massive debt and decades-long repayment plans. That is a drag on our economy. We need legislation that allows students to refinance their current loans—just like people can refinance a mortgage to get lower rates—and, ultimately, we must address the rising cost of college. Higher education needs to be accessible for everyone. We should not create barriers by maintaining a system in which higher education involves exorbitant student loan debt.

Finally, the threat of climate change continues to loom. This too is a concern across the country and around the world, but it is particularly alarming to my coastal and agricultural portions of my district. Greenhouse gas emissions are at record highs, leading to a warming planet, melting glaciers, and rising sea levels. Farmers, fishers, and others who rely on our natural resources are already feeling the stress.

We must have a serious discussion about how we can curb increasing carbon emissions. Let's make this an opportunity to develop new and innovative technologies that can reduce carbon emissions while growing and advancing our economy through the creation of clean energy jobs. Let's do it for our children and our grandchildren. Let's not wait.

Yes, this continuing resolution will continue to fund the government for a short time. It will prevent another disastrous government shutdown. But it is a short-term fix that leaves numerous immediate problems unaddressed. We must do better for our constituents. They will bear the ramifications of our inaction.

I urge my colleagues to set aside our differences. Let's work together to find the solutions our constituents deserve.

HONORING JUDGE McMACKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of my dear friend Judge Michael McMaken, a longtime district judge from Mobile County and a true servant leader.

Judge McMaken was born in Oklahoma in 1947. The son of an Army officer, he grew up on various Army posts around the world. He attended college at Purdue University in Indiana and later received his master of business administration and his law degree from

my alma mater, the law school at the University of Alabama.

A true outdoorsman who enjoyed hunting, fishing, scuba diving, and almost any sport, Judge McMaken always wanted to live on Alabama's gulf coast. He got that chance when he moved to Mobile to serve as an assistant district attorney for then Mobile district attorney and now presiding circuit judge Charlie Graddick.

While working in the DA's office, he taught criminal justice at the University of South Alabama. He eventually went on to private practice until being encouraged by many people, including me, to run for district judge in 1986. After winning his first election, Judge McMaken would go on to serve as a district judge in Mobile County for 25 years.

He was instrumental in the creation of the Mobile County Drug Court, which helps give those struggling with drug addiction opportunities to beat their addiction and better themselves. That drug program became a model for other counties in Alabama and across the southeastern part of the United States.

Outside of the courtroom, Judge McMaken was a forceful advocate for civic responsibility. He was a founding member and first president of the board of directors for the Mobile Child Advocacy Center, which helps children who have been preyed upon by people who would do them harm. He also served as a president of the board of directors of Goodwill, Easter Seals, and AltaPointe Health Systems. He was actively involved with the Boy Scouts program in Alabama and a member of the Governor's Drug Advisory Council.

Judge McMaken retired from the bench in 2012 but remained very active in our community. In the late 1980s, around the same time he and his wife were expecting their first child, Judge McMaken was diagnosed with leukemia. He fought this dreadful disease for over 25 years, never relenting in his crusade for justice or his public service. He never let the disease beat him down. Sadly, on September 7, Judge McMaken finally succumbed to the disease.

Mike is survived by his loving wife, Kathy, and two wonderful children, Michelle and Bren, in addition to a number of cousins and many, many close friends.

Madam Speaker, I believe Mobile County Circuit Judge Ben Brooks said it best. He said, "The older I get, the more I know how rare it is to meet someone like Mike." I couldn't agree more. What matters most is not what you take with you when you leave this world but, rather, what you leave behind. Judge McMaken left behind a legacy of compassion, justice, community service, and civic responsibility.

The city of Mobile, Mobile County, and the entire State of Alabama will be

forever grateful for the life and the service of Judge McMaken and for his remarkable career throughout our community. We extend our greatest condolences to his family and friends.

HOUSE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, sadly, the majority is pressing forward later this week with two partisan messaging bills cloaked in the rhetoric of creating jobs and expanding opportunity, bills that actually do neither.

We will today and tomorrow, for the most part, I think, proceed in a bipartisan fashion, where we will have views on both sides of the aisle that agree and that disagree with the actions we will take on the continuing resolution and the amendment that will be considered to give authority to the President of the United States to train and equip those who are confronting ISIL. However, after we consider that, we will proceed again on the partisan messaging bills of which I spoke. This, unfortunately, has been the pattern throughout the 112th and the 113th, this Congress.

The American people are rightfully disgusted—in some cases, despairing—and certainly tired of the partisan games that lead only to gridlock that have made this Congress the most unproductive Congress in which I have served. This is my 17th Congress.

The American people are tired of watching the Republican majority walk away from their responsibilities to govern in a bipartisan way. They are tired of Republicans walking away from our middle class when they have refused to raise the minimum wage, which has a majority of votes on this floor for passage.

The minimum wage today, if it were in 2014 dollars and 1968 levels, would be \$10.77. That means those at the lowest ranks of earners in America have seen their buying power degraded by over 40 percent since 1968, and yet we won't even bring it to the floor. When I say "we," the Republican majority won't even bring it to the floor for a vote, and it has a majority of votes in my opinion.

They won't bring a bill to the floor that ensures equal pay for equal work. Every woman in this House and every man in this House except for the leadership are paid exactly the same thing irrespective of their gender. Americans believe that is the right thing to do. We can't get a bill to the floor.

We need to make higher education more affordable. Student loans have the ability to be refinanced just as mortgages can be refinanced. We can't get such a bill to the floor.

They are tired of Republicans' obsession with undoing the patient protections and cost savings of health care

reform. We spent 4 years pretending that we were going to repeal it as opposed to fixing that which could be made better on behalf of the American people.

They are tired of watching Republicans walk away from every opportunity to get our fiscal House in order, as they did with the Biden talks; the Boehner-Obama negotiations; the supercommittee, composed of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats; walked away from averting the sequester; shut down the government; and several missed opportunities to pursue fiscal sustainability.

The American people are, as I said, distressed, dismayed, and, indeed, angry at the Congress, all of us, because they see their board of directors of the greatest country on the face of the Earth not working.

They are tired of Republicans' failure to move forward with bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform. That, again, has the votes on this floor to pass, but they don't bring it to the floor.

The Republican Congress has made it clear that their message to America is: You are on your own.

You are not earning enough minimum wage? You are on your own.

You lost your unemployment insurance? You are on your own.

Sandy comes and visits the Atlantic Katrina visited. And what did we do on Sandy? We said, You are on your own. A majority of Republicans—an overwhelming majority of Republicans—voted against helping those who were struck by Sandy.

Export-Import Bank. You are in a business that is trying to export goods. You are getting a little help. You are being competitive with the rest of the world. What does this Congress say? You are on your own. Yes, we are going to extend it for a short period of time, but there are a majority of votes on this floor to extend it for a number of years, which will give confidence to the economy and to exporters and lenders that it will be in place. But what did we say? You are on your own.

You want to buy a home? Well, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee wants to eliminate Fannie and Freddie and say, Yes, you are on your own.

You need terrorism risk insurance to build and get a loan for commercial construction? It is not on the floor. You are on your own.

The American people are upset with us—and rightfully so. I am upset with us. This Republican Congress has made it clear that it is about political messaging and nothing else. That is what they said to women when they voted against the Violence Against Women Act, an act which had passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion when it was adopted and when it was reauthorized, but this Congress could

not get a majority of the Republicans to vote for it. It passed after 8 months of delay because Democrats voted overwhelmingly for it—what they said to small business owners when they voted against that Sandy relief, and it is what they told unemployed workers when they voted not to extend emergency unemployment.

While House Republicans are using September to continue sending messages to the American people, House Democrats are talking about lifting up the middle class, giving a jump-start to the middle class. This month will be one of sharp contrast and, yes, next month and, yes, November.

□ 1030

There are choices to be made, a sharp contrast. The overwhelming majority of the American people are for every one of the issues that I have just mentioned. Poll after poll after poll shows them to be so.

There will be a contrast between obstruction and progress—between Republicans who have said their number one priority is winning an election and Democrats who want to win the battle for economic equality and economic opportunity for the American people.

The American people deserve a Congress that is on their side. House Democrats are committed to doing what is necessary to jump-start our middle class, create good jobs, and open doors of opportunity for all Americans.

Jump-starting the middle class means helping more of our businesses make it in America and create jobs that pay well. We, by the way, passed yesterday "Make It In America" legislation—good legislation, bipartisan legislation. It was done on a voice vote. The reason it was done on a voice vote is because there was some concern that a large number of Republicans might vote against it. That would have been a bad vote for them, so we passed it on a voice vote.

It means equal pay for equal work and greater access to affordable child care. It means access to higher education, spanning job training and opportunity. It means enabling more Americans to own a home, save for retirement, and know with certainty their children will be better off than we are and that they were.

That, Madam Speaker, is what the American people expect us to do. It is so sad that we haven't been doing it. It is so sad that we cannot have the House work its will, which is, of course, what the Republicans said in their pledge to America. That is what the young guns told us they were going to do. We have had more closed rules than any Congress in which I have served. That means that ideas can't be put forward.

Madam Speaker, the American public will have a choice between a stark con-

trast of who is on their side. Let's hope the next Congress is a Congress of which the American people can be proud.

DEFEND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY FROM ISIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about one of the greatest threats to the United States of America and our allies. An evil that is so barbaric and ruthless that it can't be ignored but only dismantled and destroyed. Madam Speaker, I am talking about the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant, also known as ISIL.

Many of you, many of all of us, have watched in horror as two American journalists—James Foley and Steven Sotloff—and a British citizen, David Haines, were gruesomely murdered by ISIL. As a mother and as an American, my thoughts and prayers go out to their families and to all the victims of this vile terrorist group.

Madam Speaker, ISIL is the most ruthless and well-financed terrorist group in the world. Their goal is simple: kill the innocent and ultimately terrorize the United States of America and our allies. We have an obligation, one that has been long overdue, to stop this barbaric terrorist organization before they strike us at home.

Madam Speaker, we must not let that happen. We must stand together, stand together as a Nation, a people, in a unified bipartisan fashion, to stop ISIL once and for all. Make no mistake about it, we are at war with radical Islam.

ISIL must not have a safe haven in Syria, or anywhere else, with the time and the space to operate and carry out attacks against our allies and our homeland. They must be destroyed.

Our Commander in Chief has asked for the "tools" to defeat ISIL. Madam Speaker, I will support the President in our effort to complete the mission and to defeat the enemy. But I do remain concerned that the President does not have the long-term vision and the will to complete the mission.

As Americans, we should all want the President to succeed. The cost of failure is far too great. However, the cost of not acting is even greater. The President's rhetoric must match his action and his resolve.

Madam Speaker, Congress will answer the call of the American people and give the President the tools that he has asked for while providing rigorous oversight and requiring accountability for the duration of this military campaign. We must complete the mission.

I, for one, stand ready to work with anyone to defend our national security and protect our very way of life.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working in Florida for a very simple reason: no one wants to be uninsured. People want affordable health insurance.

Florida enrolled more people in health insurance coverage than any other State using healthcare.gov. This only illustrates just how high a demand there is for affordable coverage in our State.

During the first open enrollment period, some 983,000 Floridians signed up. More than 90 percent were eligible for some type of financial assistance under the law, which drove premiums down to an average of \$79 a month in Florida.

In the span of a few months, our State's uninsured rate dropped from 25 percent to under 20 percent. I am confident that when open enrollment begins this fall, even more Floridians will take advantage of the opportunity to get covered.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, there are 1.06 million Floridians who won't have that opportunity. They don't make enough money to qualify for help buying private insurance in the marketplace, and they have been denied the Medicaid coverage that they are eligible for by Governor Rick Scott and by our GOP State legislature.

Health care reform was designed to help more Americans afford private health insurance and provide basic coverage for low-income people through Medicaid. To do so, the law extended eligibility for Medicaid to people earning up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level.

Talking in terms of the Federal poverty level seems abstract, but for the millions of Americans working hard for such little income the hardships that they face are very real. Earning 138 percent of the poverty level means barely making ends meet. For a full-time minimum wage worker it means scraping by on less than \$16,000 a year; for a family of four it means bringing in less than \$32,000 a year, struggling to afford food and other basic necessities. Unfortunately, in Florida, it also means going uninsured. That is unacceptable in 2014 when there is a Federal law on the books that says that they don't have to be.

As a member of the House Medicaid Expansion Caucus here in Congress, unfortunately, I find myself in a position where I have to ask Governor Scott and my former colleagues on the floor of the legislature just a few questions: Are two young parents working fast-food jobs in Miami less deserving of primary care visits than a couple working at the same burger chain in Colorado? Are the chronic headaches of a home cleaner in West Palm Beach

somehow less serious than those doing the same work in West Virginia? Is a loved one struggling with substance abuse in Orlando any less worthy of treatment than someone in New York or in Maine? Are these 1,060,000 Floridians somehow undeserving of the coverage our Federal health care law has made them eligible for?

These are some of the most hard-working people in our State. They are proud moms and dads. They are cashiers and housekeepers, security guards and fast-food workers, office clerks, and landscapers. They are veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. They are adults who have gone back to college to further their careers.

Our desire to give Florida families the same shot at leading healthy, productive lives as Americans in any other State should be enough to convince Governor Rick Scott to call the legislature back into session tomorrow to get it done.

But just in case our responsibility to protect families and promote public health isn't enough, economists have also found that no other State has more to lose by rejecting Medicaid expansion—by rejecting Medicaid expansion—than Florida.

Just this month, a McClatchy analysis of The Urban Institute data concluded that Florida's decision to deny Medicaid to 1,060,000 people will cost our State an astronomical \$66.1 billion by 2022. Florida's hospitals are expected to lose \$22.6 billion over that same period and will continue to bear the burden of providing expensive emergency room care to uninsured patients for nothing in return.

The billions and billions of dollars at stake for Florida through Medicaid expansion would do far more than expand basic coverage to 1.06 million low-income people. These dollars would also generate new growth and opportunity throughout Florida's economy.

That is because when hospitals are actually paid for their services their balance sheets improve, they have more room to invest and to expand. When they build a new surgery wing, they put to work more engineers and construction contractors and they hire new staff and they create good, well-paying jobs in our State.

According to the Council of Economic Advisers at the White House, the economic growth injected into Florida's economy would deliver about 63,000 new jobs between now and 2017. Missing out on that kind of opportunity will be devastating for our State. Failing to cover those 1,060,000 Floridians would not deliver real savings to taxpayers in the long run.

It is time for Governor Scott and the Florida legislature to focus less on politics and more on helping Floridians, parents, students, veterans, and workers get the coverage they desire and that they are entitled to.

IRS ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of five common-sense bills that hold the government accountable to the people it was created to serve.

It is amazing that we have an agency called the Internal Revenue Service to which we have surrendered almost unlimited power for the purposes of collecting revenues of this country. Arguably, American citizens will tell you that the IRS has control over their lives, their liberty, and their property, and, some would argue, without due process of law.

You don't tell your taxman: I am not going to answer that question, I am going to take the Fifth, because immediately he will seize your property.

Yet we witnessed on television—as we found out—that the IRS was being looked into for being incompetent and corrupt and maybe the most incompetent and corrupt Federal agency in the country, and that they were actually out investigating groups who were voicing their absolute constitutional right to express their opinion in the political arena and the right to gather and meet, which is guaranteed by the Constitution.

But, no, the first thing we get from the person in charge is: I am going to take the Fifth Amendment. As many can see, we have been battling in the committee process in Congress over and over with the IRS. They have abused our tax system to target conservative political organizations, and this abuse has to be stopped and they have to be held responsible. Of course, when we actually have someone that we see is responsible, the quick solution for the IRS is transfer them somewhere else.

Well, I am proud the House has taken action to curb the power of the IRS by streamlining the removal of Federal bureaucrats who engage in misconduct or destroy Federal records. In front of a Federal District Court, you just try shredding records that a court has ordered you to bring before them and see what that Federal judge will do to you.

We are also voting to prohibit the IRS officials from using personal email to conduct official business, putting fairness back into the appeals process, and ensuring taxpayers know the status of IRS investigations. This is not much to ask. Just tell us what is going on.

These bills are important steps toward a level of accountability the Obama administration has been unwilling to take. This is good legislation. It sets our bureaucrats straight.

□ 1045

WE CANNOT PERMANENTLY BE AT WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND TAKE CARE OF OUR OWN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, many years ago, I voted for the first gulf war after attending classified briefings about the great threats we faced from Saddam Hussein's elite troops; then I watched them surrender to CNN camera crews and empty tanks. I realized then that the threat had been greatly exaggerated.

A few years later, we rushed to war in Iraq against weapons of mass destruction that were not there. The threat at the time of the second gulf war was greatly exaggerated, and I am glad that I voted against going to war that time.

After the horrible beheadings of two American citizens, I felt we should respond, and I have publicly supported limited air strikes. I hope we can at some point, if we are not doing so already, send in a special operations team, or teams, to get those who have committed these beheadings just as we got Osama bin Laden; however, I do not support sending thousands of young Americans as combat troops on the ground into Middle Eastern civil and religious wars.

The primary responsibility for fighting over there should be up to the countries in that region, and I do not believe we should have some fake coalition where most of the fighting and most of the funding comes from the U.S. military as in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

While ISIS—or ISIL, as it has also been referred to—is a threat, we have faced far greater threats at other times in our history.

Some of our leaders clamor for war to prove how tough they are. Some want to be little Churchills. Many may believe, if they don't support the strongest possible action, they are afraid they will be blamed if something bad happens; however, both our President and the Secretary of Homeland Security have said our intelligence and military officials have no evidence of any credible threat against the U.S. at this point.

In addition, we have spent \$716 billion on homeland security since 9/11, just at the Federal level, not counting the billions spent by State and local governments and private companies. Just one company, FedEx, told me a couple of years after 9/11 that they had spent \$200 million on security that they would not have spent had 9/11 not happened.

On top of that, we spend much more on defense than the next top 10 nations combined and almost more than all na-

tions combined since the poor nations spend very little on defense. If we devoted our entire Federal budget to the Middle East, we could not stop all the fighting or solve all the problems of that region. If we spent our entire Federal budget on homeland security, we could not make our country 100 percent perfectly safe.

Some radical Islamic fanatic may do something bad in the U.S. but we are already spending all we can and doing all we can if we are going to meet the needs of our own people. The first obligation of the U.S. Congress should be to the American people, and the people of the Middle East are going to have to solve most of their own problems on their own.

We do not have the money or the authority to try to run the whole world, and we certainly shouldn't panic or overreact to this threat from ISIS. Just a few weeks ago, their numbers were supposedly between 5,000 and 10,000. Now, we suddenly have them up to 20,000 to 31,000, but we have over 1 million in our military, and, supposedly, other nations are going to help against ISIS.

The leaders of ISIS have proven themselves to be cowards by beheading unarmed, defenseless men in front of cameras in undisclosed locations. We fought against al Qaeda in Iraq and Afghanistan and then with al Qaeda in Libya. A year ago, our hawks wanted to take out Assad in Syria. Now, we want to have him with us against ISIS.

I agree with what Judge Andrew Napolitano wrote a few days ago:

What should Congress do? It should declare once and for all that we will stay out of this ancient Muslim civil war of Shia versus Sunni. We have been on both sides of it. Each side is barbarous. In the 1980s, we helped the Sunnis. Now, we are helping the Shias.

Last year, Mr. Obama offered to help the Islamic state by degrading its adversaries; now, he wants to degrade the Islamic state. We have slaughtered innocents and squandered fortunes in an effort to achieve temporary military victories that neither enhance our freedom nor fortify our safety.

We will only have peace when we come home, when we cease military intervention in an area of the world not suited for democracy and in which we are essentially despised.

I agree with Judge Napolitano.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I say again that we cannot take care of our own people and our country if we are permanently at war in the Middle East.

WILDFIRE SEASON IN THE WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, last night, in the town of Weed, California, which is in my own First Congressional District, over 100 of my constituents' homes were destroyed or damaged by

fire, along with an elementary school and a timber mill, one of the area's largest employers. Thousands of my constituents are under evacuation orders, and the fire is not yet contained.

Aside from this tragedy, hundreds of thousands of acres of northern California forests have burned so far this year. In fact, the combined impact of the fires is already larger than last year's Rim Fire near Yosemite.

Unfortunately, while the Rim Fire received nonstop coverage, most of America is probably unaware of this year's calamities. The unfortunate truth is that rural California and much of the West experience massive wildfires like these every year. Over the past decade, wildfires have only grown in size and severity.

Madam Speaker, it doesn't have to be this way. We know why our forests are burning. It is because of decades of mismanagement caused by Federal bureaucracies and excessive regulations and red tape. They have an attitude at the Forest Service in many cases of just let it burn.

We suffer from road closures, inaccessibility to our forests, poor management, and, certainly, the ability to stop fires once they are started because of these policies.

The simple fact is our forests are not just mismanaged or even poorly managed. They are entirely unmanaged. As a result, they are overgrown, unhealthy, and ready to burst into flames at any time. I am supporting several measures to address the crisis in our forests, and last night's events create even more urgency for Congress and this administration to act.

Chairman HASTINGS' bill, H.R. 1526, which was passed in this House and I am a cosponsor of, would restore common sense to forest management, requiring the Forest Service to actively manage public forests to reduce fuel loads and improve forest health.

It is high time that the Senate act on this measure or, at the very least, produce its own forestry measure in the Senate so we can negotiate a final product. This would be part of the now 384 House bills that are languishing over in the Senate that need action.

Chairman SIMPSON's bill, H.R. 3992, another measure I am supporting and cosponsoring, will end the diversion of forest management funding to firefighting by treating fires like other disasters, allowing flexible wildfire disaster funding.

The Forest Service's increasing use of forest management funds for wildfire suppression means that we are no longer in the business of managing forests and, instead, just putting them out—or trying to—when they burn. This measure deserves a hearing in committee and action on the floor before this session ends.

Madam Speaker, without action on these bills, our forests will continue to

burn. Our constituents will continue to see their homes and livelihoods destroyed, and rural communities across the West will continue to suffer.

In the House this year, we hear about this being a do-nothing Congress and how it has been the least productive. The House of Representatives has been doing its job.

When we have 384-plus bills sitting over in the Senate languishing, waiting for action, then it is a misnomer that action is not going on in this House; indeed, it is a do-nothing Senate.

The people of the West in the line of these fires are suffering and demand action of their government. When they are not getting it, they are the victims.

Madam Speaker, before the end of this year, we need to take serious action on the management of our forests by allowing timber to be cut and processed in order to achieve forest health. We have an overload. We have an inventory in our forests.

There is much more that can be sustainable, on the number of trees per acre, on what is safe and healthy for the trees as they compete for limited water supply underground, therefore, stressing the trees, causing them to be susceptible and more in danger of insects that weaken and kill the trees; it is, thereby, a self-perpetuating prophesy of forests that are weak and then burn.

Madam Speaker, my constituents in Siskiyou County and last night in Weed, California, have suffered from this mismanagement—the nonmanagement—the incompetence and even what some people feel is criminal treatment they are getting from their Federal Government because of inactivity.

Madam Speaker, it is high time we pass these measures and do what we need to do to make our forests healthy and safe, as well as help the economy for those people. Certainly, in Congress and our government, we use a lot of wood and paper products. Why should they not come from California or from our Western States?

REMEMBERING JOAN D'ALESSANDRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Joan D'Alessandro and to recognize her mother, Rosemarie, for her tireless dedication to victims' rights and child safety.

In 1973, Joan D'Alessandro was sexually molested and murdered by her neighbor, Joseph McGowan, after she simply went to his house to deliver Girl Scout cookies. Joan's body was found 3 days later, on Easter Sunday, in New York States' Harriman State Park. Joseph McGowan was later con-

victed of first degree murder and sentenced to life in prison.

Joan was 7 years old when she was murdered. This month, she would have celebrated her 49th birthday. In the four decades since her death, her mother, Rosemarie, has used the tragedy of her daughter's death as a motivation to ensure the protection of other children.

She has mounted several successful campaigns to keep her daughter's killer behind bars, and she has worked tirelessly to strengthen laws against child predators.

In the 1990s, Rosemarie launched a grassroots movement to pass what is called Joan's Law. This legislation imposes a life without parole sentence on anyone convicted of molesting and murdering a child under 14. Governor Christine Todd Whitman signed the bill into law in 1997. President Clinton signed a Federal version of this law in 1998.

Even with these successes, Rosemarie continues to do even more. Earlier this year, she unveiled a butterfly sculpture and garden in Hillsdale, New Jersey. This sculpture is a tribute to Joan's life. It also serves as a reminder to each and every one of us to be diligent about keeping our own children safe.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in coming together to remember Joan's birthday; moreover, I ask you to join me in thanking Rosemarie for all she has done to protect countless other children.

We will never fully understand the grief that she has suffered all these years, but we hope that she finds comfort in knowing that we are inspired by her determination to make the world a safer place.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In these waning days of deliberation before Members leave to focus on the upcoming election, bless them with focus on the pressing matters of these days. May they be filled with wisdom

and a spirit of goodwill and cooperation that good solutions to unfinished business might be arrived at together.

Finally, bless our world with peace and all those seeking an end to violence.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOLF led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEPTEMBER IS NATIONAL RICE MONTH

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight one of my favorite months of the year, initiated in 1991 by Congress. September is known as National Rice Month.

With its healthy attributes, it should be no surprise that the typical American will consume, on average, 25 pounds of rice this year.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the largest rice-producing district in all of America, and I also am cochairman of the Congressional Rice Caucus. I have seen firsthand for several years the hard work that producers in the First District of Arkansas put into making a crop year after year that feeds not only us here at home, but also feeds countless others across the world.

So, as we stop and consider all the products here at home we have come to enjoy that include rice, let us also remember that our rice producers will export over 2 million metric tons of rice to markets all over the world this year. Our rice producers are feeding us here at home, Mr. Speaker, and they are also feeding the world.

UKRAINE PRESIDENT'S UPCOMING ADDRESS TO JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the men and women through their Representatives in Congress will welcome an ally and a friend. When Ukraine's new President, Petro Poroshenko, addresses a joint session of Congress on Thursday, he will do so at a pivotal moment in his country's history.

Ukraine is facing an existential threat from Russian aggression. President Putin's incitement of violence in eastern Ukraine and arming of separatist rebels there must stop.

The United States has responded with tough sanctions. I will push for even tougher sanctions if President Putin continues to disregard Ukrainian sovereignty.

The people of Ukraine are fighting for democracy. The United States stands behind them in their efforts.

Let this week's address only strengthen the longstanding alliance and friendship between the United States and our friend Ukraine.

ANTI-SEMITISM AROUND THE WORLD

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit for the RECORD a statement on my concerns about the troubling increase in anti-Semitism in the Middle East, Europe, and, I regret to say, here in the United States, particularly on college campuses in recent years.

Some have likened the freedom and safety of the Jewish people to "the canary in the coal mine" of a nation's religious freedom and tolerance, meaning, if the Jewish population is threatened, so too will others in time.

For the religious freedom and safety of all people, we must speak out against these disturbing trends and anti-Semitic acts around the world.

I am also calling for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to update the 2006 report on anti-Semitism on college campuses to review recent trends and look at what recommendations, if any, have been implemented.

CONDEMNING NFL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern and disgust at the NFL's belated and inadequate response

to violence against women and children by its players.

If the league were serious, it could use its significant resources to have a positive impact and help change how society views the issue, just as teams have raised money and awareness to fight breast cancer.

But I am not convinced that the NFL commissioner, owners, coaches, and players want to change. Are they sincere or just doing damage control before continuing business—by the way, highly profitable, but tax-exempt business—as usual?

I believe the buck, not just the big bucks, stop with the commissioner. Because he has failed, I think Goodell must go—either resign or be ousted by the owners. My colleagues and I will be watching to see whether the NFL truly reforms, and we will be revisiting congressional oversight and legislation related to the NFL.

KRAUTHAMMER CORRECT AGAIN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in last week's Washington Post, columnist Charles Krauthammer analyzed the President's plan to defeat ISIL:

"Beyond the strategy's halfhearted substance is the author's halfhearted tone. Obama's reluctance and ambivalence are obvious. This is a man driven to give this speech by public opinion. It shifted radically with the televised beheading of two Americans. Every poll shows that Americans overwhelmingly want something to be done—and someone to lead the doing."

ISIL's conquest in Iraq and Syria is a consequence of the administration's failed policies that do not achieve peace through strength. The President ignored evidence of increasing terrorist safe havens across North Africa, the Middle East, and Central Asia, as the southern border is now porous.

The United States must effectively defeat ISIL to stop attacks on American families. I hope the President shows real leadership and takes effective action to achieve victory over those who vow mass murder of American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President should take action remembering September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MILITARIZATION

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to stop the free flow of excess Defense De-

partment military weapons and equipment to local law enforcement.

Our neighborhoods need to be protected, but Americans oppose blurring the line between the police and military. When law enforcement uses military MRAPs on Main Street, that changes the relationship with the public.

Our country is not a war zone, and it should not feel like one. That is why Representative RAÚL LABRADOR and myself are introducing the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act. This is a commonsense and bipartisan bill to reform the Department of Defense 1033 program to stop the free flow of this equipment from foreign battlefields directly to the streets of America.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CLEAN AIR STRONG ECONOMIES ACT

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, EPA will soon propose a new lower ozone standard. We have made important gains in air quality, but this new proposal is so low that most of America, including all but five national parks, will be out of compliance.

This new rule will mean lost jobs and lost opportunities. It means no new permits for Mom and Pop and their American Dream. They will struggle to grow. That is why tomorrow BOB LATTA of Ohio and I are introducing the Clean Air Strong Economies Act. This commonsense bill requires EPA to protect health and consider whether a new rule can be met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help us balance clean air with a strong economy and American jobs.

REPUBLICAN OBSTRUCTION

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on House Republican leadership to stop playing games and start governing.

We are scheduled to debate 36 bills this week, but many are just repeated failed attempts that went nowhere beyond this House because they will do nothing to create jobs or strengthen the economy.

Instead of working to pass comprehensive immigration reform or raising the minimum wage or decreasing income disparity between men and women, we are instead repackaging and repassing partisan talking points and special interest handouts.

This Congress is on track to be the least—the least—productive in U.S. history.

We have seen valuable time and tax dollars wasted in trying to sue the President, over 50 failed attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act—including the 2-week Republican government shutdown over the same issue—and attempts to legitimize flimsy conspiracy theories.

House Democrats stand ready to work with House Republican leadership when they decide to stop playing games and get back to work. We are ready to jump-start our economy, make it in America, reunite families, and bring back jobs from overseas.

ISIS BENEDICT ARNOLDS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, evil ISIS has arrogantly beheaded yet another Westerner. This time, a British aide worker, David Haines, was executed. His assassin was an ISIS masked outlaw with a British accent.

ISIS has been heavily recruiting turncoat citizens in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. These American passport holders are particularly dangerous since they can easily slip back into our country undetected and bring ISIS' reign of terror to our homeland.

That is why I have introduced the FTO Passport Revocation Act. This legislation would authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals who fight with foreign terrorist organizations.

The Benedict Arnold traitors who have turned against America and joined the ranks of the terrorist army ISIS should lose their right to reenter the United States. This bill will help law enforcement locate these individuals overseas by preventing them from traveling internationally so that they can be captured and brought to justice.

Once Americans cross over to the dark side and go to war against us, they are not welcome back—unless they are in handcuffs.

And that is just the way it is.

VOTING RIGHTS IN OHIO

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks from today, Golden Week will begin in the State of Ohio. This is a one-stop voting opportunity that will allow Ohio residents to register and cast in-person absentee ballots at the same time. But for the U.S. district court ruling against the GOP-led general assembly, Ohio voters would not have this opportunity.

According to a Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights report, African American voters made up 78 percent of all early voting ballots in the country.

There are people working in every State to make it more difficult for citizens, and particularly people of color, to exercise their right to vote. That is why it is critical for each of us to do all we can to protect it.

I support the Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2014, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

11TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 11th annual National Preparedness Month and to urge all Americans to be disaster aware and take action to prepare.

According to FEMA, less than 40 percent of all Americans have an emergency plan. This startling fact is a reminder that our Nation must continue to prepare for all types of disasters.

As congressional cochair of National Preparedness Month, I hope all Members will join me in promoting the importance of preparedness. The first 72 hours after a natural disaster or terrorist attack are critical.

This September, urge your constituents and families to take action by creating an emergency kit that includes things like water, nonperishable food, phone chargers. Families should have communication plans and designate a meet-up point in case they get separated. And lastly, we should follow our first responders and Red Cross on social media. Taking these kinds of steps can save lives when disaster strikes.

Mr. Speaker, this month and every month, let's pledge to be disaster aware and take action to prepare.

□ 1215

CHILDREN'S CARDIOMYOPATHY MONTH

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month.

Cardiomyopathy is a chronic disease of the heart muscle and it increases the risk of sudden cardiac arrest. Sudden cardiac arrest claims almost 300,000 lives in the United States every year. It is the leading cause of death for schoolchildren.

That is why I introduced the Teaching Children to Save Lives Act, which would help teach our students across the country the lifesaving skills of CPR and how to use an AED.

Additionally, I recently introduced the SAFE PLAY Act to help ensure the

health and safety of students who are athletes. Some of them have cardiomyopathy as well.

This is an issue facing youth and families all across the United States. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing September as Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month, participate in the first annual AED Hunt on the Hill tomorrow, and to cosponsor the SAFE PLAY Act and Teaching Children to Save Lives Act, because together we can make a difference.

PROHIBITING TSA FROM ACCEPTING NOTICE TO APPEAR FORMS

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to prohibit TSA from accepting Notice to Appear forms as valid ID for clearing airport security.

Notice to Appear forms summon illegal immigrants to present themselves for removal hearings. They contain no real security features and can be easily forged.

After first denying it to the press, the TSA admitted to me that they were giving illegal immigrants special leeway by accepting Notice to Appear forms. This defies commonsense.

Those who violate our laws should never be held to a lower security standard than law-abiding citizens. It is a serious security risk. It is unfair to honest Americans. It must stop now.

I call on all of my colleagues to support this legislation. TSA must stop giving illegal immigrants special treatment.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is Constitution Week, the week that we honor our Constitution, drafted in 1787 on September 15 and signed on the 17th.

I spoke to a class about it in Memphis. I looked at the class, which is almost entirely African American, and I thought about the Constitution having in it slavery and not having in it a woman's right to vote.

Then I have been watching Ken Burns' "The Roosevelts" and seeing how Teddy Roosevelt would have thought about where we are today. Teddy Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt knew we needed a central government to work for the people. Teddy Roosevelt said the Constitution was for the people, not the people for the Constitution. He put right first and he fought the trusts and he looked after labor and he looked after the average American worker. He would have been

repelled at the idea of not having a Voting Rights Act, as he had Booker T. Washington, the first African American in the White House.

He would have been concerned about what this Congress is doing today and the prospect of war and our power to declare war and not acting and not exercising our constitutional prerogatives.

The Ken Burns series is a tribute to two great men and a great family, Teddy and Franklin Roosevelt, who made America better. I wish this Congress would do the same.

FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to stand up in support of legislation that I cosponsored that the House will consider later today, H.R. 24, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act.

As the creator of U.S. monetary policy, the Federal Reserve is one of the most influential institutions in our government. Unfortunately, it is also mentioned as one of the most secretive institutions of government. This act would require the Federal Reserve System to submit itself to a full, fair, and open audit process.

President Harry Truman, from the great Show-Me State, once said that "secrecy and a free democratic government don't mix." In all of government, including the Federal Reserve, openness, transparency, and accountability are absolutely required. Hundreds of my fellow Missourians have contacted me asking to fully audit the Federal Reserve in just the first 15 months that I have been in office.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to audit the Fed.

ISIS

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we are about to begin a very important and difficult debate. Both sides have strong, credible arguments. But I would urge those who are opposed to what the President has suggested to offer their own alternative. Because it does seem as though, while the President has chosen a bad option, it is the best of all the alternatives, and that is the difficulty.

ISIS is expanding exponentially in terms of the size of its force, its financial and military wherewithal. If ISIS was, for example, to be able to lay siege to Baghdad, where we have a substantial presence of American personnel, what do we do then? Clearly we would have to be militarily engaged.

This is a difficult debate, but I would urge those who chose any of the credible reasons for voting against it to tell us what they would do instead.

PAUL AND MARGARET McNAMARA

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Paul and Margaret McNamara of Champaign, Illinois, for recently being recognized as Angels in Adoption by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institution.

Dr. McNamara and Margaret are parents of six children, four of whom they have adopted. They made the decision to adopt because they understood that countless children across the globe are without a permanent family. After the births of their first two children, Daniel and Annie, they began looking into adopting children with special needs.

They adopted their son, Joseph, from South Korea, and then Jonathan from India. When they learned that Joseph's sibling, David, was in foster care in South Korea, they adopted him as well.

The McNamaras have been extremely active in their community, as well as their church, in providing information and support to families considering adoption.

Adoption is a selfless act of kindness, and it is truly an honor to have the McNamaras in my district. Their dedication and continued community support are unprecedented, and we should take a moment to appreciate those who adopt both at home and abroad.

PANCREATIC CANCER

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of pancreatic cancer awareness. There are no early detection methods for pancreatic cancer, and treatment options are limited.

Over 130 million Americans suffer from a chronic condition or rare disease. Like pancreatic cancer, many have no cures and limited treatment options.

The 21st Century Cures initiative is a bipartisan effort to get cures and treatments to patients more quickly. Millions of Americans who suffer from cancer, including the nearly 50,000 with pancreatic cancer, will benefit from this initiative.

I held two 21st Century Cures roundtables in my district in August to hear from patients, patient advocates, researchers, clinicians, and representatives from medical device companies. Pancreatic cancer advocates participated as well.

Together, we can raise awareness and find cures and treatments for chronic and deadly diseases like pancreatic cancer.

RECOGNIZING CORNERSTONE'S SUSAN NEIS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and recognize Susan Neis and the 29 years of service to our community she has provided as executive director for Cornerstone Advocacy Service.

Susan's hard work began in 1985, when Cornerstone was just a few staff members and volunteers working together in one room out of a church in Bloomington. Under her leadership and her vision for preventing domestic abuse, Cornerstone has now grown to 80 employees who provide around-the-clock crisis counseling, emergency shelter services, and transitional housing to ten cities across Hennepin County.

I have spent time at Cornerstone myself, and I have seen firsthand the services they provide in our community for adults and children who have been traumatized by domestic violence, by sexual violence, and human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of Cornerstone's success is a reflection of Susan's hard work, her dedication, and her passion.

I would like to thank Susan for helping save lives, for serving our community, and I congratulate her on her successful tenure at Cornerstone, and I wish her the best in her retirement.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a radical idea: let's let parents choose where to send their kids to school, let's make it easier for them to save for their children's education, let's give every kid in America access to a great school. Our current education system works for many, but it is failing too many others.

Today, I introduced a bill to change that. My bill, H.R. 5477, lets Federal education dollars follow students. It lets parents use 529 education savings accounts on pre-K to 12 education expenses. It eliminates the cap on contributions to Coverdell education savings accounts and allows those funds to be used for home schooling.

Some may say our current system is the best we can do. But deep down we all know we must do better.

Let's give all students a chance no matter where they live. Let's pass the

Enhancing Educational Opportunities for All Students Act and make that dream a reality for every child.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 722

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McKeon of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for six hours equally divided and controlled by Representative McKeon of California and Representative Smith of Washington or their respective designees, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Section 4(c) of House Resolution 567 is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

“(7) The provisions of paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(12) of clause 4 of rule XI shall be considered to be written rules adopted by the Select Committee as though pursuant to such clause.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for fiscal year 2015. The rule is a structured rule which provides for the consideration of a short-term continuing resolution keeping the government funded until December 11, 2014.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the adoption of a technical amendment by Chairman ROGERS and makes in order an amendment by Chairman MCKEON. That amendment provides the authority for the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups or individuals.

For this amendment, the rule provides 6 hours of debate equally divided between Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule corrects a technical error and puts in place the base rules of the House regarding media access to the hearings and meetings of the Benghazi Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend Chairman ROGERS for bringing a bill to avoid a government shutdown to the House. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is frustrating that we are forced into acting on a short-term continuing resolution when we spent much of this year, both in committee and on the floor, updating congressional funding priorities for fiscal year 2015.

This House has done its work. I wish I could say the same for the other body. While the Senate has chosen not to pass even one appropriations bill on the floor, this House has passed seven.

While the Senate Appropriations Committee has passed eight of the 12 appropriations bills out of committee, the House Appropriations Committee has approved all but one. If the Senate would work with us, I believe we could pass all of our bills on time.

The CR we are considering today is a clean bill continuing the funding of government operations at last year's levels. It includes only 36 so-called anomalies all within the total level of funding.

These changes are necessary to address current immediate needs like addressing the Ebola crisis, funding programs to counter regional aggression toward Ukraine and other former Soviet Union countries, and funding to ensure appropriate treatment of veterans and continued oversight of the VA.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the Export-Import Bank through June 30, 2015. I know some of my friends will disagree with me; however, I believe the Export-Import Bank provides a vital service. In an era when foreign governments are directly subsidizing industries, our companies are in need of a level playing field. I believe the Export-Import Bank does that.

In my home State of Oklahoma, since 2007, financing provided by the Export-Import Bank has supported over \$1.1

RECOGNIZING CASE MANAGEMENT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize our Nation's case managers and the role that case management plays in our health care and our social services sectors.

October 12-18 marks National Case Management Week. During this time, we recognize the contributions case managers make each and every day and the role that they play in educating individuals about their health care options across the continuum of care.

While all too often overlooked, case managers are critical in improving health care outcomes for individuals across the country, promoting quality health care for patients.

As we continue to look at ways to improve health care delivery in America, let us not forget the role case managers play in cost-effective outcomes for patients.

Today, I offer my thanks and praise for our Nation's case managers. During this upcoming National Case Management Week, let us all recognize the value that case management brings to the health care arena.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 16, 2014 at 11:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5134.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 124, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 722 and ask for its immediate consideration.

billion in sales by U.S. companies that would not have existed otherwise; in addition, the Export-Import Bank has returned over \$2.6 billion to the United States Treasury since 2008.

Finally, and most significantly, the McKeon amendment would provide the President with the authority he has requested to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition. The amendment ensures congressional oversight by requiring detailed progress reports on a plan, a vetting process, and procedures for monitoring unauthorized end use of provided training and equipment. It would also require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy.

Mr. Speaker, when we look back on what brought us to this point, there are at least three significant failures that we can point to: first, former Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki was given the opportunity to create a multiethnic, multisectarian, inclusive State of Iraq, but, instead, he squandered it; secondly, President Obama didn't insist forcefully enough to keep a residual American presence in Iraq; and, third, Mr. Speaker, when ISIL expanded out of Syria and into Iraq, both Prime Minister al-Maliki and President Obama were slow to respond.

When Ramadi and Fallujah fell to ISIL, their indecisive leadership allowed and encouraged this terrorist organization to assert itself in the Middle East. Mr. Speaker, the salient discussion is not about the past and how we got here but about the future and what we must do now.

I agree with the President that ISIL represents a clear and present danger that must be dealt with, confronted, and destroyed. I am willing to give the President the authority and the funds needed to accomplish this mission. This amendment gives the President what he has requested while maintaining an appropriate role for Congress, but I do disagree with the President on several important issues.

I don't believe that he has the inherent authority to use military force in Syria, and nothing in this amendment authorizes him to do so.

I believe that going to war on the authorizations that were passed in 2001 and 2002, which dealt with very different times, places, and peoples, is shaky, at best. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a vast majority of my colleagues, including myself, were not even here in Congress when those authorizations were approved.

When we return in November, I hope that we repeal the 2001 and 2002 authorizations and replace them with ones that reflect the views of this Congress not the Congress of the last decade.

Additionally, I disagree with the President's choice of tactics. Regardless of whether he intends to use them or not, I believe the President was far

too quick to rule out options and tools that he, in fact, may need later. War is the most unpredictable of all human enterprises. History shows that it is vital for a commander to maintain as much flexibility as possible.

I also do not believe that the authority and resources the President has requested will be nearly enough to achieve the mission he has outlined. It is going to take far more from our country, our allies, and our friends on the ground to destroy ISIL than envisioned in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the President can succeed in the effort to destroy ISIL without bipartisan, popular support, and I hope he will take this opportunity to build on that. We are not Republicans or Democrats in war, but Americans first. The Commander in Chief has asked for our support in the underlying legislation. He should get it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the excellent Representative from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when James Madison declared the Congress' "power over the purse" in the Federalist Papers as the most "complete and effectual weapon," he warned of "dishonorable stagnation." I fear we have achieved that. Rather than doing the hard work of coming up with long-term fiscal solutions for our Nation, we have resorted, once again, to short-term measures.

In the 4 years since Republicans took control of the House, not a single regular appropriations bill has been signed into law; instead, we have had manufactured crises, brinksmanship, fiscal cliffs, near defaults on the national debt, massive omnibus bills, and government shutdowns.

This continuing resolution may avert a national crisis in the short term by funding the government until December 11 of this year, but it is further demonstration the House majority has failed to do their most basic job.

They have been so obsessed with suing the President, investigating the nonexistent scandal in Benghazi, and holding more than 50 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act that they have not done the routine work of Congress, funding the government. It is clear that under the current House majority our "power of the purse" has turned into "dishonorable stagnation."

Not only has the House majority found new ways to procrastinate on finding long-term solutions, they insist on passing the most closed rules in a single Congress ever; in fact, just last week, they celebrated the 75th closed rule, which makes this their diamond jubilee. They continue to pass closed rules which stifle debate and impedes the work of this Chamber.

Through this tactic, half of the country's Representatives have been silenced by the House majority. Even though Democrats received over a million more votes than Republicans did in the 2012 election, we are shut out. Our Nation's districts have been so gerrymandered, our representative democracy has been skewed beyond recognition.

I also oppose the inclusion of section 2 in the continuing resolution. That provision, which further excuses the Select Committee on Benghazi from adopting written rules to govern its work, does not belong in a rule for a must-pass funding bill; rather, the Benghazi Select Committee, just like every other committee of the House, should be required to meet, debate, and vote in open session on its basic rules and procedures that will govern its work.

The House majority previously tried to free the Benghazi Select Committee from this responsibility when it passed H. Res. 567 and established the committee last May. Four months later, they have realized on the eve of the select committee's first hearing that H. Res. 567 was not adequate; and so they inserted at the last minute a provision that, rather ironically, now excuses the select committee from the express requirement contained in clause 4 of rule XI for committees to adopt written rules to assure that meetings open to the public may be covered by audiovisual which means "in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum."

When H. Res. 567 was brought to the floor for a vote in May, 186 Democrats voted against it. Let me reiterate that what this bill was doing is excusing the Benghazi Select Committee from having written rules like every other committee of the House is required to do. Not a single Republican joined us in voting against what we normally do.

Many of us objected to the creation of the Benghazi Select Committee in the first place as an unnecessary and partisan pursuit. Seven different congressional committees issued nine separate reports that answer the key questions about what went wrong in Benghazi.

Many of us believe that, to the extent any legitimate questions remain, the standing committees of jurisdiction along with Select Committees on Intelligence are fully capable of addressing those and overseeing the implementation of the needed reforms. It is unfortunate that not everyone seems to have the same confidence in the work of their colleagues.

We also objected because H. Res. 567 skews the process by failing to equalize majority and minority representation and resources and by seeking to excuse the select committee from following the basic requirements that apply to other committees of the House.

Basically, that says that we on the minority side have been shut out again. No guarantees and no discussion at all of fairness or openness either in resources, ability to see documents, or to call for witnesses.

I offered an amendment to address many of these concerns, but the effort failed. After much debate about whether even to participate in the select committee's work, Democrat members of the House ultimately agreed to do so in the hope that Republicans would fulfill their promises of a bipartisan, fair, and transparent process.

□ 1245

Just as we were guaranteed an open process at the beginning of the term, we have been had yet once again.

Inserting a last-minute provision in the rule on this must-pass funding bill will allow a select committee to avoid negotiating over or adopting the basic rules and procedures, and it does not honor the promise of openness. It will not win the public's trust. You cannot continually shut out half the Congress.

The Benghazi Select Committee, like every other committee in the House, should be required to meet, debate, and vote in open session on the ground rules that will govern its investigation. What the CR does is fund the government, and the rule for it should not be a means for the House majority to change language governing the highly political Benghazi Select Committee.

Programs and services all over the country cannot continue to run, as we are going to be asking them to do, on a month-to-month basis. They need certainty and reliability, which they clearly aren't getting.

Instead of investing in emerging technologies or medical research, of which we used to be at the forefront, the majority lurches from stopgap to stopgap, and now that strategy has caught up with us. Running the United States Government in 3-month tranches is a true recipe for disaster.

The CR does extend funding for operations of all Federal agencies, programs, and services until December 11 of this year and provides funding at the current annual rate of just over \$1 trillion. However, it does include changes to existing law that are needed to prevent catastrophic, irreversible, or detrimental changes to government programs, specifically to address current national or global crises.

Regarding Ukraine, the CR continues the current flexibility with the State Department and USAID to respond to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine. Congress and the United States must continue to support the Ukrainian people in their fight for a free and democratic country. It is with some delight that we welcome Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko to our Chamber later this week.

The CR also increases funding to address the disability claims backlog at

the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as to investigate claims about medical care. We all agree that when our troops come home they deserve the best medical care, and this increase in funding will help to ensure that we provide just that.

Finally, regarding our involvement in confronting the rising threat to the Islamic State, or ISIL, while I am disappointed in the process that led to the continuing resolution, I do agree the House must debate at least one portion of the President's plan. We as Representatives need to debate if or how we arm rebel forces in Syria as well as other tactics in the broader effort. However, I have deep concerns about the ever-louder drumbeat toward war.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan claimed the lives of 6,640 of our men and women in uniform and critically wounded 50,450—50,450 come home to an already stressed VA system that cannot adequately care for them. The true cost of a war is not just in dollars, but in lives taken and destroyed, and I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the path before us.

Mr. Speaker, with this continuing resolution, we have an opportunity to avoid a short-term crisis, but if we continue to postpone the fundamental work of Congress, the Nation's economy will be at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising I am going to disagree with my friend about who has and who hasn't done their job and who has been open and who hasn't been open in terms of how they have operated on the floor.

The reality is this House majority has repeatedly brought appropriations bills to the floor and moved them across the floor. Unfortunately, our counterparts and the Democratic majority in the Senate have not been able to do that for whatever reason. It's a little hard to have an appropriations process when the United States Senate will not bring a single appropriations bill to the floor largely because the majority on that side is evidently afraid of voting on any sort of amendments to an appropriations bill.

Now, if you actually look at the record in terms of who has been open and who hasn't, I remind my friends that the Democrats' 2006 manifesto, "A New Direction for America," states:

Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full, and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

The fact remains that when Democrats took control of the House they did just the opposite. Throughout the 111th Congress, in the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI's time as Speaker, the House never considered a single

bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process.

On the contrary, under Republican control, the House has returned to consideration of appropriation bills under an open process, with 22 open rules. This year alone, the House has considered 404 amendments during the appropriations process, 189 of which were offered by our Democratic colleagues. Contrast that to the United States Senate, where that process has not happened at all.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority to the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis will show Republicans are running a much more open, transparent House of Representatives.

Let me also, if I may, Mr. Speaker, turn to the issue of the Benghazi Select Committee. I know that has caused considerable concern, I think, largely based on misunderstanding.

Clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI, which applies to all standing committees and the select committees, mandates that the meetings of the select committee be open to the public, including the press, unless there is a vote conducted in open session to close such a meeting. The rule today only ensures that the logistics for media covering the hearing follow the standing rules of the House. There is no change to the rules governing public access to the meetings of the select committee.

Might I, just for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, actually read the relevant portion of the rules here—“(7) The provisions of paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(12) of clause 4 of Rule XI shall be considered to be written rules adopted by the select committee as though pursuant to such clause”—essentially applying to the select committee our own rules. That is the only thing that is being done here. It is a technical amendment, certainly no effort to short-circuit the process or make it less transparent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I know we have had this debate before and this discussion before, blaming everything on the Senate, but the fact is we have not done our job here in the House.

There were several appropriations bills that had committee approval, but none of us ever had the chance to vote for them. They were never brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the amendment on Syria that will be offered later today and voted on tomorrow.

If it was a bad idea before to get involved in Syria's civil war, why is it now a good idea?

Is it only because ISIL has expanded its operations over a fluid border into Iraq?

How long will we support the Syrian Free Army?

Who are these people?

How much will it cost?

What happens if and when our weapons fall into the wrong hands?

What are the countries in the region offering in terms of substantive solutions?

What is the clearly defined mission?

How does this end?

Do we have answers to any of these questions as we prepare to vote?

We are talking about war, Mr. Speaker. When you drop bombs on people, that is war. And we can talk all we want about so-called boots on the ground, but unless some of our soldiers weren't given shoes, we already have boots on the ground. We need to be honest about that.

We have trained and equipped Iraqi soldiers for over a decade. And for what? To watch them shed their uniforms and to turn their weapons over to ISIL? Is that what we are doing here again, Mr. Speaker?

If the real purpose of U.S. military operations in Syria is to bring the killers of the two American journalists to justice, then perhaps good intelligence and a well-prepared Special Forces operation could do so, just like we hunted down Osama bin Laden.

I want to be perfectly clear on one other point. Any amendment to provide title 10 authority to train and equip Syrian opposition forces must not be seen in any way as an authorization for U.S. Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in Iraq or Syria. It must not be seen as a substitute for specific congressional action.

Authorization to carry out sustained military operations is not something that should be stuck into a conference report. There should be nothing backdoor about it. That would be an insult to our uniformed men and women, an insult to their families, an insult to this House, and an insult to the American people.

On July 25, this House voted 370–40—370–40—in favor of my resolution to require specific congressional authorization for sustained combat operations by U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq. Yet, since August 8, the U.S. Navy and Air Force have flown more than 2,700 missions against the Islamic State in Iraq, including 156 airstrikes. These airstrikes have occurred almost daily over the past 6 weeks.

Last week, the President announced that those operations will escalate and likely expand into Syria. This morning, they expanded to targets near Baghdad. If that doesn't qualify as sustained combat, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what does.

So, if this House is serious about what it said in July, then we should demand a vote this month on congressional authorization for U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria. Anything less would constitute yet another failure on the part of this House to carry out its constitutional duties. Anything less would make a mockery of that vote that this House took in July. But, if this leadership gets its way, we will leave Washington for nearly 2 months without such a vote, and I expect and I think we all expect that during that time U.S. combat operations in Iraq and Syria will expand and escalate.

I know this is a hard vote. I know it is politically difficult. But we were not elected to duck the hard votes. We weren't elected to avoid difficult choices. War is a big deal. We need to do our jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote “no” on this rule, and I will vote “no” on the Syria amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to respectfully, once again, disagree with my friend from New York on the appropriations process. The reality is we have brought bill after bill to this floor. Every Member has had the opportunity to offer any amendment on seven different bills and to vote “yes” or “no” on their final disposition. The Senate hasn't brought any. And, frankly, at some point the Senate's failure to do its job begins to impact our ability to do ours, because it is very difficult to get time on the floor and use it knowing there is not anything going on on the other side. And that is just the reality of it.

So, if my friends can talk the Senate into beginning to move, I think they would actually find the House, which is already far ahead of them, would continue to work with them and we would actually begin to pass bills. But until the Senate will bring a bill to the floor of any kind for an appropriation, very difficult for us to get our work done over here.

Now I want to address myself, if I may, to my friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN. There is much in what he says that I agree with. Frankly, I think he is correct when he says that we need at some point a full authorization, a full debate, full discussion. He is absolutely right, and I want to commend him for the action he took in his amendment on Iraq in July that we voted on. I was very happy to vote it. So I think, in substance, I find very little to disagree with in what my friend has to say. I do point out a couple of things, though.

First, and I think my friend is aware of it, the Speaker has actually taken the position that we need a full authorization debate and discussion. And I am told that he conveyed that to the President and actually said he thought this institution, our country, which I

know is what we care about supremely, and the President himself would be better off under such discussion. That is a viewpoint that I agree with, and I think many Members on both sides of the aisle and with both points of view on the issue also hold that opinion. So this is actually a decision that has been largely made, in a sense, by the President.

We are trying to respond in a short period of time to what the President has asked us to do, and I think that is an important point to remember in this. This is not a fight on this floor between Democrats and Republicans or even for proponents. I think it is, at another level, a difference in perception about what authority the President has, his view versus probably Congress' view on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1300

I think it is a challenge in terms of timing. It is extremely difficult for the leaders of either Chamber to look like they are undercutting the President at a time of danger and when he has come with this request. We have set 6 hours of debate aside for a reason. If you will remember, the President's original request was simply to drop this measure in the continuing resolution and have no vote and no discussion at all. It was actually our side and your side that insisted that it be pulled out and that a vote and discussion occur. When we come back—again, I share my friend's opinion—I would be prepared to do it before the election. I see no particular need in waiting, but I don't get to make that decision.

At the end of the day, we are giving the Commander in Chief what he is asking for. I think we are trying to be both responsible and helpful. We have actually curtailed considerably what the President asked for. We noted specifically that this does not authorize the use of military force in Syria. We have required reviews. I suspect we will be revisiting this issue again—I certainly would hope so—and I look forward to working with my friend to make sure that we do.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his words about his view that we ought to have a vote here in the Congress with regard to authorizing any kind of military operations in Iraq and Syria, and I appreciate his comments last night in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think what he is saying and I think what I am saying reflects the sentiment of most Democrats and Republicans. This is not a partisan issue. I think the gentleman is right in saying that the piece that we are voting on today has nothing to do with bombing Syria or with bombing in Iraq, but that continues, and that has escalated. My concern is that we may

very well adjourn by the end of this week and not come back until after the elections, and that that involvement in both of those countries will have deepened, and we have not yet been promised that we will actually have that vote.

I think Members on both sides would feel a little bit more relieved if, in fact, the Speaker would give us an ironclad promise that there will be a vote on an AUMF with regard to Iraq and Syria.

Mr. COLE. In reclaiming my time, if I may, I don't presume to speak for the Speaker. I know that we have this vote largely because the Speaker wanted to make sure that we had a vote, and I know the request that he made of the President. Look, I am not condemning the President on this either. I understand all Executives try to tell you they have the authority to do everything they want. Ours do when we have a Republican, and Democrats do.

All I can say is, at the end of the day, I think we have a robust debate, and we have an opportunity to register opinion. But I want to continue to work with my friend and make sure that we have precisely the kind of debate and discussion and vote that his own amendment in July actually envisioned, because I think my friend is correct. I think this is an issue of constitutional propriety, and I think it is an issue, ultimately, of war and peace, and I think we ought to all vote on it. I would be happy if we did it before the election, but I will work with my friend to make sure that we do it as quickly as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds because I can't resist it, although I am so fond of Mr. COLE, but we can't really blame it on the Senate that we have not done our work over here.

The House was able to find the time to vote 55 times to kill the health care bill, which is providing health insurance for 8 million Americans who didn't have it before. For goodness shakes, we could do that once a week, but we couldn't do the appropriations bills.

Now I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlewoman.

I want to thank the Speaker, and I want to thank Leader PELOSI for working together to give us an opportunity to vote on this question of developing a Free Syrian Army. Make no mistake: the decision that Congress will make on that question is of great importance because it is, in fact, a major escalation in U.S. involvement.

Mr. Speaker, there is a collective revulsion at what ISIS did in the beheadings of two young Americans, and there is a good people here in this country, where parents saw the possi-

bility of their own sons being in that circumstance, and everything in all of us wants to react to that.

The question is: Is the prospect of creating a Free Syrian Army a good step at this time?

The administration is briefing us. All of us are doing all of the consideration we can. We are going to have a debate on that. I want to ask some questions that I think are important for us to come to a conclusion.

First, I want to compliment President Obama. He did use air power to stop the slaughter of the Yazidis. In that circumstance, he had ground forces, the Peshmerga, and a reliable ally in the Kurdish Government.

Number two, the President was wise not to bomb when they were threatening Baghdad because he saw rightly that the problem was Mr. Maliki, who had created sectarian division and who had really undercut the capacity of his army by putting cronies in instead of good leaders.

Then, third, the President has exercised great restraint about not having us be involved in the maelstrom of the Syrian civil war. That is a Sunni-Shia civil war that is out across the entire belt of Syria and Iraq.

But what do we do?

As for our allies who are in the region—Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Egypt—what are they going to contribute when they are the principal objects of this threat? They have over 1,000 planes among them, and they have armies. We haven't yet seen that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WELCH. Second, the vetting process: How on a practical level will that work?

We want the moderate Syrian rebels, but, in fact, we are going to be working with Egypt and with Saudi Arabia. They would nix Muslim Brotherhood participation. They want extreme folks who support the very conservative regime in Saudi Arabia. We are creating a very practical dilemma in the potential success of the so-called "Free Syrian Army."

Finally, is the fundamental issue here one of military leadership or is it one of political reconciliation between Sunni and Shia? Is that a problem that can be solved by our military or is it a problem, ages old—centuries old—in that region, the conflict between Sunni and Shia?

When I consider the contributions that the men and women of our Armed Forces made to Iraq, in which they threw out Saddam Hussein and gave stability and gave an opportunity for the people of that country to decide to live civilly together or in civil war forever, we gave them the chance they deserved.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my good friend, a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee and a fellow subcommittee chairman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. COLE.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make three points about the continuing resolution.

Number one, as an appropriator, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say we do not like continuing resolutions, because we on the Appropriations Committee have worked hard to pass our bills. We passed seven off the House floor, and the Senate was unable to move one single bill and, as a result, shut down the appropriations process.

The reason Members should be attuned to this is, during the appropriations process, you find out about a lot of programs that need to be discontinued, some that need to be modified, some that need to be enhanced, some that need to be limited altogether. We passed those bills on the House floor through a very vigorous amendment process, and that is a superior way to handle appropriations compared to the continuing resolution method, which just continues programs and really empowers more of the executive branch over the legislative branch.

I believe that Chairman ROGERS and Speaker BOEHNER have worked very hard to return this body to the regular order process of 12 different appropriations bills. We were well on our way to having that happen when the Harry Reid Senate shut down the process, and that is why we are here with the CR today. I am hopeful that we can go back into these bills and improve on the continuing resolution, and I do stand in support of it.

Number two, let me say this about the bill. It has appropriate and important funding to take on the Ebola virus that has broken out in West Africa. This bill provides \$88 million—\$30 million for the CDC—to put staffers on the ground and to address the needs there and then \$58 million to the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, which is working on the possibility of 12 different vaccines for Ebola. They are not in the marketplace right now. We do not have a vaccine, and we need to do this research. That is why this amendment has been put in the continuing resolution, and it is something that all Members should be attuned to.

I want to remind the Speaker that 2,500 people have already died because of Ebola and that the number who have been infected is somewhere between 3,800 and maybe as high as 4,500, or even higher than that. Getting the number, itself, is very difficult to do.

Then, thirdly, let me say this about the use of force in the McKeon amendment that we are having, and I think Members do deserve to have a separate

vote on this. It is important for the educational process. It is important for the discussion and the debate for the entire country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. As I have looked at the 2001 and the 2002 authorizations for military force, I believe that the President is probably right. I haven't come to a 100 percent conclusion on that, but I believe that he does have that authority. I think it would be far better off for everyone to have a separate vote, and I hope that we can have that happen sooner rather than later. But, in the meantime, this vote is very significant, and Members need not fool themselves that the McKeon amendment does help move this process forward.

When we talk about airstrikes only and training only, and when we have made this decision not to have ground troops, we do not need another half-pregnant war in the Middle East. If it is important enough to fight, it is important enough to win, and we need to give the Commander in Chief all of the resources that he needs to have this victory. People often say airstrikes will get the job done, and they point to the NATO operation in Yugoslavia in 1999—1,000 aircraft, 38,000 combat missions, 2,300 missiles—but the reality is that that war only ended when the President took the next step, and that was to commit ground troops. That is how important this is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COLE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to be sure Members look back because that is the example where people say airstrikes alone are sufficient, when they point out the operation in Yugoslavia that was from March 24, 1999, to June 10. Even though we did not have ground troops, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Wesley Clark, said that he was convinced that the planning and preparation for ground intervention, in particular, pushed Milosevic to concede. We need to be very, very careful and mindful about this. If it is worth fighting, it is worth winning, and if it is something we are going to win, we need to give the Commander in Chief all of the tools that he needs to have a victory.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the Middle Eastern tragedy in which this resolution will further entangle America is directly related to the wholly unnecessary Bush-Cheney invasion of Iraq. Having learned so little from the sacrifices of that conflict, the Congress now ap-

proves greater involvement in a Syrian civil war that has already taken almost 200,000 lives.

The administration has affirmed this very day that what it is talking about is definitely a war, a declaration of war, while it seeks to avoid this Congress declaring that war, a Congress in which too many of the people's representatives fear making a decision today on whether to declare war.

□ 1315

Instead, we vote on an amendment here to authorize the administration to do what it is already doing in Jordan, while declining to consider a vote on what it should not do without specific congressional authorization.

Reliance on resolutions approved by this Congress on this floor over a decade ago, in 2001 and 2002, is very instructive. First, it shows the dangers of open-ended authorizations. Resolutions such as the one we have today will not only govern the actions of President Obama but future Presidents as well.

Second, once begun, this Congress, even under Democratic control, has shown little ability to contain war. Third, despite billions expended and with courageous Americans on the ground, the results over more than a decade of trying to successfully train Iraqis and Afghans is not particularly encouraging; indeed, the reality is the American taxpayers have been compelled to pay for the arms for our enemies as well as for our allies; nor do we have any explanation today as to how taking a few Syrians for training in Saudi Arabia—a country with its own brutal history of regular beheadings, financing extremists around the world, and opposing democracy most everywhere—how that will work better than our previous training on the ground with Americans.

Rejecting the resolution today does not mean that we should do nothing. When Americans are brutally murdered, the President already has the necessary authority, which he should use forcefully, to go after these barbaric murderers. There is a significant difference between confronting the savagery of ISIS and initiating a multiyear war in the region.

With the steadily growing number of U.S. military on the ground in Iraq now approaching 2,000 and recurrent demands from the same people that led us wrongly into Iraq in the first place that we add even more on the ground, the danger of escalation is very real.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Now, with our military leaders conceding that ISIS is a regional threat, it would kill as many Americans as it could—if it could—just as is true of some of the terrorist groups today in Africa; but, with it

being a regional threat, not a threat to our homeland today, the question arises of why the countries in the region—who are more directly impacted from ISIS—why aren't they providing the bulk of the resources necessary to confront it?

They are always content to have Americans kill as many of their enemies in their centuries-old conflict as we will kill. They would let the Americans do all of the bleeding and all of the paying for this conflict. A photo-op with 40 countries does not an army make.

Ultimately, this resolution, like our previous unwise invasion, will make our families less secure, not more secure, and that should be the ultimate test of our actions.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to quickly note that I actually agree with a very good deal of what my friend from Texas has to say.

I do want to correct him on one item. The amendment we are talking about is not like the authorizations of 2001 and 2002, mostly because it is very finely tailored to limit the executive branch.

It actually runs out on December 11 or earlier if we actually pass a National Defense Authorization Act and deal with the Syrian issue in that context; so it is very limited in terms of time, very limited in terms of scope. It explicitly states that it does not authorize military action in Syria.

With all due respect, I would suggest that most of my friend's disagreements are with this administration. They are largely disagreements with the President. The Speaker is doing what he can to provide an opportunity for us to debate and express that in the continuing resolution, and I will work with my friend from Texas to make sure that we have a fuller, more robust debate because I think the country deserves that, and I think my friend is right to demand it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that makes two changes: first, it would strike a special waiver for the Benghazi Select Committee that lets them avoid the transparent and deliberative process of debating and voting on their own written rules for media access, which every other committee has to do; second, we would bring up the bill introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years, bringing certainty and stability to an agency that helps to create jobs in the United States.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the previous question so that I might, indeed, offer H.R. 4950 to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years instead of what the underlying continuing resolution would do, which would reauthorize it for 9 years.

I do so for two reasons: number one, the argument of certainty—here is the truth: the fact of the matter is a 9-month extension of the Export-Import Bank is not certainty. Here is the truth: we are already losing business because of the cloud of the debate that hangs over this Chamber with respect to the continuation of the Export-Import Bank, and that is documented, I might add; so we need certainty.

Everybody who comes from the private sector has made that argument on this floor. I come from the private sector. I make that argument.

The truth of the matter is this: the number one advocate for eliminating the Export-Import Bank likes the idea of a 9-month extension because it plays into his hands of getting rid of it.

Now, I take the gentleman from Oklahoma at his word. I know him to be a gentleman of honor and integrity, and I appreciate, deeply, his words in support of the Export-Import Bank, but the Export-Import Bank will be weakened with this language and will be subject to termination at the end of June 30 when it is isolated and left alone.

One of the arguments that is offered for 9 months is to give time for an effort to develop a reform proposal. I know of one such effort underway by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), and he is operating in absolute good faith. There is no question in my mind. He is working hard to get there.

There is equally no question in my mind that the effort to extend the Ex-Im, if we do it for 9 months, will be severely weakened, severely weakened. There is no assurance. There is no certainty that it will go beyond that date. We have a proposal that would do that, which has 201 signatures on it as co-sponsors, I might add.

The second reason, the Export-Import Bank makes America stronger. It created 205,000 jobs last year. It reduced our Nation's deficit by \$1 billion in October when that amount of money was transferred to the U.S. Treasury. It creates jobs, and it creates good-paying jobs, manufacturing jobs. It enables America to compete in an increasingly global economy.

Most people lose sight of the fact that, just since the year 1980, global trade has increased fivefold. I beseech the House: do not unilaterally disarm.

Here is the truth: 59 other countries, virtually every developed nation on the face of the planet, has an export credit authority, and most of them are larger than ours, expressed either in terms of

absolute dollars or percentage of their gross domestic product.

For us to allow the Export-Import Bank to expire is to unilaterally disarm in an increasingly global trade-driven economy. For us to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 9 months is to tee it up for elimination, and you know this in your heart. You know this in your heart because the advocate for doing away with it thinks this is a good idea and has as much said that it tees it up for elimination.

The Export-Import Bank is good for America. It makes America stronger. It creates jobs. It creates good-paying jobs, and it enables us to compete in a global economy.

I ask you to defeat the previous question so that we might offer a longer-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my friend from Washington for his kind words. I couldn't agree more with him about the Export-Import Bank. I think it is a very important institution that ought to be reauthorized, and I intend to work with my friend to make sure that happens when the time comes.

I don't think, as a rule, reauthorization in a continuing resolution is a good idea. I think it is much more appropriate, particularly for a matter this controversial and this serious—and, again, I agree with the substance of what my friend says—that we go through a normal committee process and that we come to the floor and have a full debate. I don't think this is the appropriate vehicle for that.

While I look forward to working with my friend on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, I doubt that it is going to happen in this particular vehicle so, hopefully, in the new Congress, as we make persuasive arguments, as my friend has advanced, we will find that we get the broad bipartisan support we need to do that reauthorization.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority's insistence on brinkmanship and short-term solutions threatens the Nation's economy, and regular appropriations bills have been replaced with fiscal cliffs, temporary stopgap measures, massive omnibus bills, and government shutdowns.

It is far past time that this Chamber's majority party does the good work of government and works to provide stability to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do want to revisit, in closing, this issue of appropriations and openness, and I want to remind my friends on the other side of some recent history.

In 2010, when my Democratic colleagues controlled the House, they only considered two appropriations bills. At that time, by the way, they also had control of the Senate. I presume it would have been easier for them to have cooperated with a Democratic Senate than for us, but perhaps not because they only got two appropriations bills done the last year they were in the majority.

My colleagues deviated from the longstanding practice of open rules for appropriations bills by making in order only 40 amendments that year. You heard that correctly. Democrats considered two of 12 bills, with only 40 amendments made in order.

This year, Republicans have considered seven of 12 bills, considering 404 amendments, 189 of them which were offered by my Democratic colleagues. I will let the American people decide who has the better record on actually bringing appropriations bills to the floor and opening them up for full consideration by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate all of those who spoke today for the sincerity and the thoughtfulness of the debate. I particularly know that we probably find ourselves on common ground in wanting to make sure the government doesn't shut down, pass a continuing resolution.

It is interesting to me that that was not the subject of a great deal of contention; so I would hope that is something that brings us together. It is something that, certainly, the Speaker wants to accomplish, but the President and the majority leader want to accomplish that as well. Surely, we can find a bipartisan amendment for that.

Obviously, the great issue of the day and this week is going to be this discussion over the Syrian matter, and, again, I want to congratulate my colleagues for the seriousness with which they are approaching this.

I think we have all learned some very hard lessons in the last 13 years, and I am pleased that the amendment that would bring to the floor—an amendment, by the way, the President didn't particularly want.

I would recall for the RECORD that the President wanted this authorization for active title 10 authority for him to train Syrians to simply be dropped into the continuing resolution. It was the Speaker with the support of the Democratic leadership as well that

wanted to make sure that we had a separate vote and discussion on this issue. I think that is a very good thing.

Now, I agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I would prefer a much more robust and fuller discussion, and I hope we reach that point. I think that is exactly the course that the Speaker recommended to the President.

□ 1330

He said:

I think the institution that I preside over will be better served, I think you will be better served, and I think the country will be better served if we have that debate.

I know the Speaker made every effort to get to that point. Others have a different point of view. I respect the President. Like most Chief Executives, he has had to take some very expansive views of his authority under the Constitution.

I recognize some people, frankly, are concerned about having this vote ahead of an election. Personally, I would prefer to do it ahead of an election, but I don't get to make those decisions, and I think the Speaker has done the best that he can do in reconciling all the conflicting opinions between the Senate, the House, and the executive branch and has managed to bring us at least something that is a serious debate and will be taken seriously by the country; moreover, I am particularly pleased that my chairman, Mr. SESSIONS, on the Rules Committee made sure that we will have not a cursory debate but 6 hours of debate.

If any Member wants to voice their opinion, 6 hours is an awful lot of time. I suspect they are going to have the opportunity to come down here and do that, and I hope they will.

I think what we are going to see is probably a bipartisan opposition to the amendment and bipartisan support. Frankly, in issues of war and peace, that is probably the better way for us to proceed; so I think it is a challenging situation. I think all concerned are trying to work together and do the right thing and to present clarity.

I just want to go on record once again, personally, as hoping that as soon as possible that we come back—the President asked for broad authority—that we repeal the '01 and '02 resolution, something the President has asked us to do himself before, and work together and present a more precisely defined and limited resolution that gives him the authority to act robustly in the defense of our country, to punish people who commit the barbarous acts that we have seen in recent weeks, and to do the things that are necessary with the full bipartisan support of Congress to secure the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying resolution upholds the primary responsibility the American people have sent us here

to do, ensuring the continued funding of the government. While not my first choice, passage of a continuing resolution is better than any of the alternatives; additionally, it provides the President the additional authority he has requested to degrade and destroy ISIL.

I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 722 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4950) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for 7 years, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4950.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,

asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 2154.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—224

Adersholt
Amash

Amodei
Bachus

Barletta
Barr

Benishek	Guthrie	Poe (TX)	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Bentivolio	Hall	Pompeo	Garcia	(NM)	Ruppersberger	Crawford	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Hanna	Posey	Grayson	Lynch	Ryan (OH)	Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Price (GA)	Green, Al	Maffei	Sanchez, Linda	Culberson	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Black	Hartzler	Reed	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	T.	Daines	Kline	Rohrabacher
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Reichert	Grijalva	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rokita
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Renacci	Hahn	Matsui	Sarbanes	Denham	LaMalfa	Rooney
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Ribble	Hanabusa	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky	Dent	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)	Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Schiff	DeSantis	Lance	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Rigell	Heck (WA)	McDermott	Schneider	Diaz-Balart	Lankford	Ross
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Roby	Higgins	McGovern	Schrader	Duffy	Latham	Rothfus
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)	Himes	McIntyre	Schwartz	Duncan (SC)	Latta	Royce
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Hinojosa	McNerney	Scott (VA)	Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Runyan
Burgess	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)	Honda	Meeks	Scott, David	Ellmers	Long	Ryan (WI)
Byrne	Hurt	Rogers (MI)	Horsford	Meng	Serrano	Farenthold	Lucas	Salmon
Calvert	Issa	Rohrabacher	Hoyer	Michaud	Sewell (AL)	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Camp	Jenkins	Rokita	Huffman	Miller, George	Shea-Porter	Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Scalise
Campbell	Johnson (OH)	Rooney	Israel	Moore	Sherman	Fleischmann	Marchant	Schock
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Jackson Lee	Moran	Sires	Fleming	Marino	Schweikert
Cassidy	Jolly	Roskam	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter	Flores	McAllister	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Jones	Ross	Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Jordan	Rothfus	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Speier	Fortenberry	McCaul	Sessions
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Royce	Kaptur	Neal	Swalwell (CA)	Foxx	McClintock	Shinkus
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Runyan	Keating	Negrete McLeod	Takano	Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Shuster
Coffman	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)	Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Thompson (CA)	Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Simpson
Cole	King (NY)	Salmon	Kennedy	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)	Gardner	McKinley	Sinema
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Sanford	Kildee	Owens	Tierney	Garrett	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scalise	Kilmer	Pallone	Titus	Gerlach	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Labrador	Schock	Kind	Pascrell	Tonko	Gibbs	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Cook	LaMalfa	Schweikert	Kirkpatrick	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas	Gibson	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Costa	Lamborn	Scott, Austin	Kuster	Payne	Van Hollen	Gingrey (GA)	Messer	Southerland
Cotton	Lance	Sensenbrenner	Langevin	Perlmutter	Vargas	Gohmert	Mica	Stewart
Cramer	Lankford	Sessions	Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Veasey	Goodlatte	Michaud	Stivers
Crawford	Latham	Shinkus	Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Vela	Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stockman
Crenshaw	Latta	Shuster	Lee (CA)	Peterson	Velázquez	Granger	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Culberson	LoBiondo	Simpson	Levin	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky	Graves (GA)	Mullin	Terry
Daines	Long	Sinema	Lewis	Pocan	Walz	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Lipinski	Polis	Wasserman	Griffin (AR)	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Schultz	Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NJ)	Lofgren	Quigley	Waters	Grimm	Noem	Tipton
DeSantis	Marchant	Smith (TX)	Lowenthal	Rahall	Waxman	Guthrie	Nugent	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Southerland	Lowey	Rangel	Welch	Hall	Nunes	Upton
Duffy	Massie	Stewart	Lujan Grisham	Richmond	Wilson (FL)	Hanna	Olson	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	McAllister	Stivers	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth	Harper	Palazzo	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman				Hartzer	Paulsen	Walberg
Ellmers	McCaul	Stutzman				Hastings (WA)	Pearce	Walden
Farenthold	McClintock	Terry	Bachmann	DesJarlais	Maloney,	Heck (NV)	Perry	Walorski
Fincher	McHenry	Thompson (PA)	Barton	Edwards	Carolyn	Hensarling	Peters (CA)	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Thornberry	Bridenstine	Gutiérrez	Miller, Gary	Herrera Beutler	Petri	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McKinley	Tiberi	Capito	Harris	Nunnelee	Holding	Pittenger	Weststrup
Fleming	McMorris	Tipton	Castor (FL)	Holt	Pelosi	Hudson	Pitts	Westmoreland
Flores	Rodgers	Turner	Crowley	Hunter	Rush	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Forbes	Meadows	Upton	DeFazio	Kinzingler (IL)		Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Williams
Fortenberry	Meehan	Valadao				Hultgren	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Messer	Wagner				Hurt	Price (GA)	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walberg				Issa	Reed	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walden				Jenkins	Reichert	Womack
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Walorski				Johnson (OH)	Renacci	Woodall
Garrett	Mullin	Weber (TX)				Johnson, Sam	Ribble	Yoder
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)				Jolly	Rice (SC)	Yoho
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Weststrup				Jordan	Rigell	Young (AK)
Gibson	Neugebauer	Westmoreland				Joyce	Roby	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Whitfield						
Gohmert	Nugent	Williams						
Goodlatte	Nunes	Wilson (SC)						
Gosar	Olson	Wittman						
Gowdy	Palazzo	Wolf						
Granger	Paulsen	Womack						
Graves (GA)	Pearce	Woodall						
Graves (MO)	Perry	Yoder						
Griffin (AR)	Petri	Yoho						
Griffith (VA)	Pittenger	Young (AK)						
Grimm	Pitts	Young (IN)						

NAYS—188

Barber	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Barrow (GA)	Cartwright	DeLauro
Bass	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Beatty	Chu	Deutch
Becerra	Cicilline	Dingell
Bera (CA)	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Ellison
Bonamici	Clyburn	Engel
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Enyart
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Esty
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Farr
Bustos	Courtney	Fattah
Butterfield	Cuellar	Foster
Capps	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Franks (FL)
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carney	DeGette	Gallego

NOT VOTING—19

Messrs. CICILLINE, SCHNEIDER, and ISRAEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 192, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Clawson (FL)
Barber	Buchanan	Coble
Barletta	Bucshon	Coffman
Barr	Burgess	Cole
Benishek	Byrne	Collins (GA)
Bilirakis	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Conaway
Black	Campbell	Cook
Blackburn	Carter	Costa
Boustany	Cassidy	Cotton

NAYS—192

Amash	Clyburn	Garamendi
Barrow (GA)	Cohen	Garcia
Bass	Connolly	Gosar
Beatty	Conyers	Grayson
Becerra	Cooper	Green, Al
Bentivolio	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Bonamici	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Higgins
Brooks (AL)	DelBene	Himes
Brown (FL)	Deutch	Hinojosa
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Honda
Bustos	Doggett	Horsford
Butterfield	Doyle	Hoyer
Capps	Duckworth	Huffman
Capuano	Ellison	Israel
Cárdenas	Engel	Jackson Lee
Carney	Enyart	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Castro (TX)	Farr	Jones
Chu	Fattah	Kaptur
Cicilline	Foster	Keating
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kennedy
Clay	Gabbard	Kildee
Cleaver	Gallego	Kilmer

Kind	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	Brown (FL)	Garrett	Lujan Grisham	Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Vargas
Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Brownley (CA)	Gerlach	(NM)	Roskam	Shuster	Veasey
Kuster	Napolitano	Scott, David	Buchanan	Gibbs	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ross	Simpson	Vela
Langevin	Neal	Serrano	Bucshon	Gibson	(NM)	Rothfus	Sinema	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)	Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Nolan	Shea-Porter	Bustos	Gohmert	Lynch	Royce	Slaughter	Wagner
Lee (CA)	O'Rourke	Sherman	Butterfield	Goodlatte	Maffei	Ruiz	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Levin	Owens	Sires	Byrne	Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Runyan	Smith (NE)	Walden
Lewis	Pallone	Slaughter	Calvert	Gowdy	Marchant	Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walorski
Lipinski	Pascrell	Smith (WA)	Camp	Granger	Marino	Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Walz
Loeb sack	Pastor (AZ)	Speier	Campbell	Graves (GA)	Matheson	Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Lofgren	Payne	Swalwell (CA)	Capps	Graves (MO)	Matsui	Salmon	Southerland	Schultz
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Takano	Capuano	Grayson	McAllister	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Waters
Lowe	Peters (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Cárdenas	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	T.	Stewart	Waxman
Lujan Grisham	Peterson	Thompson (MS)	Carney	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Stivers	Weber (TX)
(NM)	Pingree (ME)		Carson (IN)	Griffin (AR)	McCaul	Sanford	Stockman	Webster (FL)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Tierney	Carter	Griffith (VA)	McClintock	Sarbanes	Stutzman	Welch
(NM)	Polis	Titus	Cartwright	Grijalva	McCollum	Scalise	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup
Lynch	Price (NC)	Tonko	Cassidy	Grimm	McDermott	Schakowsky	Takano	Westmoreland
Maffei	Quigley	Tsongas	Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McGovern	Schiff	Terry	Whitfield
Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Van Hollen	Chabot	Gutiérrez	McHenry	Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Williams
Massie	Rangel	Vargas	Chaffetz	Hahn	McIntyre	Schock	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Matheson	Richmond	Veasey	Chu	Hall	McKeon	Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Vela	Cielline	Hanabusa	McKinley	Schwartz	Thornberry	Wittman
McCarthy (NY)	Ruiz	Velázquez	Clark (MA)	Hanna	McMorris	Schweikert	Tiberi	Wolf
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Visclosky	Clarke (NY)	Harper	Rodgers	Scott (VA)	Tierney	Womack
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Walz	Clawson (FL)	Hartzer	McNerney	Scott, Austin	Tipton	Woodall
McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman	Clay	Hastings (FL)	Meadows	Scott, David	Titus	Yarmuth
McIntyre	T.	Schultz	Cleaver	Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Sensenbrenner	Tonko	Yoder
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters	Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Meeks	Serrano	Tsongas	Yoho
Meeks	Sarbanes	Waxman	Coble	Heck (WA)	Meng	Sessions	Turner	Young (AK)
Meng	Schakowsky	Welch	Coffman	Hensarling	Messer	Sewell (AL)	Upton	Young (IN)
Miller, George	Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Cohen	Herrera Beutler	Mica	Shea-Porter	Valadao	
Moore	Schneider	Yarmuth	Cole	Higgins	Michaud	Sherman	Van Hollen	
Moran	Schrader		Collins (GA)	Himes	Miller (FL)			
			Hinojosa	Miller (MI)				
			Conaway	Miller, George				
			Connolly	Moore				
			Honda	Moran				
			Horsford	Mullin				
			Hoyer	Mulvaney				
			Hudson	Murphy (FL)				
			Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)				
			Huffman	Nadler				
			Huizenga (MI)	Napollitano				
			Hultgren	Neal				
			Hunter	Negrete McLeod				
			Hurt	Neugebauer				
			Israel	Noem				
			Issa	Nolan				
			Jackson Lee	Nugent				
			Jeffries	Nunes				
			Jenkins	O'Rourke				
			Johnson (GA)	Olson				
			Johnson (OH)	Owens				
			Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo				
			Johnson, Sam	Pallone				
			Jolly	Pascrell				
			Jones	Pastor (AZ)				
			Jordan	Paulsen				
			Joyce	Payne				
			Kaptur	Pearce				
			Keating	Perlmutter				
			Kelly (IL)	Perry				
			Kelly (PA)	Peters (CA)				
			Kennedy	Peters (MI)				
			Kildee	Peterson				
			Kilmer	Petri				
			Kind	Pingree (ME)				
			King (IA)	Pittenger				
			King (NY)	Pitts				
			Kingston	Pocan				
			Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)				
			Kline	Polis				
			Kuster	Pompeo				
			Labrador	Posey				
			LaMalfa	Price (GA)				
			Lamborn	Price (NC)				
			Lance	Quigley				
			Langevin	Rahall				
			Lankford	Rangel				
			Larsen (WA)	Reed				
			Larson (CT)	Reichert				
			Latham	Renacci				
			Latta	Ribble				
			Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)				
			Levin	Richmond				
			Lewis	Rigell				
			Lipinski	Roby				
			LoBiondo	Roe (TN)				
			Loeb sack	Rogers (AL)				
			Lofgren	Rogers (KY)				
			Long	Rogers (MI)				
			Lowenthal	Rohrabacher				
			Lowe	Rokita				
			Lucas	Rooney				
			Luetkemeyer					

NOT VOTING—18

Bachmann	DesJarlais	Maloney,
Barton	Edwards	Carolyn
Bridenstine	Harris	Miller, Gary
Capito	Holt	Nunnelee
Castor (FL)	Hunter	Pelosi
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Rush
DeFazio		

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—410

Aderholt	Becerra	Blackburn
Amodei	Benishke	Blumenauer
Bachus	Bentivolio	Bonamici
Barber	Bera (CA)	Boustany
Barletta	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Barr	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Bass	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Beatty	Black	Brooks (IN)

NAYS—4

Amash	Duncan (SC)
Broun (GA)	Massie

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann	DeFazio	Maloney,
Barton	DesJarlais	Carolyn
Bridenstine	Edwards	Miller, Gary
Capito	Harris	Nunnelee
Castor (FL)	Holt	Pelosi
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Rush

□ 1419

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call votes 497, 498, 499, and 500, I was away from the House floor and would have voted "aye" on all four measures.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 722, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Pursuant to House Resolution 722, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113-600 is adopted, and the joint resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 124

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums

are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2014 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2014, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division A of Public Law 113-76).

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-76).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113-76).

(4) The Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division D of Public Law 113-76).

(5) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2014 (division E of Public Law 113-76).

(6) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113-76).

(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division G of Public Law 113-76).

(8) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division H of Public Law 113-76).

(9) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2014 (division I of Public Law 113-76).

(10) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division J of Public Law 113-76).

(11) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of Public Law 113-76).

(12) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division L of Public Law 113-76).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 0.0554 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2014 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2014 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2014.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Acts.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 11, 2014.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2015 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2014, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or

about the first day of any month that begins after October 2014 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) The reduction in section 101(b) of this joint resolution shall not apply to—

(1) amounts designated under subsection (a) of this section; or

(2) amounts made available by section 101(a) by reference to the second paragraph under the heading “Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses” in division H of Public Law 113-76.

(c) Section 6 of Public Law 113-76 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this joint resolution, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2015 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Food and Nutrition Service—Commodity Assistance Program” at a rate for operations of \$275,701,000, of which \$208,682,000 shall be for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

SEC. 117. For “Department of Health and Human Services—Food and Drug Administration—Salaries and Expenses”, amounts shall be made available by this joint resolution as if “outsourcing facility fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j-62,” were included after “21 U.S.C. 381,” in the second paragraph under such heading in division A of Public Law 113-76.

SEC. 118. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction” may be apportioned up to the rate

for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except sections 106 and 107 of this joint resolution, for “Department of Defense—Overseas Contingency Operations—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Army”, up to \$50,000,000, to be derived by reducing the amount otherwise made available by section 101 for such account, may be used to conduct surface and subsurface clearance of unexploded ordnance at closed training ranges used by the Armed Forces of the United States in Afghanistan: *Provided*, That such funds may only be used if the training ranges are not transferred to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for use by its armed forces: *Provided further*, That the authority provided by this section shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated as provided under section 114 for such account.

SEC. 120. The following authorities shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense:

(1) Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 374 note).

(2) Section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).

(3) Section 127b of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding subsection (c)(3)(C) of such section.

(4) Subsection (b) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (20 U.S.C. 7703b(b)), notwithstanding paragraph (4) of such subsection.

SEC. 121. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid disruption of continuing projects or activities funded in this appropriation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 3 days after each use of the authority provided in subsection (a).

SEC. 122. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for “Department of Energy—Environmental and Other Defense Activities—Defense Environmental Cleanup” for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to assure timely execution of activities necessary to restore and upgrade the repository.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the spending rate authority provided in this section that exceeds customary apportionment allocations.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 5016 (113th Congress), as passed by the House of Representatives on July 16, 2014, at the rate set forth

under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request Act of 2014 (D.C. Act 20-370), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Office of Special Counsel—Salaries and Expenses” at a rate for operations of \$22,939,000.

SEC. 125. The third proviso under the heading “Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account” in division E of Public Law 113-76 is amended by striking “\$17,500,000,000” and inserting “\$18,500,000,000”: *Provided*, That amounts made available by section 101 for such proviso under such heading may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to accommodate increased demand for commitments to general business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That this section shall become effective upon enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 126. Sections 1101(a) and 1104(a)(2)(A) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (title XI of division C of Public Law 105-277; 47 U.S.C. 151 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “November 1, 2014”.

SEC. 127. Section 550(b) of Public Law 109-295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “October 4, 2014”.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. (a) Amounts made available by section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security for “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology”, “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Air and Marine Operations”, “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Construction and Facilities Management”, and “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and Border Patrol agents in accordance with the provisos under the heading “U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 113-76;

(2) sustain border security and immigration enforcement operations;

(3) sustain necessary Air and Marine operations; and

(4) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2014, and comply with the fifth proviso under the heading “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses” in division F of Public Law 113-76.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 130. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) shall be applied by substituting “on the date that is 1 year after the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015” for “10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act”.

SEC. 131. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40

U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 132. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other than under section 413(h) of such Act) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2014 (except that the amount appropriated for section 403(b) of such Act shall be \$598,000,000, and the requirement to reserve funds provided for in section 403(b)(2) of such Act shall not apply with respect to this section), and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the applicable portion of the first quarter of fiscal year 2015 at the pro rata portion of the level provided for such activities through the first quarter of fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 133. Amounts allocated to Head Start grantees from amounts identified in the seventh proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Children and Families Services Programs” in Public Law 113-76 shall not be included in the calculation of the “base grant” in fiscal year 2015, as such term is used in section 640(a)(7)(A) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)(7)(A)).

SEC. 134. The first proviso under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance” in division H of Public Law 113-76 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting “2015” for “2014”.

SEC. 135. Amounts provided by this joint resolution for “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 136. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by this joint resolution for “Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, there is appropriated \$58,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for expenses necessary to support acceleration of countermeasure and product advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act for addressing Ebola.

SEC. 137. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by this joint resolution for “Department of Health and Human Services—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—Global Health”, there is appropriated \$30,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for expenses necessary to support the responses of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this section as the “CDC”) to the outbreak of Ebola virus in Africa: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for transfer by the Director of the CDC to other accounts of the CDC for such support: *Provided further*, That

the Director of the CDC shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after the date of any transfer under the preceding proviso.

SEC. 138. Amounts made available by this joint resolution for “Department of Education—Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research”, “Department of Education—Departmental Management—Program Administration”, and “Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Community Living—Aging and Disability Services Programs” may be obligated in the account and budget structure set forth in section 491 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 3515e).

SEC. 139. Of the unobligated balance of amounts provided by section 108 of Public Law 111-3, \$4,549,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 140. Section 113 of division H of Public Law 113-76 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) for “September 30, 2014”.

SEC. 141. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are made available for accounts in title I of division J of Public Law 113-76 at an aggregate rate for operations of \$6,558,223,500.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report delineating the allocation of budget authority in subsection (a) by account and project.

SEC. 142. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,524,254,000.

SEC. 143. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—Office of Inspector General” at a rate for operations of \$126,411,000.

SEC. 144. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2014”.

SEC. 145. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Broadcasting Board of Governors—International Broadcasting Operations”, “Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Economic Support Fund”, “International Security Assistance—Department of State—International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, “International Security Assistance—Department of State—Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs”, and “International Security Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Foreign Military Financing Program” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to sustain assistance for Ukraine and independent states of the Former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe to counter external, regional aggression and influence.

SEC. 146. Section 7081(4) of division K of Public Law 113-76 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for “September 30, 2014”.

SEC. 147. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied through June 30, 2015, by substituting such date for “September 30, 2014” in section 7 of such Act.

SEC. 148. (a) Section 44302(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking

“September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015”.

(b) Section 44303(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015”.

(c) Section 44310(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015”.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After 1 hour of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-600, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for 6 hours equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 124.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.J. Res. 124, a short-term continuing resolution to keep the doors of the Federal Government open after the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

H.J. Res. 124 is a critical measure that ensures that hardworking Americans continue to have access to the government programs and the services they rely on and helps avoid the unnecessary uncertainty and economic harm caused by the threat of a government shutdown.

The bill continues government operations at the current rate of \$1.012 trillion into the next fiscal year and lasts until December 11, 2014. That level is in line with the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that this House approved last year.

My committee sought to draft a responsible, restrained bill that does not

include controversial riders and does not seek to change existing Federal policies; however, it does make several very limited adjustments to prevent catastrophic or irreversible damage to critical government programs to address pressing global crises that have surfaced in recent months or to ensure good government.

These are changes I believe all of my colleagues can and should support. These include provisions, Mr. Speaker, that, one, increase funding at the Department of Veterans Affairs to help deal with the disability claims backlog and further investigations into wait-list allegations; two, to boost funding for Ebola research and response; three, to provide some funding flexibility within CBP and ICE to meet border security needs; and, four, to continue a surge in funding for State Department programs that help counter regional aggression against Ukraine and other former Soviet states. Each of these provisions is funded within the total discretionary funding level of \$1.012 trillion.

The CR will also extend authority for certain laws currently in place such as the Internet Tax Freedom Act for the duration of the CR and the Export-Import Bank through June 30 of next year.

Later, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will offer an amendment to this bill to address the President's request for the authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to fight ISIL. This critical amendment will address an issue of great importance to our national security, and attaching it to this continuing resolution will allow its enactment within a swift timeframe.

It does not involve any new or additional funding for these activities. I hope that my colleagues in the House will support the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, but we cannot address each and every aspect of Federal agency budgets within the scope of a continuing resolution like this one. These line-by-line budget decisions must be made in full-year regular appropriations legislation.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that the House made great strides toward completing this vital work, which is our constitutional duty, by approving 11 out of 12 appropriations bills in committee and seven of them on the floor of the House, all before the August recess, dealing with some 400 amendments to those seven bills on the House floor.

The House made a good faith effort to complete all of these bills, but, unfortunately, the Senate has failed to approve a single appropriations bill which is why we are at this point today in trying to pass a continuing resolution.

It is high time that the Senate leadership allows us to complete critical

legislation to fund the entire Federal Government in an up-to-date, line-by-line way in regular order.

This continuing resolution will allow us the time, hopefully, to do just that; however, as we move forward, we cannot and should not continue to fall back on stopgap funding bills like this one.

These lurching short-term bills only postpone the tough budget decisions, heighten our Nation's mistrust of Congress, and cause uncertainty within our Federal agencies and the economy.

At this point, though, the best way to avoid causing serious damage to the country is to pass this continuing resolution. It is our most clear path forward. It allows us the time we need to draft bicameral pieces of legislation that reflect our real and urgent budgetary requirements and utilize our Nation's taxpayer dollars in the most responsible, representative way.

□ 1430

Before I close these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the service and hard work of the staff of the committee on both sides of the aisle, but I especially want to acknowledge the service and hard work of the clerk of the Defense Subcommittee, Tom McLemore.

Over his years on this committee he has been an integral member of the staff, no more so than his time as Defense clerk. Sadly, this will be his last bill before he moves on to greener pastures, and we will miss him a great deal. So I want to thank Tom for his service to this committee and to the Nation.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, we have just under 2 weeks left until the end of the fiscal year on September 30, so I ask that the House pass H.J. Res. 124 today without delay. I also urge the Senate to pass this bill and submit it to the President for his signature as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While it was my sincere hope that we could have completed action on all 12 appropriation bills before the end of the fiscal year, I understand Chairman ROGERS' desire to quickly pass the CR and prevent another disastrous government shutdown.

This continuing resolution gives the House and Senate Appropriations Committees roughly 3 months to reach agreement on each of the discretionary bills and the important programs they fund. Of great importance in these negotiations will be the funding levels in the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education bill. Unfortunately, it has the dubious distinction of being the only one not even brought to the full committee for markup, denying Members on both sides of the aisle the op-

portunity to offer amendments and have a full, open debate about these critical programs.

Yesterday, Ranking Member DELAURO and all the Democratic members of that subcommittee introduced our version of the bill that we hope will help clarify our priorities for the process in the coming months.

The CR portion of this legislative package contains much-needed funding to address urgent crises, including the spread of Ebola, ensuring critical work continues to develop and manufacture treatment therapies, as well as work on a vaccine.

However, I do regret that the majority's proposed CR resorts to one of the worst legislative mechanisms to reduce scoring, an across-the-board cut. This type of provision shirks one of the most fundamental responsibilities of this committee, making difficult decisions about program levels. Worse still, it is misleading to the public and creates an illusion that program levels remain at last year's level, when they are, in fact, lower.

I also have concerns with the length of the extension of the Export-Import Bank.

The President spoke forcefully about the threat of ISIL last week. There is a clear need for an international coalition to execute an aggressive, targeted strategy aimed at degrading ISIL, and later this afternoon, the House will begin debate on the administration's request for narrow title 10 authority.

Lastly, the rules of this CR added three technical changes to the underlying text that were needed and which I support. Additional language was needed on the Ebola funding, on the LIHEAP money, and on recreation fees.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, no appropriator ever wants a CR, but none of us want to repeat last year's shutdown. It is my sincere hope that if this CR is enacted we can use the coming months wisely to craft agreement on all 12 bills by December 11. There is absolutely no reason to punt our responsibilities into the new year and the new Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the full committee for yielding, and I rise in support of the continuing resolution.

We must pass this continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government open and operating for taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this legislation continues funding to pay our troops, for the Department of Defense operations, and for defense and maintenance, research and development, and procurement at fiscal year 2014 levels.

But a word of caution to my colleague. We have had a great deal of

talk lately from some quarters about eventually extending this continuing resolution to September of next year, 2015. That would be a very bad idea for the Department of Defense and many other important agencies and programs. While this approach might hold the line on spending in other agencies and programs, a yearlong continuing resolution has proven to be terribly costly for the Department of Defense.

Funding under a CR promotes budget uncertainty that makes defense planning and managing programs nearly impossible. It is damaging to our men and women in uniform, our military readiness, our defense industrial base, and our defense posture as we face challenges around the world, in the Middle East, the Pacific, Africa, Europe, and considered additional actions in Iraq and also Syria.

Three months ago, our full committee and our Defense Subcommittee produced a strong, bipartisan fiscal year 2015 Defense Appropriations bill. We hope the Senate will now join us to complete the process, allowing us to fulfill our responsibilities under the Constitution for a strong national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I commend your strong efforts and that of the staff and urge support of the resolution.

But before I conclude, may I also join with Chairman ROGERS in saluting Tom McLemore, the clerk to the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, for his years of hard work on behalf of all Members, Republicans and Democrats, his strong work on behalf of a strong national defense, for his work with me in my brief tenure as chairman, but for the many years of loyal support he gave to our late chairman, Congressman Bill Young of Florida.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Labor, HHS, and Foreign Operations Subcommittees of Appropriations.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member for her unwavering leadership on our committee on so many issues.

Thank you, Congresswoman LOWEY.

Let me thank also our chairman for continuing to try to help us work in a bipartisan way to bring a real Labor, HHS bill to the floor.

This continuing resolution contains, yes, critical and much-needed funding to address the Ebola crisis in Africa. It also, though, includes across-the-board cuts which will negatively impact my congressional district, all of our congressional districts, and countless households across America.

For example, this CR includes two different cuts to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. It includes a \$14 million reduction in the TANF contingency fund and a \$15 million reduction that will eliminate

TANF research funds, funds that are used, mind you, by the Department of Health and Human Services to evaluate the effectiveness of TANF programs and to develop approaches for improving employment outcomes among TANF recipients.

These cuts are unnecessary and come at a time when people are literally living on the edge. It is unacceptable that at a time when we are passing short-term funding bills that underfund public health and workforce training programs we are now providing over \$80 billion in war funding. The American people expect Congress to create jobs, to strengthen our economy, and to ensure that our security funds are wisely spent. With sequester cuts looming, it is time that we focus our spending here at home.

Finally, let me just address the upcoming debate and vote on funding to arm and train Syrian rebels. This should not be an amendment to the continuing resolution. National security issues should not be an afterthought to funding the government.

Now, not a single person in this body thinks that the United States should stand idle while ISIS wreaks havoc in the Middle East, but this is a sectarian civil war where the use of force and arming and training rebels will place us in the middle of a war where most recognize there is no military solution. So, before we expand the airstrikes in Iraq and vote to provide weapons and training to rebels in Syria, Congress must have a thorough and robust debate on the long-term implications of taking such actions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. I have grave concerns about the specific proposal to arm and train the Free Syrian Army, which will be voted on tomorrow by this House, and I intend to address this further during the debate on the McKeon amendment.

How can we ensure that U.S. weapons and training don't end up in the wrong hands?

How in the world will we know when our objectives have been met and when ISIS has been contained or eliminated?

How will we avoid getting embroiled in the civil war?

Congress must weigh all of the options before us, not just the military ones, before we make any decision on committing the U.S. to yet another long-term war. This is the type of debate that we failed to have in the wake of 9/11 and which resulted in the passage of an overly broad authorization that continues to be used today.

So we must ask the hard questions, not only about the current proposal to arm and train Syrian rebels, but about the entire strategy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Finally, let me just say, we cannot become embroiled in another war. The cost and the consequences to our national security, to our brave men and women in uniform, and to our ability to continue to nation-build here at home must be laid out to the public. That is our constitutional duty and responsibility. Unfortunately, we get a pass with this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also want to add my voice to those who are complimenting Mr. McLemore on his dedication to public service and his retirement as clerk of the Defense Subcommittee.

I would tell my colleagues that, despite the strong leadership and very best efforts of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, I am abjectly disappointed that we again find ourselves in the position of considering another continuing resolution. Continuing resolutions are no way to run a nation. We cannot expect good government if we are incapable of providing appropriations in a timely and predictable manner.

As importantly, I am greatly concerned about providing another authority for conducting military operations in the Middle East.

In letters to Congress, the President has cited the powers granted to him in Article II of the United States Constitution as the legal basis for some of the actions already taken. In recent briefings and public statements, the administration also indicates that the authorized use of military force resolutions passed in 2001 and 2002 remain the legal foundation for current operations. However, these authorities were approved by the Congress in a different time and for different conflicts and with a very different membership.

The time has come to rationalize the authorities with the needs of the current conflict and for the current legislative body to weigh in on this matter of war and peace rather than to rely on authorities intended for Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden.

I appreciate the President's honesty in pointing out that the efforts to combat ISIL will extend into the next administration. So why, after 3 years of civil war in Syria, are we including this authority in a continuing resolution that will be in effect for less than 3 months, providing a fleeting authority for what we all anticipate will be a

protracted effort? Further, this approach fails to take into consideration the long-term financial costs of conducting this mission, which has been estimated to cost up to \$500 million a year.

I also believe that there is an inherent flaw in this strategy, training and equipping nonstate actors as the main effort in combating a threat to the region and our national security.

□ 1445

The United States invested lives and innumerable injuries, as well as a great deal of national treasure, to train and equip the Iraqi Army, only to see the result of that professional force collapse in the midst of serious conflict. Why then do we expect the next force we train to behave differently? We must also ask ourselves if we can truly vet these rebel groups beyond their known affiliations and ensure that we are not arming the next extremist threat to the region.

I would note that, recently, some of our allies and partners in the region have made commitments of equipment, training areas, and financial resources. I believe far more will ultimately be required of them, including leadership and troops of their own, to truly degrade and defeat ISIL.

The task of fighting ISIL is complicated. I am gravely concerned with the complexities we face while ensuring the safety of our forces. It is for these reasons that I am opposed to the amendment that will be offered by Chairman MCKEON.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, a very hardworking member.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this short-term continuing resolution.

This CR simply keeps the government funded at the current fiscal year rate, which is, by the way, in line with the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that was passed by Congress last year under the steadfast leadership of Chairman ROGERS, of our subcommittee chairmen and chairwomen, and of the ranking members.

The House is doing its work. The House has done its work. We have passed 11 of the 12 bills out of the full committee, and seven of those appropriations bills, under regular order and through immense debate, have actually passed the floor of the House. Yet the Senate has passed how many appropriations bills? Mr. Speaker, not even one. That is why we are here, once again, with this continuing resolution. Our record very clearly shows that, unlike the Senate, the House is committed to actually doing the hard work—to going line by line to fund the

vital programs and looking at opportunities to eliminate waste and to reduce spending.

Again, we have done our work. Now we need a willing partner, Mr. Speaker, on the other side, in the Senate, to do their part so then we can go to conference and negotiate the differences, but that is not in our hands. That is in the hands of the American people.

We are now at the end of this fiscal year, as the chairman said—just a couple of weeks away. The key is to pass this continuing resolution to keep the government running. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the weeks ahead and continuing to go line by line, agency by agency, looking for waste, making sure that we are doing what has to be done. I also know that the House will do its job.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee. Let's get this done.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking minority member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and a senior member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend, the ranking member of our committee.

I want to join with Chairman ROGERS and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN in the shout-out to Tom McLemore. I trust, as Chairman ROGERS said, that he is going on to greener pastures. He deserves to.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is an imperfect body. Our constituents remind us of that on an almost daily basis. We certainly know that this is an imperfect process within which we have to operate, and the bill before us is an imperfect bill from our perspective and, I suspect, from the majority's perspective, but that is the world we live in. We have to choose the best option oftentimes among a host of difficult options, so this is the best option—to vote "yes" on this continuing resolution. It is the most responsible thing to do. To vote "no" would say that we are willing to let the government be shut down, unfunded. So we don't have a responsible option but to vote "yes" on this continuing resolution.

I appreciate the work that Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the chairs of the committees and of the subcommittees have put in to making it as good as we could under the circumstances.

We also have an imperfect option with regard to the Ex-Im Bank. It ought to be extended for an additional 5 more years. It generates a lot of money for the United States, and we offer fewer subsidies than our allies do to multinational corporations, but to not extend it at least until June 30 is irresponsible. Again, it is the best option we have before us.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the McKeon amendment, which would provide \$500 million to train and equip Syrian soldiers to fight ISIS, I don't think we have a better option. I find it difficult to disagree with my colleagues, particularly with colleagues who I am so fond of, such as the gentleman from Indiana, but if we are going to vote "no," we ought to have an alternative.

What would we do under the circumstances? I don't know what better alternative there is.

Are we going to ignore what ISIS is doing in Iraq? Are we going to ignore the fact that the death toll over the last year has been almost 10,000 people—9,826—excluding deaths from the Syrian civil war? 17,000 have been executed in Tikrit, and 650 were executed in Mosul just because they were non-Arabs or non-Sunni Muslims. It was ethnic cleansing on an historic scale. Now 20 journalists are missing in Syria. Many of them are held by the Islamic State. The U.N. estimates that more than a million people have been displaced by violence in Iraq in this year alone.

It is serious given what they have done and particularly given the fact that ISIS is growing exponentially. I remember we got a figure of about 12,000, and then, last week, it was about 20,000. This week, it is estimated that there are over 30,000. They are recruited from all over the world—15,000 foreign fighters, 2,000 of whom are westerners who hold passports where there is a visa waiver and they might be able to get into the United States. Some of them are Americans. They are making millions of dollars a day in revenue from oil and kidnapping and so on. Their assets are estimated at about \$2 billion. This is the wealthiest, most lethal, extremist terrorist group that has yet to present itself on the planet.

Can we turn around and do nothing?

The reality is, since the United States has the largest, most capable military—larger and more capable than all of the other militaries in the world combined—the responsibility falls on our shoulders to lead. What we are doing is leading by training, by seeing to it that, while there will be boots on the ground, there won't be primarily Americans in those boots. It will be people who know the territory, who know the language, who know the culture, and who have been vetted. We will provide intelligence and air support. This is the best of a long list of bad options.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to vote "aye" and allow the President to proceed on this policy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, who made an excellent presentation.

May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a member of the Homeland Security and Foreign Operations Subcommittees.

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of passing this legislation before us.

First, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS, and I certainly want to thank the ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY, for working together to produce this continuing resolution. This continuing resolution will maintain vital funding for the Federal agencies that provide services to taxpayers.

Congress has two major responsibilities, which are to pass a budget and to pay our bills on time. This bill would ensure that, while the House and the Senate will pass these appropriations bills probably in the form of an omnibus bill at the end of the year, we need to pass this CR. Additionally, this CR will contain much-needed funds to respond to the Ebola outbreak, to the reauthorization authority for the Export-Import Bank, and to provide the administration funding flexibility to deal with unaccompanied minors at the border.

Tomorrow, we will also have an amendment to help fight the ISIS threat, and we must stand together with our President to fight that threat. I know it is a complicated situation, but doing nothing is certainly not an option. Last year, our failure to uphold the basic responsibilities of Congress resulted in a government shutdown, and we must not let that happen again. We do need the CR, but we must get back to regular order—pass full appropriations bills, go to conference, and get our job done. I think, if we are able to do that, we will be able to make sure that we do the hard job that we were sent up here to do. We were not sent up here to make the easy decisions. These are difficult decisions, but this is the responsibility of Congress.

Again, I do want to thank the chairman, and I do want to thank the ranking member. I stand in support of the CR and of the amendment that will be coming in tomorrow to fight the threat that we see with ISIS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank our very capable ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I echo the disappointment already expressed that, once again, the end of the fiscal year has come, and rather than this House completing its work on the 12 appropriations bills, we are scrambling to pass now another continuing resolution.

This is a classic definition of “dysfunction”—kicking the can down the road, shirking our responsibility to address the priorities of our Nation through precise 2015 departmental funding levels and with decisiveness. We get the reverse of that—uncertainty, a 3 month kick the can. It hurts job growth. It hurts economic recovery. We must reverse this regression and inertia. Congress must make the difficult choices that allow our Republic to function with certainty and dispatch again.

On the Energy and Water Subcommittee, we took great strides to set such a path forward. While I did not agree with some parts of the bill, our subcommittee did its job to fund critical job creation in water resource projects, to support science activities necessary for American competitiveness and economic growth, to fund work on critical national defense priorities, nuclear nonproliferation, and our cleanup efforts. Unfortunately, this continuing resolution stalls that work. Contracts cannot be let, and it keeps us mired in the past.

While our bill addresses a limited number of immediate needs, including flexibility for the Department of Energy to continue ongoing cleanup at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, America surely needs a firmer path forward, and I plead with the leadership of this institution to do that. It is my sincere hope that this short-term continuing resolution provides the necessary time to pass full-year appropriations so that Congress measures up to what the American people expect of us, and that is to do our job. 2015 funding levels should match the requirements of reality, not political stunts 6 weeks before an election.

□ 1500

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if she has further requests for time?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think, as has been said here numerous times by people on both sides of the aisle, we regret that we are having to bring a continuing resolution to the floor to continue the government over the end of the fiscal year. But that is because we attempted on the House side, on both sides of the aisle, to pass all 12 of these individual appropriations bills. And we were on our way to passing all of them until the Senate de-

cided they weren't going to take any of them up, and they haven't. So it left us no choice but to ask for a continuing resolution to keep the government's lights on until December 11, by which time, hopefully, we will be able to cobble together an omnibus appropriations bill for all of the government for all of next year.

So that is where we are. We really have no choice. I don't think either side wants to shut down the government. Certainly on this side, we do not. So the necessity is that we pass this bill.

Now, the amendment coming up, on giving the President the authority to establish training bases and equip fighters in Syria, is all important, an amendment that I certainly support and welcome into the appropriations bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her hard work on these bills all year long, and all of the staff and all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. We are a committee that abhors continuing resolutions, yet we are faced with no choice but to try to pass one.

So I urge my colleagues to support the continuing resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 124) ensures that there will be no government shutdown and that the men and women of America's armed forces and diplomatic service will have the resources they need in Afghanistan and beyond to protect the nation from the dangers of terrorism. This resolution continues funding on a temporary basis at fiscal year 2014 levels, but it does not provide the final, full-year spending levels for the government. For war-related spending, the resolution provides for an interim rate of spending that is over \$26 billion more than the President's June 26, 2014 amended request for these purposes for fiscal year 2015. At this stage, there is a great deal of uncertainty about the precise needs for these activities.

The Budget Committee has jurisdiction over the use of the statutory authority that permits for spending in excess of the discretionary caps for funding designated for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism. On a bipartisan basis, the Budget Committee has expressed concern that the OCO/GWOT budget has been misused by both this Administration and the previous Administration. In addition, Congress has generally gone along with using these funds for purposes outside of OCO/GWOT requirements. The Committee highlighted this concern in the report accompanying the FY 2015 budget resolution.

While I support this interim funding measure and want to ensure our armed forces have the resources they need for these purposes, together with the Committee's ranking Democratic member Mr. VAN HOLLEN, I will work to ensure that the final full-year appropriation for these purposes funds only those requirements that are closely related to the incremental,

non-enduring costs of our overseas engagement in Afghanistan and the broader Middle East.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, to keep the government open, the House is considering a continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 124) that permits government agencies to continue spending at the 2014 level through December 11, 2014. As a result, it allows a rate of overseas contingency operations spending at the Department of Defense, Department of State, and other agencies that if sustained over the entire fiscal year would total \$92 billion. This sum exceeds what the Administration requested for overseas contingency operations for 2015 by \$26 billion. Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN and I agree that this bill should not be interpreted as endorsing the expansion of overseas contingency operations spending above what our military commanders say is needed to support our troops engaged in war operations. Congress will revisit the full-year funding needs for overseas contingency operations at a future date, including whatever resources may be necessary to counter emerging threats, including those ISIL poses. Over the course of the CR period, the Administration should spend OCO funding at a rate that will still allow for full-year funding at no higher than the level military commanders say is needed for 2015.

The OCO budget has been misused to get around discretionary funding caps over the years. Billions of dollars of non-war related activities have been funded in the OCO budget. For 2014, Congress shifted \$9 billion of non-war activities into the OCO budget so it could free up funds within the budget caps. Over 2001 through 2014, Pentagon OCO cost reports indicate that \$71 billion of non-war funding was provided through war appropriations.

This is a problem that both Chairman RYAN and I have been looking at in the Budget Committee. We both agree that the OCO budget should only be used to fund those requirements that are related to the transitory, non-recurring costs of war activities. In fact, the Budget Committee adopted report language as part of the budget resolution affirming that goal. It says, “Abuse of the OCO/GWOT cap adjustment is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process. The Budget Committee will exercise its oversight responsibilities with respect to the use of the OCO/GWOT designation in the FY 2015 budget process, and it will oppose increases above the levels the Administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such amounts are war-related.”

We should provide our military and diplomatic corps all the resources they need to carry out the important missions the country gives them. However, we should not use the OCO budget as a back-door mechanism to get around discretionary funding caps. The continuing resolution gives the Administration the spending authority needed to keep the government open and to give the necessary resources to support those engaged in operations overseas. It does not give the Administration a blank check to finance non-war activities.

In the coming months when the House considers the final full-year appropriation for overseas contingency operations, I am committed to working with Chairman RYAN to ensure that funds appropriated in the OCO budget will only be used for war-related costs.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support the inclusion of additional funding for the United States Office of Special Counsel, "OSC" in section 124 of H.J. Res. 124. There is a critical need for ongoing oversight of the Department of Veterans Affairs, "VA." This section of the Continuing Resolution recognizes that need by providing an increase in funding for the OSC.

OSC protects whistleblowers government-wide who expose waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Since the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs discovered the use of unofficial, unlawful scheduling lists at the Phoenix VA Health Care System, VA employees across the country have stepped forward to report allegations of further misconduct and threats to Veterans' health care. Whistleblowers have been at the heart of exposing misconduct and promoting accountability at the VA. Many of them have faced retaliation and threats from VA management. This has a chilling and crippling effect on our efforts to restore confidence in the VA.

OSC has been inundated with claims of retaliation and disclosures from VA employees. OSC's numbers are at record-setting levels. In the aftermath of the initial exposure of the VA scandal, cases from VA employees comprise over 29 percent of all OSC's cases, which covers the entire Federal government. This year, OSC will receive over 300 more cases from VA whistleblowers than in the previous year. This is a massive increase for a tiny Federal agency like OSC. In testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Special Counsel Carolyn Lerner told us that OSC had to establish a new priority intake system for VA cases. OSC also reallocated much of its small staff to deal with the VA increase.

Despite its small size, OSC's efforts are making a tremendous difference. Its work has already resulted in relief for courageous VA employees who were retaliated against for speaking out about wait lists and improper care. OSC's review of the VA Office of Medical Inspector led to an overhaul of the internal oversight structure at the VA.

However, OSC cannot keep up with the influx of claims and respond to them in a timely and responsible manner. The funding increase will provide the additional staff and related expenses necessary to support ongoing investigations of misconduct and whistleblower reprisal. It will promote accountability and better administration of the VA.

I thank Chairman ROGERS for his work to help clean up the problems at the VA through increased funding of the OSC in section 124 of H.J. Res. 124.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's request to train vetted, moderate Syrian rebels, as I believe it is only one step in the right direction and it's supported by military experts.

Tremendous oversight is going to be necessary in this effort. And unfortunately I fear, as do many experienced generals and military

personnel, that it's part of a strategy that's insufficient to secure America's national security.

The President's stated objective is to destroy ISIL. However, I believe that this overall strategy, and the means requested, are not enough to meet this objective.

The current strategy relies on U.S. airpower in support of local forces. This is not a counterterrorism effort, and to destroy ISIL, it's necessary to have strong coordinated ground troops.

The local ground forces the President is planning to rely on appear currently unready and they will need to operate with a strong central command and control.

The President's strategy does not provide for U.S. Special Forces and the backing of our ground troops, even though our military leaders have repeatedly suggested the exact recommendation.

Our security is too important to base military strategy on political calculations. Our strategy must be firmly rooted in what is necessary in order to complete the mission and to ensure our security. From Clausewitz to Powell, military leaders have preached the necessity of decisive force.

I served in Iraq. We heeded this wisdom and committed to win with decisive force. We acted on military reality and not political risk.

We can do this again and fulfill the American objective to destroy ISIL, but we must commit ourselves to do what is necessary. Not only what it takes, but whatever it takes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the core pillars of the President's plan to fight ISIS—the use of American surveillance, intelligence assets and air power to support the ground operations of the Iraqi army and Kurdish fighters in Iraq, and to strike ISIS military equipment, troop concentrations, and command and control in Syria. I also believe we should supply weapons to those groups in Syria, such as the Syrian Kurds, who have consistently fought ISIS, and whose priority is to defeat ISIS. I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues to revise the existing 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force to more clearly support these objectives, but to also ensure that U.S. ground forces are not engaged in combat in Iraq or Syria.

My one concern with the Administration's plan relates to the proposal to arm the so-called "moderate" Syrian opposition. I believe that it is a well-intentioned proposal that will have unintended negative consequences that will not serve our ultimate goal of defeating ISIS.

First, the primary objective of these Sunni Islamist fighters is the defeat of Assad and his Alawite dominated regime—not the defeat of ISIS. Since the start of the war there have been shifting alliances among these Sunni Islamist forces that include the al-Qaeda affiliate, Jabhat al-Nusra, different elements of the Free Syrian Army, the Islamist Front, Ahrar al-Sham and ISIS, among others. Their common cause and overriding objective is defeating Assad. Indeed, the commander of the Syria Revolutionaries' Front, Jamal Maarouf, one of the most militarily proficient commanders of the FSA, recently said that, "It's clear that I'm not fighting against al-Qaeda. This is a problem outside of Syria's border, so it's not our

problem. I don't have a problem with anyone who fights against the regime inside Syria."

While there is no doubt that Assad is a brutal dictator, he does not pose the same threat to the United States as ISIS, and his forces have recently been battling ISIS. At this point, arming fighters whose primary purpose is to weaken Assad has one unintended result—strengthening ISIS. Indeed, I fear that the arms we provide to the so-called Syrian opposition are more likely to end up in ISIS hands than to be used against ISIS terrorists.

There is one group within Syria that has been battling ISIS from the start, and that is the Syrian Kurds. We should provide material support to these Kurdish fighters in Syria.

We should also continue our efforts to get the Sunni tribesmen in Iraq and Syria to take up the fight against ISIS. The President and his team deserve great credit for helping to push former Prime Minister Maliki from power. He ruled Iraq, not as a nationalist Iraqi leader, but as a Shia strongman. That sectarian approach alienated the Sunni population in Iraq, and made them more open to tolerating the rise of ISIS.

With the emergence of a more inclusive Iraqi government, we must work with all parties to assure Sunni tribesmen that their interests are better served by a united Iraq than by ISIS. That is why the President's emphasis on a political component to this strategy is so important.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). All time for debate on the joint resolution has expired.

AMENDMENT PRINTED IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT 113-600 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and sustenance, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes:

(1) Defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition.

(2) Protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria.

(3) Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria.

(b) Not later than 15 days prior to providing assistance authorized under subsection (a) to vetted recipients for the first time—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of—

(A) the plan for providing such assistance;

(B) the requirements and process used to determine appropriately vetted recipients; and

(C) the mechanisms and procedures that will be used to monitor and report to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate on unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment and other violations of relevant law by recipients; and

(2) the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of how such assistance fits within a larger regional strategy.

(c) The plan required in subsection (b)(1) shall include a description of—

(1) the goals and objectives of assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(2) the concept of operations, timelines, and types of training, equipment, and supplies to be provided;

(3) the roles and contributions of partner nations;

(4) the number of United States Armed Forces personnel involved;

(5) any additional military support and sustainment activities; and

(6) any other relevant details.

(d) Not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the report required in subsection (b)(1), and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a progress report. Such progress report shall include a description of—

(1) any updates to or changes in the plan, strategy, vetting requirements and process, and end-use monitoring mechanisms and procedures, as required in subsection (b)(1);

(2) statistics on green-on-blue attacks and how such attacks are being mitigated;

(3) the groups receiving assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(4) the recruitment, throughput, and retention rates of recipients and equipment;

(5) any misuse or loss of provided training and equipment and how such misuse or loss is being mitigated; and

(6) an assessment of the effectiveness of the assistance authorized under subsection (a) as measured against subsections (b) and (c).

(e) For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) The term “appropriately vetted” means, with respect to elements of the Syrian opposition and other Syrian groups and individuals, at a minimum, assessments of such elements, groups, and individuals for associations with terrorist groups, Shia militias aligned with or supporting the Government of Syria, and groups associated with the Government of Iran. Such groups include, but are not limited to, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, and Hezbollah.

(2) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(f) The Department of Defense may submit a reprogramming or transfer request to the congressional defense committees for funds

made available by section 101(a)(3) of this joint resolution and designated in section 114 of this joint resolution to carry out activities authorized under this section notwithstanding sections 102 and 104 of this joint resolution.

(g) The Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to carry out activities as authorized by this section which shall be credited to appropriations made available by this joint resolution for the appropriate operation and maintenance accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming action is submitted to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That amounts made available by this subsection are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available only if the President so designates such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

(h) The authority provided in this section shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

(i) Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(j) Nothing in this section supersedes or alters the continuing obligations of the President to report to Congress pursuant to section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543) regarding the use of United States Armed Forces abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 722, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment to House Joint Resolution 124 to provide authority to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition in order to defend the Syrian people from attacks by ISIL and to protect the United States and our friends and allies.

ISIL is a clear and present threat to our allies across the Middle East and to the United States. In this time of crisis, the President has asked for this authority because none of the existing Department of Defense train-and-equip programs fit the circumstances. Specifically, the President has requested the authority to train and equip non-governmental entities fighting in the non-U.S.-led operation in Syria.

There is no doubt that any strategy to defeat ISIL must contain a Syria component. I believe that there are options to defeat ISIL in Syria short of a major U.S.-led combat operation. But the window of opportunity is closing.

That is why I am supporting the President's request and have agreed to draft an amendment to the continuing resolution based on a modified version of the administration's initial proposal.

My amendment would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and the sustainment of the vetted opposition. The provision is intended to authorize activities necessary to facilitate such training and equipping activities, including the appropriate modification of existing facilities and the establishment of expeditionary facilities suitable for such training and accommodation, as well as payment of stipends to trainees.

The President's request did not specify the amount of funding that would be required for this effort and contained few oversight requirements. Therefore, my amendment would strengthen congressional oversight by requiring detailed reports, including progress reports on the plan, the vetting process, and the procedures for monitoring the end use of the training and equipment. It would also require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy.

This amendment does not authorize additional funds. However, it would allow the Department of Defense to submit reprogramming requests to Congress should the President require funds to execute this authority. It also permits the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign contributions.

Lastly, the amendment would state that nothing in this bill be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities. There may be a time when we need to have an AUMF debate, but this is not it. The President has not asked for such an authority.

My amendment is narrowly focused on training and equipping Syrian opposition fighters to counter ISIL. This language was drafted in collaboration with the chairs of the national security committees and shared with the minority. Additionally, the language for this authority has been reviewed by the Department of Defense and the National Security Council.

Lastly, let me emphasize that this train-and-equip authority is a necessary part—but only one part—of what should be a larger strategy. It must be part of a larger effort in Syria, in Iraq, and across the region.

Let's also remember that it will be our men and women in uniform who will be conducting this training. We continue to ask more and more of our military, yet their funding continues to be cut. This is not sustainable and must be addressed.

Again, ISIL is a clear and present threat to the United States and our interests. My amendment is a necessary step to support what should be a larger

strategy by the President to defeat ISIL.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I too rise in support of this amendment. As the chairman laid out, there is no question that ISIL is a clear threat to our interests, and they are a threat in two clear ways. Number one, a large number of foreign fighters are going over to Syria and Iraq to support them. Some of those foreign fighters—estimates are somewhere in the 100 range—have come from the U.S., and thousands have come from Western Europe. Many of those have returned to that home country, and they present a clear threat. As long as ISIS or ISIL is there to threaten us, the fighters that fight with them will become a threat to the rest of us.

But in a broader sense, if ISIL is able to control territory in Iraq and in Syria and have a safe and secure haven, they will, without question, plot and plan attacks against the West. They have already said that is their plan, and that is exactly what happened when al Qaeda had safe haven in Afghanistan. So denying ISIL safe haven is clearly in the United States' interests.

I think a humanitarian aspect of this is also worth stating. As was noted by some earlier speakers on the CR debate, you cannot imagine a more violent and dangerous and just hedonistic group of people. The number of folks that they have brutally murdered in Iraq and Syria solely because they refused to pledge allegiance to ISIS and their twisted view of their religion is staggering. This is a group that must be stopped.

Now, the sad fact is, the United States military cannot stop them on our own. This has to be primarily a local fight. The folks in the region have to take up this battle.

And I believe that they have started to in Iraq, but we need to open a front in Syria. Because the problem is, if ISIS can hold themselves out as an organization that is fighting against Western imperialism, that brings supporters to them. If, on the other hand, they are, as they clearly are, just a group of murderous thugs that are killing more Muslims than anybody has killed in a very long time, then we can build support from the local population, from the Sunni population, to oppose them.

Now, we have already seen some success on this in Iraq. And I think the President was absolutely right to take his time in Iraq and wait for a coalition to work with. If the U.S. had simply come in over the top right off the bat and had started bombing ISIS, we would have been perceived as choosing the Shia side in the Shia-Sunni civil

war. And in so doing, we would have strengthened ISIS. By insisting that Prime Minister Maliki be replaced, by insisting that Iraq begin to at least start some sort of power sharing arrangement with the Sunnis, we were able to build a stronger coalition by also building support from the Kurds, a Sunni group. We could then be in support of them fighting ISIS and pushing them out.

Now, the great flaw in this theory is, the border between Iraq and Syria is nonexistent, as far as ISIS is concerned, and they can go back and forth across it.

□ 1515

If we don't have any way to get at them in Syria, it gives them an enormous advantage in continuing to press the fight in Iraq and potentially elsewhere, but the challenge is: How do we open that front? Because we face the same dilemma in Syria that we faced in Iraq.

The dominant issue that started everything in Syria was opposition to the Assad regime, a regime very much worth opposing. As the President and many on the floor here have said, Assad must go. He is an illegitimate leader.

If we were simply to come in and appear to be playing the role of Assad's air force in Syria, again, that would strengthen ISIS. That would drive Sunnis and the anti-regime elements in Syria into their arms.

Mr. Speaker, we need a partner in Syria that we can support that is an alternative to Assad and is an alternative to ISIS. The problem is that right now we don't really have one.

We have a small group of people that we have been supporting in a variety of different ways, but we need that group to grow. We need to have a partner to support if we are ever going to hope to contain ISIS in Syria in Iraq. The only way to do that is to start.

I have heard a number of complaints. People say, "But, gosh, are there really any moderates out there? Are there enough to make a difference? What if they switch sides?"

There are all kinds of problems, but the bottom line is if you believe that we have to open a front in Syria to stop ISIS—and I don't see how you can believe otherwise—to give them Syria and say, "We are not going to challenge you there," I think makes it impossible to even significantly degrade them and, certainly, to ever defeat them; so we need to open a front.

How do you do that, Mr. Speaker? Well, you can't open a front unless you start the process, and that is what Mr. McKEON's amendment does. It starts the process. It gives the ability to train and equip a force that will be opposed to Assad and opposed to ISIS.

Now, I don't think we should have any illusions, and I know Americans—

I would prefer this as well—we would say, Look, we are going to win this war, and we are going to win it in 100 days, and here is what we—this is going to be a long process. This is not something that is going to happen quickly.

It is simply the nature of the conflict in that part of the world that it is going to take time to find the people, train them, and equip them, but, if we do not try, Mr. Speaker, then ISIS is going to sit in Syria unchallenged, continuing to brutally murder civilians of all stripes and continuing to spread their unique ideology of hatred and violence. We have to start somewhere, and I think this amendment gives us the opportunity to start somewhere.

I also want to note that I like the fact that the amendment is only effective until the end of the CR and says that this should be contained in the National Defense Authorization Act. This is an authorizing action, and it should be done in an authorizing bill.

Now, we have got to get started, and we don't have time. Regrettably, the Senate has not acted, so we don't have the NDAA yet, but we will in the next month or two. I think we can then put this language into the NDAA and make it more long term in terms of the authorization; so I appreciate that.

I also feel, as the chairman does, that Congress should do a broader AUMF on the fight against ISIS, on what we are doing in Iraq and Syria. We have launched, I think, well in the hundreds, now, of bombing missions against ISIS. This is something where Congress should act.

Mr. Speaker, the only area of disagreement I have is I keep hearing colleagues say, "Well, the President ought to ask for it. We are the legislative branch." I hear all the time, "Gosh, the President is overstepping our authorities, always telling us what to do, and he is ignoring the law."

Why does he have to ask? If this is what we want to do—we are the United States Congress. The legislative branch ought to act.

I think the President is right in saying he is going to do what he believes he has the right to do under article II to protect this country, but Congress should act; so we should act. We shouldn't wait for him to ask. We should put together an AUMF to more broadly authorize this, and that is something that should be appropriately done as well.

In the short term, we need to start a front against ISIS in Syria, and the only way to do that is to build a legitimate local force that can begin that fight. Train and equip is the first step, I believe, and then this process that regrettably will not be quick.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS),

my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate the chairman and Mr. SMITH for their work on this issue.

I rise in support of this amendment. It has become urgent, Mr. Speaker, that we make serious strides against ISIL, and we must act quickly to curb their influence and to fight back against terrorism of the most brutal sort.

Chairman McKEON's amendment which provides the authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to fight ISIL is the right approach, and I support its inclusion on this continuing resolution.

Over the past week, the House has done due diligence to ensure that this amendment language is appropriate, supporting limited yet adequate efforts to degrade and destroy ISIL.

While providing our Commander in Chief with the tools he has requested for the near term, language is also included to prevent an open-ended blank check for these efforts.

This will help ensure that Congress maintains funding authority and oversight over taxpayer dollars and the use of our military forces. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. SMITH who just spoke who gave a very eloquent and full explanation of where we are, and I support his statement.

I encourage my colleagues to support this critical amendment and then the underlying resolution today or tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State, and I want to associate myself with his remarks, as well as the remarks of the chairman of our Armed Services Committee and the chairman of our Appropriations Committee.

All three leaders have played a consequential role over the last many years in establishing the United States military as the largest, most capable, and best-funded military in the world, in fact, larger than all the other militaries combined; so it is no wonder that the rest of the world turns to us for leadership.

That is not the major reason they turn to us for leadership, Mr. Speaker. They turn to us because they understand our profound belief and respect for human rights, democratic governance, and inclusive society.

Now, ISIS violates everything we believe in. They are opposed to respect for human rights. They are opposed to democratic governance and, certainly, to an inclusive society. That is not the reason why we support this amendment—because there are other people like that—but, in the judgment of our

military, ISIS is expanding at a rate that cannot be ignored, and that has to be stopped.

ISIS is expanding in numbers exponentially. They are worth \$2 billion. They are, now, the best-funded, most lethal terrorist organization that we have ever seen in modern history; so we cannot turn our backs on this. We know that we have substantial assets and, particularly, personnel in Baghdad. They will be targeting Baghdad as soon as they are capable of it.

We have to protect the capital of Iraq. We need to contribute to stability in that region because it is not going to stay static. It is only going to get worse, or it is going to get better.

The proposal before us is not to put American boots on the ground, but to use American intelligence, to use American trainers, to use American equipment, and to prepare Syrians, particularly, to do the job that needs to be done in their region of the world.

They know the geography, they know the language, and they understand the cultures. We are going to prepare them to be the best equipped and best trained to carry out a mission that they must share with us.

ISIS, if it is not confronted, will grow. It will become a greater threat. That is what we hear from our military. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our military has earned respect for their judgment. They know how to provide the kind of security that so many Americans are able to take for granted.

If they say this is the right thing to do at this point in time, it seems to me the Congress needs to show support for them; so I stand in support of the McKeon amendment.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Today, we face, as we know, a great and growing threat from ISIL. Never has a terrorist organization controlled so much territory, a safe haven, as well, to plan future attacks.

Never has one had access to vital natural resources. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the ready cash, the heavy weaponry, and the personnel that ISIL possesses.

We are late in responding. At least 2 years ago, the President had a proposal on his desk to arm those under threat inside Syria. It was backed by his Secretary of State, backed by his Defense Secretary, and backed by General Petraeus, then head of the CIA.

If the President had accepted this recommendation coming from his entire national security team years ago, we might be in a different position right now, but we are where we are.

The question is Syria continues to spiral out of control, Assad has hung to

power, and ISIL has risen from a terrorist group to a terrorist army. That is where we are.

Caught in the middle has been the civil society types, those who are trying to defend—in Aleppo—defend themselves from the barrel bombs coming down from above from Assad while at the same time trying to defend themselves from ISIL attacks on the ground. They have been left to fend on their own.

These are the individuals—I will remind you for those who remember the tapes, who remember the programming at the time—chanting “peaceful, peaceful” as they were protesting the Assad regime.

Assad's soldiers opened up with automatic weapons fire on them in the streets of Damascus. After Assad began this slaughter, they took up arms to defend themselves.

The question is: Will we give them the wherewithal to fight back against the ISIL attacks that are, right now, on the borders of Aleppo?

In July, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard unprecedented testimony from a Syrian Army defector named “Caesar.” He showed our committee pictures of the atrocities—tens of thousands of people tortured, men, women, and children—by Assad. Assad has killed over 200,000 people now. The fact is that Assad is a protector of no one except himself. That is the bottom line.

Where ISIL operates, they have gone on a horrifying rampage, killing and beheading. Some of you have heard about the crucifixions there. In the meantime, Assad is no fool.

His regime has pursued a strategy to avoid confrontation with ISIL, focusing his efforts on wiping out these rebels in Aleppo that we are talking about supporting who are fighting ISIL; indeed, the Assad regime continues to purchase crude oil from ISIL, giving them ready cash, an average of \$2 million daily for that terrorist group. His strategy is to present the world with a choice between the regime and the ISIL extremists.

Friends, we do not have to play his game. What we can do—what this amendment would do—is give the Syrian opposition what they desperately need, training and equipment. We are looking to aid these individuals who have risked their lives to combat the Assad region and to combat the ISIL terrorists that they are fighting today, but, Mr. Speaker, these fighters aren't starting from scratch.

They have been in the fight for several years. Out of sheer commitment and determination, they have hung on, but, with greater U.S. training and supplies, they will be bolstered. As an ultimate boost, this force would be supported by U.S. and coalition airpower, and that puts real spine into a fighting force which will be needed to confront

and defeat ISIL. Our military has provided this type of training around the world for decades.

Mr. Speaker, let's do it here. Let's go on offense against ISIL. I ask for support for this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, ISIL poses a threat of extraordinary significance to the United States. In its size, its wealth, and its barbarity, it is, in fact, a threat to all of civilization.

This week, we will be voting to fund one piece of the ongoing effort to rid the world of the cancer that is ISIL, and that is the training and equipping of the opposition in Syria. Whether to support the rebels is an important decision, but it pales in comparison to the larger question facing Congress and the Nation, and that is: Should we authorize the President to use our Armed Forces in Syria and Iraq?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we will not be considering that larger question before we leave town in advance of the election. This is, I believe, a mistake of constitutional dimension. The administration has acknowledged that the military campaign we are about to embark upon amounts to war and will likely last years.

If Congress' power to declare war is to mean anything, it must compel us to act under circumstances such as these. If we sit on our hands, we set a precedent for future administrations that they may wage war without Congress' approval, and the declaration clause is no more than excess verbiage in our Constitution from a bygone era.

□ 1530

The President has broad authority as Commander in Chief to defend the Nation, but that authority is not without limit. As one former constitutional law professor and then Senator named Barack Obama said in 2007:

The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the Nation.

The administration has acknowledged that ISIL does not yet pose an imminent threat; nonetheless, it has asserted that it has the authority to act based on the 2001 authorization to use military force against al Qaeda passed in the days immediately following September 11. This reasoning is tenuous at best. That authorization addressed to a different enemy, at a different time, and at a different place does not provide the legal foundation for a war on ISIL, an organization that itself is at war with al Qaeda.

Today I have introduced a tailored and narrow authorization for the use of force in Iraq and Syria. My resolution specifies the enemy and explicitly does not authorize the large-scale deployment of ground troops to fight in either country. The resolution includes an 18-month sunset clause so that Congress can insist on its oversight role. It also immediately repeals the 2002 resolution to use force in Iraq and provides the same 18-month sunset for the 2001 authorization to use force, to harmonize the legal authority we provide to wage war against any foe and to ensure that no future President can claim to use it as a basis for unilateral action.

In matters of war, Congress is not some suitor that needs to be asked by the President to dance. Requested or not, Congress must exercise its responsibility to decide whether to send the Nation's sons and daughters to war. We should not go to war, let alone adjourn, without a vote.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to my good friend from California, we have adjoining districts and we agree on many things, we disagree on a few things, but I would like to say that I agree with you. This is something that the Congress should address.

For 20 years—I have been here 22 years—whenever a President has asked for this, we have addressed it. We have not addressed it without having the request from the President.

This is something we had quite a debate a few weeks ago about what previous Presidents have done or not done and what authorities they have and what they don't have, and some of it just has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court. The President says he has the authority. He says he needs this additional authority to help in Syria. That is the question we are addressing here today. I think that we are bound to have this discussion. I know the Speaker wants to have it. Mr. SMITH said he wants to have it. I want to have it.

I think one thing that we should really probably consider in all of this, this is not going to be a 1-month or a 2-month or probably even a 1-year or 2-year commitment that we are making here. ISIL is very serious about this, and we are going to be in this fight, as we have seen in the past, for a long time. And it is a new commitment. So I am thinking that, as close as we are to the election, there are going to be a lot of new Members here that are going to be living with this discussion, this debate, this vote, potentially for a long time. And I think those are the people that probably should make that decision in January or as close as they feel comfortable to having that debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment, but with serious reservations, reservations that have nothing to do with the substance of the amendment.

I applaud Chairman McKEON for his very diligent work to craft an amendment that responds to our Commander in Chief's proposal to address the very real, serious threat we face in a thoughtful and responsible manner while preserving Congress' constitutional authority and oversight in these matters.

Let me be clear, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria poses a clear and present danger to the United States, our homeland, our friends and partners in the Middle East and around the world.

The President has proposed that he be granted the authority to train and equip Syrian opposition groups in hopes that they will use their training and turn their weapons on ISIS, a truly savage and cruel cult of extremists.

We all watched the President's television address last week. That address left this Member and many constituents with more questions than answers.

The strategy the President announced is not so much a strategy as a continuation of a counterterrorism policy that relies on others to be on the front line to protect United States national security interests when their motivations, interests, and capabilities may or may not align with our interests.

I have to state here and now that I am concerned that the President's plan is, first of all, very late; secondly, may be based on unrealistic assumptions.

We have been told that there is a comprehensive strategy and a multinational coalition of the willing to fight the terrorists who have gained massive amounts of ground in both Syria and Iraq. To date, neither the Congress nor the American people have been told all of the details on that strategy or how it will be implemented.

The President has repeatedly proclaimed that there will be no American boots on the ground, but our constituents should not be misled. There are American boots on the ground currently in Iraq, and there is a strong likelihood there may be boots on the ground in Syria and, in the skies above, planes, and those who fight will remain in harm's way.

The White House is relying on so-called moderate rebel groups to fight ISIS, groups that do not and will not exist in any great numbers and whose primary target is the Syrian dictator, President Assad. How do you reconcile those competing goals?

Indeed, there are many complicated questions in a complicated region of

the world with ever-shifting alliances and loyalties, but this is where the terrorists who want to do us harm have taken hold.

Despite reservations and questions, we must take action. The threat is real, and ISIS must be confronted now. I support the McKeon amendment because it will provide the experts and the Department of Defense the authority they need to put together a clearly defined, realistic strategy and address unanswered questions for both this Congress and our constituents.

That, however, does not and must not mean that Congress will cede its constitutional obligations. We must exercise our responsibilities and not give the President a blank fiscal check.

I commend Chairman McKEON for recognizing that Congress must be informed and a full partner with the administration. This amendment does not provide the administration with the blank check they originally sought.

In this measure, we provide authority for a limited train-and-equip program with strong congressional oversight. This amendment does not allow any funds, be they appropriated funds or foreign-partner funds, without prior notification and approval to congressional defense committees in accordance with standard reprogramming procedures.

This amendment does not—I repeat, does not—provide an authorization for the use of military force. Indeed, the amendment includes language that makes it explicitly clear that this train-and-equip authority is not an authorization for the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield the chairman an additional minute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment. ISIS needs to be confronted, and sooner rather than later. However, in the weeks and months to come, this House must use its oversight powers under the Constitution to monitor this strategy and demand changes when and if it falters.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the exposition just given by our colleague. I find myself in agreement with much of what was said, particularly the concerns, the unknowns, and the fact that this amendment is going to wind up in a CR, and we are going to be voting on the CR and the amendment, whether we like the amendment or not, or we shut down government. That causes me great concern.

My real concern is beyond just this amendment, limited as it is. And I thank the chairman for making this as

limited—it ends sometime in December, I think December 11; that is good. The fact that the reporting is there; that is good. The fact that we are knowingly going to find ourselves right smack in the middle of a civil war that has gone on for 3 years and the previous 3 we couldn't figure out which side we wanted to be on and who we wanted to work with, apparently we now know who we want to work with, or at least we will find out who we want to work with. A lot of unknowns here, a lot of concerns.

The big concern is this, and that is that the administration presently does not intend to have the Congress of the United States carry out its constitutional responsibility to declare a war or not. They have figured out a way to avoid having the Congress deal with the most fundamental of issues.

They claim that the 2001–2002 authorization to use force in Afghanistan and in Iraq is sufficient to carry on what may be an unending war in Iraq and, quite possibly, in Syria. The War Powers Act has been pushed aside. We don't need to worry about that, says the administration. We don't have to vote because they have these other two authorizations to use force still in effect.

This is not right. This is a new war, a continuation of the problem that has existed in this area for more than 1400 years. So now it is in for a dime; we are going to be in for many, many dollars and many, many people.

My plea to the Congress, my plea to all my colleagues is this is not the step. This is but one small, little movement towards a much larger. And will we have the courage to carry out our constitutional responsibility and take up the larger issue of what to do with airstrikes and beyond?

For me, we ought to be voting on that larger issue. I believe the administration is dead wrong in saying they don't need to come back to Congress for a larger issue of an authorization to use force.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my friend and colleague, the vice chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the chairman's amendment.

I am very much in sympathy with the comments that have been expressed here on the floor that we should have a larger debate about the Authorization for Use of Military Force. That is not, however, what is before us with the chairman's amendment. And I understand some people would like for it to be.

But what we have before us here is a specific request that the President has made for train-and-equip authority for certain Syrians to help provide ground forces against ISIL.

I think, just for perspective, it is important to remember that the United States has been involved in training and equipping security forces in over 40 countries. We haven't gotten into a war in all of those. This is something we know how to do, and we do it competently all around the world.

But I completely agree with those who say this is a very complex, volatile situation, and there are considerable doubts about whether the President's approach is going to be successful. There are especially doubts about whether his policy will be carried out with a seriousness of purpose and a perseverance that is required against such a formidable opponent. I confess, I share those doubts.

But, at the same time, two facts seem clear to me. One is that ISIL is a significant threat. It is not the junior varsity. It is the best-equipped, best-trained, best-financed terror organization and has several thousand people with Western passports that are a part of it.

Secondly, is that a threat like this will not be eliminated from the air. And so what that means is you are going to have to have some sort of forces from the ground. Now, some of them need to be the Kurds; some of them need to be the Iraqis. But you need to have some sort of competent ground force in Syria as well or else it becomes a safe haven. So that is where this train-and-equip authority to help develop that competent ground force inside from Syria is important. But it is only—and I think everybody acknowledges this—it is only one small part of what needs to be a much broader strategy.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, despite all the doubts and concerns, having a competent ground force inside Syria with whom we can talk, with whom we can work, whatever the course of events there, has got to be a useful thing.

But for the moment, between now and December 11 or so, giving the President this authority that he has asked for so he can take advantage of some offers from other countries, so he can begin the preparations for this training, seems to me to make sense. We give him this authority with all the checks and oversights that have been described and are very important. We give him this authority, and, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the President to make it work.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you so very much for giving me this opportunity to address the House.

I think today and tomorrow may be recorded in history as one of the most serious decisions that this Congress has had to make. Personally, I don't

know enough to see where the President needs authority to do what we are about to allow him to do because of a threat to the United States of America.

I have talked with everyone that is willing to listen to me in my congressional district and they have given me a whole lot of things that they are concerned about. But I haven't come close, as much as they love this President of the United States, in convincing them that training people overseas that we don't know to fight ISIS is in their best national interest.

The point that I asked to come to the floor is that it is so easy to try to bring justice to a situation if it doesn't cause you anything or any inconvenience. Already we have lost trillions of dollars and over 6,000 lives in this area, and I don't think we have yet to declare war.

What I am suggesting on drafting legislation is that if it does reach the time that this honorable body is prepared to discuss all of the issues and determine whether or not any enemy is a threat to the United States and that we are going to go to war with them, that we should attach to that two provisions that would force every American to evaluate whether or not they believe that they are prepared to make sacrifices.

One of them, of course, is a war tax. These last wars, the only people who have suffered were those people who had boots on the ground or those people who know people or those people who went to the funerals. Certainly those that have gained profit because we needed their services overseas, they haven't made any sacrifices.

When it comes down to discretionary spending, what I consider a threat to the United States of America is our failure to provide money for research, for development, for education, for jobs, for infrastructure. But if we attach the two things to any bill where we are prepared to debate and determine whether our great Nation is being threatened, then I don't think it is asking too much of Americans to be able to say, yes, we are willing to pay taxes for it, and, yes, we are ready to have mandatory recruitment of young men and women who are prepared to say that if our Nation is in trouble we all should be doing something.

But all these people that are willing to fight with other people's kids I think is not the standard that this august body should have.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's amendment to authorize the training and equipping of appropriately vetted elements of Syrian opposition to combat the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, better known as ISIS.

I have been to the border of Turkey and Syria and met with opposition leaders and refugees, which now total more than 2 million people, and I have seen the ramifications of standing on the sidelines of this conflict, such as increased risk to our national security and interests, regional instability, and immense human suffering.

ISIS poses a serious and grave threat to the United States and it must be destroyed. This action alone will not topple ISIS, but it is a foundational element of any broad effort to root out this barbaric terrorist army and prevent its followers from taking further hold in the Middle East and one day, as they have threatened to do, bring their brutality here to our homeland.

Ongoing efforts by the brave men and women of our U.S. military, in coordination with regional partners, have blunted ISIS's territorial gains in Iraq and have granted some reprieve to persecuted Christians and other ethnic minorities.

But fully destroying ISIS will require striking at its center of gravity, which includes eliminating safe havens and bases of operation in Syria. Supporting those in Syria who are also committed to this fight is a necessary step.

I believe today's amendment does establish strict parameters and rigorous oversight to ensure that training and equipping Syrian opposition forces does not aid the Assad regime or undermine the mission to destroy ISIS.

Recent events have reminded us all that barbarity, evil, and uncertainty still exists in the world. ISIS is the latest front in civilization's struggle against radical extremists, and now is the time to act.

I want to make sure, too, that we bring to bear the weight and might of our strong Nation in cooperation with our partners to destroy ISIS and the threat it poses, understanding that we must continue to request and receive more specifics on how these efforts will be prosecuted.

This resolution, I must remind folks, does not authorize the use of military force, only the training and equipping of these forces. It is the first step of many steps in which Congress must be involved in addressing this threat. That is our constitutional responsibility. Today's effort is that first step. But we must not forget that we have to continue to remain involved as a Congress in the future efforts this Nation takes against this extremist threat and others around the world.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The subject of boots on the ground came up, and I think this is a really important point for why this debate has been so divisive. So many people are concerned about this action.

I think what we all want to do is we want to confront the threat that is

ISIS, which has been well described. The violence that this group has perpetrated on people in their region and foreigners is unimaginable. Make no mistake about it: if they are allowed to spread, that violence will spread as well.

But there is concern about the U.S. getting again engaged in that part of the world because of Iraq and Afghanistan. A number of my colleagues have raised the issue of: Well, gosh, we put 150,000 U.S. troops into Iraq, we left, and 2 years later it had all fallen apart. We are in Afghanistan, there is still a raging violence of a war going on there. Here we go again, basically. Have we not learned our lessons?

I believe the boots on the ground comment shows in an odd way that we have learned our lesson. We are not going to do a full-scale military commitment to Iraq. Now, I think a lot of people are against ISIS. I think a lot of people mistake that we are not going to do that, not so much because it wouldn't work, but because we just don't want to do that. We don't want to spend the money and risk the lives.

That is not really the case. The reason we are not going to do a full-scale U.S. military commitment is because a lesson that we have learned in the last 12 years is the limitations of the ability of the U.S. military to bend cultures in this part of the world to their will. It doesn't work. That is why we are not going to send in the U.S. military.

Because then you set up a situation where you have a fight between, in the minds of the people in that part of the world, the evil West and Islam. If you set up that dynamic, we cannot win.

Now, that means that we can't do the full-scale military commitment. But what we can do is we can enable partners. I know there is considerable concern about the fact that we spent a lot of money, supposedly enabling partners in Iraq, and when ISIS came rolling across the border of Syria they simply melted away.

Now, two things:

Number one, I would submit to you that they melted away because of what the Maliki government had done to alienate the entire Sunni population. It wasn't that they couldn't fight; it is that they chose not to because they did not want to fight on behalf of what was essentially a sectarian corrupt Shia government. The Sunnis would not fight on behalf of them.

But also I want to point out, we have successfully trained militaries around the world. If you look at the Horn of Africa and the threat that we faced in Somalia, we have trained Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda.

They have been incredibly effective fighting forces. Across the Red Sea in Yemen, we have trained the Yemenis as they confront al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Not as clearly effective

as we have had in the Horn of Africa, but, nonetheless, they have contained the threat.

I was, on a much smaller scale, in the Philippines a number of years back where we trained the Filipino authorities to try to contain various terrorist threats down there.

It has been effective. Just because it wasn't effective in Iraq doesn't mean that it can't be effective to train an indigenous force to effectively fight the fight that we want them to fight. But it can't be just the U.S. military.

Now, the final point on the boots on the ground issue that I think is a bit misleading: we are all searching for that clear-cut way to say: We will do this but we won't do that; we won't go too far, we won't take that step that makes us too big a U.S. military engagement.

The problem is there is no black-and-white line here. There is no way to define that. There is no way to say: Well, okay, if we step across this line then there is no going back. In fact, I have heard the concern raised we are sending in advisers, and, gosh, everybody knows that when you send in advisers the next thing you know you have got 500,000 troops and 70,000 U.S. soldiers dead. That is what happened in Vietnam. That is not what happens every time you send in advisers from the cases that I cited a moment ago. It doesn't have to be that way.

The boots on the ground issue is, I think, effectively simple and straightforward. We have already had boots on the ground, but we are not going to make this a U.S. military-led fight because it cannot be. It would not be successful if it was. This is going to be an effort to train and equip and advise, to build a force that can confront ISIS. Because right now in Syria, it is a choice between Assad and ISIS for too many people. A good number of those people would love to have another option.

Don't read into the fact that some people are joining ISIS the belief that somehow they are absolutely aligned with them. They oppose Assad; ISIS is, in many cases, the only game in town. We need to give them another option: a Sunni-led indigenous force that we train and equip to help begin the process of getting to the point where they can be a legitimate force. It will not be a short process. It just won't. It is going to take time. But ISIS needs to be confronted. This is the first necessary step in doing that. We can't do it without local partners taking the lead. This is a way to get those local partners the capability to get there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are many who support this amendment. There are many who feel like it is not enough.

I would like to just relay a couple of instances.

I just returned from the Middle East. I met with leaders of Israel, Jordan, Egypt, Morocco. And one of the things that I think needs to be addressed, and the people—the people—need to understand this: who ISIL is. In about 600 AD, people moved—Arab people—moved into the area that they called Levant. They controlled that area—it took them about 50 years to conquer it—and they controlled it from about 650 AD to about 1500 AD, when they were defeated by the Ottoman Empire.

□ 1600

That area comprised what we now know as part of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Iran. It was a huge area. ISIL wants to go back to that same area. They want to control that same area. They want to set up a caliphate so that they can then export terrorism around the world, and they are going to be brutal about it. They have great designs. They are willing to do anything it takes to win.

I don't know why it seems like, when the President talks, the first thing he says is, "No boots on the ground." As was just mentioned by the ranking member, there are boots on the ground. We have a force of over a thousand right now in Iraq. As he explained, their army kind of wilted for the reasons that he gave.

I talked to General Petraeus the other day, and he said their army will fight, but there are certain things that they need that only we can provide, and that is what we can provide without entering into the combat, without putting in divisions, without putting in what I guess is the reference to boots on the ground, which is a certain number—and I don't know what that number is—but we are not going to do that. That is not what we are talking about.

Saying we are not going to have boots on the ground is just kind of not being totally truthful with the American people. There are and will continue to be boots on the ground. They will provide training. They will provide leadership. They will provide ISR.

They will provide the intelligence and the things necessary for the Iraqis to be successful in pushing ISIL out of the ground that they have conquered and taken. They will be able to take it back.

What we are talking about is the ability to go in and train Syrian forces so they will be able to take back territory that they have lost in Syria and, by doing so, that will deprive ISIL of having a safe haven so, as they are pushed out of Iraq, they won't be able to go into Syria.

We need to envelop them and end their mission right there. Don't let them get into Lebanon and Jordan and these other countries. Don't let them squeeze out into those countries. We need to stop them now. The leaders in that area told me how big this threat

was. They said, "Don't think the oceans are going to protect you now. They will not."

We all know that one of the big threats over there is foreign fighters entering into this fight. A lot of them have passports and will be able to enter back into Europe and come to this country and do a lot of serious things that we don't want to see happen. We would rather fight them there than here. That is the purpose of this amendment and the thing that we are talking about right now.

ISIL is a dangerous threat right now, and we need to address them right now. They are going very rapidly. They are very well-funded and well-led. They are fighting as an army, not as a little rag-tag terrorist group. We need to address them that way.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my good friend and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of his amendment.

Mr. Speaker, last January, ISIS retook Fallujah. Eight months later, President Barack Obama told Americans, "We don't have a strategy yet."

It was 7 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that George Bush warned:

To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would mean surrendering the future of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, he could not have been more right.

If you delete all the things Mr. Obama so very unwisely said he would not do, most of what remains of his plan is in keeping with the Bush doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe President Obama owes George Bush an apology, along with the men and women who freed Iraq and then watched their blood-bought gains evaporate while this administration stood by as women and children were beheaded, crucified, raped, and sold into slavery.

We must make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. It was the vacillation and the tepid and inept leadership of President Obama that brought us where we are today, and, now, even though this administration is still inexplicably unwilling to admit it, we do, indeed, face a jihadist enemy that is more dangerous than ever, and it is now more vital than ever that this Congress, the President of the United States, and the American people commit ourselves to doing whatever is necessary to destroy this enemy before its insidious hand reaches into the heartland of America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the McKeon amendment to authorize the training and equipping of appropriately vetted members of the Syrian opposition.

I believe that Chairman MCKEON has crafted language which strikes the appropriate balance between giving the President the authority he is requesting while also ensuring that Congress maintains oversight of our efforts to combat ISIL.

However, let me be clear. We are only here today because of President Obama's weak and failed leadership. My criticism of the President is not about party politics or about his style of leadership but is based, simply, on his failed foreign policy.

Syria is a case study in Obama's failed policy. He drew an arbitrary red line and spectacularly failed to enforce it. We also lost the opportunity to support moderate dissidents in Syria when it would have done the most good.

Next door, in Iraq, President Obama raced for the exit for political reasons instead of recognizing that the threat from Islamic extremists could quickly return without some sort of counterweight. He didn't end the war in Iraq; he merely abandoned it.

The bottom line is that ISIL was a regional threat that has metastasized into a threat to our allies in the region, including Israel, and to us here at home.

Unfortunately, the President's failed foreign policy is not isolated to ISIL. The President's reset with Russia was worthless. Obama's "leading from behind" intervention in Libya has created another haven for terrorists there.

Our allies in Europe are threatened by Russia, and our allies in Asia are threatened by China. Iran does not seem to be slowing its efforts to destroy Israel. None of these are easy problems, but President Obama has failed to provide clear and strong American leadership in each case, and, in each case, America and the world are worse off as a result.

Let's provide training to moderates who will fight ISIL and hope the President's slowness of action hasn't made it too late.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day. Today, the House is debating on a continuing resolution and also an amendment to that resolution which would authorize under title 10 the expenditure of \$500 million to train moderate Syrian opposition forces.

This is not an authorization for the use of military force. It is just simply for the limited purpose which I just stated, but I feel compelled to go a little bit further as to why it is necessary that we be in favor of that amendment to the CR as well as the CR itself.

If we do nothing against the ISIL threat, if we choose to be isolationists and take a wait-and-see attitude, the chances are great that the situation will get worse. When it gets worse, that means ISIL gets more powerful. They have been on the run lately, and they have gotten more powerful now.

I know people on the other side of the aisle will say that it is the President's fault that ISIL got this strong, but ISIL would not have gotten this strong had it not been for the instability that we created ourselves when we went into Iraq and went to war for an illegitimate purpose, and so we disrupted the stability in that region, and we are still recovering from it now.

What do we do now? I would much rather have a President that is thoughtful, deliberate, careful, and moderate in terms of the use of military force than to have a trigger-happy, shoot first, ask questions later type of President. We have seen what that got us.

Our President has taken a very reasonable, modest approach. We have not put massive amounts of armaments in Syria that could now be used against us. He was smart enough not to do that; but, now, we have the situation where, due to a number of forces outside of our control, ISIL has gotten bigger, has gotten more menacing, has gotten stronger, and it is a distant threat to our homeland, but it is a threat.

What do you do when the wolf is barking out, saying, "I'm coming to get you," what do you do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. What do you do when the wolf is in front of the door? Do you move back from the door and then kneel down and pray and hope that everything is okay? Or do you take some action?

In this kind of situation, the wolf is not at the door yet, but the wolf is coming. The wolf has told you that he is coming. There is a lot of logic into taking preemptive measures to make sure that the wolf does not come to the door.

I would rather have the fight there than have it here. The limited fight that we are going to do is the use of our air power, once we train what is called moderate Syrians—opposition.

I don't know how that is going to turn out, but I do know that we have no choice but to do something. We must build up the ground forces over there with our partner nations to enter the fight on the ground. We support them.

I support this resolution offered by the chairman of the HASC Committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ala-

bama (Mr. BYRNE), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding and for his continued leadership on this issue of grave importance to our Nation.

I support the chairman's amendment because I believe we must do everything we can to defeat this vile enemy known as ISIL. Time is of the essence here. With each passing day, ISIL continues to get stronger.

The President has finally asked for a very limited authorization, not of force, but for training and supplying. Based upon the information that I have received, I believe that arming and training Syrian rebels is an important first step.

Just a few weeks ago, I joined Chairman MCKEON and a few other colleagues on a trip to the Middle East. While there, we met with numerous foreign leaders and defense officials. One thing became very clear: there is regional interest and support for defeating ISIL, but they are waiting on our leadership.

I believe arming and training the Syrian rebels to be a necessary step, but I do not believe it alone will be sufficient. Just this morning, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, expressed more action will likely be needed.

Our enemy should not just be degraded or contained. Our enemy must be defeated.

□ 1615

In order to accomplish that objective, more action will be needed, including overt help from Sunni Muslims in the region and air attacks from the United States.

It is also important to note the safeguards Chairman MCKEON has written into this amendment. This amendment requires that each fighter be thoroughly vetted by the Department of Defense and that regular progress reports be provided to Congress.

I firmly believe that a new Authorization for the Use of Military Force is needed to specifically address ISIL and new action in Syria. The current AUMFs from 2001 and 2002 are simply not applicable to this conflict, and I hope the President will recognize the article I, section 8 powers of this Congress, which are exclusive, and ask us for a new AUMF. That is why this resolution explicitly states that it does not give President Obama authority to send new U.S. forces into combat in Syria.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment. The President has laid out a bold and decisive strategy to lead a multilateral operation designed to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL.

This is a threat the United States, sooner or later, must address. I prefer sooner. ISIL's acts of genocide are undermining the stability of Iraq, threatening our partners in the Kurdistan region, and reversing gains made by moderate forces in Syria.

I believe Congress has a constructive and collaborative role to play here in the effort to eliminate the ISIL threat. I appreciate that the measure before us takes a step in that direction while addressing many concerns that have been raised about the effort to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition.

First, the amendment provides for careful congressional oversight. The Department of Defense must report to Congress on the vetting process for trainees 15 days prior to providing any such assistance. The President must report to Congress on how this operation fits within our overall regional strategy, and the Department of Defense must submit a report every 90 days updating Congress on the status of this operation. These are prudent measures and consistent with the constitutional role of congressional oversight.

Second, this amendment does not provide a blank check for military operations. No additional funds are provided by this measure, and the Department of Defense must submit any reprogramming requests to this Congress.

Third, this is not an open-ended commitment. The limited activities authorized by this amendment will remain in effect until the earlier of the date of the expiration of the CR or the enactment of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act.

Almost 1 year ago, in response to the President's consultation with Congress on the deepening crisis in Syria, I introduced a resolution authorizing the President to carry out airstrikes against the Assad regime. In that case, Congress chose to demur. Today I hope we act not only on this resolution, but ultimately on a new Authorization for Use of Military Force allowing the President to carry out airstrikes against ISIL. The 2001 AUMF has gone stale, and it is time for a new, focused AUMF targeting ISIL.

I believe the President would find bipartisan support here in Congress for airstrikes in Iraq and Syria. This tactic, thus far, has effectively bolstered our partners on the ground, protected American assets, and facilitated the humanitarian missions.

But instead of taking up this charge and debating issues of war and peace, we are about to break for another recess. While I support the measure before us today, I hope Congress will do

more to assert its constitutional role and responsibility and act as a stakeholder in the fight against this terrorist threat.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his strong leadership of our committee.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Certainly, the Islamic State is an evil organization and a threat to our country. There is no question on that. I saw that firsthand leading paratroopers in Iraq, al Qaeda in Iraq executing, at close range, Iraqis who were working with us just to provide for a better day for their people. This evil organization has to be defeated. The question is: How?

Well, first of all, we always reserve the right to act in self-defense. If we learn of specific intelligence that the enemy is preparing, planning an attack on us, we always reserve that right. We will take action to protect our people. But, as the President reported when he spoke to the American people last week, the intelligence community, we do not have that specific intelligence at this moment that they are going to be able to strike our country. So then the question occurs again: What is the smartest way to deal with this threat?

I maintain, based on my experience, escalating in Syria right now is not the best approach. We should instead implement a three-point plan.

Number one, empowering the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurdish forces to defeat the Islamic State. We have seen in recent days, with our help, they have been begun to reverse some advances of the Islamic State, and they have a capacity.

As was mentioned earlier, the big issue that they have is they weren't willing to fight and die for that Prime Minister. They didn't have the will to stand up because they didn't believe. Now we have had a new election. They are rallying around, attendant to their constitution, a new government, and they do need our support, and we should be standing there with them.

Why is it so important that we do it that way?

Well, our enemy, the Islamic State, is trying to frame this struggle as one, in their words, between the believers and the nonbelievers. There is certainly an element here, but it goes much broader than that.

In the main, what is really at stake is what is happening to the mainstream Muslims in Iraq and Syria. Why this is so important is, when we help the Iraqi Army and the Kurdish forces to defeat militarily the Islamic State, that also lessens the ability of the Islamic State to recruit and to fundraise internationally. Long-term, that is what is key to success here.

So, number one, empower the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurdish forces.

Number two, we have not set the conditions for actions in Syria. There is no credible partner there, and that is really the issue.

What we should be doing is working to compel—working with our friends and our neighbors in the region, other nations across the world, to compel the Government of Syria to get to some brokered agreement with the rebel forces, including what we would call the Free Syrian Army. From that foundation, we will be in a stronger place to complete the final destruction of the Islamic State.

Here is the issue, the big idea that the administration is advancing right now. The big idea is that we need a ground element to support airstrikes.

Now, given my military experience, I understand that and I actually agree with that point. But here is the point: What they are advancing today, what we have learned, is that, at the earliest, we would see a ground force in 6 to 8 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, evidently I am not going to get any more time. I ask the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 1 minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GIBSON. So the issue is that here it is, the administration saying that they need a ground partner to conduct these air attacks, but we are not even going to have a ground partner for 6 to 8 months, and they are talking about launching airstrikes within a month. This is a problem.

The other problem is these forces on the ground have not shown themselves to be militarily competent nor politically trustworthy. We should work politically in Syria. That is the second point.

The third point is we ought to secure our borders, commonsense point. But look, they have expressed the desire to attack our country, and we need to protect ourselves from that.

So empower the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurds, work politically to get a partner in Syria, and secure our borders. And reject this amendment, with all due respect.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, taking military action is the gravest responsibility of our government, and I take my role in helping to decide our Nation's policies very seriously.

I support the current plan to engage and ultimately destroy ISIL, but it won't be successful unless we can enlist an alliance of nations within the region

that are fully and demonstrably committed to true democratic inclusion and are willing to fight for their own freedom. Mr. Speaker, I don't see how we can ally ourselves with nations that turned a blind eye to having their citizens send money to the very terrorists we are about to engage.

This effort will take time and should include training potential allied military units in nonbattlefield locations and providing appropriate arms to competent and reliable allied military units. Meanwhile, the President must demonstrate America's commitment to the region by using very limited American airpower in conjunction with local military units to help prevent additional ISIL territorial gains.

I do not support the involvement of American ground troops beyond their training mission or the excessive use of American airpower. Both of these are not needed and would likely be counterproductive in the end.

While I support this amendment and I thank the chairman for proposing this amendment, I want to urge my colleagues to consider the long-term effects of authorizing force to our soldiers, to the innocent civilians, and to the sustained stability in the Middle East.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the McKeon amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition groups.

ISIL is a terrorist group, organization, that threatens our allies, savagely murders Americans and others. It threatens our national security interests, and it must be destroyed. It must be destroyed, including in Syria.

Now, however, Mr. Speaker, I have serious reservations about the President's plan. It is no lie that there is a trust gap with this President. Unfortunately, the President has consistently ignored what was clear to just about everyone else. The President must start listening to the advice and the guidance of our senior military commanders. Against the advice of his generals, the President prematurely withdrew from Iraq so he could claim a political victory. Unfortunately, the enemy continued to fight. There is a trust gap.

More recently, according to press reports, the President has already dismissed some of the preferred recommendations of his generals in favor of a more limited role for our Armed Forces. Mr. Speaker, there is a trust gap. We know that airstrikes and training and equipping and vetting the Syrian opposition groups are necessary, but as we have heard, it is not sufficient.

Will the President do what is sufficient, what is necessary? There is a trust gap.

What President are we supposed to believe and trust, the one who, in August, said that those Syrian opposition forces were, frankly, not a real thing, or the one who now says that they are the ones who are going to defeat ISIS? There is a trust gap.

Unfortunately, the President has refused to lead until the opinion polls kind of pushed him to it. So that is why I am so grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the language that you have to have robust oversight and increased transparency and that the administration must keep Congress up to speed on planning and logistics.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can stop repeating the mistakes of the past. It is time for the President to treat this threat like what it is—a national security threat to the United States—and that he listens to his generals.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition groups and to confront the threat posed to our Nation by ISIL.

ISIL are thugs, murderers. They are monsters, and they must be stopped. Their trail of destruction and slaughter of innocent men, women, and children must be stopped.

ISIL has laid out their goals and their strategy, and that is to reestablish a caliphate and death to anyone who stands in their way, or, to use their motto, "convert or die." They must be destroyed.

Now is the time for the United States to make clear our goals and our strategy, that we will not stand by idly. We will not watch and wait for the slaughtering of more innocent civilians.

I am pleased that the President has finally committed to some action. It should have happened months ago, if not a year ago.

□ 1630

The President has been timid for far too long. It is time to act. By coming together as a unified body to take this important step, we will tell the world that America stands together in opposition to global terrorism and to the monsters of ISIL.

This amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition groups sends a clear signal to our European allies that we are committed to eradicating ISIL and that we hope they will join us in this effort. It sends a message to moderate Arabs and Muslims in the region and around the world that we stand with them against terrorism.

This amendment strengthens the Commander in Chief's request for ensuring that Congress has oversight and greater transparency, which is our constitutional duty. We must do all we can on every front to ensure these killers do not gain one more inch of ground in their pursuit of a terrorist state. With this amendment, we send a firm message that America is not going to allow this cancer to spread.

Congress must act now. For that reason, I strongly support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" to send a clear, strong, overwhelming message that a bipartisan Congress stands with the President to defeat ISIL and all evil everywhere.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, we have to applaud the President and the Vice President for using all means at their disposal to track down the killers of the journalists, but it can be and should be done in the same way we tracked down Osama bin Laden—using our intelligence, using our selective capabilities, and making sure that these murderers and these killers have no safe refuge.

Having said that, launching airstrikes on another country by any standard, by any definition, is an act of war. Now, whether you think it is a good idea or not, it requires this Congress to step up and assume its responsibility and make that declaration. Have we not had enough of imperial Presidencies doing whatever they like anywhere in the world? When are we going to step up and assume our responsibility?

Now, with regard to this amendment, make no mistake about it: we have been on the side of every side in this conflict going back to al Qaeda. That was the Mujahedeen. We armed them because they were the enemy of our enemy. Then we supported Saddam Hussein. Oh, no. Wait a minute. Let's overthrow him, and let's put the Shiites in power. Then we said no, no, no. Wait a minute. They are not being nice to the Sunnis; so let's give arms and money to the Sunnis. And we refer to this Free Syrian Army as moderates?

Read the paper. I can't talk about what we saw and heard in our briefings, but that is the Muslim Brotherhood. Did you hear the latest news? It just came out over the wire. I would bet you guys haven't heard it. The founder of the Free Syrian Army, the one we are going to give \$5 billion to, Riad al-Asaad—he just said we are not going to use that money to fight ISIS. No, no, no. We are fighting Assad. Oh, wait a minute. We were going to attack Assad last year, and now we want to fight people who are going to keep Assad in power? What are we doing?

The definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over and over

and over again and expecting different results. In this case, make no mistake about it, we have given arms to every element in this conflict, with the notion that somehow the enemy of our enemy is our friend. At the end of the day, we have no friends in this conflict. Either directly or inadvertently, they end up using the arms and the weapons that we have supplied against—yes, you guessed who—us.

It is time to wake up. It is time to put an end to it. It is time for this Congress to step up. It is so much responsibility that the Constitution could not be more clear on who declares war. It is the Congress of the United States, not the President of the United States.

My fellow colleagues, please, I beg you—I plead with you—to step up. Assume our obligations here. If there is a declaration to be made, let's make it. Most importantly, right now, let us reject this amendment and stop pouring money into this conflict that goes back thousands of years and can only be resolved by the people in that region and a part of that conflict.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, at the President's request and in the amendment that we are debating—we got a little bit far afield there—there is no request for money. The President says he doesn't need any additional moneys to carry this out. All he needs is the authority to go into Saudi Arabia and take their offer of training the Syrians to be able to go home and defend their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this amendment even though I cannot support it. All I can say is, here we go again, committing our resources—both troops and money—to a conflict that can easily become a war without end.

ISIS is more an immediate threat to the Middle East than to our Nation. Where is the greater Middle East commitment to combat this threat? Why are they not providing the greater commitment of resources to defend their own countries? Is it not ridiculous that the United States borrows money to buy friendship, to buy arms, and to train those who could today be our friends but tomorrow be our enemies?

A former commandant of the Marine Corps recently asked me this question, and I now ask the House of Representatives: Are we simply arming and training another Taliban? That is from a former commandant of the Marine Corps.

We all agree this is a difficult and challenging issue, but a strategy with no end state is a failed strategy, and I am concerned that the commitment we

make today will become an ongoing commitment for which we truly do not grasp its consequences until it is too late. That is what my concern is and the concern of the American people.

I think about the \$1.7 trillion we spent in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think about the 4,000 Americans who gave their lives, the 30,000 wounded, the 100,000 Iraqis who were killed—and here we go again. I don't care if the President is a Democrat or a Republican. This is a failed policy, and it will be proven to be a failed policy.

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I listened to Mr. RANGEL very carefully. This is a quote from Pat Buchanan: Is it not an act of senility to borrow from the world to defend the world?

It is absolute senility.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we ought to focus on what is the appropriate foreign policy and what is the appropriate role in Congress.

I rise in support of this amendment.

In fact, the amendment is quite similar to the Free Syria Act, which was introduced by several of us, under the leadership of ELIOT ENGEL, a year and a half ago. That approach of vetting appropriate Syrian forces and of providing training was a good but difficult policy then. It is a good and even more difficult policy now.

We have to vet those we train, and it should only be certain elements of the Free Syrian Army in that we should only cooperate with those who are not only going to stand up for the Sunni majority but protect the Christian and Alawite minorities, and we have to arm only those who are strong enough and careful enough not to lose the weapons we give them to more extremist forces.

This arming of the Syrian rebels is part of an overall plan that will include American military action. There is general agreement of no boots on the ground or at least of no boots on the front lines, but let us speak honestly to the American people. The American people are asking for a guaranteed, successful plan that would provide the immediate and total destruction of ISIS, with very few or no American casualties. Such a plan cannot be created. Instead, the policy that this amendment is part of will contain and weaken and punish ISIS and keep limited American casualties, and hopefully avoid them altogether.

We must remember that the enemies of ISIS are nearly as evil and are probably more dangerous than ISIS itself. Those enemies include Assad, who has killed well over 100,000 of his own people and gassed many of them until he faced world pressure; Iran and Hezbollah, which have killed many hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans; and the Iraqi Shiite militias, including Mr. Maliki, who created the

situation on the ground in Iraq which led to the creation of ISIS.

What is the role of Congress?

We look at article I and article II of the Constitution, with different roles for the President of the United States and Congress in military policy. Thomas Jefferson determined it was necessary to get the approval from Congress before he deployed marines to the shores of Tripoli—our first non-declared war, our first intervention in the Middle East. That wisdom is reflected in the War Powers Act, adopted in 1973. That act, I think, is a fair, constitutional, and reasonable clarification of the interaction of article I and article II—the war powers of the Congress and the Commander in Chief power of the President.

Now, under some questioning, the President and his administration have finally come up with their theory as to why Congress has already authorized the military action he anticipates. And that is, this Congress, in 2001, authorized every effort to go after al Qaeda. The forces of ISIS are a group that joined al Qaeda after 2001 and left al Qaeda a year ago or so. Does this mean you can leave al Qaeda, or are you always part of al Qaeda? Do we have several al Qaedas? How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?

The President's authority to engage in this war is questionable. The fact that he is stretching the 2001 War Powers Act resolution is not commendable, but this Congress has also failed to play its role. We wrote a resolution in 2001. Instead of revising it, we leave it there, and then some of us are upset that the President stretches it or applies it to circumstances not then anticipated. We should be revising and repealing the War Powers Resolutions of 2001 and 2002, and we as a Congress should indicate what we think is the appropriate foreign and military policy. Instead, we focus only on the narrowest part of the President's policy. In doing so, we join with several administrations in being part of the multidecade decline of the role of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. By our failure to repeal and replace the War Powers Act resolution, which no longer fits current circumstances, we are complicit with many administrations in the multidecade decline of the role of this Congress in shaping American foreign policy.

I look forward to restoring the balance provided by our Founders, to following the policies followed in the Jefferson administration, in following the War Powers Act, and in crafting a resolution applicable to today's circumstances rather than abdicating our responsibility and sitting back as the

President stretches words that were never intended to apply to the situation we face in Iraq today.

□ 1645

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), my friend and colleague.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving for 14 years as a pilot in the Air Force, flying both combat rescue helicopters and the B-1, an aircraft which, by the way, has dropped a disproportionate amount of the ordnance on Afghanistan and Iraq.

I have spent weeks traveling through the area, meeting with various leaders. I have listened to this debate, and I have tried to weigh all sides while we look for a solution to a very difficult problem in an impossibly difficult part of the world, and, even now, it is with reluctance that I am willing to stand and take a stance in support of this amendment, but I have simply reached the conclusion that we have no other choice.

In meeting with President el-Sisi or Prime Minister Netanyahu or King Abdullah or Foreign Ministers and military leaders, what we heard was nearly universal: Where is the United States? Can we count on you to stand by your allies and your friends?

This fight, this battle against ISIS that our President so reluctantly calls a war is a generational battle. I believe it is the defining battle of our lifetime. We cannot afford to waffle. We have been doing that for far too long now.

Yes, this is a terrible situation. There are no good options. All we have are messy and conflicted options, each of which has their own dangers, but this much is true: there is one very worse option, and that is to do nothing.

We may not trust some of the Syrian rebels. I distrust ISIS even more. We may not like some of the leaders we have to align with. Some of them may prove to be unreliable, but nothing and no one represents more of a threat.

To those who are unwilling to support this amendment, I would ask you: How can you justify doing nothing? That is the only option that we have been given. Do nothing, or do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our friends and our allies in the region to step up and lead. After months, even years of inaction, the President is finally doing that.

I wish that we were doing more. I wish that we were doing more, but this is the only option that we have been given, and we must at least do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), my friend and colleague.

Mr. ROSS. I thank Chairman McKEON for his leadership on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, prior to September 11, 2001, terrorist groups had a much different strategy. They remained virtually invisible, and their strategies were unpredictable.

Today, the terrorist threat to America and the free world is on the rise, the enemy is expanding, and that enemy is ISIL. This is an enemy that commits human atrocities and distributes video footage showing brutal human torture.

It is now very clear what threats America and all of the international community face if ISIL is not destroyed.

Two Americans and one British citizen have tragically fallen victim to ISIL's radical terrorist actions. These barbarians are the face of pure evil, and they must be crushed.

We have heard Secretary of State John Kerry call American military actions against ISIL "significant counterterrorism" operations. This is a pitifully weak way to motivate the men and women of our Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker. This is war, and the United States and the free world must be victorious.

The House's action today calls to mind a discussion I recently had with a mother in my district of Bartow, Florida. Aileen Payne is a Gold Star Mother. She is the mother of Corporal Ronald Payne, Jr., the first marine who was killed in combat in Afghanistan.

When we met last week, she exuded a passion for ensuring that Congress has a thoughtful debate on providing the President the authority required by our Constitution to take the fight to ISIL. She understands, perhaps more than most Americans, the significance of putting the lives of American soldiers at risk.

Her son's death came with a very high price, the price of freedom, the price of national security, and the price of victory. She, nor I, want the loss of her son to be in vain.

The amendment we are deliberating today is a step in the right direction. While I support this amendment, I believe the words of this Gold Star Mother must be heard and considered. If we do not develop and implement a strategy, a winning strategy to eradicate ISIL, we will be taking for granted the very freedoms that we have been afforded and defended by our brave troops, now and throughout the history of our country.

Corporal Payne would want us to defend American freedom and defeat terrorism worldwide. He gave his life for that cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, while this amendment does not represent my ideal military strategy against ISIL, I believe that Congress is fulfilling its constitutional duty today, and I stand in support of its efforts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Chairman McKEON, and I want to be very clear about what is at stake here today.

The terrorist group ISIL poses a direct threat to our allies and friends in the Middle East; and, of equal importance, left unchecked, their nihilistic vision could pose a direct threat to the United States, particularly given the number of individuals fighting with ISIL who have American and Western passports.

I am gravely concerned that those individuals could return home and carry out acts of violence against the homeland. We have a clear imperative to act.

These terrorists have brutally murdered two unarmed American journalists and an aid worker from the United Kingdom. They have slaughtered thousands of innocent Muslims, killed children, and committed unspeakable atrocities against women and religious minorities.

ISIL and its agents operate without regard to international borders, and any strategy to degrade and defeat these terrorists must acknowledge this reality. In Iraq, the United States and its allies are operating in support and at the request of the sovereign Government of Iraq, as well as Kurdish forces. We have friendly boots on the ground and U.S. advisers in place, but, in Syria, we lack that clear partnership.

I believe the President has rightly committed to an approach that does not involve U.S. combat troops fighting on foreign soil, but the opposition needs training and equipment that the U.S. and its allies are able to provide.

Our commitment, however, needs to be matched by that of other countries in the region, including Sunni countries with whom the United States has a rich history of partnership. After all, ISIL is not just a problem for the United States. It is also a problem for the many Western countries with citizens fighting overseas.

It is a problem for our NATO allies, for whom Syria is a neighbor, and it is a problem for the safety, security, and the stability of the entire region.

We can't simply kill terrorists and expect to see democracy flourish. We must carefully consider the full range

of possible outcomes in Syria and what risks we may incur in a nation and region already riven by years of civil war, the use of weapons of mass destruction, and a terrible humanitarian crisis.

This is an exceedingly complex task but one that we must address. If we do not act, we face a darker, more uncertain future. Congress and the administration must do their parts. Today's amendments are only a down payment on what will assuredly be years of difficult oversight, debate, and discussion.

It is far from a blank check. It will require a great deal of hard work, and there are many legitimate questions that remain unanswered, but we need to act, and I believe that this amendment represents a prudent first step.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), my friend and colleague who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the leadership for this extended debate. This is an important conversation we should be having, and to have an unprecedented almost 6 hours of debate just reflects how great we do, in fact, consider this.

I also want to thank the leadership for allowing two different votes, a vote on this amendment and then a vote on the CR and not trying, somehow, to combine those two because I think that would have also lessened the gravity of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment, but I do so with grave reservations, and, in fact, in the speech of the Intelligence Committee, I would give this low confidence that this mission will, in fact, be successful.

Mr. Speaker, there are no Boy Scouts in Syria. There is not anybody over there fighting that you would want to live next door to you in your neighborhood; but, with that said, we will go through under this President's stated plans a vetting process that will try to find those Syrian opposition teams—people, individuals, and/or groups that are secular that are not Islamic jihadist and they are not a part of the Assad regime—in order to create this force that they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be in all likelihood the last time we will come to this Chamber and discuss the fight against radical Islam or this fight in Syria. Those discussions may very well be, as General Dempsey said today, involving the deployment of U.S. military assets other than just fighting this thing from the air.

I want to be able at that point in time to say to the American people, "We have explored every other opportunity, every other way of getting at

this, of creating ground forces in Syria, short of sending American troops into harm's way again." I think it is what we deserve.

We clearly want to train these Syrians to be able to defend their own country. That is the most successful model. We have had a long experience with doing that, a checkered past in some instances; but, nevertheless, the best alternative, as we see today, is to make that happen.

I would also point out to my colleagues that by December 11, when this authorization expires, we will know a whole lot more than we do today.

Today, we are looking at this whole issue from about 10,000 feet, so to speak. By December 11, if this plan is put into place, we will know what the President specifically has in place. We will know how the President intends to vet. We will know how the President—where and how these training camps will be set up.

We will have the military's evaluation of how that process will work. We will just simply know a whole lot more then than we know today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to get us to that point. Help us understand the additional facts that we don't have in the RECORD today in order to do that, but, to do that, you will have to support this amendment.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment to get us in this overall group a better sense of understanding of what might or what might not be accomplishable by this December date, whether it is through a new CR or the omnibus or the NDAA so that, at that point in time, we will make a much more informed decision than we will today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, first off, I would just say thank you to Chairman McKEON for his work and for the leadership's work and, indeed, for providing this time for debate.

As was just stated by my colleague from Texas, I don't think that there is a more sacred vote out there for Members of Congress than on issues of war. I mean, in its balance hangs life and death. In its balance hangs all kinds of financial and life considerations. In its balance hangs how allies are going to view our actions going forward. This is an incredibly important subject, and, indeed, I thank Chairman McKEON for his work and the committee's work on this matter.

That having been said, I rise, though, in respectful opposition not to the committee's work but to the actions of the President because I think his ap-

proach has been fundamentally flawed. I say that, first off, because I think that step one of an issue of war has to be congressional approval, and I think it is so important based on what the Constitution said for the President, indeed, to come to the Congress to ask for a declaration of war, and he has, quite simply, not done so.

I would then say, "Okay. On what basis does he move forward?" If you look at what he and others have said, they hang a large part of their hat on the authorization of 2001, and I think what is interesting here is what the President, himself, said just 2 years ago.

He said, "The AUMF is now nearly 12 years old. Unless we discipline our thinking, our definitions, our actions, we may be drawn into more wars we don't need to fight or continue to grant Presidents unbound powers more suited for traditional armed conflict between nation states."

I think that the President was right. I agree with the President; yet members of the administration have been coming to Capitol Hill.

They have been, basically, making the case that with that AUMF they have the authorization to go, in essence, another 25 years. I think that that, again, is mistaken. These are not blank checks. Each war and each war effort needs to be debated in isolated form based on that effort.

□ 1700

I would thirdly say that I think that this effort is fundamentally flawed because what von Clausewitz talked about with regard to war. I don't think, at the end of the day, we are going to affect the military center of gravity of our opponent because, if you look at the center of gravity, I would argue it is their faith, it is their willpower, and it is their motivation.

As we saw with the Nazis and the bombings on London, bombing alone will not change will, and, in some cases, it strengthens resolve. What you are left with is, in the void that is created with bombings, boots on the ground, but, in this case, we are leaving that precious job of boots on the ground to what are described as "moderate rebels," whatever that is, and an example, that we have to look back in what just happened.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the activities of this spring, 1,000 ISIS soldiers routed 30,000 trained soldiers after we spent \$25 billion in that process. I think there are a whole host of mistakes and errors in this plan and would respectfully rise in opposition to it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

My colleagues, there are only bad choices left in Syria and Iraq, but, in my opinion, the worst choice of all would be to do nothing. This is an attempt to do something. I want to commend Chairman McKEON.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the McKeon amendment which would authorize a train-and-equip mission for the vetted moderate Syrian opposition. Again, the worst choice would be to do nothing. This is an attempt to do something. It is urgent that we do it now.

Every day we wait is a day longer that ISIS gets stronger and the opposition gets weaker. Now, I think it should be plainly stated that this is a separate issue from an AUMF. This is separate. This is talking about aiding and abetting the vetted Syrian opposition.

Now, I was in favor of doing this 2 years ago. For 2 years, I have been working to assist the moderate opposition. In early 2013, I introduced the Free Syria Act to provide the Syrian opposition with the weapons they need to fight the Syrian regime and the extremists that now control large parts of Syria and Iraq.

This is authorizing a train-and-equip mission for the vetted moderate Syrian opposition. It isn't perfect, but it is a step forward, and it is far, far better than doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, since I introduced that legislation, the situation in Syria has gotten much worse. More than 200,000 people have died, and millions have been driven from their homes.

Now, it is impossible to know the answers to the what-if questions. What if we had trained the moderate opposition 2 years ago? What if they had been able to hold territory against Assad and ISIS? What if and what if? We have to deal with what we have now. What might have been, no one will ever know. Right now, this is a very, very important thing for us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleagues are war-weary. I am war-weary. I understand the American people are war-weary. I am war-weary, but, again, I think doing nothing would invite something very similar that happened to my city, New York City, on that fateful day of September 11, 2001.

We kicked the Russians—or the world kicked the Russians out of Afghanistan when that happened; so what happened was we took our eye off the prize; and so we allowed Afghanistan to become a safe haven. We allowed the Taliban to welcome in al Qaeda, and al Qaeda had a safe haven to plot and plan attacks against the U.S. homeland.

That is replicating itself right now in Syria and in Iraq, and, if we do nothing, ISIS will plot and plan, and we will have many more September 11s in the United States, in Europe, and in the Middle East. That is why this is in the

national interests, the U.S. national interests, and it is something that we really need to do.

The Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing last month with the Syrian defector “Caesar,” a military photographer who smuggled thousands of images out of Syria to demonstrate the atrocities of the Assad regime. The gruesome photographs of Christians and Muslims—men, women, and children—starved, tortured, and killed by the regime demonstrate the true brutality of Assad and his cronies.

Last month, the American people and the world woke up to the brutality of ISIS which has beheaded two American journalists and murdered countless Christians and other minorities and most recently beheaded someone from the United Kingdom.

A self-financed terrorist group with highly-trained fighters willing to die, ISIS represents an immediate threat to our interests and allies and, if left unchecked, the U.S. homeland.

Terrorism, wherever it rears its ugly head—they are all the same. Whether it is ISIS or ISIL or al Qaeda or Hamas or Hezbollah, they are all terrorists, and they all want to use terror to achieve their political goals.

I see Assad and ISIS as two sides of the same coin. Fighting one must not empower the other. Only fighting Assad would allow ISIS to flourish, but only fighting ISIS would leave Assad in power, and he is the biggest magnet drawing foreign fighters to ISIS. Believe it or not, they have this symbiotic relationship from all around the globe.

This crisis does not end unless the moderate opposition is empowered to show the Syrian people that they can fight ISIS and win and, later on, they will fight Assad and win. Through this strategy, the moderate opposition can gain leverage and create the conditions on the ground to compel a political solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to change course in Syria and the region. This authorization can give new hope to the Syrian people and to the people of the region that the United States will stand with them against terrorism.

Like many of my colleagues, I have attended a number of briefings on these matters, and I have noticed a persistent theme.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I hope to correct this persistent theme. I have heard from some Members that Syrian Christians would prefer to live under Assad than the moderate opposition. This is a complete mischaracterization, in my opinion, of the situation in Syria.

Assad may profess to protect Christians, but, in reality, he buys his oil from ISIS; thereby bankrolling them and their massacres of Christians. ISIS would not be able to fund their operations without the Assad regime.

The moderate opposition has publicly stated their acceptance and tolerance of Christians, and the Syrian Christian community has welcomed the U.S. call to degrade and destroy ISIS terrorists and the efforts of moderate Syrians to defend their communities.

I understand the reticence of some of my colleagues to get involved. Again, we have no great choices here, but the worst choice is to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Congressman McKEON. Chairman ROYCE and I conduct the Foreign Affairs Committee in a very bipartisan fashion. We pride ourselves in being one of the most bipartisan committees.

Foreign policy should be bipartisan. Issues like this should be bipartisan. I think we can all be proud to be Members of Congress. This is being done in a bipartisan way. I certainly support this resolution.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous gentleman for his comments. He is the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He understands this situation very well, and the only thing I would say is the reason we say ISIS/ISIL—I would just say ISIL because they are the same. We need to let the American people know who the enemy is. It is that group, ISIL, and they are the worst of all, in my opinion.

Secondly, the reason we are doing this now is twofold. The President asked for it. We only have one Commander in Chief at a time. I didn't vote for him, but he is our Commander in Chief. He asked for this. We are responding to that request as he asked us as Commander in Chief.

Secondly, and I think this is very important, Saudi Arabia stepped up and said not to keep this secret, but: we overtly will open up our territories and give you training facilities to train these Syrians.

That sends a message to people in that part of the world that this is not the big, bad Satan America against the world. This is moderate Arabs, Kurds, Sunnis, and Shi'a all joining together against terrorism that is out to destroy the world.

I think that opened up this possibility for the President to ask for this, and I am hopeful that we will be able to give him that authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work on this very difficult subject.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, our best CIA analyst could not have predicted that large swaths of Iraq and Syria would be overrun, conquered, by a group called ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

ISIL is better financed, better armed, commands more territory, and boasts a larger army than al Qaeda ever has in its dark history. Its twisted form of religion is eighth century barbarism wielding 21st century weaponry.

Mr. Speaker, they kill, they behead, they crucify, they rape, and they fly a black banner of death wherever they go.

Of late, appropriate American leadership has stopped their advance and prevented further humanitarian catastrophe. Now, the question is what to do next. At this point, we are debating a narrow amendment to authorize President Obama to train and arm so-called moderate Syrian rebels.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I offered an amendment to stop any potential arms from flowing to the Syrian opposition. At that time, there was no broad strategy. Weaponizing moderate rebels, in a battleground of shifting loyalties and no guarantee of victory, was an ad hoc idea that could have made the situation much worse.

Now, this new amendment is narrowly tailored with appropriate benchmarks and aggressive oversight; yet, in reality, we are trying to manage very low expectations, and I remain concerned. Unfortunately, this distracts us from a more complete discussion of the overall strategy as outlined by the President.

One thing has to be clear and must continually be made clear: this is the world's problem, not America's problem alone. The international coalition must be truly robust, not symbolic, and include regional Sunni Muslim nations who must fight for their own protection.

The broader answer here is a regeneration of Iraqi forces who must also fight for themselves; plus the Kurds must be truly empowered to defeat ISIL near their homes and to set up protective zones for neighboring minority and vulnerable communities. Finally, cutting off the financing and support for ISIL, hopefully, ensures that this rampage will be short-lived.

Mr. Speaker, action has risks, but the consequences of inaction are too grave. ISIL is a threat to all innocent persons and a threat to civilization itself.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult decision, a difficult choice, and likely one that does not have a good or better outcome than what we can propose today. I think the American people

need to understand that, as we act today, many of us do with reluctance.

I will vote in support of Mr. McKEON's amendment, but I do so very reluctantly. I have fear that what we face is a situation in which we will arm folks who subsequently will take negative action against us; however, when weighing the consequences of taking no action, as many of my colleagues have indicated, I think we have no choice but to move forward as this amendment is recommending and the President has requested.

I also believe that we are taking back in Congress power that has drifted over many years to the President, irrespective of what party he is in—or she may be in, in the future—and I think that this is an important constitutional step that we should all support.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), my friend and colleague.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank him for his effort in putting together this amendment, and, before he leaves the floor, I would like to commend my friend, Mr. ENGEL from New York, for the very vigorous bipartisan speech that he gave here today because this is what this issue warrants. Chairman McKEON has shown it, and I think all of us have to come together to the extent we can to support the President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of the President. I believe that action should have been taken earlier against ISIS, but we can have these debates. That is all in the past.

□ 1715

The fact is that ISIS is a real threat to the United States. As someone who comes from a district that lost over 150 people on 9/11, I never, ever want to go through that again.

I can say right now that ISIS is more powerful than al Qaeda was on 9/11. They have more financing. They have more weapons. They have more members. They have more of their fighters who have passports that will enable them to come into the United States. And we know that they are committed to destroying Western civilization, so it is essential that we take action against ISIS and take it quickly and take it emphatically.

I believe the President has the constitutional and statutory power to act, but I also think it is important for Congress to work with the President. The President has asked for this power to train moderate Syrians, and now I am not certain if that would work. I think it is going to be difficult to vet a sufficient number. It will be difficult to find them, to work with them.

Having said that, as Commander in Chief, the President is entitled, I believe. That is his prerogative, and we should stand with him on that, because

if we can put together an effective fighting force on the ground, that would make our airpower all that more effective.

It is also important that we try to put together a coalition, and I believe Congress standing together as one, by showing strong support for the President, that will encourage other countries to join with us. They will realize we are in this for real, that we are not just making empty gestures. It is important for Congress to come forward at this time.

Now, having said that, I also believe that the President should be more open with the American people and say this is going to be tough. And I believe that there are going to be boots on the ground. Now, I don't believe we have to have combat troops, per se. This is not going to be easy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that no matter how well a war is planned, no matter how specific our strategy is, the fact is that there are going to be tough days ahead. This is going to be very rough. This is not going to be easy. And we have to condition the American people, prepare them for that and be honest with them.

We as Republicans, I believe, have an obligation not just to be critical, but to stand with the President if we believe overall that ISIS has to be stopped, and we have to support our Commander in Chief in doing that.

So what happened in the past is in the past. I don't want the past to be prolonged, but we can work constructively and positively and to make sure that the job gets done because too many lives are dependent on it.

I am not in this for Iraq. I am not in this for Afghanistan. Yes, that is important. I am in this for the people in the United States, people who never, ever should be attacked again, and our forces overseas who are in harm's way. That is our main obligation, and that is who I am voting for today when I vote for the chairman's amendment.

Again, I thank him for the outstanding job he has done; and since this may be my last time, to also commend him for the great job he has done as chairman over the last several years.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my friend.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment, which would permit the administration to train and equip Syrian opposition forces to confront the deadly threat posed to them and their country by ISIL.

This measure is limited, at least for another day the broader question of authorizing the use of force against ISIL.

It extends only until December 11, the expiration date of the continuing resolution that it amends; but it is necessary if our country is to get underway the training of forces that are essential, if the Syrian component of the President's plan to degrade and defeat ISIL is to succeed.

The President has no intention of introducing ground combat forces into this conflict, but our strategy does depend on indigenous forces in Iraq and Syria fighting for their own countries, forces capable of taking advantage of the air and other support we will provide.

Getting such forces up to speed in Syria is one of the most difficult aspects of the challenges we face. Many speakers today have stressed these uncertainties and risks. I doubt there is a single one of them that the President hasn't recognized and considered in devising his strategy. But he has also done what we must now do: consider the consequences of letting the threat of ISIL go unchecked.

The continued spread of ISIL and its version of violent jihad present a grave threat to our national security and that of our allies in the region and around the world. The United States must work with allies to ensure that militant extremists do not further destabilize an already volatile region or establish a staging ground for terrorist activities aimed at American personnel and assets both at home and abroad.

So we have a grave responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to weigh the costs and benefits of our actions or of inaction or of this resolution being defeated. This is not a time, if I may say so, for Members to vote "no" and then hope the resolution, nonetheless, passes. We don't have the luxury of holding out for a perfect or assured outcome. We must make the best decision we can, countering the threat, but in a careful and measured way that maximizes the chances for success and that gives this body the ability to monitor and oversee the process so as to make course corrections when necessary.

I believe the resolution before us meets these tests, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY, my friend and colleague.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I want to put this in strategic context. We are seeing a once-in-a-century upheaval in the Middle East, and the most virulent manifestation of that is occurring in Syria today with a very complex civil war raging over several years.

On one side you have the brutal Assad regime aligned with Iran and Hezbollah, another terrorist group, and on the other side a panoply of Sunni groups of which the worst, the most barbaric, is ISIL. It is in America's national interest, our national security

interest, to defeat and destroy ISIL, period, hands down.

This is going to require American unity, American resolve. And I can tell you, never, never in recent times has American leadership been more in demand. This is the time for us to step up. It will take a lot of work. It is going to take merging the fighting capabilities of the Kurdish Peshmerga with the Iraqi forces; and, yes, it will take the U.S. training and vetting moderate Syrian forces to deal with this.

This is a necessary first step, and that is why I support this amendment. It is necessary. It is not sufficient. Again, we need a broader strategy that is going to involve a coalition. This first step will show that American resolve to friends and foes alike as well as those who are on the sideline. We will demonstrate that and pull this coalition together.

This will help the President have the necessary leverage to do this and put this coalition in place to defeat this threat of ISIL, but also to get to a broader political settlement in the region, because what is going on in Syria, even beyond ISIL, is a national security threat to the United States. That is why this country, all Americans, must speak with a unified voice. A strong vote on this amendment is essential as a first step to putting this in place.

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President—I urge the President—to put all diplomatic efforts into putting together a strong coalition and to ask for very specific deliverables on each of these countries, whether it is Turkey or Qatar or the Saudis. These countries have to step up if we are going to have a successful strategy in the long run.

The President needs leverage. This gives him the first step. I would hope that he will come to the Congress for a broader authorization for the use of military force because I do believe that will give him all the leverage he needs to complete this diplomatic task in putting a coalition together, along with the military strategy with these allies in the region, to defeat the immediate threat of ISIL and to eliminate this major problem we are seeing with a failed state in Syria that has allowed ISIL and some of these other extremist groups to arise.

This is the time for unity. This is the time for American leadership. This is a time that we step up.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Mr. SMITH, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a fateful one. If operations planning is not executed properly, it will result in the United States becoming embroiled in a modern version of the Hundred Years' War.

Over the past decade, and indeed since the bombing of our Marine barracks in Lebanon three decades ago, our Nation's blood and treasure have been expended in growing numbers to influence Middle East foreign policy. Most recently, the result has shifted Iraq from a Sunni-led dictatorship under Saddam Hussein to be replaced by a corrupt, unrepresentative Shi'a-leaning regime led by Nouri al-Maliki. Both corrupt regimes thwarted democratic advancement, and now a new, untested government has been set in place in Baghdad, but its effectiveness is unknown. Its connectivity to its own people across its provinces is uneven and undemocratic.

Meanwhile, we witness the rise of ISIL, a barbaric Sunni force largely composed of foreign fighters from other nations that manifests the discontent of the Sunnis. ISIL's leader had been a leader inside al Qaeda Iraq.

Recognize for the most part, Iraq's huge Sunni population has been vastly ignored and purposefully excluded in Iraq's al-Maliki-led government. There is a huge chasm between Baghdad's politically unrepresentative government and the reality of the Sunni tribes not affiliated with ISIL that have dug in for the long haul and exist in key provinces in Iraq.

It is to America's peril if we miscalculate and fail to understand their importance. It is to America's peril if we underestimate who the enemy is, what ISIL is fighting for and against, and what it will take to defeat ISIL.

America must stand at liberty's side but never place our military between two warring factions whose hatred for one another is legendary and lethal. If America is pulled into a civil war on the lands of Iraq and Syria, perceived as having taken sides with the Shi'a against the Sunnis, we will be on the wrong side of history.

Our military has already lost over 6,000 valorous Americans, with 50,000 more brave wounded or incapacitated. Our Nation has spent over a trillion dollars, including training over 800,000 Iraqis to defend their own nation.

But legions of Iraq's Army that our government trained, at the first test of their mettle against ISIL, tore off their uniforms and fled. It is not disputed that an important reason for this is that the former Prime Minister of Iraq, Maliki, purposefully weakened his own Iraqi Army by putting his incompetent cronies in charge of units that ultimately were underequipped and could not fight.

To win, America cannot and must not make the mistake of ignoring the legitimate concerns of Sunni native tribal leaders in Iraq who have been summarily cut out of the decisions being made by a Baghdad government so unrepresentative and so utterly calculated against Sunni representation. This exclusion will imperil success in

any coalition effort to rid the regime of ISIL's barbarism.

It has come to my attention that the exclusion of Iraq's four main Sunni-Arab tribal groups from contact with decisionmakers in Baghdad and elsewhere continues. The current government in Baghdad, led by Prime Minister Haider Abadi, does not engender nor seek their confidence. There is no contact between, for example, historic Sunni tribes and the Iraqi Government nor our government. What a gaping omission. The four main tribes are the Al-bu Khalifah, Al-bu Mar'i, the Al-bu Fahd, and the Al Sulayman. It has also come to my attention that if any Iraqi claims to speak for them in Baghdad, he does not, or he does so fraudulently.

Before I can vote on any resolution that might potentially embroil our military in taking sides in a major Shi'a-Sunni civil war across that vast region, I would seek assurances that our government has been in direct contact with the native Sunni tribes in Iraq whose mettle was proven in the first awakening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I ask for an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. To fail to understand their importance or their systematic exclusion from the machinations in Baghdad is to play a war game of chess with half the board empty.

Be aware, if certain key decisionmakers in our own government as well as Baghdad's didn't recognize that Mosul could be taken by ISIL, why depend on those same advisers to plot a forward strategy now? Our policy should be to leave no chessmen off the table.

Today, very, very, very reluctantly, I will support this resolution, but with great misgivings. I hold the sincere hope the administration will hear my pleas to measure up to the full task at hand. Leave no major Sunni interests absent from the daunting political and military coalition that must be forged to be successful in this venture.

□ 1730

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McALLISTER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. McALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for all his hard work on getting this amendment before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I am very frustrated that I stand before you today and we can wage a war on Ebola, yet we sit back for hours and allow ISIL to wage a war against us.

A "no" vote is the easiest vote to cast. We cannot stand back and do nothing while ISIL continues to

threaten our national security and terrorizes the Middle East.

Everyone wants to be a general, but now is not the time to argue amongst ourselves. Back home, people think all we do is argue about petty politics and get nothing accomplished. Now is the time to take action and stand unified behind House leadership and deal with this serious threat.

We are dealing with one of the most barbaric terrorist organizations we have seen in years and the American people cannot afford to have Congress go home without authorizing an effective strategy to annihilate ISIL.

This resolution does not appropriate new funding; it simply gives congressional approval to act in the best interest of our national security without acting unilaterally.

It would be a disservice to American citizens and our allies if we continue bickering while ISIL mobilizes and recruits new members. Destroying ISIL requires a coordinated effort to arm and train those fighting our enemies.

As a veteran, I do not want to see my brothers in arms' blood shed and them die in vain for where we have not completed a mission.

Mr. Speaker, 9/11 is a reminder that terrorism does not recognize boundaries. We are the United States. We must stand united to defeat all enemies, both foreign and domestic, when appropriate, on their soil and not ours.

I urge my colleagues to act now and pass this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his very deliberative work in leading our minority.

I am glad that we are debating the President's proposal to arm and train the Syrian rebels. But, Mr. Speaker, I am totally disappointed that a debate on something that could have such broad implications on the United States' national security and the region is being included as an amendment to the continuing resolution. When I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, the first rule I was taught was that you don't authorize on appropriations bill.

Yet this is another instance of Congress taking a pass on its solemn constitutional obligations to weigh in on matters of war and peace.

I am reminded of the failure to have a thorough and robust debate in the wake of 9/11 and the resulting overly broad authorization which I could not vote for because it was a blank check for perpetual war, and it still is on the books and it is being used as the authority for the strikes that are taking place now. This resolution should be repealed.

And it was the rush to war against Iraq in 2002 that led us to where we are

today. ISIS did not exist until the unnecessary and ill-begotten war in Iraq, which created sectarian violence and a civil war.

We should be clear what the United States is committing itself to in Iraq and Syria. The U.S. has conducted nearly 3,000 missions and more than 150 airstrikes, and has deployed more than 1,000 troops already. In a speech about the United States' mission against ISIS, the President said: "I don't think we're going to solve this problem in weeks. This is going to take some time."

I ask today: Does this amendment begin to help us contain ISIS or to dismantle ISIS? And what are we getting ourselves into? It is more complex than just an up-or-down vote on arming and training the members of the Free Syrian Army.

The consequences of this vote will be—whether it is written into the amendment or not—a further expansion of a war currently taking place and our further involvement in a sectarian war. That is the consequence of this amendment.

As I said earlier, no one in this body believes that we should stand by while ISIS wreaks havoc across the region. And the brutal nature of ISIS and who they are, we understand very clearly, and we must address ISIS in a big way now. No one believes that we should not deal with ISIS.

But let me just tell you, a military solution, as the President said, is not the way we are going to dismantle or disable or stop ISIS. I supported the President's plan to protect U.S. personnel and to prevent genocide. But any expansion of the military strikes and what took place during that terrible period really requires a full debate and an authorization of the use of force here on this floor, and that is not what we are doing today.

Also, what is missing from this debate are the nonmilitary solutions and options to this crisis. The President and his national security experts have stated repeatedly that there is no military solution. Yet here we are today once again only discussing more arms and more airstrikes.

There are too many unanswered questions for me to support this amendment. How will we avoid embroiling the United States in a sectarian conflict—in a deeper involvement, actually, in a sectarian conflict—in Iraq and Syria? How do we ensure different outcomes than when we spent U.S. tax dollars, mind you, to train and equip the Iraqi army?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE of California. How will we ensure that the United States weapons

that we are providing to Syrian rebels won't get into the wrong hands, as they did with the rebels when we supported them in Libya? How will we ensure that what we are doing now won't further destabilize the region? And how will we ensure that we do not stand here years from now debating on how to stop another ISIS—ISIS II?

Mr. Speaker, what is missing from this debate is the political, economic, and diplomatic and regionally-led solutions that will ultimately be the tools for security in the region and for any potential future threats to the United States.

These are significant questions that must be answered before Congress should vote on a proposal, no matter how limited, to intervene militarily once again in a region that is very complicated and that is very dangerous. We should not act in haste, and we must heed the lessons of the past. We must also live up to our constitutional obligation to debate authorization of the use of military force rather than authorize to send arms to Syrian rebels on a continuing resolution to keep the government open. That is why I will vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING, my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the President's vague and inadequate strategy for dealing with ISIS; and, therefore, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

In his haste to claim credit for withdrawing our troops from Iraq, President Obama left the door open to exactly the kind of crisis that has exploded throughout the region. Instead of working hard to renew a status of forces agreement with a sufficient number of American troops to preserve the peace, President Obama was anxious to use withdrawal from Iraq as a campaign slogan in 2012. We are now reaping the whirlwind sown by that reckless policy.

This new policy is little more than an incremental strategy, not unlike the one used in Vietnam. History warns of the dangers of such approaches. By moving hesitantly, in piecemeal fashion, the enemy has more time to learn, adapt, and get stronger. This is a recipe for stalemate and failure.

There is another obvious lesson in all of this: almost since taking office, the Obama administration has been working to reduce our military. President Obama has directed over \$1 trillion in cuts to the U.S. military since he took office. Under his planned cuts, senior Army leaders have testified that the Army would be unable to repeat its performance over the last decade in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And, finally, the President has acted as if dangerous and avowed enemies are either not serious threats—like the JV team of global terrorism—or he has acted as though they are reasonable enemies who are willing to negotiate peace.

Neither is true with ISIS. If we are going to degrade and destroy them it will not happen through an indecisive strategy that relies on unreliable and largely unknown help from Syrian rebels, whose own motivations and goals are mixed, and almost impossible to be certain of.

In addition, recent history has taught us that the weapons and resources we commit to other forces could easily fall into the hands of even worse enemies, like ISIS.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I support President Obama's authority as Commander in Chief, but his game plan is flawed. It will lead to failure and will put us in more danger.

The President's approach of using American air power and local ground troops is wise. It worked in Afghanistan and it worked in Kosovo.

However, President Obama is choosing the wrong locals to support. With this vote, Congress approves the arming and training of the Free Syrian Army, which is riddled with radical Muslims. In short, we may again be arming insurgents who will end up our enemy.

We are told that the Free Syrian Army has been vetted and that we can trust them. This is wishful thinking, not realistic planning.

The President wants to send more equipment and supplies and weapons to the Kurds. That is certainly a good concept, but proposes to send our assistance via the Iraqi Government in Baghdad. Rest assured, Baghdad will pass on whatever it doesn't want to keep for itself. And remember, they wasted most of what we have already given them. Arming radical Islamists is bad enough; depending on Baghdad to distribute our military equipment to the right people makes even less sense.

We should arm the Kurds directly; then, instead of relying on an unknown and perhaps radical force, we should instead reach out to the Assad regime and enlist his support in a fight against the common enemy. Perhaps we should consult President Putin in Russia about this issue rather than consult the mullahs in Iran.

The President's proposal will not work. I will not support it. Yet another infusion of American troops into this never-ending conflict in the Middle

East is a wrong move. It is wrong for the people of the United States and will not succeed.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, again, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the tremendous leadership that you have given to this Nation. I am grateful for what you have done as a servant in our Congress to protect this Nation, to provide the security that is needed, and I admire you greatly for your work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment.

This amendment is critical to begin the needed process to destroy ISIS. Yes, it is limited in scope of what the President has designated the Congress to approve, but it is necessary. We must convey to the world our commitment to destroy ISIS, the gravest threat that we have ever seen in the history of this country.

But a grave threat, Mr. Speaker, requires a commitment, a thorough commitment, to make sure the job is done. What we are doing today is limited in scope, but yet it is very important. We cannot, however, have a commitment that is limited, we cannot have the mindset of a Neville Chamberlain, who never recognized the threat and the force of Adolf Hitler in Germany.

We have an enormous threat before us today. The President gratefully acknowledges the threat. However, he has been long in coming to that reality of what we face in the world today.

□ 1745

Yes, he did stand down on missile defense in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Yes, he did stand down our military to the lowest levels since World War II. Yes, he has appeased the Iranians and given them additional time to build up their economy, to build up their nuclear capacity.

He has a scope of the world and understanding that is foreign to me. There are real adversaries out there. Gratefully, he understands the adversaries that we have in ISIS today. They are but yet a part of the dimension of what we are forced to encounter. It must be done, and it must be done with this initial amendment. We will need to come back. We will need to be honest with the American people of what is required to secure this country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), my friend and colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership.

The Obama administration is so out of touch with reality, it is disturbing. Just last year, President Obama said the war on terror is over. Last month, the official White House spokesperson said Obama's policies have enhanced the world's tranquility, even though there are serious growing conflicts in Gaza, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Ukraine, and China.

Today, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey publicly recommended deploying U.S. combat troops to Iraq should the President's coalition-building efforts fail to curb the threat of ISIS.

If there ever was a time to ensure that America's military was well-prepared, highly trained, and fully equipped, it would be right now. Our enemies are growing stronger, our allies aren't stepping up, and the President's sequester has strained our military's ability to plan and prepare for all potential threats.

The President was caught off guard, leaving our troops underfunded. He must have a clearly defined strategy that fully funds and equips our military.

My district, the 25th District of Texas, is home to Fort Hood, the largest military base in America and home to some of the greatest young men and women the country has ever known. These soldiers and all who wear the uniform need to have the full support of their Congress and their President.

They need adequate funding, training, and the best armored trucks, planes, weapons, and ammunition in the whole wide world. We need to have an unbeatable military readiness and the highest quality of life for the greatest military in the history of the world.

Before President Obama takes any more actions to combat our terrorist enemies, he must work with Congress to roll back his sequester cuts and provide our troops with the support and resources they need and deserve.

In God we trust.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 hour and 50 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1 hour and 55 minutes remaining.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A lot has been said today on both sides of this issue. As I have listened carefully to all of the arguments, it seems to me that the main argument, as I have heard it, against acting on this amendment at this time is that it doesn't go far enough or we don't know for sure if it would be successful.

I have been in this body now for 22 years. I wish that I had the foresight every time we come to this floor to know exactly what is going to happen after we take action, but it seems to me that none of us really has that foresight.

We can think about it, we can project, but we really don't know what is going to happen if we take action. Sometimes, we know what is going to happen if we don't take action. I think that is probably what we ought to be thinking a little bit about today.

There were some comments made about Iraq and Syria. One thing that I think hasn't been mentioned that I think we know is that we left Iraq precipitously. We can talk about blame. We can place it on President Obama.

I could criticize him for a lot of things, but I sure wouldn't want his job, and I think, because we did leave early, we didn't leave any residual force behind. Maliki did some things that we probably all would have changed.

Saddam Hussein, who was a Sunni—Sunnis are the minority in Iraq—oppressed the Shi'a; so, when Maliki came in, a Shi'a, he oppressed the Sunnis. I think one thing that we do know is that the new Prime Minister, Haider al-Abadi, is really making an effort to reach out to the Sunnis, the Shi'a, and the Kurds to bring a legitimate government that will look out for all of its people.

I think that has given us the opportunity to go into Iraq. The President has put over a thousand of our troops in there, bucked them up, and helped them with the things that they need to be successful in fighting off the terrorists, ISIL, and I think that there are things that they cannot do that we can help them with.

They need intelligence. They need ISR. They need logistics. They need air support. If we provide those things and they see that they are getting good support from their government and that it is not a fight between different sects or different regions and yet they can actually fight together as Iraqis, they will be successful in pushing ISIL back which would be a good thing. They can retake the territory that has been lost.

In the meantime, if we vote for this amendment, we give the President the authority to train Syrians that are thoroughly vetted in Saudi Arabia and then put them back into the fight.

These people are fighting for their homeland. These are people that are fighting for their villages, and they are fighting for their families. Are they perfect? We don't know, but I was talking to one of our retired generals who has been in the fight, and he told me that, sometimes, you have to work with people that are willing to fight the same enemy that you are willing to fight.

In this case, these people that we are looking at are willing to fight ISIL. If they have the help that we can provide, they can be successful, and then the people that we train can go back into the fight in Syria, and we can squeeze ISIL in between Syria and Iraq and keep them from entering into other nations where we do not wish to fight at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate all the time and energy that our House Republican leaders have put into this issue, trying to work with the President, but the truth is that, if you look back under this President as Commander in Chief, we trained people in Libya. We provided weapons to Libya that were then used against us in Benghazi.

There are Americans dead because this administration felt compelled to go in and take out Qadhafi. Sure, it was under the guise of NATO, but we did it. This administration saw to the bombing of Qadhafi. It refused to allow him to leave peacefully, and it has cost us.

Because Libya fell, so did Algeria and Tunisia, and it jump-started, as I have said before, the new Ottoman Empire, the new caliphate that the Muslim brothers and so many of the radicals are saying they are going for.

One of the big problems, too, when we go in and train, as this President wants to do for the Syrians, they learn our tradecraft. They use it against us, as they did at Benghazi.

Al Qaeda today has indicated that all jihadists must combine together. That pressure is going to get greater and greater. Also, today, the Muslim Brotherhood cleric who had been kicked out of Qatar—I believe he is now in Turkey—is calling for an all-out Muslim Brotherhood opposition to the United States.

Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the head of the Muslim Brotherhood, is likewise begging jihadists to combine together in their fight against the United States.

Where is al-Qaradawi? He is in Turkey. Yes, that is the Turkey that this President says we are going to count on as one of our allies, and yet Turkey has announced last week that they will not allow the U.S. to conduct air strikes against ISIS from Turkish air bases.

We are in big trouble here. Our action will unify radicals against us. It has already been announced that Colonel Riad al-Asaad, the leader of the Free Syrian Army, has said it would not join the alliance against the Islamic State unless it receives assurances on toppling the Syrian regime. That was reported by Anadolu, the Turkish news agency, just in the last few days.

This is serious stuff. We are uniting the jihadists of the world to come

against us. Why? Because there is nothing lower to these jihadists than infidels that help invade what they consider to be a Muslim country.

We are about to ask for more than this administration knows. Why? Because it continues to purge our training material. They are not allowed to understand what it is we are up against.

When you lose *The New York Times*, as this administration has, you are in big trouble if you are President Obama.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say again that most of the arguments I have heard are, "Don't do this." I haven't heard an alternative.

I think what we need to remember—and we hear it a lot around here—is let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. The President, the Commander in Chief, has asked for this authority. Saudi Arabia is willing to work with us on this. We need to develop the coalition. We are working hard to make that happen.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree very strongly with Chairman McKEON on one point. You can raise all manner of different questions, but there are no guarantees. If you are trying to figure out how to vote on this and you won't vote in favor until we are guaranteed nothing can go wrong, then save yourself the argument and just vote "no." This is a very dangerous part of the world, and, in any part of the world, something can always go wrong. We cannot guarantee that there will be no bad outcomes.

I think one of the things that has been lost in all this is that train and equip has been equated simply with Iraq and Afghanistan and has been deemed a failure. I really want to point out to people that the U.S. military—and the U.S. Government more broadly—has engaged in many very successful train-and-equip missions.

In fact, this is the way out of Iraq and Afghanistan, the way out of committing over 100,000 U.S. troops to a battle to try to fundamentally change a country. You build partnerships, and those partners in those local areas are the ones that do the fighting and pursue the interests.

In Somalia, we have a very significant problem with al-Shabaab. We have not, I believe, lost a U.S. life in that region. We have trained and equipped Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda. They have helped take the fight to al-Shabaab in Somalia in a very successful manner.

□ 1800

We are working with the Yemeni Government right now to help defeat al

Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula within Yemen. And believe me, the country of Yemen is not a model of anything. It has all manner of different challenges in terms of its governance. And you certainly could have looked at that and said, Wow, we are going to work with those guys?

But we did not want al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula to continue to grow and continue to threaten us, where at least two terror attacks against the U.S. were launched, so we trained and have worked with the Yemen Government in a way that has helped contain AQAP. Train and equip absolutely is a policy that can work, and that is what we are going to try and do in Syria.

So backing up to the policy there, there are several steps to this.

First of all, should we confront ISIS? I mean, that is an initial decision. And I suppose you can decide that it is way across the world. You have got Sunnis fighting Shi'as. You have got Syria. You have got Iran. You have got all manner of different people all mixed up in this. Let's just wash our hands of it and hope it works out.

The problem with that is ISIS has made it clear that they will kill Americans and that they will threaten us. And if they continue to grow and continue to hold territory, they will absolutely plan and plot attacks against the United States. So simply allowing ISIS to go forward doesn't strike me as a good option, which brings us to the second question.

Okay, if you want to try to contain them, how do you do it? And I completely agree with the cautionary notes that have been cited about just sending in the U.S. military to do it. I think the risks there are enormous, and it would not be successful because it would unite all—not all, but would unite a fair number of Sunnis and radicals against us.

So the option on the table is to train and equip local partners to do the fighting. We have done it successfully with the Kurds. We are making progress now with Iraq now that we have got Maliki out as Prime Minister and we have a new government that at least gives the Sunnis some hope that they will be included in the Iraqi Government.

In Syria, we will have to work with the Free Syria movement. Now, we have already been working with a lot of these folks. We have already been providing humanitarian assistance and some other assistance as well, so it is not like we don't have anybody over there. We do know some folks and we should work with them, because the alternative is allowing Syria to be divided up between Assad and ISIS, and that alternative is unacceptable.

Lastly, I want to say that I fully understand the concerns about mission creep. I fully understand the concerns about open-ended warfare, but this is not what we are talking about.

As the chairman and many others have said, we should have a debate about an AUMF on this floor. This is not an AUMF. This in no way authorizes any U.S. military action against anybody. All it does is it authorizes the Department of Defense to train and equip other forces. Our forces will be hundreds of miles from the battlefield, training and equipping other forces.

So I agree, there is a much larger debate to have if an AUMF is put out on the floor, and we have to think about will this be taken and interpreted way too broadly. We have seen that happen with the 2001 AUMF, for instance. So that will be a worthy debate.

That is not what we are doing here. In fact, this is something that 3 years ago many people suggested that the U.S. Government should do. But we cannot do it unless Congress authorizes the Department of Defense to do it.

So I think this is much more narrow in scope than the broader debate, and the broader debate is one we should have. But here we are talking about a very narrow approach of train and equip that, frankly, can help limit U.S. action.

I have heard some of my colleagues say, well, you know, we understand the bombing. We need to do the bombing because ISIS is a threat and all that. But we don't want to do the train and equip which, to me, is just completely backwards.

If you are concerned about mission creep, if you are concerned about the U.S. getting too involved, then direct military action is certainly a heck of a lot more involvement than training and equipping others in the region to lead the fight.

I think that is an appropriate policy. I applaud the chairman for his work in putting this together.

We do have more work to do. This only authorizes this until the CR runs out, December 11, I believe, so we will have to do this in the National Defense Authorization Act. But I think it is a modest and appropriate step, and whatever criticism you have of all manner of different mistakes, perceived and actual, that the President may have made before, please don't let that color what is an incredibly important policy decision as we try to decide how to confront a very real threat in ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.J. Res. 124 is postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AMERICAN ENERGY SOLUTIONS FOR LOWER COSTS AND MORE AMERICAN JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, JOBS FOR AMERICA ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 22, 2014, THROUGH NOVEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-601) on the resolution (H. Res. 727) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from September 22, 2014, through November 11, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5405, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5461, by the yeas and nays;

S. 1603, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5405) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 320, nays 102, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—320

Amash	Foster	Maloney,
Amodei	Fox	Carolyn
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Maloney, Sean
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Barber	Gallego	Marino
Bartlett	Garcia	Massie
Barr	Gardner	Matheson
Barrow (GA)	Garrett	Matsui
Benishek	Gerlach	McAllister
Bentivolio	Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)
Bera (CA)	Gibson	McCarthy (NY)
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul
Bishop (GA)	Gohmert	McClintock
Bishop (NY)	Goodlatte	McCollum
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McHenry
Black	Govdy	McIntyre
Blackburn	Granger	McKeon
Boustany	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Braley (IA)	Griffin (AR)	Rodgers
Bridenstine	Griffith (VA)	McNerney
Brooks (AL)	Grimm	Meadows
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Meehan
Broun (GA)	Hall	Meeks
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Hanna	Messer
Buchanan	Harper	Mica
Bucshon	Harris	Miller (FL)
Burgess	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Bustos	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Moran
Calvert	Heck (WA)	Mullin
Camp	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Campbell	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (FL)
Cardenas	Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Carney	Himes	Neugebauer
Carter	Holding	Noem
Cassidy	Honda	Nolan
Chabot	Hoyer	Nugent
Chaffetz	Hudson	Nunes
Cicilline	Huelskamp	O'Rourke
Clawson (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Coble	Hultgren	Owens
Coffman	Hunter	Palazzo
Cole	Hurt	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Israel	Pearce
Conaway	Issa	Perlmutter
Connolly	Jenkins	Perry
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Peters (CA)
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Peters (MI)
Costa	Jolly	Peterson
Cotton	Jordan	Petri
Cramer	Joyce	Pittenger
Crawford	Keating	Pitts
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)
Crowley	Kilmer	Polis
Cuellar	Kind	Pompeo
Culberson	King (IA)	Posey
Daines	King (NY)	Price (GA)
Davis (CA)	Kingston	Quigley
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rahall
DeGette	Kirkpatrick	Reed
Delaney	Kline	Reichert
DelBene	Kuster	Renacci
Denham	Labrador	Ribble
Dent	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rigell
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Roby
Duckworth	Langevin	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Lankford	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Rogers (MI)
Ellmers	Latta	Rohrabacher
Engel	Lipinski	Rokita
Enyart	LoBiondo	Rooney
Eshoo	Loebach	Ros-Lehtinen
Esty	Long	Roskam
Farenthold	Lowey	Ross
Farr	Lucas	Rothfus
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Fitzpatrick	Lujan Grisham	Ruiz
Fleischmann	(NM)	Runyan
Fleming	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger
Flores	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Lummis	Salmon
Fortenberry	Maffei	

Sanchez, Linda	Smith (NE)	Wagner
T.	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (TX)	Walden
Sanford	Southerland	Walorski
Scalise	Speier	Walz
Schneider	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Schock	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Schrader	Stockman	Wenstrup
Schweikert	Stutzman	Westmoreland
Scott, Austin	Swalwell (CA)	Whitfield
Scott, David	Terry	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Sewell (AL)	Thornberry	Wittman
Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Wolf
Sherman	Tipton	Womack
Shimkus	Turner	Woodall
Shuster	Upton	Yarmuth
Simpson	Valadao	Yoder
Sinema	Vargas	Yoho
Sires	Veasey	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Vela	Young (IN)
Smith (MO)	Visclosky	

NAYS—102

Bass	Garamendi	Negrete McLeod
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarelli
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Bonamici	Grijalva	Payne
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Butterfield	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Capuano	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Rangel
Cartwright	Huffman	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Chu	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Clay	Jones	Schiff
Cleaver	Kaptur	Schwartz
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kennedy	Serrano
Conyers	Kildee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Takano
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Tierney
DeFazio	Lewis	Titus
DeLauro	Lofgren	Tonko
Deutch	Lowenthal	Tsongas
Dingell	Lynch	Van Hollen
Doggett	McDermott	Velázquez
Doyle	McGovern	Wasserman
Edwards	Michaud	Schultz
Ellison	Miller, George	Waters
Fattah	Moore	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Welch
Fudge	Napolitano	
Gabbard	Neal	

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1841

Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. SMITH of Washington, RICHMOND, GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and SCHIFF changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. POLIS, THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FARR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS
CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5461) to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 97, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—327

Aderholt	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Amash	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Amodei	Culberson	Heck (WA)
Bachmann	Daines	Hensarling
Bachus	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Barber	DeGette	Higgins
Barletta	Delaney	Himes
Barr	DelBene	Holding
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Honda
Beatty	Dent	Hoyer
Benishkek	DeSantis	Hudson
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart	Huelskamp
Bera (CA)	Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hultgren
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bishop (NY)	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers	Israel
Black	Engel	Issa
Blackburn	Enyart	Jenkins
Boustany	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Esty	Johnson, Sam
Braley (IA)	Farenthold	Jolly
Bridenstine	Fincher	Jordan
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Keating
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Brown (FL)	Flores	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Forbes	Kilmer
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Kind
Bucshon	Foster	King (IA)
Burgess	Fox	King (NY)
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Kingston
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger (IL)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kirkpatrick
Camp	Gabbard	Kline
Campbell	Gallego	Kuster
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Labrador
Carney	Garcia	LaMalfa
Carter	Gardner	Lamborn
Cassidy	Garrett	Lance
Castro (TX)	Gerlach	Lankford
Chabot	Gibbs	Larsen (WA)
Chaffetz	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Clawson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Latham
Cleaver	Gohmert	Latta
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Coble	Gosar	LoBiondo
Coffman	Gowdy	Loebsack
Cole	Granger	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Lowe
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Conaway	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Connolly	Griffith (VA)	Lujan Grisham
Cook	Grimm	(NM)
Cooper	Guthrie	Luján, Ben Ray
Costa	Hall	(NM)
Cotton	Hanabusa	Lummis
Courtney	Hanna	Lynch
Cramer	Harper	Maffei
Crawford	Harris	Maloney,
Crenshaw	Hartzler	Carolyn

Maloney, Sean	Petri
Marchant	Pittenger
Marino	Pitts
Massie	Poe (TX)
Matheson	Polis
Matsui	Pompeo
McAllister	Posey
McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)
McCarthy (NY)	Quigley
McCaul	Rahall
McClintock	Reed
McCollum	Reichert
McHenry	Renacci
McIntyre	Ribble
McKeon	Rice (SC)
McKinley	Rigell
McMorris	Roby
Rodgers	Roe (TN)
McNerney	Rogers (AL)
Meadows	Rogers (KY)
Meehan	Rogers (MI)
Meeks	Rohrabacher
Meng	Rokita
Messer	Rooney
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (FL)	Roskam
Miller (MI)	Ross
Miller, Gary	Rothfus
Moran	Roybal-Allard
Mullin	Royce
Mulvaney	Ruiz
Murphy (FL)	Runyan
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger
Neal	Ryan (WI)
Neugebauer	Salmon
Noem	Sanford
Nolan	Scalise
Nugent	Schiff
Nunes	Schneider
O'Rourke	Schock
Olson	Schweikert
Owens	Scott, Austin
Palazzo	Scott, David
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner
Pearce	Sessions
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)
Perry	Shea-Porter
Peters (CA)	Sherman
Peters (MI)	Shimkus
Peterson	Shuster

NAYS—97

Bass	Green, Gene
Becerra	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)
Butterfield	Hinojosa
Capps	Horsford
Capuano	Huffman
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Jeffries
Chu	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA)	Jones
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur
Clay	Kelly (IL)
Cohen	Kennedy
Conyers	Long
Cummings	Langevin
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)
Davis, Danny	Levin
DeFazio	Lewis
DeLauro	Lofgren
DeMott	Lowenthal
Dingell	McDermott
Doggett	McGovern
Doyle	Michaud
Edwards	Miller, George
Ellison	Moore
Farr	Nadler
Fattah	Napolitano
Fudge	Negrete McLeod
Grayson	Pallone
Green, Al	Pascrell
	Pastor (AZ)

NOT VOTING—7

Barton	DesJarlais	Rush
Capito	Holt	
Castor (FL)	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 1849

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUN LAKE TRUST LAND
REAFFIRMATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1603) to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 64, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—359

Amodei	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Coble	Foster
Bachus	Coffman	Frankel (FL)
Barber	Cohen	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Collins (GA)	Fudge
Barrow (GA)	Collins (NY)	Gabbard
Bass	Conaway	Gallego
Beatty	Connolly	Garamendi
Becerra	Conyers	Garcia
Benishkek	Cook	Gardner
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Garrett
Bilirakis	Costa	Gerlach
Bishop (GA)	Cotton	Gibbs
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Granger
Black	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Blumenauer	Crowley	Grayson
Bonamici	Cuellar	Green, Al
Boustany	Culberson	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Griffin (AR)
Brady (TX)	Daines	Grimm
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Gutiérrez
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Hahn
Broun (GA)	DeFazio	Hall
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hanabusa
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Hanna
Buchanan	DeLauro	Harper
Bucshon	DelBene	Hartzler
Bustos	Denham	Hastings (FL)
Butterfield	Deuth	Hastings (WA)
Byrne	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Camp	Doggett	Hensarling
Capps	Doyle	Higgins
Capuano	Duckworth	Himes
Cárdenas	Edwards	Hinojosa
Carney	Ellison	Honda
Carter	Ellmers	Horsford
Cartwright	Engel	Hoyer
Cassidy	Enyart	Hudson
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Huffman
Chabot	Esty	Hultgren
Chaffetz	Farenthold	Hunter
Chu	Farr	Israel
Cicilline	Fattah	Issa
Clark (MA)	Fincher	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Jeffries
Clay	Fleischmann	Johnson (GA)
Cleaver	Flores	Johnson (OH)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng

Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky

NAYS—64

Aderholt
Amash
Bentivolio
Bridenstine
Burgess
Campbell
Carson (IN)
Clawson (FL)
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fleming
Forbes
Foxy
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Griffith (VA)

Grijalva
Harris
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Jenkins
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
Lamborn
Marchant
Meadows
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Perry
Pitts
Poe (TX)

Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Moran
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Barton
Capito
Castor (FL)
DesJarlais
Holt
Nunnelee
Rush
Stockman

□ 1857

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1900

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5404) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. References to title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 3. Scoring of budgetary effects.

TITLE I—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY
RELATING TO HEALTH CARE

Sec. 101. Extension of requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Sec. 102. Extension of authority for pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces.

Sec. 103. Extension of authority for pilot program on assistance for child care for certain veterans receiving health care.

Sec. 104. Extension of authority to make grants to veterans service organizations for transportation of highly rural veterans.

Sec. 105. Extension of requirement for report on activities of Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Interagency Program Office.

Sec. 106. Extension of authority for the performance of medical disabilities examinations by contract physicians.

Sec. 107. Extension of authority for collection of copayments for hospital care and nursing home care.

Sec. 108. Extension of authority for recovery from third parties of cost of care and services furnished to veterans with health-plan contracts for non-service-connected disability.

TITLE II—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY
RELATING TO HOMELESSNESS

Sec. 201. Extension of current funding level for comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans.

Sec. 202. Extension of authority for homeless veterans reintegration programs.

Sec. 203. Extension of authority to provide referral and counseling services for certain veterans at risk of homelessness.

Sec. 204. Extension of authority for treatment and rehabilitation services for seriously mentally ill and homeless veterans.

Sec. 205. Extension of authority to provide housing assistance for homeless veterans.

Sec. 206. Extension of authority to provide financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing.

Sec. 207. Extension of authority for grant program for homeless veterans with special needs.

Sec. 208. Extension of authority for the Advisory Committee on Homeless Veterans.

TITLE III—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY
RELATING TO BENEFITS

Sec. 301. Extension of authority for the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education.

Sec. 302. Extension of authority for calculating net value of real property at time of foreclosure.

Sec. 303. Extension of authority relating to vendee loans.

TITLE IV—OTHER EXTENSIONS OF
AUTHORITY AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 401. Extension of authority to transport certain individuals to and from Department of Veterans Affairs facilities.

Sec. 402. Extension of authority for operation of the Department of Veterans Affairs regional office in Manila, the Republic of the Philippines.

Sec. 403. Extension of requirement to provide reports to Congress regarding equitable relief in the case of administrative error.

Sec. 404. Extension of authority for Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans.

Sec. 405. Extension of authority for temporary expansion of eligibility for specially adapted housing assistance for certain veterans with disabilities causing difficulty ambulating.

Sec. 406. Restoration of prior reporting fee multipliers.

Sec. 407. Extension of authority for agreement with National Academy of Sciences.

Sec. 408. Health professionals education debt reduction.

Sec. 409. Amendments to Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE I—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO HEALTH CARE

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE NURSING HOME CARE TO CERTAIN VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

Section 1710A(d) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR PILOT PROGRAM ON COUNSELING IN RETREAT SETTINGS FOR WOMEN VETERANS NEWLY SEPARATED FROM SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 124 Stat. 1143; 38 U.S.C. 1712A note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out a pilot program under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2015.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal years 2010 and 2011” and inserting “fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2015”.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (e) of section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 124 Stat. 1144; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out a pilot program under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2015.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS TO VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HIGHLY RURAL VETERANS.

Section 307(d) of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 124 Stat. 1154; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 105. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS INTERAGENCY PROGRAM OFFICE.

Section 1635(h)(1) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 460; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 106. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL DISABILITIES EXAMINATIONS BY CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.

Section 704(c) of the Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-183; 38 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.

Section 1710(f)(2)(B) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 108. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.

Section 1729(a)(2)(E) is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2015”.

TITLE II—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO HOMELESSNESS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF CURRENT FUNDING LEVEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2013(7) is amended by striking “\$150,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000,000”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.

Section 2021(e)(1)(F) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (d) of section 2023 is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c)(3) of such section is amended by striking “enter into contracts” and inserting “make grants”.

SEC. 204. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION SERVICES FOR SERIOUSLY MENTALLY ILL AND HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) GENERAL TREATMENT.—Section 2031(b) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

(b) ADDITIONAL SERVICES AT CERTAIN LOCATIONS.—Section 2033(d) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2041(c) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 206. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.

Section 2044(e)(1)(E) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2013 and 2014” and inserting “fiscal years 2013 through 2015”.

SEC. 207. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

Section 2061(d)(1) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 208. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2066(d) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

TITLE III—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO BENEFITS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE VETERANS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

Section 3692(c) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CALCULATING NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY AT TIME OF FORECLOSURE.

Section 3732(c)(11) is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2015”.

SEC. 303. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO VENDEE LOANS.

Section 3733(a)(7) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “September 30, 2014,” and inserting “September 30, 2015.”

TITLE IV—OTHER EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSPORT CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS TO AND FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FACILITIES.

Section 111A(a)(2) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR OPERATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REGIONAL OFFICE IN MANILA, THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Section 315(b) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 403. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE REPORTS TO CONGRESS REGARDING EQUITABLE RELIEF IN THE CASE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR.

Section 503(c) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 404. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MINORITY VETERANS.

Section 544(e) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 405. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY AMBULATING.

Section 2101(a)(4) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015”.

SEC. 406. RESTORATION OF PRIOR REPORTING FEE MULTIPLIERS.

During the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the second sentence of section 3684(c) shall be applied—

(1) by substituting “\$9” for “\$12”; and

(2) by substituting “\$13” for “\$15”.

SEC. 407. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENT WITH NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

Section 3(i) of the Agent Orange Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-4; 105 Stat. 13; 38 U.S.C. 1116 note) is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 408. HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATION DEBT REDUCTION.

Section 7683 is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Education debt reduction payments under the Education Debt Reduction Program shall consist of—

“(1) payments to individuals selected to participate in the program of principal and interest on loans described in section 7682(a)(2) of this title; or

“(2) payments for the principal and interest on such loans of such individuals to the holders of such loans.”;

(2) in subsections (b) and (c), by striking “payments to” both places it appears and inserting “payments to or for”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “made to” and inserting “made to or for”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “payable to that” and inserting “payable to or for that”.

SEC. 409. AMENDMENTS TO VETERANS ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014.

(a) EXPANDED AVAILABILITY OF HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES.—Section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “provide the veteran an appointment that exceeds the wait-time goals described in such subsection or” before “place such”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “(or other digital channel)” after “website”;

(2) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by adding at the end the following new sentences: “An agreement entered into pursuant to this subparagraph may not be treated as a Federal contract for the acquisition of goods or services and is not subject to any provision of law governing Federal contracts for the acquisition of goods or services. Before entering into an agreement pursuant to this subparagraph, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the requirements of this section, furnish such care and services to such veterans under this section with such entities pursuant to sharing agreements, existing contracts entered into by the Secretary, or other processes available at medical facilities of the Department.”;

(3) in subsection (1)(1), by inserting “a copy of” before “any medical record”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(t) WAIVER OF CERTAIN PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 501 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply in carrying out this section.”.

(b) COLLABORATION BETWEEN VA AND INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—Section 102 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish” and inserting the following: “The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service shall jointly establish and implement”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Entering into an agreement between the Department and the Indian Health Service described in paragraph (2)(A) with respect to the effect of such agreement on the priority access of any Indian to health care services provided through the Indian Health Service, the eligibility of any Indian to receive health services through the Indian Health Service, and the quality of health

care services provided to any Indian through the Indian Health Service.”; and

(3) by striking subsection (d).

(c) PROMPT PAYMENT.—Section 105 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “section 1315” and inserting “part 1315”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “chapter 39” and inserting “chapter 39 of title 31”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “required by subsection (b)” and inserting “required by subsection (c)”.

(d) IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS TO MOBILE VET CENTERS.—Section 204 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and readjustment counseling services” after “other health care”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and events” after “locations”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “and outreach contacts” after “appointments”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “and readjustment counseling” after “telemedicine services”; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by inserting “and outreach contacts” after “appointments”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and readjustment counseling” after “health care services”; and

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking “mobile vet centers and”.

(e) IMPROVED TRANSPARENCY.—Section 206(b) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “comprehensive database” and inserting “comprehensive, machine-readable data set”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “notice in the database of the reason” and inserting “notice of the reason”; and

(3) in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), by striking “database” each place it appears and inserting “data”.

(f) INFORMATION ON CREDENTIALS.—Section 207 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “successor database” each place it appears and inserting “successor data set”.

(g) REPORT ON STAFFING SHORTAGES.—Section 301(b)(3) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Not later” and all that follows through “2019” and inserting the following: “On October 1 of each year beginning in 2015 and ending in 2019”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking “at each” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “or guidelines of the Department with respect to determining the ratio of residents to staff supervising residents.”; and

(B) by striking clause (v) and inserting the following new clause:

“(v) Efforts of the Department, as of the date of the submittal of the report, to recruit and retain medical residents to work for the Veterans Health Administration as full-time employees.”.

(h) PROJECT ARCH.—Section 403(j) of the Veterans’ Mental Health and Other Care Improvements Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-387; 38 U.S.C. 1703 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “In carrying out” and inserting “Notwithstanding any provision of law relating to the use of competitive procedures in entering into contracts, in carrying out”; and

(2) by inserting “under this section” after “make use of contracts entered into”.

(i) CLARIFICATION OF APPROVAL OF COURSES OF EDUCATION PROVIDED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING AND IN-STATE TUITION RATE FOR VETERANS.—Paragraph (1) of section 3679(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter and subject to paragraphs (3) through (6), the Secretary shall disapprove a course of education provided by a public institution of higher learning if the institution charges tuition and fees for that course for covered individuals who are pursuing the course with educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of this title while living in the State in which the institution is located at a rate that is higher than the rate the institution charges for tuition and fees for that course for residents of the State in which the institution is located, regardless of the covered individual’s State of residence.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5404, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment to H.R. 5404 would extend a number of expiring current authorities and critical programs at both the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labor. These programs include authorizations for veterans’ health care and homeless programs, benefits for disabled veterans, and home loan programs.

These noncontroversial programs are set to expire at the end of this fiscal or calendar year. These are not new programs, and the costs have either been fully offset or have been assumed in the baseline budget for this year.

The amendment to H.R. 5404 would also make certain technical and conforming changes to Public Law 113-146, the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014. These changes are needed to ensure proper and swift implementation of this important law that provides veterans whose care at VA is delayed with a choice to obtain private care and provides the Secretary the tools he needs to hold senior VA

managers accountable. The changes have the support of the majority and minority leadership of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for all of the hard work and dedication that went into H.R. 5404, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2014.

This bill would extend a number of important programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs. We must ensure that the VA has the resources and authority to provide high-quality health care services and benefits that veterans have earned and deserve, no matter where they choose to live.

H.R. 5404 extends the Department's authority to deliver nursing home care to our veterans, give child care assistance for veterans so they can make their medical appointments, and provide counseling retreats for our women veterans.

For veterans who live in highly rural areas like my district, this bill extends VA's authority to give grants to veterans' service organizations to transport our rural veterans to their medical appointments, which is critical for increasing access to VA health care.

This bill also extends critical homeless programs that the VA needs to end veteran homelessness by 2015. Programs such as housing assistance, financial assistance, counseling, and reintegration services will continue so that veterans who experience homelessness or are at risk of being homeless have a safety net of services to help themselves in their time of need.

Finally, H.R. 5404 contains several extensions that will assist the Department in its efforts to provide specially adapted housing to veterans who have difficulty getting around their own homes, permit the VA to recruit and retain needed medical specialists, improve education benefit programs, and allow the VA to maintain an effective, functioning home loan guaranty program.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5404, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the sponsor of the bill and a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee who has made many important contributions to the welfare of veterans such as this bill we are considering right now.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to tackle the pressing need for VA health care reform, the last

thing our veterans need is even more uncertainty with the many other benefits that have an equally important impact on their lives.

H.R. 5404, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act, extends several important VA authorities that support the services they rely on every single day.

As current military forces overseas draw down, our country must prepare to welcome back thousands of returning soldiers, many of whom are young and aspiring to build a new life for themselves and their loved ones.

For the next year, veterans can continue to utilize programs that help them pay off school debt, for health education, and buy affordable homes, helping their transition into civilian life be an easier one.

For those veterans who require more day-to-day medical care, they can continue to qualify for child care assistance and specially adaptive housing grants, as well as accessing expanded health services, such as those provided by the VA's 70-plus mobile vet centers around the country.

Transportation services to VA medical facilities will also continue, giving peace of mind to the many disabled or rural-based vets that too often find themselves restricted by mobility or distance. In rural districts like mine across the country, veterans often travel over 90 miles for an appointment, disrupting their lives and causing physical and financial hardship.

Additionally, this bill reinforces our fight against homelessness by expanding rehabilitation, counseling, and housing programs to help these underserved veterans get back on their feet. Since 2009, veteran homelessness has dropped 23 percent, largely due to the success of these services. Whenever I travel back to my district and meet with local veteran constituents and organizations, it is clear that these grant programs are making a real difference.

In California's Central Valley, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Stockton has received a grant from the VA that is helping preserve 791 households in San Joaquin County from the threat of homelessness. That is 791 families who have a chance to build a stable home life and keep their kids in school.

As cochair of the Veterans Jobs Caucus, I place especially high importance on the continuance of our essential reintegration and job training programs. Through their service, these hard-working men and women gain the skills and qualities that are highly valued by employers. We must do all we can to connect them with the resources and training they need to land worthwhile jobs that will bring this financial security and dignity to their lives.

In closing, I would just like to thank the ranking member and the chairman as well as all of the committee for

their hard work in putting this bill together. This is a great bipartisan bill that will continue to help the lives of those that have given everything for the freedoms of our country.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), who is also a member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee and likewise has made very solid and important contributions for veterans.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5404. This legislation will continue to protect millions of American veterans who swore to protect and defend this great Nation, including the 54,000 in my district who depend on the VA for care and support.

Earlier this summer, I served as a member of the VA Conference Committee. My fellow conferees and I were able to work together and again prove that helping vets is not political or partisan; it is American.

When that legislation was signed into law, I said it was the first step toward reforming the VA. Today's legislation is yet another step in the right direction. H.R. 5404 would extend the number of important veterans' service programs to vets in rural areas, homeless vets, vets with mental illness, all in an effort to improve their quality of life.

Of the 8 million veterans enrolled in the VA health care system, roughly 3 million live in rural areas. These vets live 30 or more miles from their nearest VA and must travel long distances to receive care. This legislation would give more funding to VSOs to drive their vets to doctors' appointments, increasing their access to care.

This bill also funds programs to help our homeless veterans get back on their feet and reduce the number of homeless veterans. It also helps to fund job training, counseling, and placement services for those vets so they can find a good-paying job. Additionally, and just as importantly, this bill also addresses suffering from mental health issues. This legislation will help fund programs to help vets with mental illness with greater outreach, rehabilitation services, care, and treatment.

Today is an important opportunity as Members of Congress take another step forward towards meaningful reform and to take another step in the right direction. Today we stand together to help our Nation's heroes. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with nothing but the best.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5404 and send this important, must-pass measure to the Senate to ensure that these important programs and services continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

I too urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 5404, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5404, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3593) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3593

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “VA Construction Assistance Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to testimony by the Director of Physical Infrastructure of the General Accountability Office before the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives in May 2013, schedule delays of major medical center construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs have averaged 35 months, with the delays ranging from 14 months to 74 months.

(2) The average cost increase attributed to such delays has been \$336,000,000 per project.

(3) Management of the major medical facility projects currently underway as of the date of the enactment of this Act in Denver, Colorado, Orlando, Florida, and New Orleans, Louisiana, should be subject to the oversight of a special project manager of the Army Corps of Engineers that is independent of the Department of Veterans Affairs because, according to the Comptroller General of the United States, such projects have experienced continuous delays and a total cost increase of nearly \$1,000,000,000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the management of the major medical center construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs has been an abysmal failure; and

(2) in order to minimize repeated delays and cost increases to such projects, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should fully implement all recommendations made by the Comptroller General of the United States in an April 2013 report to improve construction procedures and practices of the Department.

SEC. 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION REFORMS.

Section 8104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i)(1) With respect to each project described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

“(A) use the services of a medical equipment planner as part of the architectural and engineering firm for the project;

“(B) develop and use a project management plan to ensure clear and consistent communication among all parties;

“(C) subject the project to construction peer excellence review;

“(D) develop—

“(i) a metrics program to enable the monitoring of change-order processing time; and

“(ii) goals for the change-order process consistent with the best practices of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(E) to the extent practicable, use design-build processes to minimize multiple change orders.

“(2) A project described in this paragraph is a construction or alteration project that is a major medical facility project.”.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL PROJECT MANAGER FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL CENTER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL PROJECT MANAGER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to procure, on a reimbursable basis, the services of the Army Corps of Engineers with respect to appointing not less than one special project manager who has experience in managing construction projects that exceed \$60,000,000 to oversee covered projects until the date on which the project is completed.

(b) DUTIES.—A special project manager appointed under subsection (a) to oversee a covered project shall—

(1) conduct oversight of all construction-related operations at the project, including with respect to—

(A) the performance of the Department of Veterans Affairs involving the prime contractors; and

(B) the compliance of the Department with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including the VA Acquisition Regulation;

(2) advise and assist the Department in any construction-related activity at the project, including the approval of change-order requests for the purpose of achieving a timely completion of the project; and

(3) conduct independent technical reviews and recommend to the Department best construction practices to improve operations for the project.

(c) PLANS AND REPORT.—

(1) COMPLETION PLANS.—Not later than 90 days after being appointed under subsection (a), a special project manager shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailed plans of the covered project for which the special project manager is so appointed.

(2) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after being appointed under subsection (a), and each 180-day period thereafter until the date on which the covered project is completed, a special project manager shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report detailing the progress of the covered project for which the special project manager is so appointed. Each report shall include—

(A) an analysis of all advice and assistance provided to the Department under subsection (b);

(B) an analysis of all changes ordered by the Department with respect to the project,

or claimed to have been made by contract between the Department and the prime contractor, including the extent to which such changes comply with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including the VA Acquisition Regulation;

(C) an analysis of the communication and working relationship between the Department and the prime contractor, including any recommendations made by the prime contractor to aid in the completion of the project; and

(D) identification of opportunities and recommendations with respect to improving the operation of any construction-related activity to reduce costs or complete the project in a more timely manner.

(d) COOPERATION.—

(1) INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide a special project manager appointed under subsection (a) with any necessary documents or information necessary for the special project manager to carry out subsections (b) and (c).

(2) ASSISTANCE.—Upon request by the special project manager, the Secretary shall provide to the special project manager administrative assistance necessary for the special project manager to carry out subsections (b) and (c).

(e) COVERED PROJECTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered projects” means each construction project that is a major medical facility project (as defined in section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code) that—

(1) was the subject of a report by the Comptroller General of the United States titled “Additional Actions Needed to Decrease Delays and Lower Costs of Major Medical-Facility Projects”, numbered GAO-13-302, and published in April 2013; and

(2) has not been activated to accept patients as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3593, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

In a moment I will yield to the bill’s sponsor, Mr. COFFMAN, for a more detailed description.

The goal of this legislation is to improve the way VA manages its major construction projects.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that VA has a poor track record in managing

major medical facility projects. Major construction projects are routinely completed years late and tens of millions of dollars over budget. Unfortunately, the critically needed VA hospital being constructed in Aurora, Colorado, for instance, has run into major problems, as have a handful of others around the country.

This legislation would direct the inclusion of an outside entity, the Army Corps of Engineers, which has a record of on-time, on-budget completion of projects, to assist in the management of VA's major facility construction efforts.

No longer can veterans afford to wait years for needed facilities to open. This bill finally would move VA away from the status quo, which clearly has not served veterans or the taxpayers well at all.

□ 1915

I would like to commend my colleague and friend, Representative MIKE COFFMAN, and applaud his leadership on this important issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased that we are bringing up a bill that I introduced, along with the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, Representative COFFMAN.

This bill takes aim at two of the VA's most chronic problems: accountability and efficiency. It is also an attempt to make real reforms in the VA construction process.

This bill may not have all the answers, but it is a step forward in a discussion we must have on addressing the facility needs of the VA and ensuring that we are addressing the access requirements in a timely and cost-effective manner.

We have seen time and again how VA has underperformed in the management of its multibillion-dollar construction budgets.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office testified to the committee on a number of significant cost overruns and completion delays.

There may be some disagreement on the metrics and the magnitude of VA shortcomings in this area—and I do wish to note that VA has made steps in the right direction—but in the end, we are faced with a very real issue that VA needs additional expertise with construction management and the acquisition of major medical facilities.

I believe that asking the Army Corps of Engineers to provide the expertise they have to the VA is a step we should explore. I am hopeful that we will pass this bill today and continue the discussion with the members of this committee, the VA, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

This legislation shows what we can do by working across the aisle. It would codify some of the GAO recommendations from 2013, as well as other industry best practices.

H.R. 3593 would also provide technical assistance to the VA in the form of special project managers and design construction evaluations on, particularly, troubled major construction projects.

While I recognize the Corps of Engineers and VA have some reservations with the bill, I believe we can work within the confines of the legislative language to ensure a positive outcome for all parties.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3593 as part of our role as watchdogs on behalf of veterans and taxpayers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for her support of this good piece of legislation.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), who is a member of the VA committee, a subcommittee chairman of the committee, and the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I introduced H.R. 3593, the VA Construction Assistance Act, along with my friend and ranking member, ANN KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, to address significant problems with the VA's construction practices, problems which became public knowledge through our subcommittee's work.

My proposed reforms are designed to speed construction and rein in the out-of-control costs of three major VA regional projects under development in Aurora, Colorado; New Orleans, Louisiana; and Orlando, Florida.

We introduced this legislation late last year based on the investigative work of our subcommittee and in response to a Government Accountability Office report that found that VA's major construction projects had been mired in mismanagement. The report concluded early last year that these projects are more than \$360 million each over budget and almost 3 years on average behind schedule.

The VA Construction Assistance Act implements GAO-recommended reforms by assigning medical equipment planners to these construction projects and streamlining the change order process. The proposal also goes a step further by requiring the assignment of an emergency manager from the Army Corps of Engineers, independent of the VA, to oversee these projects, and only these three major medical facility projects, currently under construction.

The GAO specifically singled out the Army Corps of Engineers as an organization with a record of building similar projects within budget and on schedule for the Department of Defense.

Our veterans cannot simply hope that the situation improves. We must get these construction projects delivered so our Nation's veterans receive the health care services that they have earned while at the same time protecting the taxpayers from massive cost overruns. Notably, this bill is supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion.

As such, I urge each of my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member KIRKPATRICK for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to this legislation. Let me just say, I understand I am the longest-serving member on the VA—23 years—and I understand—don't confuse me with too many facts—that this bill only includes three projects: Denver, Colorado; Orlando, Florida, one that we have been working on for over 25 years; and New Orleans, Louisiana. These projects, all of them, are far too along in the process to inject a special project manager. The Orlando VA Medical Center is currently 94 percent complete and construction is planned to be completed by the end of this year.

New Orleans is 52 percent complete and completion is scheduled for February 2016. The VA and the contractor have signed an agreement on a firm fixed price and are working closely together on the delivery of this project.

I understand that the gentleman from Colorado is concerned about the Denver VA Medical Center. However, the project is 55 percent complete, and any efforts to change the leadership midstream would only delay things further and cost our veterans time and money that could be better spent on their health care.

As a senior member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I know firsthand the amount of critical infrastructure work that the Corps of Engineers have accomplished around the country. With nearly \$6 billion in backlog of authorized civil works projects for the Corps of Engineers and with new, critical port-related projects included in the recent passage of the Water Resources Development Act, there are grave concerns by the Army Corps about their ability to participate in this project, especially the costs that it would relate to the Army Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the letter in the RECORD from the Army Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, Sept. 12 2014.

Hon. CORRINE BROWN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: I am writing in response to your letter to Lieutenant General Thomas P. Bostick dated September 11, 2014, requesting the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers views on H.R. 3593, The VA Construction Assistance Act of 2013, the best way to resolve projects covered under H.R. 3593 and how the Corps is currently working with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) on other projects. H.R. 3593 concerns appointment, duties and reporting of an independent Corps special project manager (PM) to oversee completion of certain covered VA major medical facility construction projects in Denver, Colorado, Orlando, Florida and New Orleans, Louisiana.

The Corps prior experience in use of a special PM with another federal agency was not found to be beneficial. In 2011, the Corps and the Department of Energy (DOE—Environmental Management) conducted a one-year pilot study known as the “Project Management Partnership”. Three senior level positions for Corps persons were established: one at DOE HQ, one at Savannah River, and one at Oak Ridge, to support specific DOE missions and projects. DOE and the Corps agreed to terminate the pilot, as the agencies processes and cultures were found not well aligned. It was also found that inserting a Corps special PM into ongoing DOE projects, especially those experiencing delays and cost growth was not feasible, since the special PM did not have clearly delegated authority responsibility by which to act within DOE.

The appointment of an independent special PM in the case of H.R. 3593 would present a number of problems. A special PM would not have authority with the VA project delivery team or VA contracting officer. A special PM would also not have links to VA’s project or agency automatic information systems. The covered projects’ direct contractual relationship and fiduciary responsibility are between the VA and construction contractor. The Corps is not a party to those contracts. The VA is better situated than the Corps to submit the detailed completion plans and progress reports to the House and Senate Committees on Veterans’ Affairs due to its direct relationship with the construction contractor. Finally, the proposed legislation, as written, is unclear towards which agency must bear the administrative costs resulting from the special PM’s Congressional reporting requirements. The Corps does not have appropriated funding sources that would be legally available to satisfy reporting requirements on the VA’s behalf.

H.R. 3593 effectively establishes a governance mechanism for the covered projects. However, this does not appear to be the matter at hand; project development, acquisition, and execution appear to be the issues for these projects. An alternative approach would be more appropriate to address these matters. An independent review and examination of the covered projects by multi-disciplined Corps design-construction evaluation teams would enjoy both independence and the depth of necessary Corps enterprise support that could recommend an effective path forward for the projects’ completion. Existing authorities coupled with an interagency agreement in a willing partnership between the Corps and VA would provide both parties sufficient authority to enable them to work collaboratively, on a cost reimbursable basis, towards resolving project

delays and cost escalation. An interagency agreement could be arrived at reasonably quickly between VA and the Corps, upon formal request by VA for Corps technical services, for such an evaluation of a covered project.

The Corps, as part of its interagency capabilities, has an established relationship with the VA, providing support for a broad range of facility construction and maintenance requirements. Authority for the Corps’ work with VA is based on the Economy Act, which, coupled with an interagency agreement, provides sufficient authorities to work collaboratively. During 2007, the Corps of Engineers and the VA formalized its relationship through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Corps to provide the VA support in the execution of their minor construction and non-recurring maintenance needs.

Prior to fiscal year 2007, Corps execution support to VA was at or below \$2 million annually for work for the Veterans National Cemetery Administration. In 2007, as a result of the MOA, the workload grew to \$7 million and rose to \$377 million by the turn of the decade through the expansion of the Corps work for the VA. Over the last several years, the Corps managed work at 74 different VA facilities nationwide.

The Corps also is supporting the VA with the development of its project governance processes. Two Corps personnel are currently assigned to VA headquarters to assist with the VA’s development of a VA Program Review Board (PRB) framework that is modeled on the PRB process used by the Corps. The PRB framework will support senior VA leadership in their oversight of construction programs including monitoring of project performance and challenges.

As execution funds have grown over the years so has the collaborative relationship between the Corps and VA. The Corps regional and local offices have developed relationships with each of the 23 Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) offices around the country. Whether and how a VISN incorporates the Corps services into its projects is at the discretion of each VISN.

I hope this response has adequately addressed your questions and concerns related to this matter. If you have additional questions or concerns, please contact me or your staff may contact Mr. Kurt Conrad, Military Programs Liaison at (202) 761-0630.

Sincerely,

LYLOYD O. CALDWELL, P.E.,
Director of Military Programs.

Ms. STELLA S. FIOTES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
OFFICE OF CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES
MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS
AND CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS WITNESS TESTIMONY 03/
25/2014: LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 3593,
THE VA CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF
2013

Section three of the bill would institute certain requirements for VA major medical facility projects, including mandates for the use of a medical equipment planner, use of a project management plan, and use of a construction peer excellence review. It would also require development of a metrics program to enable the monitoring of change-order processing time and goals for the change order process consistent with the “best practices” of other federal agencies.

Section four of the bill would mandate that within 180 days VA enter into an agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to procure a “special project man-

age” on a reimbursable basis to oversee three named current VA major construction projects for facilities in Denver, Colorado, Orlando, Florida, and New Orleans, Louisiana. The bill enumerates the duties of the special project manager and requires that plans and progress reports be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Veterans’ Affairs. It also establishes that VA provide the special project manager with the requisite information and administrative assistance necessary to carry out their tasks.

VA has a strong history of delivering facilities to serve Veterans. In the past 5 years, VA has delivered 75 major construction projects valued at over \$3 billion that include the new medical center complex in Las Vegas, cemeteries, polytrauma rehabilitation centers, spinal cord injury centers, a blind rehabilitation center, and community living centers.

VA appreciates the strong interest and support from the Subcommittee to ensure that our major construction projects, and more specifically the Denver, Colorado, New Orleans, Louisiana, and Orlando, Florida facilities, are delivered successfully. While there have been challenges with these projects, we have taken numerous actions to strengthen and improve our execution of all VA’s ongoing major construction projects, including the three projects that H.R. 3593 addresses. For the reasons expressed below, VA does not believe that the approach outlined in the bill will achieve the desired results, and thus does not support it.

VA believes the creation of a special project manager would be problematic in the management and supervision of these projects. Specifically, the special project manager adds more levels of management and may complicate, if not confuse, the project delivery process. The bill raises serious questions about the contractual relationship between the VA and its contractor, the lines of authority the special project manager will have vis-à-vis VA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the effect upon the independent exercise of discretion by the VA contracting officer, who is ultimately responsible for managing the contract on behalf of the Government. The legislation we believe will also lead to increased management and overhead costs associated with funding the special project manager and support team.

VA continuously evaluates its processes and delivery methods for each lease and construction project on its merits, and we benchmark industry best practices with several agencies including the National Institute of Building Sciences, General Services Administration and the USACE. When VA determines that the best delivery strategy is to employ another agency such as the USACE, this strategy is used. VA and the USACE have a long history of working together to advance VA facility construction and share best practices, and our current discussions are a logical evolution of that relationship.

Since 2008, VA has engaged USACE to support maintenance and minor construction projects at more than 70 of our medical facilities. VA engaged USACE to review the contracts for the New Orleans and Denver projects, and they continue to assist in schedule evaluation in Orlando. More recently, USACE is supporting VA in establishing a Project Review Board process, similar to the process used by USACE districts, and supporting the VA National Cemetery Administration in its maintenance and minor construction program.

As outlined in the cited Government Accountability Office (GAO) testimony and April 2013 report, the delays and cost increases on the Denver, New Orleans and Orlando projects occurred in the planning and design phases; each of these projects is now in the construction phase. Last year, VA took aggressive action on the recommendations in the April 2013 GAO report and all recommendations were closed as of September 2013. Their recommendations included the addition of medical planners, the streamlining of the change order process, and clearer definition of roles and responsibilities in the project management.

In addition to closing the GAO recommendations, VA has worked diligently to address and close all of the recommendations identified through the VA's Construction Review Council (CRC), which was established in 2012 and is chaired by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to serve as the single point of oversight and performance accountability for the VA real property capital asset program. With the personal commitment of the Secretary, and the diligent efforts of senior staff and management, all CRC recommendations have been implemented since October 2013. These recommendations include improvements in the development of requirements, measures aimed at improving design quality, better coordination of funding across the Department to support VA's major construction program, and advances in program management and automation. Through the CRC and the VA Acquisition Program Management Framework that provides for continual project review throughout the project's acquisition life-cycle, VA will continue to drive improvements in the management of VA's real property capital programs.

Our focus across the spectrum of construction project management has led to advancements in our overall construction program. Areas of increased effort include improving requirements definition and acquisition strategies, assessing project risk, assuring timely project and contract administration, partnering with our construction and design contractors, early involvement of the medical equipment planning and procurement teams, and engaging in executive level on-site project reviews. Additionally, the monthly updates provided to the Committees on key projects have increased the transparency in our program.

The way the Department is doing business today has changed significantly since the Orlando, Denver and New Orleans projects were undertaken. The lessons learned and the improvements made have resulted in positive changes and are being applied to help ensure the Department's capital program is delivered on time and within budget.

The costs associated with enactment of this legislation cannot be predicted with specificity, as they will depend on the scope and details of the arrangement mandated to be concluded with the USACE under the bill.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with prior experience, the Army Corps has indicated that this kind of agreement does not work. They presently have all of the authorization they need to work with VA. And, in fact, they—the VA—spent \$377 million at 74 projects they already participate in nationwide, so they don't need an additional authorization.

What this bill would do would only slow down the project in Orlando. I have spent—and all of the Members

from the Orlando area and from Florida—we have spent years on this problem, and it is not just the VA's problem. For years, we did not have any construction going on with the VA. These projects, these last projects, we hadn't done any construction in the VA in 15 years, so certainly a lot of the expertise was gone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. But now it is not a benefit to have additional responsibilities placed particularly in Orlando at this time. We have a project that is close to completion. We want to bring this project in on time. By the time this bill is ever passed and signed into law, I am hoping that the veterans will be in the VA facility in Orlando, Florida.

In addition, we have worked with them—and the people who are handling it are not just the VA—the construction people. It has been a problem all along. I am not saying that the Army Corps could not be helpful, but at this time they absolutely cannot be helpful in this project.

So as we move forward, take Orlando out of what you are proposing. It is too late. We are ready for our VA facility to open up in Orlando, Florida, and to serve the veterans of the central Florida area. May God continue to bless America, and certainly the veterans deserve to be able to move into the VA facility in the Orlando, central Florida, area.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. COFFMAN for bringing this bill. I think it is extremely important, and it directly affects the Omaha VA in-patient facility, as well as veterans all around the Midwest area.

The cost overruns of the Denver, or the Aurora hospital, as well as Orlando and others, have been noted in the GAO report showing that these hospitals on average are 35 months delayed and somewhere between 300 and \$400 million over budget. It shows a serious inability of the VA's construction and management subagency to manage and run these projects.

I am pleased that this legislation would require the VA to employ at least one special project manager from the Corps of Engineers. It has been noted by every speaker here today that the Corps of Engineers has a specialty, a somewhat amazing ability to get projects done on time and on budget, so having their level of expertise injected into this, even if it is just an advisory or a consulting role, I think is an important first step.

I would prefer that we just turned it all over, the VA hospital construction,

to something like the Corps of Engineers, but this is a legitimate good first step in this process.

Now, our Omaha facility remains number 23. It has been in that area now for 6 years, and it looks like unless we improve this process and get their spending under control that it could be more than a decade before our new VA in-patient replaces an over 60-year-old building where they had no water for one 24-hour period because of the poor infrastructure. So that is how we are harming our veterans by not getting these projects done on time and within budget.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for taking charge of this issue and all of the conversations you and I have had about this over the last couple of years.

□ 1930

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

I think, again, going back to this Government Accountability report, it says that, on average, these projects are \$366 million over budget; on average, these projects are 35 months behind schedule. There are a number of recommendations that are taken right from this report that are part of this bill.

One recommendation that wasn't specifically in the bill, but it was mentioned in the bill by referencing that the Army Corps of Engineers basically builds the same projects for the Department of Defense—the hospitals—on schedule and within budget.

We are talking about, again, hundreds of millions of dollars wasted in every single facility that is not going to the health care our veterans have earned; so I think it is only right that we move forward with this, not only to be fair to the men and women who have served us in uniform and sacrificed so much in defense of this country and giving them the benefits that they have earned through their service, but also out of respect to the taxpayers of the United States who have basically had their hard-earned dollars wasted in building these projects with these incredible and massive cost overruns.

I have had countless meetings with the Corps of Engineers, and they said that they could not publicly state their support for this, but I have given this legislation to them and said, "Come back to me if you have any issues with it."

They did not other than to say they feel prospectively they should be the ones managing these projects, period. My bill does not address that prospectively.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues support H.R. 3593 and work with our partners in the executive branch to improve the delivery of facilities for our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I too thank the gentlewoman from Arizona once again for her bipartisan support of this good piece of legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues in the U.S. House to support H.R. 3593, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3593, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4276) to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Care Improvement Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTED LIVING SERVICES FOR VETERANS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) MODIFICATION OF REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (e) of section 1705 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 38 U.S.C. 1710C note) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each calendar quarter occurring during the period beginning January 1, 2015, and ending September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include each of the following for the quarter preceding the quarter during which the report is submitted the following:

“(i) The number of individuals that participated in the pilot program.

“(ii) The number of individuals that successfully completed the pilot program.

“(iii) The degree to which pilot program participants and family members of pilot program participants were satisfied with the pilot program.

“(iv) The interim findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the success

of the pilot program and recommendations for improvement.

“(2) FINAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a final report on the pilot program.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—The final report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

“(i) A description of the pilot program.

“(ii) The Secretary’s assessment of the utility of the activities carried out under the pilot program in enhancing the rehabilitation, quality of life, and community reintegration of veterans with traumatic brain injury.

“(iii) An evaluation of the pilot program in light of independent living programs carried out by the Secretary under title 38, United States Code, including—

“(I) whether the pilot program duplicates services provided under such independent living programs;

“(II) the ways in which the pilot program provides different services that the services provided under such independent living program;

“(III) how the pilot program could be better defined or shaped; and

“(IV) whether the pilot program should be incorporated into such independent living programs.

“(iv) Such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding improving the pilot program.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY-BASED BRAIN INJURY RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATIVE CARE SERVICES.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “ASSISTED LIVING” and inserting “COMMUNITY-BASED BRAIN INJURY RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATIVE CARE”;

(2) in subsection (c), in the subsection heading, by striking “ASSISTED LIVING” and inserting “COMMUNITY-BASED BRAIN INJURY RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATIVE CARE”;

(3) by striking “assisted living” each place it appears, and inserting “community-based brain injury rehabilitative care”; and

(4) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “and personal care” and inserting “rehabilitation, and personal care”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks to H.R. 4276, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4276, as amended, would require the Department of Veterans Affairs, beginning in January, to provide reports to Congress on the pilot program for assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury.

With passage of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act earlier this year, we were able to extend this important program for another 3 years. As of June 1 of this year, 187 veterans from 46 different facilities in 22 States have been enrolled for services.

These are severely injured veterans who still want to live within their communities. For that reason, this bill also amends the definition of “assisted living” to encompass community-based brain injury residential rehabilitative care.

Too often, pilot programs are initiated and abandoned by the VA with little reporting or data analysis as to the effectiveness or efficiency of the program. That is why this bill is important.

It would require the Secretary to provide quarterly reports to Congress on utilization, status, and veteran satisfaction as well as interim assessments as to the success of the program and recommendations for improvement.

It would also require a final report as to how the VA would expect to continue or integrate this pilot into other services that are vital for enhancing the quality of life for those veterans suffering from what has been called one of the signature wounds of recent conflicts, traumatic brain injury, or TBI.

I am grateful to Representative BILL CASSIDY, my friend and colleague from Louisiana, for his leadership in introducing this legislation, and I am proud to join him in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Traumatic brain injury has become a signature wound of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. These conflicts have caused hundreds of thousands of servicemembers to sustain TBIs.

The Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act extended the pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with TBI until October 2017. This pilot has helped nearly 200 veterans with moderate to severe brain injuries, and this program fills a treatment need which residential VA facilities currently cannot handle.

H.R. 4276 will improve the reporting requirements for the TBI assisted living pilot program so that we can better gauge its success and expand the definition of community-based residential

rehabilitative services so that veterans with TBI have other residential and home-based assisted living options.

Congress has provided significant resources for this program, currently approaching \$30 million per year. Reports show that veterans believe this is a successful and popular program, but we in Congress must provide vital oversight so that innovative pilot programs meet our veterans' needs. This is why we need better data on the cost and benefits of this program to veterans.

This bill will require the VA to submit detailed quarterly reports on this pilot program. I believe that these increased reporting requirements will ensure that the VA is providing the best rehabilitative services for our veterans with TBI.

Earlier this year, I held a field hearing on access to care for veterans with TBI at the VA medical center in Tucson, Arizona. The Tucson VA's polytrauma care unit is one of several VA centers across the country that is at the very forefront of providing care and rehabilitative services for veterans with TBI.

I believe the VA's cutting-edge treatments and its coordinated care for veterans with TBI serve as a model for innovative care that could be expanded to other medical specialties so that the VA may better address the unique health care needs of our veterans.

In the coming months, we must look to fundamentally reform the VA in how it provides benefits and services to veterans. We must look to some of the VA health care delivery programs that show promise, such as the assisted living pilot program, to implement best practices throughout the VA system that will give our veterans the timely, world-class health care they deserve. I look forward to engaging my colleagues and veterans in this goal.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4276, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative BILL CASSIDY, my friend and colleague and a sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, over 19 percent of returning veterans suffer from some form of traumatic brain injury.

That is why in March I introduced H.R. 4276 which would extend a VA pilot program to care for those suffering from traumatic brain injury, or TBI, and was pleased when a portion of this bill was included in the Veterans Access to Care Act of 2014.

In addition to extending the program for a longer length of time, my bill also created metrics for determining the success of the program.

I am pleased the House will now vote on the amended portion of my bill which creates more thorough, frequent reporting requirements and expands

the definition of "assisted living" to encompass broader definitions of care. The expanded reporting requirements allow for a more thorough determination of how successful this program is in rehabilitating patients suffering from TBI.

I am a doc. I know that, unless you measure something, it will not change. If we measure and find it doing well, hopefully, we expand; if not, we improve it.

It will also measure the satisfaction that the veteran and their family members have with the program. By expanding the definition of "assisted living," the bill also allows for more partnerships to take place with non-VA facilities so that veterans can receive the kind of care that serves their unique needs.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to care for our veterans and ensure they receive the best care available. I thank Chairman MILLER for working with me on this legislation.

I appreciate the opportunity to have it considered, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the ranking member. This is certainly a bill that I can support.

H.R. 4276 would improve the reporting requirement for the TBI assisted living pilot program so that we can better gauge its success and expansion of the definition of the community-based residential rehabilitation services so that veterans who have TBI have other residential and home-based assisted living options.

I think it is important for us to go back to what the first President of the United States said about any war that we participate in:

"The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justifiable, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country."

We are not just talking about this on Veterans Day, but about how we treat them and how we support them every day. I think this bill goes a long way to deal with some of the problems that they are experiencing after returning from the last two wars; so this is certainly a bill that I can support.

I want to say may God continue to bless America. I want to thank the veterans for their service—and not just thanking them, but this is really putting your money where your mouth is.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4276, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I too encourage all Members to support H.R. 4276, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4276, the Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Improvement Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which have demanded multiple deployments for many of our nation's courageous soldiers, have taken a psychological toll on U.S. service members.

As our brave military men and women fight to defend our great country, they put themselves at risk of combat-related health problems, including traumatic brain injury (TBI), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other brain related maladies.

More than 280,000 United States service members have been diagnosed with a degree of TBI in the past 10 years, and more than 19 percent of veterans may have some form of the disorder.

There is no doubt that these fearless men and women suffering from traumatic brain injuries deserve not only our gratitude, but also our support throughout recovery and treatment.

Thanks to the Assisted Living Pilot Program, these veterans struggling daily with TBI will be provided with 24-hour assisted living help.

Mr. Speaker, our United States veterans bravely put their life on the line to defend our freedoms and to keep our nation safe.

By passing H.R. 4276, veterans combating TBI and PTSD will receive assistance to enhance their rehabilitation, quality of life, and community integration.

The Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Care Act expands the requirements for Veterans Affairs Department reports to affirm the enrollment, completion, and effectiveness of the pilot program.

The community-integrated rehabilitation treatment provided by the pilot program will serve as a vital resource to our veterans as they overcome burdensome health problems.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4276 to show their support and gratitude for the sacrifices made by our service men and women, and to ensure that veterans battling traumatic brain injuries receive the care and rehabilitation they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4276, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2258) to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of

compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) **RATE ADJUSTMENT.**—Effective on December 1, 2014, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2014, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.**—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.**—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.**—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) **CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.**—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) **DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.**—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) **DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.**—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.**—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2014, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) **PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased under subsection (a), not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1945

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2258.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I rise today in favor of S. 2258, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, it is timely that we consider this legislation today, having just observed last week the 13th anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks on our homeland, the catalyst for our efforts to fight terrorism.

Many of those who have sacrificed so much in recent and past conflicts aimed to protect America from harm are in continued and increased need. This is critical legislation that authorizes a cost-of-living adjustment for disabled veterans receiving disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs and other compensation for survivors of veterans who have died as a result of their services to our country.

The amount of the payment increases will be determined by the Consumer Price Index, which controls the cost-of-living adjustment for Social Security payments as well.

I would like to thank Congressman RUNYAN of New Jersey, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs within the Committee on Veterans Affairs, for introducing H.R. 4095, a companion bill to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate passed S. 2258, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014, which provides that veterans receive a cost-of-living adjustment beginning in December. Today, the House can also act to ensure veterans continue to receive the support they deserve.

This is a bill that we must pass every year in order to ensure that the benefits we pay our veterans do not lose purchasing power because of inflation. Today we have the opportunity to pass this measure and send it to the President’s desk.

This bill directs the VA to increase the rates of veterans’ disability compensation, provide additional com-

ensation for disabled veterans with dependents, ensure certain disabled veterans receive a clothing allowance, and increase dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children. These adjustments would be made effective December 1, 2014, and match the increase in Social Security benefits.

S. 2258 will assist the estimated 4.5 million veterans and survivors who receive these monthly benefits and often depend upon these payments to make ends meet. For some, it is their only source of income.

Without this annual COLA increase, veterans, their families and survivors, would see the value of their hard-earned benefits slowly erode. Providing for this cost-of-living increase is another important thing Congress can do to help veterans and their families that have already sacrificed so much for us.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2258, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding to me and for all her hard work on behalf of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, I rise in support of S. 2258, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act.

Unlike Social Security COLA increases, Congress must act each year to provide veterans with the COLA increase that they earned and deserved.

I was proud to introduce the corresponding legislation in the House with our subcommittee chairman, JON RUNYAN. Together, we also introduced legislation to make this yearly adjustment automatic.

So today, the House will pass a number of bills that are designed to meet the bipartisan goal of ensuring our Nation’s heroes receive all the benefits they have earned. But there is an important bill that has been blocked from consideration in the House. That bill is H.R. 2529, the Veteran Spouses Equal Treatment Act, which would provide all married veterans and their families access to Federal benefits that they deserve.

Last week in the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee, only one Republican had the courage to vote to provide access to VA benefits to legally married, same-sex couples, regardless of where they live, couples who received the benefits while they were in the military but lost them upon becoming veterans if they reside in certain States.

We heard all types of pitiful excuses. We heard that it was unconstitutional

for Congress to force States to adopt Federal directives. That is ridiculous and intellectually dishonest. In fact, this House voted unanimously earlier this year to mandate that States provide instate tuition for veterans, a bill authored by the very Member who made the specious states' rights argument against H.R. 2529. And if you can even believe it, we heard process arguments as an excuse for not doing the right thing. I would remind my colleagues that they are the ones who make the process.

So when we vote today to adjust the COLA, remember that this increase is meaningless to thousands of our Nation's heroes in States like Texas, Florida, and North Carolina. They will not be receiving the benefits they earned and deserve. It is shameful and it is unfair.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2258, I would remind them of these facts and implore the Republican leadership to do the right thing and bring H.R. 2529 to the floor for a vote so all veterans will get the benefits they earned and deserve.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2258 and send this important bill to the President today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I too urge all Members to support S. 2258, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, thank you, Chairman MILLER, for your work to bring this legislation to the floor of the House that is so important to so many veterans depending on VA compensation.

This legislation affects the benefits of all veterans, by raising the compensation they receive to allow them to continue to buy the products they need to live.

It is important to pass this clean bill to make sure that those who have sacrificed to protect the freedoms we hold most dear do not suffer in these tough economic times.

In the words of the first President of the United States, George Washington:

"The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2258, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, it is an undeniable truth that our military veterans deserve our deepest gratitude for the courage and valor they demonstrated while defending the United States of America.

One way the nation can express its deepest appreciation for our service men and women is by assisting disabled veterans with compensation and financial support.

The VA estimated that it will provide compensation to over 4 million beneficiaries in FY 2014.

Among the veterans estimated to receive such compensation are:

136,897 World War II veterans
140,169 Korean War veterans
1,327,348 Vietnam-era veterans
1,546,030 Gulf War-era veterans
695,574 veterans who served during peacetime

Close to half of the nearly 2 million veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have or will seek compensation for service-related injuries, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

We must be certain that disability compensation provides adequate assistance to veterans, and this bill does so by increasing the amounts paid by the same cost-of-living adjustment that will be payable to Social Security recipients.

Mr. Speaker, not only does S. 2258 benefit our injured veterans, it also helps the families of these injured service members by providing increased compensation for dependents and surviving spouses.

By passing S. 2258, countless veterans and their families would have financial stress alleviated thanks to increased rates of veterans' disability compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all members to support the passage of S. 2258 to ensure that all of our courageous veterans receive adequate disability compensation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2258.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 24) to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 24

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Comptroller General shall complete an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under sub-

section (b) of such section 714 within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the audit required pursuant to subsection (a) is completed, the Comptroller General—

(A) shall submit to Congress a report on such audit; and

(B) shall make such report available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests the report.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "or (f)";

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "or (f)"; and

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking "or (f)"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "or (f)"; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 24, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act, directs the GAO to conduct a full audit of the Federal Reserve.

The Dodd-Frank legislation mandated a GAO audit of the Fed, but that audit issued by the GAO in July of 2011 focused solely on certain issues concerning emergency credit facilities. GAO remains restricted under the current law from conducting a broader audit of the Fed that includes, for instance, a review of the Fed's monetary policy operations and its agreements with foreign governments and central banks.

Under this bill, the GAO, as the investigative arm of Congress, is allowed

to conduct the audit that reviews all these transactions and is required to report such findings of the audit to Congress.

Now, while Congress should not manage the details of monetary policy, it needs to be able to conduct oversight of the Fed. The Fed was created by Congress to be a central bank independent of influence of the U.S. Treasury. It was never intended to be a second Treasury Department.

In recent years, the Fed's extraordinary interventions into the economy and financial markets have led some to call into question its independence. The Fed remains ultimately responsible to the American people and their elected representatives. This is why H.R. 24 has strong bipartisan support, with 228 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. A version of this bill passed the House of Representatives last Congress by a vote of 327–98.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for working with me to bring this legislation to the floor. I will insert our letters of exchange in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I encourage and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: On July 24, 2014, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered H.R. 24, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2013, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 24, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 24, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOV-
ERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on the Financial Services' jurisdictional interest in H.R. 24, the "Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2013," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 24 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 24 and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 24. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to H.R. 24.

Let me be clear. I support transparency surrounding the operations of the Federal Reserve. Transparency helps ensure that the Federal Reserve is implementing policies that will achieve the objectives given to it by Congress: supporting maximum employment, price stability, and moderate, long-term interest rates.

I emphasize, however, that the Federal Reserve has been subject to audit since 1978. Further, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which I supported, significantly expanded the authority of the Government Accountability Office to examine the Federal Reserve's operations.

It also required the Federal Reserve to make public a wider range of data than it had previously disclosed. For example, Dodd-Frank authorized GAO to begin auditing discount window operations and required the Federal Reserve to begin releasing information about emergency credit transactions and discount lending programs.

Critically, however, Dodd-Frank ensured that transparency surrounding the Fed's operations was expanded in a way that would not compromise the Fed's ability to review and alter monetary policy without fear that its internal deliberations would be made public.

Mr. Speaker, if enacted, this bill would severely curtail the independence that has been a hallmark for the Federal Reserve and has been essential to its ability to strengthen our country. Specifically, H.R. 24 would permit GAO to audit the communications that members of the Federal Reserve's

Board of Governors have with each other and with staff regarding monetary policy.

The act would also permit GAO to audit transactions conducted under the direction of the Federal Open Market Committee. Such audits, which could be conducted on an almost real-time basis under this bill, could have a chilling effect on the Fed. If board members know that their statements may become public, they may be inhibited from speaking candidly about the economic trends they are observing or the monetary policies they believe would best respond to current conditions. Further, simply by requesting that the GAO conduct certain audits, Members of Congress could seek to influence the Fed's deliberations and policy decisions.

The Federal Reserve is responsible for stewarding monetary policies that will support our Nation's long-term growth. We should expand transparency surrounding the Federal Reserve in a way that will ensure short-term political considerations do not unduly influence the Federal Reserve's monetary policymaking responsibilities.

The Oversight Committee has not held a single hearing or heard a single witness regarding the far-reaching consequences that passage of this legislation could have. I oppose this legislation, and I urge Members to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia (Mr. BROUN), a man who has worked very hard on this particular issue.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the United States Constitution, article I, section 8, where it enumerates the powers of Congress, one of those powers is, as I am reading, "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin."

In 1913, Congress abdicated its responsibility and its duty over to the Federal Reserve. It is unconstitutional that we have done so, and it has caused some disastrous effects.

I thank my friend Mr. MEADOWS for yielding me time to speak on behalf of H.R. 24, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act, better known as "Audit the Fed."

This is the same bill that passed the U.S. House in the 112th Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. This is a vital piece of legislation that will help to usher in a new era of transparency in this Nation's monetary policy, and I am pleased to speak on its behalf with my colleagues.

Over the century, since its inception in 1913, the Federal Reserve has controlled our Nation's monetary policy—

and therefore our economy—under a veil of secrecy. Throughout these last 100 years, Congress has only exercised a relatively small degree of oversight over the Federal Reserve. This lack of accountability has led to grievous consequences, and this must end.

For instance, since the Federal Reserve establishment in 1913, the value of the U.S. dollar has fallen 95 percent. In other words, the value of today's dollar is approximately worth one nickel of what a dollar was worth in 1913. What this does is cause a dramatic decline in the value of the U.S. dollar, and it is driven by the easy money policies of the Federal Reserve.

What does this mean in practical terms for the American people?

The steady decline of the U.S. dollar punishes thrift and savings, erodes the value of those savings, and harms older Americans living on fixed incomes. Just as bad, the expansion in money supply under the Federal Reserve has led to an unstable environment of booms and busts that have wrecked the financial security and stability of average Americans. This hurts poor people and senior citizens and the middle class the absolute most. Rich people will do fine with the policies of the Federal Reserve. Wall Street bankers and the big money folks are fine, but the policies of the Federal Reserve hurt poor folks, they hurt senior citizens, and they hurt the middle class. It is not fair.

Since the 2008 financial crisis, the Federal Reserve's balance sheet has grown at an unprecedented rate, and it now contains \$4 trillion worth of assets. At the same time, the enactment of the Dodd-Frank financial reform law has granted the Federal Reserve a greater role than ever in managing our economy and in overseeing the regulation of our financial system. Yet, in spite of the undeniable importance of the Federal Reserve, current law specifically prohibits audits of the Federal Reserve's deliberations, discussions, or actions on monetary policy.

In 2011, a partial audit of the Federal Reserve, required by the Dodd-Frank law, found that the Fed had loaned \$16 trillion to financial institutions, some of which were not even American, between 2007 and 2010. This incredible sum was quietly loaned out with no public notice and no congressional oversight. If this is the sort of activity brought to light by just a partial audit, then I believe this further highlights the absolute necessity of a full audit. This bill will require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve and of the Federal Reserve banks within 12 months of enactment.

The Federal Reserve is a creation of Congress, and it must therefore be subject to the oversight and regulation of Congress.

I must recognize and commend the leadership and years of work by my

friend and colleague, Dr. Ron Paul, on this important issue. In the last Congress, Dr. Paul's bill amassed a bipartisan coalition that saw this legislation pass in a 327-98 vote. I am deeply honored to carry on this legacy of Dr. Paul's.

I urge my colleagues here in the House to support this important piece of legislation, and I urge our friends in the Senate to take up this bill's counterpart by my medical colleague, Senator RAND PAUL's S. 209.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my friend and colleague Congressman PAUL BROWN's Federal Reserve Transparency Act, otherwise known as "Audit the Fed."

Our mutual friend and predecessor, Congressman Ron Paul, first introduced this bill back in 1983. His often lonely voice and courageous efforts to shed light on the secretive and harmful actions of the Federal Reserve have finally paid off over 30 years later. In July of 2012, Congressman Paul's "Audit the Fed" bill passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote of 327-98. Sadly, it has yet to receive a vote in the Senate.

As Congressman Ron Paul stated here on the House floor in 2011, in words that remain current and relevant today in 2014:

Throughout its nearly 100-year history, the Federal Reserve has presided over the near-complete destruction of the United States dollar. Since 1913, the dollar has lost over 98 percent of its purchasing power, aided and abetted by the Federal Reserve's loose monetary policy. How long will we as a Congress stand idly by while hardworking Americans see their savings eaten away by inflation? Only big spending politicians and politically favored bankers benefit from inflation.

Since its inception, the Federal Reserve has always operated in the shadows, without sufficient scrutiny or oversight of its operations. While the conventional excuse is that this is intended to reduce the Fed's susceptibility to political pressures, the reality is that the Fed acts as a foil for the government. Whenever you question the Fed about the strength of the dollar, they will refer you to the Treasury and vice versa. The Federal Reserve has, on the one hand, many of the privileges of government agencies while retaining benefits of private organizations, such as being largely insulated from Freedom of Information Act requests.

The Federal Reserve can enter into agreements with foreign central banks and foreign governments, and the GAO is prohibited from auditing these agreements. Why should a government-established agency, whose police force has Federal law enforcement powers and whose notes have legal tender status in this country, be allowed to enter into agreements with foreign powers and foreign banking institutions with no oversight?

Particularly because the Fed has operated swap lines with foreign central banks and

provided hundreds of billions of dollars of bailouts to foreign commercial banks, the Fed's negotiations with the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements, and other foreign institutions should face increased scrutiny, most especially because of their significant effect on foreign policy. Given the currency crisis in Europe and the prospect of the Fed propping up foreign governments or bailing out American banks invested in European debt, this issue is of especially pressing concern.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MASSIE. Thank you.

Congressman Ron Paul's words are even more true today than they were then, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. It is time to force the Federal Reserve to operate by the same standards of transparency and accountability to the taxpayers that we should demand of all government agencies.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I have no additional people wishing to speak on this particular bill, but I would like to read one statement from Senator RAND PAUL. He said: "It is time for more transparency in virtually every part of our government."

I think most Americans can agree on that, and the Fed is the most logical place to start. I hope the House passes the "Audit the Fed" bill, and I look forward to pushing this bill in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I will be brief, but I urge Members to vote against the legislation. I think it is a giant step in the wrong direction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Tonight, we have heard from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who not only has authored this legislation but has pushed at every attempt to make sure that we have accountability and transparency. The American people deserve that.

When much of the financial crisis was happening in 2008, this very body debated over and over again on whether a stimulus should be put forth to stimulate the economy. At the same time, the Federal Reserve was making investment dollars that made that stimulus package look very small in comparison. Yet we are to assume that, like other government agencies, they are doing everything correctly. We know, as history has shown us, that that is not always the case.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this particular bill—to support transparency, to let the accountability be with the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 24, a bill that would undermine the Federal Reserve's independence and politicize its monetary policy decision making.

Mr. Speaker, this so called "Federal Reserve Transparency Act" has little to do with bringing transparency and accountability to the Federal Reserve. The truth is—this bill is nothing more than an effort to pressure and discourage the Fed from ever again being able to take the extraordinary action it has taken in recent years—action which has lowered unemployment, stabilized prices, and kept our economy from entering a second Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve is already subject to extensive transparency, oversight and disclosure requirements, including regular audits with limited exemptions.

The fact is, since 1982 the Government Accountability Office has had the authority to audit the books of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks. And in 2009, as part of the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress required GAO to audit the emergency lending facilities created in response to the financial crisis. This has already been accomplished and the results of the audit are posted on the Federal Reserve's website.

If that wasn't enough, the Board's financial statements are audited on an annual basis by an outside auditor—and the results are published in the Board's Annual Report.

In addition to audits of its financial statements and emergency lending programs, the Federal Reserve provides comprehensive communication on monetary policy deliberations—releasing statements, publishing minutes and issuing transcripts following the completion of Federal Open Market Committee Meetings.

Furthermore, since 2011 the Chairman of the Federal Reserve has held regular press conferences to discuss the outlook for the economy and explain the rationale for its Federal Reserve policy decisions.

I find it baffling that we are here debating whether the Federal Reserve should be more open and transparent—even as Janet Yellen is scheduled to hold a press conference to discuss the outlook for monetary policy tomorrow afternoon.

While the Fed's decisions are—and must continue to be—transparent, it is also imperative that monetary policy decision making remain insulated from short-term political pressures—in order to promote economic growth and keep inflation in check.

But Mr. Speaker, this legislation would empower the GAO to investigate any and all policy decisions made by members of the Federal Reserve's rate setting committee, including decisions about when, and how, to unwind the Federal Reserve's ongoing stimulus program.

Doing so would wipe out all of the statutory protections that ensure deliberations, decisions, and actions on monetary policy matters are shielded from second guessing.

By empowering the GAO to challenge the decisions of Fed policy experts, and make legislative or administrative recommendations to the Congress, this measure aims to inject political pressure into monetary policy deci-

sions—something that would undermine the Fed's ability to make the tough—and sometimes unpopular—decisions that are necessary for the good of the economy.

But this is not the Republican Majority's first politically motivated assault on the Federal Reserve's independence. We've seen this time and again.

Earlier this year Financial Services Committee Republicans took up and passed the "FRAT Act", a bill which virtually eliminates any discretion the Fed has to set monetary policy—by forcing it to make decisions in accordance with a mathematical formula and by requiring GAO to investigate any deviation from it—even in the case of changing economic conditions.

Such absurd constraints on the Federal Reserve would inevitably increase uncertainty surrounding policy decisions, and decrease the public's confidence that the Fed can act appropriately in response to new economic realities.

In closing I would reiterate that it is important for the American people to understand that these bills are not designed to address real problems, or a lack of transparency. Rather, the FRAT Act—and the bill before us today—are unnecessary.

They will cause needless uncertainty and undermine the Fed's ability to conduct monetary policy in an independent manner.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 24, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5169) to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5169

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Senior Executive Service Accountability Act".

SEC. 2. BIENNIAL JUSTIFICATION OF POSITIONS.

Section 3133(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "positions" the following: " , with a justification for each position (by title and organizational

location) and the specific result expected from each position, including the impact of such result on the agency mission,".

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3393(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "1-year" and inserting "2-year".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3592(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking "1-year" and inserting "2-year".

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF PAY RETENTION FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE MEMBERS REMOVED FOR UNDER PERFORMANCE.

Section 3594(c)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(B)(i) any career appointee placed under subsection (a) or (b)(2) of this section shall be entitled to receive basic pay at the highest of—

"(I) the rate of basic pay in effect for the position in which placed;

"(II) the rate of basic pay in effect at the time of the placement for the position the career appointee held in the civil service immediately before being appointed to the Senior Executive Service; or

"(III) the rate of basic pay in effect for the career appointee immediately before being placed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section; and

"(ii) any career appointee placed under subsection (b)(1) of this section shall be entitled to receive basic pay at the rate of basic pay in effect for the position in which placed; and".

SEC. 5. REQUIREMENT THAT PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS BE ESTABLISHED IN ADVANCE.

Section 4312(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "on or" and inserting "not later than 30 calendar days"; and

(2) by inserting "in writing" after "communicated".

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS TO ADVERSE ACTION PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO CAREER APPOINTEES IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.

(a) SUSPENSION FOR 14 DAYS OR LESS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEE.—Paragraph (1) of Section 7501 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'employee' means—

"(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary period or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

"(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

"(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d); or

"(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service; and".

(b) MODIFICATION OF CAUSE AND PROCEDURE FOR SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "misconduct," and inserting "such cause as would promote the efficiency of the service, misconduct,";

(B) in subsection (b)(4), by adding at the end before the period the following: " , but no later than 30 days after the date that the employee's answer was received under paragraph (2)";

(C) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively;

(D) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) An agency head may extend the deadline for an employee to answer under subsection (b)(2) or the deadline for the agency to issue a written decision under subsection (b)(4) for no more than 30 days each. Any extension by the agency head under this subsection must be in writing and document the reasons for granting the extension.”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(g)(1) With respect to an employee subject to removal under this subchapter, if a final order or decision is issued in favor of the agency by the agency, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or the applicable reviewing court under section 7703, the employee—

“(A) shall pay to the agency an amount equal to any pay received by the employee during the period beginning on the date that the employee received notice under subsection (b)(1) and ending on the date of such final order or decision; and

“(B) have removed from such employee's credit any annual leave accrued during such period.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall apply only to an employee who, during the period described in paragraph (1)(A), is placed on administrative leave or any other type of leave whereby the employee is in a status without duties but with pay.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subchapter V of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 3593—

(i) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “misconduct,” and inserting “such cause as would promote the efficiency of the service, misconduct,”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “misconduct,” and inserting “such cause as would promote the efficiency of the service, misconduct,”; and

(B) in section 3594(a), by striking “misconduct,” and inserting “such cause as would promote the efficiency of the service, misconduct,”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Congress looks to the Senior Executive Service, or “SES” as we refer to it, to provide leadership so that the government may successfully deliver services to the American people.

A 1978 law creating the SES intended it to be an elite corps of leaders serving just below the high-level Presidential appointees. The roughly 8,000 SES members are spread across government agencies and are intended to be that link between the political appointees and agencies' career workforce.

In a budget-constrained environment, senior executives must be good stewards of the taxpayer dollars so citizens receive the best value for their money. Unfortunately, the Oversight Committee's investigations have, time and time again, identified SES members embroiled in agency scandals. This has created a need to restore the public confidence by increasing accountability and performance within the government's executive corps.

In February of 2012, the committee began investigating allegations that the Internal Revenue Service inappropriately scrutinized certain applicants who were seeking tax-exempt status. Documents and information showed that SES member Lois Lerner, the Director of the IRS' exempt organization unit, was extensively involved in the targeting of conservative groups' tax-exempt organizations while working to maintain a veneer of objective enforcement.

In April of 2012, the committee began investigating SES member Jeff Neely for the excessive, wasteful and, in some cases, impermissible waste of taxpayer dollars associated with the GSA conferences, at a luxury resort in Las Vegas.

□ 2015

Mr. Neely directed those planning the conference to make it over the top; thus it came as no surprise when photos surfaced of Mr. Neely relaxing in a Las Vegas hot tub on the taxpayers' dime.

Senior Executive Servicemembers also chose to conceal problems within the VA health care system. With more than 20 veterans' deaths linked to substandard care, the work of the VA inspector general and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, under Chairman MILLER, paints a very disturbing picture.

In response to all of this, H.R. 5169 gives agencies the tools to better manage their senior executives. The bill eliminates a provision in the current law that allows an executive removed for performance and placed in a new Federal job to retain their executive salary. I might add that that averages \$161,000.

The bill makes senior executives subject to suspensions without pay for less than 2 weeks instead of a simple reprimand or admonishment in the same manner as frontline employees would receive. The bill makes senior executives accountable for conduct contrary to the efficiency of the Federal service.

The bill extends the probationary period for senior executives from 1 year to 2 years, and, if used properly, that probationary period gives agencies an effective tool to ensure that executives are productive. If executives are not performing in an acceptable level, they will be terminated.

The bill ensures that senior executives receive their performance plans—

the foundation of accountability for poor and high performance—at least 30 days in writing before the appraisal cycle begins.

Mr. Speaker, following the committee's consideration, we have worked on a bipartisan basis to address the concerns of the minority.

First, the bill before the House today reflects the adoption of the amendment offered and withdrawn at the markup of the bill by the Delegate from the District of Columbia and maintains a requirement for agencies to provide 30 days' advanced notice to senior executives facing termination.

Second, the bill requires agencies to make a decision on termination and other disciplinary actions within 30 days of receiving the employee's response to that proposed action.

Finally, the bill ensures that senior executives fired for misconduct return any salary and leave accrued while on nonduty status. This means that the executive retains his or her avenues to appeal but, in the end, if terminated, is required to make the taxpayer whole.

Combined, these changes bring needed accountability to the Federal Government's executive leadership core.

I urge the Members of the House to support this measure, joining me in providing agencies additional tools to address instances where senior government officials are engaging in behavior contrary to the principles of public service.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Oversight Committee Chairman ISSA and the sponsor of H.R. 5169, the gentleman from Michigan, TIM WALBERG, for working with my Democratic colleagues Representatives LYNCH and NORTON to address some of our concerns.

Although much progress has been made in improving this legislation, I believe that there remains sufficient constitutional issues to cause concern, and, therefore, I must reluctantly oppose H.R. 5169, the Senior Executive Service Accountability Act.

I understand that this legislation was meant to address recent allegations of misconduct and management failures by senior executives at various agencies. While the allegations are quite troubling, I don't believe they justify governmentwide changes to the Senior Executive Service that will bring senior executives much closer to becoming “at-will” employees.

I am concerned that the provisions in this bill that would extend the probationary period for senior executives from 1 to 2 years and authorize suspensions for less than 14 days would give agency heads and political appointees the opportunity to terminate or suspend career senior executives for politically motivated reasons, and it is a

very real possibility that this would go unchecked simply because there is no third-party review of an agency's actions under these circumstances.

I fear that this could result in the politicization of the Federal Government's career senior executive core which would undermine the very protections against political patronage and corruption instituted under the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883.

I am also deeply troubled by the clawback provision in this legislation which would require an SES member who has been removed from Federal service to pay back the salary and accrued leave he or she received during the period pending removal.

I think it is highly likely that the courts and the Merit Systems Protection Board would construe this clawback provision in the same way they construe involuntary or enforced leave.

The Federal Circuit Court of Appeals and the MSPB have held that the imposition of involuntary or enforced leave constitutes a constructive suspension, requiring an agency to provide procedural due process to the employee before placing him or her on such leave status. These procedural rights must include notice, an opportunity to respond, an agency decision, and appeal rights.

Although this clawback requirement is limited to those senior executives who were placed on some form of leave with pay but without duties, they would never have been given the chance to challenge the agency's decision; moreover, the practical and real effect of the clawback provision is that the senior executive is removed from Federal service upon notice of removal which is, in essence, "at-will" employment.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5169; and, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the State of Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my distinguished colleague who is the author of this piece of legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me and also thank him for his comments on this legislation. He laid it out extremely well.

Mr. Speaker, Congress expects the Senior Executive Service to provide leadership so the Federal Government may successfully fulfill their obligations to the American people. That is what it is all about. We serve at their will and for their purpose and so does the Senior Executive Service.

We also look to senior leaders to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars so citizens can have confidence that their hard-earned tax dollars are being utilized sensibly.

Unfortunately and especially in light of the numerous scandals at the IRS and Veterans Administration perpetuated by senior executive branch officials who let things happen and get out of control, we need to take legislative action to restore public confidence and increase accountability and performance within the Senior Executive Service.

The bill I have introduced, the Senior Executive Service Accountability Act, gives agencies commonsense tools to hold senior leaders more accountable for their taxpayer-funded work. Let me make this clear: the bill will make it easier to remove officials who have been found to have engaged in misconduct.

Specifically, it eliminates the current loophole that allows an executive who has been removed for poor performance and placed in a new Federal job from retaining their executive salary. It promotes fairness to make SES employees subject to the same employment standards as the employees they supervise.

It provides greater transparency on the number of senior leaders at each agency and their exact job requirements. It limits the amount of time an agency has to finalize its decision on whether to terminate an employee who has engaged in misconduct, thereby preventing bad actors from receiving their paychecks for months after they were found to have committed acts of misconduct.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of my colleagues on H.R. 5169.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about accountability, accountability for Senior Executive Service people, people like Lois Lerner.

The ranking member of the committee who I have a great deal of respect for stated in his opening comments that he is nervous about this legislation because it might "politicize senior government officials." Well, that is what we have now.

I mean, what could be more political than a high-ranking official at the Internal Revenue Service targeting people who disagreed with her political views? This is all about holding people accountable who do the very things the ranking member talked about.

We need this legislation because, Lord knows, the Justice Department is not doing their job. They are not holding anyone accountable. I mean, think about this fact pattern: you have got the FBI leaking to The Wall Street

Journal in January of this year that no one is going to be prosecuted in the IRS scandal.

You have got the President's now famous remark on Super Bowl Sunday, on national television, where he says:

There is no corruption here, not even a smidgen.

Talk about prejudging the outcome of a case when you have the highest-ranking official in the executive branch, and, of course, we have now—we have known about for several months—the lead attorney at the Justice Department on this case, Barbara Bosserman, who gave \$6,750 to the President's reelection campaign and the Democratic National Committee; so, of course, we need something like this because the Justice Department isn't going to hold anyone to account.

Now, there is one bright spot, Mr. Speaker. This House in a bipartisan fashion told the Attorney General that we need a special prosecutor. Every single Republican voted for that measure. More importantly, 26 Democrats said, This is so egregious; this is so wrong. We not only need Mr. WALBERG's legislation, but we need a special prosecutor in the Justice Department to hold people to account.

When I talk with folks back home—every single day I am out and about, they walk up to me. "Someone needs to be held to account for systematically targeting our most fundamental right, our First Amendment right to speak out in a political fashion against our government. That was targeted, and people need to be held to account for it."

That is why I applaud the gentleman from North Carolina for his work on the committee and the gentleman from Michigan for sponsoring this great piece of legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership on this issue and managing this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and introduction of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bills on the floor this evening represent our ongoing effort to get to the bottom of the IRS' targeting effort of innocent American citizens on the basis of their political beliefs and to ensure that such malfeasance never happens again.

As I have stated repeatedly over the past year, it is imperative that we find out who ordered the targeting, when the targeting was ordered, and why.

I commend my colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform and Ways and Means Committees for their tireless pursuit of justice for the American people.

The Judiciary Committee has been an active partner in this effort. On May 15, 2013, Attorney General Eric Holder promised me and Judiciary Committee members that he would conduct a fair, impartial investigation of the IRS targeting matter.

The Attorney General made his famous pledge that:

This will not be about parties . . . this will not be about ideological persuasions . . . and anyone who has broken the law will be held accountable.

Unfortunately, that appears to be where the administration's commitment to pursuing this investigation ended. On May 7, 2014, following a year of no apparent progress in the investigation, the House passed H. Res. 565, calling on the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate the IRS targeting of conservative groups.

□ 2030

That resolution, which laid out in detail the case for a special counsel, passed by a bipartisan vote of 250–168. Significantly, 26 Democrats joined in calling on the Attorney General of the United States to appoint an independent special counsel.

Since H. Res. 565 passed the House, other events have bolstered the already solid case for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate this matter. Incredibly, on June 13, the IRS announced that it had “lost” an untold number of emails belonging to Lois Lerner which were sought by congressional investigators. The “lost” emails covered the period between January 1, 2009, and April 2011, a period when the IRS’ targeting of conservative groups was occurring regularly. How convenient.

Not 2 weeks ago, the IRS announced that it had also lost emails from five other employees involved in congressional investigations, including two agents in the supposedly “rogue” Cincinnati office. Again, how convenient.

On July 30, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the need for a special counsel to probe the IRS matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At that hearing, we heard testimony that the Justice Department had demonstrated it “can no longer fairly and justly oversee” any further investigations into the ongoing IRS targeting scandal and the “only opportunity for justice” lies with an independent special counsel.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has repeatedly demonstrated its unwillingness to work with congressional investigators to ensure we all know the full story behind the IRS’ targeting of conservative groups. Their attempt to pull the wool over the American peoples’ eyes speaks volumes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of our ongoing efforts to uncover the truth and ensure accountability for the IRS’ targeting of conservative groups. I commend my colleagues for bringing these important bills to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for them.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for allowing me the opportunity to make a few closing comments on this issue that I wouldn’t have introduced if I didn’t feel it was important.

Senior executives have the opportunity to lead, to set policy, and to expand capabilities at their agency. This is a tremendous opportunity and privilege, a privilege of service we must not take lightly.

Now, I hasten to quickly state that a majority of Federal workers, including senior executives, are hardworking public servants doing the job that they have been asked to do, and I want to recognize and thank those hardworking men and women. Unfortunately, the recent scandals that we have talked about, like those at the VA and the IRS, have shined a light on those who have abused their position.

Lois Lerner certainly abused her position, and American taxpayers will never understand how Lois Lerner was placed on administrative leave on May 23, 2013, and then retired 4 months later on September 23, 2013, successfully avoiding termination after she acknowledged the IRS wrongfully scrutinized conservative groups for years. Ms. Lerner continued to receive a full salary during this time, roughly \$60,000, for which the average American would have to work 15 months to earn.

Then members of our Oversight and Government Reform Committee know the full story, the story of the so-called secret agent man who was allowed for years to not show up to his department work under the ruse of being a CIA agent. There was an unbelievable breakdown in the senior executive oversight, I might state.

Now, the American people need to have confidence that these executives are acting honestly and responsibly. Mr. Speaker, The Senior Executive Accountability Act is an attempt, an important attempt, an important step towards holding bad actors accountable for their actions in restoring the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues for their support of H.R. 5169.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do oppose this legislation. We understand the intent of the sponsor, and we applaud him for his efforts. I think that we have to be very, very careful with people’s constitutional rights I have stated in my opposition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to close with just a few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the IRS and the scandals that have been surrounding that are not a big deal to address this piece of legislation. Perhaps a picture of the gentleman in a Las Vegas hot tub is not a reason to address this piece of legislation, but I can tell you that our veterans are, Mr. Speaker.

Those facts that have been the headlines for far too long really are at the core of what we are as a body, that we must protect the men and women who have fought so valiantly for our country and for the freedoms. If we cannot hold our senior executives accountable for the sake of our veterans, then what good is there of any law?

What we must do, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this for the veterans of our country to make sure that there is more accountability on behalf of American taxpayers so that we, once again, can start to trust our government.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5169, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RECORDS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5170) to improve Federal employee compliance with the Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the “Federal Records Accountability Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Removal for deliberate destruction of Federal records.
- Sec. 3. Use of non-official electronic messaging accounts.
- Sec. 4. Reporting of the loss or potential loss of records.
- Sec. 5. Senior Agency Official for Records Compliance.
- Sec. 6. Preservation of electronic messages and other records.
- Sec. 7. Presidential records.
- Sec. 8. Retention of electronic correspondence.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL FOR DELIBERATE DESTRUCTION OF FEDERAL RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after subchapter V the following:

“SUBCHAPTER VI—FEDERAL RECORDS

“§ 7551. Definitions

“In this subchapter the following definitions apply:

“(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘employee’ means—

“(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

“(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

“(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d) of this title; or

“(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service.

“(2) SUSPENSION.—The term ‘suspension’ has the meaning given that term in section 7501 of this title.

“§ 7552. Suspension and removal

“(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL FINDING.—If the Inspector General of an agency determines an employee of the agency has willfully and unlawfully concealed, removed, mutilated, obliterated, falsified, or destroyed any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing in the custody of such employee, or verifies a violation under section 2208 or 2911 of title 44, the Inspector General shall promptly inform the head of the agency of that determination in writing.

“(b) SUSPENSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of an agency shall suspend an employee of that agency who has been determined by the Inspector General under subsection (a) to have willfully and unlawfully concealed, removed, mutilated, obliterated, falsified, or destroyed any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing in the custody of such employee, or who has been verified by the Inspector General to be in violation of section 2208 or 2911 of title 44.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS AFTER SUSPENSION.—An employee suspended under subsection (b) is entitled, after suspension and before removal, to—

“(1) be represented by an attorney or other representative;

“(2) a written statement of the charges against the employee within 15 days after suspension, which may be amended within 30 days thereafter;

“(3) an opportunity within 15 days after the receipt of the written statement under paragraph (2), plus an additional 15 days if

the charges are amended, to answer the charges and submit affidavits;

“(4) a hearing, at the request of the employee, by an agency authority duly constituted for this purpose;

“(5) a review of the employee’s case by the head of the agency or a designee, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and

“(6) a written statement of the decision of the head of the agency.

“(d) REMOVAL.—Subject to subsection (c) of this section and after any investigation and review the head of the agency considers necessary, the head of an agency shall remove an employee suspended under subsection (b) if such head determines that the employee willfully and unlawfully concealed, removed, mutilated, obliterated, falsified, or destroyed any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing in the custody of such employee.

“(e) APPEAL.—An employee who is removed under subsection (d) is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new items:

“SUBCHAPTER VI—FEDERAL RECORDS

“7551. Definitions.

“7552. Suspension and removal.”.

(2) SUBCHAPTER II APPLICABILITY.—Section 7512 of such title is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suspension or removal under section 7552 of this title.”.

SEC. 3. USE OF NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNTS.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS ACT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2208. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, Vice President, or covered employee may not create or send a Presidential or Vice Presidential record using a non-official electronic messaging account (in this section, referred to as ‘applicable electronic message’) unless the President, Vice President, or covered employee—

“(1) includes an official electronic messaging account of the President, Vice President, or covered employee, as applicable, as a recipient in the original creation or transmission of the applicable electronic message and identifies all recipients of the applicable electronic message in such message;

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the applicable electronic message, including a complete list of the recipients of such message, to an official electronic messaging account of the President, Vice President, or covered employee, as applicable, within fifteen days after the original creation or transmission of the message; or

“(3) prints a complete copy of the applicable electronic message, including a complete list of the recipients of such message, and submits the message to the appropriate location or individual for appropriate archival storage by the Executive Office of the President within fifteen days after the original creation or transmission of the message.

“(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—An intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines) by a covered employee, as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be forwarded to the Inspector General of the agency for a verification of the violation, and upon verification, shall be subject to the suspension and removal provisions under section 7552 of title 5.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ means—

“(A) the immediate staff of the President;

“(B) the immediate staff of the Vice President;

“(C) an individual of the Executive Office of the President whose function is to advise and assist the President; or

“(D) an individual of the Office of the Vice President whose function is to advise and assist the Vice President.

“(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGE.—The term ‘electronic message’ means electronic mail and all other means by which individuals and groups may communicate with each other electronically.

“(3) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends an electronic message.”.

(b) FEDERAL RECORDS.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of a Federal agency may not create or send a record using a non-official electronic messaging account (in this section, referred to as ‘applicable electronic message’) unless such officer or employee—

“(1) includes an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee as a recipient in the original creation or transmission of the applicable electronic message and identifies all recipients of the applicable electronic message in such message;

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the applicable electronic message, including a complete list of the recipients of such message, to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee within fifteen days after the original creation or transmission of the record; or

“(3) prints a complete copy of the applicable electronic message, including a complete list of the recipients of such message, and submits it to the appropriate location or individual for appropriate archival storage by the Federal agency within fifteen days after the original creation or transmission of the message.

“(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—An intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines) by an officer or employee of a Federal agency, as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be forwarded to the Inspector General of the agency for a verification of the violation, and upon verification, shall be subject to the suspension and removal provisions under section 7552 of title 5.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGE.—The term ‘electronic message’ means electronic mail and all other means by which individuals and groups may communicate with each other electronically.

“(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends an electronic message.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER 22.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2208. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.”.

(2) CHAPTER 29.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.”.

SEC. 4. REPORTING OF THE LOSS OR POTENTIAL LOSS OF RECORDS.

Section 3106 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3106. Unlawful removal, destruction of records

“(a) NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) ARCHIVIST AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—Whenever the actual, impending, or threatened unlawful concealment, removal, mutilation, obliteration, falsification, or destruction of any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing in the custody of an agency comes to the attention of the head of the Federal agency, the head of the agency shall—

“(A) notify the Archivist; and

“(B) publish a general description of the records at risk or that have been lost on the website of the agency.

“(2) AGENCY NOTIFICATION.—Whenever the actual, impending, or threatened unlawful concealment, removal, mutilation, obliteration, falsification, or destruction of any record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing in the custody of an agency comes to the attention of a Senior Agency Official for Records Management, such official shall immediately notify the head of the agency.

“(b) RECLAMATION OF RECORDS.—With the assistance of the Archivist, the head of a Federal agency shall initiate action through the Attorney General for the recovery of records the head knows or has reason to believe have been unlawfully removed from the agency, or from another Federal agency whose records have been transferred to the legal custody of such head.

“(c) ACTION BY THE ARCHIVIST.—In any case in which the head of the agency does not initiate an action for the recovery of records described in subsection (b) or other redress within a reasonable period of time after being notified of any such unlawful removal, the Archivist shall request the Attorney General to initiate an action described in subsection (b), and shall notify the Congress not later than 5 days after the date on which such a request has been submitted to the Attorney General.”.

SEC. 5. SENIOR AGENCY OFFICIAL FOR RECORDS COMPLIANCE.

(a) SENIOR AGENCY OFFICIAL.—Chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§3108. Senior Agency Official for Records Compliance

“(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than November 15, 2014, the head of each Federal agency shall designate a Senior Agency Official for Records Management, and not later than November 15 of each year thereafter the head of each Federal agency shall reaffirm or designate a new Senior Agency Official for Records Management.

“(b) AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Senior Agency Official for Records Management shall—

“(1) be at least at the level of an Assistant Secretary or the equivalent; and

“(2) be responsible for the coordinating with the appropriate Agency Records Officer and appropriate agency officials to ensure compliance with all applicable records management statutes, regulations, and any guidance issued by the Archivist.

“(c) FEDERAL AGENCY COORDINATION.—In addition to the designation made pursuant to subsection (a), the head of a Federal agency may designate additional Senior Agency Officials for Records Management as the head of the agency determines to be necessary.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“3108. Senior Agency Official for Records Compliance.”.

SEC. 6. PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGES AND OTHER RECORDS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 3(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2912. Preservation of electronic messages and other records

“(a) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Archivist shall promulgate regulations governing Federal agency preservation of electronic messages that are determined to be records (as such term is defined under section 3301 of this title). Such regulations shall, at a minimum—

“(1) require the electronic capture, management, and preservation of such electronic records in accordance with the records disposition requirements of chapter 33 of this title;

“(2) require that such electronic records are readily accessible for retrieval through electronic searches;

“(3) establish mandatory minimum functional requirements for electronic records management systems to ensure compliance with the requirements in paragraphs (1) and (2);

“(4) establish a process to certify that Federal agencies' electronic records management systems meet the functional requirements established under paragraph (3); and

“(5) include timelines for Federal agency compliance with the regulations that ensure compliance as expeditiously as practicable but not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

“(b) COVERAGE OF OTHER ELECTRONIC RECORDS.—To the extent practicable, the regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall also include requirements for the capture, management, and preservation of other electronic records.

“(c) COMPLIANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency shall comply with the regulations promulgated under subsection (a).

“(d) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Archivist shall periodically review and, as necessary, amend the regulations promulgated under subsection (a).

“(e) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS.—

“(1) AGENCY REPORT TO ARCHIVIST.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Archivist a

report on the agency's compliance with the regulations promulgated under this section.

“(2) ARCHIVIST REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after receipt of all reports required by paragraph (1), the Archivist shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on Federal agency compliance with the regulations promulgated under subsection (a).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 3(c)(2), is further amended by adding after the item relating to section 2911 the following new item:

“2912. Preservation of electronic messages and other records.”.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2901 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (14); and

(2) by striking paragraph (15) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(15) the term ‘electronic messages’ means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals; and

“(16) the term ‘electronic records management system’ means software designed to manage electronic records, including by—

“(A) categorizing and locating records;

“(B) ensuring that records are retained as long as necessary;

“(C) identifying records that are due for disposition; and

“(D) ensuring the storage, retrieval, and disposition of records.”.

SEC. 7. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

(a) ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2206 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) provisions for establishing standards necessary for the economical and efficient management of electronic Presidential records during the President's term of office, including—

“(A) records management controls necessary for the capture, management, and preservation of electronic messages;

“(B) records management controls necessary to ensure that electronic messages are readily accessible for retrieval through electronic searches; and

“(C) a process to certify the electronic records management system to be used by the President for the purposes of complying with the requirements in subparagraphs (A) and (B).”.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(6) The term ‘electronic messages’ has the meaning given that term under section 2901(15) of this title.

“(7) The term ‘electronic records management system’ has the meaning given that term under section 2901(16) of this title.”.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 3(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2209. Certification of the President’s management of Presidential records

“(a) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—The Archivist shall annually certify whether the electronic records management controls established by the President meet requirements under sections 2203(a) and 2206(5) of this title.

“(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Archivist shall report annually to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on the status of the certification.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 3(c)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2209. Certification of the President’s management of Presidential records.”

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 2203(f) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) One year following the conclusion of a President’s term of office, or if a President serves consecutive terms one year following the conclusion of the last term, the Archivist shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on—

“(A) the volume and format of electronic Presidential records deposited into that President’s Presidential archival depository; and

“(B) whether the electronic records management controls of that President met the requirements under subsection (a) and section 2206(5) of this title.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. RETENTION OF ELECTRONIC CORRESPONDENCE.

(a) RETENTION OF RECORDS OF HIGH LEVEL OFFICIALS.—Section 3102 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the identification of electronic messaging accounts (as defined in section 2911) that should be preserved because such accounts are most likely to contain records that should be preserved as permanent Federal records and the automatic retention of those records, including the accounts of each head of a Federal agency, the deputies and assistants of such head, the head of each program office and staff office, each assistant secretary, each administrator, each commissioner, each director of an office, bureau, or the equivalent, each principal regional official, each staff assistant to such official (such as a special assistant, confidential assistant, and administrative assistant), each career Federal employee, each political appointee, and each member of the Armed Forces serving in equivalent or comparable positions; and

“(5) electronic capture, management, and preservation of the electronic messaging accounts (as defined in section 2911) described in paragraph (4), in accordance with the records disposal requirements of chapter 33 of this title such that—

“(A) electronic records are readily accessible for retrieval through electronic searches; and

“(B) there are mandatory minimum functional requirements for electronic records management systems to ensure compliance with this section.”

(b) REVIEW BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 3107 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Chapters 21” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapters 21”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL EVALUATION.—The Comptroller General shall evaluate and report to Congress not less than every two years on agency management of electronic mail records required under paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 3102.”

(c) REVIEW BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 4(a) of the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) to review existing and proposed legislation and regulations relating to records retention requirements under the chapters 21, 29, 31 and 33 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Federal Records Act) for programs and operations of such establishment and to make recommendations in the semiannual reports required by section 5(a) concerning compliance with records retention requirements.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 31, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, compliance with the Federal Records Act and the Presidential Records Act is vital in preserving the history of our government and ensuring its continued transparency.

Unfortunately, too frequently of late, Congress has heard examples of agencies and individuals failing to comply with the basic provisions of Federal recordkeeping law. The most recent illustration is the IRS which, according to the Archivist of the United States, failed to follow the law by not disclosing the potential loss of Federal records relating to Lois Lerner.

In another instance, the Oversight Committee learned that the then-Assistant Attorney General Tom Perez used his personal email account almost

1,200 times over a 4-year period to conduct official business. We should not tolerate this type of behavior.

Democracy requires transparency, Mr. Speaker. The public has a right to know the actions their government takes on their behalf. This principle of a right to know has been enshrined in numerous statutes at the Federal, State, and local levels. These include open meeting laws, Freedom of Information Act processes, and records laws.

At the national level, two bedrock transparency laws are the Federal Records Act and the Presidential Records Act. Together, these two laws ensure that our Nation’s key documents, whether they be emails, maps, agendas, microfilm, or any other type of media, are preserved, sometimes in perpetuity, as a clear record of the government’s operation and decision-making process.

Unfortunately, in recent weeks, particularly in relation to the events at the IRS surrounding the loss of Lois Lerner’s emails, it is clear that records laws are not being followed appropriately by agencies and their employees.

The Archivist of the United States in testimony before this committee on June 24 stated that the IRS “did not follow the law” in failing to notify him of the potential loss of Federal records of Lois Lerner’s hard drive.

Records can be lost due to ignorance, inattention, or intentional malice. We should not tolerate any of these excuses, but the intentional destruction of records, Mr. Speaker, in particular, is a criminal act, and Federal employees found to have committed such a crime should be fired.

I am pleased that today we are considering the Federal Records Accountability Act of 2014, a bill I was proud to introduce. This commonsense legislation will make a number of reforms to better hold Federal employees accountable to the requirements of the Federal Records Act and the Presidential Records Act.

Specifically, the bill creates a process requiring agencies to fire employees who have been found to have “willfully and unlawfully” altered, removed, or destroyed a Federal record.

The bill bars Federal employees from using nonofficial emails and other electronic messaging accounts to conduct official business, unless that communication is disclosed in full within 15 days to the government. Failure to do so would be considered a “willful and unlawful” destruction of Federal records and subject the employee to termination.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, the legislation will require agencies to disclose on their Web site notices indicating an actual, impending, or threatened loss of Federal records. This expands the current law mandate that agencies

only inform the Archivist, the mandate recently ignored by the IRS.

This bill also requires agencies to appoint or reconfirm a senior agency official for records management. This individual would be responsible for ensuring full agency compliance with records laws, and Congress will be able to hold them directly accountable for noncompliance.

Additionally, thanks to an amendment from my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, this bill will require agencies to preserve their electronic records in an electronic format. This reform will end the absurd and yet all too common practice in which agencies require emails and other electronic records to be manually printed out for long-term storage and instead save them on a hard drive.

Finally, thanks to efforts by Ms. SPEIER and Mr. DESANTIS, the bill will require agencies to automatically capture all official emails, instant messages, tweets, and other electronic communications by senior agency officials, their assistants, and other officials likely to come into regular digital contact with a large number of Federal records.

This process will dramatically improve transparency at the most senior levels of government by starting with the presumption that electronic messages are Federal records instead of the current process under which officials self-select what constitutes a record.

Collectively, the reforms in H.R. 5170 will send a powerful message that transparency and faithful record-keeping are priorities of our government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill and I want to thank Representative MARK MEADOWS for his hard work on this bill.

This bill would make the Federal Government's records more transparent. This bill includes the language of a bill I introduced, the Electronic Message Preservation Act. That portion of the legislation would require the Archivist of the United States to issue regulations mandating that within 2 years of enactment all Federal agencies manage and preserve their email records electronically.

The bill would also direct the Archivist to establish standards for the preservation and management of electronic Presidential records and to annually certify that the White House has records management controls in place that meet those standards. Under this bill, the Archivist must report 1 year after the President leaves office on whether the controls used by the President met the required standards.

This amendment would move agencies out of the arcane print-and-file recordkeeping systems that many of them still use, a system which can lead to records getting lost or not being turned over in response to requests.

This bill also includes an amendment offered by my colleague Representative JACKIE SPEIER during the committee markup. The Speier amendment would provide a clearer standard for agencies to follow with regard to which records had to be kept and for how long. Under this approach, the records of senior agency officials would be kept permanently.

This bill also provides procedures for agencies to follow if an employee intentionally destroys records. Under this bill, employees will be held accountable and they will also receive the same due process rights that they have under current law.

There are a couple of issues with this bill that I would like to flag. One concern that has been raised is that the bill could have the unintended consequence of encouraging Federal employees to save every email. Under current law, the National Archives works with agencies to establish schedules that define how long an agency has to keep categories of records.

Agencies can't save everything forever or the volume would be so overwhelming we wouldn't be able to sort out important information from junk. We should evaluate this concern and just ensure that we aren't creating unintended consequences.

Another concern that has been raised with this bill is that, in attempts to restrict the manner in which the President and Vice President create records, the bill says the President and Vice President or a covered employee may not create or send a Presidential or Vice Presidential record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless the President or Vice President or covered employee takes certain steps. Those steps include copying an official email account, forwarding a copy of the email to an official account, or printing the email and properly archiving it.

The Presidential Records Act already requires the President, the Vice President, and their immediate staff to preserve their records. I think we should just make sure that we are not crossing the line in the requirements for the President and the Vice President. I believe those two concerns should be evaluated and addressed if this bill is considered in the Senate.

Again, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we look at this particular piece of legislation, the real genesis of this came from very troubling testimony

that a number of us on both sides of this aisle heard in hearing after hearing. It was not one agency. It has been a plethora of agencies that seem to have communication that is going on, Mr. Speaker, on a regular basis that is not being preserved.

Now, part of this is accountability; part of this is historical. Can you imagine what our Founding Fathers would do if they had communicated to one another and never preserved the letter or the communication that had taken place between them? What would our history be? It would be filled with a number of holes. So, from a historical perspective, we have the real duty to require it for our children and our grandchildren to understand what goes on in government.

But, from an accountability standpoint, I think that is where most Americans are focusing these days, Mr. Speaker. They don't understand why we continue to lose email after email, while there seems to be hard drive problems at the IRS that transcend all logical comprehension of why so many hard drives would have failed. I have a hard time understanding that as well.

Regardless of those issues, if we enact this particular bill—and I think the ranking member from Maryland because he has, indeed, with his amendment made this bill better. It is stronger, and I thank him for his support. Because when we work together in a bipartisan way to make sure that these records are kept, it not only preserves it for historical purposes, but it starts to build back the foundation, block by block, layer by layer, where the American people can once again trust their government.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we take this act and make it into law. So I encourage my colleagues to support this. I urge them to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5170, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF PERSONAL EMAIL ACCOUNTS PROHIBITION

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5418) to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. IRS EMPLOYEES PROHIBITED FROM USING PERSONAL EMAIL ACCOUNTS FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

No officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service may use a personal email account to conduct any official business of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Tonight I rise in strong support of H.R. 5418. This bill which I introduced is a response to the Ways and Means Committee's year-and-a-half-long investigation of the IRS' targeting of taxpayers based on their political beliefs.

In its exhaustive ongoing investigation, the committee found that some IRS employees risk that confidential information by circumventing official email and using their personal, non-secure email for official business. H.R. 5418 fixes this problem by prohibiting employees of the IRS from using a personal email account to conduct any official business, ensuring there is a full record of IRS activity and that taxpayer information is secure.

There is no reason for an IRS employee to have confidential taxpayer information on his or her home computer without the necessary safeguards against disclosure. This behavior must be stopped, and I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

This is the first of three straightforward bills concerning the IRS. It is my hope the Republicans will focus the debate in the straightforward manner that is warranted, and that is what is happening on this bill.

Currently, the IRS restricts its employees from sending emails that contain sensitive but unclassified data outside the IRS network unless approved by senior agency management, but the manual does not specifically reference the use of personal email accounts. This legislation would specifically prohibit the use of personal email accounts to conduct official agency business. I support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the introduction of this bill and I support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good bill. It is a commonsense bill. It has broad support. I urge its support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5418.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A RIGHT TO AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5419) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL RELATING TO ADVERSE DETERMINATIONS OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7123 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL RELATING TO ADVERSE DETERMINATION OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe procedures under which an organization described in section 501(c) may request an administrative appeal (including a conference relating to such appeal if requested by the organization) to the Internal Revenue Service Office of Appeals of an adverse determination described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ADVERSE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an adverse determination is described in this paragraph if such determination is adverse to an organization with respect to—

“(A) the initial qualification or continuing qualification of the organization as exempt from tax under section 501(a) or as an organization described in section 170(c)(2),

“(B) the initial classification or continuing classification of the organization as a private foundation under 509(a), or

“(C) the initial classification or continuing classification of the organization as a private operating foundation under section 4942(j)(3).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to determinations made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Tonight I rise in strong support of H.R. 5419. This bill which I introduced requires the IRS to grant the same fair and unbiased appeal process to groups applying for tax-exempt status as it grants to other taxpayers.

During the investigation, we found that groups were being denied their ability to appeal denials of tax-exempt applications due to an unfair administrative practice at the IRS. This puts too much decisionmaking power in the hands of Washington bureaucrats, the same people we now know were depriving certain conservative groups of their right to operate as tax-exempt groups. This bill fixes that and provides equal rights to appeal for all tax-exempt applicants.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under current law, tax-exempt organizations are not able to request an administrative appeal of their initial classification of tax-exempt status. The bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

I might add, this would apply to all, whatever their political leanings, provided they meet the requirements of the statute. So this would apply to liberal as well as conservative organizations that were subject to the inappropriate standards used by the IRS.

In 2012, the IRS received 51,748 applications for 501(c)(3) status and 2,774 applications for (c)(4) status.

□ 2100

In each case, less than three-tenths of 1 percent were denied. In 2013, two-tenths of 1 percent of all 501(c)(3) applications and 501(c)(4) applications were denied.

I support this legislation, and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I think this is, again, commonsense legislation that is needed. It is a necessary reform which came out in the investigation that we have done so far.

I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5419.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING RELEASE OF INFORMATION REGARDING CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5420) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RELEASE OF INFORMATION REGARDING THE STATUS OF CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6103(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION REGARDING STATUS OF INVESTIGATION OF VIOLATION OF THIS SECTION.—In the case of a person who provides to the Secretary information indicating a violation of section 7213, 7213A, or 7214 with respect to any return or return information of such person, the Secretary may disclose to such person (or such person’s designee)—

“(A) whether an investigation based on the person’s provision of such information has been initiated and whether it is open or closed,

“(B) whether any such investigation substantiated such a violation by any individual, and

“(C) whether any action has been taken with respect to such individual (including whether a referral has been made for prosecution of such individual).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in support of H.R. 5420. This bill, which I introduced, reforms the Tax Code’s rules on information disclosures to victims of unauthorized disclosures.

In recent years, the IRS has leaked the confidential tax information of numerous groups: The National Organization for Marriage, Crossroads GPS, Americans for Responsible Leadership, Freedom Path, and others. Disclosing taxpayer information like this is a crime, but current law does not allow the victimized taxpayer to know anything of the status of the investigation into the leak.

H.R. 5420 fixes this by allowing victims of unauthorized disclosures to learn about the status of any investigations into their particular cases.

Additionally, some victims of IRS targeting were subject to the flagrant disclosure of their confidential tax information to the media. Yet these victims are not permitted access to any information about the progress on the investigation of these violations.

This bill provides certainty to taxpayers who have been victimized in this manner to inquire about the status of their investigations. It is a commonsense bill. It is a good reform.

I urge a “yes” vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support this legislation.

When a taxpayer makes a complaint regarding unlawful disclosure of information, current law does not permit the Treasury Department to provide the affected taxpayer with information concerning the status or resolution of the complaint.

Under the provision here, the enumerated circumstances in which taxpayer information may be lawfully disclosed by the Treasury Department would be expanded to include disclosure to certain complainants of information regarding the status and results of any investigation initiated by their complaint.

I support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend across the aisle. I think if only we could conduct business this way, it might all be good and we could solve a lot of problems, so I thank the gentleman.

This is, again, a commonsense reform, it came out of the investigation, I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5420.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL GENERAL WELFARE EXCLUSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3043) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3043

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. INDIAN GENERAL WELFARE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before section 140 the following new section:

“SEC. 139E. INDIAN GENERAL WELFARE BENEFITS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Gross income does not include the value of any Indian general welfare benefit.

“(b) INDIAN GENERAL WELFARE BENEFIT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Indian general welfare benefit’ includes any payment made or services provided to or on behalf of a member of an Indian tribe (or any spouse or dependent of such a member) pursuant to an Indian tribal government program, but only if—

“(1) the program is administered under specified guidelines and does not discriminate in favor of members of the governing body of the tribe, and

“(2) the benefits provided under such program—

“(A) are available to any tribal member who meets such guidelines,

“(B) are for the promotion of general welfare,

“(C) are not lavish or extravagant, and

“(D) are not compensation for services.

“(c) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Indian tribal government’ includes any agencies or instrumentalities of an Indian tribal government and any Alaska Native regional or village corporation, as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601, et seq.).

“(2) DEPENDENT.—The term ‘dependent’ has the meaning given such term by section 152, determined without regard to subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), and (d)(1)(B).

“(3) LAVISH OR EXTRAVAGANT.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Tribal Advisory Committee (as established under section 3(a) of the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act of 2013), establish guidelines for what constitutes lavish or extravagant benefits with respect to Indian tribal government programs.

“(4) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRIBAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM.—A program shall not fail to be treated as an Indian tribal government program solely by reason of the program being established by tribal custom or government practice.

“(5) CEREMONIAL ACTIVITIES.—Any items of cultural significance, reimbursement of costs, or cash honorarium for participation in cultural or ceremonial activities for the transmission of tribal culture shall not be treated as compensation for services.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 140 the following new item:

“Sec. 139E. Indian general welfare benefits.”.

(c) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Ambiguities in section 139E of such Code, as added by this Act, shall be resolved in favor of Indian tribal governments and deference shall be given to Indian tribal governments for the programs administered and authorized by the tribe to benefit the general welfare of the tribal community.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years for which the period of limitation on refund or credit under section 6511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 has not expired.

(2) ONE-YEAR WAIVER OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—If the period of limitation on a credit or refund resulting from the amendments made by subsection (a) expires before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, refund or credit of such overpayment (to the extent attributable to such amendments) may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before the close of such 1-year period.

SEC. 3. TRIBAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish a Tribal Advisory Committee (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the “Committee”).

(b) DUTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Committee shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to the taxation of Indians.

(2) EDUCATION AND TRAINING.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Committee, establish and require—

(A) training and education for internal revenue field agents who administer and enforce internal revenue laws with respect to Indian tribes on Federal Indian law and the Federal Government’s unique legal treaty and trust relationship with Indian tribal governments, and

(B) training of such internal revenue field agents, and provision of training and technical assistance to tribal financial officers, about implementation of this Act and the amendments made thereby.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 7 members appointed as follows:

(A) Three members appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(B) One member appointed by the Chairman, and one member appointed by the Ranking Member, of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(C) One member appointed by the Chairman, and one member appointed by the Ranking Member, of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) TERM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each member’s term shall be 4 years.

(B) INITIAL STAGGERING.—The first appointments made by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A) shall be for a term of 2 years.

SEC. 4. OTHER RELIEF FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF EXAMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend all audits and examinations of Indian tribal governments and members of Indian tribes (or any spouse or dependent of such a member), to the extent such an audit or examination relates to the exclusion of a payment or benefit from an Indian tribal

government under the general welfare exclusion, until the education and training prescribed by section 3(b)(2) of this Act is completed. The running of any period of limitations under section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to Indian tribal governments and members of Indian tribes shall be suspended during the period during which audits and examinations are suspended under the preceding sentence.

(b) WAIVER OF PENALTIES AND INTEREST.—The Secretary of the Treasury may waive any interest and penalties imposed under such Code on any Indian tribal government or member of an Indian tribe (or any spouse or dependent of such a member) to the extent such interest and penalties relate to excluding a payment or benefit from gross income under the general welfare exclusion.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(1) INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “Indian tribal government” shall have the meaning given such term by section 139E of such Code, as added by this Act.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” shall have the meaning given such term by section 45A(c)(6) of such Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act.

This bill would clarify the Tax Code so that spending by Native American tribes on health care, housing, education, care for the elderly and disabled, and other programs for the good of the tribe will be excluded from taxes.

These programs were traditionally tax-exempt, but in recent years the IRS has informally reinterpreted the rules in order to tax more and more of these programs. Simultaneously, the agency has subjected tribes to expensive and intrusive audits.

With their unique history of tribal sovereignty, Native Americans should not be subjected to arbitrary tax enforcement. This bill would put tribes on par with State and local governments and would end unwarranted intrusions into tribal self-government. It is broadly supported across the country and was actually given a zero score by the Joint Tax Committee.

Thus, I urge my colleagues to support the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act, and I will be submitting a more detailed statement for the

RECORD that will provide clarity, context, and congressional intent for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, considering a committee report will not accompany H.R. 3043, which is being considered by the House today, I take this opportunity as the author of the legislation to provide some context and congressional intent.

Under current law, taxpayers must generally include all items of income in computing gross income. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) guidance has established a general welfare exclusion under which payments made to individuals by governmental entities pursuant to legislatively provided social benefit programs for the promotion of the general welfare are not included in the recipient’s gross income. To qualify under the general welfare exclusion, payment (1) must be made under a government program; (2) must be made for the promotion of general welfare; and (3) must not be made as compensation for services.

In evaluating Indian tribal government programs under the general welfare exclusion, including the second prong of this test (“for the promotion of general welfare”), the IRS has frequently insisted that tribal benefits be based on individualized determinations of financial need. This stipulation prevents the general welfare exclusion from covering programs designed to provide substantially equal benefits to all qualifying members of a tribe or to provide benefits based on determinations of needs that are not financial in nature. These needs would include health coverage programs, education and cultural programs, elder programs, and housing programs.

Under IRS guidance released in June 2014, however, the IRS will conclusively presume that payments from Indian tribes to tribal members and their spouses and dependents will qualify under the general welfare exclusion without a determination of need if certain requirements are met. Under Revenue Procedure 2014–35, the payments (1) must be made pursuant to a specific Indian tribal government program with written guidelines; (2) must not discriminate in favor of the tribe’s governing body and be made available to all qualifying members of the tribe; (3) must not be compensation for services; and (4) must not be lavish or extravagant. In addition, only certain types of programs that meet the procedural requirements will qualify for the conclusive presumption. The Revenue Procedure lists 23 such non-exclusive qualifying programs covering housing, education, elder care, health care, culture, and other welfare projects. Taxpayers may apply the rules retroactively to file for refunds for any open tax years.

The provisions in H.R. 3043 would codify this IRS guidance, specifically applying the general welfare exclusion to Indian tribes and payments received by tribal members, their spouses and children. The bill mandates that tribal government benefits would qualify for exclusion under the general welfare doctrine so long as the benefits (1) are provided pursuant to a specific Indian tribal government program; (2) are available to all tribal members (including spouses and dependents) who meet the government program’s guidelines; (3) are not lavish or extravagant; and (4) are not compensation for services.

The provisions in H.R. 3043 also require that the tribal program be “for the promotion of general welfare,” but would not limit its application through conclusive presumption to specific types or examples of tribal programs. I expect that the IRS will apply this requirement in a manner that is no less favorable than the safe harbor approach in Revenue Procedure 2014–35, and that the IRS will not interpret the statute as requiring individualized determinations of financial need where a tribal government has established a program consistent with the statute. In construing the individual statutory requirements, including a determination of whether a program is “for the promotion of general welfare”, it is expected that the IRS will develop regulations that are no less favorable to tribes than Revenue Procedure 2014–35, including no limitation of a tribe’s ability to address community needs and to make benefits available to all eligible tribal members. This is based on the legislative purpose of the bill as well as the specific statutory construction provision in Section 2 (c) of the bill, which states that “deference shall be given to Indian tribal governments for the programs administered and authorized by the tribe to benefit the general welfare of the tribal community.”

Provisions in H.R. 3043 also would require the Treasury Department to (1) establish a Tribal Advisory Committee to advise the IRS and Treasury on matters relating to taxation of Indians; (2) establish and provide training and education for IRS agents and tribal financial officers about the new provisions; and (3) suspend audits and examinations of Indian tribal governments and tribal members related to the general welfare exclusion until this education has been provided.

Concerns linger that the IRS may not fully understand the role that general welfare programs play in maintaining tribal culture and tradition, and that these issues should be addressed through government-to-government consultation rather than through tribal or member audits that may deter tribes from preserving culture and tradition or pursuing self-determination. It is intended that the Tribal Advisory Committee address these concerns and work with tribes on a government-to-government basis. This would be accomplished by appointing qualified tribal leaders and in the alternative, qualified tribal financial officers to the Tribal Advisory Committee. Such qualified individuals would have intimate knowledge of federal Indian law and policy, as well as the financial and community needs of Indian tribes. These qualifications would enhance the Department’s administration of federal tax policies affecting tribal governments while ensuring that treaty rights and principles of tribal self-governance are properly balanced with federal tax policy.

The provisions in H.R. 3043 codifying the IRS guidance concerning the general welfare exclusion would be effective for tax years for which the period of limitations is open as of the date of enactment. Taxpayers would have one additional year from the date of enactment to file for a refund with respect to any such open tax year. And, the bill would provide the IRS with discretion to waive any interest and penalties under the Code for any tribe or tribal member in connection with the general welfare exclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to provide clarity, context, and congressional intent for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3043.

I was an original cosponsor of this legislation.

I commend my friend and colleague from California, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for his leadership on this issue.

We are trying to correct a wrong interpretation with the IRS that will treat Native Americans like we do other sovereign entities in this country. That is why this legislation would codify existing IRS practice and bring crucial permanence and clarity to tribes across the country. It levels the playing field for tribal governments, treating them more like State governments, and it also respects tribal culture, traditions, and practices.

The bill excludes from taxation income received on tribal general welfare programs, many of which are identical to the tax-exempt Federal and State programs in the areas of health care, education, housing, eldercare, emergency assistance, cultural programs, burial assistance, and legal aid, and provides necessary deference and flexibility to these tribal governments so that they can develop programs and determine priorities that promote the general welfare in their own communities.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this legislation doesn’t cost taxpayers a cent—it has no budgetary impact—so we are not adding to the deficit.

This bill is supported by numerous national organizations, including business and tribal organizations, regional tribal and intertribal organizations, and a multitude of State-based tribal governments.

I want to just take a moment to thank the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin, the Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin, and the National Congress of American Indians for working tirelessly on this issue. My staff and I greatly appreciate their assistance in getting this in order for tonight.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I, again, thank my friend for his leadership, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank the gentleman for mak-

ing this truly one of the few bipartisan bills that has no opposition, where we come together for the right reasons to get something done for the benefit of all of our communities, especially our tribal communities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act of 2013.

First, I would like to thank Congressman NUNES for his hard work on this legislation. Without his leadership, this bill would not have made it as far as it has today.

I would also like to thank the Ways and Means chairman, DAVE CAMP, for his support throughout this process, and all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have joined in the effort to get this legislation passed and considered this evening.

This legislation codifies, Mr. Speaker, the proper tax treatment of certain services provided by the tribe for education, public safety, to promote its culture, and to provide for the general welfare of the tribe. This is an issue of fair treatment of taxpayers—in this case, Native American taxpayers, such as those who live in the sovereign Seneca Nation in western New York, in my home district, the 23rd Congressional District of New York.

This legislation will ensure that the unique legal relationship and tax issues with regard to members of the Indian Nations and tribal governments are recognized and respected by the IRS going forward.

I urge my colleagues to join us and pass this legislation tonight. It is only fair that we do the right thing by these Native American taxpayers.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t have any further requests for time on this, but I would like, at this time, to have the following documents inserted into the RECORD: a letter of support for H.R. 3043 from the Ho-Chunk Nation, which is in my congressional district in western Wisconsin; a letter of support from the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin in Oneida, Wisconsin; and a letter of support from the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes, which is headquartered in Gresham, Wisconsin.

HO-CHUNK NATION LEGISLATURE,

September 9, 2014.

Re Tribal Welfare General Exclusion Act (H.R. 3043).

Hon. RON KIND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KIND: I am writing on behalf of the Ho Chunk Nation (Nation) to thank you for your co-sponsorship of the Tribal Welfare General Exclusion Act (H.R. 3043), a bi-partisan bill introduced by Representative Nunes and 54 other Members of the House. The Nation is reliably informed

that House leadership is interested in bringing this bill to the floor during the very short September 2014 session.

As you know, tribal members across the country have been harassed by the IRS seeking to force them to include in calculations of gross income the value of tribally-provided programs and services. This legislation is necessary to clarify that various programs and services provided by Indian tribal governments to their tribal members are not characterized as income for purposes of computing taxable income by the federal Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

To be excluded under H.R. 3043, tribally-provided welfare benefits must be available to any tribal member under established guidelines, are for the promotion of general welfare, are not lavish or extravagant, and are not compensation for services. The bill would also establish a Tribal Advisory Committee to provide education and training to IRS officials and staff and to help enforce internal revenue laws in Indian country.

H.R. 3043 is strongly supported by the National Congress of American Indians, the Native American Finance Officers Association, Indian tribes across the country, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Joint Committee on Taxation has determined that, if enacted, H.R. 3043 "would have a negligible effect on Federal fiscal revenues."

For all of these reasons, we respectfully urge you to communicate your support for H.R. 3043 to Chairman Camp and Ranking Member Levin as well as with Republican and Democrat leadership. Thank you for your longstanding support for the Nation and, indeed, for tribal communities across the country, and your kind consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JON GREENDEER,
President.
HEATHER CLOUD,
Vice President.

ONEIDA TRIBE OF INDIANS OF
WISCONSIN, BUSINESS COMMITTEE,
September 4, 2014.

Hon. RON KIND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KIND: I hope this letter finds you doing well. First, I commend you for your support and thank you for your co-sponsorship of H.R. 3043 (the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act), a bill to address certain inequities in the tax code relative to the delivery of basic general welfare programs to our members. Second, we have been made aware of an effort by the bill's primary sponsor, Congressman Devin Nunes, that he is working with the Majority's leadership and Chairman Camp to consider H.R. 3043 on the Suspension Calendar sometime this month. Your support of such an effort would be critical to securing the votes necessary for the passage of this bill. I am asking that you do what you can to help in this effort.

While the Obama Administration has done an outstanding job in addressing many of the concerns of Indian Country by releasing Revenue Procedure 2014-35 earlier this year, that determination is not a permanent solution to our GWE concerns. Additionally, the Procedure provides no reforms to the way the IRS does business on Indian lands, does not require IRS agents to receive training or education in federal Indian law or the U.S. trust obligations to Tribes and individual Indians, and does not give Tribal leaders a voice in the Administrative process at the Department of Treasury. Only with the adop-

tion of statutory changes will Indian Country find a full level of assurance that the benefits we extend to our Tribal members will not be met with invasive audits and potential financial ruin. The bill you have co-sponsored brings us that level of assurance.

Again, thank you for all of your efforts to help Indian Country achieve basic fairness under our nation's tax code. Your continued support on this issue is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MELINDA J. DANFORTH,
Vice Chairwoman.

MIDWEST ALLIANCE OF
SOVEREIGN TRIBES,
September 16, 2014.

Re Reform the IRS in Indian Country—Vote
YES on H.R. 3043.

Hon. RON KIND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KIND: We write on behalf of the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes to thank you and ask that you please educate others on why they should vote "YES" on H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act, when the bill comes to the House floor for a vote. And we thank you in advance for co-sponsoring this bill!

Federal Indian affairs policy is grounded in the history and course of dealings between the U.S. and Indian tribes. Tribes ceded or had taken hundreds of millions of acres of our homelands to help build this Nation. In return, the U.S. made solemn promises to provide for the health, education, and general welfare of Indian people. Sadly, federal programs and services designed to meet these promises have been unfunded or underfunded for decades. As a result, tribal governments are stepping in to meet these shortfalls by directly providing programs and services to our tribal citizens. Instead of fostering these acts of Indian self-determination, the IRS has targeted Indian tribes for audits, seeking to impose federal income taxes on tribal government programs and services.

Tribal leaders nationwide raised concerns with these targeted IRS intrusions of Indian self-determination. H.R. 3043 will implement long-needed reforms of the work of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in Indian Country and clarify that federally recognized tribal government programs and services provided to our citizens are not subject to federal income taxation. Passage of this bill will help align federal tax laws with federal Indian law and policy, strengthen Indian self-determination, and respect the local decisions of tribal governments to improve our communities. On September 17, 2013, the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) ruled that H.R. 3043 "would have a negligible effect on federal fiscal revenues."

For these reasons, we again urge you to ask others to vote "YES" on H.R. 3043 as introduced when the bill comes to the House floor for a vote. We appreciate your consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

SCOTT R. VELE,
Executive Director.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, since I have no further speakers, I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan piece of legislation tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we have one final speaker left. I yield 2 minutes

to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NUNES for doing this. Thank you for the bipartisan support from everyone, and particularly in the Ways and Means Committee.

This is one of those sort of semijoyous moments where we actually get to do something that is good legislation and good policy, and sometimes you desperately wish around here we had more of this.

Being from Arizona, I have 22 tribes in my State. As a much younger man in the legislature, I actually chaired the Indian Affairs Committee in my State legislature, and we spent years working with our communities to become self-sufficient, to maximum their sovereignty and respect it. So many of my tribes in Arizona now are actually engaging in activities to bolster their population, to provide them the basic benefits that you and I would receive from our city council, from our county, from our State. The clarification this provides just puts them on equal footings with what happens in our other communities and for those who live off reservation. That is why this is such good legislation. It is rational, it makes sense, and continues to incentivize the right direction, the right sovereignty, the right approach for our Native American people in this country.

With that, Mr. NUNES, thank you for doing this.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say a special thanks to Chairman DAVE CAMP, Ranking Member LEVIN, all the Ways and Means staff that worked on this legislation. This is legislation that has been around for several years. And especially I would like to thank Damon Nelson from my staff, who has been on this doggedly since he found out the injustice that was being done to tribes across America. So I would like to thank him for his special support for doing the important work that our staff does to get something like this across the finish line.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act. H.R. 3043 would align federal Indian affairs policy with federal tax policy. H.R. 3043 would require field agents to receive training and education on federal Indian law and the government's treaty and trust obligations to Native Americans to ensure that their actions in the field follow the law and IRS policy. It would do so by clarifying that tribal government programs and services that aid the general welfare of the tribe are not subject to federal income taxation. It also establishes a Tribal Advisory Committee within the Treasury Department. Additionally, the Joint Committee on

Taxation has determined the bill would do this at little to no cost to the federal government.

The Constitution clearly states that the federal government shall provide for the general welfare of the people. The IRS excludes a broad array of government services including, but not limited to, education, public safety, court system, social services, public works, health services, housing authority, parks and recreation, cultural resources, and museums. Through treaties and executive order, Indian tribes ceded hundreds of millions of acres of their homelands to the United States. In return, the U.S. made promises to provide for the health, education and general welfare of Native communities. Sadly, we have fallen short in meeting these solemn obligations. In recent years, Indian tribal governments have stepped in to cover these shortfalls in federal obligations by offering tribal government programs and services to meet the needs of their communities. To be clear, these are governments providing government services for their citizens.

Instead of fostering these acts of tribal government self-determination, over the past decade, some IRS field agents have targeted tribes for audits and investigations seeking to tax tribal citizens for benefits derived from these programs and services. Field agent decision-making has been at best inconsistent and arbitrary. Activities allowed in one audit have been challenged in another. Field agents have conversely given wide deference to federal and state government programs that provide for the general welfare of their citizens. In doing so, they have exempted general welfare programs from taxation, an exception known as a "general welfare exclusion."

H.R. 3043 will codify and better align federal tax policy with Indian affairs policy and ensure that IRS policies that recognize appropriate tribal government actions are actually being implemented in the field.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge passage of H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to clarify a number of interpretive issues with regard to H.R. 3043 and the IRS guidance, Rev. Proc. 2014–35, that it generally codifies.

In passing this legislation, Congress expects IRS to apply its current guidance and any future guidance that it might issue to implement H.R. 3043 in a manner that does not impose significant administrative burdens on either a Nation or its members in administering the safe harbor programs. Thus, for example, we expect that a Nation may establish a program meeting the safe harbor program standards for the benefit of all of its members relying on certification and recoupment procedures.

Further, in applying the current guidance for prior periods, Congress expects that the IRS will not challenge arrangements that are consistent with the spirit of the guidance in terms of what payments are eligible and without regard to specific documentation and similar requirements imposed by the guidance.

Finally, with respect to the provision in H.R. 3043 suspending current audits and examinations, Congress intends that it apply to all payments and benefits from a tribal government to its members for their general welfare and

further, that a tribal government may, at its option, waive suspension of its examination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3043.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESERVING WELFARE FOR NEEDS NOT WEED ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4137) to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4137

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preserving Welfare for Needs Not Weed Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER CARD TO ACCESS TANF ASSISTANCE AT ANY STORE THAT OFFERS MARIJUANA FOR SALE.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 408(a)(12)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 608(a)(12)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of clause (ii);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting "; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) any establishment that offers marijuana (as defined in section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act) for sale."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 4137, the Preserving Welfare for Needs Not Weed Act.

Federal welfare benefits are an important means for many individuals and families to get critical assistance for basic necessities until they get back on their feet.

Shockingly, as a result of recent State laws legalizing recreational marijuana in Colorado and also in my home State of Washington, we are seeing new abuses of these benefits. In these States, a person can walk into one of the newly opened pot shops and use their welfare benefit card to pay for pot.

These are Federal tax dollars meant for basic necessities and, instead, they are being used to purchase something that is illegal under Federal law. It is exactly this misuse of tax dollars that this bill is designed to stop.

This bill, which I introduced earlier this year as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources—the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the program that we are talking about tonight and that is being abused—will block access to welfare cash in stores selling marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the struggles that families can go through during my hard times from my own childhood growing up, and from what I witnessed as a law enforcement professional for 33 years. From the time I was a cop on the street in King County Washington through my days as the sheriff there, I witnessed how too often a lack of a job, living in a crime-ridden neighborhood, and using drugs tore families apart.

□ 2115

In some ways, things have even gotten worse today. For instance, we had millions of long-term unemployed struggling to get back to work during the so-called Obama recovery.

To make ends meet, many turned to benefits like TANF, which is the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The TANF program provides millions of low-income Americans temporary assistance to help adults transition to work and support their children while they are doing that. TANF is a flexible grant to States, but it also includes rules to ensure that our tax dollars are being spent appropriately.

Sadly, a disturbing number of people were spending welfare benefits in liquor stores, casinos, and even strip clubs. In 2012, Congress passed a law that required States to block welfare benefits from being accessed in those places, and President Obama, rightly, signed it into law.

Since then, both Washington State and Colorado have legalized marijuana, opening up a new loophole—the "pot shop loophole," as I call it—which the bill before us would close, along with the other shops that I mentioned before that are already closed to the use of your welfare benefit card, like liquor stores, casinos, and strip clubs. This bill just adds "pot shops" to that list.

This isn't an idle concern. A report examining welfare transactions in Colorado revealed over \$5,000 in welfare benefits were accessed in stores selling marijuana in the first month such stores were open. With other States considering legislation to legalize marijuana, it is important that we close this "pot shop loophole" now before it expands.

This bill simply says that when it comes to spending welfare benefits—money taxpayers provide to low-income parents to help support their children—we are drawing a line. Taxpayer-funded welfare benefits must be spent on children's and families' needs and not on weed.

I encourage all Members to support this simple commonsense fix so that welfare funds are used as they were intended, to support the needs of low-income families and children and not to support drug use.

This legislation builds on good policy this Chamber has already crafted and passed in the last Congress. It has no cost, according to the Congressional Budget Office, and, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As mentioned, this bill is designed to prevent individuals from using their TANF Electronic Benefit Transfer cards in establishments that sell marijuana. This restriction would add to a current law on prohibition of EBT transactions in casinos, liquor stores, and adult entertainment clubs.

While it is important that benefits under TANF be used only to support the basic needs of struggling families, I think it is regrettable that this legislation is coming to the House floor without any markup, hearings, or discussion within our committee.

Such discussions usually raise questions that are worth examining before legislation is considered on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of Mr. LEVIN as to whether or not he has any speakers on his side.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have one.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the Needs not Weeds Act is a pretty catchy title. I think it could fit on a bumper sticker. In fact, perhaps it already has.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this proposal has only a little to do with weeds and nothing whatsoever to do with the needs of our neighbors who are trying to move out of poverty and into the middle class of America, the people

that are down there on the bottom economic rung that are trying to climb up another rung or two. This Congress is indifferent to their needs. You might say their hopes have just gone up in smoke.

On the very day that we are considering this proposal, we are being called upon by the same folks to approve a companion Republican resolution that once again cuts resources for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, indeed, not one, but two cuts, a cut of \$14 million each year from the TANF contingency fund on which about a third of the States have relied on for assistance in this recession to help people find jobs and provide other services and an additional \$15 billion cut annually from TANF research funding.

Those are the dollars that permit us to determine whether our tax dollars are being spent effectively in developing new approaches for job training and other services.

You have got to wonder what these Republicans are smoking. How can they tout their supposed commitment to preventing waste and, at the same time, insist on eliminating the very dollars that are designed to prevent waste and help us determine whether our tax dollars are being spent efficiently and effectively?

From my experience in this Congress, I understand that facts will be ignored by Republicans when they conflict with Republican ideology, but, in this case, abandoning any research concerning how our tax dollars are being spent makes no sense; indeed, it makes no dollars and cents.

Mr. Speaker, these nearly \$30 million in cuts continue the Republican effort to reduce the real purchasing power and dollars available for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. They follow a prior cut of over \$300 million in employment assistance and cash benefits through the TANF program.

This is all amidst the growing inequality in this Nation. We have the lowest level of poor families receiving direct cash assistance from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families in almost 50 years. In my own State of Texas, only about one in every 24 children receive TANF assistance directly, and, when they get it, they don't get very much.

This is the 50th anniversary of Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty. Isn't it time that we renew that effort in a meaningful, reformed way, instead of waging war on those who are in poverty?

Time and time again, my Republican colleagues have refused to enact a long-term reauthorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program; instead, they favor these short-term extensions like this 3-month extension that we are considering in the continuing resolution.

Each of those short-term extensions offers them an opportunity to stereo-

type the poor, the old welfare Cadillac image. Just blame the poor for being poor.

I support every reasonable effort to reduce fraud and abuse. I don't oppose this bill. What I oppose is dealing with the peripheral instead of tackling the substantive problem of helping folks climb out of poverty into the middle class.

As was mentioned, on one of these short-term TANF extensions, we previously focused on prohibiting poor people from the evil of withdrawing their funds from a strip club or casino. I supported that.

This one will prevent them from using their TANF cards at a place that sells marijuana. Well, perhaps in December, when we are back on the next extension, we can prohibit them from using their funds and withdrawing them at a massage parlor or a Cadillac dealer or maybe with the space aliens out in Area 51 in New Mexico.

I meet with these families. I have met with them in San Antonio, Lockhart, San Marcos, and Austin. For the most part, they are hardworking families. In many cases, they have hit a bad bump in the road. Today's bill does nothing to address the tattered safety net that we have in this country which is increasingly more hole than net.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Each year, we do less and less for those who struggle while the gap continues to widen between those who have little or nothing and those who are incredibly wealthy.

I believe that poverty should be viewed as a major national problem that needs resolution by us working together, not a weapon to just score more political points at election time.

I think the real poverty that is at stake this week is the poverty of cooperation, the poverty of seeking a bipartisan answer to the struggles of so many American families.

As long as this Congress ignores the hard work of developing solutions to help those in our communities that are most disadvantaged, we will have less as a Nation to celebrate.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman from Texas has just given his speech, I want to say to him that I applaud what he has said. It is late. It is 9:30 at night. It is hard to know who is listening, but the words expressed by Mr. DOGGETT need to be heard.

In addition to the reduction in TANF funding, including for research, I think we should also be reminded at this late hour that, because of the unwillingness of Republicans in this U.S. House to follow the bipartisan lead in the Senate, I think more than 3 million people

who lost their jobs through no fault of their own, who are looking for work, have essentially been out in the cold.

□ 2130

I guess some of them have applied for TANF. But when you look at the data that Mr. DOGGETT has put forth, I think we need to take a look, whatever is the hour of the day or night, at what has been happening in terms of the addressing of poverty in this country. So I am glad we have had this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleague's comments, Mr. DOGGETT's a little earlier, there are a lot of things that Mr. DOGGETT said that I agree with, and I know he knows that.

We have known each other for a while. He is the ranking member on the Human Resources Subcommittee, and we have been working together on lots of legislation that help address foster care and families and welfare and food stamps and aid to needy families.

Those are things that he knows that I care about passionately. And I know that the Republican party, even though tonight you may not think so, cares about people passionately and wants to solve these issues to help our most needy find employment, find an opportunity and hope in this country to provide for their family. That is what both sides I think really want.

As my colleague knows, we spent hours earlier today debating the continuing resolution for 2015. That debate will continue tomorrow.

The reason we are not debating TANF reauthorization right now is because the CR includes a provision that will extend the TANF program at the Congressional Budget Office baseline level through December 11 of this year. So that bill, not the one before us, provides for the extension of the program that the gentleman had earlier talked about.

I would also like to point out a letter that is dated July 31, 2014, date stamped, to Senator SESSIONS from Secretary Burwell. And it says, in just the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

Thank you for your letter to former Secretary Kathleen Sebelius expressing concern that Temporary Assistance for Needy Families cash assistance is being used to create an increase in drug dependency. I am aware of the media reports related to individuals withdrawing cash at Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) located in establishments selling marijuana in Colorado, which has legalized the use of marijuana. I agree that any inappropriate expenditure of public funds is a cause for concern and should be addressed immediately.

This is a commonsense fix so welfare funds are used as intended to help needy families temporarily, to help them find jobs, get back on their feet, provide for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4137.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING MEDICARE POST-ACUTE CARE TRANSFORMATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4994) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for standardized post-acute care assessment data for quality, payment, and discharge planning, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act of 2014" or the "IMPACT Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. STANDARDIZATION OF POST-ACUTE CARE DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1899B. STANDARDIZED POST-ACUTE CARE (PAC) ASSESSMENT DATA FOR QUALITY, PAYMENT, AND DISCHARGE PLANNING.

"(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT DATA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

"(A) require under the applicable reporting provisions post-acute care providers (as defined in paragraph (2)(A)) to report—

"(i) standardized patient assessment data in accordance with subsection (b);

"(ii) data on quality measures under subsection (c)(1); and

"(iii) data on resource use and other measures under subsection (d)(1);

"(B) require data described in subparagraph (A) to be standardized and interoperable so as to allow for the exchange of such data among such post-acute care providers and other providers and the use by such providers of such data that has been so exchanged, including by using common standards and definitions, in order to provide access to longitudinal information for such providers to facilitate coordinated care and improved Medicare beneficiary outcomes; and

"(C) in accordance with subsections (b)(1) and (c)(2), modify PAC assessment instruments (as defined in paragraph (2)(B)) applicable to post-acute care providers to—

"(i) provide for the submission of standardized patient assessment data under this title with respect to such providers; and

"(ii) enable comparison of such assessment data across all such providers to whom such data are applicable.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(A) POST-ACUTE CARE (PAC) PROVIDER.—The terms 'post-acute care provider' and 'PAC provider' mean—

"(i) a home health agency;

"(ii) a skilled nursing facility;

"(iii) an inpatient rehabilitation facility; and

"(iv) a long-term care hospital (other than a hospital classified under section 1886(d)(1)(B)(iv)(II)).

"(B) PAC ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT.—The term 'PAC assessment instrument' means—

"(i) in the case of home health agencies, the instrument used for purposes of reporting and assessment with respect to the Outcome and Assessment Information Set (OASIS), as described in sections 484.55 and 484.250 of title 42, the Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, or any other instrument used with respect to home health agencies for such purposes;

"(ii) in the case of skilled nursing facilities, the resident's assessment under section 1819(b)(3);

"(iii) in the case of inpatient rehabilitation facilities, any Medicare beneficiary assessment instrument established by the Secretary for purposes of section 1886(j); and

"(iv) in the case of long-term care hospitals, the Medicare beneficiary assessment instrument used with respect to such hospitals for the collection of data elements necessary to calculate quality measures as described in the August 18, 2011, Federal Register (76 Fed. Reg. 51754–51755), including for purposes of section 1886(m)(5)(C), or any other instrument used with respect to such hospitals for assessment purposes.

"(C) APPLICABLE REPORTING PROVISION.—The term 'applicable reporting provision' means—

"(i) for home health agencies, section 1895(b)(3)(B)(v);

"(ii) for skilled nursing facilities, section 1888(e)(6);

"(iii) for inpatient rehabilitation facilities, section 1886(j)(7); and

"(iv) for long-term care hospitals, section 1886(m)(5).

"(D) PAC PAYMENT SYSTEM.—The term 'PAC payment system' means—

"(i) with respect to a home health agency, the prospective payment system under section 1895;

"(ii) with respect to a skilled nursing facility, the prospective payment system under section 1888(e);

"(iii) with respect to an inpatient rehabilitation facility, the prospective payment system under section 1886(j); and

"(iv) with respect to a long-term care hospital, the prospective payment system under section 1886(m).

"(E) SPECIFIED APPLICATION DATE.—The term 'specified application date' means the following:

"(i) QUALITY MEASURES.—In the case of quality measures under subsection (c)(1)—

"(I) with respect to the domain described in subsection (c)(1)(A) (relating to functional status, cognitive function, and changes in function and cognitive function)—

"(aa) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A), October 1, 2016;

"(bb) for PAC providers described in clause (iv) of such paragraph, October 1, 2018; and

"(cc) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2019;

"(II) with respect to the domain described in subsection (c)(1)(B) (relating to skin integrity and changes in skin integrity)—

"(aa) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (2)(A), October 1, 2016; and

"(bb) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2017;

“(III) with respect to the domain described in subsection (c)(1)(C) (relating to medication reconciliation)—

“(aa) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2017; and

“(bb) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of such paragraph, October 1, 2018;

“(IV) with respect to the domain described in subsection (c)(1)(D) (relating to incidence of major falls)—

“(aa) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (2)(A), October 1, 2016; and

“(bb) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2019; and

“(V) with respect to the domain described in subsection (c)(1)(E) (relating to accurately communicating the existence of and providing for the transfer of health information and care preferences)—

“(aa) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (2)(A), October 1, 2018; and

“(bb) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2019.

“(ii) RESOURCE USE AND OTHER MEASURES.—In the case of resource use and other measures under subsection (d)(1)—

“(I) for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (2)(A), October 1, 2016; and

“(II) for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such paragraph, January 1, 2017.

“(F) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY.—The term ‘Medicare beneficiary’ means an individual entitled to benefits under part A or, as appropriate, enrolled for benefits under part B.

“(b) STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTING ASSESSMENT DATA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than October 1, 2018, for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (a)(2)(A) and January 1, 2019, for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such subsection, the Secretary shall require PAC providers to submit to the Secretary, under the applicable reporting provisions and through the use of PAC assessment instruments, the standardized patient assessment data described in subparagraph (B). The Secretary shall require such data be submitted with respect to admission and discharge of an individual (and may be submitted more frequently as the Secretary deems appropriate).

“(B) STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the standardized patient assessment data described in this subparagraph is data required for at least the quality measures described in subsection (c)(1) and that is with respect to the following categories:

“(i) Functional status, such as mobility and self care at admission to a PAC provider and before discharge from a PAC provider.

“(ii) Cognitive function, such as ability to express ideas and to understand, and mental status, such as depression and dementia.

“(iii) Special services, treatments, and interventions, such as need for ventilator use, dialysis, chemotherapy, central line placement, and total parenteral nutrition.

“(iv) Medical conditions and comorbidities, such as diabetes, congestive heart failure, and pressure ulcers.

“(v) Impairments, such as incontinence and an impaired ability to hear, see, or swallow.

“(vi) Other categories deemed necessary and appropriate by the Secretary.

“(2) ALIGNMENT OF CLAIMS DATA WITH STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA.—

To the extent practicable, not later than October 1, 2018, for PAC providers described in clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (a)(2)(A), and January 1, 2019, for PAC providers described in clause (i) of such subsection, the Secretary shall match claims data with assessment data pursuant to this section for purposes of assessing prior service use and concurrent service use, such as antecedent hospital or PAC provider use, and may use such matched data for such other uses as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(3) REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN EXISTING DATA.—In the case of patient assessment data being used with respect to a PAC assessment instrument that duplicates or overlaps with standardized patient assessment data within a category described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, revise or replace such existing data with the standardized data.

“(4) CLARIFICATION.—Standardized patient assessment data submitted pursuant to this subsection shall not be used to require individuals to be provided post-acute care by a specific type of PAC provider in order for such care to be eligible for payment under this title.

“(c) QUALITY MEASURES.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTING QUALITY MEASURES.—Not later than the specified application date, as applicable to measures and PAC providers, the Secretary shall specify quality measures on which PAC providers are required under the applicable reporting provisions to submit standardized patient assessment data described in subsection (b)(1) and other necessary data specified by the Secretary. Such measures shall be with respect to at least the following domains:

“(A) Functional status, cognitive function, and changes in function and cognitive function.

“(B) Skin integrity and changes in skin integrity.

“(C) Medication reconciliation.

“(D) Incidence of major falls.

“(E) Accurately communicating the existence of and providing for the transfer of health information and care preferences of an individual to the individual, family caregiver of the individual, and providers of services furnishing items and services to the individual, when the individual transitions—

“(i) from a hospital or critical access hospital to another applicable setting, including a PAC provider or the home of the individual; or

“(ii) from a PAC provider to another applicable setting, including a different PAC provider, a hospital, a critical access hospital, or the home of the individual.

“(2) REPORTING THROUGH PAC ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To the extent possible, the Secretary shall require such reporting by a PAC provider of quality measures under paragraph (1) through the use of a PAC assessment instrument and shall modify such PAC assessment instrument as necessary to enable the use of such instrument with respect to such quality measures.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not make significant modifications to a PAC assessment instrument more than once per calendar year or fiscal year, as applicable, unless the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a justification for such significant modification.

“(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consider applying adjustments to the quality measures under this subsection taking into

consideration the studies under section 2(d) of the IMPACT Act of 2014.

“(B) RISK ADJUSTMENT.—Such quality measures shall be risk adjusted, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(d) RESOURCE USE AND OTHER MEASURES.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT FOR RESOURCE USE AND OTHER MEASURES.—Not later than the specified application date, as applicable to measures and PAC providers, the Secretary shall specify resource use and other measures on which PAC providers are required under the applicable reporting provisions to submit any necessary data specified by the Secretary, which may include standardized assessment data in addition to claims data. Such measures shall be with respect to at least the following domains:

“(A) Resource use measures, including total estimated Medicare spending per beneficiary.

“(B) Discharge to community.

“(C) Measures to reflect all-condition risk-adjusted potentially preventable hospital readmission rates.

“(2) ALIGNING METHODOLOGY ADJUSTMENTS FOR RESOURCE USE MEASURES.—

“(A) PERIOD OF TIME.—With respect to the period of time used for calculating measures under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall, to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, align resource use with the methodology used for purposes of section 1886(o)(2)(B)(ii).

“(B) GEOGRAPHIC AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall standardize measures with respect to the domain described in paragraph (1)(A) for geographic payment rate differences and payment differentials (and other adjustments, as applicable) consistent with the methodology published in the Federal Register on August 18, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 51624 through 51626), or any subsequent modifications made to the methodology.

“(C) MEDICARE SPENDING PER BENEFICIARY.—The Secretary shall adjust, as appropriate, measures with respect to the domain described in paragraph (1)(A) for the factors applied under section 1886(o)(2)(B)(ii).

“(3) ADJUSTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consider applying adjustments to the resource use and other measures specified under this subsection with respect to the domain described in paragraph (1)(A), taking into consideration the studies under section 2(d) of the IMPACT Act of 2014.

“(B) RISK ADJUSTMENT.—Such resource use and other measures shall be risk adjusted, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(e) MEASUREMENT IMPLEMENTATION PHASES; SELECTION OF QUALITY MEASURES AND RESOURCE USE AND OTHER MEASURES.—

“(1) MEASUREMENT IMPLEMENTATION PHASES.—In the case of quality measures specified under subsection (c)(1) and resource use and other measures specified under subsection (d)(1), the provisions of this section shall be implemented in accordance with the following phases:

“(A) INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE.—The initial implementation phase, with respect to such a measure, shall, in accordance with subsections (c) and (d), as applicable, consist of—

“(i) measure specification, including informing the public of the measure's numerator, denominator, exclusions, and any other aspects the Secretary determines necessary;

“(ii) data collection, including, in the case of quality measures, requiring PAC providers to report data elements needed to calculate such a measure; and

“(iii) data analysis, including, in the case of resource use and other measures, the use of claims data to calculate such a measure.

“(B) SECOND IMPLEMENTATION PHASE.—The second implementation phase, with respect to such a measure, shall consist of the provision of feedback reports to PAC providers, in accordance with subsection (f).

“(C) THIRD IMPLEMENTATION PHASE.—The third implementation phase, with respect to such a measure, shall consist of public reporting of PAC providers’ performance on such measure in accordance with subsection (g).

“(2) CONSENSUS-BASED ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each measure specified by the Secretary under this section shall be endorsed by the entity with a contract under section 1890(a).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of a specified area or medical topic determined appropriate by the Secretary for which a feasible and practical measure has not been endorsed by the entity with a contract under section 1890(a), the Secretary may specify a measure that is not so endorsed as long as due consideration is given to measures that have been endorsed or adopted by a consensus organization identified by the Secretary.

“(3) TREATMENT OF APPLICATION OF PRE-RULEMAKING PROCESS (MEASURE APPLICATIONS PARTNERSHIP PROCESS).—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the provisions of section 1890A shall apply in the case of a quality measure specified under subsection (c) or a resource use or other measure specified under subsection (d).

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(i) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—For purposes of satisfying subparagraph (A), the Secretary may use expedited procedures, such as ad hoc reviews, as necessary, in the case of a quality measure specified under subsection (c) or a resource use or other measure specified in subsection (d) required with respect to data submissions under the applicable reporting provisions during the 1-year period before the specified application date applicable to such a measure and provider involved.

“(ii) OPTION TO WAIVE PROVISIONS.—The Secretary may waive the application of the provisions of section 1890A in the case of a quality measure or resource use or other measure described in clause (i), if the application of such provisions (including through the use of an expedited procedure described in such clause) would result in the inability of the Secretary to satisfy any deadline specified in this section with respect to such measure.

“(f) FEEDBACK REPORTS TO PAC PROVIDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning one year after the specified application date, as applicable to PAC providers and quality measures and resource use and other measures under this section, the Secretary shall provide confidential feedback reports to such PAC providers on the performance of such providers with respect to such measures required under the applicable provisions.

“(2) FREQUENCY.—To the extent feasible, the Secretary shall provide feedback reports described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than on a quarterly basis. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, with respect to measures described in such paragraph that are reported on an annual basis, the Secretary may provide such feedback reports on an annual basis.

“(g) PUBLIC REPORTING OF PAC PROVIDER PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection, the

Secretary shall provide for public reporting of PAC provider performance on quality measures under subsection (c)(1) and the resource use and other measures under subsection (d)(1), including by establishing procedures for making available to the public information regarding the performance of individual PAC providers with respect to such measures.

“(2) OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW.—The procedures under paragraph (1) shall ensure, including through a process consistent with the process applied under section 1886(b)(3)(B)(viii)(VII) for similar purposes, that a PAC provider has the opportunity to review and submit corrections to the data and information that is to be made public with respect to the provider prior to such data being made public.

“(3) TIMING.—Such procedures shall provide that the data and information described in paragraph (1), with respect to a measure and PAC provider, is made publicly available beginning not later than two years after the specified application date applicable to such a measure and provider.

“(4) COORDINATION WITH EXISTING PROGRAMS.—Such procedures shall provide that data and information described in paragraph (1) with respect to quality measures and resource use and other measures under subsections (c)(1) and (d)(1) shall be made publicly available consistent with the following provisions:

“(A) In the case of home health agencies, section 1895(b)(3)(B)(v)(III).

“(B) In the case of skilled nursing facilities, sections 1819(i) and 1919(i).

“(C) In the case of inpatient rehabilitation facilities, section 1886(j)(7)(E).

“(D) In the case of long-term care hospitals, section 1886(m)(5)(E).

“(h) REMOVING, SUSPENDING, OR ADDING MEASURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may remove, suspend, or add a quality measure or resource use or other measure described in subsection (c)(1) or (d)(1), so long as, subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register (with a notice and comment period) a justification for such removal, suspension, or addition.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—In the case of such a quality measure or resource use or other measure for which there is a reason to believe that the continued collection of such measure raises potential safety concerns or would cause other unintended consequences, the Secretary may promptly suspend or remove such measure and satisfy paragraph (1) by publishing in the Federal Register a justification for such suspension or removal in the next rulemaking cycle following such suspension or removal.

“(i) USE OF STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT DATA, QUALITY MEASURES, AND RESOURCE USE AND OTHER MEASURES TO INFORM DISCHARGE PLANNING AND INCORPORATE PATIENT PREFERENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2016, and periodically thereafter (but not less frequently than once every 5 years), the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to modify conditions of participation and subsequent interpretive guidance applicable to PAC providers, hospitals, and critical access hospitals. Such regulations and interpretive guidance shall require such providers to take into account quality, resource use, and other measures under the applicable reporting provisions (which, as available, shall include measures specified under subsections (c) and (d), and other relevant measures) in the discharge planning process. Specifically, such

regulations and interpretive guidance shall address the settings to which a patient may be discharged in order to assist subsection (d) hospitals, critical access hospitals, hospitals described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(v), PAC providers, patients, and families of such patients with discharge planning from inpatient settings, including such hospitals, and from PAC provider settings. In addition, such regulations and interpretive guidance shall include procedures to address—

“(A) treatment preferences of patients; and

“(B) goals of care of patients.

“(2) DISCHARGE PLANNING.—All requirements applied pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be used to help inform and mandate the discharge planning process.

“(3) CLARIFICATION.—Such regulations shall not require an individual to be provided post-acute care by a specific type of PAC provider in order for such care to be eligible for payment under this title.

“(j) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—Before the initial rulemaking process to implement this section, the Secretary shall allow for stakeholder input, such as through town halls, open door forums, and mail-box submissions.

“(k) FUNDING.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account, from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841, in such proportion as the Secretary determines appropriate, of \$130,000,000. Fifty percent of such amount shall be available on the date of the enactment of this section and fifty percent of such amount shall be equally proportioned for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

“(l) LIMITATION.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review under sections 1869 and 1878 or otherwise of the specification of standardized patient assessment data required, the determination of measures, and the systems to report such standardized data under this section.

“(m) NON-APPLICATION OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995’) shall not apply to this section and the sections referenced in subsection (a)(2)(B) that require modification in order to achieve the standardization of patient assessment data.”.

(b) STUDIES OF ALTERNATIVE PAC PAYMENT MODELS.—

(1) MEDPAC.—Using data from the Post-Acute Payment Reform Demonstration authorized under section 5008 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171) or other data, as available, not later than June 30, 2016, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall submit to Congress a report that evaluates and recommends features of PAC payment systems (as defined in section 1899B(a)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a)) that establish, or a unified post-acute care payment system under title XVIII of the Social Security Act that establishes, payment rates according to characteristics of individuals (such as cognitive ability, functional status, and impairments) instead of according to the post-acute care setting where the Medicare beneficiary involved is treated. To the extent feasible, such report shall consider the impacts of moving from PAC payment systems (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(D) of such section 1899B) in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act to new

post-acute care payment systems under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PAC PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT.—

(A) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 2 years after the date by which the Secretary of Health and Human Services has collected 2 years of data on quality measures under subsection (c) of section 1899B, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and appropriate stakeholders, submit to Congress a report, including—

(i) recommendations and a technical prototype, on a post-acute care prospective payment system under title XVIII of the Social Security Act that would—

(I) in lieu of the rates that would otherwise apply under PAC payment systems (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(D) of such section 1899B), base payments under such title, with respect to items and services furnished to an individual by a PAC provider (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(A) of such section), according to individual characteristics (such as cognitive ability, functional status, and impairments) of such individual instead of the post-acute care setting in which the individual is furnished such items and services;

(II) account for the clinical appropriateness of items and services so furnished and Medicare beneficiary outcomes;

(III) be designed to incorporate (or otherwise account for) standardized patient assessment data under section 1899B; and

(IV) further clinical integration, such as by motivating greater coordination around a single condition or procedure to integrate hospital systems with PAC providers (as so defined).

(ii) recommendations on which Medicare fee-for-service regulations for post-acute care payment systems under title XVIII of the Social Security Act should be altered (such as the skilled nursing facility 3-day stay and inpatient rehabilitation facility 60 percent rule);

(iii) an analysis of the impact of the recommended payment system described in clause (i) on Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing, access to care, and choice of setting;

(iv) a projection of any potential reduction in expenditures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act that may be attributable to the application of the recommended payment system described in clause (i); and

(v) a review of the value of subsection (d) hospitals (as defined in section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(1)(B)), hospitals described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(v) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(1)(B)(v)), and critical access hospitals described in section 1820(c)(2)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i-4(c)(2)(B)) collecting and reporting to the Secretary standardized patient assessment data with respect to inpatient hospital services furnished by such a hospital or critical access hospital to individuals who are entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of such Act or, as appropriate, enrolled for benefits under part B of such title.

(B) REPORT BY MEDPAC.—Not later than the first June 30th following the date on which the report is required under subparagraph (A), the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall submit to Congress a report, including recommendations and a technical prototype, on a post-acute care prospective payment system under title XVIII of the Social Security Act that would satisfy the criteria described in subparagraph (A).

(3) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “Medi-

care beneficiary” has the meaning given such term in section 1899B(a)(2) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a).

(c) PAYMENT CONSEQUENCES UNDER THE APPLICABLE REPORTING PROVISIONS.—

(1) HOME HEALTH AGENCIES.—Section 1895(b)(3)(B)(v) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395fff(b)(3)(B)(v)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “subclause (II)” and inserting “subclauses (II) and (IV)”; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking “For 2007” and inserting “Subject to subclause (V), for 2007”;

(C) in subclause (III), by inserting “and subclause (IV)(aa)” after “subclause (II)”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(IV) SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—For the year beginning on the specified application date (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(E) of section 1899B), as applicable with respect to home health agencies and quality measures under subsection (c)(1) of such section and measures under subsection (d)(1) of such section, and each subsequent year, in addition to the data described in subclause (II), each home health agency shall submit to the Secretary data on such quality measures and any necessary data specified by the Secretary under such subsection (d)(1).

“(bb) STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA.—For 2019 and each subsequent year, in addition to such data described in item (aa), each home health agency shall submit to the Secretary standardized patient assessment data required under subsection (b)(1) of section 1899B.

“(cc) SUBMISSION.—Data shall be submitted under items (aa) and (bb) in the form and manner, and at the time, specified by the Secretary for purposes of this clause.

“(V) NON-DUPPLICATION.—To the extent data submitted under subclause (IV) duplicates other data required to be submitted under subclause (II), the submission of such data under subclause (IV) shall be in lieu of the submission of such data under subclause (II). The previous sentence shall not apply insofar as the Secretary determines it is necessary to avoid a delay in the implementation of section 1899B, taking into account the different specified application dates under subsection (a)(2)(E) of such section.”.

(2) INPATIENT REHABILITATION FACILITIES.—Section 1886(j)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(j)(7)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C) and (F)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “For fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent rate year” and inserting “Subject to subparagraph (G), for fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year”;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “and subparagraph (F)(i)” after “subparagraph (C)”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For the fiscal year beginning on the specified application date (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(E) of section 1899B), as applicable with respect to inpatient rehabilitation facilities and quality measures under subsection (c)(1) of such section and measures under subsection (d)(1) of such section, and each subsequent fiscal year, in addition to such data on the quality measures described in subparagraph (C), each rehabilitation facility shall submit to the Secretary data on the quality measures under such

subsection (c)(1) and any necessary data specified by the Secretary under such subsection (d)(1).

“(ii) STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA.—For fiscal year 2019 and each subsequent fiscal year, in addition to such data described in clause (i), each rehabilitation facility shall submit to the Secretary standardized patient assessment data required under subsection (b)(1) of section 1899B.

“(iii) SUBMISSION.—Such data shall be submitted in the form and manner, and at the time, specified by the Secretary for purposes of this subparagraph.

“(G) NON-DUPPLICATION.—To the extent data submitted under subparagraph (F) duplicates other data required to be submitted under subparagraph (C), the submission of such data under subparagraph (F) shall be in lieu of the submission of such data under subparagraph (C). The previous sentence shall not apply insofar as the Secretary determines it is necessary to avoid a delay in the implementation of section 1899B, taking into account the different specified application dates under subsection (a)(2)(E) of such section.”.

(3) LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITALS.—Section 1886(m)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(m)(5)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C) and (F)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “For rate year” and inserting “Subject to subparagraph (G), for rate year”;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “and subparagraph (F)(i)” after “subparagraph (C)”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For the rate year beginning on the specified application date (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(E) of section 1899B), as applicable with respect to long-term care hospitals and quality measures under subsection (c)(1) of such section and measures under subsection (d)(1) of such section, and each subsequent rate year, in addition to the data on the quality measures described in subparagraph (C), each long-term care hospital (other than a hospital classified under subsection (d)(1)(B)(iv)(II)) shall submit to the Secretary data on the quality measures under such subsection (c)(1) and any necessary data specified by the Secretary under such subsection (d)(1).

“(ii) STANDARDIZED PATIENT ASSESSMENT DATA.—For rate year 2019 and each subsequent rate year, in addition to such data described in clause (i), each long-term care hospital (other than a hospital classified under subsection (d)(1)(B)(iv)(II)) shall submit to the Secretary standardized patient assessment data required under subsection (b)(1) of section 1899B.

“(iii) SUBMISSION.—Such data shall be submitted in the form and manner, and at the time, specified by the Secretary for purposes of this subparagraph.

“(G) NON-DUPPLICATION.—To the extent data submitted under subparagraph (F) duplicates other data required to be submitted under subparagraph (C), the submission of such data under subparagraph (F) shall be in lieu of the submission of such data under subparagraph (C). The previous sentence shall not apply insofar as the Secretary determines it is necessary to avoid a delay in the implementation of section 1899B, taking into account the different specified application dates under subsection (a)(2)(E) of such section.”.

(4) SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (6) of section 1888(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395yy(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) REPORTING OF ASSESSMENT AND QUALITY DATA.—

“(A) REDUCTION IN UPDATE FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2018, in the case of a skilled nursing facility that does not submit data, as applicable, in accordance with subclauses (II) and (III) of subparagraph (B)(i) with respect to such a fiscal year, after determining the percentage described in paragraph (5)(B)(i), and after application of paragraph (5)(B)(ii), the Secretary shall reduce such percentage for payment rates during such fiscal year by 2 percentage points.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—The application of this subparagraph may result in the percentage described in paragraph (5)(B)(i), after application of paragraph (5)(B)(ii), being less than 0.0 for a fiscal year, and may result in payment rates under this subsection for a fiscal year being less than such payment rates for the preceding fiscal year.

“(iii) NONCUMULATIVE APPLICATION.—Any reduction under clause (i) shall apply only with respect to the fiscal year involved and the Secretary shall not take into account such reduction in computing the payment amount under this subsection for a subsequent fiscal year.

“(B) ASSESSMENT AND MEASURE DATA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A skilled nursing facility, or a facility (other than a critical access hospital) described in paragraph (7)(B), shall submit to the Secretary, in a manner and within the timeframes prescribed by the Secretary—

“(I) subject to clause (iii), the resident assessment data necessary to develop and implement the rates under this subsection;

“(II) for fiscal years beginning on or after the specified application date (as defined in subsection (a)(2)(E) of section 1899B), as applicable with respect to skilled nursing facilities and quality measures under subsection (c)(1) of such section and measures under subsection (d)(1) of such section, data on such quality measures under such subsection (c)(1) and any necessary data specified by the Secretary under such subsection (d)(1); and

“(III) for fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 2018, standardized patient assessment data required under subsection (b)(1) of section 1899B.

“(ii) USE OF STANDARD INSTRUMENT.—For purposes of meeting the requirement under clause (i), a skilled nursing facility, or a facility (other than a critical access hospital) described in paragraph (7)(B), may submit the resident assessment data required under section 1819(b)(3), using the standard instrument designated by the State under section 1819(e)(5).

“(iii) NON-DUPLICATION.—To the extent data submitted under subclause (II) or (III) of clause (i) duplicates other data required to be submitted under clause (i)(I), the submission of such data under such a subclause shall be in lieu of the submission of such data under clause (i)(I). The previous sentence shall not apply insofar as the Secretary determines it is necessary to avoid a delay in the implementation of section 1899B, taking into account the different specified application dates under subsection (a)(2)(E) of such section.”.

(B) FUNDING FOR NURSING HOME COMPARE WEBSITE.—Section 1819(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i-3(i)) is amended by

adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall transfer to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account, from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 a one-time allocation of \$11,000,000. The amount shall be available on the date of the enactment of this paragraph. Such sums shall remain available until expended. Such sums shall be used to implement section 1128I(g).”.

(d) IMPROVING PAYMENT ACCURACY UNDER THE PAC PAYMENT SYSTEMS AND OTHER MEDICARE PAYMENT SYSTEMS.—

(1) STUDIES AND REPORTS OF EFFECT OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ON QUALITY AND RESOURCE USE.—

(A) STUDY USING EXISTING MEDICARE DATA.—

(i) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall conduct a study that examines the effect of individuals’ socioeconomic status on quality measures and resource use and other measures for individuals under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) (such as to recognize that less healthy individuals may require more intensive interventions). The study shall use information collected on such individuals in carrying out such program, such as urban and rural location, eligibility for Medicaid under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) (recognizing and accounting for varying Medicaid eligibility across States), and eligibility for benefits under the supplemental security income (SSI) program. The Secretary shall carry out this paragraph acting through the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under clause (i).

(B) STUDY USING OTHER DATA.—

(i) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study that examines the impact of risk factors, such as those described in section 1848(p)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(p)(3)), race, health literacy, limited English proficiency (LEP), and Medicare beneficiary activation, on quality measures and resource use and other measures under the Medicare program (such as to recognize that less healthy individuals may require more intensive interventions). In conducting such study the Secretary may use existing Federal data and collect such additional data as may be necessary to complete the study.

(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under clause (i).

(C) EXAMINATION OF DATA IN CONDUCTING STUDIES.—In conducting the studies under subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary shall examine what non-Medicare data sets, such as data from the American Community Survey (ACS), can be useful in conducting the types of studies under such paragraphs and how such data sets that are identified as useful can be coordinated with Medicare administrative data in order to improve the overall data set available to do such studies and for the administration of the Medicare program.

(D) RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACCOUNT FOR INFORMATION IN PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT MECHANISMS.—If the studies conducted under subparagraphs (A) and (B) find a relationship between the factors examined in the studies

and quality measures and resource use and other measures, then the Secretary shall also provide recommendations for how the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services should—

(i) obtain access to the necessary data (if such data is not already being collected) on such factors, including recommendations on how to address barriers to the Centers in accessing such data; and

(ii) account for such factors—

(I) in quality measures, resource use measures, and other measures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (including such measures specified under subsections (c) and (d) of section 1899B of such Act, as added by subsection (a)); and

(II) in determining payment adjustments based on such measures in other applicable provisions of such title.

(E) FUNDING.—There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) (in proportions determined appropriate by the Secretary) to carry out this paragraph \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(2) CMS ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Taking into account the relevant studies conducted and recommendations made in reports under paragraph (1) and, as appropriate, other information, including information collected before completion of such studies and recommendations, the Secretary, on an ongoing basis, shall, as the Secretary determines appropriate and based on an individual’s health status and other factors—

(i) assess appropriate adjustments to quality measures, resource use measures, and other measures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) (including measures specified in subsections (c) and (d) of section 1899B of such Act, as added by subsection (a)); and

(ii) assess and implement appropriate adjustments to payments under such title based on measures described in clause (i).

(B) ACCESSING DATA.—The Secretary shall collect or otherwise obtain access to the data necessary to carry out this paragraph through existing and new data sources.

(C) PERIODIC ANALYSES.—The Secretary shall carry out periodic analyses, at least every 3 years, based on the factors referred to in subparagraph (A) so as to monitor changes in possible relationships.

(D) FUNDING.—There are hereby appropriated to the Secretary from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) (in proportions determined appropriate by the Secretary) to carry out this paragraph \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(3) STRATEGIC PLAN FOR ACCESSING RACE AND ETHNICITY DATA.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and report to Congress on a strategic plan for collecting or otherwise accessing data on race and ethnicity for purposes of specifying quality measures and resource use and other measures under subsections (c) and (d) of section 1899B of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a), and, as the Secretary determines appropriate, other similar provisions of, including payment adjustments under, title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

SEC. 3. HOSPICE CARE.**(a) HOSPICE SURVEY REQUIREMENT.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1861(dd)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(dd)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) Any entity that is certified as a hospice program shall be subject to a standard survey by an appropriate State or local survey agency, or an approved accreditation agency, as determined by the Secretary, not less frequently than once every 36 months beginning 6 months after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and ending September 30, 2025.”

(2) FUNDING.—For purposes of carrying out subparagraph (C) of section 1861(dd)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(dd)(4)), as added by paragraph (1), there shall be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account—

(A) \$25,000,000 for fiscal years 2015 through 2017, to be made available for such purposes in equal parts for each such fiscal year; and

(B) \$45,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 through 2025, to be made available for such purposes in equal parts for each such fiscal year.

(b) HOSPICE PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY RECERTIFICATION TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO APPLY LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF BENEFICIARY RULES.—Section 1879 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395pp) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to a denial of a payment under this title by reason of section 1814(a)(7)(E) in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to a denial of a payment under this title by reason of section 1862(a)(1).”

(c) REVISION TO REQUIREMENT FOR MEDICAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN HOSPICE CARE.—Section 1814(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(a)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “(and, in the case of clause (ii), before the date of enactment of subparagraph (E))” after “2011”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) on and after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, in the case of hospice care provided an individual for more than 180 days by a hospice program for which the number of such cases for such program comprises more than a percent (specified by the Secretary) of the total number of all cases of individuals provided hospice care by the program under this title, the hospice care provided to such individual is medically reviewed (in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary); and”

(d) UPDATE OF HOSPICE AGGREGATE PAYMENT CAP.—Section 1814(i)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f(i)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(B) For purposes” and inserting “(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), for purposes”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) For purposes of subparagraph (A) for accounting years that end after September 30, 2016, and before October 1, 2025, the ‘cap amount’ is the cap amount under this subparagraph for the preceding accounting year updated by the percentage update to payment rates for hospice care under paragraph (1)(C) for services furnished during the fiscal year beginning on the October 1 preceding

the beginning of the accounting year (including the application of any productivity or other adjustment under clause (iv) of that paragraph).

“(iii) For accounting years that end after September 30, 2025, the cap amount shall be computed under clause (i) as if clause (ii) had never applied.”

(e) MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.—Section 1898 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading to read as follows: “**MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND**”; and

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish under this title a Medicare Improvement Fund (in this section referred to as the ‘Fund’) which shall be available to the Secretary to make improvements under the original Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under part or enrolled under part B including adjustments to payments for items and services furnished by providers of services and suppliers under such original Medicare fee-for-service program.”

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “during” and all that follows and inserting “during and after fiscal year 2020, \$195,000,000.”; and

(4) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “from the Federal” and all that follows and inserting “from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund in such proportion as the Secretary determines appropriate.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the IMPACT Act. This bill has a clever name and it will do what it says; it will have a positive impact on the Medicare program.

Much work has been done to investigate how to improve care for seniors, and last June, the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee held a hearing on care delivery after a hospitalization, or what we call post-acute care. Much like the IMPACT Act, the hearing was bipartisan and focused on post-acute reforms that the President advanced in his annual budget.

It has been over a decade since meaningful changes have been made in the care of Medicare patients after hospitalization is paid.

We have recently made progress. Site-neutral payments for long-term care hospitals and a value-based readmission program for nursing homes have been signed into law. These changes are a positive step in the right direction.

Talks of broader reform have been ongoing as concerns of the impact of the solvency of the major source of funding for this care, the Medicare hospital insurance “HI” trust fund, persist.

The Medicare trustees have explicitly told us the trajectory of spending from the HI trust fund is unsustainable. The trustees’ current estimate is that the HI trust fund will be insolvent by 2030.

Since 2008, the trust fund has been spending more money than it has been taking in. No wonder the HI trust fund has not met the trustees’ formal test of short-range adequacy since 2003.

This is a major problem. The HI trust fund is a ticking time bomb.

The IMPACT Act is not the full solution, but it is a vital step on the path toward the solution. The IMPACT Act lays the foundation for future reform.

The act establishes standard data and metrics across all of Medicare’s post-hospitalization settings, including nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities. This important information will allow Congress to make future reforms armed with the facts.

We all owe it to the seniors across America to catapult the Medicare program into the 21st century, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Caring for our seniors after they are in the hospital is important, and we need to ensure the trust fund is solvent to allow us to continue to provide this care to our children and grandchildren.

This is just plain, good, common-sense policy. I am voting in favor of the IMPACT Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that this bill is being considered as amended.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

This legislation is truly a bipartisan effort. I congratulate Mr. BRADY and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on the committee who worked on this. And I think Mr. BRADY would like to join me, I am sure, in thanking the staff for their very considerable work on this.

The Affordable Care Act is making major strides towards improving our health care system, including moving toward accountable, quality-driven care. This legislation furthers this quality effort in the post-acute care space.

It is also the first step towards modernizing post-acute care payments to

Medicare providers. The current lack of apples-to-apples quality and patient assessment data in post-acute settings makes it difficult to evaluate the quality and cost effectiveness of these providers.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation, crafted with my colleagues on the Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, requires post-acute providers to report common data elements across settings, including patient assessments of function and mobility and quality and resource use measures. Over time, this data will enable health care providers, patients, and their families to determine the best post-acute setting for that patient's particular condition and preferences.

The legislation also asks the Secretary and MEDPAC to provide suggestions and models for how Congress may reform post-acute care payments in the future.

As we continue to strive for quality and value in the Medicare program, it is important we do not discourage providers from caring for complex patient populations. That is why this legislation directs the Secretary to study the effect of individual socioeconomic status, health literacy, English language proficiency, and other factors on quality and research use measurement, and then incorporate those findings into value-based performance programs.

Lastly, the IMPACT Act ensures quality within the hospice benefit by requiring that providers are surveyed by an appropriate accrediting agency at least once every 3 years.

Overall, the IMPACT Act is supported by a multitude of stakeholder organizations. So I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" and to take this important step—and I want to underline that—this important step towards modernizing vital post-acute care.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee and a champion for affordable health care.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong support of the IMPACT Act, H.R. 4994. In particular, I would direct my comments tonight in regards to the provisions that deal with hospice care in America. I thank the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, a friend who has stood with us in regards to this act, and I echo his support and request for support for its passage this evening.

When we drafted the Hospice Opportunities for Supporting Patients with Integrity and Care Evaluations, otherwise known as the HOSPICE Act, I was glad to bring those issues to the forefront in the debate that has been incorporated in the IMPACT Act tonight.

To me, hospice care is the right thing to do for our fellow Americans that

face those hard decisions as we deal with health care at the end of our lives.

To me, the HOSPICE Act and the provisions in the IMPACT Act go to ensure that there is quality care when it comes to hospice care for our fellow Americans.

These reforms are necessary. They are the right thing to do, and they will ensure that hospice in America is done in a quality, well-conducted manner for all of our fellow Americans.

I would like to thank my coauthor on this, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON from California, with his bipartisan support, and with my colleague on the other side joining us in regards to these reforms to hospice care across America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will close just briefly to reiterate, this is a product of months and months of work across the aisle, our staffs working together many, many hours, I think, probably at various hours of the day and night, maybe even as late as it is tonight on other days. So I think we should be proud of this product, and I hope all of us will support it.

I thank Mr. BRADY for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to close.

The bill began with an open letter to stakeholders, as Ranking Member LEVIN said. Following our bipartisan call to action, we received over 70 comments in response to our letter asking for specific recommendations to improve care for seniors.

□ 2145

There were three central themes that stakeholders urged us to pursue, and they are very simple:

One, create a common measure set with standardized data to assess the quality of health care, the way it is delivered;

Two, carefully research and study Medicare's post-acute settings to inform future payment and delivery system reform;

And then third, place an emphasis on informing the patient and team of caregivers during the discharge planning process in order to more effectively coordinate care.

The IMPACT Act achieves these important objectives.

Support for IMPACT comes from hospitals, nursing homes, home health care providers, leading quality groups like the National Quality Forum, and leading beneficiary advocates. I would like to highlight a few:

From the National Home Care and Hospice Association:

"We are very supportive of the goals behind the IMPACT Act and fully sup-

port the development of a uniform patient assessment and discharge planning process."

From the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, which represents rehab physicians:

"The presence of these quality measures will ensure that patients are receiving the best possible care in the most appropriate setting."

Finally, from the National Coalition on Health Care, which represents many Medicare beneficiary organizations:

"With this information, payers, providers, consumers, and family caregivers can work together to identify the best care setting for each individual, and policymakers can begin the challenging work of implementing broader reform to Medicare's post-acute system."

On behalf of Chairman DAVE CAMP, I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, and his staff for all of their good work and thank Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH in joining us in this bipartisan, bicameral effort.

It is time to support our seniors and improve the Medicare program on which they rely. I urge my colleagues to join me and vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, "you get what you pay for." This is true in medicine as in many other fields, and it is why federal healthcare payment policies are so important.

The Affordable Care Act made important reforms in this area. We established many new programs to move us away from a healthcare system that rewards volume over value, such as the Hospital Value Based Purchasing program, the Physician Value-Based Payment Modifier, the Medicare Shared Savings Program or ACOs, and the many new payment models being tested under the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI).

Although we have yet to pass final legislation, the bipartisan, bicameral Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) physician payment reform policies we adopted in the House earlier this year would make valuable additional reforms.

And the bill before us, the Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act of 2014, would take another crucial step toward the modernization of Medicare payments to healthcare providers.

Post-acute care providers, such as nursing homes, long-term care hospitals, and home health agencies are the logical next providers to undergo payment and delivery system transformations. There is tremendous variation in healthcare spending across post-acute care settings. And there is only inconclusive evidence to support which patients should receive which services in which settings of care.

Before we revamp how providers are paid in these settings, we must ensure we have the information we need to make informed decisions. Comprehensive and reliable quality and outcomes data must be collected and analyzed before we can implement payment reforms, such as equalized payments across settings or bundled payments.

And that is exactly what this bill does. It gathers the data we need to compare quality across different post-acute care providers, improve hospital and post-acute care discharge planning, and understand how to appropriately account for socio-economic status in payment and quality performance. This information will help us improve the payment and delivery systems for post-acute care, thereby ensuring Medicare beneficiaries receive the right high-quality care, in the right setting, at the right time.

I am pleased to see this important bipartisan effort to reform post-acute care move forward, which will lead to improved quality, improved outcomes, and lower healthcare costs. I urge my colleagues to vote for its swift passage.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4994, the IMPACT Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation makes several small changes to improve post-acute care quality measures and reporting systems in Medicare.

This bill will lay the groundwork for future changes that will reform how Medicare pays for post-acute care.

This bill has support across the post-acute care community, including providers and beneficiaries.

This bill is budget neutral. In short, this is an innocuous bill.

Yet, the bottom line is this:

Congress must do more than pass small, innocuous bills. My constituents in Seattle—and constituents from coast to coast—are coping with a list of growing challenges.

Yet, this Congress is content to push the urgent work of tackling these challenges to another day.

Seniors, patients and doctors need Congress to find a permanent fix for the flawed Sustainable Growth Rate formula in Medicare.

American seniors deserve greater safety and security, but Congress' most recent SGR patch—thrown together last Spring—expires in March.

By then, Congress—just like the 17 times before—will be up against an urgent deadline and flailing to find a permanent solution.

American families need Congress to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program.

More than 8 million children and pregnant women access affordable health coverage through CHIP.

But federal funding faces a cliff next year, and this Congress isn't doing anything about it.

America needs a reenergized primary care workforce.

By 2020, our nation's health system will be staggered by a shortage of 45,000 primary care doctors.

But this Congress isn't talking about extending Medicaid payment parity before it expires in December.

This Congress isn't talking about reauthorizing the National Health Service Corps.

And this Congress certainly isn't talking about new ideas like R-DOCS—a program, modeled on our military's ROTC program, to train and place new primary care doctors where they are needed most.

Yes, we might pass legislation like the IMPACT Act this week. But the American people

demand and deserve bolder action and bigger results from their Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4994, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR PASSENGER FEE LIMITATIONS

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5462) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON FEES CHARGED TO PASSENGERS OF AIR CARRIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 4494 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) LIMITATION ON FEE.—

“(1) AMOUNT.—Fees imposed under subsection (a)(1) shall be \$5.60 per one-way trip in air transportation or intrastate air transportation that originates at an airport in the United States, except that the fee imposed per round trip shall not exceed \$11.20.

“(2) DEFINITION OF ROUND TRIP.—In this subsection, the term ‘round trip’ means a trip on an air travel itinerary that terminates or has a stopover at the origin point (or co-terminal).”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a trip in air transportation or intrastate air transportation that is purchased on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5462, a bill I introduced to address executive overreach affecting the traveling public.

Specifically, this bill would lower fees for certain airline passengers by clarifying congressional intent and set-

ting a mandatory cap on the fees that TSA collects for round trips.

Since 9/11, aviation user fees have helped to defray security costs and ensure that our vital transportation network remains safe. However, when the Bipartisan Budget Act increased these fees, TSA took the language to mean that it was authorized to collect an even higher amount than Congress intended, and it eliminated its own longstanding cap on round trip fees.

Bipartisan Members of the House and Senate, including the authors of the Bipartisan Budget Act, agree that TSA is not authorized to collect these higher fees from travelers, which will add \$60 to \$70 million annually to the cost of air travel.

H.R. 5462 looks to correct this overreach and save American taxpayers from having to shell out millions of dollars in extra fees. Reducing the burden on airline passengers benefits everyone—from helping families save money when taking a vacation to cutting costs for our small businesses whose employees travel for work.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5462.

At the outset, I would like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Representative HUDSON, for the bipartisan approach he has taken with this legislation. I know that Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. RICHMOND have joined him on this legislation, and I have as well.

H.R. 5462 seeks to remove any confusion about a key provision of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 as enacted into law in December 2013. Section 601 of that law provided for the aviation security fee that the Transportation Security Administration collects to increase to \$5.60 per one-way trip.

We know that since 9/11 this department was created, and the fees have been utilized to continue to protect the homeland, fees that are assessed on the airlines and utilized by the Transportation Security Administration, but we are attempting to make sure that the process is fair. The language did not specifically cap the fee for a round trip ticket, but common sense would tell us that Congress intended the passenger fee for a round trip to be twice that of a one-way trip, or \$11.20.

Regrettably, TSA has missed this intent, resulting in some passengers being assessed excessive fees.

We have the responsibility here in the United States Congress to provide the kind of oversight that treats the Transportation Security Administration fairly: providing them with resources; ensuring that they are protecting the traveling public; ensuring that their TSOs are trained; and, as

well, acknowledging the important work that they do. But we have, likewise, a responsibility to the traveling public, and we must balance that with making sure that the fees that are assessed are not excessive.

The legislation before us today clarifies that the passenger security fee should be capped for a round trip at twice the rate assessed for a one-way trip.

Mr. Speaker, for the better part of 5 months, the Committee on Homeland Security and others in Congress have been engaged in a back-and-forth with TSA on this issue. It is my sincere hope that, with this guidance and the enactment of this legislation, this will resolve this issue, once and for all, for the American flying public. Again, as I indicated, it is important to be balanced and fair.

Simply put, this straightforward, bipartisan legislation will ensure that passengers are no longer charged air transportation fees above and beyond what Congress envisioned and intended.

Let me again thank Chairman HUDSON for his leadership on this issue and for the give-and-take that has gone on.

I do want to add two points to my closing remarks as I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5462 so that TSA can no longer charge passenger security fees above and beyond what is reasonable and what Congress has intended.

I think it is important—and I know Mr. HUDSON will agree with me—the work of the Transportation Security Administration and the improvement of training that we have seen in TSO officers in the line of defense, if you will, that they serve in the Nation's airports.

I want to acknowledge an incident that allegedly occurred, or occurred, with a FAM officer in Nigeria. I want to express to the Federal Air Marshals my concern for that issue and that incident. To the particular air marshal who was in the line of duty and his having been attacked with a hypodermic needle, we express our concern, and we are pleased that there are continued negotiations regarding the process of those FAMs going through international airports.

Lastly, I would say—and I hope that we will engage in this discussion—I know Chairman HUDSON is having a number of meetings. We are all aware, on the backdrop on the debate we will have tomorrow on ISIL, of the potential of the impact on the homeland. We know that we have about 100 American passport individuals who have left for the foreign fighters.

I am looking to introduce in very short order legislation that indicates No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act of 2014, which gives greater details and assessment of the No Fly List, the watch list, to make sure that those with

American passports who have gone to the fight cannot be on our airlines; so I am looking forward to working with the committee on this issue.

I only offer that, Mr. Speaker, because of the important work of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, and the responsibility that we have here on the securing of the homeland really is a strong component of the Transportation Security Subcommittee.

You have been a leader along with the ranking member. I look forward to working with you, and I believe that the Homeland Security Committee and the Homeland Security Department are key factors in securing the homeland in the backdrop of this new threat of ISIL as all of the other committees work together on making sure that Americans are safe.

I conclude by asking my colleagues to support H.R. 5462 and to support the idea of a fair and balanced assessment on passenger security fees.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to commend the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Representative HUDSON, for the bipartisan approach he has taken with this legislation.

H.R. 5462 seeks to remove any confusion about a key provision of the "Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013," As enacted into law in December 2013.

Section 601 of that law provided for the aviation security fee that Transportation Security Administration collects to increase to \$5.60 per one-way trip.

The language did not specifically cap the fee for a round-trip ticket but common sense would tell us that Congress intended the passenger fee for a round-trip to be twice that of a one-way trip or \$11.20.

Regrettably, TSA has missed this intent, resulting in some passengers being assessed excessive fees.

The legislation before us today clarifies that the passenger security fee should be capped for a round-trip at twice the rate assessed for a one-way trip.

Mr. Speaker, for the better part of five months, the Committee on Homeland Security and others in Congress have been engaged in back-and-forth with TSA on this issue.

It is my sincere hope that enactment of this legislation will resolve this issue, once and for all, for the American flying public. Mr. Speaker, simply put, this straightforward, bipartisan, legislation will ensure that passengers are no longer charged air transportation fees above and beyond what Congress envisioned and intended.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 5462 so that TSA can no longer charge passengers security fees above and beyond what is reasonable and what Congress intended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Ranking Member RICHMOND, Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and Ranking Member JACKSON LEE for their work on this issue, and I appreciate the

comments the gentlewoman had tonight. I would echo that I appreciate the bipartisan nature in which she works on issues on the Homeland Security Committee. I appreciate the relationship we have had. I respect the gentlewoman very much. I appreciate the advice that she has given me, and I appreciate the cooperation under which we have worked throughout this Congress.

I think this product that we bring to the floor today is an example of bipartisanship of the best kind—where we can come together, Republicans and Democrats, and work for the betterment of the American people. I thank the gentlewoman for that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit a letter from the airline industry in support of this bipartisan bill.

SEPTEMBER 16, 2014.

Hon. MIKE MCCAUL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL, CHAIRMAN HUDSON, RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON AND CONGRESSMAN RICHMOND: On behalf of Airlines for America (A4A), I am writing to reiterate our strong support for H.R. 5462 that would require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to cap the September 11th Security Fee (\$5.60 per one-way trip) for a round-trip at twice that of a one-way trip (i.e., \$11.20).

In an effort to streamline the passenger security fee and eliminate a "per-enplanement" fee structure, Congress applied a flat fee of \$5.60 per one-way trip under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Pub. L. 113-67). The intent was to simplify the fee assessment and cap the passenger security fee for a round-trip at twice that of a one-way trip, as has been TSA's long-held policy. Unfortunately, when TSA implemented the higher fee on July 21, 2014, the agency eliminated the round-trip cap.

While the Act simplified the fee structure, Congress otherwise intended to leave the pre-existing regulatory structure in place. This is unmistakably clear from the limited revisions to the statute. Congressional intent has been emphatically underscored by the Members of Congress who were responsible for drafting these revisions, House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-WI) and Senate Budget Committee Chairwoman Patty Murray (D-WA), in a letter to TSA Administrator John Pistole (May 6, 2014). This change was made against the backdrop of the existing cap on the fee for a round-trip that was twice the maximum one-way fee.

Under H.R. 5462, which would require TSA to honor the round-trip cap, passenger security fees would be limited to \$5.60 per one-way trip and \$11.20 per round-trip. Airlines and their passengers are already paying more than their fair share of federal taxes and fees. The passenger security fee increase that took effect in July will cost airline passengers—who paid a near-record \$2 billion in aviation security taxes in 2013—over \$1.2 billion annually or \$12.6 billion over the next

decade. As a result of the passenger security fee increase, government-imposed taxes and fees now constitute \$63, or 21 percent, of the cost of a typical \$300 domestic round-trip ticket. To add insult to injury, eliminating the round-trip cap will result in airline passengers paying about \$60 million more per year than Congress intended.

Thank you for your leadership and for fighting for the traveling public on this important issue. We stand ready to help ensure swift, bipartisan approval of H.R. 5462 by the House.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS E. CALIO.

Mr. HUDSON. As the chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I am committed to finding commonsense solutions that reduce taxes and make air travel more accessible, leading to more frequent trips, increased tourism, and more dollars invested in our local economies.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5462, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important bipartisan legislation. This bill clarifies Congressional intent on the matter of security fees incurred by airline passengers and corrects the Transportation Security Administration's misinterpretation of the Bipartisan Budget Act's minor modifications to these fees.

TSA should not collect additional passenger security fees beyond what Congress has authorized. H.R. 5462 is common sense, bipartisan legislation to clarify the fee structure that Congress intended and protect the traveling public from millions of dollars in excess charges on their flights.

I applaud Subcommittee Chairman HUDSON, as well as Ranking Member THOMPSON and Ranking Member RICHMOND for working together on a bipartisan basis to address this problem. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) ignored the clear Congressional intent of the Bipartisan Budget Act (P.L. 113-67) (BBA) and began collecting aviation security fees beyond the round-trip limitation that has existed since the Aviation Security Act of 2001. TSA had every opportunity to work with Congress to adjust the fee collection structure, but they unfortunately chose to ignore both the intent of the BBA and the concerns of individual members.

H.R. 5462 re-institutes the round-trip cap through statute, ensuring that passengers will not be made to pay a security fee in excess of what is authorized by Congress. Because the Congressional Budget Office has updated its baseline projection to incorporate TSA's incorrect implementation of the BBA, H.R. 5462 has a cost. However, passage of the bill will return security fee receipts to the level originally estimated by the CBO upon passage of the BBA.

I thank my colleague, Mr. HUDSON, for introducing this bill and I fully support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5462.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FIGHTING EBOLA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was extremely important to rise today to congratulate the President on recognizing the crucialness of the fight against this horrific disease Ebola in Africa.

I have been in Africa over the last 4 or 5 months. Ebola is devastating to the West African countries. They have been fighting on their own, but it has been recognized that they do not have the infrastructure to be able to contain the disease. We are sending 3,000 of our men and women of the United States military but, as equally important, we are providing for the self-made hospital containers that can be utilized to provide the infrastructure for these countries to be able to fight Ebola.

There is no medical system existing now because everyone is fighting, and therefore everyone is, in essence, ensuring that the illness is not taken care of. This is a crisis. We need to be engaged, and we need to fight against Ebola so it can be extinguished and the people in Africa can get back to their lives again.

□ 2200

THE ISLAMIC STATE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was in agreement with the President going after IS but not with people we can't trust.

Andy McCarthy has a great article here entitled, "But They Were Really Moderate Beheadings," pointing out that the people the President wants to support actually are guilty of beheadings themselves. But apparently they are moderate beheadings.

It is also important to note that Hezbollah has released a statement saying that President Obama is not determined enough to confront IS. And they said: "Those who delve deeper into the American stance will notice that Americans accept IS in our region while trying to prevent it from spreading to their country."

This is not the way to go. These people cannot be trusted. It is time for us

to either help the Kurds—since Turkey is not willing to face this crisis by putting boots on the ground and actually fighting IS for us, then arm the Kurds. I know the Turks are afraid of that. But we are more concerned about IS.

Help the Kurds. And let's wipe out IS but not with free Syrians we can't trust.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4197. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5134. An act to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7126. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Margin Protection Program for Dairy and Dairy Product Donation Program (RIN: 0560-A123) received September 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7127. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Animal Welfare; Importation of Live Dogs [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0053] (RIN: 0579-AD23) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7128. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination in Programs or Activities Conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture (RIN: 0503-AA52) received August 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7129. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Allegheny County, PA, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8347] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7130. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Pike County, IN, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8345] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7131. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Housing Program Fee: Final Fee Increase [Docket No.: FR-5721-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ19) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7132. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Emergency Homeowners' Loan Program Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5795-F01] (RIN: 2502-AJ24) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7133. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Asset-Backed Securities Disclosure and Registration (RIN: 3235-AK37) received September 4, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7134. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act (RIN: 1210-AB67) received August 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7135. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulations (RIN: 0991-AB87) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7136. A letter from the Chief, Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 21, 73, 74 and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands [WT Docket No. 03-66] (RM-11614) received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7137. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Light Load Handling System and Refueling Cavity Design [NRC-2013-0148] received August 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7138. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment and Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 140106011-4338-02] (RIN: 0648-XD357) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7139. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD375) received August 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7140. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reappointment of the 2014 Gulf of Alaska Pacific Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Limits for the Trawl Deep-Water and Shallow-Water Fishery Categories [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD361) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7141. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 12814338-21711-02] (RIN: 0648-BE39) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7142. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary Regulations and Management Plan [Docket No.: 130817310-4485-02] (RIN: 0648-BD60) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7143. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery and Possession Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 14010611-4338-02] (RIN: 0648-XD418) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7144. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of Firearms Transaction Record, ATF Form 4473 (Low Volume)

(2008R-21P) [Docket No. ATF-19F; AG Order No. 3451-2014] (RIN: 1140-AA34) received August 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7145. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vessel Documentation Renewal Fees [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0990] (RIN: 1625-AB56) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7146. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services — 2014 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 22)] received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7147. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0122; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-002-AD; Amendment 39-17938; AD 2014-16-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7148. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0544; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-057-AD; Amendment 39-17935; AD 2014-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7149. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Nabb, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0368; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-26] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7150. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Revocation of Jet Routes; Northeast United States [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0104; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-4] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7151. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Grand Rapids, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0501; Airspace Docket No. 14-AGL-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7152. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification and Establishment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Huntingburg, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0990; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Orders of Compliance, Cease and Desist Orders,

Orders of Denial, and Other Orders [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0505; Amdt. No. 13-36] (RIN: 2120-AK43) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Repair Stations [Docket No.: FAA-2006-26408; Amdt. No. 145-30] (RIN: 2120-AJ61) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0616; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17954; AD 2014-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0236; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-184-AD; Amendment 39-17937; AD 2014-16-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0175; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-014-AD; Amendment 39-17957; AD 2014-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1327; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-17934; AD 2014-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0129; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-17931; AD 2014-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7160. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0120; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-056-AD; Amendment 39-17932; AD 2014-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7161. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0250; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-165-AD; Amendment 39-17930; AD 2014-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7162. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1158; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-232-AD; Amendment 39-17501; AD 2013-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7163. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0219; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-17939; AD 2014-16-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7164. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0468; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-17924; AD 2014-15-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7165. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0531; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-17940; AD 2014-16-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7166. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1068; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-17923; AD 2014-15-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7167. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0121; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-17928; AD 2014-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7168. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0034; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-006-AD; Amendment 39-17948; AD 2014-16-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7169. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1065; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-230-AD; Amendment 39-17915; AD 2014-15-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7170. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0511; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-023-AD; Amendment 39-17953; AD 2014-15-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7171. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0077; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-021-AD; Amendment 39-17941; AD 2014-16-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7172. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance Information Access (RIN: 2900-AO42) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7173. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendment to the List of CBP Preclearance Offices in Foreign Countries: Addition of Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates [CBP Dec. 14-09] received August 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7174. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Material Advisor Penalty for Failure to Furnish Information Regarding Reportable Transactions [TD 9686] (RIN: 1545-BF59) received August 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7175. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Foreign tax credit guidance under section 901(m) [Notice 2014-45], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7176. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Segregation Rule Effective Date [TD 9685] (RIN: 1545-BM18) received August 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7177. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Concise General Statement Concerning 2014 National Pool (Revenue Procedure 2014-52) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7178. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Dixon V. Commissioner, 141 T.C. No. 3 (2013) (AOD 2014-01) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7179. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Procedures for Automatic Change in Method of Accounting under the Retail Inventory Method (Rev. Proc. 2014-48; RP-120878-14) received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7180. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Retail Inventory Method [TD 9688] received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7181. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Debt That Is a Position in Personal Property That Is Part of a Straddle [TD 9691] (RIN: 1545-BL24) received August 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7182. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance Regarding Dispositions of Tangible Depreciable Property [TD 9689] (RIN: 1545-BL52) received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7183. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; FY 2015 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update; Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements and Process and Appeals for Part D Payment for Drugs for Beneficiaries Enrolled in Hospice [CMS-1609-F] (RIN: 0938-AS10) received August 4, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

7184. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems for Acute Care Hospitals and the Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System and Fiscal Year 2015 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements for Specific Providers; Reasonable Compensation Equivalents for Physician Services in Excluded Hospitals and Certain Teaching Hospitals; Provider Administrative Appeals and Judicial Review; Enforcement Provision for Organ Transplant Centers; and Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Program [CMS-1607-F and CMS-1599-F3] (RINs: 0938-AS11; 0938-AR12; and 0938-AR53) received August 4, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 727. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from September 22, 2014, through November

11, 2014 (Rept. 113-601). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 24. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 113-602 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5169. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 24 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5475. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5476. A bill to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5478. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make certain limitations on the transfer of personal property to Federal and State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5479. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require public disclosure of the method used to calculate consumer credit scores and inclusion of debt settlement agreements in consumer reports; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 5480. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from obligating or expending funds for alternative energy generation projects unless specifically authorized

by law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5481. A bill to continue the use of a 3-month quarter EHR reporting period for health care providers to demonstrate meaningful use for 2015 under the Medicare and Medicaid EHR incentive payment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5482. A bill to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COTTON, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 5483. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to continue the national security exemption from emissions regulations when an excess Department of Defense vehicle covered by the exemption is transferred to a firefighting agency in a State or to any other State agency; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 5484. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5485. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 5486. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 5487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5488. A bill to require a review of the completeness of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the derivative terrorist watchlist utilized by the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 5489. A bill to provide for youth jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5490. A bill to require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to impose fees and assessments to recover the cost of appropriations to the Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5491. A bill to establish United States embassies with consular services in the five countries in the Caribbean with which the United States has diplomatic relations but no permanent diplomatic presence: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5492. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5493. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1989 to expand the Coast Guard Junior Reserve Officers Training Program Pilot Program to include a Coast Guard unit at Pinellas Park High School in Pinellas Park, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 5494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5495. A bill to prohibit the Federal Housing Finance Agency from reducing or limiting the multifamily housing business of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia,

and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 5496. A bill to require the holder of a subordinate lien on the property that secures a federally related mortgage loan, upon a request by the homeowner for a short sale, to make a timely decision whether to allow the sale; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the election to expense the cost of qualified film, television, and theatrical productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 5498. A bill to establish a demonstration program to facilitate physician reentry into clinical practice to provide primary health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 5499. A bill to prohibit contracts that prohibit consumers from making certain public comments on businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.J. Res. 125. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the terrorist organization Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant ("ISIL"); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 726. A resolution strongly supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H. Res. 728. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Small Business Saturday" and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our land and naval forces.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 5476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United

States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 5480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 1 and Article I Section 9.

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 5481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 5483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 5486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 5487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States which states, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." and clause 3 of section 8 of Article I, which provides that, Congress shall have power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of Article I provides that "Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ." and clause 18 of section 8 of Article I that states that Congress shall have power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power to establish and appropriate funds, to determine its purpose, amount, period of availability, means of access, and to set forth terms and conditions governing its use.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 5493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 5494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, "The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 5497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 5498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 5499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.J. Res. 125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 139: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 318: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 377: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 411: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 713: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 725: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 963: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1070: Mr. RUSH, Mr. VELA, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1074: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1213: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1318: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1339: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1449: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1507: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1508: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1563: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1666: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1698: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1827: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1838: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 1998: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2012: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2073: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2224: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2309: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2313: Mr. REED.
H.R. 2330: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2453: Mr. DAINES and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2482: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2504: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2523: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2638: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2692: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2694: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2706: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2780: Mr. DELANEY and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2831: Ms. KAPTUR and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.

H.R. 2841: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2847: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2856: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2887: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2969: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3023: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3043: Mr. ROKITA and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3116: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3123: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3279: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3367: Mr. KLINE and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 3382: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3387: Mr. YOHIO.
H.R. 3424: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3482: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 3571: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3649: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3662: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3698: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 3708: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3712: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3742: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 3833: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 3850: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3877: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3899: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3992: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4122: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 4137: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 4158: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 4169: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4190: Mr. TONKO and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4240: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 4249: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4351: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 4426: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4551: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4578: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4580: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 4582: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 4679: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4682: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BOUTSTANY.
 H.R. 4741: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 4778: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4793: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 4807: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 4816: Mr. CICILLINE and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 4857: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4876: Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 4880: Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 4930: Mr. OLSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4999: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5009: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SPIER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 5069: Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 5071: Mr. KIND, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 5083: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 5098: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5101: Ms. NORTON and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 5107: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 5110: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. REED, and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 5119: Mr. SCHOCK and Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 5182: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 5212: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5213: Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 5228: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 5229: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5242: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 5245: Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 5253: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 5260: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 5277: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5283: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 5313: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 5321: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 5363: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 5364: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5370: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 5391: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 5403: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KIND, and Mr. ENYART.
 H.R. 5405: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 5407: Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 5418: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5419: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5420: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5431: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5440: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 5441: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 5449: Mr. HANNA and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 5456: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 5458: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5459: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 5460: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 5462: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 5470: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. COOK, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 113: Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.J. Res. 119: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Res. 72: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. SALMON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H. Res. 428: Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 620: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PARENTHOLD, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. GOWDY, and Mrs. NEGRETTE MCLEOD.
 H. Res. 658: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H. Res. 685: Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 714: Mr. BERA of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Natural Resources in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Science, Space, and

Technology in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4, "Jobs for America Act," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

The provisions of H.R. 4, the Jobs for America Act, that warranted a referral to the Committee on Small Business—Title III of Subdivision B of Division III (the Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act)—do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XXI, cl. 9 of the Rules of the House.

OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services in H.R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 4 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 4, the Jobs for America Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 4, the Jobs for America Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMILCAR CORDOVA

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Amilcar Córdova. Mr. Córdova hails from the "City of Giants," Carolina, Puerto Rico. He persuaded his mother to move to the United States after his graduation from high school in 1985. His family moved to Pennsylvania, where he began working at a national insurance company as a mail clerk. He slowly started moving up the ranks within the industry until he became a Health Claims Supervisor.

In 1994, Mr. Córdova moved to Orlando, FL this time with his own family. After moving, he left the insurance industry for a sales career in advertising. In 2008, Mr. Córdova co-founded Amigos Profesionales Business Network, an organization that focuses on introducing and showcasing Hispanic professionals and business owners to the general market. Inspired by both his new profession and having an in-depth understanding of the growing vibrant and thriving Hispanic demographic, in 2010 he founded his own advertising agency, Córdova Marketing Solutions, which specializes in the development of small businesses by providing consulting, marketing, and advertising services.

In 2010, he also joined the Puerto Rican Chamber of Commerce of Central Florida as its Executive Director and in 2013 he was elected President. In this capacity, he has organized trade mission trips to Puerto Rico to help establish connections between businesses in the Commonwealth and Central Florida.

He has also been a member of Hispanic Young Professionals and Entrepreneurs (HYPE), an organization that strives to provide guidance and support to Hispanic youth in middle and high school. HYPE promotes higher education and vocational training in order to prepare youth for their future careers so that they can advance our economy and improve our community.

Mr. Córdova is the Marketing and Public Relations Director of The Valle Law Firm. He recently became an Authorized Local Expert for Constant Contact, a company that provides tools to empower small businesses to grow customer relationships and level the playing field.

Mr. Córdova has two sons, Amilcar Córdova II and Schavier Córdova, and three grandchildren, Yamilette, Gabriel, and Isavella. His mother, Aida I. Cruz lives in Orlando, FL, and his father, Gypsy M. Córdova, still lives in Puerto Rico.

I am happy to honor Amilcar Córdova, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Central Florida community.

HONORING PEGGY KIRKPATRICK FOR OVER 22 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE FOOD BANK FOR CENTRAL & NORTHEAST MISSOURI

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize Peggy Kirkpatrick who has served the needs of Missouri citizens for over 22 years as the Executive Director of the Food Bank for Central & Northeast Missouri and will be retiring at the end of this year. This incredible woman has cared for and made a resounding difference in the lives of thousands of families in Missouri's 4th District and beyond.

Mrs. Kirkpatrick began her career at the Food Bank for Central & Northeast Missouri over two decades ago. Transforming a nearly-shuttered program into one of the most prominent food banks in the United States, Peggy's legacy will continue long after her retirement. Under Mrs. Kirkpatrick's leadership, the Food Bank went from distributing about 3.4 million pounds of food in 1992 to over 36 million pounds in 2013. She was also instrumental in making the Food Bank one of only two in the entire nation, at that time, to not charge client agencies for their products and services. I rise to recognize Mrs. Kirkpatrick's passion for her tireless work to better the lives of those in her community.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I call all my colleagues to join me in applauding the service and commitment of Mrs. Kirkpatrick. Her steadfast and enduring service is a shining example for all. We are blessed to have such dedicated citizens like Peggy serving us, and we wish her the best in the years to come.

CELEBRATING 160 YEARS OF THE DEKALB MUNICIPAL BAND

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today in celebration of the DeKalb Municipal Band as they celebrate 160 years of concerts this December.

From humble beginnings as the Silver Cornet Band in 1854, the DeKalb Municipal Band has a history as interesting and unique as its many members. In its early years it was the official band of the Third Regiment of the Illinois National Guard, and was later renamed the DeKalb Military Band following the return of musicians who served in World War I. In the 1930s, Hopkins Park was built and the band found a permanent home for concerts.

Since then, Hopkins Park has been outfitted with a wooden shell, funded by the band members themselves, which was eventually upgraded to the current concrete and steel band shell that includes seating for 3,000 to enjoy today's concerts.

As one of the most historic bands in the Midwest, the DeKalb Municipal Band keeps the tradition of providing music and entertainment to DeKalb and the surrounding communities alive with their annual summer concert series, including their July 4th Fireworks Spectacular. The commitment of the musicians, conductors, and volunteers who have helped the Municipal Band survive and thrive for 160 years is to be commended. DeKalb and the surrounding communities can take pride in the Band's historic traditions and I know we can all look forward to many more decades of music in Hopkins Park.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Illinois' Sixteenth District of Illinois, I wish to express our appreciation and sincere congratulations to all those who have helped make the DeKalb Municipal Band a success over the past 160 years.

SCOTLAND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is an exciting and historic time for self-determination in Scotland. Scots (and others) are voicing the pros and cons for Scotland's vote this week on independence. To go it alone or not from the United Kingdom is the question before the feisty Scots.

Thousands of Scots came to the United States for a new life over 300 years ago. My own family line traces back to Scotland and the Weems (Wemyss) clan. (Some would say it explains my personality.) The Weems castle, built in the 15th Century, still proudly stands in the town of Fife, Scotland.

My ancestors fought with Robert the Bruce in the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314. The King of England, Edward II, invaded Scotland with the largest English Army to ever attack Scotland. His army outnumbered Robert the Bruce's common Scot army 4 to 1. But the Scots are fearsome warriors. After days of hand to hand combat, the Scots beat the English and declared Scotland's de facto independence.

However, Scotland and England were joined under the United Kingdom 400 years ago.

Texas Weems came by way of the Carolinas in the 1700s then they moved to Tennessee and finally settled in early Texas in the 1800s.

From America's struggle for Independence and Texas's successful fight for Texas independence from Mexico (Texas was a sovereign republic from 1836-1845), such causes

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

are noble but difficult. During the Texas War of Independence, at least four Scots fought and died at the cradle of Texas liberty—The Alamo.

If government truly is of the people, by the people and for the people, then people that are ruled over by a government should be the ones to choose that government. Self-determination is a natural right.

Scotland will have that peaceful choice this week, and do what is best for “Scotland the Brave.”

And that’s just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF RYLAND KELLEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary American, Richard Ryland Kelley, who was born on October 2, 1925, in Palo Alto, California, and died on August 30, 2014. He was an energetic, creative, generous and poetic man, and was a central figure in the development of Silicon Valley.

Ryland Kelley was a graduate of Stanford University and served his country in the Army Air Corps during World War II. He joined his father in forming a real estate firm that became known as Hare, Brewer and Kelley (HBK). The firm developed many San Francisco Peninsula communities, including Ladera, Lindenwood, Atherton Heights and Hidden Valley in Woodside. HBK also built the Palo Alto Office Center, Mayfield Mall, Webster House, a retirement community in Palo Alto, and the Pajaro Dunes resort in Watsonville.

Ryland Kelley was a writer and a poet, who at the time of his death was planning to produce six one-act plays. He wrote seven plays and published three books of poetry. He was deeply involved in athletics since his days on the Stanford football and basketball teams, and tasted politics while helping Paul N. “Pete” McCloskey in his successful campaign against Shirley Temple Black for an open seat in Congress. He was a true renaissance man. Realizing that he was near death, he held a poetry reading for his closest friends at his son’s home in June.

Ryland Kelley leaves his devoted wife of 65 years and my precious friend, Shirley Sneath Kelley; his son Rich and his wife Gina of Woodside; his son Tom of San Francisco; and his son Bruce and his wife Susan, of West Hartford, Connecticut; and four grandchildren.

I had the privilege of knowing Ry for over three decades. His friendship, sage advice and counsel, and keen observations enriched my life immeasurably. Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in expressing our deepest condolences to Ryland Kelley’s family and to all those who knew, respected and loved him. I consider it a great blessing to have called him my friend, and his countless contributions to our community are eloquent statements about this uniquely gifted and giving man. Our country

and our community were blessed by his life, and we are bettered having known him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JOHN HEUBERGER, DEPUTY COMMANDER OF THE DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY DISTRIBUTION CENTER IN TOBYHANNA, PA

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. John Heuberger, who will retire on Friday, October 3, 2014 from his position as the Deputy Commander of DLA Distribution in Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Heuberger is a Vietnam Era Veteran, having served in the United States Navy from 1971–1974 as a Hospital Corpsman 3rd Class. He later spent three years in the Naval Reserve and began his career as a federal employee, where he continued to proudly serve our country.

As a federal employee, Mr. Heuberger worked at a wide range of facilities across New York and Pennsylvania. His assignments included the Veterans Administration Extended Care Center in St. Albans, New York, the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Brooklyn, New York, the Veterans Administration Center in Northport, New York, and as a General Supply Officer at Tobyhanna Army Depot in Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania.

Since 1992, Mr. Heuberger has served as Distribution Facilities Manager, DLA Distribution at Tobyhanna Army Depot.

Mr. Heuberger is the recipient of the Army Award for Civilian Service, the Department of the Army Certificate of Appreciation, numerous other awards, and has been honored by Vice-President Al Gore with the National Partnership for Reinventing Government Award.

Mr. Heuberger is a role model in the workplace—truly an individual other federal employees should seek to emulate. His hard work and dedication to all facets of our making our military the best it can be are overly commendable. During his Tobyhanna years, he drew on past experiences and relationships to hone his leadership skills, consistently sought to promote positive thinking, and provided invaluable guidance to his colleagues and fellow employees. The role Mr. Heuberger played in his years of service at DLA is an integral part of the critical mission to supply and equip our military. I am honored to recognize outstanding individuals engaged in this mission.

I extend my congratulations to Mr. Heuberger for a job well done in service to our nation. The Department of Defense and everyone at Tobyhanna will miss him, I’m sure, but I wish him well in retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOSE R. BALASQUIDE

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Jose Balasquide. Born in Puerto Rico, Mr. Balasquide has been residing in Central Florida since 1993.

Mr. Balasquide has been active in the political, civic, and business communities in Central Florida. As Governmental Affairs Director for the Puerto Rican Chamber of Commerce of Central Florida, he worked to promote the region’s economic development.

A former Legislative Assistant to a Florida State Senator, Mr. Balasquide has remained politically active. He served as the Florida State Director of the Mi Familia Vota Educational Fund (MVEF), where he led campaigns to help increase civic engagement in the Latino community and build a new, influential community of voters. He has also directed Latino civic engagement efforts, and mobilized over 75,000 Latinos in Florida during the 2012 elections.

Mr. Balasquide is also a Member-at-Large for the Executive Board of the Central Florida Redistricting Council. In this capacity, he has been battling for the fair redistricting of the state of Florida.

Mr. Balasquide served as the Director of the Latino Civic Engagement Working Group, a platform for Latino civic organizations to develop a regional and state progressive civic engagement plan. In 2013, he served as the President of the Florida Democratic Hispanic Caucus and he is currently the President for its Osceola County Chapter. He is also a Partner at Business Entities Advisors LLC., a consulting company, and a Consultant with Beacon Solutions, LLC.

A graduate of the Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, College of Business Administration, Mr. Balasquide is a licensed insurance adjuster and a financial advisor.

I am happy to recognize Jose R. Balasquide, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Central Florida community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES-CARIBBEAN PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the United States-Caribbean Partnership Act of 2014.

I ask my colleagues to imagine countries where tens of thousands of American citizens travel for pleasure or business; where thousands of American citizens go to school; where there is a constant concern about drug trafficking to the United States; but where the United States has no U.S. embassies. Surprisingly, there are five countries in the Caribbean—only a few hundred miles from the

United States—where we have no physical diplomatic presence. My legislation will correct this problem by establishing U.S. embassies in the five countries in the Caribbean with which the United States has diplomatic relations but no permanent diplomatic presence: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Currently, all diplomatic relations with these countries are run out of the U.S. embassy in Barbados.

While these countries are small, they must not be taken for granted. They are key voting members of the United Nations and other international organizations. As members of the Organization of American States (OAS), their votes are extremely important, particularly as countries in the hemisphere choose a new Secretary General next May. We must work with our partners in the Caribbean to ensure that the next OAS Secretary General is committed to upholding the principles enshrined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter. Without a U.S. presence in these five countries, it is very difficult to conduct in-person diplomacy with our counterparts on a range of crucial international issues. These countries are also of profound interest and importance to the millions of Caribbean-American citizens in the United States.

Currently, in order to meet with local officials, the private sector or civil society, U.S. diplomats must fly in from Barbados (or Washington) on often expensive, infrequent flights, and stay overnight in often expensive island hotels. Close working relationships with key leaders cannot develop, because our diplomats are not there to establish them. And, our diplomacy is limited to phone calls, emails and faxes, even though we all know that the best interaction is carried out in person. In addition to our stymied diplomacy, U.S. citizens living in these countries do not have full consular services to assist in the event of emergencies.

This bill establishes new embassies in Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines while using existing funding. I authored an amendment to create these embassies in 2011 which was approved unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I look forward to working with the Obama Administration to get this legislation across the finish line this time.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY MIGHTY MACS 1972–1974 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAMS

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the players and coaches of the Immaculata University Mighty Macs 1972–1974 Women's Basketball Teams on the occasion of their enshrinement into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

Led by their young coach, Cathy Rush, the Mighty Macs won the first three women's college basketball championships in 1972, 1973, and 1974 and this performance is considered the birthplace of modern college women's basketball. Rush is a Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Inductee, Class of 2008. In addition to the national championships, the Mighty Macs were the first women's team, along with the University of Maryland, to appear on national TV; first women's team, along with Queen's College, to play at Madison Square Garden, and the first women's college team to play outside the United States (Australia in 1974). Their inspirational story was made into a feature-length theatrical movie called *The Mighty Macs* and released by Sony Pictures in 2011.

The Mighty Macs are: Janet Ruch Boltz '73 of Glen Mills, PA; Denise Conway Crawford '74 of Havertown; Janet Young Eline '74 of Gettysburg, PA; Theresa Shank Grentz '74 of West Chester, PA; Nancy Johnston '76 (deceased); Barbara Deuble Kelly '77 of White Bear Lake, MN; Tina Krah of Indianapolis, IN; Patricia Mulhern Loughran '77 of Broomall, PA; Judy Marra Martelli '75 of Media, PA; Maureen Mooney '73 (deceased); Sue Forsyth O'Grady '72 of Drexel Hill, PA; Patricia Opila Penater '72 (deceased); Rene Muth Portland '75 of Bloomington, IN; Betty Ann Hoffman Quinn '73 of Ardmore, PA; Cathy Rush (coach) of Sarasota, FL; Mary Scharff '77 of Audubon, NJ; Marianne Crawford Stanley '76 of Raleigh, NC; Maureen Stuhlman of South Lake Tahoe, CA; and Marie Liguori Williams '77 of Hollywood, FL.

Mr. Speaker, in light of their outstanding accomplishments, history-making seasons, and enshrinement in the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing the players and coaches of the Immaculata University Mighty Macs 1972–1974 Women's Basketball Teams.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,741,170,643,844.86. We've added \$7,114,293,594,931.78 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF NASA AMES RESEARCH CENTER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the scientists, engi-

neers and staff of the NASA Ames Research Center for their legacy of contributions to our nation. For three quarters of a century NASA Ames has been a center of research, innovation, creativity and discovery.

NASA Ames was established on December 20, 1939, in Sunnyvale and Mountain View, California, and is now part of the 18th Congressional District of California which I'm privileged to represent.

Aeronautical researchers at NASA Ames constructed the world's greatest series of wind tunnels, improved the aircraft that led America to victory in World War II, and helped design supersonic jet aircraft.

Spacecraft engineers at NASA Ames played a major role in the exploration of space and continue to study human-machine interaction, fundamental space biology and biotechnology. Information technologists at NASA Ames opened the fields of supercomputing, helped lay the foundations of the commercial internet and network security, and serve as a conduit for the sharing of ideas between government and the firms of Silicon Valley. The planetary scientists of NASA Ames have inspired a sense of awe at the vastness, beauty and complexity of the universe through robotic missions to explore our solar system.

The earth scientists of NASA Ames helped bring better understanding to the environmental dynamics of our planet, and collaborated with scientists to develop new tools to fight fires, address the challenges of climate change, and make us better stewards of our ecosystems.

The educators of NASA Ames have inspired successive generations of young people to engage in careers in science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

The government entrepreneurs of NASA Ames have done better science for less expense. NASA Ames builds, manages, and operates some of the most spectacular spacecraft that explore our solar system, as well as other solar systems, and it is a powerful and reliable source of employment and innovation with a highly skilled and motivated workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in saluting the extraordinary contributions made by NASA Ames Research Center over the past 75 years to the history, economy, ecology and knowledge of our nation.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR AJ KUEN

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major AJ Kuen, of the United States Army, for his extraordinary service to our nation. He served both Congress and the Army during his time on Capitol Hill with the Army's House liaison division. Major Kuen was recently assigned to continue his excellent work in the Army's chief of legislative liaison office at the Pentagon.

A native of Montville, New Jersey, Major Kuen graduated from the United States Military Academy with a Bachelor's Degree in

Systems Engineering before reporting to the Army's prestigious aviation school. He excelled as a young lieutenant and completed the challenging qualifications for both the Kiowa and Blackhawk helicopters.

Major Kuen reported to his first duty assignment in Fort Polk, Louisiana to serve as a Blackhawk platoon leader for the Joint Readiness Training Center. His skills as both a leader and aviator were on full display while he trained units to conduct dangerous aviation missions in Afghanistan.

Major Kuen continued his great work during later assignments. He served with the 1st Cavalry Division in Fort Hood, TX where he ensured that the Lone Star State received immediate emergency air support from the 1st Air Cavalry Brigade during Hurricane Ike. Shortly thereafter, Major Kuen deployed to Iraq as the Headquarters and Headquarters Company Commander for the 1st Air Cavalry Brigade.

Major Kuen's exceptional performances as an Army officer allowed him to compete for the Army Congressional Fellowship Program and serve as a defense fellow for Congressman Silvestre Reyes. Major Kuen transitioned to the Army house liaison division and took on the challenging responsibilities of a legislative liaison between the Army and the U.S. House of Representatives.

His dedication to duty and country are matched by his strong devotion to his family. He is married to his lovely wife Lauren and is the proud father of his newborn son Wesley.

Major Kuen is a dedicated officer who has paved a path for future leaders to follow. It is my honor to recognize his commitment to duty as he proceeds to the next chapter of his remarkable career. I wish him and his family nothing but the best in the years to come.

IN HONOR OF MS. VERA BABERS

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Vera Babers on her 100th birthday which took place on June 16, 2014. Ms. Babers has led a remarkable life that is grand in accomplishments through her hard work and dedication. I join her family, friends, and the community of Calvert, Texas in celebrating this event. I wish her more years of happiness, fulfillment, and health. Congratulations to Ms. Babers on her centennial birthday milestone.

THE RISE OF ANTI-SEMITISM
AROUND THE WORLD

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that anti-Semitism is the longest hatred in the world. And some have likened the freedom and safety of the Jewish people to "the canary

in the coal mine" of a nation's religious freedom and tolerance, meaning if the Jewish population comes under attack, so too will others in time.

Speaking last December at the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission's annual Leland Award Lecture on Religious Liberty, award recipient and religious liberty champion Dr. Robert George noted "the persistence of anti-Semitism worldwide, including in the nations of Western Europe, where it again appears to be on the rise."

Dr. George cited the observations of Britain's former Chief Rabbi, Lord Jonathan Sacks, that one of the ways that hatred of the Jewish people has persisted through the ages is by "expressing and justifying itself in terms of the dominant discourses of time and place."

In the Medieval period it was justified in warped theological terms—much to my regret as a follower of Jesus. At the end of the 19th century and into the 20th century it was expressed in nationalist terms, culminating in the horror that was the Nazi-perpetrated Holocaust.

And today, Dr. George observed, "when the dominant mode of discourse is the language of human rights, anti-Semitism is expressed by accusing Jews of violating human rights in the name of national aspirations embodied in Zionism . . ." In recent years, particularly in the months since Israel's operations in Gaza responding to Hamas' rockets, we have seen a disturbing rise in anti-Semitic incidents in the Middle East, Europe and even, I regret to say, here in the United States, particularly on college campuses.

This trend has left many Jewish students feeling intimidated and threatened, as evidenced by the recent findings of the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL) annual "Audit of anti-Semitic Incidents" for 2013 which notes that "the ADL continues to receive complaints about anti-Semitic behavior on our campuses. These incidents include threats as well as verbal and written taunts promoting anti-Semitic stereotypes or evoking disturbing Holocaust themes."

Consider the following: in a nationwide anti-Israel campaign, some pro-Palestinian student groups such as Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) have distributed "mock eviction notices" in college dormitories timed to coincide with so-called Israeli Apartheid Week. Still others have set up mock "check points."

According to Fox News, Boston's Northeastern University suspended SJP in March, 2014, "after years of alleged anti-Semitism that included repeated calls for the destruction of Israel, a 2011 disruption at a Holocaust Awareness Week event and the defacing of a statue of a Jewish donor and trustee of the university."

In some cases Jewish students who openly express their support for Israel are subjected to an increasingly hostile and intimidating environment where professors seek to promote their personal anti-Israel agenda. The local CBS affiliate in Boston reported last year that a Jewish student at Northeastern University wrote a paper arguing that Hamas was not a legitimate organization in direct response to one professor's lecture praising the terrorist organization. According to the news account, the professor instructed her to rewrite the paper.

In November 2012, two students vandalized a menorah on display in Northeastern's Krentzman Quad in Boston. On the same day, at Harvard College, fliers were distributed with phrases such as "Jews need not apply."

In 2006, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights released its report on Campus Anti-Semitism. A number of recommendations were included in the report, including that the Office of Civil Rights "conduct a public education campaign to inform college students of the rights and protections afforded to them under federal civil rights laws, including the right of Jewish students to be free from anti-Semitic harassment."

Seeing as how anti-Semitism seems to be worse today, one has to wonder if the 2006 recommendations fell on deaf ears. That is why today I am asking the Civil Rights Commission to update its 2006 report. Not only should it look at incidents since 2006 but also examine which of recommendations were implemented and, if not, why?

Perhaps we should not be surprised at the increasingly hostile campus environment given the actions taken by certain academic associations. For example, at the end of last year, the American Studies Association voted to boycott Israel's higher education institutions as part of the International Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement. Bear in mind this is not simply individual professors expressing their political views; rather it is the country's largest organization for the study of American culture and history that is doing so.

Notably, discussion of boycotts, divestment and sanctions is largely limited to Israel, but not the world's most egregious state abusers of human rights and religious freedom, like China, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, Vietnam and Pakistan, to name a few. To the contrary, many American universities are actually pursuing deeper relationships and funding from these countries—especially with China and the Gulf States.

As Jeffrey Goldberg observed, writing in the New York Daily News last December, "The American Studies Association has never before voted to boycott the academic institutions of another country. The organization's president, Curtis Marez, an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego, told The New York Times, when its reporter asked him why his group was singling out Israel, that 'one has to start somewhere.'"

Looking beyond academia we have seen other institutions and entities, including my own denomination, the Presbyterian Church USA (PCUSA), singling out Israel in troubling ways. In June, I took to the House floor to express my disappointment at the PCUSA's action on Israel, namely its decision to divest the denomination's stock from three American companies that do business with Israel in the West Bank. The Wall Street Journal ran a piece following the PCUSA decision that noted that the denomination's "Middle East Issues Committee sees only one Middle East issue. All 14 of the matters before it this year concerned Israel and Palestine. No Syria. No Iraq."

The obsession with Israel's alleged abuses seems almost farcical given the barbarism that has unfolded in recent months in Syria and

Iraq and which threatens the very existence of ancient Christian communities. The same year PCUSA adopted its divestment policy of companies that do business with Israel, it refused to join other prominent Christian churches in signing a pledge to stand with the persecuted church in the Middle East, for fear that speaking out for oppressed religious minorities might somehow be perceived as "anti-Muslim." How the church can take such an extreme position against Israel but not join others in the Christian community in speaking out against religious persecution in the Middle East is hard to reconcile.

The situation in Europe is decidedly more troubling. While anti-Semitism has been on the rise for some time now, it has been most acutely experienced by Europe's Jewish population during this summer of protests surrounding the escalation of the war in Gaza. In recent months, we have witnessed a degree of open and, at times, violent anti-Semitism in Europe that hasn't been seen since World War II.

An August 9 USA Today article described the phenomenon this way: "Four weeks of fighting between Hamas militants and Israel fueled a rise in anti-Semitism outbursts across Europe, ranging from violent attacks to chants of 'Death to the Jews' at anti-Israel demonstrations." The article continued, "In Germany and other European countries—especially France, which has a large Jewish and Muslim population—Jews have been attacked on the streets, synagogues have been bombed, Jewish groups have received hate mail and anti-Semitic slogans have been sprayed on buildings."

In short, what should have started and ended as a free speech exercise—as is expected and encouraged in any healthy democracy—in many cases morphed into violent and destructive demonstrations aimed at harming or intimidating local Jewish populations.

Commenting on the recent spate of violence and the incendiary language of the protests, the president of the Central Council of Jews in Germany Dieter Graumann aptly stated, "When calls for Jews to be gassed, burned and murdered are bawled on the streets of Germany, which no longer has anything to do with Israel's politics and Gaza. It is the most abhorrent form of anti-Semitism."

The demonstrations and protests are certainly not the whole story.

Consider this: On the afternoon of May 24, 2014, a young man casually approached the entrance of a Jewish museum in Brussels, Belgium. Pulling a Kalashnikov rifle from his bag he began to shoot. Within seconds, three people lay dead: a couple visiting from Israel and a museum volunteer. A fourth person, severely wounded, would die later. Weeks after the attack a suspect, who claimed responsibility for the deadly rampage, was arrested. The gunman reportedly spent over a year in Syria and, according to the BBC, "had links with radical Islamists."

On July 25, CNN reported that what was to be a friendly preseason soccer match in Austria between two teams from Israel and Germany, respectively, had to "be abandoned after pro-Palestinian protesters invaded the pitch and started attacking the players" from the Israeli team.

On August 1, The New York Times reported that police in the German city of Wuppertal "detained two young men on suspicion of throwing firebombs at the city's new synagogue . . ." The article continued, pointing to an incident of vandalism at the home of a prominent critic of anti-Semitism as well as a threatening anonymous phone call to a local rabbi who was told that 30 Frankfurt Jews would be killed if the caller's family in Gaza was harmed.

The Times piece also reported on several troubling incidents in Rome where Jewish shop windows in multiple neighborhoods were defaced with swastikas and abhorrent threats including, "Jews your end is near."

The British anti-Semitism watchdog, Community Security Trust reported 240 anti-Semitic incidents in Britain in July alone compared with 304 incidents in the first six months of the year combined.

The current chief Rabbi of Britain, Ephraim Mirvis, recently wrote in the Telegraph that the Jewish people can be viewed as the "canaries in the coal mine for Western civilization" and pointed to the recent wave of attacks as indications of a "new anti-Semitism" in which passion about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is used to justify "something more sinister."

Taking a step back from current events, it is important to view the phenomenon of anti-Semitism through the lens of history. From the Roman Empire's persecution of the Jews, to the burning of Jews during the Middle Ages, from the second-class codification of Jewish populations during the Inquisition, to the violent pogroms carried out against Jewish communities in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries and finally through the worst genocide in human history, the Jewish people have experienced more persecution than any other minority group in the world. Jews have been the favored scapegoats of tyrants who knew that by persecuting Jews, they could silence the messengers of the great truth of the Jewish faith—a potent teaching which inspires fear in the hearts of dictators—the equality of all created in the image of God.

Indeed, there is ample evidence that Jews truly are the canaries in the coal mine—not just in the West, but globally. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Middle East. In January, 2013, I sent a strongly worded letter to roughly 300 prominent Christian leaders in the United States urging them to utilize their spheres of influence to speak out on behalf of the persecuted church around the world, specifically in the Middle East. Even then, ancient Christian communities in countries like Iraq, Syria and Egypt were increasingly under siege. These troubling realities, of course, predated ISIS's murderous advance across large swaths of Iraq and Syria and the ensuing carnage it has left in its wake, particularly targeting religious minorities like Christians, and the previously little-known Yazidis, now a household name.

A phrase not often heard outside the majority Muslim world is "First the Saturday People, then the Sunday People." The "Saturday people" are, of course, the Jews. Their once-vibrant communities in countries throughout the region are now decimated. In 1948 there were roughly 150,000 Jews in Iraq; today, fewer than 10 remain. In Egypt, there were once as

many as 80,000 Jews; now, fewer than 50 remain. Of those, all are older than 60.

It increasingly appears that a similar fate awaits the ancient Christian community in these same lands. Iraq's Christian population has fallen from as many as 1.5 million in 2003 to 300,000 today. And the remaining population is being further squeezed from its ancestral homeland in Nineveh and the surrounding areas. A July 18 New York Times article reporting on ISIS' edict that the remaining Christians must leave soberly noted, "While a few scattered souls may find a way to stay in secret, the community will be gone." In Egypt, Coptic Christians, numbering roughly 8 million are leaving in droves. In Homs, Syria, almost the entire Christian population has reportedly fled.

Over the span of a few decades, the Middle East, with the exception of Israel, was virtually emptied of Jews. The world was largely silent. The same thing will happen to the Christian community if the current trajectory holds true.

Incredibly, this reality has been met with a stunning silence on the part of many Western policymakers and even Church leaders. There are notable exceptions, including the nearly 300 American Christian leaders and prominent lay people who signed a Pledge of Solidarity with their suffering brothers and sisters in the region, launched at a press conference on Capitol Hill in May.

Washington, D.C.'s Cardinal Donald Wuerl was among the distinguished participants in the Capitol Hill event. Just recently, at a Mass marking the start of the academic year at Catholic University, he spoke of the current crisis facing these imperiled communities and wondered aloud at the silence in face of murderous efforts to "eliminate" these brothers and sisters in faith. He urgently concluded that what is happening to them is "something that we really are not free to ignore . . ."

I mention the horrific assault on Christians in Iraq, and other parts of the region, to put the rise of anti-Semitism in other parts of the world in context. We see here a region where anti-Semitism has long been tolerated and in some cases glorified. From Iranian mullahs, to Saudi textbooks, to the Hamas charter, hatred of the Saturday People has found fertile soil and taken root.

In societies where one minority religion is demonized, is it any surprise that pluralism itself and religious freedom more specifically are in jeopardy? Is it any wonder that respect for "the other" is trumped by "death to the infidel?"

As Jews were driven from much of the Middle East, so too Christians—the Sunday People—are finding an environment that is not simply inhospitable to the practice of their faith, but downright deadly.

I was heartened by a recent New York Times op-ed penned by Ronald S. Lauder, president of the World Jewish Congress, titled "Who Will Stand Up for the Christians?" Mr. Lauder wonders at the seeming indifference of much of the world to what is currently happening in Iraq. He writes, "Historians may look back at this period and wonder if people had lost their bearings. Few reporters have traveled to Iraq to bear witness to the Nazi-like wave of terror that is rolling across that country. The United Nations has been mostly mum.

World leaders seem to be consumed with other matters in this strange summer of 2014. There are no flotillas traveling to Syria or Iraq. And the beautiful celebrities and aging rock stars—why doesn't the slaughter of Christians seem to activate their social antennas?"

Mr. Lauder recalls a speech he gave in Budapest in June during which he "made a solemn promise that just as I will not be silent in the face of the growing threat of anti-Semitism in Europe and in the Middle East, I will not be indifferent to Christian suffering." In talking of the historic Judeo-Christian commonalities, he notes that sadly now these two great Abrahamic traditions share "a kind of suffering: Christians are dying because of their beliefs, because they are defenseless and because the world is indifferent to their suffering."

Lauder concluded: "I will not be indifferent to Christian suffering."

Would that his conviction might be shared by faith leaders, the political elite and regular citizens the world over. Whether it is the expansion of an insidious anti-Semitism in Europe or the reality of deadly ethnic cleansing of Christians in Iraq, these expressions of hatred, these manifestations of evil, these violations of religious liberty must not go unaddressed and unanswered.

I am reminded of the haunting words of German Pastor Martin Niemöller, which are etched in the walls of the Holocaust Museum just blocks from here. Speaking of the Nazis, he said, "First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out—because I was not a Socialist . . . Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out—because I was not a Jew. Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me."

In order for the Nazi machinery of extermination to have been as ruthlessly successful as it was, hundreds of thousands of ordinary Germans had to simply turn a blind eye to what was happening around them.

In the book "When a Nation Forgets God," there is this unnerving account:

"I lived in Germany during the Nazi Holocaust. I considered myself a Christian. We heard stories of what was happening to the Jews, but we tried to distance ourselves from it, because, what could anyone do to stop it?"

"A railroad track ran behind our small church and each Sunday morning we could hear the whistle in the distance and then the wheels coming over the tracks. We became disturbed when we heard the cries coming from the train as it passed by. We realized that it was carrying Jews like cattle in the cars!"

"Week after week the whistle would blow. We dreaded to hear the sound of those wheels because we knew that we would hear the cries of the Jews en route to a death camp. Their screams tormented us."

"We knew the time the train was coming and when we heard the whistle blow we began singing hymns. By the time the train came past our church we were singing at the top of our voices. If we heard the screams, we sang more loudly and soon we heard them no more."

"Years have passed and no one talks about it anymore. But I still hear that train whistle in my sleep. God forgive me; forgive all of us who called ourselves Christians and yet did nothing to intervene."

Haunting words.

Without question, today, once again, the canary is struggling. In far too many places the air is poisoned with hate. What remains to be seen is whether we, who recognize this to be true, will be silent in the face of it.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DANIEL HILARIO BARAJAS

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Daniel Hilario Barajas for his service to Florida's Ninth Congressional District. Daniel Hilario Barajas was born on May 4, 1982 in Winter Haven, Florida, into a migrant farm worker family. He grew up working the orange groves of Florida, tobacco fields of North Carolina, and apple orchards of Michigan.

As a young man, Daniel had legal problems due to misguided affiliations with gangs. Though he did not complete high school, he earned his GED in 2001. In 2009, he decided to walk away from gang life and founded the "Library of Hope," a charitable organization focused on collecting books and eyeglasses to donate to inmates in Polk County. Daniel is also a Fourth Degree member of The Knights of Columbus, which he joined in 2010.

After the passing of his younger sister, Maria Isabel, in June 2012, Daniel began taking a more active role within the leadership of The Young American Dreamers (YAD) which his sister founded in 2010. Daniel uses his own personal story of his struggles as a farm worker and former gang member, as examples when speaking with at-risk kids. Through his leadership as the Executive Director of YAD, Daniel has set educational standards for all members and set up an in-house tutoring program. He travels often from Polk County to Tallahassee and Washington, DC, advocating for the issues that affect his community and YAD members.

Daniel has successfully helped stop the deportation of the father of four YAD members and is a respected local leader of the immigration reform movement. He challenged Polk County's Board of County Commissioners to build a new sidewalk between Auburndale and Lakeland, after two students were fatally hit due to the lack of a walkway outside the newly built Tenoroc High School. On August 8th, 2014, construction work began on this much needed sidewalk. Currently, Daniel is working on the passage of legislation that will designate Lake Shipp Drive in Winter Haven as a memorial highway in remembrance of his beloved sister, Maria Isabel.

Daniel credits his father, Hilario, and his mother, Maria, both of whom are veterans of the social justice movement, having worked with Cesar Chavez himself, with guiding him. Daniel also attributes his life changes to his sister, Maria Isabel, and is grateful to her husband, Enrique Martinez, for helping him in all that he does. Daniel looks to his children, Mayra and Carlos, as the motivation for his social justice work. He intends to show his

children how democracy works, so that they are left with a better world when they become tomorrow's leaders.

I am happy to recognize Daniel Hilario Barajas, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his perseverance and commitment to helping the Central Florida community.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF GREG BROWN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary American artist and muralist, Greg Brown, who died in Palo Alto, California, on August 28, 2014, at the age of 62, after a brief bout with cancer. Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, he moved to Palo Alto with his family at the age of two and remained in the community for the rest of his life.

Greg Brown began his painting career as a second-grade student when he painted a mural of a pilgrim as part of an assignment on Christopher Columbus. A graduate of Palo Alto High School, he took few formal art classes, but an apprenticeship with the Italian artist Roberto Lupetti helped him gradually begin to grow as an artist.

Greg Brown was Palo Alto's artist in residence in 1975, and created art for Palo Alto's centennial in 1994. His murals are a significant part of Palo Alto's public art collection and the nine trompe l'oeil vignettes adorning the walls of city buildings are treasures for all to enjoy. He also produced drawings and paintings and worked for private clients in many places. Greg Brown was a learner, a reader, and a keen observer of people. Mr. Brown leaves his wife, Julie, of Palo Alto, his daughter Whitney of Palo Alto, and his son Justin of Redwood City.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in expressing our deepest condolences to Greg Brown's entire family and to all those who knew and loved him. His legacy lives on in the lively, whimsical art he created and shared with countless appreciative people, and our community and our country have been enriched and blessed by his life.

RECOGNIZING THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS THEY HONOR THE TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DRAFTING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Gold Trail chapter and Sierra Amador chapter, as

they celebrate the two hundred twenty-seventh anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was founded in 1890 with the mission of promoting historic preservation, education, and patriotism.

The Gold Trail and Sierra Amador chapters include members across California's fourth district. The Gold Trail chapter has 154 members—some of whom are direct descendants of the Founding Fathers—residing in Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln, Loomis, Granite Bay, and Folsom. The Sierra Amador chapter has more than 70 members residing in Amador, Calaveras, and surrounding counties.

I rise to join the Gold Trail and Sierra Amador chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution in observing "Constitution Week" from September 17 through September 23. This week will be dedicated to paying tribute to our foundational document and the freedom that it continues to enshrine two hundred twenty-seven years after its drafting.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster charged that our nation must "Hold on . . . to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years, may not happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world." It is groups like the Gold Trail and Sierra Amador chapters who are heeding Webster's charge and preserving the Constitution for future generations.

The Constitution of the United States of America ensures through the written law that the individual liberties of all Americans are protected and preserved, and it is my privilege to rise in recognition of the Gold Trail and Sierra Amador chapters' efforts to honor this anniversary with a weeklong tribute.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. PAUL C. BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the nation's largest wartime veterans service organization, the American Legion, which was chartered by Congress in 1919 on this date in history. Since then, it has grown to include more than 2.5 million members in over 14,000 American Legion posts worldwide, and its influence is invaluable.

The American Legion supports a variety of programs that benefit the communities in my home state of Georgia and those around the world. As a Marine and retired officer in the Naval Reserves, I am deeply grateful for the Legion's commitment to mentoring youth, advocating patriotism and honor, promoting strong national security, and encouraging continued devotion to fellow service members, veterans, and their families. Therefore, it is my honor to applaud the great work of the American Legion.

Furthermore, it is my privilege to recognize the Wesley Lee Farley American Legion Post

583 and Auxiliary in Eatonton, Georgia. Incorporated in 1952, Post 583 was first comprised of World War II and Korean War veterans, who built the post from the ground up, supported by donated material from the Eatonton community and unending fundraisers by the future Unit 583 Auxiliary. Today, the post proudly presents to qualified students the "Fannie Pearl Farley Scholarship." A charter member, Mrs. Farley served as the 69th Department of Georgia President, which is the highest office in the American Legion Auxiliary, and today she is still an active member of the post.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I express my sincere respect and support for the American Legion, dedicated to upholding the ideals of freedom and democracy, while working to make a difference in the lives of fellow Americans around the world.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF DEBBIE S. FRANK

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of this great institution and those who serve and work here to acknowledge and to express appreciation to one of our long-tenured House employees, Debbie Frank, who is retiring from the House following her twenty years of service as a Senior Employee Assistance Counselor with our Office of Employee Assistance (OEA).

Following the completion of her Master's Degree in Social Work at the University of Pennsylvania and the initiation of her career in New Jersey with the Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) at Cooper Medical Center and New Jersey Transit, Debbie joined the OEA staff in 1994, as the OEA and other non-legislative services transitioned from the Clerk of the House to the newly created Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). Throughout her career with the House and the CAO organization, Debbie has worked tirelessly with managers and employees, whether it is the House, Congressional Budget Office or the United States Capitol Police, she has assisted them in addressing the myriad of personal challenges, mental health and addiction problems, and other behavioral and work-life balance issues that potentially impact the performance and productivity of our workforce. Whether Debbie was providing the OEA's critical assessment, referral and follow-up services to an employee in crisis, consulting with a Member or Chief of Staff on strategies to manage an employee's return to work following an absence for addictions treatment, facilitating a Member's annual staff retreat, or conducting a training session for the general House workforce, Debbie consistently brought compassion, competence, organizational insight, institutional sensitivity, and practical solutions to her work. Over the years, she also became a strong advocate for a mindfulness approach to building personal resiliency in dealing with the stresses of an employee's work life and those of his or her personal life—an approach that

I've studied, advocated and personally practiced for years.

During her tenure with the OEA and the House, Debbie managed a number of key initiatives for the OEA, including the House Health and Wellness Fair, the Drug-free Workplace training, and the OEA's Disaster Response capability. Since its inception in 1994, Debbie also served as the OEA's field placement supervisor for graduate level social work students interning with the OEA and learning the fundamentals of employee assistance programming and service delivery in the workplace.

In addition to her day-to-day work with the employees, managers, and Members routinely seek out the services and resources of the OEA to deal with the challenges presented when an employee's personal issues impact their performance or the effectiveness of the office, and Debbie has been on the front lines in providing support, assistance, guidance, and reassurance to the House community in the midst of some of the most troubling events of the past two decades. She was on-site in Oklahoma City working with House staffers following the Murrah Federal Building bombing in 1995. In 1998, she was part of the OEA team's response to the Capitol Police and House communities following the tragic fatal shooting of two Capitol Police officers in the Capitol Building. Following September 11th and the anthrax incident in October 2001, Debbie was also part of the CAO's communications effort, managed by the OEA and serving as the critical informational conduit to the House workforce throughout the six weeks that sections of the House campus were closed—keeping employees and families informed of the status of the remediation efforts and the staggered opening of offices and the availability of House services as sections of the House buildings were cleared for occupancy and resumption of operations. She served as the OEA's lead in working with the House response team following Hurricane Katrina in 2005. And she helped manage the OEA's immediate and ongoing response to the tragic shootings in Tucson in January 2011.

As Debbie departs the House and embarks on her retirement in Texas, I join the Chief Administrative Officer, Ed Cassidy; the CAO's Chief Human Resource Officer, Jason Hite; and the entire OEA team—Bernard Beidel, Liz McBride-Chambers, Kristin Welsh-Simpson, and Margot Hawkins-Green—in wishing Debbie well and Godspeed. And I personally thank her on behalf of the many Members, employees and family members she has helped, assisted and supported over the past two decades. Well done, Debbie!

ACKNOWLEDGING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DONALD RIEGLE COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARDS

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the 25th Anniversary of the Donald Riegle Community Service Awards. For the past

25 years the Flint Jewish Federation has utilized this event as a vehicle to recognize individuals in the Flint area who have displayed an exceptional commitment to community.

As Michigan's former senior United States Senator, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., retired after three terms in the U.S. Senate, and ten years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives. Throughout his federal legislative career, Senator Riegle served as a champion of Soviet Jewry. In addition, he co-sponsored major legislation pertaining to freedom of immigration issues and personally intervened with the leadership of the former Soviet Union on behalf of Jewish Refuseniks.

This year's award recipients, Debra Goldensteinman, Philip Shaltz and Ernelle Taylor, have worked hard to make our community a better place. The proceeds from the event will provide funding for the necessary acculturation of social programs, as well as the continuation of services, such as transportation, interpreters, meal services and citizenship preparation for Genesee County residents.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Flint Jewish Federation for upholding the life, legacy and leadership of Senator Donald W. Riegle, Jr. and applaud them on this milestone celebration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of September 15, 2014, a series of votes was held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have cast the following votes: Rollcall 497—I vote "yea."

CELEBRATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise to celebrate National Hispanic Heritage Month and its 2014 theme, Hispanics: A legacy of history, a present of action, and a future of success. The people of the United States will once again celebrate the histories, cultures, and traditions of our Hispanic American brothers and sisters from September 15, 2014, through October 15, 2014.

Hispanic Heritage Month begins each year on September 15, the anniversary of the independence of five Latin American countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Mexico and Chile observe their independence days on September 16 and September 18. Since its inception as National Hispanic Heritage Week in 1968, which later became National Hispanic Heritage Month in 1988, Americans have taken this time to not only pay tribute to the rich culture and traditions of Hispanic Americans, but also to reflect on the numerous contributions they

have made that have led to improvements within their communities, and in turn, a better America.

Our nation's success is reliant upon the rich heritage and cultural diversity of its people. Hispanic Heritage Month celebrates the many Hispanic leaders and members of our communities who have added to the prosperity of the United States in every facet of society including medicine, business, arts and entertainment, sports, education, politics, and the military.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month. Throughout America's history, present, and future, the Hispanic community has played and continues to play a major role in enriching the quality of life and culture of our great nation, and for their outstanding contributions they are worthy of the highest praise.

HONORING MATTHEW BARMANN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Matthew Barmann. Matthew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 419, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Matthew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Matthew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Matthew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Matthew Barmann for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on September 15, 2014. Listed below is how I would have voted if I had been present.

Roll Number 497—H.R. 5018—To establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended—aye.

HONORING GEORGIA INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND

HON. LYNN A. WESTMORELAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to recognize Georgia Industries for the Blind as they celebrate National Disability Employment Awareness Month.

Since the opening of its first manufacturing plant in 1949, Georgia Industries for the Blind has been creating, sustaining and improving employment opportunities for people who are blind. Georgia Industries for the Blind is part of the Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency and operates from its corporate headquarters in Bainbridge, Georgia. They have operations in three other facilities in Georgia that collectively employ over 100 blind individuals. They are proof that a workplace should be welcoming to the talents of all people and should be a critical part of everyone's efforts to build an inclusive community and a strong economy.

Georgia Industries for the Blind has demonstrated the importance of raising awareness throughout the year about disability employment issues and to acknowledge the many and varied contributions of people with disabilities.

It is with great pride that I recognize the contributions of Georgia Industries for the Blind to the personal and economic independence of blind individuals not only during National Disability Employment Awareness Month, but throughout the entire year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, due to a change in floor schedule, I was unavoidably absent on Monday, September 15, 2014.

Had I been present I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 497, I would have voted "aye" (September 15) (H.R. 5108, To establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes (REP JEFFRIES)).

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF EL PASO BRANCH OF THE NAACP

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California, to honor and celebrate the 100th anniversary of the El Paso Branch of the NAACP.

Founded in 1914 by civil rights activist Dr. Lawrence Aaron Nixon, the El Paso Branch was the first branch of the NAACP established in the state of Texas. The El Paso Branch's long history is rich with examples of El Pasoans taking the lead to end discrimination in Texas.

In 1923, the Texas legislature passed a law which prohibited African-Americans from voting in Democratic primaries. On July 26, 1924, with the sponsorship of the NAACP, Dr. Nixon took his poll-tax receipt to a Democratic primary polling place and was refused a ballot. Thus began a twenty-year struggle in which Dr. Nixon and his El Paso attorney, Fred C. Knollenberg, twice carried their case to the United States Supreme Court. It was not until the landmark decision in *Smith v. Allwright* ended the white primary that the way was cleared, and on July 22, 1944, Dr. and Mrs. Nixon walked into the same El Paso voting place and voted in a Democratic primary.

In 1955, the El Paso Branch sought to challenge the segregation clause contained within the state constitution. The NAACP asked Thelma White, valedictorian of segregated Douglass High School in El Paso, to challenge the law. With the assistance of the NAACP, she submitted her application to Texas Western College (now the University of Texas at El Paso). Texas Western returned Ms. White's application along with her unopened transcripts.

Ms. White's attorneys, including Thurgood Marshall, filed suit in federal district court in March 1955, claiming White's rights of equal access to an education had been violated. That summer, in anticipation of an adverse ruling from the court, the University of Texas (UT) Board of Regents voted to allow Texas Western to admit African-American students, while promising to investigate desegregating the main university in Austin at a later date. Ms. White's attorneys refused to abandon her suit, and on July 18th, Federal District Judge Robert E. Thomason issued a declaratory judgment on her behalf, permanently enjoining the UT system from denying her or any other African-American student the right to study at Texas Western. He further ordered all Texas universities to immediately desegregate. That fall, both Texas Western College and the main university in Austin admitted their first black students. In El Paso, twelve students gained admission to the school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor the El Paso Branch of the NAACP and the extraordinary work they have done to make our community, the State of Texas and our country a more just world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 15, 2014, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 497, "yea."

HONORING ALEXANDER LAPP

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Alexander Lapp. Alex is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Alex has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Alex has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Alex has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Alex remodeled a loft at Liberty Christian Fellowship Church in Liberty, Missouri, repainting it and adding railings and other safety improvements as the church converts the loft from a space for teenage youth to a space for children to meet.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Alexander Lapp for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF NANCY STEPHENS CAMPBELL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to honor Nancy Stephens Campbell on occasion of her 100th birthday.

Ms. Campbell was born September 16th, 1914 in Borden Springs in Cleburne County, Alabama. She went to school in Chulafinnee through 7th grade, moving to Ranburne schools in 9th grade. She graduated from high school in Selma in 1933. After graduating, Nancy returned to Cleburne County to teach. She married Hugh Campbell, of Heflin, and together they had four children. Between their children Hugh Jr., Jim, Linda and Ann, Ms. Campbell has 10 grandchildren and 23 great-grandchildren.

Nancy Campbell taught preschool at Heflin First United Methodist Church for many years, and the children there began to call her "Nannie." She has been a member of Chulafinnee United Methodist Church her entire adult life. Ms. Campbell has resided at Autumn Cove Retirement Community in Anniston for the past three years.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating Ms. Campbell's 100th birthday today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOSEPH "BEBO" MANJIKIAN

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the long, full life of a beloved constituent, family man, athlete, gardener, centenarian, and genocide survivor: Joseph "Bebo" Manjikian.

I had the great pleasure of celebrating Bebo's 104th birthday with him and a great many members of his family, the Armenian community in the San Gabriel Valley of California, and other local elected officials. Bebo was an extraordinary man and an example of triumph over tragedy.

He was a man who, well into his 90s, was power-lifting and competing in the Senior Olympics, winning gold medals no less. Bebo trained by staying active with a unique blend of traditional exercise and his diligent gardening, tilling the soil and tending to his cherished fruit trees. It was said that if everyone did this, the way Bebo did, their fitness would be rewarded with good crops and a beautiful garden. And in many ways, this was the philosophy of Bebo's life. He believed in being a role model through his actions. He would say, "You have to walk the walk."

Bebo was also a genocide survivor. He was born in 1910 in the Armenian village of Kessab, which was then part of the Ottoman Empire. His father, an Armenian officer conscripted into the Ottoman Army, was killed in the Armenian genocide of 1915. Bebo and the rest of his family were driven from their village and forced into exile by Turkish soldiers. Their village was destroyed and they endured sickness and hunger, walking for miles. They could not stop or they risked being shot, so his mother fed her children with weeds and grass. Eventually Kessab became part of Syria after World War I and Bebo was able to return. And, though his life would ultimately take him far from his childhood home, he ended up marrying a woman also from his village, named Sara. Bebo rejoiced in Sara's traditional cooking, harkening back to the couple's roots. They never forgot where they came from, and never ceased to keep their best memories and traditions alive.

Bebo was a self-taught man and entrepreneur of great skill. At 18 he left his village again and settled in Palestine, where he lived for over two decades and worked as a mechanic for the British Army. In 1950 he came to the United States with his young family and settled in Inglewood, California, where he operated his own mechanic shop for 25 years. His family recalls that he could fix anything, and he would tell them "In Kessab, there were no Home Depots." Once again, he taught others through his example, not only sharing his skills but also his belief in empowering himself and others. He also spoke a remarkable seven languages, despite much formal education. These included German, French, Hebrew, Turkish, Arabic, English, Armenian, and Kessabern.

Perhaps most of all, Bebo was a family and community man. He and Sara eventually moved to the West Hills and spent much time

with family in Pasadena. They had three children, eight grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. Bebo was always quick to help a relative or friend in need, opening his home to them. After his retirement he worked at Camp Kessab, an Armenian youth camp in California focused on traditions from Bebo's home village. He was instrumental in keeping the place going. Bebo was deeply devoted to his family and community, sharing stories and testifying to over a century of history, still sharp in his mind.

His loss is a loss for all of us. He was an incomparable repository of experiences; an unbelievable specimen of physical and mental acuity; an exemplary citizen and humanitarian. But most of all Bebo was an inspiration to know. He will be greatly missed and long remembered; he who always walked the walk.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRINI MESTRE-QUIROZ

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Trini Mestre-Quiroz. Mrs. Mestre-Quiroz is an example of leadership and dedication.

Born in Guayaquil, Ecuador, she moved to New York at age fifteen. She later moved to New Jersey where she met her late husband, Jose Manuel Mestre, and became a mother to two wonderful daughters, Jacqueline and Jeannette.

Upon moving to New Jersey, Mrs. Mestre-Quiroz began her lasting commitment to civic involvement. She was instrumental in the creation of several community-based organizations, including the first multi-cultural, multi-lingual day care center in New Jersey.

Due to her community leadership, Mrs. Mestre-Quiroz was selected to become the first minority female to serve as an assistant to a Mayor of a major city in New Jersey. She was later appointed to serve as one of 200 nationwide Community Service Specialists for the Department of Commerce.

During the early seventies, Mrs. Mestre-Quiroz worked tirelessly with the students and faculty at her alma mater, Rutgers University, in order to further the implementation of affirmative action measures. Her efforts helped persuade the university to hire its first Hispanic Dean of Academics at its Newark campus.

Mrs. Mestre-Quiroz is active in politics and has been involved in local and federal elections in New York, New Jersey, and Florida. She currently serves as Secretary and Chair-in-Waiting for the Black, Latino and Puerto Rican Alliance for Justice of Florida.

I am honored to recognize Trini Mestre-Quiroz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her lifelong commitment to serving her community.

JUDGE DONALD J. VOLKERT, JR.

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Judge Donald J. Volkert, Jr., who will be joined by his friends, family and colleagues tomorrow night in celebration of his retirement as assignment judge for Passaic County.

Judge Volkert received his undergraduate degree from the University of Charleston in 1966, and later received his law degree from Ohio Northern University in 1969. He then began his impressive career at the Supreme Court of Ohio, and from there he had many different judicial appointments in Essex County from the criminal division, to the family division, to drug court. During his tenure in Essex County, Judge Volkert served on a wide range of committees; he was chair of the New Jersey Conference of Family Presiding Judges, chair of the Bail Judges Sub-Committee as well as co-chair of the Essex County Youth Services Commission.

In May 2008, Judge Volkert was named assignment judge of the Passaic Vicinage by Chief Justice Stuart Rabner. Since his appointment, Judge Volkert has helped make the Passaic County Drug Court into a model for other vicinages.

A strong believer in continuing education, Judge Volkert serves as chair of the Sub-Committee on Judicial Education and is a frequent lecturer for the Institute of Continuing Legal Education, Judicial College and New Judge Orientation as well as numerous other seminars and learning programs.

Judge Volkert has always been an avid supporter of our troops and with one son in the Marine Corps his dedication has only grown. Judge Volkert was instrumental in instituting Military Appreciation Month in Passaic County which honors veterans as well as assists them in getting the services they may need. Judge Volkert's appreciation for our veterans is unwavering; at the first Military Appreciation Month event he stated, "I don't think we could ever do enough to honor the men and women who have served our country."

Judge Volkert has made an outstanding mark on Passaic County with his compassionate nature and dedication towards upholding justice. I know he is looking forward to spending more time with his wife Susan, his six children Christine, Scott, Jaime, Elizabeth, Stephen, and Michael, as well as his three grandchildren, Jack William, Paula Marie and Max Higgins.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the achievements of individuals like Judge Volkert.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Judge Volkert's coworkers, family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing Judge Donald J. Volkert, Jr.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday September 15, 2014 I was not present for 1 vote. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 497, I would have voted "yea."

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES D. FIELD

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Congressman MARK TAKANO, to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community are exceptional. Riverside, California has been fortunate to have dynamic and committed leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent to make their communities a better place to live and work. Charles Field is certainly one of these individuals. Charles' wide ranging accomplishments have made a permanent mark on Riverside. On September 17, 2014, Charles will be stepping down from the Western Municipal Water District Board of Directors after seven remarkable years of service.

During Charles' time with the Western Municipal Water District Board, he enthusiastically gave his talents to a variety of positions, including President, Vice President and Secretary. Additionally, Charles represented the Western Municipal Water District through distinguished leadership on the Chino Desalter Authority and on the Chino Basin Watermaster Board as well as serving on additional Western Municipal Water District and regional committees during his tenure.

Charles' dedication to civic service was matched by his passion in the legal field. Prior to joining the Western Municipal Water District Board of Directors, Mr. Field spent more than forty years in the various legal capacities, serving as a judge at the Riverside County Superior Court from 1990 to 2004 and also as a partner at the Riverside law firm Best, Best and Krieger.

It is hard to imagine that Charles would have any free time on his hands, yet he always found time to further support the community and the lives of those around him. The variety of organizations Charles gave his efforts to include the Riverside Arts Council, the Riverside County Barristers, the Mission Inn Foundation Board, the Historic Committee for Riverside Superior Court, the Press-Enterprise Board of Directors, the Board of Regents of the University of California, and the UCR Alumni Association.

For all that he has done, it is no surprise that Charles has been the recipient of numerous community awards. His dedicated civic leadership, service and support of the Riverside community were honored with the prestigious Frank Miller Civic Achievement Award.

Charles, along with his wife, Virginia, also received the Lifetime Achievement Award for their devoted community involvement from Riverside's Mayor's Commission on Aging.

Charles' unparalleled commitment and tireless passion for public service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the Riverside community. We are proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many individuals are grateful for his service and we salute him as he steps down and embarks on a new chapter.

HONORING RILEY TOMLINSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Riley Tomlinson. Riley is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 419, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Riley has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Riley has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Riley has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Riley Tomlinson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNUAL HISPANIC PIONEERS BREAKFAST

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hispanic Pioneer's Breakfast in Aurora, Illinois.

For the past ten years, Alderman Juany Garza, who represents Ward 2 on the City Council of Aurora, has hosted a breakfast to honor the members of the Hispanic community who have given back and inspired us all.

These breakfasts have honored diverse members of the community. Past honorees have included local sports figures, health care providers, police officers, firefighters, and members of the military.

For the 10th Annual Hispanic Pioneer's Breakfast, Alderman Garza is highlighting the contributions of the unsung heroes in Aurora, people who have dedicated their time and effort to making their community better without looking for praise or reward.

I would like to thank our unsung heroes for their dedication to making our community stronger. I would also like to thank Alderman Garza for her continued service to the people of Aurora, Illinois.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 497: I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING THE LIFE OF JEAN H. "GRANNY" HARPER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Jean H. Harper, who sadly passed away on August 28, 2014. "Granny," as Jean was affectionately called by loved ones, community members, and those in her church family, lived a life of service and selflessness.

Born in Avondale, North Carolina, on January 14, 1921, she was the fifth child of David and Alda Sims Hart's twelve children. Shortly after, her family relocated to Washington, DC, where she resided for the rest of her life.

Jean worked as a dietitian at Freedman's Hospital (the forerunner of Howard University Hospital) for 32 years. While working at the hospital, she met the love of her life, James "Jimmy" Harper, who she soon married before the birth of her sole child, her daughter Barbara Jean. In 1954, the family moved to their eventual life-home on Taylor Street NW. She remained a devoted servant of her community and missionary within her church, working actively up until her passing in the Pastor's Aide Ministry of the Trinity A.M.E. Zion Church.

However, Jean was most devoted to her family. She could always be found with Barbara, her grandchildren, great grandson, and other members of her extended family and close friends. She enjoyed traveling, cooking and socializing, but was renowned for being a problem solver for all who came into contact with her.

I had the privilege to know "Granny" through her daughter Barbara, a former staff member of my office. I was always delighted to check in with her over a birthday call or simply reminiscing about the old days. She was a comforting soul and devoted woman of God, who had time for anyone that needed her. While "Granny" is no longer with us, her spirit and loving memory will always live on.

In memory of her mother, Barbara recited a poem by Calan Booth at Jean's funeral entitled, "Mother," which I include, as it resonated with me deeply:

Without you Mother,
I would not be here,
for the start of my life
came from you Mother dear.

When I was a child
you sacrificed for me,
and shaped what I would be.

Now the years have gone
and I'm not always there,
but I know you still worry,

about my welfare

I can never pay for
all you've had to do,
but I can say Mother,
I still love you

Mr. Speaker, Jean "Granny" Harper was a dear friend, and a wonderful human being. I am so truly saddened by her passing. She will be dearly missed.

MY LIFE IS WORTH IT CAMPAIGN

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, few words are more isolating and strike fear in the heart of a person or the parent of a child than cancer. 36,570 Tennesseans will be diagnosed with cancer this year. Thankfully, due to the work of thousands of scientists, death rates due to all cancers continue to decline. 14 million Americans who are cancer survivors will celebrate their birthdays this year. These stories of hope in the face of a devastating illness inspire us all.

But not everyone is surviving. It is sobering to think, in the U.S., someone dies because of cancer every 60 seconds. We must continue the fight against this devastating illness. We must examine all barriers to finding the cure for all cancers.

One such barrier is the time it takes for new therapies to reach the patient. Delays occur at the regulatory level and at the reimbursement level. The time it takes for a new drug to move from the laboratory to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval can take 10–15 years. Additional time is spent in determining the reimbursement level by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).

Recently, the FDA showed that it has the flexibility to greatly shorten the time line to approval. A meningitis vaccine, not previously available in the U.S., was granted FDA approval in a remarkably shortened timeline. The landmark decision came after meningitis outbreaks at U.S. colleges resulted in deaths and disability and a great public outcry.

The same flexibility needs to be shown to those who have cancer and are reaching for promising therapies that regulators have kept just out of their reach.

I am pleased that the grassroots organization, "My Life is Worth It," has begun an online campaign to collect one million signatures in support of several critical actions that can be taken to bring innovative cancer therapies to the patients that need them most.

On September 16th there will be a powerful display around the Capitol Reflecting Pool on the National Mall. The "Lights of Hope" sponsored by the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network is estimated to involve over 15,000 committed advocates, serving as a beacon of hope to those who have been touched by cancer—while remembering those who have been lost. As we look out on the National Mall and see these lights, let Congress resolve to do all we can to ensure that those who need it most have the hope to survive and live a happy and fruitful life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 497 had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP
OF STATE SENATOR DARREN
SOTO**HON. ALAN GRAYSON**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Florida Senator Darren Soto. Born in New York in 1978, Darren Soto is of both Puerto Rican and Italian descent. He earned a bachelor's degree in Economics at Rutgers University and attended law school at George Washington University in Washington, DC.

Darren is a commercial and civil rights attorney proudly practicing law in Central Florida. He is an ardent defender of civil rights and is committed to rendering legal services pro bono to the community. In 2006, he was named class counsel in the federal class-action brought on behalf of Hispanic voters against the City of Kissimmee in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

Darren is also a former member of the Civil Service Board for the City of Orlando, and held the positions of Treasurer of the Orange County Democrats and Vice President of Communications for the Orange County Young Democrats (YD). He was also the co-host for YD's Speak Easy events, which provide a monthly forum for local and state leaders to speak to young voters.

Darren was elected to represent District 49 in the Florida House of Representatives in a special election in 2007, and was subsequently re-elected in 2008 and 2010. He has passed several important pieces of legislation including the Luis Rivera-Ortega Street Racing Act, the Firefighter Death Benefit Bill (inspired by the death of Volusia County firefighter John C. Curry), and the Bus Driver Notification Bill. He has also been a critical voice in defeating attempts to convert Florida to non-judicial foreclosures, stopping the split of the Florida Supreme Court, and blocking a proposed anti-Hispanic Arizona-style immigration law in Florida.

In 2012, Darren was elected to represent District 14 in the Florida Senate. He is currently serving as Vice Chair on the Judiciary Committee. Senator Soto also serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Criminal and Civil Justice, the Appropriations Subcommittee on General Government, the Community Affairs Committee, the Environmental Preservation and Conservation Committee, and the Ethics and Elections Committee.

In May of 2013, Darren married Amanda Betlow, an Orange County school teacher.

I am honored to recognize Senator Darren Soto, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his

leadership and contributions to the Central Florida community.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL
MARK F. NEWSOME**HON. JOHN R. CARTER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lieutenant Colonel Mark F. Newsome for his unrivaled dedication to the United States Army and this great nation. LTC Newsome recently completed a prestigious assignment with the Army's budget congressional liaison office and now serves as the Chief Financial Officer for Fort Belvoir Community Hospital.

A native of Prentiss, Mississippi, LTC Newsome enlisted in the Army in 1986 and completed the Army's rigorous basic training. He's served in an array of military assignments throughout his career. LTC Newsome led medical platoons with the 25th Infantry Division in Hawaii and set a superior example while serving as Chief Financial Officer for various Army community hospitals across the nation. His leadership has positively impacted the soldiers and peers he served with over the years.

LTC Newsome is both a warrior and scholar who enhanced his education throughout his career. After a successful enlistment, he pursued the Army's Green-to-Gold scholarship with the Reserve Officer Training Corps at North Carolina A&T State University. LTC Newsome is a distinguished military graduate and graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Science in Accounting. He's also a graduate of the Defense Comptrollership Program at Syracuse University with a Masters of Business Administration and Masters of Public Administration.

It has been a pleasure to work with LTC Mark F. Newsome during his time as an Army budget congressional liaison where he inherited the tremendous responsibility of staffing Army senior leaders and briefing Congressional Members. These officers provide an invaluable service to both the military and Congress. They assist Members and staff in understanding the Army's policies, actions, operations, and requirements. Their firsthand knowledge of military needs, culture, and tradition is a tremendous benefit to Congressional offices. His efforts and relationships with Congress left an everlasting impression of professionalism and commitment.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending LTC Newsome for dedicating over two decades of service to his country. We wish Mark, his fiancée S. Kiayona, and his children D'Angleau and D'Antoine all the best as they continue their journey with the United States Army.

HONORING TAKODA LUCKER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Takoda Lucker. Takoda is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 419, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Takoda has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Takoda has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Takoda has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Takoda Lucker for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING MR. LUKE P. MARTIN,
JR.**HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Mr. Luke P. Martin, Jr. who will be honored on Thursday, September 18, 2014 in New Bern, North Carolina for his rich and unique family history and his commitment to his community by having the day forever named in his honor.

Luke P. Martin, Jr. is 97 years old and the surviving son of an escaped slave who became one of the first men to enlist in the Union Army's First North Carolina Colored Volunteers during the Civil War. Mr. Martin's father, Private Luke Martin, Sr. escaped slavery in 1863 near Plymouth, North Carolina and found his way to New Bern where he joined what became the 35th Regiment of U.S. Colored Troops.

A statue of Private Martin, Sr. is currently displayed in the North Carolina Museum of History as an enduring reminder of the approximately 200,000 African Americans who fought during the Civil War. Private Martin's 1861 Springfield rifle and a Confederate Calvary sword acquired by Private Martin when he courageously fought and was wounded in the 1864 Battle of Olustee can also be found there. After fighting in the war, Private Martin settled in New Bern where he became the third pastor of St. John Missionary Baptist Church and was regarded as a well-respected civic leader. Private Martin died in 1917, the same year his son, Luke, Jr., was born.

Luke P. Martin, Jr. was born on July 11, 1917, making him one of Craven County's oldest living residents. He continues to live in the home built by his father in the 1890s. Mr. Martin was the lead Master Mason in the restoration of the historic Tryon Palace in the early

1950s, and supervised the construction and brickwork on more than fifty major buildings throughout the southeast. He taught vocational classes for over 20 years at Pamlico County High School putting his considerable talents into teaching others.

At 97 years old, Mr. Martin still works as a funeral assistant for Oscar's Mortuary, as he has since the business opened its doors in 1954. He and his late wife, Inez, reared seven children including their son Frederick, who was killed while serving our country in Vietnam on February 28, 1968. He is a lifelong member of St. John Missionary Baptist Church, where he holds the distinction of being the congregation's oldest and longest-serving trustee, having served in that capacity for more than sixty years.

Mr. Speaker, Luke Martin has spent his life as an active and engaging member of his community. He has built upon the courageous sacrifices his father made so long ago, and I am happy to participate in the celebration of Luke P. Martin, Jr. Day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Luke P. Martin, Jr. and the Martin family for their contributions to the city of New Bern and our Union.

TRIBUTE TO JUDY McCAULEY

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Judy McCauley upon her retirement from the U.S. Small Business Administration as its West Virginia District Director. Judy has served as the state's District Director since 2004 and has worked diligently with West Virginia's small businesses providing lending assistance, government contracting assistance, business counseling and training, disaster assistance, international business opportunities and compliance. Judy also had oversight of the Small Business Development Centers, Women's Business Center and SCORE Chapters.

Prior to her appointment, McCauley served as procurement center representative, commercial marketing representative, and contracting officer for SBA in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia, overseeing the release of procurement opportunities and contract awards.

She was recently appointed to the 2011–2012 Affiliate Leadership Council for the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation and serves on the Board of Advisors for the Small Business Development Centers, West Virginia Export Council, Glenville State College Department of Business and Vision Shared Entrepreneurship Committee. McCauley serves on the SBA Administrator's Area Director/District Director Council and functions as the SBA point-of-contact for the West Virginia FEMA Voluntary Agency Liaisons and the West Virginia Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters. She is actively involved in the statewide collegiate business plan competition, hosted by West Virginia University and is a recipient of the West Virginia Women in Business Champion Award.

McCauley recently served on the SBA Administrator's National Advisory Council, representing the District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and West Virginia. She served on the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce Small Business Committee and the Regional Contracting Assistance Center Board of Advisors. McCauley was instrumental in the creation of West Virginia's premier federal procurement conference, "Teaming to Win", and served as chairman of the board, and conference director.

As a member of the Northern West Virginia Chapter of the National Contract Management Association (NCMA), McCauley served as chapter president and national director. She is a recipient of the chapter's "Award of Excellence," the national "Blanche Witte Award," a contributor to NCMA's national magazine, and a featured speaker at the national conference. McCauley is an NCMA Fellow.

A native of West Virginia, McCauley earned her bachelor's and associate's degrees from Fairmont State University. She currently resides in Fairmont with her husband, Matt and her daughter, Lauren.

Mr. Speaker, the State of West Virginia owes Judy McCauley a tremendous debt of gratitude for her many years of service with the Small Business Administration. It is my honor to thank Judy for her dedication to small business owners all over West Virginia, and congratulate her on her much deserved retirement. I am proud to call her friend and fellow Mountaineer.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEEP-SEA SUBMERSIBLE "ALVIN"

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the deep-sea research submersible *Alvin* and in celebration of the critical role the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) has played in supporting ocean exploration for generations.

Commissioned on June 5, 1964, *Alvin* epitomizes American innovation and has allowed our nation to secure its position as a global leader in oceanography and marine sciences. Throughout over 4,760 dives, *Alvin* has shed light on countless discoveries, including the first observation of the deep-sea mid-ocean ridge during the French-American Mid-Ocean Undersea Survey known as Project FAMOUS, exploration of wreck of the RMS *Titanic*, and emergency recovery of a hydrogen bomb from the Mediterranean Sea in 1966. Recently, *Alvin* served at the front lines of the response to the Deepwater Horizon disaster and investigated impacts to the deep-sea habitats in the Gulf of Mexico.

Today, *Alvin* continues to inspire scientists and engineers in developing a new generation of deep-submergence technology, which is vital to our national security and United States Naval operations, as well as marine commerce and maritime industries. Further, *Alvin* is a working example of the critical need for

continued federal investments in research and development that will ensure that our understanding of this remaining frontier for discovery continues on trend.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in commemoration of *Alvin* and the irreplaceable advances in scientific research that it has helped to achieve. I am proud to represent Massachusetts, where *Alvin* and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution call home.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ESPERANZA COMMUNITY HOUSING CORPORATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Esperanza Community Housing Corporation on the celebration of its 25th anniversary.

Esperanza has been a South Los Angeles institution since 1989, when it was founded as part of a community organizing campaign to keep families in local affordable rental housing. Over the years, it has grown into a prominent social justice and community development non-profit, serving a wide array of needs for tens of thousands of people in the Figueroa Corridor and throughout South L.A.

Esperanza has been a leader in the fight to improve South L.A.'s housing, economic, health, cultural, and environmental conditions. No race, ethnicity, age, or gender is exempt from the organization's outreach. Esperanza has spent a quarter-century establishing partnerships in every corner of the community—building relationships with South L.A.'s residents, community leaders, and local businesses, and bringing them together in common cause to achieve remarkable goals.

The fruits of Esperanza's work are visible for all to see. Esperanza has provided more than 400 community residents with training in grassroots leadership and in comprehensive community health education services. It has promoted local economic growth by creating more than 200 local jobs and providing housing for almost 20 small businesses and non-profits. It has also fought to reduce slum housing, while at the same time developing safe and affordable residential properties that offer housing for 165 low-income families. It developed the Mercado la Paloma, a community meeting place and economic development incubator that has become a first-rate forum for cultural events and community non-profit activities, as well as a home for 13 small family-owned businesses. And on a range of other subjects—from human rights, to food policy, to the arts, to environmental justice—Esperanza has been an unwavering voice for a stronger, more sustainable, and more vibrant community.

Mr. Speaker, as Esperanza Community Housing Corporation celebrates its 25th anniversary, I want to thank and congratulate Executive Director Nancy Halpern Ibrahim, all the remarkable staff, and the organization's visionary founder, Sister Diane Donoghue, for their outstanding record of grassroots service to the

residents of South Los Angeles. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating all that Esperanza has done to improve the community. Esperanza's 25 years of dogged and productive work have been a model for community development organizations and activist movements across the country, and I wish it many more years of success.

IN SUPPORT OF SCOTTISH
INDEPENDENCE REFERENDUM

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, the Friends of Scotland Caucus was founded to honor the spirit of freedom and the bonds of friendship, prosperity, and culture which our two great nations cherish and respect. It is in that spirit that I have joined my fellow Co-Chairman of the Friends of Scotland Congressional Caucus, Rep. JOHN J. DUNCAN, in introducing H. Res. 724. This resolution voices the support of the U.S. House of Representatives for the peaceful, inclusive, and democratic way in which the Independence Referendum is taking place. Indeed, the future of Scotland must be determined by the People of Scotland, and we should support that effort.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS
CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5461, the Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014, sponsored by our colleague Mr. BARR of Kentucky.

This bill is a common sense fix to several problems that have arisen from the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act—problems that are detrimental to our economy and needlessly limit opportunities for our fellow Americans to live better lives.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that today 19 million Americans are unemployed or underemployed. No matter how hard many of them try to find work, the jobs just aren't there in this economy because the President's economic policies have failed them. Clearly, job number one for Congress continues to be job creation and economic growth. That's why the House has passed more than 40 bills aimed at creating jobs, many of them I am proud to say originated in the Financial Services Committee, which I chair. These are common sense ideas, many of them bipartisan, aimed at supporting wage earners, strengthening small businesses, and removing Washington's onerous red tape road blocks that stifle growth and kill opportunity.

Yet Senate leaders have failed to bring a single one of these jobs bills up for a vote, even though they are supported by both Republicans and Democrats. Before time during this Congress runs out, I once again call on

the Senate's leaders to get to work. They can start with H.R. 5461. Both Democrats and Republicans strongly support this bill. Even the Ranking Member of the Financial Services Committee—who has announced she will be voting against H.R. 5461—acknowledges in a "Dear Colleague" letter circulated to all our offices that the bill offers "bipartisan, sensible regulatory relief," yet still for some reason she will vote against it.

Let me briefly describe this bill and why it's needed to help the American people.

H.R. 5461 provides the Federal Reserve with the flexibility to set capital standards for insurance companies under its supervision. Because of the onerous Dodd-Frank Act, Washington regulators are imposing one-size-fits-all capital standards designed for banks onto firms that are not banks but insurance companies. Research has shown that applying capital standards that are meant for banks to insurance companies could massively increase costs between \$5 billion to \$8 billion. This increase in costs will result in higher premiums and reduced benefits for policyholders. Many policies could simply become unavailable to consumers as companies stop offering certain insurance products. H.R. 5461 ensures proper capital standards are applied to insurers under the purview of the Fed and that these institutions can continue serving American consumers.

In addition, H.R. 5461 incorporates three other bills that originated in the Financial Services Committee and previously received overwhelming bipartisan support: H.R. 634, the Business Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act; H.R. 3211, the Mortgage Choice Act; and H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employees Act.

In this time when there seems to be so little that Republicans and Democrats in Washington agree on, I think it's important to note just how much bipartisan support all of these bills earned.

H.R. 634 passed the Financial Services Committee 59-0 on May 7, 2013 and then passed the House 411-22 on June 12, 2013. This bipartisan bill exempts manufacturers, ranchers and small companies that buy and sell derivatives to hedge against business risk from burdensome margin and capital requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act.

H.R. 3211 passed the committee unanimously by voice vote on May 22 of this year and then passed the House by voice vote on June 9. This bipartisan bill increases access to mortgage credit for low- and middle-income Americans by modifying the definition of "points and fees" for the purposes of determining whether a mortgage is eligible for treatment as a "Qualified Mortgage" under Dodd-Frank.

H.R. 4167 passed the committee 53-3 on March 14, 2014 and then passed the House by voice vote on April 29. This bipartisan bill addresses unintended, harmful economic consequences for collateralized loan obligations caused by the final version of Dodd-Frank's Volcker rule.

Mr. Speaker, not a single one of these ideas is divisive. All are bipartisan, and each one offers common sense regulatory relief to our struggling economy. Anyone who tries to claim otherwise is simply misstating the facts because the record is absolutely clear.

I urge House passage of this bipartisan bill, including its provisions that were previously and overwhelmingly approved by the House with support from Republicans and Democrats, and I call on Senate leaders to put partisanship aside and to stop their dilatory tactics. The House once again is offering bipartisan solutions to help our economy and create jobs. There's no excuse why the Senate should not do the same.

HONORING THE JOLIET REGION
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND
INDUSTRY, 2014

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry as it celebrates its 100 year anniversary.

For the past century, the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry has supported local businesses with training, charitable work, and community promotion.

I would like to recognize and thank the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry Chair of the Board Jeff Thompson and the rest of the Chamber Board for their leadership and dedication to our community. I would also like to recognize and thank Russ Slinkard, the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and all of the staff.

The Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry has been a partner to the city as it has grown and changed over the past 100 years. The Chamber plays a vital role in the economic health of Joliet and the surrounding area.

Again, I would like to congratulate the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry for 100 years of service to our community.

IN HONOR OF CLARA MAE MILLER

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Clara Mae Miller on her 100th birthday. Ms. Miller has led a remarkable life that is grand in accomplishments through her hard work and dedication. I join her family, friends, and the community of Calvert, Texas in celebrating this event. I wish her more years of happiness, fulfillment, and health. Congratulations to Ms. Miller on her centennial birthday milestone.

RECOGNIZING THE
CONTRIBUTIONS OF JULIO ROCHA

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Julio Rocha. A motivated leader, Julio Rocha's passion for entrepreneurship, business management, and volunteerism is evidenced by 14 years of experience as a financial advisor and community leader.

A business owner with a successful track record in Central Florida, Julio has utilized his business management, business development, and investment know-how through leadership positions at several community and national organizations. Julio has been recognized as an "Orlando Power Broker" by the Orlando Sentinel and one of the "25 Most Influential Hispanics" in Central Florida by Vision Magazine.

Julio's work to further education started in 2006 and has earned him national recognition. In 2012 Julio received the "Brillante Award for Volunteer Excellence" from the National Society of Hispanic MBAs. Among his many endeavors in this area, he was instrumental in establishing scholarships and fellowships with local colleges and universities.

Julio was born in New York City and raised in the South Bronx. He is a graduate of "San Jose" La Salle, Lake Brantley High School, and earned an AA from Seminole State College. He has a BA with a concentration in Behavioral Science, and an Advanced Management and Financial Planning Certificate from the University of Central Florida. Julio also has an MBA with a concentration in entrepreneurship from Rollins College, Crummer Graduate School of Business.

I am honored to recognize Julio Rocha, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his leadership and contributions to the Central Florida Community.

HONORING JAMISON DUNN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jamison Dunn. Jamison is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1414, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jamison has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jamison has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jamison has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. After graduation, Jamison plans to continue a life of service by enlisting in the Armed Forces and serving our country.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jamison Dunn for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

FIGHT AGAINST CANCER

HON. CHRIS STEWART

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the fight against cancer. Although there have been great medical strides made over the years, it is sobering to think that today, in this nation, someone will die of cancer every 60 seconds. That is a terrible outcome, and we need to remain vigilant in our fight to eradicate this awful disease.

It is true that much has been done in recent decades to extend lives, to save lives, and to improve the lives of individuals who have cancer, but still there is much more that we can do. Patients are still being denied access to innovative treatments for reasons that have nothing to do with the effectiveness of a treatment and everything to do with the fact that we are studying, regulating, and paying for new cancer drugs in the same way we did 50 years ago. In the face of the Ebola crisis, the federal government and healthcare organizations have reduced regulatory barriers in order to reduce the time required to get new medicines to patients from six years to less than two. We owe it to cancer patients to allow them the same rapid access to these treatments, particularly when it might be their only hope of survival.

In particular, there are three at least policy objectives we should be pursuing: (1) to direct the FDA to approve new life-extending drugs for cancer once Phase I studies show a high response rate; (2) to encourage programs that provide early detection and identification of genetic mutations that are known to increase cancer risks; and (3) to require that the FDA accelerate access to experimental treatments for patients who have run out of treatment options or are excluded from clinical trials.

These are critical policy goals that must be considered by Congress. There is no doubt that some minds at the FDA may be difficult to change. But I believe that difficulty cannot be compared to the life and death decisions that our citizens and their families and friends face when access to the innovative cancer therapies that provide their best or only chance to save, prolong and improve their lives remains out of reach because of our lack of action.

This is a challenge we can meet, and I'm optimistic that we will.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY 2014

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Taiwan on their National Day. On

October 10, Taiwan will celebrate their 103rd National Day, also known as Double Ten day because it falls on the tenth day of the tenth month.

October 10, 1911 marks the beginning of the Wuchang Uprising which led to the fall of China's Qing Dynasty. In turn, the fall of the Qing Dynasty paved the way for Taiwan to become the beacon of democracy and economic powerhouse it is today.

We greatly appreciate Taiwan as a friend and as an economic partner. Taiwan is the United States' 16th largest export market. As a matter of fact, in 2013 Taiwan imported almost \$26 billion dollars in goods from the United States last year. From my state, New York, Taiwan imported over \$750,000,000 dollars worth of goods in 2013.

Both in New York and nationwide, the U.S. economy greatly benefits from a robust economic relationship with Taiwan—this relationship is good for Taiwan and it is good for America.

Congratulations again to Taiwan on their National Day. We look forward to many more years of close friendship.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR GENERAL
DEBORAH A. ASHENHURST

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major General Deborah A. Ashenurst for being elected Chair of the National Guard Association of the United States Board of Directors. General Ashenurst has the distinguished honor of being the first woman to serve in this position.

Since enlisting in the Ohio Army National Guard in 1978, General Ashenurst's military career has been nothing short of outstanding. General Ashenurst was commissioned as an Engineer Officer through the Ohio Army National Guard Officer Candidate School in 1980. After completing the Engineer Basic Course, she served as a reconnaissance officer with the 54th Support Center. Throughout her service, General Ashenurst has commanded and held staff officer assignments located at all levels of the Guard.

General Ashenurst's most recent assignments include: the Commanding General of the 73rd Troop Command; the Commander of the 237th Personnel Services Battalion; the Director of the Property and Fiscal Operations for the United States Property and Fiscal Office for Ohio. She has also formally served as the Central Ohio Chapter President of the Association of the United States Army and President of the Ohio National Guard Association.

Today, General Ashenurst continues to serve our country with great commitment and enthusiasm. She serves as the Adjutant General of the Joint Force Headquarters—Ohio. She is also a member of the Ohio Governor's cabinet where she is responsible for commanding the Ohio National Guard and maintaining the military readiness of the Ohio Militia.

General Ashenurst has been unwavering in her service to both Ohio and to the United

States. I offer my sincere congratulations to Major General Deborah Ashenhurst for being elected to this position. On behalf of Ohio and the country, I thank her for her service and wish her the best in her new role.

RECOGNIZING THE HOLLEY FAMILY AS THE 2014 OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLORIDA, OUTSTANDING FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Holley Family from Baker, Florida, for being selected as the 2014 Okaloosa County, Florida, Outstanding Farm Family of the Year.

Like so many farmers in our Nation, farming is a family affair for the Holley's. Together, three generations of the Holley family—Hughdon and his wife of 47 years, Joan, along with their son Gary and his wife Susan, and their grandchildren, Michael and Bryan—work together on their nearly 200 acre farm on a wide variety of agricultural areas. On their family farm, the Holley's produce high quality vegetables and row crop corn and wheat. In addition to successfully cultivating vegetables, corn, and wheat, the Holley's also work tirelessly to successfully maintain a wide array of additional farming activities, including beekeeping, timber production, and raising cattle.

The Holley's are a hard-working family that exemplify the qualities and high-character that have been hallmarks of our Nation's agricultural heritage. During nearly a half-century of marriage, both Mr. and Mrs. Holley worked full-time jobs away from the farm, while also raising their two sons, Gary and Keith. As Mr. and Mrs. Holley have grown older, the row cropping and oversight of the majority of the farming operations have been left to Gary; however, Hughdon and Joan still enjoy farming on a smaller scale in their retirement years.

Being a member of the Farm Bureau has allowed the Holley family to expand their vast knowledge of farming and has allowed for their great success, and the greater Northwest Florida community has been able to share in the fruits of their labor through local farmers markets where the Holley's sell their produce.

Mr. Speaker, our great Nation was built by farmers and their families. The Okaloosa County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Holley's tireless work and their dedication to family, and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Holley family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

TRIBUTE TO MARY BETH WALKER

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mary Beth Walker who is leaving the House to take a position with the Office of the Solicitor of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Ms. Walker served in the House's Office of General Counsel for two and one half years as an Assistant Counsel. We will miss her.

Ms. Walker provided frequent and invaluable legal advice and representation to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as to Members, officers, and other committees of the House more generally. Our staff came to rely on her expertise and guidance in connection with many of their investigative and oversight activities, as well as in connection with the Committee's interactions with the other branches of the federal government. Over the years, Ms. Walker played a significant role in safeguarding the legal and institutional interests of the House of Representatives.

Ms. Walker served the House with great distinction, and we know she will serve the Patent and Trademark Office with that same level of distinction. We thank her for her service to the House and extend to her our very best wishes for her continued success.

HONORING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MABEL WADSWORTH CENTER

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Mabel Wadsworth Center as it celebrates its 30th anniversary of providing outstanding health care and educational services to the women of Maine.

The Mabel Wadsworth Center is the only private, not-for-profit, feminist health center in the state of Maine. The center is named for Mabel Wadsworth, a pioneer in Maine for women's health, education, and reproductive justice. Since 1984, the organization has been dedicated to providing quality health care to women while empowering patients to take control of their health and their lives.

The Mabel Wadsworth Center works tirelessly to provide clinical and educational services to women regardless of their age, ability, race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, or economic status. Across Maine and the region, the Center has also become an advocacy leader on issues important to women and women's health.

This year, the Mabel Wadsworth Center celebrates 30 years of promoting and protecting access to quality women's healthcare in Maine. I am delighted to recognize the accomplishments of the Center and their dedicated team and look forward to their continued success in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Mabel Wadsworth Center on three decades of exceptional care and advocacy.

POLITICAL PRISONERS ON HUNGER STRIKE IN EGYPT

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, approximately 80 political prisoners in Egypt are on a hunger strike to protest their detention and the Egyptian government's continuing crackdown on dissent.

Over the past several years, the Government of Egypt has undertaken harsh measures to silence its critics. Even as Egypt has committed to undertake a democratic transition, its efforts to quell dissent have increased and worsened within the past year.

Last November, former Egyptian President Adly Mansour approved a severe anti-protest law that effectively bans any protests not sanctioned by the government. Under that law, dozens of peaceful protesters have been arrested for demonstrating against it.

According to international human rights organizations, those arrested for violating the protest law over the past several months join the more than 41,000 people who have been subjected to politically-motivated arrests since last July. Among those now in detention are opposition leaders, human rights activists, peaceful protesters, and journalists.

Many of these detainees have given up any hope for a fair trial or for securing their freedom, and more than eighty prisoners have gone on hunger strike in protest of their detentions and the Government's on-going crackdown on dissent.

Today, I call upon the Government of Egypt to immediately release all those detained for political reasons or for exercising their rights to free speech, expression and assembly. I also call upon the Egyptian government to repeal or amend those laws currently being used to repress peaceful dissent and ensure compliance with Egypt's obligations under international human rights law.

I welcome the release on bail yesterday of at least three of the prisoners who were taking part in the hunger strike. They will continue to pursue an appeal of their convictions for violating the anti-protest law. Despite their release, however, dozens of other activists remain imprisoned and as of today, over 80 prisoners are estimated to be on hunger strike.

In September, Egyptian authorities announced that an initiative for reconciliation would be put on the table following the passage of a transitional justice law once the new parliament is established at the end of the year. Reconciliation requires respect for individuals, political parties and organizations that hold differing points of view. And such respect requires that the government and the people of the nation allow for the free expression of dissenting views. As one of our key security partners in the region, the United States should insist that Egypt respect peaceful dissent and pledge to support and help Egypt achieve a truly democratic transition.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 17, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE END OF LIFE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 years, I have been spending a significant amount of time making sure that the Federal Government is a better partner in helping families as they deal with some of the most difficult times they will ever encounter, as a loved one enters their last stage of life.

This often involves an elderly spouse or relative, but not necessarily. This is a challenge that faces all of us, regardless of age, health, or family circumstance. The youngest, healthiest, most vital member of your office could suffer an accident or come down with a disease this afternoon.

We all must at some point face this challenge that requires that we do a better job of meeting those needs, helping our families understand the circumstances and choices and that we make their wishes known, and that those wishes are respected.

This afternoon there is an important landmark in this effort to protect fam-

ilies, as the Institute of Medicine releases key facts and recommendations on improving the quality and honoring individual preferences at the end of life. It is entitled "Dying in America," sort of a jarring title, but it should be required reading for everyone in government, health care, insurance, anyone who is involved with this complex web that should be supportive of families in their time of need, but too often fails them.

This report makes clear that most people nearing the end of life are not physically, mentally, or cognitively able to make their own decisions about care, and that the majority of those patients will receive acute care from physicians who don't even know them.

The default is often for more hospital days, intensive care, and emergency care, which means that there are more transitions about care settings, which can be unnerving for patients and complicate their care. All this combines to jeopardize the quality of end of life care, while obviously adding to its cost and complexity.

This panel of experts, after months of intense study, makes a compelling case that we all should be working to provide comprehensive care for individuals nearing end of life, how it should be seamless, high quality, integrated, patient-centered, family-oriented, and consistently accessible around the clock.

It should be tailored to the needs and desires of the families, and the resources that we can save by doing it right can be redirected to enhance the quality of their last days. Often done right, it will enable them to live longer as well as more comfortably.

This report is an opportunity for all of us to step back and make sure we are doing everything we can to play our part in meeting the critical responsibilities not just for our constituents, but for our family members.

Dr. PHIL ROE and I have introduced H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care Act. There are 60 bipartisan cosponsors focusing on the Federal Government placing value on this relationship, on these critical conversations, and empowering families and patients to control the circumstances that matter so much to them.

We strongly urge that everyone looks at this Institute of Medicine report and that you cosponsor the Personalize Your Care Act. I congratulate the Institute for the careful research, the clear analysis, and the strong recommendations. It is an important step

to make sure that critical assistance to support our families, that they deserve and demand, is available.

HONORING JAMES C. RUSSELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. James C. Russell, master distiller at the Wild Turkey Distillery in Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, and to mark the event of his 60th year in the industry.

Mr. Russell, or Jimmy as he is warmly known to family, friends, and acquaintances alike, is the living example of the maxim that you ought to do what you love. Born into a family of distillers just 3 miles from the Wild Turkey Distillery in Lawrenceburg, Jimmy has been instrumental in the craftsmanship of nearly every barrel since he began working at the facility on September 10, 1954, when he was just 19 years old.

Since becoming master distiller in the late 1960s, Jimmy has been prolific, distilling more than 3 million barrels with his keen eye for detail and palate for flavor. When he is not in Lawrenceburg overseeing production, Jimmy is traveling the world as one of perhaps the most famous ambassadors for Kentucky's signature bourbon industry.

Mr. Russell has seen the ebbs and flows of the industry over the years and has been a key player in fostering the recent explosive growth of bourbon. Treated like a rock star wherever he goes, as adoring fans clamor for his autograph or a bottle of American Honey or his Russell Reserve, the indefatigable spirit of this Kentucky Bourbon Hall of Famer, or the so-called "Budha of Bourbon," will help guide the bourbon industry long into the future. Jimmy's son Eddie, himself a Hall of Famer, will ensure that the family's time-honored tradition of producing complex, finely honed bourbons continues into the fourth generation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join Jimmy's friends, family, fans, and fellow master distillers in raising a toast to celebrate Mr. Russell's contributions to a distinctively American and Kentucky industry on this momentous anniversary. I know I speak for millions more across the country and around the world when I say that I look forward to enjoying the fruits of Jimmy's labor for many more years to come.

WOMEN OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the success of our districts and the livelihood and future of our communities relies heavily on the devotion and service of those who go above the call of duty. The helpers willing to devote their time and energy to improving the lives of those around them deserve to be recognized.

This fall, through my 2014 Women of the Year awards, I have made an effort to recognize, honor, and celebrate the vital contributions of outstanding women in my district. Through their work or volunteerism, these women have all vastly improved the quality of life in their communities.

My office will recognize the achievements of Pat Ash, Marci Coglianese, Deborah Eernisse, Gloria Estrada, Lee Ann Grigsby-Puente, Mary Grimmer, Samina Masood, Dr. Frances Nelson, Gloria Partida, Linda Plummer, Lonetta Riley, Denise Rushing, Michelle Scully, and Nicole Van Vleck.

These are exemplary examples of sacrifice and devotion. These civic leaders have helped improve their communities in various ways. They are advocates for education, agriculture, flood protection, environmental stewardship, the arts, promoting healthy communities, organizing events to promote world peace, and raising community awareness to end bullying.

Throughout our history, America's foremothers have made great strides in securing their equal rights and equal treatment under the law. And while we have come very far, there is still work to be done. We stand on the shoulders of those giants, but that does not mean we should cease to reach further.

The success these women have had in their lives translates directly to the success of their communities. The correlation is undeniable. When women succeed, our communities succeed, and our States succeed. "When women succeed, America succeeds."

I will continue to work to shape a Nation that fosters possibilities, opportunities, and equity for women. A large component of that mission is the Economic Agenda for Women and Families, which highlights three areas of importance.

The first is pay. Women in this country make only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men doing exactly the same work. For African American and Latino women, the pay gap widens to 64 cents and 55 cents to the man's dollar. The minimum wage has not kept up with inflation, and when adjusted is more than 30 percent lower than it was in 1968. This is an unacceptable impediment to our success, and particularly the success of women.

Women cannot succeed if wages are inequitable or insufficient. Paycheck

fairness and increase in the minimum wage that includes tipped workers are just two solutions that will begin to mend the chasm created by the wage gap.

The second area is work and family balance. The lack of policy ensuring earned paid sick days and paid maternity leave is, quite frankly, appalling. Our inaction on ensuring work and family balance not only affects the lives of parents, but the lives and the development of their children.

The third area is child care. The passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 in the House of Representatives is a good first step towards ensuring access to child care, but there is still much more to be done.

Ensuring the success of women, and thereby the success of America, is imperative. I am proud and extremely thankful to have these women working and serving in the communities I represent. The devotion, care, and service shown by them, and by those like them, are what make my district and America succeed.

OPPOSITION TO ARMING SYRIAN REBELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we will be asked as a Congress later today to vote on authorization of the President's request to arm Syrian rebels.

I rise this morning to oppose the President's request, and I do so with a heart of conviction that says we must do more to combat, confront, defeat, and destroy ISIS, but also with the conviction, respectfully, that the President's request is simply wrong.

ISIS constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States. My belief on this is clear. I was one of a little over a dozen Members of Congress to recently introduce legislation authorizing the President to do more.

We must eradicate the ISIS regime that perverts a religion founded on peace and uses it as a platform to engage in crucifixions and beheadings and mass murders.

But I oppose today's request because it fails to seek the full authorization of this body. It fails to seek a clear mandate of the American people and because it asks this body to approve only one small portion of an overall strategy that is continuing to evolve. And that portion is most controversial, most questioned, and most vulnerable to failure.

We should be here today as a Congress debating whether we are a Nation at war, whether ISIS constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States, and if we are at war,

we as a Congress should be asking the question: Are we fully engaged as a Nation to defeat ISIS, and are we fully committed to accepting the consequences and the casualties required to do so? But that is not what today's vote is about.

Today's vote is whether we as a Nation put our reliance on Syrian rebels, and that leaves far too many unanswered questions. We tried this in Iraq, to mixed results. We know Syrian rebels—we know this—some will cooperate with ISIS and, in fact, contribute to the additional killings of Syrian Christians and religious minorities. Are we prepared as a body to accept those collateral casualties of terror?

We know training will take months. What will we be doing tomorrow? We know Russia has declared this will be an act of aggression. What is our Nation's response, and what is this body's response? And how does today's debate contribute to our Article I, Section 8 authority under the Constitution? Are we quietly allying with the Syrian Government, a regime that 18 months ago we said we wanted to topple, or is this an act of aggression against Syria's sovereignty? And where is this Congress in this debate?

The final question is: Do we seriously think, as the President portends, that this will not require a single pair of boots of our Special Operations community to touch Syrian soil? Do we truly rely on Syrian rebels to lay the targets for our elite air assets?

There are boots on the ground today. We can call them military advisers, but the fact is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff yesterday said, if necessary, he would recommend putting them in a combat role. We are not having that debate here on the floor of the House.

The American people deserve a President and a Congress that are honest about what we face as a Nation militarily. The doubt in this debate in this Congress has been palpable. We question the strategy, we question the trust of Syrian rebels, we question our constitutional responsibility, and yet we are prepared as a body to ignore all doubt, to ignore our uncomfortable conviction of opposition to this request simply out of a desperate hope that somehow this matter might resolve itself without the President and the Congress having a hard conversation, recognizing that we are a war weary and tired Nation faced again with an asymmetric threat from terrorists who have threatened our homeland.

We want to believe the beheadings and the audible threats of terror to our shores is not real, but we know it is. We as a Nation do not have the luxury to choose what threats confront us; we only choose our response.

So my request of my colleagues in this House is that we have a full debate

on what we face as a Nation. The President has brought us this very limited request merely out of statutory convenience, not out of constitutional conviction. We should not accept that.

My request of the President is this: very respectfully, do not trample on the constitutional authority of this Congress as you reluctantly march to the drumbeat of war that you are rightfully hesitant to engage in and with an elusive strategy that leaves so many unanswered questions today.

This body should have a full debate. The American people deserve to know that the President has requested full authorization and this Congress has had an opportunity to deliberate on it. I reluctantly oppose the request today, knowing we must do so much more to confront ISIS. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

CONGRESS AND THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, later today we are likely to see bipartisan support for an amendment to authorize the Secretaries of Defense and State to provide limited assistance to properly vetted factions within the Syrian opposition as part of the broader effort to “degrade, and ultimately destroy” the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. The President specifically asked Congress to provide these authorities, and I somewhat reluctantly will agree to support it.

But I want to add a caution, that this action should not be interpreted as granting congressional authorization for the broader use of military force to combat the growing threat posed by ISIL. Quite the contrary, the amendment specifically prohibits the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities absent such explicit authorization.

Now, the President asserts he already has the authority to confront ISIL. In his most recent notification to Congress, he cites the executive’s constitutional authority “to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief . . .” While this issue has been the subject of long-simmering debate between our branches and among historians and scholars, I would modestly note that the Constitution explicitly grants to Congress, and only to Congress, the power to declare war. If there are inherent unenumerated powers in the role of Commander in Chief, most surely logic dictates there are similar inherent, unenumerated powers Congress is vested in with our role to declare war.

Let us make no mistake, we are confronting here on this issue a matter of war and peace. Yet, in the same breath we are discussing the danger, we are

preparing to shutter Congress for another 7 weeks until after the election.

The President said he welcomes congressional support for this effort to show the world we are “united in confronting this danger.” I am glad he welcomes congressional input, but I, for one, believe the President actually needs specific congressional authority, whether he wants it or not, for what he himself acknowledges will be a prolonged campaign to eradicate the cancer-like ISIL. Anything short of that is an abrogation of our sworn duty to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

This isn’t President Obama trampling on the Constitution. This is Congress, in a long 60-year history, of winking and blinking about our responsibility because we don’t want to bear it. But on matters of war and peace, we either live up to our constitutional responsibility, which is quite clear, or we go on a 7-week recess.

My colleagues know there are historical cases in which congressional acquiescence has been construed to confer support or authorization where none has been given. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution is certainly a case in point. It led to a prolonged war and 55,000 U.S. deaths.

The 93rd Congress adopted the War Powers Resolution to reassert Congress’ role after both Korea and Vietnam. The War Powers Resolution requires the President to consult with Congress prior to introducing American forces into hostilities.

The administration has recently argued that the aerial strikes do not constitute hostilities because they don’t involve sustained fighting. But again, out of the President’s own words, he said last week this would be “a comprehensive and sustained effort.” That doesn’t sound like a temporary action by the Commander in Chief.

And to put an even finer point on the issue, I remind my colleagues of H. Con. Res. 105, which was adopted in July, that prohibits the President from deploying or maintaining U.S. Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.

I agree with the President when he said we are strongest as a Nation when the President and Congress work together. On the most important issue we ever vote on, war and peace, we must come together, and this branch must live up to its constitutional responsibility at long last.

FIGHTING THE ISLAMIC STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the President’s assertion last week, the Islamic State is Islamic and

it is a State, or at least it has all the attributes of a State. It is precisely this combination that makes it so dangerous, a messianic and clearly stated intention to wage jihad on American soil and the resources and equipment to do so.

In response to this danger, the President proposes that the United States wage a continuing air war against the Islamic State, but to avoid any commitment of ground forces. Instead, he seeks to use vetted elements of the Free Syrian Army as the American proxy force and proposes to arm and train them for that purpose.

This raises two major concerns. First, many elements of the Free Syrian Army have a long history of collaborating with the Islamic State. Its principal mission is to destroy the Syrian Government, which though utterly despotic, is currently fighting the Islamic State. We court a very real risk that this equipment will either be turned against Syria as it fights the IS, or turned over to the IS as elements of Iraqi Security Forces recently did.

Second, committing insufficient force in any conflict is self-defeating, and air strikes alone cannot win a war. For 13 years, the brave young Americans who stepped forward to defend our country after 9/11 have found themselves hamstrung by political correctness on the battlefield, perilously commingled with hostile forces, endangered by rules of engagement that undermine their ability to defend themselves, and denied the full resources and commitment of our country.

We are in precarious times, with an administration that either cannot or will not learn from the mistakes of the past. Until we are prepared to put the full might and resources of our Nation behind a war against the Islamic State, we can at least act to contain IS advances, protect our people, and restore the martial strength and national will that will certainly be needed in the years ahead.

First, I believe the President is correct to order selected air strikes in tactical support of resistance forces where they are actively engaged against the IS. Where we can turn the tide of battle in these engagements, we must. And the immediate destruction of oil fields under IS control is vital to reduce the resources that it is currently converting to cash.

Second, it is appropriate to take immediate, significant, and focused retaliatory strikes against the Islamic State in response to specific acts that it commits against American interests. This is the Reagan model in Libya, and it worked.

Third, the direct threat posed to the United States by the IS is not on Syrian or Iraqi soil, but on American soil. The Islamic State has been explicit in declaring its intention to insert a Fifth Column within our borders and wage

jihad on Americans. For far too long we have ignored the threat posed by a wide open southern border, lax enforcement on the northern border, and non-enforcement of visa overstays. And this neglect needs to stop now. We must secure our borders, enforce the time limits on visas, and change the law to revoke the passports of any American who takes up arms for the Islamic State.

Fourth, we must recognize that the improving world situation that justified reducing military spending in recent years has now reversed, and so must our priorities. The world is now becoming more dangerous and unstable, and our military budget must be adjusted to meet that growing danger. Our Nation's weakened fiscal condition requires a comprehensive review of our spending priorities as a matter of vital national security.

Fifth, we must assure that our only reliable ally in the Middle East, Israel, has all the equipment and supplies and assistance it may need in coming years, and that it will have the unqualified support of the United States when it must take action for its own security.

Mr. Speaker, Islamic fascism is now advancing into a vacuum that many past blunders have created, the worst of them being to underestimate the terrible demands that war requires. These are mistakes we can no longer afford to make. Confronting the rise of European fascism in the 1930s, Churchill counseled measured resistance where possible, while undertaking utmost martial preparation. That advice lights our path that we must take today.

ANYTHING FOR FOOTBALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, "anything for football." It is a phrase I have heard a lot recently, that we should ignore what happens off the field for the sake of the sport.

This creed used to mean something positive. Vince Lombardi, the namesake of the Super Bowl trophy, said he viewed his players as "neither black nor white, but Packer green." "Anything for football" meant he had to fight racism and homophobia off the field to coach the best football team possible.

Recently, "anything for football" has been used to justify an organization that perpetuates violence and sexism rather than teamwork, family, and sport. Instead of fighting injustice off the field for the sake of the sport, the NFL chooses deafening silence. We are told to ignore what happens on the sidelines, in disciplinary boardrooms, or behind elevator doors, all for the sport. Well, I refuse to ignore what is happening.

The NFL thinks they can play by their own rules. As we saw in the Ray Rice case, these decisions go all the way to the top. Commissioner Roger Goodell is judge and jury, yet he is also the one who stands to profit by seeing these cases hushed and unpunished.

Since he took over the NFL in 2006, there have been 56 arrests of players for domestic violence. The NFL has been inconsistent in its response, ranging from counseling, to single game suspensions, to conditional fines, to nothing at all.

After a player is arrested, more often than not they continue to play, even if there is clear evidence for their violent crime. When a police officer is being investigated for domestic violence, they are suspended with pay until the investigation ends. If the NFL is serious about zero tolerance, why shouldn't it play by the same rules?

Of the 56 football players arrested for domestic violence, they only saw a combined 13 games suspended. The NFL would rather see these players on the field than take a stance against violence. After all, "anything for football." I say, "Bench them."

Ray McDonald of the San Francisco 49ers was arrested at a party after his fiancée, who was 10 weeks pregnant, showed police bruises on her neck and arms. He has played the last 2 weeks. Why hasn't he been benched? "Anything for football." I am an avid 49er fan, but this is disgusting. I expect more from my 49ers.

Greg Hardy of the Carolina Panthers was arrested and convicted for assaulting his former girlfriend. The woman said Hardy picked her up, choked her, threw her on a couch covered in assault rifles and shotguns, and bragged to her that they were loaded. He is appealing his case and still playing. Why hasn't he been benched? "Anything for football."

Ray Rice of the Baltimore Ravens, who was indicted in March with assaulting his then-fiancée, has finally received a punishment befitting his crime, but only after a video of the actual event was released. After he was indicted, his coach, John Harbaugh, said, "He will be part of our team. Support the person without condoning the action." Why wasn't he benched from the start? "Anything for football."

The list goes on and on. Like the military and universities, the NFL thinks they can enforce their own justice internally. They have failed. The NFL should change their policies so that these players stay on the bench while they are investigated.

This week I will send a letter to Commissioner Goodell and team owners, calling on them to immediately change their domestic violence policy. When a player is arrested for domestic violence, the NFL should immediately suspend the player and continue to pay them until a preponderance of the evi-

dence determines their guilt or innocence. This suspension should continue until the end of court proceedings, when the NFL can then apply its player policy. It is what we do with police officers. This is what zero tolerance looks like.

Two-thirds of all Americans watch the NFL. Let us work together to put an end to the NFL's inaction. Lombardi didn't just think we could fight racism through football. He said, "People who work together will win, whether it be against complex football defenses or the problems of modern society."

It may be difficult, but we deserve sports that show the best in our society. After all, "anything for football."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4194. An act to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

S. 2117. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 2440. An act to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

S. 2511. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

S. 2539. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, reappoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) vice the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

ONLY CONGRESS DECLARES WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the plan that has been put forward by the President.

As you, Mr. Speaker, just noted a few moments ago, it is a small portion of a larger and, what I believe to be, fundamentally flawed plan.

I say that for many different reasons, one of which is the simple reality that body bags from a far off battle or from a far off war don't return to Washington, D.C. They return to congressional districts and States across this country. It is for that very reason that the Founding Fathers believed so strongly in Congress having the authority, and the sole authority, for the declaration of war.

I mean, I think it is important to look to what James Wilson, who happened to be one of the biggest advocates for a strong Presidency, said to his own State delegation back in 1787. He said on the importance of congressional authority with regard to war:

This system will not hurry us into war. It is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man or a single body of men to involve us in such distress, for the important power of declaring war is vested at the legislative level at large.

George Washington said this:

The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress. Therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.

James Madison said this:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature. The Executive has no right in any case to decide the question whether there is or is not cause for declaring war.

I think our Founding Fathers had it right, and if we move forward today without stopping and waiting and insisting upon the President's constitutional duty to come before this body and ask for a declaration of war, I think we are making a mistake.

I would say, secondly, that I think we are making a mistake because the news of today is that General Dempsey now says if the plan doesn't work out, he would in fact recommend American ground troops there in this crisis in the Middle East. I think that that is telling. Because if you stop and think about it, is America the only group that is expected to suffer through the ravages of war with regard to boots on the ground in this instant if General Dempsey's call is right?

Think about this. There have been 6,600 American deaths there in that part of the world in recent history. There have been more than 50,000 soldiers that have returned with life-altering wounds. I mean, their lives are changed forever, and yet we can't get a real firm commitment out of allies there in the Middle East as to what they will or won't do with regard to ground troops.

So if it is that big a threat, why is it that allies in that part of the world are not making real and substantial commitments with regard to what they

will or won't do with regard to ground troops?

Thirdly, I would say what we are doing is we are signing up for an open-ended commitment, maybe a 5- or a 10- or a 15- or a 20-year commitment, without legal authority to do so. The administration is resting solely on the 2001 authorizing language, which was to President Bush, in the wake of 9/11, for pursuing perpetrators of 9/11.

And yet in this instance what they are saying is, well, no, no, that gives us authority for the next 10, 15, 20 years. That is not the case. Congress authorized for that action. I think it is a misreading of the law to move forward as they have.

Finally, I would make this point. The Bible says, "Be hot, be cold, but don't be lukewarm." And I think this plan is predicated on lukewarm. I have some colleagues who say we need to commit ground troops; we need firmer involvement. I have others who say we don't need to do anything at all. And we are splitting it right down the middle. Let's bomb a bit and let's arm "moderate rebels" and we see how that works.

We have a snapshot of how that works because just this spring 1,000 ISIS soldiers routed two divisions of Iraqis, about 30,000 folks, in no time. Mind you, these are the same folks that American taxpayers spent \$25 billion training and equipping. We equipped about 200,000 of them. It has not worked well.

I think we need to pause, first, for constitutional reasons; second, for legal authority reasons; and third, for a flawed strategy that is based on lukewarm. We have that chance today, and I would beg of my colleagues to do so.

STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our number one priority should always be strengthening our economy and expanding job growth and opportunity.

That is why I launched the "Brad At Your Business" initiative, to hear firsthand about the opportunities and challenges facing the businesses in my district.

So far I have visited more than 80 companies, speaking with owners, managers, and employees about their aspirations and needs for achieving success. I have spoken with some of the largest companies in our country, but also to small- and medium-sized businesses; second-, third-, and fourth-generation family firms, startups, advanced manufacturing companies, retail, and service firms.

Throughout these visits, I have heard several recurring themes, including concerns about our growing skills gap, our aging infrastructure, the need to

reform our broken immigration system, and the need to modernize our Tax Code to successfully compete in a global economy.

These conversations have subsequently led to concrete actions, such as introducing the AMERICA Works Act and the LEARN Act, that will help better match worker training programs to specific employer needs.

If we are to successfully lead a resurgence of the U.S. economy, we need more collaboration between our business owners, workers, and elected officials.

Only by working together can we reignite social mobility, rebuild the ladders of opportunity, and achieve a more inclusive prosperity for all Americans.

MORE DEBATE NEEDED ON WAR VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is 10:40, September 17, 2014. And for me, this is an historic event, because I will be able to tell my grandkids and those who would listen that on the eve of the House of Representatives taking a vote that would expand the war powers of the President of the United States, that I stood in the well of the House talking to a House that was void of any Member of the House of Representatives.

I make this point not so much to indicate the importance of anything I might say this morning, but because I really think that the whole country should be concerned about the gravity and importance of the vote that we take today, which in my 44 years I cannot think of any vote that is more important and certainly more historic.

It goes unchallenged that the vote today would expose more members of the military to bodily harm. It is clear that the administration has called this a war on ISIS or ISIL. It is abundantly clear that the threat to our national security is subject to a whole lot of debate. And while I may not have the answer to whether or not there is a threat, to me, I cannot think of anything more important than the 435 Members of the House and the 100 Members of the other body, at least before we vote, to be able to debate this issue.

I intend to vote against the amendment that would include an expansion of our military venture, which means that I will be forced to vote against the concurrent resolution. But I think the House Members, Republicans and Democrats, should resent the fact that these votes are combined into one vote.

The vote as to whether or not it is constitutional, the vote as to whether or not it is a threat to the United States security, the vote as to how we

are going to pay for it, the vote in terms of who is going to make the sacrifices, these are the things that should be debated. There is no lawful reason why these two issues have to be joined in one vote.

I do hope I get an opportunity to bring an amendment to the authority of the President to use military force by conditioning it to two things: that if this Congress and the American people believe that we have a threat to our national security, then by all means we should be prepared to make the sacrifices to protect our country.

What are those sacrifices? Well, one is financial sacrifice. Because the trillions of dollars that was spent—I think it is close to \$6 trillion since we have been involved in the Middle East—most of the profits have been made by the military industrial complex. But the \$6 trillion comes out of our budget, and there is not a war tax. I think we need that.

The other question has to be that we cannot dismiss the military that is in Iraq today and those that may be in that area, whose lives are endangered. That is less than 1 percent of United States population is making the sacrifice. We already lost 6,800 American lives in this war, and it is very difficult to explain to their families and friends at funerals what the cause was or whether we won or lost.

But the question should be once we make a determination that there is a threat to our national security, we should have the mandatory Selective Service Act reinstated. We already have it on the books. We should activate it to make certain that if you are voting to put more men and women's lives into jeopardy, make certain it is universal men and women would be selected to make certain that they provide for a national service of some sort.

So what I am suggesting is that I can never believe that this country would be voting this day and that the debates would be that I would be talking to an empty Chamber in pleading for the American people that if you are going to make a decision that we should really go to war, because there is a threat to the security of the United States of America, one, that should not be debated just on the question of the continuance of support of the budget of the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Joseph Holcomb, St. Andrew Avellino Catholic Church, Flushing, New York, offered the following prayer:

All powerful and merciful God, we praise You and give You thanks for all Your gracious gifts, most especially the gift of Your infinite and unconditional love.

It is Your gift of love that inspires and drives us to seek peace throughout our Nation and our world to gain an awareness that we share a common destiny which is ultimately transcendent, peace that is not the mere absence of war but as a harmonious co-existence of individual citizens within a society governed by justice, one in which the good is also achieved for each of them.

Help us through Your gift of love to work diligently in these coming days, months, and years to seek peace for all.

May our deliberations in this, the United States House of Representatives, bring about understanding, tolerance, and peace in our great Nation and the world.

We pray this in Your holy name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOSEPH HOLCOMB

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my colleagues to Father Joseph T. Holcomb, the guest chaplain today.

Father Holcomb serves St. Andrew Avellino Roman Catholic Church in Queens, New York.

A native New Yorker, Father Holcomb attended Holy Family Catholic Grammar School, Cathedral Preparatory Seminary, Cathedral College of the Immaculate Conception, and Seminary of the Immaculate Conception.

He went on to attain a bachelor's degree from Cathedral College in Douglaston, New York. He also received a master's degree in divinity from Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington, New York, and a master's in social work from Fordham University in New York City.

He was ordained to the priesthood in 1980 and has been faithfully serving multiple communities ever since. In July 2009, he was appointed as the sixth pastor of St. Andrew Avellino Roman Catholic Church and has worked tirelessly to make improvements where possible.

His efforts have led to crucial enhancements in the church and an enriched connection with its parishioners. Father Holcomb's work in the church has touched thousands of lives, and we are so privileged to have him in the Queens community.

Father Holcomb is a pillar of leadership and faith in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Father Holcomb to the House of Representatives and to thank him for serving as our guest chaplain today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 227 years ago, our Founding Fathers came together to write the Constitution, and it is on this foundation that we have built the greatest

Nation on Earth. The Constitution protects our democracy and our individual liberties that define the American way of life that we are all blessed to enjoy.

I have spent most of my life defending what the Constitution stands for, 29 years in the United States Air Force and now in the United States Congress. I consider this to be an honor and a privilege.

We can all do our part to defend America's freedom by understanding and remembering our Constitution's significance. That is why today, on national Constitution Day, I encourage all Americans to join me in reflecting on the history and the meaning of this important document. We must never take our freedom for granted.

ONE NEWARK PLAN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am concerned about the Newark Public Schools' One Newark plan which picks winners and losers among schools and students.

Earlier this year, I sent a letter to the superintendent of Newark Public Schools, Cami Anderson. I am deeply troubled by its actions which ignore efforts to strengthen traditional public schools; further, I question whether the One Newark plan will truly help realize this vision for all students in the Newark public school system, especially children with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I sent this letter in February. More than 5 months later, I have yet to receive a single response. The people I represent are very upset over the lack of answers and the complete disregard for their concerns, and they have a right to be upset.

The opening of the schools in the Newark public school system this year was a debacle. There have been protests, and there will continue to be until the voices of the people are heard.

We are talking about the future of Newark, the future of our district, the future of our State, and the children that we love.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This landmark legislation was initially passed in 1964, permanently paving the way for the protection and growth of our Nation's natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, New York's 19th Congressional District is home to some of the most amazing scenery in the Na-

tion. Constituents in our district can walk and bike in the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys; they can hike through the Catskill Mountains and paddle along the streams that feed into the Hudson River.

I'm proud to say my constituents know how important it is to preserve and protect our land. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been a tremendous success for New York State.

It has been estimated that outdoor recreational activity supports over 300,000 jobs for New York and that over 4 million New Yorkers participate in hunting, fishing, and viewing wildlife each year.

Additionally, my district benefits from the Forest Legacy Program funded under the LWCF. This program helps States preserve and maintain their forest land.

Mr. Speaker, next year, we will have the opportunity to reauthorize LWCF. I would encourage all my colleagues in the House and Senate to reflect on the legislation's success, recognize our Nation's legacy of historic beauty, and to support the reauthorization next year.

CLEAN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of clean energy sources and the leading role America is poised to play in this field.

Earlier this summer, the company SolarCity announced its intention to open one of the largest solar production plants in the world in Buffalo, New York. This display of renewable energy would be a tremendous addition to the western New York community through the creation of over 1,000 jobs; however, the continued growth in renewable energy is dependent on Congress enacting the right policies.

This is why we must extend the solar investment tax credits which are due to expire at the end of 2016. We also need to ensure that consumers selling energy back to the grid are able to do so at predictable and fair prices.

That is why today I have sent a letter to the Secretary of Energy urging his office to formulate best practices for net metering. This allows those who generate their own electricity from solar power to feed what they do not use back to the grid.

Just as the Buffalo Niagara region was an early adopter of hydroelectricity, we intend to be a leader in clean energy technologies like solar power as well.

COMMEMORATING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the U.S. Marshals Service was founded on September 24 of 1789, U.S. marshals have served this country with dedication and distinction, upholding its creed of "Justice, Integrity, Service." I rise today to commemorate the service's 225th anniversary.

The U.S. Marshals Service will celebrate its birthday next week in my district by breaking ground on the U.S. Marshals Museum in Fort Smith, Arkansas. The museum will be funded in part by the sale of coins commemorating the 225th anniversary of the Marshals Service.

The museum's 20,000 square feet will highlight pivotal moments in our oldest Federal law enforcement agency's history and pay proper tribute to the heroism the marshals have shown over the past 225 years.

I speak for all of my constituents in the Third District of Arkansas and my fellow Arkansans when I say we are humbled to have the U.S. Marshals Museum make Fort Smith its home and honored to play a prominent role in the next 225 years of the U.S. marshals history.

Happy birthday, U.S. marshals.

PROTECTING OUR HOMELAND AND OUR HOMELIFE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the value of our Constitution. I just left the Homeland Security hearing on the horror of ISIL and held up the Constitution to say that we will not allow terrorists to undermine our values, and I am grateful that we live under the Constitution that we do.

With that in mind, I encourage my colleagues to join me on H.R. 5488, a bill that I have introduced that would call for the reviewing and looking at the watch list to make sure that no foreign fighters are left off of that list and that there is a no fly for foreign fighters, again, reminding us of the processes which we use, and I hope that there will be those who will do so.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that we are facing economic growth, but we are also experiencing problems. All I hear from the NFL are the expression of problems. I sent a letter to Director Goodell of the NFL, the commissioner, to say, "Put your resources where your complaints are."

There are so many groups that are dealing with violence against women and abuse of children that we need to

provide the NFL the resources to all of those groups. We need the NFL wives to be engaged. Stop talking, and let's do something.

This is disgraceful, but there is an epidemic of domestic violence, and the NFL can stand up and announce a major funding—as my colleague in the Senate has indicated—to be able to lift all of these groups that struggle every day to reach these women.

I would also add to them, put a campaign: see something, say something on domestic violence. I ask the NFL to stand up and be counted.

THE TRIBAL GENERAL WELFARE EXCLUSION ACT OF 2013

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act.

Under what is known as the general welfare doctrine, the IRS excludes a broad array of public services for purposes such as education, public safety, health, housing, and culture from taxation; however, this has not always been the case for tribal nations.

Recently, the IRS has challenged tribal general welfare programs, despite many of these being nearly identical to tax exempt programs provided by Federal, State, and local governments.

Members of the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, the Kickapoo, Iowa, and the Sac and Fox Nation in Kansas have all voiced their concerns to me about invasive IRS audits and examinations that seek to tax government programs and benefits to their members.

This bicameral and bipartisan legislation will positively affect many Native Americans and is an important step in bringing IRS treatment of the tribes in line with how they are currently treating States.

□ 1215

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence should never, ever be tolerated. The NFL's inept response to the recent reports of domestic violence has thrust a tragic spotlight onto this issue that we all are well aware of.

The truth of the matter is domestic violence and sexual assault are daily realities for women across our Nation. One in four women will experience physical violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime. In 2012, in part of the area that I represent in California,

6,000 domestic violence cases were reported by the Fresno Police Department. It is hard to believe, and it is unacceptable.

Today, let's make a commitment not to let this moment fade away after the headlines are gone. As a cofounder and cochair of the bipartisan Victims' Rights Caucus, we will keep working with all the victim advocate groups to strengthen the Violence Against Women Act and end the rape kit backlog and ensure that every woman has the right to a life without violence.

OUR RIGHTS COME FROM OUR CREATOR

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 227 years ago, our Founding Fathers signed the U.S. Constitution establishing a nation united around the principle that our rights as citizens come not from the government but from our Creator.

Today we recommit ourselves by choice to upholding and defending these fundamental principles recognized in this document, including liberty, freedom, and rule of law of our great Republic. Indeed, our first act as newly elected Members of this House is to swear an oath to uphold and protect this document.

These principles have guided our Nation well over the last 227 years, both in times of prosperity as well as discord. Now, perhaps more than ever, it is our duty and it is the duty of every American to ensure these liberties and freedoms can be passed on to our children and our grandchildren.

I am honored to stand here today and commemorate the works of these 39 brave and wise original signatories to our Constitution.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Mr. HUFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, this month we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Wilderness Act, two of our Nation's most effective conservation tools.

In California, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided more than \$2 billion to protect some of our most iconic natural landmarks. In my district alone, this includes the Point Reyes National Seashore, Redwood National Park, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and countless State parks, trails, and recreation areas. The fund uses zero taxpayer dollars for these investments in the economic and environmental well-being of our communities; instead, it is funded by revenues from offshore oil and gas activities.

We celebrate also the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act, which has protected some of our Nation's most pristine and intact wild places. As climate change begins to take its toll, protecting these wild places will be even more vital to the survival of many threatened and endangered species and to the conservation values that are part of our national fabric.

This should not be a partisan issue. Every American benefits from these two important laws and the lands they protect. Please join me in supporting them for another 50 years.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN CLARKE

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, after more than 40 years in the construction trade, my friend John Clarke of Wheeling has retired.

John is a lifelong West Virginian, the former president of Local 141 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and served on the International Executive Committee of IBEW.

After serving in Vietnam with the Marine Corps, John returned home and gave back to his community, serving on over 25 local charitable and professional organizations.

IBEW International President Ed Hill has said, "Working families in West Virginia have never had a better friend than John Clarke." And more importantly, in a world conflicted with partisanship, John proudly put his country first, not his political affiliation.

He made a difference. His decades of devotion to his country and his community can only be matched by his commitment to his wife of 43 years, Margaret, and his two sons, Justin and Lucas.

I extend my congratulations to John and wish him well in his retirement.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH 2014

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, each year from September 15 until October 15, the Nation celebrates the many contributions of Latinos during Hispanic Heritage Month.

In my home State of Texas, the Hispanic community continues to relish in the cultural and historical footprint in the areas of government, architecture, business, and the arts. From north Texas Hispanic elected officials, both past and present who are advocating for the Latino community, to the Rose Marine Theater in Fort Worth and the Latino cultural center in Dallas, Hispanic culture continues to illuminate

all aspects of life and history in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex.

In the area of business and commerce, the contributions of business leaders continue to make the area that we live in one of the best in the entire country. Both Dallas and Tarrant Counties are fortunate to be served by very strong Hispanic chambers of commerce that proudly serve many of those businesses.

It is undeniable that Hispanic culture is woven into all aspects of contemporary American culture, and in the Dallas-Fort Worth area we are fortunate to be known as a city that is vibrant because of its strong Latino community.

HONORING JOSEPH JAMES DUNN

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, Montana is a State blessed with people who have a strong commitment to service. In fact, more than 100,000 military veterans call our State home, and our dedicated law enforcement officials perform critical services each and every day.

On August 14, 2014, we lost a great Montanan when Cascade County sheriff deputy and Marine Corps combat veteran Joseph James Dunn the First was killed in the line of duty.

Joe put faith and family at the center of his life, going on multiple mission trips. He was described as a "bold ambassador for Christ." No one was more important to Joe than his family: his dear wife, Robynn; son, Joey; and daughter, Shiloh.

Joe will be dearly missed by all who knew him. He personified service to his country, to his State, and to his community. Joe's life is an inspiration for all Montanans.

INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, this week the House will vote on loosely related bits of campaign fodder bundled together and labeled a "jobs" bill. But if we really want to help American workers and boost our economy, let's take a vote to increase the minimum wage. Let's show hardworking Americans that it is simply unacceptable for a mother working full-time to live \$400 below the Federal poverty line.

Let's show businesses that we understand that added buying power for our workers is the boost this economic recovery needs. President Truman once said: Full human dignity requires at least a minimum level of economic sufficiency and security.

The American people deserve that and more. The American people want and deserve a vote to increase the minimum wage.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT CONFIRMS OBAMACARE FUNDS ABORTIONS

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today disturbed by a report confirming that the Affordable Care Act provides for a massive expansion of abortion funded by the taxpayer.

This week, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office revealed that 1,036 of the plans offered under ObamaCare and eligible for taxpayer subsidies cover abortion on demand. Although the President promised in 2009 that "no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions," the law's accounting gimmicks showed otherwise.

One of my heroes, the late honorable Henry Hyde, worked hard to ensure that no American would be forced to pay for someone else's abortion. That is why the House passed H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Clearly, there has been a lack of full disclosure by the administration and the insurance companies who have ignored the law, a law which failed to provide adequate safeguards for the taxpayer.

Many Americans are, thus, unwittingly paying for a procedure which violates their most deeply held beliefs. It is time the administration honored both the letter and spirit of the Hyde amendment. It is time for the Senate to pass H.R. 7 and ensure no American is forced to pay for abortion.

McKEON AMENDMENT

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, as we prepare to cast our vote today to train and equip Syrian rebels, I want to remind my colleagues of the nearly \$20.2 billion that the United States has spent to train and equip Iraqi security forces during our decade at war there.

And what happened?

The Iraqi security forces could not secure the country and fled major Iraqi cities when confronted by ISIS. \$20.2 billion. And yet here we are again today ready to authorize hundreds of millions of dollars to train and equip members of the Free Syrian Army.

What in the world are we doing?

Instead of rushing into yet another war, flooding the region with more weapons and intervening further in a

civil war, Congress should be pressing the pause button. Instead of rushing into yet another war authorization—which of course this congressional resolution says it is not, but the unintended consequences will expand this war—Congress should be examining all of the solutions to this crisis, not just the military ones.

That is why I called and will continue to call for Congress to live up to its constitutional responsibility and have a full debate on the authorization to use force. The costs and consequences should be made clear.

HONORING CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, today, September 17, 2014, marks 82,910 days since the Constitution was signed in 1787. Though I have only been a United States Congressman for 469 of those days, on every one of them, I work to uphold the oath of office I swore: to defend our Nation's most important governing document, the Constitution.

On this Constitution Day, I would like to take some time to remind us all that all parts of the founding document are important. Especially in this time of executive overreach, we should remember that our Constitution created three equal and distinct branches of government.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise to add my voice to the thousands of citizens who will soon descend upon New York City to call for action to combat climate change. The first-ever People's Climate March will demonstrate robust support for climate action ahead of the United Nations climate summit next Tuesday.

Climate change is the defining challenge of our time. It threatens our economy and our way of life in countless ways through catastrophic wildfires, through severe storms and rising seas; and in my home State of California, one of the worst droughts on record threatens water supplies for drinking water and irrigation of valuable crops. This year alone, the drought will cost the agricultural sector \$2.2 billion dollars and over 17,000 jobs.

Our Nation is taking positive steps to curb harmful carbon emissions, but there is so much more work that needs to be done. We can't wait any longer. Our children and our grandchildren are depending upon it.

REMEMBER PUNA

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, my home State of Hawaii is a unique and a very special place. There isn't a day that goes by that either a colleague or someone stops me to share with me a very special story about Hawaii.

I stand here today to ask that you remember us in a different way: a State with a very active volcano which is now within a residential area called the Kaohe homestead, and with lava that is flowing at a rate of 705 feet a day, soon to wipe out a major highway and who knows how many other subdivisions in its way.

This area is known as Puna, the same area which took the brunt of the hurricane, later a tropical storm, Iselle in August of this year. You know, they still have not recuperated from that storm, and now they have to contend with the lava.

So I ask my colleagues, Madam Speaker, that when we look at FEMA, Department of Agriculture, other agencies which will be able to help us, that when we look at the funding of first responders, that you remember Hawaii, you remember our Big Island, and you remember the people of Puna.

□ 1230

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, as someone who was born and raised in south Florida, I know Miami thrives on investment exports and economic development provided by the Export-Import Bank facilities—the Ex-Im Bank.

This organization will lose its authorization unless Congress acts. It is crucial to fueling a prosperous economy, not only in south Florida but the entire country.

In 2013 alone, the Ex-Im Bank supported an estimated \$37.4 billion of U.S. exports and helped sustain more than 200,000 jobs. This is key. In my own district, 300 million exports since 2007.

As a percentage of the GDP, China and India provided roughly three times as much financing as we did. We need to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank to create jobs and keep our exporters in competitive foreign markets.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. This is an issue too important in the economy for partisan politics.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BACHMANN). The Chair clarifies that pursuant to section 106(b)(5)(B) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315), the Speaker's appointments of May 25, 2010, and December 22, 2010, of individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity expired on May 25, 2014.

The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 106 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Arthur E. Keiser, Fort Lauderdale, FL

William Pepicello, Scottsdale, AZ

Arthur J. Rothkopf, Washington, DC

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

STRONGLY SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 726) strongly supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 726

Whereas the United States is strongly committed to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

Whereas the Russian Federation has undertaken a campaign of political, economic, and military aggression against Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation's forcible occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea, its continuing support for separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine, and its invasion of and military operations on Ukrainian territory represent gross violations of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity and a violation of international law, including the Russian Federation's obligations under the United Nations Charter and its commitments as a participating State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine continues to exercise extraordinary restraint in response to the invasion of its territory by several thousand military personnel of the Russian Federation, who are engaged in offensive military operations in support of separatist forces, the illegal occupation and annexation of Crimea, and the tens of thousands of Russian Federation military personnel positioned offensively on the Ukrainian-Russian border since March 2014;

Whereas the forcible occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation and its continuing support for separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine are violations of its obligations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation has provided military equipment, training, and other assistance to separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine that has resulted in ongoing conflict that is responsible for over 3,000 deaths, hundreds of thousands of civilian refugees, and widespread destruction;

Whereas the Ukrainian military remains at a significant disadvantage compared to the armed forces of the Russian Federation in terms of size and technological sophistication;

Whereas the United States strongly supports efforts to assist Ukraine to defend its territory against military aggression by the Russian Federation and by separatist and paramilitary forces;

Whereas Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, was destroyed by a Russian-made missile provided to the separatist forces by the Russian Federation, taking all 298 innocent lives on board;

Whereas the Russian Federation has used and is continuing to use coercive economic measures, including the manipulation of energy prices and supplies as well as trade restrictions, to place political and economic pressure on Ukraine;

Whereas visa, financial, and other sanctions imposed by the United States, the European Union, and other allies and partners have placed significant pressure on the Russian Federation and its leadership but have not been sufficient to end its political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine;

Whereas the President of the United States has authority to impose stronger sanctions against the Russian Federation and its leadership;

Whereas an aggressive Russian propaganda effort through the dissemination of false information is intended to stoke ethnic divisions and incite violence, thereby posing a direct threat to the peace and stability of Ukraine;

Whereas on April 3, 2014, the President signed Public Law 113-96 for the purpose of bolstering the resources of the Broadcasting Board of Governors to counter Russian propaganda and provide the people of Ukraine and the surrounding regions with access to credible and uncensored sources of information;

Whereas the United States remains committed to Ukraine's democratic development and to the establishment of a government that includes and respects representatives from all regions of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States is committed to assisting the Government of Ukraine ensure that the parliamentary elections scheduled for October 26, 2014, are free, fair, and held in all regions of Ukraine in full accordance with international standards;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the development of a prosperous market economy in Ukraine;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the implementation of economic reforms in Ukraine, including in the fiscal, energy, pension, and banking sectors, among others;

Whereas the United States supports the development of Ukraine's trade and economic ties with other countries and especially the European Union following the signing of an Association Agreement on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States strongly supports energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries, including the development of domestic sources of energy, increased efficiency, and substituting energy obtained from Russia with imports from other countries;

Whereas the terms of the cease-fire announced on September 5, 2014, are being violated by the Russian Federation and the separatist and paramilitary forces it supports;

Whereas this cease-fire, if its terms are fully met by all parties, may be a first step toward the reestablishment of stability that must include the full withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukrainian territory, the establishment of Ukraine's control over all of its international borders, the disarming of the separatist and paramilitary forces in the east, an end to Russia's use of its energy exports and trade barriers to apply economic and political pressure on Ukraine, and an end to Russian interference in Ukraine's internal affairs;

Whereas the political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine by the Russian Federation underscores the enduring importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as the cornerstone of collective Euro-Atlantic defense; and

Whereas the United States reaffirms its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5, which states that "an armed attack against one or more" of the treaty signatories "shall be considered an attack against them all": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

(2) calls on the President to continue to work with our allies and partners in Europe and other nations around the world to reaffirm the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine and to refuse to recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation;

(3) strongly condemns the continuing political, economic, and military aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and the violation of its sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;

(4) states that the military intervention by the Russian Federation is a breach of its obligations under the United Nations Charter and its commitments as a participating State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and is a violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine; and poses a threat to international peace and security;

(5) demands that the Russian Federation remove its military forces and military equipment from the territory of Ukraine, including equipment provided to the separatist and paramilitary forces;

(6) demands that the Russian Federation end its political, military, and economic support of separatist and paramilitary forces in Ukraine;

(7) demands that the Russian Federation and the separatist and paramilitary forces it supports end their violations of the cease-fire announced on September 5, 2014;

(8) calls on the President to cooperate with allies and partners in Europe and other nations around the world to impose visa bans, targeted asset freezes, sectoral sanctions, and other measures on the Russian Federation and its leadership sufficient to compel it to end its violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to remove its military forces and equipment from Ukrainian territory, and to end its support of separatist and paramilitary forces;

(9) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with defense articles, services, and training required to effectively defend its territory and sovereignty;

(10) calls on the President to ensure the delivery of urgently needed assistance to Ukraine and to ensure that all future assistance will be rapidly delivered;

(11) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with appropriate intelligence and other relevant information to assist the Government of Ukraine to defend its territory and sovereignty;

(12) calls on the President to work with the Government of Ukraine, our allies and other nations, and international organizations to ensure that the multinational team investigating the destruction of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 is able to conduct an unrestricted investigation, guarantee the repatriation of remains and personal effects from the crash site, report its findings free of outside political influence or intimidation and to ensure that those directly and indirectly responsible for this tragedy are brought to justice;

(13) calls on our European allies, and other countries and international organizations, to join the United States in providing assistance to the Government of Ukraine to ensure that the parliamentary elections scheduled for October 26, 2014, are free, fair, and held in all regions of Ukraine in full accordance with international standards;

(14) calls on the President to expand United States international broadcasting efforts to Russian-speaking audiences in Ukraine and both inside and outside of Russia and include a broad spectrum of communications mediums to provide high-quality programming content, independent journalism, and credible information to counter Russia's propaganda;

(15) calls on Ukraine and other countries to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce the ability of the Russian Federation to use its energy exports as a means of applying political or economic pressure, including by promoting increased natural gas exports from the United States and other countries;

(16) strongly supports the efforts by President Poroshenko and the people of Ukraine to establish a lasting peace in Ukraine that includes the full withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukraine's territory, the establishment of Ukraine's control over all of its international borders, the disarming of the separatist and paramilitary forces in the east, policies to reduce Russia's ability to use energy exports and trade barriers as weapons to apply economic and political pressure on Ukraine, and an end to Russia's interference in Ukraine's internal affairs; and

(17) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5, and calls on all Alliance member states to provide their full share of the resources needed to ensure their collective defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a historic moment for Ukraine. It has withstood invasion by Russian forces, their illegal occupation and annexation of Crimea, the arming of separatist militias by Moscow, the cutoff of natural gas and imposition of trade barriers aimed at undermining Ukraine's economy. They have suffered under a Russian propaganda offensive designed to sow fear and exploit division, and they have had many other assaults along the way.

I had an opportunity—myself and ELIOT ENGEL of New York—to travel to Ukraine, along with JIM GERLACH. We are happy to have Mr. GERLACH and MARCY KAPTUR with us today. They are the authors of this resolution, a resolution in support of Ukraine. I will lay out what we saw both in western Ukraine and in the east, because we traveled across that country.

But before I do that, let me point out that thousands and thousands of Ukrainians have been killed by the fighting in the east and hundreds of thousands have been made refugees.

But Ukraine still stands. It stands unbowed, more determined than ever

to secure its independence and its sovereignty and its territorial integrity. This resolution that the House clearly has before it states unambiguously our support for Ukraine in its effort.

The United States, our European allies, and many other countries have made clear that we will not allow Russia to bludgeon—bludgeon—Ukraine into submission, because that is exactly what they attempted to do. We have opposed tough sanctions on Russia. We have provided extensive assistance to help Ukraine through this very difficult time. Its military needs to be bolstered. And we are supporting the establishment of a democratic system representing all of the people of Ukraine.

Importantly, yesterday, the Ukrainian Parliament passed a law granting greater autonomy—including Russian language rights—to those in the east. A strong democracy respectful of individual rights is the best counter to Vladimir Putin's very autocratic ways.

Ukraine faces many challenges, including growing economic problems, the possibility of a gas shortage this winter, and a never-ending onslaught of propaganda. We will continue to assist Ukraine, but it is vital that in Ukraine—and we carried this message when we were in country—they implement the far-reaching economic and structural reforms necessary to enable that country to grow.

Ending Russia's ability to use its oil and natural gas as a weapon has got to be a priority. There are many steps that Ukraine itself can take, beginning with reforming its energy sector to expand its own production of energy and, of course, to increase efficiency. The United States and other countries, especially Ukraine's neighbors in Europe, can help by making alternative supplies available to that country.

You notice that the Polish engineers have reverse-engineered those pipes so that gas can come into Ukraine. Western Ukraine has tremendous possibilities for oil shale. We met when we were in Azerbaijan with the government there that is building a pipeline into Central Europe, and we know that a lot more can be done in order to get gas into Ukraine.

The U.S. can take a major step forward by removing the restrictions we have imposed on ourselves that severely limit the export of our abundant supplies. We have got a glut on our market. Frankly, this is a way to create jobs here, this is a way to help our balance of payments. Let's sell this to Ukraine because they deeply need it. And, frankly, the prices in the east are very, very, high and this will give us a new market.

And the other body could act on legislation this House has passed to revamp U.S. international broadcasting so there is an effective counter to Moscow's never-ending propaganda. This is

legislation that I and my colleague ELIOT ENGEL have authored in order to make certain that the people in Ukraine and, frankly, that Russian-speaking populations everywhere, can hear the truth about what is happening inside their own countries, as well as an appeal to political pluralism and tolerance and all of the values that the international community should share.

In April, Ranking Member ENGEL and I led a delegation, as I mentioned, to the Ukraine to see for ourselves the situation on the ground, including in the east in Dnipropetrovsk, in eastern Ukraine, which borders the region controlled by the separatists. There and in Kiev, we had extensive discussions with a range of senior officials, including Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, about the situation in their country. We also spoke with leaders of the civil society community: women's groups, lawyers' groups, Jewish groups, Tatar groups, Russian-speaking communities. All strongly supported a united Ukraine; all opposed Russian intervention. All shared with us that at the end of the day they wanted Ukraine whole, they wanted Russia out.

We met with Mr. Poroshenko prior to his election and assured him of strong U.S. support. Now the entire Congress will demonstrate that continuing commitment when the President of Ukraine addresses the joint session tomorrow. The message will be heard loud and clear, not just in Ukraine, not just in Kiev, but also in Moscow and around the world, that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine now and always.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Tomorrow, we will welcome the President of Ukraine, Petro Poroshenko, to address a joint session of Congress. It is fitting that the leader of the Ukrainian people will speak in this Chamber where over the centuries our own democracy has grown and thrived.

Today, we know that freedom and democracy in Ukraine are under threat. So with this resolution we will send a clear signal to President Poroshenko and to the people of Ukraine that we stand by them. America stands with them.

I visited Ukraine a few months ago with my friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman ROYCE. Everywhere we went we heard the same thing: the people of Ukraine do not want Russian interference in their country.

Ukraine is an independent Nation—it is not part of another country—and the people of Ukraine have a right to make a determination for themselves as to what their policies would be without

intimidation from Mr. Putin or anybody else.

This hit home, especially for me, when I visited a synagogue in eastern Ukraine. My four grandparents were born in Ukraine.

□ 1245

Two older men at this synagogue approached me to talk about the Russian threat. Over the last century, their eyes have seen the tide of history roll in and out of Ukraine.

They had fought against Hitler's army, they had lived under the yoke of Soviet tyranny, they had witnessed democracy spread across Eastern Europe, and, now, they were looking East at a new threat on the horizon. "Don't abandon us," one of them said. "America is very, very important."

If anything, that threat has only grown worse in recent months. Separatist forces, bolstered by President Putin, continue to wreak havoc across eastern Ukraine. Russian weapons have brought down a plane full of innocent civilians. Thousands of Russian troops have spilled over the border, trampling on Ukrainian sovereignty.

Mr. Poroshenko comes to us with his country on the brink. With this measure, we say to him, "We support Ukraine. We support the right of Ukraine to determine its own future." We are also saying to our friends and allies around the world that this Russian aggression must not stand and that democracies must unite to meet this challenge.

Finally, we are saying to Mr. Putin, "If you continue to threaten your neighbors, if you continue to sow unrest, if you continue to defy the will of the global community, you will isolate your country, and your actions will have consequences."

I should also add that I think the credibility of the NATO alliance is really hanging in the balance. For the past 20 or 25 years, we have proceeded on the fact that Russia was not a threat and that Russia, indeed, in many ways, was a partner.

That is no longer, unfortunately, the situation. Russia is an adversary, and the NATO alliance has to adjust to that. The equation that NATO has to adjust to has changed because of the actions of Mr. Putin in Ukraine.

We have to make sure that our NATO allies feel strengthened. We have to make sure that the countries bordering Russia and the rest of Europe feel that they are not being intimidated, and countries like Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova ought to be free to exert their independent thinking and what they feel is best for their country and not be intimidated by Mr. Putin.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), cochairman of

the House Ukraine Caucus and the author of the resolution we have before us.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I give particular thanks to Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their great support and cooperation for this resolution and for Ukrainian people themselves; also, a special thanks to my colleagues in the House, Congresswoman KAPTUR, Congressman LEVIN, and Congressman PASCRELL, for your terrific support on these important issues involving our two countries.

This resolution sends an unmistakable message to the Russian Federation and to the entire world that this House stands united with the people of Ukraine. During the last 10 months, no other ally has experienced more internal upheaval or a more imminent threat to its sovereignty than our friends in Ukraine.

Last November, the people of Ukraine flooded the Maidan in Kiev to peacefully protest a corrupt and arrogant regime.

For nearly 3 months, Ukrainians risked their lives—and more than 100 civilians died—while ushering in a new era and a new system of governance, an era in which elected leaders will be accountable and transparent; honor the fundamental human rights all Ukrainians have, regardless of their political affiliation; and bolster alliances with the United States and European Union to foster greater economic opportunity and prosperity.

The smoldering fires of the Maidan had barely been extinguished, however, when a new threat emerged on Ukraine's eastern border with Russia. Russian President Vladimir Putin illegally occupied and then annexed Crimea. He emboldened and equipped separatists who have been fomenting discord through eastern Ukraine.

Clearly, what Putin has in mind for Ukraine is not a new era of openness, liberty, and opportunity, but, rather, a return to a bygone era of political intimidation and coercion, and Putin's gambit to reassert Russian influence has exacted a lethal toll.

The United States estimates 3,000 Ukrainian civilians have been killed since April as a result of the clashes in eastern Ukraine, but, through all of these challenges, Ukrainian people have not wavered in their desire to remain independent and restore stability to their system of governance and an economy ravaged by the excesses of the previous regime.

I believe the people of Ukraine deserve our moral and material support as their country continues to confront challenges from within its borders and from its belligerent neighbor, and that support must include defense articles, services and training, and intelligence information that will allow Ukraine to

effectively defend its territory and maintain its sovereignty.

I truly believe that an independent and democratic Ukraine enhances the security of the United States and offers greater economic opportunity for citizens in both countries; therefore, I ask my colleagues to pass this resolution and reaffirm the United States' commitment to supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to independently determine their future free from intimidation and free from outside influence.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago—several years ago—several of us walked into this very, very historic room. The President of Ukraine at that time was President Yushchenko. A lot has happened since that “Orange Revolution.” A lot has happened to Ukraine.

We see in Ukraine a democratically elected Mr. Poroshenko, who will be here tomorrow, walking down the same aisle in a very, very different political environment.

I rise in support of House Resolution 726, supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future. That is what this resolution is all about. We must make clear our position that Russia's actions over the past year to intimidate and bring violence and death to the people of Ukraine, as well as the victims of Malaysia Flight 17—lest we forget—is behavior that is unacceptable to the entire international community.

Ukraine is a sovereign nation. That either means something or it doesn't. It has borders. It has a democratically-elected government. It has the right to govern itself as it sees fit.

Mr. Putin doesn't understand the concept of a sovereign nation. It is like he is living in a time before Westphalia. When the people of Ukraine decided they wanted to further integrate with Europe, he sent an army to invade. That was his answer.

My congressional district in northern New Jersey is home to many Ukrainian Americans. They are proud American citizens. They are proud of where they came from. They are proud of the culture and proud of this culture in this great Nation. They refuse to let Russia bully their homeland. They know how to assimilate Ukrainian Americans in the United States. They are proud Americans.

While we have already put tough multilateral sanctions on Russia, we need to do more. We wish Russia no harm, but we are not going to be dictated by Mr. Putin's dream whims.

I am pleased that we have a ceasefire that appears to be holding, but we don't know for how long. Russia needs to immediately withdraw any military assets it has in Ukraine, and the militias in the east should be disarmed.

We should provide Ukrainians with defensive arms so that they can defend their country in sovereignty. This is how you treat an ally, not with words. I am pleased this resolution calls for the President to do just this.

We cannot let up on this pressure, Mr. Speaker, on Mr. Putin. After Ukraine, he has his eyes set on allies in the Baltic States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. We know Ukraine is not a part of NATO, at least not yet. Do we have a specific treaty with Ukraine? No, we don't, but they are our allies. That much means something.

The United States of America stands with the people of Ukraine today, and we will continue to stand with them in the future. I thank Mr. GERLACH from Pennsylvania for putting this resolution forward, as well as MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio; Mr. LEVIN from Michigan; and, of course, Mr. ENGEL is always there to do the right thing in international discourse.

I am honored to be here today to present this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all echo what Mr. PASCRELL just said. I want to commend Mr. GERLACH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN for this.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the co-author of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the ranking member for yielding and also Mr. GERLACH. Many of us have enjoyed working with him. We are going to miss you. We don't do enough work together in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly—kind of emotionally, in a way—support this resolution because of what has been going on in Ukraine. This resolution shows our support for Ukrainian people's right to determine their own future and to build a country that is free and democratic.

We stand firmly with Ukrainian people and condemn Russia's aggression. We should always remember that the impetus for Ukraine's freedom comes from within, from within Ukrainian people. It is their desire to be free that is the ultimate force behind all international efforts.

Time and events have shown, time and again, that Ukrainian people are standing up for their freedom. From the Orange Revolution in 2004 to the protests in Maidan Square earlier this year, it is clear to the world that Ukraine is determined to build her own future.

The past year has been very difficult. Ukrainian people have paid a very high price to govern according to their own wishes. The images and reports from Ukraine have been hard to accept, and we are deeply saddened by the lives

lost and by the overwhelming uncertainties that still loom ahead; yet Ukrainian people have spoken through their actions.

Just yesterday, here at the Capitol, the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus held a celebration to commemorate the 400th anniversary of its oldest school, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

At the event, I was delighted to see the strong support stemming from the American Ukrainian community. The community's work in my home State of Michigan and all across this Nation has led to close collaboration between our two nations and has reaffirmed our common values.

The community's work is especially important now, when others try to speak for the values and aspirations held true by Ukrainian people.

Tomorrow, we will welcome President Poroshenko to a joint meeting with Members of the House and Senate. We eagerly look forward to his remarks.

The passage of this resolution will be emblematic of the support from the American people, but we should always remember that the impetus for a free and democratic Ukraine comes from Ukrainian people themselves, but we can, should, and will help their efforts to continue to build a free Ukraine.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). She and I traveled to Ukraine together many years ago on my first trip there.

She is also the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus and has long been an advocate for a free and independent Ukraine.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to thank Ranking Member ENGEL so very much for yielding me the time, as well as Chairman ROYCE for his leadership and willingness to do all that was necessary to bring this bill to the floor today and to join JIM GERLACH, SANDER LEVIN, BILL PASCRELL, all very, very valued members of the Ukrainian Caucus.

□ 1300

We rise as colleagues in support of H. Res. 726 as we continue to strongly support the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their own futures, their sovereignty, without outside interference and, God forbid, further bloodshed or loss of life.

The brave people of Ukraine continue to face incredible challenges, not only an assault on their borders by Russia, but reforming their own government and their judiciary to develop a rich civil society with the rule of law.

The task that lies ahead for Ukraine is daunting but beckons liberty forward. This is Ukraine's moment in modern history. I expect her to become one of the greatest nations in Europe.

While the situation remains unstable, there are clear signs of hope, the

ultimate reflection of the intrepid soul of the Ukrainian people who have endured history's raw edge. Just yesterday, Ukraine's President, Petro Poroshenko, signed the landmark and long-awaited European Union Association Agreement, a brave step forward. We recall it was this desire for a closer association with Europe and the West on the part of the Ukrainian people that was ultimately responsible for the start of the crisis which persists today.

As a great nation—the name Ukraine means “borderland”—Ukraine should reach west and east and north and south. It is just that vast a land and its potential unlimited.

But in trying to accomplish that effort with Europe, what began as a peaceful protest in Kyiv, the capital, ended in bloodshed, first at the hands of the former corrupt Yanukovych regime, and now at the hands of Russian agitators under the directives and support of Russia's President, Vladimir Putin.

Still, we look forward to tomorrow's historic joint meeting of our Congress here in this House in honor of President Petro Poroshenko's first official visit to the United States. We must heed President Poroshenko's words and take into great consideration any request he makes of us, a vital friend and ally.

We continue to stand in solidarity with Ukraine and her people, and the passage of this bill, H. Res. 726, on the eve of President Poroshenko's visit aims to further illustrate the special friendship and bond our two countries share.

Were it not for Ukrainian Americans in our country and other Americans who had endured under the Soviet mantle for some generations, the visit here would not have as deep a meaning. We share Ukraine's struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's passage. I thank all of those—Ranking Member ENGEL; Chairman ROYCE; my colleague as cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus, JIM GERLACH; SANDER LEVIN and BILL PASCRELL—for making this moment possible.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very important and valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend Mr. ENGEL from New York, and I congratulate the authors of H. Res. 726. They have done a great job in building bipartisan support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The United States must stand with the people of Ukraine in the face of Russia's naked aggression and reverse violations to Ukrainian sovereignty and prevent further Russian meddling and attacks on what they consider former Soviet republics.

We must remember that this assault began in Crimea, part of Ukraine. It

was in Crimea that Russian military forces violated, initially, Ukrainian sovereignty, and it was Russia then that ultimately illegally arranged for the annexation of this territory, territory of a sovereign country.

Subsequently, we have witnessed further incursions by the Russian military into eastern Ukraine. Now Europe is attuned to the threat, but, Mr. Speaker, I am stuck on Crimea. Ignoring Russian aggression in Crimea only emboldened Putin to do it again in eastern Ukraine.

I am very pleased that the authors of this resolution adopted the principles of our bipartisan legislation introduced earlier this year with Mr. STEVE CHABOT, and like the Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act, which is H. Res. 726, formerly and utterly rejects Russian sovereignty over Crimea and calls on our allies to do the same. Without a clear stance on the issue of Crimea, the West ultimately becomes unwittingly complicit in Putin's further aggression and interference throughout Ukraine.

What is next? Moldova? Georgia? The Baltic Republic?

Congress must address the Crimea underlying issue if we are going to have credibility on the whole issue of Putin's aggression in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the authors of this resolution for doing just that; and again, I thank Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE for the way they comport the House Foreign Affairs Committee in true bipartisan fashion.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will close and say that this is a very important and timely resolution.

When Chairman ROYCE and I visited Ukraine a few months ago, we had the good fortune to meet with many Ukrainian officials and people running for President. Mr. Poroshenko, who will address us tomorrow in joint session, was one of them.

I can tell you that Chairman ROYCE and I both were very impressed with Mr. Poroshenko. We really felt that there was great hope for Ukraine and thought that he was the likely winner. Everything that he has done, in my opinion, since he has won just reaffirms our initial feeling about him.

I was very happy that Ukraine signed the European Union Association Agreement yesterday. It strikes a very good balance but moves Ukraine closer to the West where the people want it.

I can tell you that when we went to Ukraine and we stood in Maidan Square where the protests happened, you really felt—it was a palpable feeling—that you were part of history, people, average Ukrainians, coming up to us in the street thanking the United States of America for its strong support of Ukraine and for the independence of Ukraine.

Now, the resolution—and I think it is important to highlight certain things—says that the United States is strongly committed to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and the United States strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries.

It also talks about Crimea, and I think that that should not be forgotten. Mr. CONNOLLY is quite right. The taking of part of another country through military force cannot be fathomed and we cannot look the other way. We need to very strongly condemn it. Crimea is part of Ukraine, not part of Russia.

So what we have here in this resolution—and I again want to commend Mr. GERLACH and Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. LEVIN and all the people who put it together—is a commonsense resolution that says that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine and stands with the right of the people of Ukraine to determine its own future.

This is a very important resolution. It is a very timely resolution, and I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Ukrainian people have had a long, turbulent history of struggle. It is important to remember that when that vote for independence came, it passed overwhelmingly across Ukraine.

For me, I think the most memorable point of that trip was standing with Mr. ENGEL in the synagogue—it was Passover—adjacent to the largest community center, Jewish community center in all of Europe.

ELIOT ENGEL, whose four grandparents all came from Ukraine, spoke to the hopes that the American people have for a Ukraine which is a Ukraine that embraces tolerance, political pluralism, freedom, a Ukraine in which the persecution of people is a thing of the past but in which the future lies with the democratic ideals that we share, a Ukraine independent, a Ukraine free of threat, free of outside influence.

These are the hopes embodied in this resolution because the Ukrainian people have withstood these enormous pressures. They have endured this great suffering. They know there are many challenges still to overcome before they can rest secure. But the Ukrainians that we spoke with told us that among the most important things sustaining them throughout this difficult time is the knowledge that we in the United States stand with them.

Tomorrow, President Poroshenko will address this joint session of Con-

gress here; and by granting him, his country, this honor and by adopting this resolution today, we will demonstrate our continuing commitment to Ukraine and to helping its people achieve the freedom, achieve the security and prosperity that they so rightfully deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 726, a resolution supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman GERLACH, for introducing this bipartisan resolution and urge all Members to support it to show the solidarity of the people of the United States with the people of Ukraine.

The United States is strongly committed to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

The United States strongly supports efforts to assist Ukraine to defend its territory against military aggression by the Russian Federation and by separatist and paramilitary forces.

The Russian Federation has undertaken a campaign of political, economic, and military aggression against Ukraine.

For example, Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, was destroyed by Russian-backed Ukrainian separatists using a Russian-made missile, taking the lives of all 298 innocent persons on board.

That is why I strongly support H. Res. 726, which condemns the continuing political, economic, and military aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and the violation of its sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity.

I strongly support the resolution's demand that the Russian Federation remove its military forces and military equipment from the territory of Ukraine, including equipment provided to the separatist and paramilitary forces.

I applaud the resolution's call for the President to cooperate with allies and partners in Europe and other nations around the world to impose visa bans, targeted asset freezes, sector sanctions, and other measures on the Russian Federation and its leadership sufficient to compel it to end its violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in voting for H. Res. 726.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 726.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 24, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5462, by the yeas and nays;

S. 476, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 24) to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 92, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—333

Aderholt	Clay	Fleming
Amash	Coble	Flores
Amodei	Coffman	Forbes
Bachmann	Cohen	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cole	Fox
Barber	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Conaway	Gabbard
Barrow (GA)	Cook	Gallego
Benishek	Costa	Garamendi
Bentivolio	Cotton	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Gardner
Bilirakis	Cramer	Garrett
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gerlach
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Gibson
Black	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Blackburn	Daines	Gohmert
Boustany	Davis, Danny	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Gowdy
Bridenstine	DeGette	Granger
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DelBene	Graves (MO)
Brown (GA)	Denham	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Dent	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	DeSantis	Griffin (AR)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffith (VA)
Bucshon	Doggett	Grijalva
Burgess	Doyle	Grimm
Bustos	Duckworth	Guthrie
Byrne	Duffy	Hahn
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Hall
Camp	Duncan (TN)	Hanna
Capito	Ellmers	Harper
Carter	Enyart	Hartzler
Cassidy	Esty	Hastings (WA)
Castro (TX)	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Chabot	Farr	Hensarling
Chaffetz	Fattah	Herrera Beutler
Chu	Fincher	Higgins
Ciilline	Fitzpatrick	Hinojosa
Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann	Holding

Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer

Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

NAYS—92

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings

Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Maloney
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Pallone

Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes

Barton
Castor (FL)

Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen

NOT VOTING—6

DesJarlais
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Nunnelee

□ 1343

Messrs. PALLONE, LARSON of Connecticut, KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE of California, Messrs. CLEAVER, CLYBURN, RICHMOND, ENGEL, MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. CUMMINGS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WOODALL, DOGGETT, COHEN, FATTAH, and KEATING changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR PASSENGER FEE LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5462) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—423

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishiek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore

Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

Sinema	Tierney	Waxman	Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Scott, Austin	Swalwell (CA)	Walorski
Sires	Tipton	Weber (TX)	Collins (NY)	Higgins	Meeks	Scott, David	Takano	Walz
Slaughter	Titus	Webster (FL)	Conaway	Himes	Meng	Sensenbrenner	Terry	Wasserman
Smith (MO)	Tonko	Welch	Connolly	Hinojosa	Messer	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Smith (NE)	Tsongas	Westrup	Cook	Holding	Mica	Sessions	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Westmoreland	Cooper	Holt	Michaud	Sewell (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Waxman
Smith (TX)	Upton	Whitfield	Costa	Honda	Miller (FL)	Shea-Porter	Thornberry	Weber (TX)
Smith (WA)	Valadao	Williams	Cotton	Horsford	Miller (MI)	Sherman	Tiberi	Webster (FL)
Southerland	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)	Courtney	Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Shimkus	Tierney	Welch
Speier	Vargas	Wilson (SC)	Cramer	Hudson	Miller, George	Shuster	Tipton	Westrup
Stewart	Veasey	Wittman	Crawford	Huelskamp	Moore	Simpson	Titus	Westmoreland
Stivers	Vela	Wolf	Crenshaw	Huffman	Moran	Sinema	Tonko	Whitfield
Stockman	Velázquez	Womack	Crowley	Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Sires	Tsongas	Williams
Stutzman	Visclosky	Woodall	Cuellar	Hultgren	Mulvaney	Slaughter	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Swalwell (CA)	Wagner	Yarmuth	Culberson	Hunter	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Takano	Walberg	Yoder	Cummings	Hurt	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Valadao	Wittman
Terry	Walden	Yoho	Daines	Israel	Nadler	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Wolf
Thompson (CA)	Walorski	Young (AK)	Davis (CA)	Issa	Napolitano	Smith (TX)	Vargas	Womack
Thompson (MS)	Walz	Young (IN)	Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Neal	Smith (WA)	Veasey	Woodall
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman		Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Southerland	Vela	Yarmuth
Thornberry	Schultz		DeFazio	Jenkins	Neugebauer	Speier	Velázquez	Yoder
Tiberi	Waters		DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Noem	Stewart	Visclosky	Yoho
			Delaney	Johnson (OH)	Nolan	Stivers	Wagner	Young (AK)
			DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Nugent	Stockman	Walberg	Young (IN)
			DelBene	Jolly	Nunes	Stutzman	Walden	
			Denham	Jones	O'Rourke			
			Dent	Jordan	Olson			
			DeSantis	Joyce	Owens			
			Deutch	Kaptur	Palazzo			
			Diaz-Balart	Keating	Pallone			
			Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell			
			Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Pastor (AZ)			
			Doyle	Kennedy	Paulsen			
			Duckworth	Kildee	Payne			
			Duffy	Kilmer	Pearce			
			Duncan (SC)	Kind	Pelosi			
			Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Perlmutter			
			Edwards	King (NY)	Perry			
			Ellison	Kingston	Peters (CA)			
			Ellmers	Kinzing (IL)	Peters (MI)			
			Engel	Kirkpatrick	Peterson			
			Enyart	Kline	Petri			
			Eshoo	Kuster	Pingree (ME)			
			Esty	Labrador	Pittenger			
			Farenthold	LaMalfa	Pitts			
			Farr	Lamborn	Pocan			
			Fattah	Lance	Poe (TX)			
			Fincher	Langevin	Polis			
			Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Pompeo			
			Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Posey			
			Fleming	Larson (CT)	Price (GA)			
			Flores	Latham	Price (NC)			
			Forbes	Latta	Quigley			
			Fortenberry	Lee (CA)	Rahall			
			Foster	Levin	Rangel			
			Fox	Lewis	Reed			
			Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Reichert			
			Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Renacci			
			Frelinghuysen	Loeb	Ribble			
			Fudge	Lofgren	Rice (SC)			
			Gabbard	Long	Richmond			
			Gallego	Lowenthal	Rigell			
			Garamendi	Lowey	Roby			
			Garcia	Lucas	Roe (TN)			
			Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)			
			Garrett	Lujan Grisham	Rogers (KY)			
			Gerlach	(NM)	Rogers (MI)			
			Gibbs	Luján, Ben Ray	Rohrabacher			
			Gibson	(NM)	Rokita			
			Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Gohmert	Lynch	Roskam			
			Goodlatte	Maffei	Ross			
			Gosar	Maloney,	Rothfus			
			Gowdy	Carolyn	Roybal-Allard			
			Granger	Maloney, Sean	Royce			
			Graves (GA)	Marchant	Ruiz			
			Graves (MO)	Marino	Runyan			
			Grayson	Massie	Ruppersberger			
			Green, Al	Matheson	Rush			
			Green, Gene	Matsui	Ryan (OH)			
			Griffin (AR)	McAllister	Ryan (WI)			
			Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon			
			Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda			
			Grimm	McCauley	T.			
			Guthrie	McClintock	Sanchez, Loretta			
			Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sanford			
			Hahn	McDermott	Sarbanes			
			Hall	McGovern	Scalise			
			Hanabusa	McHenry	Schakowsky			
			Hanna	McIntyre	Schiff			
			Harper	McKeon	Schneider			
			Hartzler	McKinley	Schock			
			Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Schrader			
			Heck (NV)	Rodgers	Schwartz			
			Heck (WA)	McNerney	Schweikert			
			Hensarling	Meadows	Scott (VA)			

NOT VOTING—8

Barton	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Byrne	Harris	Rooney
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	

□ 1351

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 476) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—419

Aderholt	Boustany	Cárdenas
Amash	Brady (PA)	Carney
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Bachmann	Braley (IA)	Carter
Bachus	Bridenstine	Cartwright
Barber	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Castro (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Broun (GA)	Chabot
Bass	Brown (FL)	Chaffetz
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Becerra	Buchanan	Cicilline
Benishek	Bucshon	Clark (MA)
Bentivolio	Burgess	Clarke (NY)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Clawson (FL)
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Calvert	Cleaver
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Clyburn
Black	Campbell	Coble
Blackburn	Capito	Coffman
Blumenauer	Capps	Cohen
Bonamici	Capuano	Cole

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta	Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Barton	Conyers	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Byrne	Harris	Rooney

□ 1359

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, September 16, 2014, 3 hours and 30½ minutes of debate remained on the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-600 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

The gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) has 1 hour and 41½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has 1 hour and 49 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of something that I am for, and that is the chairman's amendment as he has presented it.

Madam Speaker, I think that for so many of us who represent men and women in uniform who comprise our fighting forces and who have been so diligent in this battle, in this war on terrorism, we look at these votes and

certainly it causes us concern; and we know that the measure that the House is taking up is a measure as requested by the President—we recognize that—and we recognize, also, the severity and importance of the issue.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue that should require the full attention of every member and every staff member of this body. And I think that we all approach this—I do—with a lot of questions, and we realize that what the Commander in Chief has asked for is really, in the opinion of so many of the men and women that I represent, a half measure.

I wish we would see more leadership, and I am hopeful that in days to come we will see leadership from our Commander in Chief. That is what the men and women deserve, and that is what the American people deserve as we seek to protect our homeland.

I wish that we could stand here and say this administration has learned their lessons, because they have so mishandled the drawdown in Iraq. And the rhetoric of al Qaeda being on the run was truly a disservice to our military forces and to our men and women in uniform and to the American people.

It would be my hope that as we take a first step that we recenter our focus and commit to annihilating ISIL from the face of the Earth.

Mr. SMITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, the threat from ISIS is real. All of us have seen the violence and the barbarism of ISIS. The rapid advance of ISIS militants within Iraq and Syria is an immediate threat to these countries in the region.

No one should be under any delusion about what will happen if the U.S. sits this one out. If unchecked, the ISIS threat will grow and become even more difficult to address down the road and directly threaten our Nation.

As we have seen since President Obama authorized the limited airstrikes against ISIS in August, we have the ability to mitigate the ISIS threat, but we cannot defeat ISIS by ourselves with U.S. airstrikes.

Thomas Friedman said it well in *The New York Times*:

ISIS loses if our moderate Arab-Muslim partners can unite and make this a civil war within Islam—a civil war in which America is the air force for the Sunnis and Shiites of decency versus those of barbarism . . . It is about them and who they want to be.

As I see it, an important aspect of U.S. assistance under this amendment in the training of Syrian rebels is that it will be an occasion for nations with a Sunni majority to join in a battle against the fanatical Sunni ISIS. Hopefully, this can lead to expanded involvement of other nations in this battle at the same time as Iraq's Shi'a majority, with our active encouragement,

finally provides full rights and participation for its Sunni and Kurdish minorities.

So amidst all the difficulties and the challenges—and they are serious and many—this amendment can hopefully serve as a stepping stone, as a stepping stone to a broad-based, effective coalition against the spread of ISIS.

Our country can provide air support, can provide intelligence and other logistics, but in the end, it cannot achieve for the people of Syria and Iraq on the ground what they can only do for themselves.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), my colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman, whose amendment I support here today, and I will support any measure that will lead to the destruction of ISIS.

This administration has known about this threat for over a year. It wasn't until the two beheadings of an American journalist and a British aid worker that the American people really understood the pure evil that is ISIS. The White House has been sending mixed messages. Words do matter.

Finally, I believe this administration realized, despite its flawed narrative over the years, what the threat from ISIS really is. In fact, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said, to fully defeat ISIS, we have to go into Syria. I agree with him. We must cut off the head of the snake wherever it exists, and it does exist in Syria.

While limited in nature, this authorization will begin the process to do just that by vetting, equipping, and training moderate forces by the United States military in Saudi Arabia.

I had some reservations about the vetting process. I did visit with Pentagon officials, and I got greater confidence. I do believe the numbers are a little bit too low, but the broader strategy under General Allen is to lead a coalition not only of NATO allies, but of these moderate Sunni nations to build a ground force in Syria which currently does not exist.

It is vital, Madam Speaker, that Sunni moderates stand up, Sunni moderates and Arab nations step up to the plate to defeat and combat Sunni extremists in their own backyard.

While this is a step in the right direction, I believe that, long term, the administration needs to come forward with a comprehensive strategy, one that the American people and Congress can debate, which could be fully authorized by Congress.

In closing, Madam Speaker, there is nothing more important that we debate up here, that we talk about here, that we vote on up here than matters

of war and peace. It is for that reason that I support this amendment. For, if we do not hit ISIS overseas, they will certainly hit us in the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment.

I don't take that lightly. I spent 18 years on the Armed Services Committee and about 12 years on the Homeland Security Committee, and with any decision like this, we have to weigh what we know and what we don't know.

We know that, if left unchecked, ISIS would become a direct threat not only to the United States, but possibly to the entire world. That is why we are going after them currently in Iraq with partners that we know we can trust, such as the Kurds.

We know that we cannot sit on our hands, close our eyes, and hope that ISIS goes away. That is why we need a good plan.

We know that we cannot do this alone, that we need a committed international coalition to stop ISIS.

The President says we have a coalition of 40. You know, it is interesting because I remember the Iraq war and the coalition. Some of our coalition members sent one person. I would really like to know who our coalition is and what they are really going to do before I vote for any plan.

What don't we know? We don't know how moderate these Syrian rebels really are. In fact, some of my Syrian constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Orange County, have told me that there are no moderates left or, worse, that the moderates, given the choice between losing or Assad or ISIS, want ISIS, and they say people aren't going to fight against ISIS.

We don't know if somewhere down the line they will turn our guns right back on us. In fact, that is one of the scariest things that we have to face. We simply don't know who we can trust. In an uncontrolled, war-torn destabilized country, who do we trust?

We can look back, for example, at what happened in Central America, how the rebels there, who were armed by the United States, went after innocent civilians. This blood will be on our hands when that happens.

We need a winning strategy to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIS.

Now, we are in an election season. Everybody says this isn't political, but I know, I have been talking to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and some are wondering what they do 7 weeks away from an election.

I have got to tell you, this is not a political vote. The last time people took a political vote in this House, it was on the Iraq war, and many of my colleagues say it was the worst vote they took.

□ 1415

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my friend and colleague.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank our chairman.

This proposal just examines one piece of the puzzle, not the totality of the Syrian crisis. The White House should have come to Congress for a full authorization for use of military force in Syria to put all of our options on the table with no limitations.

ISIS is part of the radical Islam threat, which the 9/11 Commission identified as a serious threat to U.S. national security and to world peace and stability.

I have serious reservations about the President's plan to train and equip the so-called "moderate opposition" in Syria because we don't want ISIL to get even more of our equipment and arms, as it did in Iraq.

ISIL is not the only terror group in Syria, Madam Speaker, nor is it the only hurdle for stability in Syria and Iraq. There are dangerous terrorist groups operating in Syria, like al-Nusra and other terrorist organizations, that are waiting to take up the mantle should ISIL fall. And, then, of course, Assad is still responsible for the deaths of over 200,000 people.

Last year, the President failed to act militarily when Assad used chemical weapons against his own people. We cannot have a plan that does not address the removal of Assad simultaneously alongside the destruction of ISIL and other terrorist threats.

Even though I will vote for the McKeon amendment, we still won't be approaching this situation in a comprehensive manner that is required.

We were successful in isolating Iran with sanctions until we unraveled that with these nuclear negotiations. We can do the same in Syria. I am afraid that this misguided negotiations approach in Iran will preempt many to acquiesce and take a deal that will undermine our national security and leave Iran with enrichment capabilities.

That, Madam Speaker, is a real and present danger in the Middle East: a nuclear Iran. This could be a calamity for the region and U.S. national security interests, such as the safety and the security of our strong ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Yesterday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, revealed that the use of military forces on the ground may be needed in Syria. If our military officials believe that it is absolutely necessary to use the U.S. military on the ground, I would fully support that.

We cannot take anything off the table and showcase to the terrorists what we are not willing to do. The full range of United States political, eco-

nomic, and military power must be brought to bear against this radical threat. Announcing to the enemy a self-imposed limit on the part of our arsenal is signaling that we do not possess the necessary will to prevail against radical Islam.

I thank the chairman for the leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank Mr. McKEON for his leadership.

We will see today a bipartisan action, bipartisan action on behalf of America, on behalf of its security, on behalf of our international partners in confronting terrorism.

Madam Speaker, today, the House is fulfilling one of its most important responsibilities: to protect our national security and defend our interests overseas. Among those interests is to prevent the dangerous ISIL terrorist group from spreading and threatening American personnel, our allies, and innocent civilians.

The amendment before us will authorize the President to train and equip moderate Syrian opposition to degrade and destroy ISIL in Iraq and Syria. No sanctuaries, no place to hide. ISIL is already threatening Americans and our allies in the Middle East and Europe; and, if left unchecked, it will surely threaten us here at home.

This amendment is Congress' opportunity to demonstrate unity in support of the President's strategy and provide him with the authorization he needs to help train and equip our regional partners to go on the offense against ISIL. ISIL has already murdered and captured soldiers, innocent civilians, and journalists, including, of course, two Americans, and members of religious communities have been targeted, targeted for their faith. They are no more than a collection of criminal terrorists bent on imposing their fanatical objectives on others by force, violence, and barbarism.

ISIL constitutes a dual threat. They pose a counterterrorism threat to the United States and our regional partners and they represent a destabilizing force in the region.

Madam Speaker, we cannot ignore the challenge that ISIL presents to America and to the world. There is no question that there will be challenges. But we know empirically the cost of doing nothing is far too great.

The President was right to wait until a government had been formed in Iraq that is ready to move forward against ISIL. Americans don't want American women and men on the ground, but Americans do want ISIL confronted. Congress has an important role to play in this effort, and this amendment

ought to be a strong and clear message to the world that the American people, through their elected representatives, will join those in the region to prevent the terrorist group ISIL from running rampant across the Middle East.

It is a message to our allies and regional partners that our Nation is prepared to train and equip those who are working to stop ISIL's advance. And it is a message to the world that we are united in our resolve to meet this threat. We clearly may have differences on this House floor, but we are Americans when it comes to defending our people and our country.

Madam Speaker, with regard to the underlying bill, the continuing resolution, let me make some brief comments.

House Republicans have chosen not to repeat their government shutdown from last year. I think they are making a wise decision.

There are things I would change in this bill, just as I know there are things my friends on the Republican side would change in this bill. That is compromise. That is the legislative process. That is what our Founding Fathers envisioned. That, in fact, is governing.

I am hopeful that this continuing resolution will give Congress the time it needs to complete work on appropriations for the fiscal year 2015 that meet our obligations to the American people and to America's future.

We need a budget that embraces fiscal sustainability while investing in job growth and competitiveness so that we can grow our middle class.

While it is important that Congress move forward with this 72-day funding bill, I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, that we are not extending the Export-Import Bank's charter for multiple years. Not doing so is another example of undermining our competitive position for the world and the competence of our job creators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. As CNBC pointed out last week:

At first glance, it might seem like a congressional deal to extend the Export-Import Bank's charter through June would be good news for the beleaguered institution, which supports American exports with loan guarantees and other credit assistance. In fact, it is the exact opposite. An extension to June could be a death sentence for the bank.

I sincerely pray it is not.

Congress has a responsibility to make sure the bank's charter is extended beyond June. We need a multiyear reauthorization along the lines of the one proposed by Ranking Member WATERS and Representative DENNY HECK.

The Export-Import Bank is instrumental in helping small businesses access foreign markets, and uncertainty

over its future has already cost American businesses lucrative trade deals.

I urge us between now and June to come together in a bipartisan way to move forward with legislation that achieves this goal. I believe if the House is allowed to vote, we will achieve that objective, as we have in the past.

While I oppose this provision, I will vote for the amendment and for final passage of the continuing resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I think it is in the best interest of America, the best interest of our national security, and I urge this House to act in a way that will make our constituents proud and safer.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a letter that was written to myself and Ranking Member SMITH from four of our leading experts in the area, former Ambassadors to the area, and former generals: Ryan C. Crocker, Robert S. Ford, General Jack M. Keane, and General David H. Petraeus. This letter was dated this morning:

Dear Chairman McKeon and Ranking Member Smith:

We write to express our strong support for congressional authorization of the provision of assistance and training to properly vetted members of the Syrian opposition.

The Free Syrian Army is simultaneously fighting both the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad and the barbaric Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham. Providing greater assistance to the Free Syrian Army is the United States' best opportunity to develop a moderate force that is capable of defeating ISIL and bringing about a post-Assad Syria that is free of terror.

As you may know, Free Syrian Army forces have recently achieved some successes on the ground against ISIL forces in northern Syria, but their effectiveness is limited by their lack of sufficient assistance and training.

Building up the moderate opposition in Syria will be a key element of any successful strategy against ISIL. To be sure, after 3 years of war, it will take a long time to build the moderate opposition. But there is no viable alternative. The United States must set to this task immediately.

Finally, we note that approval of this measure should not prevent or circumscribe Congress from considering a properly scoped authorization for the use of military force in the future, or from otherwise revisiting or revising its position on this issue as conditions on the ground evolve. But time is of the essence, and we are convinced of the urgent need for Congress to authorize this effort.

Sincerely, Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker; Ambassador Robert S. Ford; General Jack M. Keane, USA, Retired; and General David H. Petraeus, USA, Retired.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, and the chairman, whom I am very,

very lucky and honored to serve under and serve with.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment. It is not an easy vote. I have been looking for reasons to support this amendment and I can't find it.

This amendment does nothing to destroy the Islamic state. This amendment does not crush the Islamic state. What this amendment does is start training Islamists to fight Islamists, and we may have that Islamist army to fight Islamists in a matter of a few years.

I will not vote for something that I know will not work. Arming Islamists to fight other Islamists is not a winning strategy. I don't believe the weapons and tactics that we bestow to the Islamists will only be used against America's enemies. We have been through this before in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think I am one of the only people speaking here today who has served in the U.S. Marine Corps in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In a confusing situation with many warring factions on all sides, the last thing that we should do is arm Islamic rebels to fight other Islamic rebels.

□ 1430

The truth is that the President invited the Islamic State into Iraq when he removed our eyes and ears on the ground and removed the U.S. military from Iraq 2 years ago. We will continue to be at war with radical Islam in this area well into the future, but that doesn't matter now. What matters is that the Islamic State is on the march, and it presents a serious regional threat.

We need to crush the Islamic State. We need to kill them. We need to destroy them. We need to burn the Islamic State to the ground, and you don't do that by training Islamic Syrians. You don't crush the Islamic State by training Islamists to fight other Islamists.

Arming Islamic fighters is no longer a viable strategy. It was a year ago, it was 2 years ago, but it is not now. There is no confidence that we are arming the right people, and there is no assurance that those weapons and U.S. tactics and U.S. communications gear won't fall into the wrong hands.

The Saudi Arabians are going to help us fight in Syria. If I remember right, Madam Speaker, the Saudi Arabians provided the majority of the hijackers who killed 3,000 Americans on 9/11. I refuse to stand with the Saudi Arabians.

We need to crush ISIS, not work on training more Islamic radicals.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise in support of the McKeon amendment to grant the President the authority needed to fund and train Syrian opposition forces and counter the threat posed by ISIS.

Since the September 11 attacks, our Nation has taken the fight to terrorists. Our brave men and women in uniform supported by the defense and intelligence agencies have kept us safe from another attack on American soil. Now, our allies on the ground in the Middle East must take the fight to ISIS, supported by our air power, arms, and expertise.

I agree with the administration that the most effective way for the United States to realize this goal is providing training and equipment to our allies in Iraq and select groups among the Syrian opposition. This is not a situation that can be solved by the introduction of U.S. troops into combat. In fact, such a response would jeopardize the gains made recently following the air campaign over Iraq.

It is vital, however, that the Syrian opposition groups selected to receive support be fully vetted by the administration to ensure to the greatest extent possible that no weapons or expertise will end up in the hands of our enemies, whether they be the Islamic State or another bad actor involved in the conflict.

We must only provide support to those groups that both the Department of Defense and State have determined to have the greatest chance of success. While there are no guarantees in this situation, the administration must take appropriate steps to minimize the risk and avoid repeating history.

It must also be made clear that these efforts are not the first step of an ever-escalating conflict ending with widespread U.S. involvement in a combat role. Our allies in the Arab world, both Sunni and Shi'a, must be the leaders of the international alliance to combat ISIS.

Only through a coalition and widespread involvement of Arab nations will these efforts succeed and not be seen as yet another chapter of Sunni on Shi'a violence or another chapter in a war between the Christian West and the Muslim Middle East. Our allies must make significant military commitments to support moderate groups in opposition to ISIS.

Finally, the administration must be able to give a clear view of their long-term strategy and goals going forward. Entering a conflict without clear objectives and an exit strategy is not a situation that any Member of the House wishes to repeat.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend and the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, we face an enemy who

poses a grave and growing threat to the United States and our allies, a threat that has been ignored for too long and must no longer be tolerated.

I know that many of us in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle believe that the President's strategy should do more to eradicate those extremists from the Earth, but despite those reservations—reservations that I share—we must support this amendment and take this first step towards a comprehensive strategy to combat these brutal terrorists.

Voting against this request would send a terrible message that America is unwilling to stand with those who are already fighting a common enemy and confirm the views of many in the region that America is but a paper tiger.

I am not convinced this train-and-equip effort will change the balance of power on the ground anytime soon, and I believe this approach comes with great risks. I am also concerned that airstrikes alone will be insufficient to meet the international threat posed by these terrorists.

Congress must maintain a central role. We must conduct oversight to ensure this program is managed effectively. Under the leadership of Chairman McKEON, we have taken the President's original request and have added substantial oversight provisions to ensure this program is properly and carefully managed.

Congress must also push the President to craft a comprehensive strategy that recognizes the inescapable reality that ISIL is but a symptom of a broader terrorist threat.

Preventing the next 9/11 requires us to confront the reality that al Qaeda, ISIL, and similar radical terrorist groups are spreading, operating out of sanctuaries across the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia. These groups pose a grave and growing threat to the United States. Our strategy cannot ignore these growing dangers.

A President who has made ending the war on terrorism the central focus of his foreign policy must now change. He must now make winning the war a priority. The Congress will need to push the President and his administration to do this right; to confront America's enemies; and to restore America's alliances, strength, and credibility.

This institution will be in no position to do that if we block his simple request today. Congress must now vote to support the first steps of what will be a long march toward that victory.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise against this amendment to arm and equip both Syrian rebels and other Syrian groups and individuals.

I want to be clear: we need to take action against the threat posed by

ISIL, and I support the President in the use of airstrikes, but our response must also be appropriate to the complexity of the situation on the ground in Syria.

First and foremost, we must make sure that any response to the threat that we face does not plunge us deeper into a complicated and sectarian civil war. I feel that this amendment may lead to that.

With their barbaric attacks against journalists, women, children, and innocent civilians, ISIL is a terrorist group, pure and simple. While they are not now a threat to our Nation, they do have the potential to be one if left unchecked.

I believe that operating with our allies in the region, like Arab nations and leaders in the newly-formed Iraqi government, we must be part of a broad coalition to address this potential threat, but I do not think this amendment is the right way forward.

Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is a tyrant. He has tortured and massacred his own people for years now. He should stand before the world and be made to pay for his crimes, but, as the very existence of ISIL illustrates, simply arming those who oppose his tyranny will not make America or the region safer.

Syria is a deeply complex situation. It is a nation in the midst of a civil war, splintered between Shi'a and Sunni, authoritarians and al Qaeda, and along countless other points of fractures.

I do not see how we are going to be able to thread the needle whereby we arm those we think are "good guys" in this conflict without inadvertently making the "bad guys" stronger as well.

We need to take action against ISIL, and I support airstrikes and other counterterrorism measures, but I believe that the amendment before us today provides much broader authority, and I cannot support it.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. The President took an important step in his address to the Nation last week. He said that he is committed to "degrading and destroying" ISIL. The President should be commended for evolving from his position last month when he indicated that he didn't think ISIL posed much of a threat to America.

Madam Speaker, much, much more must be done. I am concerned that the President isn't fully listening to his military leaders. Reports have emerged indicating that President Obama did not choose to use the recommendations that our military leaders gave him.

Specifically, it has been reported that General Lloyd Austin, the top commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, advised the President to send in some Special Operations Forces to advise and assist Iraqi Army units while fighting the militants.

Just today, at a Senate hearing, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Martin Dempsey said that the reality of the threat of ISIL might make the hands-off approach that the President is pursuing insufficient to deal with the threat. It is troubling when a Commander in Chief with no military experience chooses to ignore the advice of his military leaders.

On one hand, Secretary Hagel has said that we are at war with ISIL. On the other hand, it appears as if the President may be settling for what may be less than overwhelming force in confronting an enemy that he says should be destroyed because of the threat it poses.

Again, it was encouraging to see President Obama acknowledge ISIL as the threat that they are to Americans, to our homeland, and our friend and allies; however, I hope, when this authorization expires in December, that President Obama will take the steps that his military leaders propose that will actually accomplish the President's goal of degrading and destroying ISIL.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and—he insisted I say this—a fellow graduate of Fordham University.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. We all agonized as to what we should do, but I want to correct the record. At 2:25 this afternoon, through the chair, when we started to pontificate on this floor about Islamists against Islamists, what we do is perpetuate the agony. What we do is stir up the pot when we stereotype who is with us and who is not with us.

Not every Muslim is the same, not every Christian is the same, as we found out in the Balkan wars in 1998 and 1999. In fact, in that war, we assisted Kosovo because it was being totally overcome with Serbs. One was Muslim; the other was Christian.

I think it is not good that the Congress go on record as pitting one group against the other. I don't think it works. I don't think it is healthy, Madam Speaker.

Let's be clear about what this vote is about. This is not an authorization for open-ended war. This is not October 2002 which was an authorization. No one knows that better than the chair and the ranking member who have done a spectacular job, I believe, in keeping this a fair debate and a fair discussion, and I want to compliment both of them.

I believe that ISIL is a threat to our national security, and I support the

President's mission to end that threat. While America must lead, we cannot do this alone. We must see a real commitment from our coalition partners in the region, and we must provide the kind of support that is necessary if we are going to be successful.

In 3 months, when we get to December and we have to vote for a CR again and we have to vote whether we are going to continue to go down this path, we better have tangible evidence that those countries who signed sheets of paper that they are going to support us have tangible support out there for us and are not just sending cupcakes for the troops.

We can do our part. We can arm all the properly vetted opposition forces in Syria that we can find and provide air support and training for those on the ground, but we won't be successful in destroying ISIL unless our partners in the region help us cut off their funding, better police their borders, provide combat troops on the ground, and end the political bickering that causes the chaos and mistrust that groups like ISIL thrive under.

I am pleased that the President has chosen to come to Congress to get our support for his plan. I believe that the provisions of this amendment will allow us to perform the oversight that is constitutionally responsible.

However, as I said before, this is not a blank check. Today, we are voting for a limited mission and ensuring that we properly vet those we are arming.

□ 1445

I am pleased that we will revisit this issue later this year in the intervening months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. If our coalition partners don't step up to the plate, I don't see how we could be successful in destroying ISIL and why we should continue.

The lesson we learned from the war in Iraq is that American military might alone is not enough to defeat enemies. No matter how murderous and vicious a terrorist organization like ISIL may be, sometimes the American military intervention cannot be the silver bullet that solves all of our problems. And we say this about the greatest air and sea and land troops in the world. It is going to take a broad regional coalition acting as one, both militarily and politically.

Madam Speaker, I close by simply saying this: We need support, not only in the short term, but in the long term to have a government in Syria. We pray to God that they will have a government that can sustain itself.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today 227 years ago on September 17, our Founding Fathers signed our Nation's most precious document, the U.S. Constitution.

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states: Congress shall have the power to declare war. The President does not have that power, only Congress.

Congress gives our President the power to defend our country; however, that authority remains subject to checks and balances, particularly by this body.

As such, if the President believes a state of war exists between ourselves and ISIL—the comments made by both the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State indicate that he does—then let him make it constitutional by first coming to Congress and asking for that declaration.

Today, the House will vote on the President's request to authorize assistance to train and arm the Syrian rebels. I have long opposed arming the Syrian opposition out of the fear that these weapons will fall into the hands of Islamic radicals such as ISIL. Rather than supporting relatively unknown opposition groups in Syria to battle these forces, the Islamic State, we must instead turn to our longstanding allies, the Kurds.

The Kurds have shown repeatedly that they have the capacity, the tenacity, and the will to stand up to ISIL. With our support, the Kurdish Peshmerga, together with the Iraqi security forces, will be able to successfully annihilate the evil forces of ISIL.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, if the President wishes to engage this country in military action against ISIL, then I urge him to ask Congress for a declaration of war. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I respect all of my colleagues on the tough decisions that we are asked to make today.

I believe that America must use our military might any time that our families face an imminent threat. Though ISIS, like a number of terrorist groups around the world, would like to kill more Americans, our military leadership has made it clear that ISIS does not represent such a threat today. It is a regional threat without the capacity to do the harm it would like to do.

Rejecting this one amendment does not mean doing nothing about ISIS. The President already has the necessary authority to respond to this savagery when Americans are murdered.

Now the President's response, however, has been expanded, and he pro-

poses a full-scale war. This amendment establishes a new objective for this broader war—to end the civil war in Syria that has already consumed almost 200,000 lives.

Approving this amendment is the one vote that has been requested to enable this broader war—but without a declaration by the Congress to approve that war and without knowing what commitment those in the region will really make in order to fight this war.

I got a communication from a constituent of mine in San Antonio. Her name is Gloria Flores, and she tells me this. She poses some questions that are not being answered today in Washington.

"In my view," she says, "ISIS is just one more extreme group which, if destroyed, will be replaced with another group . . . I don't say 'boots on the ground' because that phrase . . . takes away from the terrible toll that will affect a family if its son or daughter is killed. My nephew . . . was killed in Afghanistan, and we are still mourning his death . . . Any armed force should consist of almost entirely Middle Eastern soldiers. Why should American kids," she asks, "carry the load for Saudis, Jordanians, et cetera?"

Why, indeed.

But this purported coalition does not carry its own load. Others may appear in photos. They may cheer from the rear, but nearby countries are not risking their young people in ground combat. In one case, we even have a neighboring country that will not even permit us to launch an attack by air from its soil.

With the number of our U.S. military on the ground already approaching 2,000 in Iraq and with General Michael Hayden, the former NSA and CIA head, expecting 5,000 by the end of the year, the danger of escalation is very real.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Now, I do find it difficult to understand, with its hostility to Christians and brutal disdain for our American values, how Saudi Arabia can be a place for training anyone—certainly no Syrian women learning to drive there.

Ultimately, I believe that this resolution has to be evaluated on whether it secures our families in a stronger way. I think it entangles us in a conflict that we cannot get out of as quickly as those trained Iraqi soldiers dropped their uniforms and their guns.

Today is Constitution Day. Let us use our constitutional powers to consider a declaration of war before this entanglement.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President's request to train vetted moderate Syrian rebels, as I believe it is only one step in the right direction and it is supported by military experts.

Tremendous oversight is going to be necessary in this effort and, unfortunately, I fear, as do many experienced generals and military personnel, that it is part of a strategy that is insufficient to secure America's national security.

The President's stated objective is to destroy ISIL; however, I believe this overall strategy and the means requested are not enough to meet this objective.

The current strategy relies on U.S. airpower in support of local forces. This is not a counterterrorism effort, and to destroy ISIL it is necessary to have strong coordinated ground troops. The local ground forces the President is planning to rely on appear currently unready, and they will need to operate with a strong central command and control.

The President's strategy does not provide for U.S. Special Forces in the backing of our ground troops, even though our military leaders have repeatedly suggested that exact recommendation.

Our security is too important to base military strategy on political calculations. Our strategy must be firmly rooted in what is necessary in order to complete the mission and to ensure our security.

From Clausewitz to Powell, military leaders have preached the necessity of decisive force. I served in Iraq. We heeded this wisdom and committed to win with decisive force. We acted on militarily reality and not political risk. We can do this again and fulfill the American objective to destroy ISIL, but we must commit ourselves to do what is necessary—not only what it takes, but whatever it takes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, last week I met with a constituent from Huntington Station on Long Island, and she said to me, "Mr. Israel, war is never the answer."

I would agree with that view that war is never the answer if I believed that ISIL agreed with that view, but they do not. I have thought a lot about my constituent's comments and I have thought a lot about this resolution. There are four things that we do know.

First, ISIL is not just a threat; it is a savage threat. And what message do we send to potential beheaders around the world if we bury our head in the sand?

Secondly, ISIL has filled a vacuum, and if we do not check that vacuum, it will spread, and instability and behead-

ings and savagery will spread across the Middle East and beyond.

Number three, we cannot, nor should we, do this alone. I believe that the President has helped to organize an important international coalition to ensure that this is not on our shoulders and that we do not have boots on the ground.

Finally, there should be no blank checks. We did that. We gave those blank checks from 2000 to 2008. No more blank checks.

This resolution ensures accountability; it ensures transparency; it ensures reporting. Taken all together, Madam Speaker, this resolution is a restrained, responsible and appropriate response to the spread of ISIL, to beheading, to savagery in the Middle East and potentially around the world, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, all of us recognize the threat posed to our Nation by the Islamic State. The question before us is whether to arm and train supposedly carefully vetted elements of the Free Syrian Army as a proxy ground force.

I respect the intentions of the supporters, but this proposal runs a great risk of backfiring.

The FSA is a marriage of convenience among many Islamic factions that have a long history of collaborating with the Islamic State. The singular purpose of the FSA is not to destroy the Islamic State. It exists to destroy the Syrian Government that is now actively fighting against the Islamic State.

The equipment we provide to the FSA could easily be turned against the Syrian Government, which, despite all of its despotic tendencies, is at least at war with the IS right now, and we would weaken our overall strategic position. Or this equipment could be turned over to the Islamic State, as we watched carefully vetted Iraqi security forces recently do. In fact, that is the reason the Islamic State is armed to the teeth with American equipment.

Neither we nor the world can afford more blunders or miscalculations in this region. We should have learned by now that alliances in the Islamic Middle East are in constant flux. An ally today is a sworn enemy tomorrow. In fact, often our allies are our enemies.

After I was elected, the first man killed from my district in Iraq, Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery, died when "carefully vetted" Iraqi soldiers turned their American-provided weapons on him.

The most recent fatality from my district, Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, died when "carefully vetted" Afghan police turned their American-provided weapons on him.

Madam Speaker, our consistent experience in this region should be screaming this warning at us. We are making a big mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to this amendment because this proposed strategy actually reflects a lack of commitment to really destroy ISIL and the other Islamic extremist groups that we are at war with. Here are just a few reasons why I will be voting "no."

□ 1500

First, it is unrealistic. It will take way too long, and the number of fighters trained will be way too small to be truly effective in the fight against ISIL. Over that period of time, ISIL will continue to grow in strength.

Number two, the mission is unclear. The American people want ISIL destroyed, but the primary objective of the fighters whom we train will be to overthrow Assad.

Number three, we don't really know who they are. Presently, they are fighting shoulder to shoulder with al Qaeda and other Islamic extremists and therefore can't be trusted. The weapons and training that we give them may end up actually being used against us and our allies.

Voting to support this proposal is actually a vote to overthrow Assad because overthrowing Assad is the primary objective of the so-called Free Syrian Army.

If we combine the missions of destroying ISIL and of overthrowing Assad, this is not a smart or effective strategy for a number of reasons. We must focus on one mission—to destroy ISIL and other Islamic extremists who have declared war on us. Our mission should not be to topple the Assad regime, which would make the situation in the region even worse and more unstable than it is today.

Madam Speaker, we have heard this story before. We know how it ends. Look at Iraq. Look at Libya. Clearly, our leaders have not learned their lesson. We must focus on taking out our enemies and on investing in our own country here at home.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. My thanks to my friend from Texas for giving me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Chairman McKEON's amendment, though I have grave concerns about the President's current plan to train and equip Syrian opposition forces in the fight against ISIL.

In my opinion, Madam Speaker, the plan does not fit the threat. ISIL has made the Middle East into a war zone and an advanced training ground for

terrorists who, by their own admission, seek to do Americans great harm. Its stated objectives of redrawing the boundaries of and imposing its will on sovereign nations makes the importance of confronting this organization, in the most profound way possible, critical.

Instead of responding proportionately, President Obama has proposed we outsource the problem to other people, and as a military officer, I am concerned that he actually believes this limited use of military power can achieve the ultimate objective of destroying ISIL—a force that is 30,000 strong and growing by the day.

Madam Speaker, I fear—in fact, I firmly believe—that the problem will not be solved by the actions taken by this Congress today. However, we cannot afford to stand idly by for another day, because a step in the right direction is better than no step at all. So I join my colleagues in support of the amendment. I believe, in short order, we will be asked to do more.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, in 2011, former Secretary Robert Gates, as he was departing office, gave a speech at the West Point academy in which he said:

In my opinion, any future Defense Secretary who advises the President to again send a big American land army into Asia or into the Middle East or Africa should have his head examined, as General MacArthur so delicately put it.

I think Secretary Gates spoke for the entire country in terms of that sentiment, which, after a long, bitter experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, speaks to the weariness that many feel today in terms of those conflicts, and, certainly, with the motion that is before us this afternoon, it still rings in people's ears. I think it is important therefore to sort of measure what we are voting on with what Secretary Gates, I think, so accurately stated.

The motion before us is to provide for title 10 authorization to allow the U.S. military to train and equip forces in Saudi Arabia to take up arms against ISIL. I checked with the Congressional Research Service yesterday to determine how many title 10 operations over the last 3 years have been conducted by the U.S. military. In 28 countries all across the world, the U.S. military has been involved in training and equipping operations, from the Philippines to Yemen to Poland.

For those who argue that what we are about to engage in is a slippery slope or that this authorization somehow broadly confers on the administration the ability to conduct a land invasion or a large military force, the fact of the matter is that the long and broad experience of title 10 that we have tells us exactly the opposite. In

fact, what title 10 seeks to do is to stand up indigenous forces in those nations of allies to avoid what Secretary Gates warned about in 2011, which is to, again, not get this country involved in a large land invasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, one healthy thing has occurred over the last few days, which is that folks on both sides of this measure, I think, have come to the realization that we as a Congress need to be engaged in terms of these types of decisions.

To their credit, Mr. McKEON and Mr. SMITH have fashioned a resolution which requires by December 11 our revisiting this motion, to have regular reporting from the Department of Defense, and it requires us, I think, at some point, to take up the broader question of authorization of military force, reaching back to 2001 and 2002, in terms of limiting the scope, which, again, has been supported by this administration and which we have discussed in the House Armed Services Committee. It is also to focus on what exactly is the end game for our efforts in Syria and Iraq.

Again, the measure that is before us today, though, is simply about title 10 authorization between today and December 11. I think people should not overthink and overstate the consequences of this vote. What it provides is for America to stand up with regional allies and European allies to begin the process of degrading and, ultimately, destroying a barbaric force, which threatens stability both in the Middle East and, ultimately, America's national interests.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts and, frankly, some concerns about the President's proposal that we will vote on today to train and arm the Free Syrian Army forces to fight ISIL. We are sort of in a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" situation.

I have always said that our country needs a comprehensive plan, policy, and strategy to defeat the radical Islamists terrorizing Iraq and Syria. Certainly, ISIS represents the antithesis of American ideals, and they have gruesomely demonstrated their disgust for our Nation with the beheadings of two American journalists in recent weeks.

What we are considering today is a partial plan, one of which I remain uncertain as to whether it will have the desired outcome. In fact, since 2011, the administration has consistently re-

sisted any major efforts to arm and train the moderate opposition forces in Syria even when, I believe, a window existed to effectively do that some time ago.

At a hearing in the Appropriations Committee in February of 2012, I questioned then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton about why we were not doing more to help the moderate Syrian opposition. She flatly rejected providing support then. Now, however, I fear we may have effectively missed the time in which arming the FSA will impact the barbarism of ISIL in the region. Unfortunately, since 2011 and early 2012, the situation in Syria has become dramatically more complex, and identifying true allies in the fight against ISIS will be exceedingly difficult.

Questions remain about the President's strategy:

How will we effectively vet the opposition forces? How will we ensure that arms delivered will not be sold to ISIS forces or will not be used against already persecuted people in the region, such as the Syrian Christians?

ISIL is a threat to our Nation's security, and, no doubt, it must be destroyed and defeated, but I do have trepidation regarding this initial step in equipping the FSA at this juncture. Those voting on this measure, I suspect, will do so with great reluctance. Those voting "no" will do so with discomfort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I agree with the last speaker, Mr. DENT, that this is a very difficult vote, and I think everybody should approach it with a tremendous amount of trepidation and concern. I am sure that all of us are doing the best we can to come to the very best decision we can on behalf of our constituents.

Today, I plan on voting for the measure. The reason is that the civil war in Syria has claimed thousands of lives. Thousands more are now living under the deadly rule of ISIL, and 200,000 Syrians have been killed so far as the world, for 4 years, has not done much to protect them.

Now, the fight in Syria and Iraq can, ultimately, only be solved politically, and I believe that the growing humanitarian crisis caused by conflicts in the region warrants an urgent response from the United States. Any military action against ISIL must be led by Iraqis and Syrians. I believe U.S. troops would be a magnet for a group like ISIL, and therefore this fight must be carried forth by the people most affected—Syrians and Iraqis themselves. I believe that a vetted and better armed, moderate rebel group in Syria can fight ISIL in northeast Syria when an Iraqi Army, perhaps, can push them out of their country and into Syria. There cannot be a safe haven in Syria for ISIL.

I also want to note that much has been said about the fractured nature or the weakness of the Free Syrian Army, but I would remind people who are participating in this debate that, for 4 years, the Free Syrian Army has withstood the onslaught of the Assad government, Hezbollah, Iran, Russian weapons, ISIS, and Jabhat al-Nusra. For 4 years, these people who were dismissed as nothing but bankers and bakers and not real soldiers have stood their ground and have stood for their country.

For these reasons, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the chair of the Republican Conference.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the chairman's amendment, and I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the President on a long-term strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

Last week, the President's address to the country began to make the case that ISIL is an immediate threat to our allies in the Middle East, Europe and, ultimately, in our homeland. This is a radical and brutal force, opposed to all who do not adhere to their narrow view of Islam and the world. ISIL has declared war on our way of life and the values on which this country was founded and has flourished for over 235 years. In fact, ISIL has made clear that they will not be deterred until they see their flag flying over the White House.

When it comes to protecting the safety and security of Americans at home and abroad, America must lead. As we know, a speech is not a plan. An F-16 is not a strategy. As the Commander in Chief, we need the President to give us an honest assessment and an in-depth strategy to defend the country and our interests around the world.

This amendment responds to the President's request to use title 10 authority to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition forces. General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called it a necessary but not sufficient step. Beyond the amendment and the President's limited request, the American people need to see a plan clearly articulated with a strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

When we look around the world today, we see instability and numerous threats. The spread of radical Islam throughout the globe is pervasive. Iran continues to move toward a nuclear weapon. Russia continues to take aggressive action toward the Baltic states.

I support this amendment because America must lead. As we have seen, when America sits on the sidelines, there is a leadership void, which is filled by bad actors. I urge my colleagues to join us in taking this action.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

□ 1515

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President's funding request to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration and am mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully. Indeed, for the last several years, I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women, and beheading its hostages, including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotloff.

If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the West and attack our homeland.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria or the introduction of American ground forces, all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, and financial, diplomatic, and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces.

In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training, and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force.

There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them. But the open support of gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the debate for the past 2 days, I think one

thing that most will agree on is that ISIL poses a clear and grave danger to our Nation, our interests abroad, and our allies. And I agree with the President when he stated that we must degrade and destroy ISIL no matter where they exist. And I support many of the provisions that he outlined in the speech he gave just last week: arming the Peshmerga, bolstering the Iraqi security forces, expanding airstrikes, and disrupting the flow of finances and foreign fighters to ISIL.

But the one thing I cannot support, the one thing I will not support is arming the so-called moderate opposition force, the Free Syrian Army. It is a ragtag collection of 100 disparate groups, and, just a little more than a month ago, the President stated that the notion that arming the rebels comprised of former pharmacists, doctors, and farmers would make a difference has "always been a fantasy."

The Free Syrian Army has no cogent leadership, no organization, no command and control. And without U.S. military advisers embedded with the forces that we train and send back into Syria, we will have no visibility on their effectiveness, their defections, or whether or not our weapons are falling into the hands of our enemies.

This is a plan that is destined to fail for the sake of saying we did something, and that I cannot support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while I support airstrikes, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While there is no doubt that ISIS is a brutal terrorist group that is wreaking havoc in the region, at this time, none of the evidence I have seen, including U.S. intelligence reports, and none of the arguments I have heard convinces me that getting involved in a religious civil war in the Middle East will be successful or effective in keeping our homeland safer.

I cannot support what could turn into a war on three fronts: fighting ISIS in Iraq, fighting ISIS in Syria, and potentially Assad in Syria. Nor can I support an unprecedented scenario in which the U.S. tries to reinvent a substantially degraded rebel army to act as our boots on the ground against a former ally of theirs, ISIS, all while ignoring their stated objective of overthrowing Assad.

And this entire plan depends on our ability to identify so-called moderates in Syria who would be prepared to die for our agenda. It is not at all clear how we are going to do that.

Trillions of dollars spent, all-out war, and more than a decade of occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan did not produce the peace we sought or the stability we were promised. We spent \$25

billion to train the Iraqi Army to defend their own country, and they were decimated by ISIS in a matter of days and left their weapons to ISIS.

What would make anyone believe that spending a great deal less money to train a rebel army to defend our interests would turn out any better?

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-intentioned effort, but it is not a viable strategy. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the amendment to intervene in the civil war in Syria.

It is immoral to use the prospect of a government shutdown to pressure Members to vote for involvement in a war, much less a civil war on the other side of the globe. Because the Syrian resolution is contained within the continuing resolution, Representatives and Senators must tacitly approve the President’s aggressive intervention in order to vote to fund all government programs.

It is disingenuous for the administration to tell the American public that we are arming Syrian rebels to fight ISIS when the administration’s stated objective is to topple the secular government of Syria, a government, I might add, that has not committed aggression against the United States.

If the goal of arming and training so-called moderate Syrian rebels is to eliminate ISIS, this plan will not work. Military experts know this, as does the President. He acknowledged as much 5 weeks ago when he stated that the idea that arming rebels would have made a difference has “always been a fantasy.”

What is our endgame? What is our long-term strategy? What will this ultimately cost? What are the unintended consequences that may come about? Will we follow this with boots on the ground? Who has these answers? The American people deserve these answers.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. I also urge the same Members to stand strong and vote “no” on the underlying bill.

If this amendment should pass, there is no way to avoid culpability for a military action that is destined to cost innocent lives and will ultimately fail.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in helping us all uphold the oath that we take when we become Members of Congress to protect and defend the American people. I believe that the McKeon amendment that is on the floor today helps us to do just that as well.

Last week, the President presented to the American people a forceful

strategy to degrade and destroy ISIS, a strategy built on a firm foundation of nonmilitary action.

The President is to be commended for his strong leadership and humanitarian, political, and diplomatic components that must be part of any successful mission. In a humanitarian vein, for acting to help assist those impacted by ISIS and avert the genocide of religious minorities. Who could ever forget those people isolated on the mountain until the United States and others came to the rescue? Politically, for insisting and pushing for an inclusive government in Iraq.

And I commend the Vice President, as well, for his leadership. Without a change to an inclusive government that respects not only Shia, Sunni, and Kurds but also the religious minorities in the country as well, militarily actions would not be so productive.

And, again, in a nonmilitary vein, the President bringing together NATO allies, a coalition, as well as regional partners, to assist in degrading and destroying ISIS. This comprehensive strategy includes increasing our intelligence, disrupting ISIS’ finances, and interdicting the flow of foreign fighters.

I have said in the past, in my view, the President already has the authority to do what he is doing. And, I will add, this House has voted overwhelmingly that should the President’s actions go farther comprehensively, then Congress should vote on that authority.

Today we are called upon to authorize a discrete but critical component of the overall plan: the President’s request to train and equip moderate, vetted Syrians outside of Syria to fight ISIS.

This is not an authorization for use of military force, as we had in 2001 and 2002. I do not support, nor will I support, combat troops on the ground. That is not what this is about.

I believe that the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and those who have worked so hard to put this amendment together took many precautions and set a high standard in terms of the criteria and standards that the administration must meet with this training: where it would occur, who would be trained, extensive vetting of the moderates and the rebels. That is probably the most frequently asked question: “How do we know?” Well, we can do the best we can to vet, to ensure that we are doing what we set out to do.

The brutality of ISIS, ISIL—whatever they call themselves on any given day—is outside the circle of civilized human behavior. We wish that this action that we are called upon to do today was not necessary. But it is really hard for us to uphold our oath of office all the time to protect and defend. It is not always easy. And most of the time, it is hard for anything that takes us down a military path.

But the fact is that with the diplomatic, political, and humanitarian foundation that the President has laid, with the narrowness of the request that he is making to us, it is not pleasant, it is not easy—it is hard, but it really is necessary for the House to approve this.

We all wish, again, that it wasn’t necessary. But we will approve it to help the Syrian people take responsibility for building peace and stability in their country, to stem the threat that ISIS can pose to U.S. interests abroad and to our national security.

Now, I have frequently quoted Hannah Arendt, who said, “Nations are driven to an endless flywheel of violence because they believe that one last, one final gesture of violence will bring peace, but each time, they sow the seeds for more violence.”

I would hope that what we are doing today takes us in a different direction, one that is predicated on a nation of inclusion in Iraq, one that defeats ISIS by the moderates in-country defeating ISIS, because ISIS is now cross-border—in Iraq and in Syria, and who knows where they may try to go next.

So this is important. It is urgent. And I hope that it will have the support of our colleagues.

As with all votes, I have never asked a Member to vote with any vote of use of force or, in this case, training of moderates. But I just wanted you to know why I am proud to support the President and salute him for his efforts.

I thank Mr. McKEON for his leadership in shaping this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as I believe it is a plan which will not be successful.

Ronald Reagan reminded us to carry “a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors which make it unmistakably clear where we stand” on the issues.

No offense, but I believe the plan before us is one of pale pastels when the world needed bold action by the leader of the free world.

Who will we be supporting by arming unknown rebels in Syria? Will we not be getting involved in a Syrian civil war?

□ 1530

If the fight is with ISIL—and I believe there must be a fight against these genocidal extremists—then let’s take it to them in Iraq, begin by assisting the Kurds who have been doing the heavy lifting against ISIL after the Iraqis cut and ran.

I could support boots on the ground once again in Iraq, reclaiming the

ground for which so much American blood and treasure has been expended to liberate, but not arming unknown rebels.

Do you remember Benghazi? We armed and assisted rebels there; and, now, al Qaeda controls Libya from Benghazi to Tripoli, even swimming in the U.S. Embassy swimming pool in Tripoli.

We should not send \$500 million or \$1 to rebels in Syria, especially at a time when the Department of Defense and National Guard budgets are being cut here at home.

I believe even the war-weary Americans are looking to support a plan from President Obama that is decisive, lethal to the enemies of freedom, and definitive. This plan is not it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment that would grant the President the authorization that he seeks to identify, train up, and equip moderate Syrian forces to stand up to ISIL in their backyard.

I do so because I believe this is the best of the bad options that we face that could halt the advance of ISIL in that region and begin degrading their capability and guard against the rising threat that they pose to us and to those in the region.

I do so for three reasons. I believe that the President needs a strong bipartisan hand coming out of this Congress this week that would help him continue to build the coalition of opposition to ISIL in the region. It is going to be one of the keys to the outcome—the successful outcome—of degrading ISIL's capability. We can't do this alone, and it will be determined by those in the region to stand up against this evil force.

Secondly, I believe this is the best plan to help us avoid putting our own boots on the ground and our own men and women in uniform in what is, in essence, an ongoing sectarian civil war that has gripped that region for centuries between the Sunni and Shi'a.

There is a lot of concern, especially from Guard and Reserve units in my congressional district in Wisconsin who have been activated, called up, and deployed multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan. When I talk to them today, I can see in their eyes and hear in their voices how tired they are. They are concerned about another military intervention in this region.

Finally, I believe this resolution under title 10 will enhance congressional oversight of the mission that is taking place there and, therefore, bring greater accountability but also bring a greater say of the American people in addressing this rising threat in the region.

We are going to move away from the intel agencies running the show now and move it into the Pentagon, which brings us into the oversight capabilities which I feel has been lacking for some time in this endeavor.

This is not an easy decision. I believe the steps that we can take with this comprehensive plan now can avoid further military intervention in the future. Again, I think it is the best option we face amongst a lot of bad options.

May God bless our military personnel who will be in charge of carrying out this mission, and we all hope and pray for their success and safe return.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment before us that authorizes the administration to arm and train vetted moderate Syrian rebels in their fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL. This amendment also contains strong reporting requirements that the administration must follow to fulfill Congress' oversight authority.

ISIL has made territorial gains militarily in Iraq and Syria and announced the establishment of a caliphate in areas under its control. They have terrorized and killed members of minority groups, including Christians in northern Iraq, and have invaded Kurdish-controlled regions.

Minority groups are not the only victims being targeted. ISIL is also targeting Muslims. Last, but certainly not least, ISIL has beheaded two American journalists and a British aid worker. This type of radical, evil behavior must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

This amendment ensures that ISIL is not only confronted kinetically in Iraq but also in Syria. Providing the means for rebel groups to aggressively attack ISIL in Syria denies them sanctuary just across the Iraqi border, as is the case with the Taliban on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

An armed and trained Syrian rebel force, with assistance from the U.S. and partner nations, will open up a northern front to attack ISIL. Iraqi security forces and the Kurdish Peshmerga will be the claws in the south to squeeze this radical group. American airpower will no doubt be a force multiplier for these indigenous ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one country in the world willing and able to build a coalition of nations that includes Arab countries to defeat this radical threat, and that nation is the United States of America. The United

States has an obligation to lead and respond whenever the innocent are being massacred.

Our enemies should never underestimate our resolve. Yes, we may argue and disagree on many issues; but, when it comes to protecting America, our allies, and our interests, we are united. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a mother, I can see those who are now mourning because they have lost their babies, their family members. I can see the Yazidis in the mountains in Iraq fearful, and I can hear the cries of mothers whose sons were viciously beheaded by a terrorist group that most cannot understand the level of its viciousness.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that doing nothing is not an option, and I want to say to my friends and to my colleagues, ISIL has been here, for in 2005 Ayman al-Zawahiri, deputy head of al Qaeda, had a killer idea, and that was to establish an Islamic State.

It percolated for a number of years. In 2014, now, we have voices being raised across the world knowing that ISIL exists, and that is exactly what they want us to do, be terrorized. I refuse to be terrorized, and I also refuse to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here today to vote for an authorization to use military forces. I will not vote to send our precious treasure again to that region, but I do believe that the President has a strategy, unlike some of my colleagues, a systematic campaign of airstrikes, increased military assistance, regional political effort and humanitarian aid, changing the face of the Islam religion that people believe is the Islam religion, and looking to those who support the core values of Islam.

That is a strategy; yet we have to address ISIL. There are 20,000 to 31,000 fighters making their way across the land; so I believe that an existing provision under section 10, provision 10, simply to train and to provide instruction to those individuals who can be in the fight in the region, train them with the expertise of the United States but not put our precious treasure on the ground.

ISIS has no restraint, and we remember the names of James Foley, Steven Sotloff, British aid worker David Haines, and 40-some members of the Turkish diplomatic corps held by ISIS and many others; so I believe it is important to note what we are doing here today.

In the McKeon amendment, it provides an opportunity for Congress to be advised 15 days before action. We should hold the administration to that.

We should also say that any authorization for military forces, it must be a debate on the floor of the House. I will not vote for that today. I will not vote for that.

I do believe, again, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot stand and do nothing. I think it is extremely important that we do something, and I hope others will look at the resolution that I have and the no fly for foreign fighters, H.R. 5488, which I have introduced.

I would like to add something else to the McKeon amendment. It indicates that appropriate committees will be advised. The legislative history of this debate should reflect that the Homeland Security Committee is an appropriate committee and should be one of those that is appropriately advised.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today, we had a hearing in Homeland Security with the Secretary of Homeland Security. There is no doubt that what we are doing today is to protect the homeland.

What Americans say is they want the homeland protected. They want no more of their journalists beheaded by this heinous group.

Mr. Speaker, I close by simply saying we organized this Nation to form a more perfect Union. The Constitution says that Congress must declare war even as the President indicates that he has the authority under article II.

I believe if Congress is to do its job, we must have another debate on the authorization for military forces which we do not approve, but this is responding to the viciousness of ISIL, building up those regional forces, and making a difference.

I ask my colleagues: Can we do nothing? I think not. We must rise in support of this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to H. Res. 124, the resolution making continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2015.

Specifically, the "McKeon Amendment":

1. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups or individuals;

2. Purports to strengthen congressional oversight by requiring detailed reports, including progress reports, on the plan, vetting process, and procedures for monitoring unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment;

3. Require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy;

The McKeon Amendment does not authorize additional funds, but it would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to submit a re-

programming request to Congress should the President request Defense Department funds to execute this authority and permit the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign contributions.

Finally, the McKeon Amendment states that nothing in it is to be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to be clear about what the McKeon Amendment does and does not do.

The amendment does not authorize the use of military force or deployment of United States combat forces to Syria.

Let me be clear: I am not voting today to authorize the use of military force or to put American combat boots on the ground.

Let me also be clear on this point: Before American armed forces may be deployed to conduct combat operations in Syria or elsewhere in the region the President must come to the Congress and request and receive from it either a declaration of war or resolution authorizing the use of military force.

This is not a political nicety but a constitutional requirement, clearly specified in Article I, Section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, which by the way, was approved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787, 227 years ago this very day, September 17.

The McKeon Amendment simply authorizes the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes:

1. Defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition;

2. Protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and

3. Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria.

The McKeon Amendment cannot be construed as giving the Administration a blank check or carte blanche in achieving these objectives.

Rather, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 15 days before providing assistance to a vetted group for the first time, the Administration shall provide a report to the Congressional leadership and committees of jurisdiction describing in detail the assistance to be provided and the bases for the determination that the action contemplated are consistent with the objectives stated above.

Additionally, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the first report required by the McKeon Amendment, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a detailed progress report.

In short, the McKeon Amendment only authorizes the Administration to identify, vet, and

provide assistance to those opposition Syrian forces that can be relied upon to defend the Syrian people from attacks by the murderous ISIS jihadi.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), is a violent extremist movement. It grew out of the remnants of Al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syrian civil war—which has claimed the lives of 191,369 persons, tens of thousands at the hands of ISIS—and has spread its reach across the border between Iraq and Syria and is now seizing military bases and holding territory throughout the region.

In response, and at the request of the Iraqi government, President Obama has sent over 1,500 military advisors into Iraq and conducted over 150 airstrikes there to break the ISIS momentum, to protect U.S. personnel and save thousands of Iraq's religious minorities.

In his September 10, 2014 address to the nation, the President announced a four-part strategic plan to degrade and defeat ISIS.

The strategy outlined by the President involves the following elements:

1. a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIS;

2. increased military assistance and training for allied forces on the ground;

3. a regional political effort to work with allies; and

4. a humanitarian assistance to populations targeted by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairman McKEON that ISIS poses a significant threat to American interests, requiring an effective response.

I also believe that the President should be commended for the forceful but deliberate and steady but calm leadership he has displayed to date.

But we must act in a careful, measured, balanced, and limited way to assist the Iraqi and Syrian people most directly and immediately threatened by ISIS because left unchecked, ISIS will grow to threaten the United States.

ISIS presently controls about 13,000 square miles (about the size of Massachusetts), spanning territory in Iraq and Syria, and a fighting force estimated to be between 20,000 and 31,500 fighters.

ISIS also commands substantial resources, including cash reserves estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars and daily revenue of \$3 million from largely criminal activities.

Mr. Speaker, after its gains in Syria and Iraq, ISIS stands as one of the most dangerous jihadist groups. It was formed in April 2013, growing out of al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which has since condemned and disavowed the group for its barbarity.

It speaks volumes about any group that is too barbaric to be associated with al-Qaeda in Iraq!

Unlike other rebel groups in Syria, ISIS aims to establish an Islamic emirate that straddles Syria and Iraq. Since March 2013, ISIS has seen considerable military success, beginning with its takeover of the Syrian city of Raqqa—the first provincial capital to fall under rebel control.

In January 2014, ISIS took control of Fallujah, the predominantly Sunni city in the

western province of Anbar. It also seized large sections of the provincial capital, Ramadi, and has a presence in a number of towns near the Turkish and Syrian borders.

However, it was its conquest of Mosul in June that captured the world's attention because with the conquest of Mosul came control of oil fields in northern Iraq and Mosul's branch of Iraq's central bank, from which ISIS took hundreds of millions of dollars.

The international community received a wake-up call on August 2, 2014, when ISIS fighters pushed further into northern Iraq, overwhelming lightly-armed Kurdish Peshmerga forces that had moved into areas abandoned by the Iraqi army and seized the strategically important Mosul Dam, which supplies water and electricity to much of Iraq.

Knowing ISIS's reputation for unmatched brutality, tens of thousands of people fled their homes, particularly members of religious minorities, and 50,000 of them were trapped on Mount Sinjar without food or water, until their rescue was secured by the air strikes ordered by President Obama providing cover for the Kurdish forces who wrested back control of the Mosul Dam.

Mr. Speaker, ISIS derives significant revenues from the oil fields it controls in eastern Syria and from the sale of antiquities it looted from historical sites.

Today, ISIS is considered to be the most cash-rich militant group in the world, controlling assets estimated to exceed \$2 billion.

ISIS has shown no restraint in dealing with civilian populations, acting with heinous violence and savagery. ISIS fighters have murdered and kidnapped civilians throughout the territory under its control, including the grisly beheadings of two American journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and British aid worker David Haines.

More ominous, Mr. Speaker, is the fact many fighters recruited by ISIS have European or American passports, making it easier for them to return home. That is also why I introduced H.R. 5488—No Fly Foreign Fighters Act to protect the homeland.

To his great credit, President Obama has not rushed to judgment. He has been thoughtful. He has consulted with the Congress and the international allies.

And the President has been adamant that the planned assistance and training to rebels fighting ISIS will not involve, or lead to, American ground forces fighting a war that must be fought by the Iraqi people and Syrian rebels.

The threat posed by ISIS in Iraq presents the United States with a conundrum about what to do about ISIS in Syria. On the one hand, we do not want to strengthen the barbaric Assad regime that is opposed by Syrian rebels and opposition parties and by ISIS. On the other hand, if we provide assistance only to anti-Assad opposition forces, we indirectly strengthen ISIS.

The challenge is to identify, vet, and support those pro-democracy forces in opposition to both the Assad regime and ISIS.

The defeat of ISIS should be prioritized over the removal of Assad, though the latter should remain a long-term U.S. objective. And U.S. assistance to opposition groups should be designed and delivered with this sequencing in mind.

Finding, vetting, and equipping capable and reliable Syrian partners who are poised to fight ISIS and the Assad regime is the central strategic challenge facing the United States in countering the rise of ISIS.

On June 26, and again on September 10, the Obama administration announced additional assistance to vetted moderate opposition forces that are fighting both the Assad government and ISIS and asked Congress to authorize \$500 million to train and equip these fighters.

But a major effort to arm, train, equip, and enable possible U.S. partners inside Syria is no easy task because potential partners are weak, causing the Obama administration to hold back additional meaningful support.

But part of the reason these potential moderate alternatives to Assad and ISIS remain weak is because they do not have organized and well-coordinated assistance. These potential partners include the Syrian National Coalition; the interim Syrian government; the Supreme Military Council; the Free Syrian Army; and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood.

The necessary vetting to find capable and reliable partners must be thorough, rigorous, and meticulous because we cannot afford to provide training, equipment, and materiel to opposition forces that in turn combine, or enter into a non-aggression pact, with ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the Members of this body to be thoughtful, deliberate, and wise. This debate today is healthy and reflects and enduring strength of our democracy: open debate, deliberation, and decision.

I urge all members to reflect carefully on the threat posed to the United States by ISIS and to vote their conscience on the McKeon Amendment, guided by their best judgment as to what is the best course of action to take to protect our homeland and keep our nation and its people safe.

For my part, I will not vote to authorize the use of military force or to deploy American combat forces in Syria. Instead, I will vote for the McKeon Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the President asked this House to include very narrow language in the continuing resolution that would allow the United States military to train and equip the Free Syrian Army individuals to defend themselves.

I can understand why any soldier in any country would want training from the United States military. They are the best-trained, best-equipped, best-disciplined, and best moral fighting force in the history of warfare. Many members of this body and of the administration have asked, for months, for greater training of the Free Syrian Army.

If we had not previously trained and equipped the Iraqis and the Kurds, ISIS would have already overrun Iraq and would have already moved against our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice the concern though of the people of Okla-

homa. We believe this administration has the habit of twisting every bill into what they want it to say rather than what it actually says; so I want to clarify this amendment.

This is not an authorization for the use of military force in Syria. The President has not asked for that authority, and the Congress has not extended it.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001, this body gave specific authorization to President Bush to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organization, or persons he determines"—now get this—who "he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001."

The fighters currently on the battlefield with ISIS were about 8 years old on 9/11. The leaders of ISIS were teenagers. Unless this administration is able to show evidence that a group that did not exist on 9/11 or that 8-year-olds in Syria planned, authorized, committed or aided in the terror attacks on 9/11, the AUMF is not in effect from 2001.

This body is willing to deliberate and to engage with the American people in the sobering question of the use of military force, but we are not willing to abdicate our constitutional responsibility.

No one in this administration should understand this vote as a request to negotiate with Iran for their cooperation, offering to turn a blind eye or to turn our head while they advance their nuclear weapons program for their help and their cooperation. The world should not have to choose between ISIS or a nuclear Iran. Both are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is also not an acknowledgement of the President's plan to defend our Nation from ISIS. We have not seen a plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is not an acknowledgement of the President's plan because we have not seen the plan. Bombing some of ISIS' facilities and training 5,000 foreign fighters is not a plan.

If ISIS is a direct threat to the United States, we should treat them that way. Do not make the American people second-guess the threat by saying that the American people will be protected by the Free Syrian Army.

While I stand in support of this amendment today, the conversation must not end here. I look forward to the conversation in how the administration intends to constitutionally seek authorization to accomplish the strategy today for the American people and this body.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and my ranking member for their leadership on this issue and for the exhaustive discussions and briefings we have had. I also commend all of my colleagues for their thoughtful statements.

This is, indeed, a tough decision, but we are elected to make tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment to equip and train the Syrian rebel forces. After countless briefings and the President's speech, I am left with more questions than answers. At a briefing today, former U.S. generals have opined that training 3,000 to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army will be lame—in fact, totally inadequate.

Why would we train an inadequate number of FSAs to contain ISIL? How do we identify and vet a sufficient number of Syrians who can fight a long, protracted conflict to effectively degrade ISIL? How do we compel the Free Syrian Army to focus on ISIL instead of Assad, the brutal dictator they took up arms in the first place to destroy?

What will prevent Assad from continuing to attack the FSA? And what will we do in response? How do we avoid arming individuals that would rather do harm to the United States than ISIL? How do we create a true coalition that will share the burden of this conflict when some only agree tacitly behind closed doors?

Jordan has ISIL on both borders but cannot commit publicly to providing boots on the ground. How does a plan that relies primarily on airstrikes truly degrade ISIL's capability?

□ 1545

What I have heard in response to these questions simply doesn't add up.

We should have our eyes open wide enough to know that we are being asked to support today something much more than just training 3- to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army. There are consequences of what we have supported in the past, and there will be consequences today.

What happened when we spent billions of dollars to train and equip the carefully vetted Iraq military over almost a decade? They folded in the face of ISIL, many taking arms up with ISIL and others stripping their uniforms from their backs.

The plan before us is unrealistic and insufficient. None of the military experts outside the government believe that this strategy will topple ISIL. General Dempsey conceded yesterday that if this plan is insufficient, which I believe it is. He may recommend ground forces. He also said that there is no military solution to ISIL.

We should be frank with ourselves and the American people. We are not facing a limited engagement but a new war that will only escalate. We are setting out on a path to send our own troops to the ground. This is an amendment and a debate to start yet another war in the Middle East with a very uncertain future.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Chairman MCKEON. We are way past any good solutions in Syria, but doing nothing would be the worst solution of all.

I understand and, in fact, share many of the reservations expressed by my colleagues today. This is not an easy choice. Yet we cannot ignore the threat of ISIL. They are determined to bring war to America's shores. We must respond.

The President's request to train and equip certain Syrian opposition forces is a necessary step toward defeating ISIL, so I will support it. I will also urge the President to do more to explain the true nature of this crisis to the American people.

This will not be an easy fight. Airstrikes alone are unlikely to destroy ISIL and diminish its ability to threaten America. Americans are understandably war weary, but we did not pick this fight. Our Nation always answers the bell to defend our way of life and protect our freedom. This time will be no different.

May God bless our military personnel who will be involved in this effort. May God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership and the chairman for his on this very difficult issue.

I want to make one point clear to my colleagues. We are essentially declaring war through an amendment to a budget resolution.

Let's make no mistake. We are not simply training rebels in another country, Saudi Arabia, which, by the way, has been the most successful exporter of extremism and extremists in the world. We will reinsert those trained and equipped rebels back into Syria, and we will then be their air force. We will, through all intents and purposes, be a co-belligerent in a civil war.

So, if we are declaring war right now, I think we should do it with our eyes wide open, as my colleague just said, with a full debate, and only through the power vested in Congress through the U.S. Constitution.

The logical conclusion of our participation in this war, if successful, is to depose the Assad regime and replace it

with one of our own making in concert with these rebels. That will be the third country in 13 years whose regime we have deposed and whose government we have replaced with one of our own choosing. It is the fourth that we have been involved in, if you include Libya, in whose government we have successfully deposed. In not one of those instances can I say that this has been a success.

We also have no Muslim-majority countries contributing ground troops to this operation. I think we owe wide deference to the President in matters of foreign affairs, but when it comes to declaring war, our Founding Fathers reserved that power for the people through their representatives in Congress.

This amendment to a budget resolution, which would enter us into this war in a formal manner, makes a mockery of that and does not do justice to the servicemembers who will be asked to put their lives on the line for this U.S. policy.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The terrorist Islamic State, or IS, is a grave threat to our friends and allies in the Middle East and to our homeland. There is broad bipartisan agreement that this threat must be confronted and destroyed.

It is important for the President to work with Congress to address this terrorist threat. The President should continue airstrikes and support Kurdish and Iraqi forces in their fight.

The amendment under consideration will expand the President's authority to conduct military operations in the Middle East through the training and arming of allegedly moderate Syrian rebels.

I have serious reservations about this amendment. There is simply not enough information about these rebels. Indeed, not even 2 weeks ago, the President admitted he did not even have a strategy to confront IS. I am looking to the administration to provide additional information about the rebels it is proposing to train and arm.

Several administration officials have stated that the rebels may be fighting both the Assad regime and IS. But against whom will the rebels first turn their weapons we give them? IS or the Assad regime?

I also have very serious reservations about including this expanded military authorization in the continuing resolution, a short-term funding bill. This authorization raises very serious issues.

Make no mistake. It will ultimately involve United States servicemembers,

men and women from our cities, towns, and countryside, who will leave their families behind at home. Such a measure deserves consideration in a completely separate resolution.

The President should never have asked for such a serious matter to be added to a short-term spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the care that has gone into the preparation of the amendment before us.

I have perhaps more reason to be involved than most Members because my district, the Nation's Capital, is a perpetual high-level target for terrorists like ISIL.

Today I am compelled to come to the floor to convey the indignation of the residents of the District of Columbia that the Congress would even approach another period of war where participation of residents of the District of Columbia is virtually inevitable while they have no vote whatsoever on this preeminent matter of war and peace.

District residents pay \$12,000 annually, per capita, more in Federal taxes than residents of any other State, to support our government in war and peace. Regardless of what is decided on this amendment, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America as they have been during every war our country has fought.

The Nation, however, should not ask D.C. residents to fight another war without consent of the governed who participate with taxes and live in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, we will be debating an amendment which would not guard our Nation from terrorist infiltration nor even authorize our Armed Forces to eliminate ISIS personnel, equipment, and bases. Instead, the amendment authorizes President Obama to train and equip, with U.S. weaponry, members of the Syrian mujahideen, the so-called moderate rebels.

The amendment states that training and equipment can only be provided to "vetted" rebels, but who are those rebels? It says they can't be affiliated with ISIS, al-Nusra, and al Qaeda, which is good, but it would allow President Obama to arm other Islamist fighters who do not meet the threshold of being terrorists, including Harakat al Hazm fighters from the Muslim Brotherhood, the Syria Revolutionaries Front, and the Army of the Mujahideen.

Now, Mujahideen fighters in Syria are not moderates nor are they pro-

American. They will take our arms and use them as they see fit, most likely to fight Assad in pursuit of installing a Sunni shari'a state in Syria. They cannot be counted on to vindicate our interests, which is why it is a mistake to subcontract our American national security to Islamist fighters.

Half measures like this, will not suffice. There are no shortcuts when it comes to our national defense.

So I constantly hear people say that Americans are war weary, and I disagree with that. I think Americans are willing to do what it takes to defend our people and our Nation. I think they are weary of missions launched without a coherent strategy and are sick of seeing engagements that produce inconclusive results rather than clear-cut victory. I think they are weary of a President that consistently proves himself unwilling to do what is necessary to win.

I have heard some colleagues say that arming the Syrian Mujahideen demonstrates strength and resolve. I think it is evidence of a lack of resolve. The President's strategy rests on wishful thinking. It is not sufficient to defeat the Islamic State.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know the scourge of violent Islamic terrorism all too well. I represent the World Trade Center area in New York that was attacked on September 11, 2001. So I agree with the President that we must work together to combat ISIL.

Today, however, ISIL cannot project military power beyond the Middle East. ISIL is a direct military threat to our allies and to our interests in the Middle East. Perhaps we should help bolster the defenses of our allies, such as Jordan, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and the Emirates.

The current threat to the United States is from Europeans and Americans who may train with ISIL in the Middle East and then return to the United States to do us harm. This threat cannot be fought by military means in Iraq and Syria but by counterintelligence, appropriate surveillance, and border control here and abroad.

When it comes to ISIL operations in the Middle East, those very same operations that threaten our allies, we must ask why we do not see these threatened countries offering troops on the ground. Why are we more interested in their defense than they are?

These are some of the questions we in Congress should debate before we vote to go to war. Make no mistake; the offensive campaign of air attacks against ISIL that President Obama recently announced clearly constitutes a war within the meaning of the Constitution.

The Constitution very deliberately places the decision to go to war with the American people acting through Congress, not with the President. The decision to go to war against ISIL and to expand our efforts into countries like Syria requires congressional authorization.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force of 2001 cannot be relied upon for congressional authority for acts of war in circumstances completely unforeseen then against an enemy that did not exist then. Identification of ISIL with al Qaeda with the planning of the attacks on September 11, 2001, is specious. The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 was, similarly, not about ISIL.

Congress must assert its constitutional power to authorize or reject the use of force in Iraq and Syria. We are not being asked today to authorize a new conflict with ISIL, even if that is implied by our vote today, and therein lies the danger. This vote without a vote on the wider Authorization for Use of Military Force will be taken by the public, the media, and perhaps even the courts as a de facto authorization of military force in Syria. This would undermine our ability to seriously debate the very real questions before us.

How deadly is the threat we are facing, and what is the best way to eliminate that threat?

What will happen when American fighters are shot down over Syria and perhaps beheaded on television by ISIL? Will the demand for revenge be overwhelming?

Just how steep is the slippery slope we are embarking upon?

How long will the conflict last?

Is there an exit strategy?

What does victory look like?

How much will it cost?

How many U.S. lives will be lost?

Whom will we be arming in Syria?

Do they share our long-term interests?

What are the odds those arms will be turned against us or allies?

It is precisely these types of questions that should be asked when Congress debates the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Until we have that debate in Congress and answer these questions and make a decision on an AUMF, we should not step foot on the slippery slope to another long war. Approving this amendment would be a big step onto that slippery slope, and so I must vote "no."

□ 1600

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for working so hard with the Armed Services Committee

through Chairman McKEON to bring forth this amendment that ultimately lets the President start a process that he laid out in his speech last week.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of ISIS is real and growing. It is not just limited to the Middle East, though. Americans know this is ultimately something that we will have to confront if we don't address it now with swift action.

If you look at the legislation that has been brought forward, there were some important protections that were put in place over the course of the last few days in negotiations with the White House that, I think, are very significant and lay out clear benchmarks for President Obama over these next 3 months that this authorization would last.

The first thing the President has got to do under this authorization is to go and build that coalition. This is not a go-it-alone strategy. That is not going to be the kind of strategy that is going to work. The President has got to go and put those countries together to carry this out. He has got to get firm commitments, not only on amounts of resources that will be put in place, but also the number of troops that those countries would put in place.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, any transfers of funds that would be needed to carry this out would have to first come back to Congress before they can move forward. Any plan for vetting Syrians who we would train, which is going to be an incredibly important process, has to come back to Congress, and those plans have to be laid out.

I think that is so important that those protections are in place because, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the President is the Commander in Chief. He has asked for this authorization. But there has got to be a give and take and, ultimately, a role that Congress plays where the President is letting us know each step of the way that he is carrying out the mission as he laid it out, he is building that coalition that he said he would put together. And over these next 3 months, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be important that he does those tasks.

And ultimately, as we come back here to deal with this again, it is going to be important that the President lay out the broader strategy, because so many of our Members know this is not the final step that is going to eliminate the threat of Islamic terrorism. This is the very beginning. I think not only Members here in this body—Republican and Democrat alike—but I think people all across the country want to, ultimately, see that broader strategy by the President for how he is going to take on this challenge and eliminate these terrorists from the face of the Earth.

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is to train and equip Syrian rebels. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past when America has trained and equipped individuals.

The United States has spent billions of dollars in Iraq to train and equip Iraqi soldiers. The first time they came in contact with the ISIS members, they cut and ran.

This is ISIS propaganda that was on the Internet.

This is an American tank now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

This is a Humvee going through a parade; also, four Humvees that, apparently, have never been used that are now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

Now we want to arm Syrian rebels to keep them fighting for America. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past.

In September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot, taking small arms and ammunition provided by the CIA.

In December 2013, Free Syrian Army weapons warehoused on the Syrian-Turkey border were seized by the Islamic Front. They, like the Iraqis, cannot keep up with American arms.

Second, some say in this amendment we will support the Free Syrian Army because they are going to be examined and we will make sure that they are vetted very well. But let us understand and see how that is working out.

What is a Free Syrian Army rebel today is an ISIS member tomorrow. It looks like, in December of 2013, Saddam al-Jamal, the northeast commander of the Free Syrian Army, announced his defection to ISIS and condemned those who worked with the West.

A Washington Post article, August 18: A high-level security commander of ISIS said that there is no more Free Syrian Army in eastern Syria because they have all joined—yes—ISIS. Isn't that lovely?

It is not a good strategic plan to arm Syrian rebels. If ISIS is a national security threat, then relying on rebels in a Syrian civil war will not protect American security interests.

The United States should have a strategy to defeat the barbarians of ISIS, but we should have that debate on this House floor and not rely on mercenaries to fight American national security interests somewhere overseas.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I join many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in support of giving the President the initial authority needed to confront ISIS and Syria.

I am actually surprised and disheartened by the opposition that some here in this Chamber have towards the amendment. To be clear, I have been as vocal a critic of this administration's lack of strategy in Syria as any other person. But that does not excuse us from what, I believe, is the right thing to do, which is to give the Commander in Chief the tools necessary to confront this evil.

I don't remember many of my colleagues from this body stepping forward a year ago, or even a few months ago, urging the President to do more in Syria. In fact, at the beginning of this year, I called for bombing ISIS targets as they moved into Fallujah and Iraq. By many I was called a warmonger or somebody eager to start another war in Iraq.

It is easy to come up with any excuse not to support an amendment. Some say it doesn't go far enough. I have heard from a lot of people here that say it doesn't go far enough. Some people say that it goes too far, it is too much. It doesn't include an authorization of military force, it doesn't include an overarching strategy for ISIS or Syria.

I reject those calls for a perfect strategy from a perfect President for a perfect outcome in Syria. That is simply not possible given the circumstances we now face, due to our previous inaction.

Mr. Speaker, to those who believe that the Assad regime is a partner in the fight against ISIS, I would remind them this regime has slaughtered nearly 200,000 of its own people. In fact, in Iraq, when we were fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, the Assad regime gave AQI safe haven in Syria to fight American forces. And look no further than Hezbollah—one of the greatest enemies of the West and one of the greatest enemies of Israel is strongly supported and enabled by the Assad regime. The Assad regime created the ISIS problem, gave them safe passage through regime-controlled territory and, ultimately, attacked only Free Syrian Army targets until the West looked over, and now they look like the savior of the West by attacking only ISIS. Let's not get sucked into that argument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I support this amendment, not because it is part

of a larger strategy in Syria that we would like to see from this administration but because it is a first step in addressing ISIS in Syria.

I ask my colleagues to support this first step that many have been calling for to train the FSA before it is too late. What would our enemies and allies think if we rejected the President's authority to do this?

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SMITH. I appreciate your leadership and your courtesy.

In Iraq and Syria, we are facing an excruciating set of circumstances where there is no clear path forward.

Our challenge in the face of the atrocities perpetrated by ISIS is to reduce the suffering of innocent citizens and our allies, and to protect our security at home.

To do nothing is an option, but it is likely the worst choice.

If ISIS were only a potential threat, I would feel differently. However, ISIS is a well-funded, heavily-armed militia whose strength is increasing and whose ranks have swollen to over 30,000 and counting by some estimates. They control an ever-expanding area across Iraq and Syria's border.

To stand by, allowing ISIS to expand and strengthen its hold in Iraq and Syria, we will encourage accelerated deterioration of the security in the region that will become more difficult to address and will, ultimately, become a threat to the United States.

We must also confront those in the region who say they oppose ISIS but have yet to take action. Those regional players have an even greater stake in this struggle than the United States.

I think the "least bad" option is the McKeon amendment, which does not provide for an authorization for the use of military force.

I didn't support wars in Iraq or the later surge in Afghanistan, and I certainly would not support legislation that would expose us to another open-ended broad commitment.

This proposal strictly limits the use of United States ground forces in the region and would prevent an open-ended engagement in Iraq or Syria because the authority provided in this legislation sunsets December 11.

Any airstrikes or aid would come at no additional cost to our country, which has already spent hundreds of billions of dollars on war in the region, and requires the Department of Defense to reprogram existing funds or find regional allies to pay for our efforts.

This proposal to empower the President for 3 months is the most reasonable course of action at this point. It is

not going to settle the long-simmering collection of conflicts in the region. Authorizing the President to train and equip highly vetted Syrian opposition fighters and strike a narrow set of ISIS targets, however, may degrade ISIS in a meaningful way.

These 3 months will give the administration an opportunity to show the progress and enlist support of other countries. Congress will then reassess these efforts in December.

In the meantime, we are not undercutting the diplomatic and military efforts of the administration. Helping the administration respond, allowing the situation to clarify, making some progress, and galvanizing support are the most we can hope for over the course of the next 3 months.

I remain open to alternatives, but after listening carefully to the debate, briefings from experts, and reviewing the materials, I see no better course at this point than the limited short-term initiative this amendment provides.

I plan on supporting the amendment and I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

The President spoke last week and he presented nothing that could be remotely considered a strategy, and yet, the American people understand the destruction of radical Islamic terrorism is mandatory. It is not mandatory for creation of democracy around the world, it is mandatory for keeping people safe in places like Omaha and Denver and Wichita, Kansas, the place that I represent.

Today, the world is watching what we will do here, what Congress will do. There are folks watching this in bunkers, there are people from Hamas watching how we will vote today. They are looking at how this Congress will respond to a President who has not laid out a strategy, who has now asked us to provide one arrow in the quiver, one small piece that doesn't amount to hardly anything remotely close to a strategy. They are looking to watch and see how we will respond.

And, today, we should respond by telling the President of the United States we will support his efforts to train and equip, but that we are going to watch and demand that he develop a strategy for the destruction of ISIL and for containment in the region as well.

Remember, it is not just ISIL that is the threat. The threat extends from Damascus to Tehran, it threatens Lebanon and Jordan, it threatens all the Middle East, and, indeed, if that territory is allowed to remain inflamed, will threaten us here in the United States.

Today, we take a very small action, a measured action, one that is necessary but hardly sufficient.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment, and I urge the President of the United States to take action in a way that will defeat ISIL and defeat radical Islam and keep us all safe here in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is not a perfect plan. What America wants is a plan that guarantees success, and that success should be total destruction of ISIS immediately and without U.S. casualties. But the plan is a reasonable approach. It is the only approach on this floor. The alternative is to do nothing. No one has brought a better plan to this floor.

□ 1615

For those who say, "Let's do nothing," reflect what we have accomplished through the President's action. The Yazidis have been saved from genocide. The Turkmen who otherwise would have been slaughtered in the many thousands are no longer besieged. The Mosul and Haditha dams are no longer under the control of ISIS. None of that would be true if the President had already not begun to take action.

I now yield to the gentleman from California for a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, all the authority provided in this amendment will expire no later than December 11, 2014. Is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEON. Or the passage of the NDAA, whichever comes first.

Mr. SHERMAN. Whichever comes first. So it could even be sooner than December 11.

Second, the administration has stated that it will use this authority to train Syrian fighters outside Syria. I have a fact sheet, which I will enter into the RECORD, provided by the administration, stating that the training will take place outside Syria and that the Saudis have agreed to host facilities.

Mr. Chairman, can you confirm that it is, indeed, the administration's plan to do the training outside Syria?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it your understanding that the training bases will be outside Syria?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Attached, please find a fact sheet on the Title X program, as well as a Q&A your boss

may mind helpful. I stand by ready to answer any questions.

—Robert

ROBERT N. MARCUS,
Special Assistant to the President, White
House Office of Legislative Affairs.

IMPORTANCE OF TITLE 10 TRAIN AND EQUIP IN DEGRADING & DESTROYING ISIL

The President has outlined a comprehensive approach to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL. Part of this approach involves building an international coalition and working with and supporting local partners.

The Syrian opposition can serve as an effective, local counterweight to extremist elements in Syria, particularly ISIL. That is why we have provided a variety of types of support to strengthen the Syrian opposition since the conflict began in 2012.

In his speech at West Point in May, the President announced his intention to seek Congressional approval of a Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund that would allow us to empower and enable partners in their fight against shared terrorist threats. As part of this Fund, and as described in his Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request in June, the President requested authority for a Department of Defense (DOD)-led program to train and equip (T&E) vetted members of Syria's moderate opposition.

The T&E program can advance our counter-ISIL goals in Syria as well as our goal to work towards a political solution to the broader crisis in Syria. But ISIL's aggression in the region, paired with Saudi Arabia's new willingness to assist with this effort and impending expansion of our air campaign against ISIL, means that we must expedite the program's implementation. As ISIL is degraded and destroyed, a ground force capable of holding territory and taking advantage of gains is needed. The Syrian opposition can serve this critical role.

The T&E program will train vetted fighters, outside of Syria, to defend the Syrian people against extremists like ISIL as well as regime attacks; stabilize areas under opposition control; and help a subset of the trainees to go on the offensive against ISIL. Ultimately, the opposition will be able to hold territory from which ISIL is removed and help provide for a negotiated end to the broader conflict in Syria. We would provide lethal and non-lethal assistance to enable trainees to accomplish their missions and advance U.S. policy goals.

Initially, the program will rely on other U.S. government agencies and partner-nations that currently provide support to the vetted opposition to assist with the recruiting, vetting, and sustainment of the U.S.-trained fighters. Saudi Arabia has agreed to host and support the training facilities. Additional allies are expected to contribute to the effort in the future, as well.

Q&A ON SYRIA T&E

1) Question: We spent billions training the Iraqi Security Forces who melted away the moment they faced ISIL, why would this force be any different?

Answer: Unfortunately, since the departure of the United States, years of leadership from former Prime Minister Maliki turned a competent force into a sectarian one, removing qualified leaders and severing normal lines of authority and communication, while alienating the broader Sunni community. The new inclusive government is committed to reforming Iraq's security forces and building a National Guard responsive to the needs

of individuals communities. Syrian Opposition fighters are highly motivated to defend their homes and families from ISIL. What the opposition lacks is the resources to successfully resist and counter ISIL. That is precisely what we will work with our regional partners to give them. And, as a comprehensive approach and use of air power starts to change the momentum away from ISIL, the opposition will gain in confidence.

2) Question: How does the Syria T&E program fit into the Administration's strategy to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL?

Answer: Building partner capacity—both the capacity of Iraqi partners and vetted opposition partners in Syria—is a key to denying ISIL safe haven, limiting its access to recruits, to include foreign fighters, and disrupting the group's finances. A multi-mission force will be trained to defend opposition-controlled areas from ISIL advances and enable the opposition to challenge ISIL's control of territory in Syria. Bolstering the vetted opposition also will increase their credibility and influence within Syria and pull potential recruits away from extremist groups.

3) Question: How can you ensure that Syrian fighters trained and equipped by DOD will not pass U.S.-provided weapons to extremists?

Answer: All participants in the T&E program will be subject to a rigorous vetting process led by our Intelligence Community, consistent with U.S. law and policy, including to ensure that they are not affiliated with extremist groups. They will undergo vetting to determine their eligibility for the program as well as after they have completed training to ensure that they will be eligible for additional U.S. assistance. We also will work closely with regional partners, including the Saudis, on our vetting process in order to capitalize on their knowledge of dynamics among the armed opposition. While we cannot guarantee that U.S. assistance will never fall into the wrong hands, we will take extensive measures to reduce the possibility that our trainees will pass weapons to extremists.

4) Question: How does the counter-ISIL strategy relate to the Administration's other goal of pressuring the Assad regime?

Answer: The T&E program is one component of our counter-ISIL strategy, but our investment in this force is not just for a counter-extremist role. As the President has said, Assad has lost all legitimacy, and Syria will not witness lasting stability so long as he is in power. Assad continues to present a false choice between radical Sunni extremists and his regime, but we know that there is a Syrian opposition. Strengthening the opposition provides the best counterweight to extremist elements within Syria as well as to the Assad regime.

5) Question: Why is the T&E program so urgent now?

Answer: Saudi Arabia has recently agreed to host and support the training facilities for this program. Their active support is a critical element of a broad coalition of countries combatting ISIL. Other Sunni countries are also getting on board. If they see us hesitate, they may back away and we will lose the momentum we are building against ISIL. In order to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL, we need the authority to increase our efforts to strengthen the Syrian opposition.

6) Question: What is the timeline for the program? How soon will trained fighters return to the battlefield?

Answer: This is a long-term investment, and one that will require some time on the

front end for infrastructure development, planning, and logistics. We anticipate that initial trainees could complete training roughly four to six months after authorization and funding. We will work to expedite this timeline.

7) Question: Given the immediate threat posed by ISIL, shouldn't we have the T&E program focus entirely on ISIL?

Answer: The Syrian opposition continues to face threats from ISIL and the regime, which is why we must train them to be able to defend themselves against both enemies.

8) Question: Has ISIL negotiated a ceasefire with any element of the Syrian opposition?

Answer: We are looking into these claims as well as reports suggesting that one local brigade in Hajar al-Aswad may have reached a 24-hour agreement with ISIL that quickly broke down but that was intended to allow both sides to retrieve the bodies of their fighters who had been killed.

We would note that the Syrian Revolutionaries Front (SRF)—which is the group that the article claims has signed a ceasefire with ISIL—has issued a statement indicating that it has never ceased hostilities with ISIL and will continue to fight ISIL and the regime.

We will be thoroughly vetting any potential recipient of US assistance and, of course, any collusion with ISIL would be automatically disqualifying. Trainees will undergo additional vetting once they return to the battlefield. This vetting process will involve multiple US agencies and regional partners, and we have been using it to determine recipients of our non-lethal support to the Syrian opposition since early in the conflict. The training process will include the need to adhere to the law of armed conflict and respect for human rights.

A critical reason for our training and equipping the vetted, opposition is precisely to ensure they are capable of standing up to and countering ISIL at the local level. We are certain a vast majority of the Syrian opposition rejects ISIL, have been fighting it, and will be even more successful with our increased support. Again, we will only work with those opposition groups and members who reject ISIL and we are confident in our rigorous, layered vetting operation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The threat of ISIL is beyond anything in the last 13 years since the horror of 9/11. We see there are no limits to gross brutality. They are a terrorist threat to the region, to the United States, and to our allies.

This rushed amendment to arm and train vetted Syrian rebels is not the answer. This Chamber needs to have an informed, robust discussion and debate about the U.S. role in combating and dealing with ISIL and other extremists in Syria and Iraq.

It is a debate that should take place on its own. This issue and this amendment should not be attached to the continuing resolution or any other matter before the House.

This amendment authorizes the training and equipping of vetted Syrian

opposition forces, but we still aren't clear on who these forces are and how these rebel groups will be chosen and vetted. How do we ensure that our weapons, training, and knowledge won't be used by ISIL or other terrorist organizations in the future?

Additionally, this amendment only highlights a piece of the President's plan for addressing ISIL, a plan that includes significant long-term bombing campaigns and military escalation in Iraq and Syria.

If the House leaves for the next 8 weeks without addressing the already expanding scope of U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria, I fear that we will return in November to find the U.S. sliding down a slippery slope toward full military engagement in those countries.

We have been there before. We have seen before how mission creep can expand a limited mission into a full-blown U.S. armed response. I will not let this happen or let this country be dragged into another conflict once again without an informed discussion.

Congress needs to debate a new authorization for the use of military force before any expansion of military operations. I support the President's call to dismantle ISIL through robust regional and international partnerships, support for local capacities on the ground, and expanded humanitarian assistance.

Arming and training Syrians and Iraqis and perhaps eventually supporting them with airstrikes may push back ISIL's gains, but it will not defeat extremism. There is no lasting military solution to extremism. The only lasting solution is a political solution, one in which the rights and concerns of all groups are respected.

The U.S. must focus on building partnerships in the region and around the world to encourage moderate Sunni groups in Iraq and Syria to move away from ISIL and towards an alternative and inclusive future. We also need to have a plan for the development of this region beyond our confrontation with ISIL.

I have deep reservations and important lingering questions that need to be debated on this floor. I am concerned about exposing our soldiers once again to a protracted conflict with unclear objectives and no clear exit strategy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HONDA. I cannot support this rushed amendment that allows the U.S. to wade back into another conflict without a serious, informed discussion of the United States' military role in combating ISIL. We need to fully debate and discuss actions we as a Nation take against this vicious foe.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, ISIS poses a savage threat to the world, to Muslims and Christians in Iraq and Syria, to our allies, and to the United States. It has executed heinous acts of terror and violence and, tragically, will continue to do so. Allowing it to thrive unchallenged is not in the national interest of the United States of America.

Today's vote is not a blanket authority but a thoughtful, detailed, and limited effort to confront ISIS. We cannot and should not do this alone. We need tangible support from a global coalition and will evaluate the commitment level in 3 months. The administration must continue to work to ensure that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other Islamic nations are involved in this multinational effort.

Despite reservations and questions, in my judgment, we must take action. The threat is real, and ISIS must be confronted now. I support the McKeon amendment because it is thoughtful and it provides the experts here in Washington the authority they need to put together a clearly-defined, realistic strategy.

This amendment does not authorize the use of military force; indeed, the amendment includes language that makes it explicitly clear that this is a train-and-equip authority and not an authorization for force.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment, and, in the weeks and months to come, the House of Representatives must use its oversight powers under the Constitution to monitor this strategy and to demand changes as necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, we do have additional speakers.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment and in support of the continuing resolution.

I want to say this: I have heard a lot of people say this process isn't good and that we haven't had enough hours of debate, but I would say to Members of Congress: Have we not, in fact, had days and weeks of debate? How is it that you are a Member of Congress if you haven't thought about ISIS and the situation?

In fact, have we not had 13 years to debate this very subject internally, externally, on the floor, in committee,

and off the floor? We certainly have had a lot of time for deliberation on this.

Secondly, I want to say this: I am not certain that the President needs further approval from Congress, as I have gone back and read the resolutions of 2001 and 2002. I would also say, though, we should have a formal resolution. It would be good for the country, it is good for Congress, it is good for the education process, and it sends a very strong signal to our enemies.

Perhaps when the President sends it to us—and I hope he will in November or December—we will have an opportunity to have the debate again, and we can review how effective these airstrikes have been at that time, how effective is the training program, how well is it going, and what allies have actually stepped up and what have they contributed. Right now, we do not have the answer to those questions.

I will say another thing, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to fight this war because it is worth fighting, then it is well worth winning, and, speaking for myself, I want the Commander in Chief and our armed services to have all the tools that are available to them.

If that means having ground troops on the table, then I want to be sure that we send that signal because the last thing we need to do right now to our enemies abroad is say we are not going to do this or we are not going to do that.

We can't have a half-pregnant war. We have got to fight to win and wipe out this terrorist surge.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of 6 hours of debate on this amendment, I think it has been a good and healthy discussion. According to our count, we have had more than 90 Members of the House come to the floor and express their opinion about this situation with ISIL and Syria and Iraq.

I think part of that is it has given all Members an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns and hopes about what we can do as a country going forward, but it seems to me, through the course of these numbers of hours, that most Members agree on at least three things.

One of the things that most everybody agrees on is that ISIL is a significant threat. It seems to me they are clearly the best-equipped, best-trained, best-financed terrorist organization we have ever faced.

In addition to that, as the ranking member noted at the beginning of the debate, there are thousands of people who have Western passports who are fighting with ISIS who can easily come to the United States and Europe to launch their attacks.

The second thing I think most people agree upon is that this is a very complex situation. We have the Syrian civil war underway. You have the change of government in Iraq. You have the situation with the Kurds.

There are many players—Iran—that make this a very complex situation. All of those Members who go down and say there is no good alternative, I think I agree with that. There is no perfect alternative to deal with this.

The third thing about which there is a lot of agreement, Mr. Speaker, is there are a lot of doubts about the President's plan, a lot of doubts about whether it is going to be enough to defeat ISIL, a lot of doubts about the commitment of the administration to follow through on the plan and to persevere over time; but, in addition to that, even if it is well-done and implemented perfectly over time, no one knows for sure how this is going to come out.

With those broadly agreed-upon facts, Members have reached different judgments and different conclusions, but it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that approving this amendment to give the military—the Department of Defense—the authority to train people in Syria as part of that fight makes sense.

Just to briefly review what is in the amendment—because during these 6 hours of debate there has been a lot of discussion, some of it about things that are not in the amendment—but what is in the amendment is that the amendment authorizes the Department of Defense to train folks in Syria as part of the fight against ISIL, and it is absolutely true that the Department of Defense has done this very thing in at least 40 countries.

Now, for all those people who say this is a slippery slope to war, I just note we are not in war in 40 countries. We train people around the world every day, and the military does a very competent job of it. That is what this authority does—that is it—train folks to defend themselves.

□ 1630

This amendment has an expiration date, as you just heard, either December 11, 2014, or the passage of the NDAA, whichever happens first.

There is a broad array of oversight, beginning 15 days before anything is done, and then every 90 days thereafter specific requirements of information that has to come to this Congress.

There are limits on the funding. If U.S. taxpayer dollars are used, then the Congress has to be notified and basically, through the transfer authorities, Congress has to approve.

Finally, it is absolutely clear, because it says so, this is not an authorization to use military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

All of those people who are concerned that it is not an Authorization for Use of Military Force may have a very good point, but that is not what this is about. This is about a narrow train-and-equip authority that would provide the Syrians the ability to get into that fight against ISIL.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that I think another thing most everybody agrees upon is you can't defeat this group from the air. You have to have folks on the ground. We have folks on the ground with the Kurds. We have folks on the ground who will be more competent with the Iraqis. We need some folks in Syria to be on the ground.

That is what this amendment does. It is narrow. It has oversight. It has limits. It has a time limit. But as General Dempsey told all Members, it is necessary, but, in and of itself, it is not enough. But it is necessary.

I believe that the House ought to take this step today to begin this training, and then it is up to the President to make his strategy work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think one of the things that makes this difficult is there are so many issues swirling around here: the desire; the need that I think, as Mr. THORNBERRY said, that everyone agrees on to confront and contain ISIS.

Their savagery is just unimaginable. They are clearly a threat to us and to the region, and we need a plan for confronting them, for stopping them and, hopefully, ultimately defeating them.

Now, part of that plan is what we are doing in Iraq. Part of that plan is trying to figure out how to deal with them in Syria.

But aside from all of that, this amendment is far more basic and simple, and I think Mr. THORNBERRY explained it. It is a train-and-equip mission. This is something that the Department of Defense does all over the world in a variety of different places. We have had a great deal of success training armies in Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda to help deal with the situation in Somalia. We have had considerable success training forces in Yemen to help confront AQAP. The goal of this is to reduce the requirement for a robust U.S. military presence to advance our interests.

I have heard a number of folks, particularly on my side of the aisle, express that concern, that we don't want to go down the slippery slope of committing U.S. forces to a large-scale war, and I completely agree with them. But this amendment does not authorize military force. In fact, it is quite the opposite. It authorizes us to train local forces so that they can do the fighting.

I have also heard a number of people express the frustration which I share:

we shouldn't be over there fighting these battles; we need the local populations there to stand up and fight for themselves. But that is precisely what Mr. McKEON's amendment enables us to do. It enables the military to train local forces to fight ISIL on our behalf. And this is important, not just because it keeps us out of the fight, but because it gives us a far greater chance of being successful.

If this is perceived as the U.S. coming in against the Muslim group, then that gives ISIS a powerful propaganda message to say that they are simply defending themselves against Western aggression. If, on the other hand, they continue to do what they have been doing, which is killing Muslims and fighting Muslims, then we can recruit and get greater support from the local Sunni population to stand up against them.

This is what was successful about the Anbar Awakening back during the Iraq war, when Sunni tribesmen rose up against al Qaeda, with our support, and were able to turn the tide in Iraq at that time. That is why this is so important.

Now, the big issue of concern is what is going to happen within Syria. Are there truly moderates?

There are, unquestionably, moderates in Syria. Now they have been under a lot of pressure for the last couple of years from the Assad regime, but also from al Qaeda-affiliated groups like al-Nusra and also from ISIL. So they are clearly there. We know this because they are already, in some instances, fighting against ISIL. They are just not properly trained. They are not properly equipped, and they haven't been doing particularly well for the last couple of years. So if we can train them, they have a chance to survive.

And that is the last point that I will make. I think people can legitimately say: Is this really going to turn the tide of the war? Is this really going to defeat ISIL and give us success? This alone, absolutely not. But what it does is it gives us a chance, because if ISIL is allowed free rein in Syria, if they are not confronted by anybody but Assad, then we have no chance of defeating them.

We can do our best in Iraq, but if they can just go right across the border into Syria, as we have experienced trying to fight the Taliban in Afghanistan as they go across the border into Pakistan, if they have a safe haven where they can go without being pressured, then it is going to be very, very difficult to ever defeat them. The only way we can take away that safe haven is to find a local force that will fight our fight, and we can't get there if we don't train them.

This is about enabling the moderates in Syria enough space to survive. They survive, we slowly build from there to

get us the force that we need to defeat them in Syria and, ultimately, beat back ISIL in both Syria and Iraq.

This is not a perfect plan. This is not going to solve all problems. Believe me, it wouldn't take too long to find difficulties and challenges in any plan that was put out there, but I think this is a good and prudent step that gives us the best chance of advancing U.S. national security interests in a reasonable way.

I urge this body to support this amendment. I thank Mr. McKEON for bringing it.

I also want to join Mr. THORNBERRY. This has been an excellent debate. It is great to have so many Members come down and so articulately explain their positions. I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank ADAM SMITH, my ranking member and partner for the last few years in this effort. I think he was very eloquent. He did a good job in working this debate. I think we have heard from both sides of the aisle, both positions, and it has been a strong debate.

I want to thank Mr. THORNBERRY. He has been my vice chairman, sidekick, for the last couple of years, carried a heavy load. He is a vice chairman of the committee, but he is also chairman of a subcommittee and also serves on the Intelligence Committee and a strong, strong Member, as you can see. He did a great job of explaining the bill, laying it all out in summary form after this long debate.

There is just one other point I want to mention, and that is that there is no new money in this bill. The President did not need additional money, and any money that is needed will be reprogrammed from money that already exists. They have to come back to the Congress and go through the process to make that change. But there will be nothing added to the top line.

I want to thank our staff who worked so hard on this. This came late in the process. The President sent us language last week. It wasn't something that we could support.

I want to thank leadership for giving us the time to work this issue, that, instead of voting on it last Thursday, we had time to work. The staff worked all weekend, both sides of the aisle. Thank you. Thank you for your strong work.

We hear sometimes about government workers and they are kind of just at the government trough. I want to tell you, these people work hard, long hours, and they are devoted to their jobs. Most of them could leave here and make more money, but they are committed to what they are doing, and I want to thank them for it.

Finally, I would just like to say, as a final wrap-up, this letter that I put in

earlier, where Ambassador Crocker, Ambassador Ford, who have spent years in this area, really understand the people, understand what is going on in that area, and then General Keane, General Petraeus, who both have spent a lot of time on this issue, the four of them have signed a letter that they sent over to us this morning that they support this amendment.

I agree with, I think, probably everybody that spoke that this will not do everything, but it is an important step at this time, and I urge our colleagues to support this amendment to give our Commander in Chief the authority that he needs to protect us in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Obama that the destabilizing and destructive actions of ISIL demand an American response. While I am supportive of President Obama's targeted actions against ISIS to date, I believe our government must be mindful of the unintended consequences inherent in training and equipping fighters in a highly complex foreign conflict. For this reason, I authored a successful bipartisan amendment to the House's Defense Appropriations bill this summer, prohibiting the transfer of dangerous shoulder-fired antiaircraft missiles known as MANPADs to parties in the Syrian civil war. As President Obama uses any authority granted by Congress to train and equip Syrian rebels, I hope he honors the will of the House of Representatives to prevent the dissemination of these and other dangerous weapons in the Middle East and beyond.

We must remain cognizant that military force is not the solution to the strife afflicting Iraq and Syria. I continue to oppose the presence of U.S. ground troops in the region. We must do all we can to eliminate funding sources for ISIL and to support inclusive governance and vigorous dialogue while respecting Iraqi sovereignty. We must also do what we can to promote a peaceful settlement in Syria and to invest in employment-focused economic development throughout the region.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution of 2015 with the McKeon Amendment, which would allow for the training and equipment of Syrian opposition. Should a clean continuing resolution to provide funding to the United States government come to the floor, I would support it. However, I cannot support an authorization for war.

Since this body did not pass a budget on time, our only option is to vote to keep the government open and operating until December 11, 2014. Funding our government should not hinge on a controversial amendment added at the last minute that provides the opportunity for an open-ended war.

I am not in favor of unilateral action or troops deployed to the region and I am committed to resolving this conflict through diplomacy. I fully support any efforts by our country to provide humanitarian aid to the countless innocent civilians displaced and injured by this conflict.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and push for a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) is a growing regional threat that presents greater instability and turmoil across the Middle East. Today ISIL does not pose a credible strategic threat outside of the Middle East. So the U.S. response must reflect that reality. We cannot allow the Dick Cheneys of the world to use the horrific beheadings by ISIL as a call to war, just like the Gulf of Tonkin incident or the alleged weapons of mass destruction capabilities of Saddam Hussein. I am voting against this authorization to equip and train as yet unknown, perhaps non-existent "moderate" Syrian opposition forces to combat ISIL.

The three most successful ground forces fighting in Syria are ISIL who has ties with Saudi Arabia, the Syrian army backed by Iran, and Al Nusra which has ties to Hezbollah. The alliances between these forces are constantly shifting. One day ISIL and Nusra make common cause against the Syrian army and the other day they are all fighting each other. These sectarian wars are based on thousands of years of history and the U.S. has no role in sorting them out.

Congress is being asked to vote today on arming Syrian rebels that are yet to be vetted by the U.S. In fact, the text of this authorization requires the administration to report to Congress within 15 days on the plan for providing this assistance. Congress should know what the plan is before we vote on it. We should come back in 15 days or however long it takes for the administration to determine the scope and plan of this operation and who it is that the U.S. is going to arm in Syria. It is an abdication of our constitutional duties to vote on a vague authorization today instead of waiting and passing judgment on a more detailed assessment on this operation and an updated authorization for use of military force (AUMF).

If you turned to any of my colleagues today and asked the basic question who are the 5,000 fighters that the U.S. will train and equip in Syria, they could not give you an answer. Not even our intelligence agencies know who we can trust. Before granting authorization, Congress should at least know who it is we are giving U.S. weapons to and what their ideology and political goals are. This is a complex mess of various actors, many of whom cannot be considered trustworthy allies. The Syrian opposition is made up of hundreds of thousands of fighters from various factions that are also fighting amongst each other.

In Iraq, the U.S. is looking to form an alliance with a new government whose current Prime Minister has yet to prove he will bring Sunnis back to their proper place in an inclusive society. At the moment the Iraqi army barely exists on paper. It is extremely disturbing that the main Iraqi force currently fighting ISIL, Asaib Ahl al-haq, is incredibly hostile to the U.S. and was attacking our troops up to the last day of the U.S. occupation of Iraq.

That is why it is so critical that Congress be presented with a detailed plan of this "train and equip" operation including who it is that we are arming before we vote and this amendment fails to do that.

Most importantly what we are voting on today is a small part of President Obama's larger strategy to go to war with ISIL. No President can declare war without Congressional authorization. If the U.S. is going to war with ISIL as it appears that we are, then my colleagues need to stay here and debate and vote on an AUMF. It is our constitutional duty and to leave town without a vote on the overall military strategy is disgraceful. The American people did not elect us to punt the responsibility for matters of war and peace to the President. The purpose of an AUMF is to lay out in detail the scope, plan, purpose, and duration of a military operation and to provide both classified and non-classified briefings to Congress and allow them to debate and express their opinions on the merits of this. Absent an AUMF from Congress, we are committing ourselves to an open ended war, declared by the President about which we have little to no details.

Lastly, history has shown that U.S. involvement in sectarian as well as civil wars raging in the Middle East does not benefit our interests. ISIL would not exist today if it were not for the unnecessary U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, which I voted against. ISIL is a regional threat and it is time for Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Jordan, and other so-called "partners" to step up and fight this war themselves. They have no incentive to do it if we keep fighting it for them. Additionally, arming Syrian rebels could drag the U.S. into the Syrian civil war. General Martin Dempsey said yesterday in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee that he would put U.S. troops on the ground if he felt it was necessary despite the President's numerous statements that he would not put boots on the ground. Already you can hear the march to war. In fact, it is easy to argue that continued U.S. military actions in the Middle East only create more hatred directed at our nation and increase the risk of terrorism both here and abroad.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

There is not a member of this body who does not share the view that the terrorist organization known as the "Islamic State in the Levant" (ISIL) is a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria. ISIL's acts of barbarism are well known. The question before us is whether arming an amorphous and largely unknown Syrian opposition is the proper response to ISIL's rise.

The idea of arming the Syrian opposition has been discussed and even debated in this body over the last several years. And until now, Congress has rejected military involvement with Syrian opposition groups because we did not truly understand the size, composition, and intentions of the various opposition groups, and were concerned that the unforeseen consequences of our involvement could easily ruin any advantages there might be. The fact that ISIL emerged unexpectedly out of the Syrian fighting and surprised us with their military success in Iraq illustrates well America's lack of understanding of the situation. Furthermore, just this week, the head of the Free Syrian Army was quoted as saying if his group received U.S. aid, he would use it against the Assad regime, not against ISIL. As I have pondered this question and discussed

it with experts and with citizens in New Jersey, I have come away with more and more questions about the wisdom of the proposed action we are debating today.

The President's proposed strategy seems very similar to the one we have pursued in previous conflicts: arm and train local forces in the region and plan to turn over responsibility for the fight to those governments. That strategy failed spectacularly in Iraq. Earlier this year, U.S. trained-and-equipped Iraqi security forces melted away in the face of ISIL forces. We have been told the reason was because of the Iraqi government under former Prime Minister al Maliki. With a new Iraqi government in Baghdad results would be better. That is hardly a believable or a reassuring argument.

The American public was told the same thing years ago after the South Vietnamese generals ousted Premier Diem in late 1963. If only we had the right leadership in Saigon, they argued, we could win the war. In the wake of that U.S.-sponsored coup, the political chaos in South Vietnam only deepened, and the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies benefited from and exploited the situation to their political and military advantage, and less than a year after Diem's ouster President Johnson began committing large numbers of American ground troops to Vietnam in a vain effort to roll back the rising tide of support for the Viet Cong. Of course, the situation today in Syria and Iraq is not exactly like Vietnam under Diem or Iraq under Saddam, but we are slow to learn lessons.

Proponents of this resolution argue that a newly trained and equipped Iraqi security force may be in the field in a few months. If history is any guide, it is unlikely that schedule will be met, and in any case, Administration officials have made it clear they believe the Iraqi security forces will require significant external help for years in order to retake ISIS-controlled territory in Iraq.

In Syria, the Administration now proposes to arm an amorphous collection of Syrian opposition groups in the hopes that they can become a viable combat force. Arming Syrian rebels brings to mind our experience with the Afghan mujahedeen a generation ago. Can we have any confidence that our weapons will not be used against us eventually? The amendment before us explicitly acknowledges—through its reporting requirements—that American advisors may be killed by supposedly friendly Syrian opposition fighters, just as American advisors have been killed by Iraqi and Afghan turncoats in those nations. This amendment also recognizes—again through its reporting requirements—that American military aid may be diverted to Islamic militants through Syrian opposition traitors. If we can already see that this proposed action will lead to dead American advisors and pilfered American military aid, why are we continuing down this road?

It was telling that during his trip to the region earlier this month, Secretary of State Kerry came up empty when he sought concrete military commitments from other countries—even countries directly threatened by ISIL and its ideology. In the 1991 Persian Gulf war to oust Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait, each of those nations contributed significant military forces or allowed the use of their bases for Coalition forces. If the governments

most threatened by the march of ISIL refuse to commit combat forces against it while American pilots are risking their lives daily in airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq, why should we put more American lives at risk on the ground in Iraq and Syria? I must vote no.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment because I believe training and equipping moderate Syrian rebels to fight ISIL will increase the likelihood of success in our effort to rid the world of this threat.

We have seen that ISIL will ruthlessly slaughter anyone who does not adhere to their horrific ideology—including Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike. ISIL, with large numbers of Western fighters, is a threat not only to the Middle East but to Europe and America as well. We have seen their disgusting brutality with the beheadings of two brave American journalists, as well as others of diverse nationalities.

We must be clear about what this amendment is and what it isn't. It is not an authorization for the use of force against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. The Administration has stated that it believes it already has the authority to conduct a military campaign against ISIL, and they are proceeding pursuant to this authority. I would support a reexamination of the 2001 authorization by this Congress so we can fully debate its applicability to current threats. Thirteen years after its passage, it may be wise to refine it to empower the President to go after ISIL and other groups that pose a danger to America. This is our constitutional duty.

But this amendment is much more limited. It would simply authorize the training and equipping of Syrians to fight ISIL. Again, it does not authorize an American invasion of Iraq or Syria. If it did, I would not support it. In fact, I support this amendment precisely because I oppose an American ground war and believe we must eliminate the threat from ISIL without putting thousands of American troops in harm's way.

I oppose another American ground war not only because I believe that we have sacrificed enough already in two wars in the Middle East, although this is certainly my belief I oppose another American ground war primarily because for our campaign against ISIL to have sustained success, the combat troops driving out ISIL need to be Iraqi and Syrian, and in particular, they need to be Sunni. We actually defeated ISIL in their previous incarnation as Al Qaeda in Iraq. We were successful in doing so because we built political support among Iraqi Sunnis. Unfortunately, former Prime Minister Maliki's sectarianism alienated the Sunnis, and this, combined with Bashar al-Assad's brutality against Sunnis in Syria, allowed ISIL to emerge without really being challenged by the moderate majority of Sunnis, who saw them as the lesser of two evils.

Given this reality, the best way to eliminate the threat from ISIL is to empower moderate Sunnis in Iraq and Syria to drive them out of the areas they control. The development of a nonsectarian government in Iraq is a step in the right direction in that country, and this limited amendment is a step in the right direction in Syria. It cannot be the only step; we must continue to work with Sunni Arab countries so that the Sunnis of Iraq and Syria know that

there is a much better future for them than the destructive brutality of ISIL.

The fight against ISIL will not be short, and it will not be easy. This should not, and will not, be the last time this body addresses this international challenge. Today we are asked to take a reasoned, sensible step on the path to ridding the world of ISIL's scourge. It is a step that we would be wise to take.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I support the McKeon Amendment to the Continuing Resolution.

As a nation, we have faced many threats to our national security over the 238 years of our existence. But the danger presented by the Islamic State may be unique in its hostility, raw hatred, and dedication to eliminating the United States from existence.

Less than a week ago, we observed the anniversary of the devastating attacks of September 11, 2001. Then, as today, we are reminded of the true nature of this enemy. They will attack at will, without provocation, and without regard for the lives of any innocent people who stand in their way. In fact, the more innocent the lives they take, the better—for their purposes.

I am pleased that President Obama has finally acknowledged the threat the Islamic State presents to our national security. Not content with wreaking havoc in their own corner of the Middle East, these terrorists have conquered territory, beheaded innocent Americans, forged allegiances with al Qaeda, threatened to strike us at home, and pledged to raise their flag over the White House. They are a muscular and growing menace that must be dispatched.

After our briefings on the situation in the region and the President's proposed strategic outline, I will be supporting his efforts on behalf of the nation. But I do so with some reservations.

With what we know now, this is not a perfect plan by any means, and I trust the President will listen to the counsel of his military advisers. American military strength will be evident in powerful air strikes, but on the ground, we will be relying on a fighting force trained quickly by American personnel. These are not seasoned fighters. These are just regular people—doctors, pharmacists, plumbers, or laborers. They are not soldiers, although very shortly we will be asking them to be.

These rookie ground forces will be entering into what the President has called an anti-terrorism operation, which is, in reality, a war. The administration and its representatives have been reluctant to use that word, but when our enemies have declared war on this country, there is no other terminology that is appropriate. And it will be a two-front war—on one side they will be fighting in Syria, and on the other, in Iraq. This will not be an easy fight, and I pray that they meet with more success than their military qualifications and experience suggests they might.

Another issue that I find troubling is that we do not know exactly who we will be assisting. While we trust and depend on their courage and determination in defeating what we perceive to be our common enemy, we truly do not know what their core loyalties are. This is a situation that will require constant monitoring.

The international coalition the president says he is assembling will be key, as other countries will be called upon to fund much of the effort, and, we hope, ground troops. Though the president has pledged significant air strikes, I find it hard to believe that many nations will be convinced to enter into the conflict with full commitment, while our own president has made it clear that the United States has firmly defined limits on what it will and will not do. That is another concern that I have—that the President has broadcast to the world, and the enemy, exactly what will not be in his war plan.

In the end, the President is the Commander in Chief, though I believe it is right that Congress vote on matters as important as this. The bottom line for me, Mr. Speaker, is that today we are all Americans. We are not Republicans or Democrats.

Throughout our history, presidents from different political parties have come to Congress asking for our blessing for moving forward with armed conflict. With what I know now, and with the chance to continually examine this endeavor, I am prepared to give my consent.

That is why, despite my reservations and my concerns about the effectiveness of the somewhat vague strategy the president has outlined, I will be supporting the amendment to the Continuing Resolution. We must present a united front. It is vital that we show the world that all of us, as Americans, are together in fighting this common enemy.

Absolutely essential in gaining my support for the amendment is the requirement that the administration provide detailed and regular reports on the effectiveness and status of the ongoing training and equipping efforts. We must know that what we are doing is having the intended effect.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect plan. And I worry that moving forward in such a way can be described as somewhat less than a full effort to defeat an evil that has pledged to exterminate us.

But sitting by and doing nothing was never an option.

While we take this vote, I am reminded that even with the most careful planning, any armed conflict is inherently perilous for the men and women in our military. My thoughts and prayers go with them and their families as they head toward danger.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon Amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Defense Secretary Hagel stated, "We are at war with ISIL." He also said, "this will not be an easy or brief effort."

The current debate on the McKeon amendment does not address the "war with ISIL," but rather solely training, arming, and supporting Syrian fighters. The CIA is already training and arming Syrian fighters in Jordan, without congressional approval. How well has that worked? We are not discussing that as a body because this is a policy debate that has been rushed. The Republican majority in the House is determined to adjourn on Friday so their Members can return home and campaign for re-election.

Yes, Congress needs to pass a continuing resolution to keep the federal government funded and prevent another government shut-

down before the start of the new federal fiscal year on October 1st. But, a "must pass" continuing resolution should not be the legislative vehicle for sanctioning the training of Syrian fighters in what is certainly to be a long war against the Islamic State's terrorist army.

Over and over during the debate on this amendment we have heard how ISIL is a threat to the United States, expanding its reach into Iraq and strengthening its hold in Syria, while committing brutal and widespread acts of extreme violence. All Members agree that ISIL has grown into a vicious terrorist army that must be stopped and destroyed. Yet, this chamber's response is to vote on the McKeon amendment to train and arm Syrian fighters, and then leave town for seven weeks?

I have heard over and over again Republican colleagues condemning ISIL and then going on to disparage President Obama's efforts. Based on this rhetoric it appears that before this House can become fully engaged in authorizing a military campaign to defeat ISIL, campaigning against our President prior to Election Day comes first.

Yes, the mid-term election will take place on November 4th and many of us are on the ballot. But until then, we have an obligation to do our jobs which in this case is a matter of committing to U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria based on an authorization that is outdated and demands Congressional action.

I want President Obama to conduct airstrikes against ISIL—in Iraq and in Syria if need be. I want Iraqi forces trained and equipped so they are confident and competent to take the fight on the ground to remove ISIL from Iraq. I want a broad coalition of nations sharing intelligence, working to stop the flow of foreign recruits into Syria, and cutting off the financing of ISIL.

All of this should be done based on an updated authorization approved by this Congress for the use of military force against ISIL. I voted for the 2001 authorization following the attacks on September 11th and I opposed the 2002 authorization which took the U.S. into Iraq. But today more than half of the Members in this House were not in Congress for those votes. The war against ISIL is not the war against Saddam Hussein. This Congress has an obligation to define the scope, duration, and oversight of what will require a significant and long-term use of military force and resources.

With regard to the McKeon amendment, I have serious misgivings about training and arming some thousands of Syrian fighters with the belief that they will defeat ISIL while they are also intent on removing the Assad regime from power. The New York Times on September 11, 2014 ("U.S. Pins Hopes on Syrian Rebels With Loyalties All Over the Map") said the plan to train Syrian rebels "leaves the United States dependent on a diverse group riven by infighting, with no shared leadership and with hard-line Islamists as its most effective fighters." This description of the fighting force at the foundation of our anti-ISIL policy leaves me profoundly disturbed.

The Government of Germany is training and arming the Kurdish pesh merga forces in Iraq, but refused to train the Syrian forces. They are concerned that providing arms to the Syrian rebels could end up in the hands of ISIL.

According to Germany's ambassador to the United States, "We can't control the final destination of these arms."

Secretary Hagel is aware of this danger and assured Congress yesterday that, "We will monitor them (Syrian forces) closely to ensure that weapons do not fall into the hands of radical elements of the opposition, ISIL, the Syrian regime, or other extremist groups. There will always be risks in a program like this, but we believe the risks are justified." While I respect Secretary Hagel immensely, I must disagree with him. The risks in this instance are significant and outweigh the prospects of success.

The McKeon amendment's concept of vetting focuses solely on ensuring that recruits are not known terrorists themselves. That is hardly a standard of conduct the U.S. should be proud of. No one should be naïve about this, there is no mention of human rights or international standards of conduct because these recruits will be sent back to a war in which they will likely be committing barbarous acts of violence. And how is this in the interest of U.S. national security?

Another issue that profoundly concerns me is the porous border between Syria and Turkey in which foreign fighters and recruits are allowed to pass freely. A New York Times report on September 15, 2014 in an article entitled, "ISIS Draws a Steady Stream of Recruits From Turkey", highlights this serious problem.

ISIL has grown into a force of between 20,000 and 30,000 fighters according to published CIA estimates and it appears their numbers will continue to grow, far outpacing the modest numbers to be trained by agreeing to this amendment. Unless Turkey, our NATO ally, shuts off the flow of fighters and commits to preventing the stream of new recruits from crossing into Syria, ISIL will only grow stronger in numbers.

Yesterday, in testimony before a Senate committee, General Martin Dempsey said that if airstrikes were not effective against ISIL he would recommend to the President the deployment of U.S. troops on the ground. Now, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Dempsey has an obligation to make recommendations that will allow U.S. policy goals to be achieved. In this case that means the destruction of ISIL.

We should all expect that there will be some U.S. boots on the ground in Iraq and quite possibly Syria. Special operations forces, military trainers, and spotters to direct air strikes may all be required to enter the battle field at great risk. They need our support to achieve their missions. But a full commitment of U.S. troops on the ground to directly engage ISIL is unacceptable. This fight needs to be won on the ground by Iraqis and the Arab allies who know the risk ISIL poses to the entire region.

There is no reason why Congress cannot work with the administration, military leaders, and intelligence experts over the coming weeks to develop and approve the necessary authorization for the use of military force to demonstrate to the American people that we are united in this fight against ISIL and there are clear limits to our engagement in Iraq and Syria.

I want our Commander-in-Chief to have Congress' full support for a strategy to destroy

ISIL, but I will not write a blank check to any president. Unfortunately, this amendment and the decision by Republican leadership to prioritize campaigning for re-election rather than passing a clear authorization to take the fight to ISIL should give the American people great concern about the priorities of this Congress.

Right now millions of people in Iraq and Syria are living under the oppressive, violent rule of ISIL. It is in our national interest to join the fight to stop their reign of terror. But we need real, credible allies with military forces willing to take on the fight, the fight on the ground. This amendment does not require a commitment by any other allied nations, only desperate Syrians and U.S. taxpayers. That is not enough to earn my support.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President's funding request to support the training and equipping of moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration, and mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully; indeed, for the last several years I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women and beheading its hostages—including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotloff. If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the west and attack us on the homeland. The longer ISIL can draw new recruits, the longer the United States will have to confront the threat that these fighters will return home, many with visa-free travel to our shores.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria, or the introduction of American ground forces—all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, financial, diplomatic and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces. In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force. There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them, but the open support of Gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

The threat posed by ISIL is an outgrowth of the disastrously sectarian policies of the Nouri al-Maliki regime in Baghdad and the ruthless dictatorship of the Bashar al-Asad in Damascus. Our military efforts and those of our allies alone cannot succeed without addressing the political fractures created by both. I applaud the Administration for its role in urging the Iraqis to form a new and more inclusive government and look forward to the day when a representative government can take shape in neighboring Syria and this carnage can come to an end.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment to H.J. Res. 124. This is a difficult decision because there are no good options for American intervention in Iraq and Syria. However, ISIL is a barbaric group that poses a direct threat to our national interests and it is our obligation to respond in an appropriate fashion to this new threat. I believe the counterterrorism strategy laid out by President Obama represents the best way to combat ISIL without committing our country to another costly, deadly ground war in the Middle East.

This amendment is not a declaration of war, or an authorization for the use of military force. Rather, it is a limited effort to train and equip members of the moderate Syrian opposition who have been vetted by our government. I am confident that the limitations and the reporting requirements in the resolution will ensure sufficient oversight, ensuring the mission does not expand beyond congressional intent.

Americans are weary of war. Any efforts to expand our role in this conflict should be openly debated in Congress. Yet, we cannot turn our back on the threat ISIL poses to our allies in the region, and the humanitarian catastrophe they helped create. I will be closely watching this mission as it unfolds to ensure it remains limited in scope and in line with our national interest.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Amendment to H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Resolution, that supports training and equipping the so-called Syrian Opposition.

After attending briefings on the President's proposal, I do not believe that this Amendment has a reasonable chance of achieving his goals. Worse, it could embroil America in another endless war. I hate ISIL and the other terrorist organizations that are plaguing Syria, Iraq and eventually the U.S.; the question is whether this Amendment will "degrade and destroy" them, to use the President's words. I do not fault President Obama's intent; I doubt this particular Amendment will work. Most obviously, it expires in 90 days, according to the very terms of the CR. And even if, under authority granted outside of this Amendment, an air strike killed ISIL's leader, it would not stop ISIL.

First, remember the budgetary context of this train-and-equip mission. Remember that military spending cuts called "sequestration" will last another seven years under current law. The readiness of our military is already threatened by these cuts. Necessary long-term investments in future weapons systems are being shortchanged. Until advocates of this train-and-equip mission are willing to fully fund the U.S. military and stop sequestration, they

have no business adding extra responsibilities. America's credit-card hawks must not continue to hollow out our military while pursuing questionable foreign ventures.

Second, the Syrian Opposition is not like the Peshmerga. It is a number of disorganized, unreliable and shifting groups that face three hostile armies at once within Syria itself: Assad's army, ISIL, and the Al-Nusra Front. Each of these hostile armies has demonstrated the ability to conduct advanced military operations. They are years ahead of any possible effective counter-attack by the Syrian Opposition, unless they start fighting each other or Assad's entire military defects. We are not even sure that the people we train would remain loyal. Although the Amendment talks about vetting Syrian Opposition forces, it acknowledges that there will be "green-on-blue" violence against us. The Amendment also anticipates that some of the weapons we supply to the Opposition will be given or sold to ISIL.

Third, we are entering a series of civil wars. They are notoriously difficult to stop without years of bloodshed. The idea that U.S. Army training, guns, and bullets will facilitate a negotiated Syrian settlement is highly implausible. Another factor is the 1,400-year-old Sunni-Shia schism, giving our Muslim allies their own religious agendas. They make excuses for their failure to commit their own forces in their own backyards, even when their inaction floods their nations with refugees. Several of these nations have large militaries with advanced weaponry, which they refuse to use except for very limited, anonymous airstrikes. They want U.S. soldiers and airmen to do their dirty work.

Fourth, ISIL was created by wealthy Sunnis in nations like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait who wanted an attack dog, a proxy army, to fight the Shia threat posed by Iran, Syria, Hamas, and Hezbollah. They got more than they bargained for: a pit bull that might turn against its masters. Nevertheless, they are not muzzling ISIL, or even yanking its leash. How does ISIL continue to get its funding? Aside from rape, pillage, kidnapping, and taxing infidels, it is known for its slick corporate appeals, even an annual report on its atrocities. Have the Sunni nations punished ISIL's benefactors, refused to purchase ISIL's oil, or taken other measures to cut off its funding? No. In the case of Saudi Arabia, they offer us unused training bases for no more than 10,000 of the Syrian Opposition. That is far from enough.

Fifth, how many times must the U.S. try to rebuild Muslim nations? We've tried for years, often just inflaming them. Syria will be the eighth Muslim nation we have tried to repair in the last three decades: Kuwait, Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen. In most cases, we have not succeeded. The U.S. military is ill-suited for nation-building. As General Bob Scates pointed out in the Wall Street Journal recently, the Pentagon has trouble dealing with today's asymmetric wars.

Sixth, ask yourself what your reaction will be if an American airman—God forbid—is captured and beheaded on live television. Will this Amendment, that so carefully denies authorizing military force, suddenly become the prelude to American "boots on the ground" as

Gen. Martin Dempsey has already predicted? And who believes that our trainers and equippers—and special forces and intelligence officers—are not already "boots on the ground"? The language of the Amendment is surreal: it contains no "authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances." Unless our military operates entirely outside of Syria or northern Iraq, they are in imminent danger. And if they are training in Saudi Arabia, they will be working in a nation that beheads more people for minor crimes than ISIL could dream of.

Lastly, is there a better way to degrade and destroy ISIL? Americans, with our wonderful optimism that all problems have a quick solution, have a lot to learn about the nature of the enemies we face. Unfortunately for us, our enemies do not measure action by the clock, but by the calendar. They outwait or outlast us. They use social media against us, to dare America to fight or to recruit the West's disaffected youth with dreams of martyrdom. They will laugh that this Amendment lasts only 90 days, particularly when other sections of the CR extend much longer.

America needs to understand the threats we face from radical jihadists and to fully fund effective strategies for dealing with them. Sadly, this Amendment does neither. Therefore, I oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of H.J. Res. 124, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 273, nays 156, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—273

Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert

Camp
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Clyburn
Coble

Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Galleo
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins

Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Pascarella
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed

Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradner
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NAYS—156

Cleaver
Cooper
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
DeSantis
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo

Esty
Farr
Fincher
Fleming
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Grijalva

Gutiérrez	Matsui	Rush
Hahn	McClintock	Salmon
Hanabusa	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta
Harris	McDermott	Sanford
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Scott, Austin
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Himes	Meng	Serrano
Holt	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Honda	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Huelskamp	Miller, George	Sires
Huffman	Moore	Slaughter
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Nadler	Speier
Hurt	Napolitano	Stockman
Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Stutzman
Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Nolan	Takano
Jolly	Nugent	Terry
Jones	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Jordan	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)
Keating	Pallone	Tierney
Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Tipton
Kennedy	Payne	Titus
Labrador	Perry	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Petri	Tsongas
Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
Lewis	Pitts	Velázquez
Lofgren	Pocan	Visclosky
Lowenthal	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Luján, Ben Ray	Polis	Welch
(NM)	Posey	Westmoreland
Lummis	Price (GA)	Whitfield
Maffei	Rangel	Williams
Maloney,	Ribble	Wolf
Carolyn	Rohrabacher	Yoho
Maloney, Sean	Rooney	Young (IN)
Massie	Rothfus	

NOT VOTING—3

Barton	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
--------	------------	----------

□ 1707

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. STIVERS, CONYERS, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 124 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 21, lines 4 and 5, strike “June 30, 2015” and insert “September 30, 2021”.

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The provisions of the following bills of the 113th Congress are hereby enacted into law:

(1) H.R. 377, as introduced in the House of Representatives on January 23, 2013 (the Paycheck Fairness Act).

(2) H.R. 1010, as introduced in the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013 (the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013).

(3) H.R. 4582, as introduced in the House of Representatives on May 6, 2014, except sections 3 and 4 of such bill (the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act).

(b) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall be effective, notwithstanding any other provision of such Act, as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(c) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall have no force or effect after December 11, 2014, and, effective after such date, the provisions of law amended by such Act shall be restored as if such Act had not been enacted.

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Mrs. BUSTOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

This amendment reinforces our commitment to the middle class and making sure that jobs are created right here in America, not overseas, by taking five key steps.

First, it would extend the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank for 7 years. Illinois companies like John Deere and Caterpillar, as well as large and small businesses across our country, deserve the certainty that a long-term reauthorization would provide.

Second, it would help ensure that employers provide equal pay for equal work. Equal pay is not simply a women's issue. It is an issue for all in the middle class. With households being led by women, equal pay will help those families get further ahead. Boosting women's earnings also will increase the purchasing power of families and will help our economy.

Third, my amendment will make the minimum wage a living wage. The cost of living has skyrocketed in recent years, but wages have remained stagnant. Working full time, year round at Illinois' \$8.25 minimum wage will earn a worker only \$16,500 per year, a salary that is below the Federal poverty line.

Raising the minimum wage would not only lift many families out of poverty, but it would also increase the earning power of households across the country, leading to an increase in overall economic activity.

Fourth, my amendment would allow students with outstanding student loan debt to refinance their loans at the lower interest rates that are currently offered to borrowers. Student loan debt not only harms young people and prevents them from reaching their personal financial potential, such as purchasing a home and starting a family, but it is deadweight, pulling down our entire economy and preventing economic growth.

Fifth, and finally, my amendment would prevent government contracts from going to companies that have moved their operations overseas. The government should not be giving taxpayer dollars to companies that ship jobs overseas and take advantage of corporate inversions to avoid paying their fair share.

These five commonsense elements would strengthen the middle class and help create jobs right here in America. Too many families are struggling, and enough is enough. For too long, lawmakers have been looking out for themselves instead of looking out for the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a clean, straightforward continuing resolution that has bipartisan and bicameral support. It is our best, most clear path forward to keep the lights on in our Federal Government before the fiscal year ends.

The American people rely on the Federal Government to provide certain vital programs and services, and they expect the Congress to come together to ensure these programs continue.

Now, I would prefer to be standing here, presenting a bill that finalizes the hard work of this body to fund the entire government for the entire fiscal year. Unfortunately, the other body has refused to live up to their end of the equation.

They have yet to pass or even consider a single appropriations bill through their Chamber. Because the Senate leaves us with no alternative, we must replace politics with responsibility and pass the CR before us.

□ 1715

This motion to recommit only increases the possibility of a government shutdown, ignoring the tireless efforts of Members on both sides of the aisle to keep that from happening.

The motion to recommit would also put our national security at stake. With the addition of the McKeon

amendment, this bill now provides authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to help degrade and destroy the terrorist organization ISIL.

Sadly, the minority is trying to hijack the process at the eleventh hour. They have reached deep into their grab bag of partisan agenda items in an attempt to attach, without fair consideration, sweeping policy changes that could place undue burdens on our economy, an effort that is designed to do nothing but score political points.

Funding our government and defeating ISIL are of grave national importance, and they are too important to risk over political maneuvers like this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote “no” on the motion and “yes” on final. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—199

Barber	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Barrow (GA)	DeFazio	Huffman
Bass	DeGette	Israel
Beatty	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Becerra	DeLauro	Jeffries
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Doggett	Keating
Bonamici	Doyle	Kelly (IL)
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kennedy
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kind
Bustos	Enyart	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kuster
Capps	Esty	Langevin
Capuano	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Carney	Foster	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Cartwright	Fudge	Lewis
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Loeb sack
Chu	Garamendi	Lofgren
Cicilline	Garcia	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lowey
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cohen	Hahn	Lynch
Connolly	Hanabusa	Maffei
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Maloney,
Cooper	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Costa	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Himes	Matheson
Crowley	Hinojosa	Matsui
Cuellar	Holt	McCarthy (NY)
Cummings	Honda	McCollum
Davis (CA)	Horsford	McDermott

McGovern	Pocan	Sinema
McIntyre	Polis	Sires
McNerney	Price (NC)	Slaughter
Meeks	Quigley	Smith (WA)
Meng	Rahall	Speier
Michaud	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)
Miller, George	Richmond	Takano
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Moran	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Nadler	Rush	Titus
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Neal	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Negrete McLeod	T.	Van Hollen
Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas
O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Veasey
Owens	Schakowsky	Vela
Pallone	Schiff	Velázquez
Pascarell	Schneider	Visclosky
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Walz
Payne	Schwartz	Wasserman
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Waters
Peters (CA)	Serrano	Waxman
Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt	Garrett	McKeon
Amash	Gerlach	McKinley
Amodei	Gibbs	McMorris
Bachmann	Gibson	Rodgers
Bachus	Gingrey (GA)	Meadows
Barletta	Gohmert	Meehan
Barr	Goodlatte	Messer
Benishek	Gosar	Mica
Bentivolio	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Granger	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary
Black	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Blackburn	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Boustany	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Brady (TX)	Grimm	Neugebauer
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Noem
Brooks (AL)	Hall	Nugent
Brooks (IN)	Hanna	Nunes
Broun (GA)	Harper	Olson
Buchanan	Harris	Palazzo
Bucshon	Hartzler	Paulsen
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Byrne	Heck (NV)	Perry
Calvert	Hensarling	Petri
Camp	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Campbell	Holding	Pitts
Capito	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Carter	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Cassidy	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Chabot	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Chaffetz	Hunter	Reed
Clawson (FL)	Hurt	Reichert
Coble	Issa	Renacci
Coffman	Jenkins	Ribble
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Jolly	Roby
Conaway	Jones	Roe (TN)
Cook	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Crawford	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rokita
Culberson	Kingston	Rooney
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Roskam
Denham	Labrador	Ross
Dent	LaMalfa	Rothfus
DeSantis	Lamborn	Royce
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Runyan
Duffy	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	Latham	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Sanford
Elmiers	LoBiondo	Scalise
Farenthold	Long	Schock
Fincher	Lucas	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Marchant	Sessions
Flores	Marino	Shimkus
Forbes	Masie	Shuster
Fortenberry	McAllister	Simpson
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	McCauley	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Gardner	McHenry	Smith (TX)

Southerland	Upton	Williams
Stewart	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Wagner	Wittman
Stockman	Walberg	Wolf
Stutzman	Walden	Womack
Terry	Walorski	Yoder
Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Thornberry	Webster (FL)	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Wenstrup	Young (IN)
Tipton	Westmoreland	
Turner	Whitfield	

NOT VOTING—4

Barton	Nunnelee
DesJarlais	Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1723

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 319, noes 108, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—319

Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Enyart
Amodei	Castro (TX)	Eshoo
Bachus	Chaffetz	Esty
Barber	Chu	Farenthold
Barletta	Clay	Farr
Barr	Cleaver	Fattah
Barrow (GA)	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick
Bass	Coble	Fleischmann
Beatty	Coffman	Flores
Becerra	Cohen	Forbes
Benishek	Cole	Fortenberry
Bera (CA)	Collins (GA)	Foster
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Gallego
Bishop (UT)	Conyers	Garcia
Black	Cook	Gardner
Blumenauer	Costa	Gerlach
Bonamici	Cotton	Gibbs
Boustany	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Brady (PA)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Granger
Braley (IA)	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Crowley	Graves (MO)
Brooks (IN)	Cuellar	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Culberson	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Buchanan	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Bucshon	Davis (CA)	Griffith (VA)
Burgess	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Bustos	DeGette	Guthrie
Butterfield	Delaney	Hahn
Byrne	DelBene	Hall
Calvert	Denham	Hanna
Camp	Dent	Harper
Campbell	Deutch	Hartzler
Capito	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Capps	Dingell	Heck (NV)
Cárdenas	Doyle	Heck (WA)
Carney	Duffy	Hensarling
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Ellison	Higgins
Cartwright	Elmiers	Himes
Cassidy	Engel	Hinojosa

Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Rooney
Rothfus
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas

Velázquez
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Yoho

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
DesJarlais
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1731

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124. I intended to vote “yes” on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-155)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2014.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 2014.

CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constitution Day, which is celebrated today, September 17. On this day, we commemorate the day our Framers, 39 delegates from 12 States, signed our Nation's charter at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1787.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is more than just a document; it is the enduring structure of our Nation's government. It is a distinctive system of checks and balances, separation of powers, and protection of freedoms that has defined and guided our Nation since its founding.

Today we reiterate the values of freedom, justice, and opportunity that have provided America with generations of prosperity. Today we honor the Framers of our Constitution and the principles they put forth more than 227 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the future of our Nation is strong if we continue to hold these principles dear.

NOES—108

Amash
Bachmann
Bentivolio
Blackburn
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Chabot
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cooper
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeSantis
Doggett
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi

Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Jeffries
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kennedy
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Nadler
Neugebauer
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Perry
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher

Happy Constitution Day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained attending representational activities and thus unable to return in time for rollcall vote No. 497.

I would like the record to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 497, H.R. 5108, to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

RETIREMENT OF JUDGE MICHAEL NASH

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the retirement of an incredible man and a dear friend, Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Michael Nash.

As presiding judge of the juvenile court for more than 16 years, a total of 29 years on the bench, his retirement is a huge loss for the community and for the Los Angeles judicial system.

During his tenure, he brought numerous changes to the juvenile court: the creation of a drug court in both delinquency and dependency courts, the development of protocols to foster communication and coordination between the courts, and simple changes such as lowering the judge's bench so that children in his court could better participate in the proceedings.

While I know Judge Nash will always continue to be a champion for children and families, I want to thank him for his distinguished career and congratulate him on his well-earned retirement.

CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 227th birthday of the Constitutional Convention and the creation of America's most cherished document—our Constitution. Today is Constitution Day.

On September 17, 1787, our Founding Fathers, 39 brave Americans, created a document that to this day is the foundation of our country and is admired by people around the world.

The British statesman William Gladstone said of our Constitution:

The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

I wholeheartedly agree with this statement. The Framers established a

new form of government that for the first time respected the rights of the individual. No longer would a king or dictator rule over their citizens. The power of the government would derive from the consent of the governed.

Responsibility of good governance is not just placed on the political leaders but on the participation of those citizens who have voted for them. Benjamin Franklin, when asked outside of Independence Hall by a curious woman as to what sort of government was created:

A republic, ma'am, if you dare keep it.

PREVENTING THE EPIDEMIC OF SUICIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time for our Nation to raise awareness about the persistent scourge of suicide.

Tens of thousands of Americans die each year purposefully by their own actions. They are our neighbors and our friends, our sons and our daughters, and too often they are the men and women who have served our country honorably in the United States military. An estimated 22 veterans commit suicide every day in our country. That is one life lost every 65 minutes.

One year ago, we came together in this Chamber during a special bipartisan order to send a clear message that this epidemic of veteran suicide must end. Now, 1 year later, the fight isn't over and more work needs to be done.

Tonight we demonstrate our ongoing support for the individuals, organizations, and agencies devoted to preventing the epidemic of veteran suicide, and we challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have served so honorably.

Finally, we send a message to military families who have experienced this tragedy: Your family's loss is not forgotten. We will work to stop this epidemic. We work for the memory of your loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from Florida, Representative YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a quick moment again to thank my colleague, Representative SINEMA, for the invitation to speak today on the very important issue of veteran suicide prevention. She has been a true champion of improving access to quality care for our Nation's veterans and has been a leader in Congress pushing for the real reforms to combat veteran suicide.

By shining a light on veteran suicide rates of approximately 22 per day, we as a nation can start to understand the urgency with which we need to solve and prevent this epidemic that our veterans, their families, and their friends struggle with daily. Not coping with the stress and anxiety early enough all too often leads to the veterans taking their own life.

I want to be clear: this is not an issue that affects veterans alone; it affects all of us.

Our government asked these soldiers to place themselves in harm's way, and if when a veteran returns home they are struggling to cope, we as a nation must come together to ensure a strong support system is in place. This means we must remove the stigma associated with seeking help. This means we must hire more mental health professionals and more who have served in combat zones themselves. This means the VA must provide after-hours services. The VA must review its group therapy model. There must be a review of discharges that resulted from mental health conditions, and the Department of Defense and VA must better coordinate the transition from DOD care to VA care.

□ 1745

I have spoken with veterans throughout my district and a common theme that emerges is that they have lost faith in the VA. They feel abandoned by the very system, the very country which they fought for to preserve and to protect the liberties and freedoms we have the privileges of experiencing daily.

I had a young man send me a letter directly to my house, and I want to share some of it. He said he had been seeking care. He had served in the gulf war. He was in his mid-forties, and he had been seeking care over the course of the last 10 years. Time and time again his appointments had either been canceled or rescheduled, and he had gotten to a point where he tried to get care and over the last 13 appointments they were canceled or rescheduled. He ended the letter pleading for help, and he said that if I do not get the help and care that I need, because I have nowhere else to turn, that I am afraid I am either going to hurt somebody or myself.

We reached out to this young man, we had him come into our office, and I could see a troubled individual that

had given up on life and had no hope for the future. We intervened for this young man, we called the VA system, and they got him in that night. Since then, I am happy to report that the man has called us and said it was a life-changing experience for him and he could only imagine what would have happened had he not gotten interdiction.

Congress and the VA are working to solve these deficiencies so that our soldiers have the care they need. But it should not take an act of Congress, or a Congressman or -women, to intercede on behalf of a veteran to get the care they earned, need, and deserve. I know myself and my colleagues will do what is needed to fix the shortcomings of the DOD and the VA system.

America and Americans cannot sit idly by and bear witness to the path of devastation and destruction left in the wake of a veteran suicide for their family and friends to deal with.

I thank my colleague for bringing this very important subject to light. We all need to work in a bipartisan fashion to solve this. I thank my colleague.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative YOHO, for your leadership and, in particular, thank you for sharing the story of a veteran that your office helped.

We hear countless stories from Members of Congress in this very body of veterans who reach out to our offices, sometime as a last resort as they are facing or contemplating suicide. I am proud to say that many Members of this body have done what it has taken to help those individuals recover and stay in touch.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn the time over to my colleague from Arizona, Mr. RON BARBER, for his remarks.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Congresswoman, and thank you for bringing us together this evening on this important topic.

I represent 85,000 veterans in my district, one of the largest communities of veterans in the country. My father was a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He would be appalled if he were alive today to see what has been happening at the Veterans Affairs Department in our State and in other parts of the country. I am really proud that this Congress has taken action to address those concerns to give the Secretary the authority he needs to address those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, nearly a decade and a half of brutal conflict overseas has taken its toll on our men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. I was in Afghanistan about 3 months ago, and I saw the conditions under which our military operates. The stress is immense. Everywhere you go there is a threat. Extended deployments and multiple deployments have taken their toll

on people we have sent to protect our country and to fight the battles we asked them to fight.

It is estimated that perhaps as many as 500,000 veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan will return home, when all is said and done, with serious wounds, the wounds that are signature wounds of these conflicts: posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury.

Military service creates a culture that demands that our soldiers are tough, and the culture can also prevent many of our servicemembers from seeking the help they need. As a result, they are left to face the ghosts of war alone.

The suicide rate among our country's brave servicemen and -women and veterans is at a frightening level. Some estimates have shown that as many as 22 veterans take their own lives every day.

We must combat military and veteran suicide with the same conviction that we take on the enemy of war because it is killing our men and women in and out of uniform. We must wage a well-funded, well-planned campaign to fight this heartbreaking epidemic.

I have been pushing for better access to health care for our veterans since I came to Congress almost 2½ years ago.

One of the first bills I introduced was the Veterans Health Access Act to ensure that veterans could get the mental health care that they needed in communities without having to endure long commutes and even longer wait times at VA facilities.

Government dysfunction cannot be the enemy of our servicemen and veterans. We must do more to cut the red tape that has kept our veterans from top quality mental health care. I am pleased that the VA bill that we passed allows the VA to contract out for services close to where the veteran lives. This is essential, particularly for treatment of mental health issues.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more for those who have borne the brunt of war. We must come together—Congress, the administration, the health care community, mental health experts—to build upon a plan that will help our veterans who have served this Nation so courageously and yet may still be suffering.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for bringing this to the House floor this evening. I stand ready to work with her and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what we can for our veterans, not only in Arizona, but nationwide.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. BARBER, for your commitment to supporting veterans in Arizona.

Last year, I shared with you the story of a young veteran in my district, Sergeant Daniel Somers. Sergeant Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. Diagnosed with a traumatic brain injury and PTSD, Ser-

geant Somers ultimately took his own life after struggling with the VA bureaucracy and not getting the help he needed in time.

Together with the Somers family, we have worked to prevent veteran suicide and improve much-needed access to mental health care for our veterans.

We have recently developed the Classified Veterans Access to Care Act to ensure that all veterans, including those with classified experiences, get immediate access to mental health services in the appropriate care setting.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee included this legislation in a larger veterans package, and we expect it to be on the floor before the end of the year.

While this is an important step in supporting our veterans, we have much more work to do.

I would like to take a moment to yield the floor to the gentleman from California, Representative LAMALFA, my friend and colleague.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you. I appreciate my colleague from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) for your efforts on this.

When you become a Member of the House of Representatives and you start receiving those calls from veterans in your district on the difficulty they have with what they thought they were promised by their government when they enlisted, when they went into the military, it really, really hits home. It really affects your heart to see these veterans who have struggled to at least be heard for their claims, for their health care, by the VA, by the treatment centers.

We have to do better than that. To see the suicide rate among veterans the way it is, to know that they felt like the government has turned their backs on them, is appalling. We have to give them the hope.

My office, I know my colleagues that have spoken here tonight, have turned towards helping as much as they can. So my message, just a brief message, for our veterans out there: Do not give up. Know that we are trying to reform the VA system, trying to reform through the measures that have been brought up the way the VA treats and gets the help for veterans who have served us.

They made a promise to us. We need to keep the promise to them. For them to go feeling hopeless and that nobody cares about them, that they can't get treatment, is one of the biggest shames we could have as a country. We have asked them to do a lot. We will continue to do so in the future. We need to be prepared to take care of them properly, if they need it, when they come home.

I appreciate, again, you having this time here tonight, Ms. SINEMA, here in the House to put a spotlight on this as you have. What I have tried to do in

my office and the hard work by my own staff is to have our veterans be treated respectfully but also feel hopeful that someone hears their message, hears their plea, and then will address their needs timely and respectfully. They should not be homeless, they should not feel to the point of hopelessness that suicide is an alternative for them.

Thank you, Ms. SINEMA.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative LAMALFA, for your commitment to veterans. Your comment and your message to veterans of don't give up is one that I think we must all repeat every day, not just in words, but in our actions as Members of Congress to continue to reform the VA system and send a clear message to veterans that we won't give up either in reforming the system and taking care of them.

Earlier this evening, I shared the story of Sergeant Daniel Somers. The VA failed Sergeant Somers. We have since learned that the VA has failed thousands of other veterans through gross mismanagement and delays in access to care.

Veterans at the Phoenix VA and VA facilities across the country were placed on secret lists and had to wait months before seeing a doctor.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Inspector General's final report on the Phoenix VA Health Care System, which was released last month, confirms that the Phoenix VA, housed in my district, left 3,500 veterans at risk of never receiving care. Additionally, 1,400 veterans on the official electronic waiting list were left waiting for unacceptably long periods of care. At least 20 veterans who failed to receive timely or appropriate care passed away.

Mr. Speaker, this is immoral, un-American, and it puts our veterans at risk. But in Arizona, we are not idly waiting for Washington to take action, we are taking action ourselves.

In Phoenix, we have established a working group of community providers, veterans service organizations, and the local VA to work together to improve access to services. We also recently cohosted our first Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans in a variety of ways. Approximately 400 veterans and their families attended and got the care that they earned and that they deserve.

These are examples of the good that results when we set aside partisanship and focus instead on putting veterans first to help meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a story from my district. Last month, a local veteran, Peter, came to our district office. He came to ask for help with his claims and for help navigating the VA.

After meeting with my social work staff for 2 hours, Peter told one of my

caseworkers that he had thoughts of suicide and he had the ability to carry out those thoughts. In fact, he said, the only thing keeping him from doing so was his daughters.

Our office met with Peter for an additional 2 hours, listening to him share his feelings and focusing on solutions and next steps. We shared with him our veterans resource guide, which let him know about available community programs and organizations dedicated to supporting veterans with services that range from mental health treatment to financial assistance.

Peter told us he had no idea there were so many organizations that support local veterans, and he left our office that day feeling better than when he had arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with him personally just a few days later. He told me he had never heard of an office that would respond and care about his suicidal ideation, his depression, and his needs. I am grateful that Peter came to our office. I am even more grateful that we were able to help him.

Since meeting with Peter and other veterans in our district, we have released a veterans resource guide for the Ninth Congressional District in Arizona, a comprehensive 27-page document that provides local veterans with detailed information about community resources that are available to them. We hope that this resource guide will be replicated in districts across the country.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, the issue of veteran suicide and the systemic problems in the VA system require a substantial local and national effort. My colleagues here today believe, as I believe, that no one who comes home after serving our country should ever feel like he or she has nowhere to turn.

In response to the VA crisis, Congress recently passed and the President signed into law the Veterans Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act. This legislation makes needed reforms to the VA health care system and will ensure that Arizona veterans get access to the care that they have earned.

The Veterans Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act builds on our work to address the crisis in Phoenix by allowing veterans who have been waiting for medical care for more than 30 days to receive care from non-VA doctors.

It authorizes the VA to fire senior managers who knew about these cover-ups across the country. It reviews scheduling systems and technology so that fewer veterans slip through the cracks when seeking care.

It provides resources for more physicians and medical staff to work in VA hospitals around the country; also, it creates an independent commission to

investigate the Veterans Administration to find out what went wrong and evaluate access to care throughout the VA health care system.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was an important step forward, but more action is required. The first step is speedy and effective implementation of this important bill. I urge the VA and agencies locally who are working with the VA to speed the implementation of this important legislation and show a change of culture at the VA. We all believe that veterans deserve the best possible care.

Carl McLaughlin, a 38-year-old Army veteran, committed suicide on December 19, 2013. He had been stationed in Bosnia, and he was released from the Army on a medical discharge in 2004.

Starting in 2006, Carl was treated at the Phoenix VA, but, as time went on, it became increasingly difficult for Carl to see his doctor. According to Carl's mother, Terry, at the time of his death, Carl was waiting to hear back from the Phoenix VA to have his medications adjusted and to see his doctor.

Carl suffered from recurring pain caused by shoulder injury, severe hearing loss, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder. His depression worsened over time.

Terry, Carl's mom, told us:

The last time I saw Carl was a few days before his death. He looked really depressed, and I asked him if he had a doctor's appointment scheduled because I know he had been waiting over 4 weeks for a call back from the doctor's office. He said, no, he was still waiting.

He called them the next day, six times, and left three messages. He was put on hold and hung up on the other three times. This problem of calling and being hung up on and not getting calls back had been going on for over 1 to 2 years.

Terry asked us to share her son's story in the hope that his tragedy doesn't happen to another family.

Recently, I cosponsored legislation called the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act. This bill reviews mental health staffing requirements and increases the ability of the VA to recruit and train psychiatrists. Congress should pass this legislation this year to make it easy for veterans like Carl to see a behavioral health specialist.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to thank my colleagues who joined me this evening. Our thoughts are with the families who have lost a loved one. Each of us can do something to raise awareness, to be that light for a struggling veteran in our community.

Businesses can display signs to let veterans know that help is always available to them. Mental health professionals can volunteer with organizations like Give an Hour to provide free counseling to veterans, their family members, and active duty members and their families.

We can all learn to recognize the signs of crisis by visiting

veteranscrisisline.net and then reaching out to the veterans in our lives.

Here in Congress, we can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need and that puts veterans first and works aggressively with community providers to improve the quality and accessibility of care. We need a VA that is transparent and open to restore the trust and credibility it has lost.

We who enjoy our freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemembers, must all step up to end the epidemic of veteran suicide.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LET'S END VETERAN SUICIDE

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, few things we do here are more important than taking care of the men and women who have fought to protect our Nation. Doing something about the issue of suicide is incredibly important.

Not so very long ago, I had the opportunity to talk to a person that I had known for a very long time who I had met while serving in the legislature and who told me that his son, who was a veteran, had come back and was doing fine; yet, one day, he got the phone call that his son had committed suicide. No family should go through that.

Here in the Congress, we have an opportunity to do something about that. It is my hope that Congress, working in a bipartisan fashion, can work together to do something about this problem and to take better care across the board of the men and women who have fought every day, day in and day out, to serve our country.

ISLAMIC JIHAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I expect that, shortly, a colleague will be here that I will hand off to for a few minutes to deal with several house-keeping issues, but, for the moment that I have, I want to focus on an issue that has gained the attention—as well it should—of the American people.

The number one duty of government, Mr. Speaker, is to secure the safety and the security of the American people. That is why we have a government. That is why we exist. It is the reason why countries enjoy sovereignty and declare themselves sovereign nations.

That means they are a separate political unit, and they exist for the purpose of preserving the safety and secu-

rity of their people. That is our duty, and that is our government.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, throughout each generation that somehow, some way, there is a force that comes against a nation. In different eras, we have had different foes that the United States has had to contend with, beginning at our founding, when the United States of America, through our Declaration of Independence and through our Constitution, on this, our Constitution Day—and, by the way, we say happy Constitution Day to all Americans. We are very proud of our United States Constitution.

Contained within the Constitution is the admonition to the President, to the Congress, to the Supreme Court, again, to ensure that, in our founding document, we understand that it is the duty of the government to secure the safety and the security of the American people.

What led up to the writing of the Declaration of Independence and to the American Revolution and, ultimately, to America's founding document with the United States Constitution was a reaction of the colonists against a great totalitarian oppression that was coming against the United States. That was from the British motherland of which the United States was a colony of.

We pushed back against that oppression for many and sundry reasons, some of which were taxation, others were the taking away the rights of American citizens, whether it was forcing American citizens to take soldiers into their homes or taking away their rights as free men under the Magna Carta.

The American people rose up, and they said, "We want to have freedom." They threw off the chains of the totalitarianism of the day, the British Empire.

Going further into the future with the War of 1812, again, the United States was pushed into a conflict with the British, and, again, we had to throw off that enemy. Again, we saw our own house come apart in the time of the Civil War. There was also the Spanish-American War.

The United States was engaged in a great totalitarianism in 1917 with World War I and, again, in World War II. There was a conflict in the totalitarianism of our day. It was an evil known as Communism, both from the Soviet threat and also from Nazism.

The United States came together as a Nation. We threw off the yoke of the oppressor, of the totalitarianism of our day—in other words, a regime that had an idea that it wanted to conquer the world with its evil and immoral philosophy, whether it was Communism or whether it was Nazism.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every generation is confronted by a great evil, and the moral questions of the

day are related to that evil. The evil, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with today is something known as Islamic jihad.

Its face is ugly. Its face has reared not only just in recent decades and just the last few months of this summer, but Islamic jihad is something that has been around as long as the inception of Islam itself.

The regime of jihad has been defeated, summarily, time and time again throughout history, but it was defeated through military might, it wasn't defeated through diplomacy, and defeated it was.

It was defeated at Tours; it was defeated at the battle of the gates of Vienna; it was defeated again with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the 1920s; but it was defeated militarily. It was an idea that had grisly consequences. Those consequences were ones that led to bloodshed and suffering and misery for thousands of people across the world. Today is no different.

Today, we see the same level of bloodshed across the world. That bloodshed is coming to us, again, at the tip of the sword. This summer, it is known as the Islamic State. Some people know it as ISIS. Some people know it by the name ISIL. The President uses the term "ISIL."

This organization is just a continuation of al Qaeda—and a continuation of something even greater than al Qaeda—and that is the concept known as Islamic jihad.

Baghdadi, the head of the Islamic State, initially called them ISIS, which means the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham, or Syria.

□ 1815

That was the territory that Baghdadi was seeking to conquer. He did, in fact, conquer much of that territory.

Then he changed the name of his organization to ISIL, the Islamic State in the Levant. The Levant is a geographical area that is greater than Syria and Iraq. It would comprise much of eastern Turkey, Israel, Gaza, Lebanon, and so forth, the greater area, if you will, of the central Mediterranean area.

After that, the Islamic State issued yet another press release with yet another name change. And in the course of that name change, the Islamic State decided to drop the IS and the IL, and now they are known simply as the Islamic State.

That is because the ambitions, Mr. Speaker, of Baghdadi and the Islamic State are far grander than just Iraq or just Syria or just eastern Turkey or Israel or Lebanon or Jordan or Gaza—far bigger.

The Islamic State, you see, Mr. Speaker, encompasses the entire globe, the planet Earth. Every part of this Earth, you see, Mr. Speaker, is what is

intended. It is the ultimate in totalitarianism—what the Communists planned for, which was for control of the world under the umbrella of communism, and saw themselves ultimately defeated militarily; and again, what the Nazis saw, Mr. Speaker, as control of the world, national socialism through the Nazi Party movement and, ultimately, were defeated militarily.

So too, Mr. Speaker, the Islamic State sees their evil, violent, cruel, bloody philosophy also would encompass the Earth. That would include the United States of America. That would include, obviously, our great ally Israel. It would encompass all of North America. It would also cover the Asian nations. The entire world now, Mr. Speaker, is at threat from this totalitarianism.

And often it is said, never despise small beginnings. It is breathtaking, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen accomplished by the Islamic State. The leader, again, is a man named Baghdadi.

Baghdadi was a part of the franchise known as al Qaeda in Iraq. Al Qaeda began—we know about Osama bin Laden. Well, an affiliate of Osama bin Laden was the man named Baghdadi, who is the current head of the Islamic State.

Baghdadi, when he was a part of the franchise, al Qaeda in Iraq, was number three. We were able to target and kill number one and number two in the power structure in Iraq. That left Baghdadi as the next in command.

Baghdadi decided not only did he want to be the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, he wanted so much more. But, you see, Baghdadi was waylaid for a period of time in his life. Why? Because Baghdadi was captured by the United States. He was found to be a terrorist. He was held in detention in Camp Baka in Iraq.

So we had him, the leader of the Islamic State, the organization responsible for the beheadings of Americans, the American photojournalist James Foley and the American photojournalist James Sotloff and, this Saturday, the beheading of another British journalist. Baghdadi is responsible for all of that and so much more.

Baghdadi was responsible for ordering the murdering of literally hundreds and thousands of individuals in Iraq. We saw Baghdadi line up hundreds of soldiers in Iraq, Iraqi soldiers, and they were brutally and mercilessly murdered, being shot in the back.

We also saw additional beheadings occur, and we saw also as they chased the Yazidis up Mount Sinjar. We also heard the horrific tales of how the merciless Islamic State literally stooped so low that they buried alive women and children in graves in August.

Mr. Speaker, I despise being as graphic as I am, but we must be face-to-face with the facts that we are facing. This is an evil regime. It is an evil

philosophy with an evil goal. They are as equally committed to killing Jews as they are committed to killing Christians as they are committed to killing any Muslim who doesn't agree with their sick, failed philosophy.

The other thing we need to recognize, Mr. Speaker, is that this has a religious motivation, not because I say so, but because Baghdadi and the terrorists of the Islamic State say so. Their motivation is their religion. They say it is Islam that drives them to do what they are doing.

That is why it is perplexing, Mr. Speaker, that a week ago the President of the United States said in a televised address that Islam has nothing to do with the Islamic State. He said there are two fallacies of the Islamic State. Number one, he said, it is not Islam.

Well, Mr. President, you may not think it is Islam, but ask the leaders of Islamic jihad what they think it is. They say forthrightly and boldly, with everything that is within them, that their motivation for beheading individuals, for burying women and children alive, for establishing a global power to enforce their sick, religious ideas upon the world is based upon their religion of Islam.

That is their reasoning, Mr. Speaker, out of their mouths. And I believe that it is prudent and wise to listen to the enemy, to find out what their motivations are.

We look no further than the mad, evil, maniacal leader of the Nazi Party, as he was rising in the 1930s, when he wrote his book called "Mein Kampf." In his book, "Mein Kampf," he wrote his detailed plan. You see, he wasn't being secret, Mr. Speaker, about the evil that he wanted to bring against the Jewish people. He was very forthright. The same can be said, Mr. Speaker, of Baghdadi, who is the head of the evil regime and ideology known as the Islamic State. Baghdadi.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is what the leader of the Islamic State had to say. This is in January, and he said this to the United States, and I quote. In a speech in January of this year, Baghdadi said to the United States: "Soon we will be in direct confrontation. So watch out for us for we are with you, watching."

I repeat: "Soon we will be in direct confrontation," meaning with the United States. "So watch out for us for we are with you, watching."

That tells me, Mr. Speaker, that Baghdadi and the Islamic State don't intend to confine their bloodletting just in Iraq and Syria or in Jordan or Lebanon. Their designs are for the United States as well.

We have been told and we have read that there is an enormous amount of so-called chatter through the social media by members of the Islamic State and those who promote Islamic jihad to enter into the United States and to

bring about atrocities here within the confines of our American sovereign soil.

You see, our sovereign soil has been invaded. Our sovereign soil was invaded at Benghazi. Our U.S. consulate in Benghazi when Ambassador Chris Stevens lost his life was U.S. soil. Islamic jihadists entered our sovereign soil and killed our U.S. Ambassador on that sovereign soil.

Just within a month or so ago, Islamic jihadists again took over the airport in Baghdad, and again we saw an embassy in Libya, in Tripoli, abandoned. So United States personnel were forced to flee the United States Embassy in Tripoli and leave and gain escape through Tunisia.

It is really quite sobering when you think of the advances of Islamic jihad in the region. And that is why I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the thinking of the President when it is coming against this evil. I don't understand it because, you see, the Islamic State has not only declared their intention, they have declared that they are at war with the United States. They have declared they are at war. They have declared that they are a caliphate. They are a government. They are an Islamic government.

They have a leader in Baghdadi. They have already conquered territory, about half of Iraq, about half of Syria, which they control, also other parts of the Middle East as well. They also control parts of northern Lebanon.

They have made absolutely breathtaking strides in their short tenure of advancement. So they have land. They have a name. They have a leader. They have a government. It is known as shari'a law. That is Islamic law. That is their law of the land.

They also have an administration. They have a Shura Council, and they have an administration. They already have a line of hierarchy and an organizational flowchart of how they are going to run the Islamic State.

They have an army. Twelve thousand, presumably, are in the Islamic State Army, and brutal they are—beheadings, women raped, men beheaded, innocent children shot in the head. It is absolutely devastating.

We see Christians have been chased out of the Middle East region. The numbers are so dramatic, Mr. Speaker, of Christians that have had to flee Iraq, Christians in Mosul that have lived safely there. The ancient town of Nineveh, which Jonah went to preach in Nineveh, and that town is Mosul, Christians have been in Mosul since the time of Christ, 2,000 years. Mosul no longer has Christians. They were chased out of that city.

The Christians have been chased repeatedly out of Iraq. They are being chased out of the Baghdad area. They have been chased certainly out of northern Iraq and western Iraq, as Jews were chased out long ago.

Now, in Syria, we hear the horrific stories of Christians who have been killed and murdered and beheaded simply because they name the name of Jesus Christ. Jews have been slaughtered and beheaded simply because they name the name of their God.

Is there any greater intolerance, Mr. Speaker than the intolerance that has been shown repeatedly, brutally, lethally, by the Islamic State against Jews and Christians, and, yes, Muslims whom they disagree with.

It is a very sobering time. And so, quite rightly, our President, a week ago in his remarks, called upon the Congress to help him do something. The President gave his strategy. I listened with open ears to the President's strategy, and it was very curious to me because the President of the United States developed a strategy that consists of items that the United States is already doing. There was nothing new here.

The President called for an increase of 475 advisers to go into Iraq. The President said there wouldn't be any boots on the ground, of soldiers' boots.

He did not say that we are at war. Even though the Islamic State has declared war against the United States, the President did not say that the United States was going to war.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, something like 7 weeks ago, in the midst of the rise of the Islamic State in Iraq, with the horrific, breathtaking advances and murders, the President of the United States said that he wanted the Congress to withdraw the AUMF, which is the authorization of military force for the United States to be in Iraq.

It was really an unthinkable, bizarre request that this Congress received from the President. Would you please withdraw, the President said, my ability to be able to bring about military force in Iraq?

From my perspective, either the President and his advisers were incredibly shortsighted about this breathtaking rise of the Islamic State which, by the way, didn't just occur in the last 3 or 4 months. I am privileged to serve on the Intelligence Committee in the House of Representatives. We have watched, Mr. Speaker, literally, for the last several years, the rise of the Islamic State. We saw this coming.

That information presumably was available to the President of the United States as well. He knew they were on the rise. There has always been the Islamic jihad in the Middle East, but it has been at a different tempo. It has been on the rise.

Baghdadi, who is in his early to mid-forties, who is a very well-educated man with a doctorate degree, who literally has decades of veteran senior-level experience in al Qaeda, declaring war against the United States, literally, for decades, put himself in the position of being the top man at the

very top of the hierarchy, the top of the line of the chain of command of the Islamic State.

□ 1830

Baghdadi knew what he needed to have. He needed to be financially self-sustaining. To do that, he ordered the robbing of banks, particularly beginning in northern Iraq. Some reports estimate that the Islamic State had stolen as much as over \$400 million. We don't know the exact amount, but we do know that Baghdadi was determined, and he intended to advance. He knew he couldn't feed an army unless he had money to do so, and so he robbed it from the banks to begin his army.

Then he began to build that army by opening up prison doors and having prison breaks and bringing terrorists who had been jailed out of the prisons to join his band. So he had an army of terrorists, and he trained them even further, and he paid them with money that he stole from banks.

Then Baghdadi did something very strategic. He decided to steal oil fields, and he stole those oil fields in northern Iraq, very productive oil fields. One estimate says that one of the oil fields is worth about 10 billion barrels of oil. Whether or not that is true, that is one of the accounts that I have read. If that is true, it would be equal to about the value of the Bakken oil field, which has proven to be extremely productive and very lucrative in North Dakota here in the United States. Baghdadi is selling oil on the black market today to finance his terrorism, oil fields that he stole from northern Iraq and in the Kurdistan area.

He didn't stop there. He knew, to be viable, he also had to have refined energy products. So what did he do?

Baghdadi then stole and secured an oil refinery so that he could have oil products in order to have energy to run his army and also to be able to provide for the people under his protectorate. A "protectorate" is a very generous way of saying "dictatorship" in his caliphate. You see, he is the head guy. He is the caliph in his new self-described Islamic State, the caliphate.

You see, Mr. Speaker, he figured out how to finance himself. He took over electrical grids in Iraq and in Syria so that he could be the one who supplies the electricity to the people so that the people would be beholden to him. He put his people in charge of roads and supply lines. Baghdadi also took over a gas field in central Syria. That gas field also could be used to sell the gas for productivity or to deny that gas to Assad or to anyone he considered his enemy. You see, Baghdadi was strategic.

In August, I had the ability and the privilege to go over and visit both Turkey and Jordan and to meet with leadership there on the issue of ISIS, and,

while I was there, it was stunning. There was a public display in Jordan of well over 15,000 who were protesting against Israel and in favor of the Muslim Brotherhood and the foreign terrorist-designated organization known as Hamas. There was also a reported demonstration of 7,000 Jordanians who were protesting in favor of the Islamic State. So there is pressure on Jordan—pressure within and pressure from without.

The Islamic State now controls checkpoints, so much so that there is, effectively, no longer a border between Iraq and Syria. That has been erased. Now Iraq and Syria have been joined to one another under the control and the authority of the Islamic State. They control checkpoints not only on Lebanon but also Israel.

It was horrifying to read that the Islamic State had joined up with the Free Syrian Army, the army that the United States has been involved with in the so-called "vetting" of moderates and in the training and equipping to fight against the Islamic State.

The Free Syrian Army reports say they had actually joined up with other Islamic jihadists, known as the Jabhat al-Nusra Front, and they took over the checkpoint that controls the area of the Golan Heights leading into Israel. There were upwards of 20 to 40 different U.N. peacekeepers at that checkpoint, and that checkpoint was taken over 200 yards from Israel, as if Israel didn't have enough to deal with in the terrorist organization known as Hezbollah, which is an Iranian proxy on her north, and from Russian influence as well coming through Hezbollah. Israel has had to suffer with indignities from Assad, from Syria, as well as from the Muslim Brotherhood franchise known as Hamas in Gaza.

It has been an extremely difficult summer. I met with refugees while I was in the Middle East region, people who were just peaceful, freedom-loving people just wanting to live their lives and raise their families and love people and worship their god. They were uprooted over this summer and late spring by Islamic jihad, both in Iraq. As for one woman I spoke to, she and her family were uprooted from their home in Iraq. They had to flee their home and abandon everything they owned and flee to Syria. Once they were in Syria, there was a rise of the Islamic jihad in Syria. They had to flee Syria and make their way to Turkey. When I spoke with her, she was on the southern border of Turkey, and she was hoping that she would have the ability, with her family, to move to the United States of America. She was going to go for yet one more final interview at the end of September, and she was hoping that her family would have that chance to come and live in freedom.

That is our wish, Mr. Speaker, for all men. We want all men to have the dignity of living in peace. It is why we

honor the American Constitution today on Constitution Day. You see, this Constitution and this country mean something for the rest of the world. We think that the norms and the peacefulness that we enjoy and the prosperity that you see here in the United States must be somewhat normative across the world. We think, well, we have it, really, probably the best, but sometimes we don't recognize, really, how great we do have it. It isn't by accident—it is by design—and it came at a great cost and at a great sacrifice because our Founders recognized these ideals:

Number one, that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, rights that aren't given by government, rights that are only given by God: the right to life, to our liberty—our freedom—and to the pursuit of happiness, which means we have the privilege to work, and, once we work, we get to keep the fruit of our own labors.

What a brilliant concept. Where across the world do people have the right to life? Certainly not in Iraq today. Certainly not in Syria today. They don't enjoy the unfettered access to their right to life, because their life is imperiled by the Islamic State, which says to them: Under pain of death, you convert to Islam, or we kill you. You convert to Islam, or you pay us a tax. You convert to Islam, or you have to abandon everything you know and get as far away from us as you possibly can in the short term because we are coming after you in the long term.

Is that life? That is no life at all. But here in the United States, our Founders wisely understood that all of humanity's happiness springs from the right to life.

Number two, liberty, freedom. That is the hallmark and the emblem of the United States of America. If there is any ideal and any value, Mr. Speaker, that our Constitution champions it is this: it is liberty—freedom—from an oppressive government that would force its will on an individual human's life, because the Holy Scriptures teach that life is precious. We are but a flower that quickly fades. We are but a puff of smoke, the Old Testament teaches in the Proverbs. Therefore, this life that God has given to us, that He has breathed into every human being, as He created every human being in His image and His likeness, this is it. This is no dress rehearsal. This is the main event.

Our Founders wisely understood that it is for freedom that we have been set free so that we can then aspire to do whatever it is that we choose to do, the way that we take our finger and write the poetry of each of our lives.

Then, in the Declaration of Independence, our Founders rightly said, through the pen of Thomas Jefferson's, that we are also endowed by our Cre-

ator—again, not by a government, not by any government. Only a God who created us, gave us the unalienable right to pursue happiness, which means we can pursue whatever employment, whatever labor that we so desire, and then we have the right, the unfettered right, to keep the fruit of our labor—to build a home, to marry, to start a family, to be able to go out and further and help our community. Oh, what a Nation we have today, Mr. Speaker, the economic powerhouse of the world, the military engine of the world. This is such a great and wonderful gift that was given to us.

That is why it is right and fitting and proper for us to honor and recognize this Constitution Day. I am so grateful and so honored and privileged that we can do exactly that and honor that day. That is why we have to stand for this liberty, something that people in other countries cannot do.

We must therefore observe, and it is why we have to make sure, when there is a great totalitarianism like the Islamic State, which has declared war against the United States, we have a decision to make. Anyone can declare war on you. It is another thing to bring about warlike acts against you in an attempt to defeat you. That is exactly what the Islamic State has done. That is exactly what they have stated their intention is. I believe, if there is anything, Mr. Speaker, that history has taught us it is this: when a madman speaks, we should listen. Baghdadi, most certainly, is rational from his point of view, but his ideas are mad, and, even further, they are immoral and they are evil to deprive life, liberty, and happiness to people.

If I could just pause and ask the Speaker if there is a time limitation that we are looking at. How much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 27 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I appreciate that update.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the threats that the United States is looking at from the Islamic State: the fact that they have declared war against the United States; the fact that they have already killed intentionally, in a cruel and barbaric manner, American citizens; the fact that they are recruiting American citizens to come and join them in their evil deed; the fact that American citizens have left the Islamic State as terrorists under the creed of the Islamic State. Their creed says that those who join the Islamic State abandon any allegiance to any other government, including the American Government. They then become part of the Islamic State, and their duty and allegiance is to the Islamic State. Once they leave the Islamic State and return to the United States, then they have the ability to come in and be terrorists

in the United States. This is nonsensical to me.

You see, Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer, I asked the FBI for a classified briefing. I did so because my home State of Minnesota has a tragic, very unfortunate, nexus to terrorism. We have the distinction of having the only convicted terrorist of 9/11 being from the State of Minnesota. His name is Moussaoui.

We also have a high number of Minnesotans who left Minnesota and abandoned the United States to go and fight on behalf of another al Qaeda organization, known as al-Shabaab. That is an al Qaeda affiliate in Somalia. Well over 50 Minnesotans traveled to join al-Shabaab and fight in the cause of Islamic jihad.

We also had terrorist financing cases, which were successfully prosecuted in Minnesota. Two women were convicted of terrorist financing cases in the Minneapolis Federal district court. Two women were convicted of terrorist financing in Rochester, Minnesota, in Federal district court.

Then we had the Westgate shopping mall terror act in Kenya, and from the terrorists who were involved and claimed sponsorship of this horrific act of the shooting at the Westgate mall in Kenya, the report was that two Minnesotans were a part of that effort. Then we saw, although it hasn't been confirmed by our government, that the terrorists have named two Minnesotans.

Then we saw that very sophisticated recruitment videos were put forth to recruit individuals to come and join al Qaeda. When this occurred, three of them were featured from Minnesota. They were called the "Minnesota martyrs," three young men. One was a Caucasian American. His name was Troy Kastigar. He had been converted to Islam at a mosque called the Al Farooq mosque in Bloomington, Minnesota, where many of the individuals who have gone to fight on behalf of the Islamic State made their religious home.

Troy Kastigar said that he was honored to be a traitor to America. That was a part of his conviction to the Islamic State. He turned on his country; so, when I asked the FBI earlier this summer—and then, of course we have had, according to the FBI, at minimum, another 20 Minnesotans who have left Minnesota to join the Islamic State, including the first two Americans who were killed fighting on behalf of the Islamic State, both of whom were from the State of Minnesota.

Just as recently as several weeks ago, three young Somali American girls left Minnesota, abandoned their families, and joined the Islamic State. We have a very unfortunate nexus.

It is with that background, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the FBI if I could come in and sit with them and if they

would answer my questions in a classified setting.

I wanted to know, number one, had Minnesotans left the United States and joined to fight with the Islamic State. Unfortunately, I was told there were two. It was classified information at the beginning of the summer. Now, tragically, it has been reported worldwide that the very first two Americans were Minnesotans who were fighting for the Islamic State.

I asked the question: If these terrorists choose not to blow themselves up as suicide bombers, or if they are not killed fighting on behalf of the Islamic State, and they choose to fly back to the United States or gain entry to the United States legally through some other means with a U.S.-held passport, would they be given entry into the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I was completely floored when the FBI said to me, "Well, yes, of course, these terrorists would be allowed to come into the United States."

I asked, "Why? And how?" They told me, "We track them, and we put their names on a watch list." It isn't perfect, but the FBI puts the names of Americans on a watch list. I asked, "What happens when they are on a watch list?"

I was told that the Americans with a U.S. passport, who have relinquished U.S. citizenship and have joined the Islamic State, have become terrorists and fought on behalf of the Islamic State then were returning to the United States, would be asked additional questions at screening at an airport before they come into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am asked additional questions, sometimes, at the airport. How could this be possible?

I was told by the FBI that the terrorists then would be given entry, and they would be allowed to go, unmolested, to return to their life here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that is pure madness for us to do that. If there was one thing we should do, it is follow our Constitution, follow the way of all nations, which is to secure the safety and security and sovereignty of that Nation.

To do that, Mr. Speaker, we must take the passports of anyone who has joined up with the Islamic State and do everything that we can to prevent terrorists from reentering the United States.

These terrorists would have had battlefield experience, they would have had established relationships with a terror network, and they potentially may have a plan for terrorist activity in the United States. That should and must be done.

What we also must do—and I agree with the President of the United States—we must defeat this enemy.

The Islamic State has declared war against the United States. I believe that we must declare war against the Islamic State, but that is not what President Obama proposed.

You see, President Obama, from his rhetoric, has essentially made clear that he believes that war is obsolete in the 21st century, but that isn't the view of the Islamic State. That isn't the view of the totalitarian regime that has declared war against the United States. War isn't obsolete for their mind; yet the President of the United States is not choosing to engage the United States in war.

It is this odd hybrid where the President wants to say that he is going to try to defeat the Islamic State; yet he is not willing to do what it takes to defeat the Islamic State.

Why do I say that? Because the United States military is the greatest military—Army, Navy, and Air Force—in the world. There is nothing that can even remotely compare to the United States military; yet our President stated—both last week in his address to the Nation, as well as today at MacDill Air Force Base in his remarks—that there will be no U.S. boots on the ground. There will not be a U.S. military presence.

He is willing to use the American Air Force to fly missions and have airstrikes, but not boots on the ground.

You see, it doesn't work that way, Mr. Speaker. A military is a cohesive unit, and this is going up 50,000 feet, we have to understand: Do we have a problem? Yes, we have a problem.

Americans are being killed and beheaded by the Islamic jihadist state. They have declared war against the United States. They are using all possible means to advance themselves to their goal.

They are gaining in strength every day—huge swaths of economic territory, huge swaths of geographic territory. They are increasing the size of their armies. They are making threats against the United States.

What is our response? The President of the United States, number one, is unwilling to declare war against this enemy. He is unwilling to use our United States military to defeat this enemy.

He has asked partners across the world—whether it is Muslim, Arab nations, whether it is our traditional allies—to join him. He received some rhetoric, some nods of the head, that some allies would help him; yet there isn't one word that one country is actually going to supply troops or supply armament or supply training.

We don't know what it is that the President has put together; yet, somehow, some way, he believes that this enemy is going to be defeated. His plan is what he was doing before. It was some advisers in an Embassy in Baghdad, U.S. advisers, but not boots on the ground.

His other avenue of defeat is to have United States tax dollars vet Syrians and, supposedly, Iraqis and train them to be a part of a military effort and give them American armament after 3 and a half weeks of arming.

You see, I really don't understand this methodology, when we already have the best military in the world and the President has decided to put the best option that we have on the sidelines and then he wants to create an ad hoc army on the ground with, at best, thin loyalties to our ultimate objective.

How thin, Mr. Speaker? Well, the RAND Corporation took a look at those who were trained, vetted, and on the ground and fighting in the Free Syrian Army, and the RAND Corporation found that about half—50 percent of those that the United States had vetted, the so-called moderates trained and given American armaments to—about half had been not only sympathetic but had cooperated and joined up with the enemy, the Islamic State and the al-Nusra front.

Well, if, in fact, the RAND Corporation is accurate and we have lost about 50 percent of those that we trained, I would say we don't have a very good success ratio.

As a matter of fact, what I would say is that the Islamic State has an incredible success ratio because we will have—at taxpayer expense—identified, vetted, trained, and armed a whole new level of army for the Islamic State, the enemy.

Who is this working for? Not us. Who is this defeating? Not them. Because the Islamic State continues to grow and we are paying for part of their military training and armaments.

In fact, this same story that came out last week said that the Islamic State had raided our United States weapons depots that we had set up for arming the Free Syrian Army.

What does the President want us to do? The President wanted the United States Congress to get behind his effort to increase the amount of training and arming of the Islamic State.

You see, these moderates have been more than a mirage, more than a charade for quite a bit of time. As a matter of fact, one of my colleagues from Minnesota gave me an article today before we took the vote.

Again, I am not trouncing anyone's vote in this chamber. I want to make it very clear. Both sides of the aisle—Republican and Democrat, individual Members of Congress—wrestled with their vote. Everyone struggled with what to do. Should we back the President in what he is choosing to do? Should we not back the President?

I give all goodwill to every Member of Congress. I castigate no one for the vote that they cast today because this was truly a vote of conscience that every Member made, and every Member needs to speak for themselves.

I only speak for myself tonight, Mr. Speaker, but this came out yesterday. The leader of the Free Syrian Army, the army that the President wants us to spend \$500 million to train even more individuals, under this commander, this is what the article says: "The Free Syrian Army announced they will not sign up to the U.S.-led coalition to destroy the Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria."

I just want to repeat that again.

"The Free Syrian Army announced it will not sign up to the U.S.-led coalition to destroy ISIS in Iraq and Syria. The group's founder, Colonel Riad al-Asaad, stressed that toppling Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is their priority and that they will not join forces that U.S.-led efforts without a guarantee that the United States is committed to his overthrow."

"If they want to see the Free Syrian Army on their side"—our side—"they should give assurances on toppling the Assad regime and on a plan including revolutionary principles."

This is the army that we are entrusting to win this effort against ISIS, and this army is more interested in toppling Assad. They are not interested in toppling ISIS.

"The announcement appears to be reversing an earlier statement on Thursday by the National Coalition opposition, the Free Syrian Army's political wing, which said it was ready to work with the coalition against IS."

The political arm said yes, but the guys who are actually going to have the boots on the ground say, "No, we are not going to be there. We are not going to be fighting IS."

"Saying they had 'long called for this action,' the coalition called on U.S. politicians to authorize the training and equipping of the Free Syrian Army 'as soon as possible.'"

This is from the Middle East Eye. This is in an article that came out yesterday.

At best, we have got a very, very weak case—a very weak case. There are articles, which I agree with, that put the choice before us. It says: Do we have an enemy? Yes. What do we need to do? Defeat the enemy. I get that, but we have been unwilling to declare a war against this enemy. We have been unwilling to put the United States' military against this enemy.

What the President of the United States wants the United States to do is train some Syrians for 3 and a half weeks. We have already spent how many billion training the Iraqis, and the Iraqi Army could not stand up against the Islamic State army.

We had trained them for a very extensive period of time, with the finest training that we possibly could. They were well-equipped. Because United States residual forces were pulled by the President of the United States, the Iraqi Army could not stand up against the Islamic State, and they ran.

We think that 3 and a half weeks of training is going to do the job of the Syrians? I don't think so.

I think what the President of the United States asked us to do, Mr. Speaker, is to be a scapegoat in his failed strategy. He wants to be able to point to the Congress and say, "The Congress gave me the authority to do it."

I don't want to do that. I didn't do that today. I chose to vote "no." I am not being self-righteous when I say that.

My thinking on this is that I am willing to vote for a World War II strategy, meaning I am all in. I believe that we need to declare war against this evil empire of the Islamic State. We need to put all resources with the full plan, with an exit strategy in fully defeating the Islamic State, which we can. They are an army of 12,000.

This can be done, but I won't agree to a Vietnam war style strategy which is exactly, in my opinion, what President Obama chooses—chose to engage, with driblets and drabs, increasing a little here, increasing a little there.

□ 1900

The President, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, would have been well-served if he also would have demonstrated even more humbleness regarding our strategy—meaning, for the President to be absolutely adamant last night, as well as today, for Secretary of State Kerry to be absolutely adamant today that there will be no U.S. boots on the ground sends a signal. It sends a signal that we are not serious about defeating this evil known as the Islamic State, which we must be.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Who on the ground will be calling for the airstrikes against the Islamic State? Someone on the ground needs to do it. That is how war works. Someone who is on the ground needs to call for those airstrikes.

You cannot win a war when you only have overhead architecture and overhead surveillance. You need people on the ground who can go and gather the intelligence that you need so you know, effectively, how to defeat this enemy.

I ask this: Do we want to defeat this enemy decisively, quickly, and completely so that this enemy understands that, if they ever rear their head again, they had better think twice because we are going to so decimate their evil plan? Are we going to do that? Or are we going to do what happened in Vietnam, dribble, drab, a little here, a little there, never quite getting up what it takes to actually defeat that enemy?

What happened in the end in Vietnam? Ultimately, the Communists came in, and that country fell. It was a very sad conclusion because, you see, the postscript to the story of Vietnam was the slaughter of innocents under

the evil Pol Pot and the killing fields, and we know the history was an ugly history.

This isn't good, this is awful, but we need to see what has happened. You see, this Arab Spring has been nothing but Islamic bloodletting across the Middle East. In their own words, it is religious-based. In their own words, it is religious, shari'a inspired. In their own words, they are doing the bidding of their god to spill the blood of the infidel. This is an evil, this is a moral wrong, and this must be defeated.

The good news is it can be. We can defeat it. When we are the greatest military powerhouse in the world, when we have the capability to defeat this enemy, I don't understand it. I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, our President who just this week said that he needed to commit 3,000 American troops to the African continent for Ebola—to defeat Ebola.

Now, Ebola is a virus that has a health impact against the American people. I can understand dispatching medical personnel. I can understand dispatching people for humanitarian purposes, but the very weird thing about the President's strategy is it has been changing our military so that its purpose is to bring about humanitarian relief in the form of dispatching them for boots on the ground to deal with Ebola. That is not the purpose of a military.

The President needs to dispatch 3,000 troops—or whatever it takes—into the Islamic State to defeat the Islamic State. We don't go in willy-nilly. We go in with a very good plan, with the most brilliant military minds—and we have them—with the bravest military heroes—and we have them—and with the greatest military equipment that has ever been devised by man, and we have it. We have got it all. We have got the means for defeating this evil enemy.

To not do it, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, that is a moral wrong. That is an evil. To allow that evil to grow, thrive, and continue to slit the throats of men, women, and children; to rob them of their lives; and, yes, to see tragedy borne potentially across this land because, even today, as we are in this Chamber tonight, absolutely nothing has been done to secure America's southern border, absolutely nothing against entry by the Islamic State into this country, despite the fact that the Islamic State, through their social media, has been declaring their intent to do exactly that.

Why in the world aren't we closing our southern border and every other border and every other port of entry? Why aren't we pulling the passports of Americans who have become terrorists under the Islamic State and who seek to return to the United States?

Why would any sane country choose to take effective, commonsense answers to secure the safety of the American people? That is what a nation that

wants to survive would do. That is the better way. That is what I hope the President of the United States will do because, you see, everything is at stake

On this, our Constitution Day, let us recognize the first duty of any nation, especially the greatest Nation, is to secure the safety, sovereignty, and security of the American people. That, we must do, and I am so proud that we have the means to do it.

I believe that we will acquire the judgment to do what needs to be done. It is within the hearts of the American people. It is within our military. Now, it is up to the politicians. Listen to wisdom. Listen to the people, and do what needs to be done.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1214. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 17, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4197. To amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5134. To extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 18, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7185. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA18) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7186. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [No.: AMS-LPS-13-0079] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7187. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from any discretionary cap sequester in FY 2015, if a sequester is necessary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7188. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Lawrence M. Martin, Jr., United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7189. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semi-annual status report of the U.S. Chemical Demilitarization Program for August 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7190. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Burton M. Field, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7191. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Mark A. Brown, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 2013 report entitled, "Operation and Financial Support of Military Museums"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7193. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Peter M. Vangjel, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7194. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7195. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee (RIN: 3064-AE13) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7196. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Rehabilitation Services Administration—Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program [CFDA Number: 84.224D.] received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

7197. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0011] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7198. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Infrastructure Requirement (Visibility) for the 1997 and 2006 PM, and 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0814 and EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0692; FRL-9915-65-Region 4] received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7199. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C.I. Pigment Red 112; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0757; FRL-9914-14] received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7200. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0916; FRL-9916-14-Region 10] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7201. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Control of Gasoline Reid Vapor Pressure [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0595; FRL-9916-10-Region 7] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7202. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0096; FRL-9916-32-Region 6] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7203. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; 111(d)/129 Revised State Plan for Large and Small Municipal Waste Combustors [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0260; A-1-FRL-9915-71-Region 1] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Pinal County and Gila County; Pb [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0266; FRL-9916-11-Region 9] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7205. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0445; FRL-9915-32] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7206. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0622; and EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0124; FRL-9912-91] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7207. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0277 and EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0166; FRL-9915-69] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7208. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfuric Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0073; FRL-9914-18] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Texas: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2013-0624; FRL-9915-99-Region 6] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7210. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0504; FRL-9915-46] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7211. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, "National Air Toxics Program: The Second Integrated Urban Air Toxics Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7212. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-36, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7213. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Action Under Section 1244(d)(1) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7214. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7215. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7216. A letter from the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, White House, transmitting a letter regarding

H. Con. Res. 105; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7217. A letter from the General Manager and Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7218. A letter from the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7219. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Legal Process for the Enforcement of a Tax Levy or Criminal Restitution Order Against a Participant Account received September 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7220. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7221. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration, and Designated Reporting Official, Office of the National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7222. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's fifth annual report on activities regarding civil rights era homicides, as required by the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7223. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013, July 1, 2013 — September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7224. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the status of the Tribal Law and Order Act Pilot Program Report to Congress, November 29, 2010 to November 29, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7225. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court, transmitting notification that the Supreme Court will open the October 2014 Term on Monday, October 6, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. and will continue until all matters before the Court ready for argument have been disposed of or decided; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7226. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0329] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0251; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-17946; AD 2014-16-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell ASCa Inc. Emergency Locator Transmitters Installed on Various Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0573; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-17955; AD 2014-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0490; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-133-AD; Amendment 39-17926; AD 2014-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30969; Amdt. No. 3600] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30968; Amdt. No. 3599] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30970; Amdt. No. 3601] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0124; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-197-AD; Amendment 39-17944; AD 2014-16-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7234. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30971; Amdt. No. 3602] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7235. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0060; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-17943; AD 2014-16-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7236. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0082; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-3] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7237. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments [Docket No.: 2013-0709; Amendment No. 71-45] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7238. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0234; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-220-AD; Amendment 39-17952; AD 2014-16-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7239. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0258; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-17950; AD 2014-16-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7240. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0252; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-213-AD; Amendment 39-17933; AD 2014-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7241. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

7242. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting fiscal year 2016 Budget for the Office of Inspector General; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

7243. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2016 budget request, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

7244. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting a notification of a public hearing held on May 15, 2014 on "Stability in China: Lessons from Tiananmen and Implications for the United States"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5500. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect employment and training services for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5501. A bill to establish a grant program to enhance existing secondary education programs for the purpose of teaching high school students about the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the individual States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 5502. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEAL, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5503. A bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KIND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5505. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5506. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to, for financing alter-

ations, repairs, and improvements to, or conversion of, existing structures, modify premium charges and the dollar amount limitation on loans, including energy efficiency home improvements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5507. A bill to provide for a study by the Institute of Medicine on health disparities, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidelines on reducing health disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty in the dollar limitation on the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and extend the American Opportunity Tax Credit and to increase the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5510. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for more effective online education verification metrics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5511. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5512. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5513. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the tax credit for electric vehicle recharging property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a loan program to assist and provide incentives for manufacturers to reinvest in making products in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5515. A bill to reauthorize the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5516. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit the discharge of dredged material into the Great

Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5517. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5518. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the continuing professional education reimbursement provided to health professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 5519. A bill to authorize funding for, and increase accessibility to, the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System, to facilitate data sharing between such system and the National Crime Information Center database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide incentive grants to help facilitate reporting to such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5520. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5521. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to conduct a study on urban flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 5522. A bill to abolish the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, transfer its functions relating to the Federal firearms, explosives, and arson laws, violent crime, and domestic terrorism to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and transfer its functions relating to the Federal alcohol and tobacco smuggling laws to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5523. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the National Labor Relations Act to protect the health benefits of retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms.

PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5524. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 729. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 19, 2014 as National Service Coordinator Day to recognize the value of service coordinators in subsidized and other affordable housing communities for their work to promote and support economic self-sufficiency and independence for low-income families, older Americans, and persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BARBER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CHU, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 730. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 731. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 15, 2014, through September 21, 2014, as "Balance Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H. Res. 732. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that mandates imposed on manufacturers requiring inclusion of unproven and unreliable technology in firearms is costly and punitive, and the prohibition of firearms without such features is an infringement on the rights of citizens under the Second Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 733. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of September as "Clinical Research Innovation Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12, 13, 14, 18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 5502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Recognizing that numerous federal criminal law statutes (through which federal civil asset forfeiture is enacted) have dubious constitutional justifications, this reform bill embeds and advances constitutional principles found in the Fourth, Fifth and Tenth Amendment. The bill also derives its authority from Congress' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9 authority to "constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court." This authority includes the rules and procedures used by inferior federal courts.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 5504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 5505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause of Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 5521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 164: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 292: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 303: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 445: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 477: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 485: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 533: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 640: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1070: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARBER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1331: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1339: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARBER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1507: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1597: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1620: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1652: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1755: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1761: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1827: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1852: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 2028: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2143: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2156: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2330: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2426: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2468: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr.

RANGEL, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2500: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2506: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2706: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2794: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2918: Mr. RIBBLE and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2985: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2994: Mr. GALLEGGO and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3150: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3462: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3485: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 3505: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3556: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3560: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3680: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr.

FORTENBERRY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan,

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr.

MCKEON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs.

NOEM, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIMKUS,

Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of

Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 3708: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 3717: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3726: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3833: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3877: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3991: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 3992: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4188: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 4190: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MICHAUD,

and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4221: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 4223: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4324: Mr. POSEY and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4351: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr.

SCHNEIDER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. JOHN-

SON of Georgia.

H.R. 4432: Mr. PETRI and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4510: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr.

COOPER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr.

MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Flor-

ida, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 4526: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 4567: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4611: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4612: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 4625: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4634: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 4727: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 4740: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr.

RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 4824: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4833: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4852: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4879: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 4886: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4930: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr.

PALAZZO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr.

SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4934: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4960: Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of

Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SALM-

ON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARK of

Massachusetts, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4969: Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4972: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 4978: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 4985: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5069: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 5071: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 5083: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 5109: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 5130: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5183: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 5212: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 5213: Mr. REED.

H.R. 5233: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 5241: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5252: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 5263: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5283: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5291: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 5295: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 5300: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5304: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5327: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5336: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5343: Mr. FALCONE.

H.R. 5364: Ms. MOORE and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5395: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5398: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5403: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 5430: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 5431: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 5439: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 5441: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 5449: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 5451: Mr. KIND, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5470: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5475: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 5478: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr.

DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5483: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 5488: Mr. VELA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MATHESON.

H. Res. 190: Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 281: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 356: Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 422: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 489: Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 619: Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 620: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DUFFY.

H. Res. 707: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. GARRETT.

H. Res. 709: Mr. PETERS of California.

H. Res. 718: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 726: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

SENATE—Wednesday, September 17, 2014*(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 16, 2014)*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by Rev. Canon Andrew White, pastor of St. George's Church, Baghdad, Iraq.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Lord God, to You we submit the affairs of this new day, the work of this Senate as it takes its role in leading in a broken world. Today may You give this place great wisdom. May this Senate be the channel of Your healing, the source of Your glory. From this place may there flow the wisdom of not just humanity but of the Almighty.

O Lord, we the people of faith in Iraq—Jews, Christians, and Muslims—give thanks to You for the way this land and this place has stood with us in our terrors and trials. Through this House, we thank You that we have not been left alone. May Your glory be on this land, and may You, O God, bless America.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I extend to Chaplain Black our appreciation for the guest Chaplain today. That was a very moving prayer, and I very much appreciate the work our Chaplain does in always giving us courage and helping to build our faith.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until noon today. During that period of time Senators will be allowed to speak for up to

10 minutes each. The time will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. Following morning business the Senate will proceed to one rollcall vote on the confirmation of John Bass to be the Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, followed by several voice votes on executive nominations.

TWO WASHINGTON NATIONALS STARS HAIL FROM NEVADA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Nevada is a relatively small State population-wise but a large area. We are a State of about 3 million people. We take pride in our home State, as we should. Even though we have grown a lot in the last couple of decades, we are still a big family.

Today Nevadans are celebrating two of our home State's native sons after the Washington Nationals clinched the National League East Division crown. There is a lot of dissension here on the Senate floor and a lot of talk back and forth, but one thing you never hear often enough is that the Republican leader and I love watching baseball. We often share our views of the team and how, if we were there, we may do things a little differently, but we are still a booster for the team.

The reason I mention this today is because there are two individuals who helped the Nationals clinch the National League East Division who have deep roots in Nevada.

In his first season as manager of the team, Matt Williams, from Carson City, NV, has led his team to the National Division series. He has a stunningly powerful record athletically and is just a nice person. He was a baseball and football star at Carson City High. Carson City is the capital of the State of Nevada.

Matt Williams played baseball collegiately for the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, where he was a star. He was so good, he played 16 years in the Major Leagues. He played for the Giants, Indians, and Diamondbacks. He played in the World Series for each of those teams. He is a five-time all-star and a four-time Gold Glove Award winner. He was a stunningly good third baseman, and he sports a World Series championship ring from the Diamondbacks.

Bryce Harper had his picture on the front of Sports Illustrated when he was 15 years old for hitting a home run more than 500 feet. He is a fine young man from a wonderful family. He came

to the Major Leagues when he was 18 years old—he may have been 19. I believe he is going to turn 22 soon.

During his rookie year he had a very serious injury. What was the injury? He was running full speed and rammed into the wall at Dodger Stadium, and he was hurt. It took away from his stellar year, but he still did OK. He was Rookie of the Year and on the all-star team that first year. He played baseball at Las Vegas High School, and he left high school and went to a junior community college as a 17-year-old. Because of his power, he went to the National Junior College World Series. He is a two-time all-star. He is in his third season. In 2012 he was Rookie of the Year, and he was hurt again this year because of his enthusiasm for the game and his never-ending hustle. He hit a triple and went into third base and messed up his thumb. That required surgery, and as a result he missed much of this season. However, he is having a good season in spite of that.

We are very proud of our baseball athletes.

This year one of the greatest baseball players of all time, Greg Maddux, was, of course, on the first ballot and was made a member of the Baseball Hall of Fame. This unassuming young man has been an example for how people should be athletes—not a lot of talk, other than when he does talk. He has a lot of humility. He is a great athlete.

I wish Matt Williams, Bryce Harper, and the rest of the team the best of everything when the playoffs get underway. It should be an exciting divisional series.

I also follow the Baltimore Orioles, and until the Nationals showed up, that was about all we had in the area. They have a great team. Their owner is a tremendous trial lawyer. He still works every day practicing law. They have a tremendous team. They have had a few bad breaks. Their very young third baseman was hurt. He lost a lot of this season, as he did last year.

Anyway, it would be a great World Series to have Baltimore playing the Nationals. That would be something I would really look forward to. Again, it was exciting to watch them all year. Two or three games ago Bryce Harper hit one of his towering home runs. They are still talking about how far he hit it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in congratulating the Washington Nats in winning the Eastern Division of the National League. It is a pretty exciting development and has a lot of Nevada connections.

KENTUCKY COAL JOBS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is no secret that the Obama administration policies have been extraordinarily harmful to job creation and retention. From the perspective of my home State of Kentucky, there is no greater example of the ill-effects of these policies than the President's war on coal.

Given the unhealthy economy, the Senate should be regularly debating and voting on measures to overturn antijobs policies and pass bipartisan reforms to help grow our economy. But under the current majority, that, sadly, is not the case. The majority leader instead has refused to permit any amendments on preserving coal and coal-fired power all year long—none whatsoever; no votes at all—even though the Obama administration's antioal rules not only adversely affect States with Republican Senators, such as Kentucky, but States represented by Democratic Members as well.

The Senate's failure to address coal is reflective of the Chamber's dysfunction. While the House is passing bipartisan jobs bills, Senate Democrats' priorities are show votes.

Let's review where we are and how we got here.

In 2008 Candidate Obama said:

If somebody wants to build a coal power plant, they can—it's just that it will bankrupt them, because they are going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted.

I have to say he has been true to his word. Americans have seen a barrage of regulations and redtape from the President's Environmental Protection Agency, strangling the coal industry—one of my home State's most important sources of jobs and economic development. Kentucky miners and thousands more from the Commonwealth whose jobs rely on mining are feeling the pain from the President's efforts.

The regulations and lack of certainty in the coal industry that this administration has caused have contributed to a loss of 7,000 Kentucky jobs in that industry since President Obama took office—7,000 lost jobs. That tells me the overregulation this administration's EPA keeps piling on is contributing in a major way to the job decline in my home State.

Those of us who represent coal States have made numerous attempts to rein

in EPA, but the majority leader and fellow Democrats here in Washington have blocked us at every turn.

Last September I introduced the Saving Coal Jobs Act. The bill would have ended the abuse of the permitting process by the EPA by requiring the Agency to approve or veto mining permit applications within 270 days of their submission. It was simply a time limit to make a decision. This legislation is necessary because the EPA's tactic of choice is to sit on permits, effectively killing them. My bill also included language prohibiting any new carbon emission standards on new or existing powerplants as mandated by Federal agencies without the approval of Congress. After all, Congress, not the executive branch, is supposed to write our Nation's laws.

Unfortunately, what happened when I introduced this legislation is something that has become all-too familiar. When I made a motion to proceed to the bill, it was blocked by the majority leader.

In April I offered my Saving Coal Jobs Act as an amendment to the then-pending unemployment insurance bill before the Senate. This motion was blocked by the majority leader as well.

In May I again offered the Saving Coal Jobs Act as an amendment to the then-pending energy efficiency bill. Once again it was blocked by the Senate majority leader.

A few days later in May I offered legislation to stop the EPA from moving forward with its anti-coal jobs carbon regulations. My amendment, introduced along with Senators VITTER and HOEVEN, would have halted the administration from moving forward with new regulations on coal-fired powerplants until the technology required to comply with the regulations is commercially viable, which currently it is not. Once again this commonsense measure on behalf of Kentucky coal miners and their families and jobs was blocked by the majority leader, and that bill was originally sponsored by a colleague on the other side of the aisle, on the Democratic side. It fared no better under the majority leader than do Republican procoal bills.

Moreover, the majority leader is not just blocking procoal legislation on the Senate floor, he is also willing to shut down the committee process for fear of procoal amendments having the votes to pass. In June, he had the Senate Democrats prevent the Energy and Water Appropriations bill from being marked up when they learned I had the votes for my amendment reining in government regulations on coal-fired powerplants. So once it was clear the votes might be there in committee, they shut down the committee process.

Earlier this year, the President's EPA announced new regulations it wanted to enact on existing powerplants that would be a dagger to the

heart of my State's middle class and constitute the single worst blow to Kentucky's economy in modern times. The proposed EPA regulations on existing powerplants would kill jobs and raise utility rates across the State while making the transmission of electricity less reliable. The regulations would adversely affect Kentucky powerplants that account for literally thousands of Kentucky jobs.

These regulations are why this June I introduced the Coal Country Protection Act—legislation to block the President's proposed regulations on carbon emissions from existing powerplants if those regulations eliminate jobs, cost our economy dollars, increase electricity prices or jeopardize electricity reliability.

Those requirements are just common sense. Yet once again the majority leader refused to allow a vote on my legislation.

The importance of my Coal Country Protection Act is reflected in the findings of a recent Government Accountability Office, or GAO, study. My colleague Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska requested this study which found that as a result of EPA's existing and proposed regulations, the number of coal-fired powerplants closing across the country is even higher—even higher—than what was originally estimated by the GAO in 2012.

These coal plant retirements are largely due to EPA redtape. Current proposed regulations, from carbon regulations to proposed lower ozone standards, will only make this number increase if they move forward.

These shutdowns mean higher electricity prices. Sadly, EPA bureaucrats don't understand or don't care about how the abundance of coal in Kentucky permits the State to benefit from relatively low energy rates which make our businesses more competitive and make it easier to attract jobs. As we saw during last winter's cold snap, our country needs coal and ready access to it. Coal allows us to generate affordable power when there is an uptick in electricity use combined with spikes in natural gas prices. But as the EPA uses the administrative fiat to terminate existing and future coal-fired powerplants, there will be less coal when we need it the most—when we need a source of affordable power. Families throughout the country who rely on coal for electricity could find themselves in a tough spot in the near future with the current administration in office.

Those are the facts about this administration's war on coal, but let me provide a more vivid picture about Kentucky coal itself.

Kentuckians have been mining coal for generations. Kentucky coal helped power the Industrial Revolution that transformed our economy into the largest and most prosperous in the

world. Kentucky coal has even contributed to the struggle to defend our Nation in times of war. Kentucky's coal miners have done so much for our Nation. The Senate should not be turning its back on them now.

Jimmy Rose of Pineville, KY, is well known to many as the voice of coal country. Jimmy is a veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps who served in Iraq, a former coal miner, and a finalist from the television show "America's Got Talent." He is famous for his song "Coal Keeps the Lights On." I think Jimmy put it best when he said, "Coal keeps the bills paid, the clothes on the backs, and shoes on the feet."

I am not going to stand idly by while this administration and this EPA try to wipe out the lifeblood of my home State. The Senate was created to be a deliberative body, one that would debate and legislate on the great issues of the day. Instead, the Senate, as it is currently run, does all it can to avoid important subjects such as the war on coal.

It doesn't have to be that way. The Senate can still reclaim its mantle as a body of vigorous debate and legislative achievement, and the Kentucky coal miner can still do an honest day's hard work for good pay, because after this administration is out of office, the coal will still be in the ground. After this administration leaves office, the coal will still be in the ground.

So I am going to fight for that Kentucky coal miner to hold on to our State's birthright. This war on coal is not over, not by a long shot.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. McCONNELL. On another matter, I just explained why the war on coal has been so damaging to the people of my State. It is clear to me at least that we need to work together toward sensible, all-of-the-above energy policy. The good news is that the Republican-run House is set to present us with another perfect opportunity to work across the aisle and do just that this very week. The House plans to pass and send over a bipartisan legislative package that would create jobs while helping to make energy more affordable and more abundant.

Among other things, this energy package would finally approve the Keystone Pipeline. This is a project that is safe, shovel-ready, and could create tens of thousands of jobs right away. It is just unacceptable that the administration has now spent 6 years—6 years—dragging its feet on the Keystone Pipeline. I commend my colleague from North Dakota Senator HOEVEN for bringing attention to that fact and for his strong vocal leadership on this issue. While some on the other side of the aisle claim to be supportive of Keystone jobs, they have failed to stand up to the majority leader who

has blocked this effort time and time again on behalf of the Obama administration. We need to approve the House legislative package and finally get this pipeline built and these Keystone jobs created.

But the House's energy package would do a lot more than just that. It would also modernize the permitting process, allow for more energy exploration, increase exports of American energy, and it would help us fight back against the Obama administration's war on Kentucky coal jobs in several different ways.

One bill would prevent the administration from developing more job-killing coal regulations and another from Representative WHITFIELD would push back on the coal regulations that have already been issued.

This package is common sense. I applaud our colleagues in the House for their efforts on this issue. It presents a perfect opportunity for our Democratic friends, if they are willing to support it, to prove they are serious about real solutions for middle-class families—that they have a real agenda beyond just designed-to-fail bills.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT DANIEL N. FANNIN

Mr. McCONNELL. This morning I wish to share with my colleagues the story of a brave Kentucky airman who loved his country so much he defended it at the cost of his life.

U.S. Air Force SSgt Daniel N. Fannin, of Morehead, KY, was killed in the crash of his reconnaissance plane near Kandahar Airfield in Afghanistan on April 27, 2013. It was just a few weeks after his 30th birthday.

For his service in uniform, Staff Sergeant Fannin received several medals, awards, and declarations, including the National Defense Service Ribbon, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Air Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, the Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster, and the Bronze Star.

Daniel's mother Sharri Jones recalls this of her son:

Daniel flew on this Earth as an airman. His faith has earned him angel wings now. He died serving others, serving his country, and serving God. This mother is blessed.

Daniel grew up in Morehead and attended Rowan County Senior High School, from which he graduated in 2001. He enlisted in the Air Force shortly after graduation and at the time of his death was a 12-year veteran.

Daniel's mother Sharri remembers:

I frequently told Daniel he was my hero. Benjamin Disraeli said, "The legacy of heroes is the memory of a great name and the inheritance of a great example."

These words epitomize my son. His name will be remembered, and his works are indeed great examples. He was then, and will forever be, my hero.

Daniel's mother Sharri continues:

I used to tell Daniel that it didn't matter what he did as a career in life, but I expected him to be the best that he could be, no matter if he was a ditch digger or a CEO. He did me proud by doing just that. He was the best man that he could possibly be.

As Daniel grew up, he had to learn how to do chores such as laundry, cleaning, and cooking. Sharri's mother said:

Like all kids do, he complained constantly, and sometimes it was a battle getting him to do those things. I was fortunate enough to get to attend his Air Force basic training graduation ceremony in San Antonio. During liberty, he took me aside and said: "Mom, I want to thank you." I said: "What for, son?" He said: "For making me do all of those things you made me do, like laundry. It sure made things a lot easier for me here. Some of these guys didn't even know how to turn a washer on!"

Daniel was an avid reader from his early childhood. "The hardest form of punishment for him was not to allow him to read," says his mother Sharri. Daniel's wife Sonya Fannin certainly agreed. "He could read a 400-page book in a day or less," she says.

Daniel met Sonya while stationed in Oklahoma City. Sonya says:

One of my favorite stories to tell was that on our first date he went to the flower shop to pick a bouquet. He spent hours in the shop, he said, before finally picking two dozen white roses. When he presented them at the door, Danny didn't know that those were my favorite flowers, but that was the moment I knew.

Daniel loved to go camping, hiking, biking, and fishing. He loved the outdoors. On his and Sonya's 5-year anniversary trip to Maui, Danny's favorite activity was a submarine ride 170 feet below sea level. He liked to say he had been to the depths of the ocean and flown to the highest heights after that trip.

Daniel was assigned to the Air Force's 552nd Operations Support Squadron at Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma City. He was an airborne sensor operator and a qualified Air Force air surveillance instructor who served with distinction at Tinker Air Force Base.

In his dozen years of service, Daniel deployed on three tours as an E-3 AWACS, or airborne warning and control system, aircraft surveillance technician. He was also an MC-12 sensor operator. While in Afghanistan, Daniel was assigned to the 361st Expeditionary Reconnaissance Squadron as a member of the 451st Air Expeditionary Wing at Kandahar Air Base.

His mother said:

After his death, multiple superior officers have told me how respected he was, how well Daniel performed his duties, and that he was exceptional at mentoring young airmen personally as he was professionally. Daniel was a very devout man. Many have said that he led them to Christ or reconnected them with the Lord.

His wife Sonya agrees:

He was a Christian man of Christian values and morals. He served God in all that he did.

Daniel also liked to laugh and joke with his family and friends. Sonya says:

He went by many nicknames; “Dan the man,” “Fan Dannin,” and my dad’s favorite, “Lieutenant Dan.” My dad would always ask, “Lieutenant Dan, have you flown much lately?” Danny would stick his arms out to each side and say he had been flying as much as he could.

After Daniel’s death, at a park located near Tinker Area Force Base, where he had been stationed, Daniel’s legacy was honored with a replica E-3 AWACS aircraft dedicated in his honor in a ceremony in April of this year. Inscribed on the tail of the E-3 replica honoring Daniel are the words “Service Before Self,” one of the Air Force’s core values those who knew Daniel knew he lived by.

Sonya Fannin was present for the dedication to her husband, and she spoke to the crowd of about 300. She said:

This memorializes Daniel’s very essence, his giving spirit in a way which those in the public can see. Memorializing Danny here in the public park, a place in which our civilian friends and family can visit and heal on their own time, is truly special.

Daniel’s family members and friends are foremost in our thoughts as I recount this story for my Senate colleagues today. They include his wife Sonya Fannin, his mother Sharri Jones, his grandparents Henry and Fern Hamm, and many other beloved family members and friends.

I would like to close with some words from Daniel’s mother Sharri about her son. Here is what she said:

I know that there are many who continue to grieve deeply over Daniel’s passing. To them I would say, take the things that Daniel shared with you, learn from them, and pass them forward. Give others what he gave you. In that way, he will live forever.

I couldn’t agree more with such a heartfelt sentiment.

I would like the family of SSgt Daniel Fannin to know that Members of the Senate do indeed recognize the things Daniel gave to his country—namely, his service, his life, and his sacred honor. We will be forever grateful.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

REMEMBERING MATT HALEY

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor today my heart heavy with a challenging task, which is to convey the remarkable, the special, the powerful spirit of a friend who passed 3 weeks ago in a tragic accident in India.

Matt Haley was a remarkable Delawarean. Matt Haley was a gifted and accomplished chef and entrepreneur. Matt Haley was someone who touched so many lives in my home State of Delaware.

In 2012 Matt won the Delaware Restaurant Association’s Cornerstone Award, a lifetime achievement award recognizing restaurateurs who dedicate their lives to humanitarian efforts.

Matt owned eight different restaurants all across the beach region so well known to folks here in Washington. Matt owned restaurants in Rehoboth Beach, Lewes, Ocean View, Bethany Beach, Fenwick Island, and was involved in dozens of other business enterprises in other States.

In 2014 Matt had the best year he ever had in terms of the reach and scope of his potential and his vision and his recognition by his profession. He won the National Restaurant Association Cornerstone Humanitarian Award. I was thrilled to be able to join in that celebration here in Washington. He won the International Association of Culinary Professionals Humanitarian Award. He won the James Beard Humanitarian Award in a remarkable celebration in New York. He won all three major recognitions, major awards from the restaurant and culinary industry—the triple crown, as it were.

Having never met him, you might think this man, having been so successful as an entrepreneur and a businessman and so recognized and celebrated in all these different ways, would have been puffed up and filled with himself and with pride and with a sense of accomplishment and success. Matt did have a sense of accomplishment and success, but it came from a very different place. His spirit, his personality was profoundly different than that brief resume might suggest because Matt was someone who had a second and a third chance at life, so he embraced it with a passion and an openheartedness I have never seen anywhere else.

Matt was 53 years old and had been sober for 24 years. Not many years before this remarkable year of success he had this year, Matt had been riding the bus to work as a minimum-wage dishwasher as he was reinventing himself. Matt spent 4 years in prison on a 13-year prison sentence.

As he memorably remarked in a talk he gave days before he left on this trip

to India, Matt had life-altering, terrible experiences as a child. Matt had managed to grow up in an environment of circumstances and have experiences that would cripple any human person, any spirit, and had become someone who was violent and addicted, and inevitably, as a consequence of a lot of his actions, he ended up in jail. He was exactly the sort of person so many would be willing to write off. Yet Matt found an opportunity through the culinary arts, through the simple and powerful skill of cooking for others. He found a pathway back and a roadway up. Matt was someone who cooked not just well but was gifted at pulling together completely unrelated items and making something simple, tasty, and powerful.

Matt understood what a remarkable pathway toward success and independence restaurants can be for those who start working at the very lowest end of the scale in our country in terms of pay scale and yet can steadily grow to be successful managers or even restaurant owners.

Matt was someone who also had just gotten a positive diagnosis after struggling with a nearly life-ending bout with cancer. Matt had nearly died to this world once as a young man in prison and then had nearly died to us a second time through cancer.

I was blessed to have gotten to know him just in the last few years and to have been touched by the power of his energy. Matt had a hunger to connect with and touch and help love others in the world who hadn’t yet seen the possibilities of this world.

Matt would go anywhere, anytime to help someone in need in Delaware.

The stories are legend of what Matt did spontaneously and powerfully to reach out and touch folks in our home State and around the world who needed his special gift—not just his resources but his energy and his kindness.

Matt’s business partner Scott shared with me a story that he was literally driving down the road and came across a van from the Delaware Adolescent Program, Inc., DAPI, a van for a program that helps young moms complete school and be healthy and successful mothers. Their van was broken down by the side of the road, and, after learning more about the program and its impact and its importance and seeing their dilapidated and outdated van, he literally bought them a new one on the spot.

Matt was someone who, having never traveled before until recent years when he first became successful, found himself challenged and then enlivened and then aflamed with a passion for traveling around the world and for hearing from and connecting with young people and their needs. He tells much more powerfully than I can the story of his becoming connected to young women, to girls, in Nepal, victims of trafficking, victims of sexual abuse, who

were hungry and lonely and to whom he was able to help provide food and shelter and hope.

He later also connected with a whole community in Central America, and he traveled regularly to India and Nepal and to Central America as well as up and down my State. He volunteered in our prisons. He worked with our food bank. He spent time and gave resources in India and Nepal and in Central America. Literally the last time I spoke to Matt, I had just had an opportunity to meet a young woman who was truly struggling to find opportunity in our home State. She was a recovering drug addict and came up to me at an event in Dover and frankly said she never believed someone in my position would care and would work and take any risk to help someone like her find employment. She was interested in possibly working in a restaurant.

As we talked at greater length, I told her Matt's story. I told her how this young man, full of anger and abuse and difficulty in his young life, had ended up an addict and in prison and yet, through his own determination and through the kindness and partnership of others, had managed to go on to be an incredible success, an employer to hundreds, even thousands, and a contributor and a leader to groups such as La Esperanza and the food bank, and to support public school teachers and to support folks coming out of prison. I asked if she would be interested in hearing from him.

In my last conversation with Matt—a man who was incredibly busy, as he was finishing up several business projects and about to get on a plane to meet a long commitment with a group of girls in need—he said: Absolutely. I would love to talk to her. Get her on the phone with me.

He made time the next day to meet her, encourage her, and invite her to come to the food bank presentation he was making.

To his very last breath, Matt was passionate about touching and changing the lives of others. His very last initiative was to fund teachers and schools in southern Delaware and help provide supplies for them in their classrooms, and his very last day was spent riding a motorcycle on one of the highest and most dangerous roads in the world in the Himalaya to personally deliver supplies and engagement and support to girls in a remote village in a difficult and distant part of the world.

Matt Haley's compassion, his spirit, and his energy touched deeply me and so many others. His determination to do everything he could with every day he had and to make every difference he could in the world should inspire and challenge all of us. He has left a significant amount of his accumulated resources to his Global Delaware Fund,

which will continue his great work in these many places.

It is my hope and my prayer that all of us who have had our lives touched by Matt and by his unique and infectious humor and spirit will continue his remarkable lifetime of work and that all of us will remember that in this Nation, every person has value and every person has potential no matter where they are from or where they are today. Their path forward can be lifted if we just continue to carry forward the remarkable passion and spirit of Matt Haley.

I thank the Chair.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE AND MAJOR K.C. COURTLAND

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, it is a good day for Major Courtland to be here because another thing I want to talk about today is the Air Force itself and to pay tribute to those in the Air Force. This is the anniversary of the 67 years of service and sacrifice for our Nation—clearly the greatest air power in the history of the world, the first place we turn when we want to make an immediate difference in a chaotic situation in the world.

We are talking this week, again, about how the Air Force can make a difference, whether it is those based at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri or those based all over the world. The Air Force continues, in so many ways, to project our strength and our commitment to a more peaceful world by using the power that we do have in a way that ensures that in some cases the playing field is more fair because we keep people on the ground rather than let despotic governments get their weapons in the air. In some places we are able to intervene, as we did recently in conjunction with the Peshmerga, to allow the recapture of the dam in Iraq that is essential, and even beyond that, could have itself been used as a great weapon if that dam would have been allowed to be breached and then the flood that would have occurred because of that.

The Air Force was created in 1947 under President Harry Truman's leadership. Prior to that it was called the U.S. Army Air Corps. I am proud to stand today at one of the desks that Senator Truman used on the Senate floor—a desk later used by other Missourians, by Senator Eagleton, by Senator Danforth, by Senator Bond—but a desk used by President Truman as he served in what he said were the best years of his working life—his time as a Senator.

But he faced lots of hard challenges as President. One was how we moved forward in a new and different world after World War II and how we used our technology in different ways. One of those was to recognize that the U.S. Army Air Corps had risen to a place

that it really deserved to be recognized for what it was—the Air Force. The first Secretary of the Air Force, another Missourian, was Senator Stuart Symington, who then would later serve in this body as a Senator.

Certainly, we have benefited in our office from having Kelly Courtland, Maj. K.C. Courtland, who has been helping us this year in my responsibilities on both the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. This is actually her anniversary as well as a member of the Air Force. She now completes 24 years of Air Force service on exactly the same day that the Air Force was established 67 years ago. Twenty-four years ago Major Courtland enlisted in the Air Force. For the last year she has helped us fulfill the responsibilities in our office that we have and the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government—the one thing almost no one would argue we could do for ourselves; that is the responsibility of defending the country.

We are hoping we see Major Courtland stationed in Missouri one of these days. She is from Ludington, MI. She will be running her 85th marathon this weekend—the Air Force Marathon. She values her military training. She served from enlisted to now her role as a major and has been unbelievably helpful to us at this time.

As we think about Major Courtland and all of the others who serve, we want to be very mindful of their service, their willingness to step forward to defend our freedom, to be willing to defend our freedom at a time when, once again, we are talking about this week those who would threaten our freedom and what we will do about that and how we are looking to be sure that the strategy we have and the resolve we have is a resolve that allows us to convince our enemies that a peaceful world—a world where people can pursue their own values, where they are able to pursue their own right of conscience, where they are able to look within themselves and determine their own religious convictions rather than have someone tell them what those convictions are and demand that everybody follow exactly the same path in the way they view religion and the way they consequently would be required, because of that one view, to view society and how people should live together—hopefully those who defend us will get the kind of support and the kind of thoughtful consideration and determination they need from the people in the Senate and the House, from people in the Defense Department and the administration, from people in the White House, from the Office of the President himself on down who are going to be making decisions that will put others in harm's way as we try to prevent greater numbers of Americans, frankly, from being in harm's way.

I clearly count myself among those who believe this is a real danger to us—the location of this ISIS threat, the understanding from the Secretary of Defense that somewhere between 1 and 200 Americans are there fighting alongside this genocidal group, and many times that from Europe fighting alongside this group—people with passports that allow them to come to the United States, to not worry about coming over the border and just worrying about buying a plane ticket and coming in that way.

Of course there are those who say—and I agree: If we know who they are, we should take their passports away. That is easy if you know who they are to invalidate the passport. It is pretty hard if you do not know who they are to invalidate that passport. In fact, it just cannot be done. There are not only Americans coming back, but others from visa waiver countries who just simply have a passport from their country and they buy a plane ticket. Suddenly those who have become steeped in this wrong-headed view of the world—who have become conditioned to the idea that a life, if it does not agree with you, does not matter—they would be able to come into this country and into European countries in ways that we have not seen before and still have access—as terrorist groups have had before to many other countries—to poison the minds of people who are looking for an answer. I can assure you that this is not the right answer.

So I wish my colleagues well as we make these important decisions. We are going to be looking at whatever we decide to do in the next couple of days and over the next 75 days or so. We will have a chance to revisit that decision as we look at how force is being applied and how our hopes are being met. We will see if what the President thinks will happen as a response to what we are doing here is actually what appears to be happening later this year.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. I have come to the floor almost every week. I think I have come to the floor every week it was possible to be on the Senate floor over the course of the last year to discuss the changes we have seen in health care. We are now approaching the 1-year anniversary of the—everybody would agree—disastrous launch of ObamaCare. Most Americans now agree, not only was the launch disastrous, but actually the changes in our health care system have not been what they would have hoped for.

The administration has delayed the 2015 open season, to sign up for health care, until the middle of November now. Interestingly, the middle of November is right after the election. I assume that is not a coincidence that the

administration does not want voters to be reminded, between now and election day, of what the problems are in just trying to sign up and what the new costs and new deductibles may be.

But for whatever reason, of the many delays and the many determinations by the administration over and over again, no matter what the law said, the administration decided: Well, we can actually change that. There is no justification for November 15 except the first Tuesday in November. I think we all know that. No matter how many things we delayed, though, the health care plan continues to get less and less popular. Every month, as I look at those numbers, fewer Americans have confidence in the direction we are headed in health care than we did before.

Earlier this week, CMS began sending notices to consumers enrolled in the exchanges that have income-related discrepancies that do not match the Federal data. Apparently, about 363,000 individuals are receiving those letters. If they do not respond by September 30, the subsidy they thought they were having for their policy will not be there. In August CMS began to reach out to people who required proof of citizenship. Apparently, it is too much trouble to have proof of citizenship to take to the polls with you but not too much trouble to have citizenship proof if you are going to participate in this program that taxpayers pay for and that voters, ultimately, by who they send here and who they send to the White House, are responsible for.

On Monday, it was announced that around 115,000 individuals—1,700 of them were Missourians—were notified that their coverage would end by September 30 unless they could provide that verification of citizenship. That is not a very good notice to get with 2 weeks and a couple of days of notification: By the way, you are about to lose your health care coverage unless you can provide documents and provide them right now.

USA Today reported that healthcare.gov still remains so “glitchy,” according to them, “remains so glitchy,” that some people are being forced to send their information multiple times. Many cannot access their accounts, and then now there is the well-understood concern that the information may not be nearly as secure as we would want it to be.

Serco, a company that was hired to provide services for processing paper applications—we found out just a few days ago, after months of waiting, that the Federal Government finally responded to a St. Louis television station—KMOV’s freedom of information request which they submitted in March. It takes a long time to get one simple question answered. The question was: How many paper applications are actually being processed at this

processing center in Wentzville, MO? How many applications were processed between October of last year and March of this year?

The number was not so big that it should have been that hard to count. It was less than 5 percent of the anticipated number that the workforce was put in place for and the company was paid to process—about 271,000 people over that several months’ period of time.

The director of the project testified in September that the company, he said, was “prepared to manage an estimated 6.2 million paper applications” between that period of time, and instead they managed 271,000. When you have a workforce in place to do 6.2 million applications and they do about one-quarter of a million, no wonder people from that workplace were coming forward. Numerous whistleblowers, according to KMOV, were saying: We are playing board games. We have library books stacked up on the tables. We are told, every once in a while, to push the button that refreshes our computers so that it at least appears that the computer has not just gone away in one of many miscalculations in how this was going to work.

A GAO report released on Tuesday confirmed that people who had had concerns about this bill because it would use Federal funding for the first time to lead to taxpayer-funded abortions—and many of my colleagues in the House voted for this and voted for it only because President Obama repeatedly promised that the health care law would not lead to American tax dollars being used for this purpose. It is a longstanding policy. It is a policy that Americans have strongly supported for a long time. Unfortunately, this new report by the government itself indicates that was one more government promise not kept.

We are on the verge of entering the second year of healthcare.gov. We are on the verge of entering the second year of this new Federal involvement in people’s health care decisions. I think there is a reason that every week, every month, when Missourians are asked by the Kaiser Foundation and others about this, this is less popular than it was the month before.

Hopefully, when we come back next year, we will look for ways to make health care work better. Then we will begin to see people have more confidence if we would do that effectively month after month, instead of less confidence month after month.

I yield back and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes or until my remarks are complete.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND ISIS

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the gravest and most important issue we can debate in Congress. I am here to talk about America's involvement in the Middle East and President Obama's plan to defeat ISIS. Make no mistake, we must defeat and destroy ISIS. But how we destroy them is what we must get right.

I applaud the President for presenting a plan to the American people. I support airstrikes against ISIS. I support providing humanitarian aid. I support cutting off terrorist funding sources. Doing these things has already helped to prevent genocide and has already begun to roll back ISIS's gains in Iraq.

I also support in engaging the world community, but most importantly Turkey and the Arab League nations. Unfortunately, I have not seen signs from the region that tell me we have their full support. This should be an Arab ground war and a U.S. air war, but I cannot and will not support arming or training the Syrian opposition forces. I did not come to this decision easily.

I spoke with military and foreign policy experts. I attended classified briefings and asked questions of this administration—but, most importantly, I studied our history.

We have been at war in that part of the world for the past 13 years. If money and military might could have made a difference, it would have by now.

In Iraq alone, we spent the better part of 8 years training the Iraqi police and military force of a 280,000-person army at the cost of \$20 billion to the American people—\$20 billion. The first time they had to step up and defend their country, their people, and their way of life, what did they do? They folded in the face of ISIS, abandoning their equipment and facilities to the enemy.

I ask my colleagues and the President, why do we think that training the rebels would turn out any differently?

In West Virginia, we understand the definition of insanity. We get it.

The first principle of war is to know your enemy. And we certainly know our enemy.

ISIS is a barbaric terrorist with no respect for humanity, and they deserve to die. I have seen the videos and, like every American, I was disgusted and outraged.

But as it is most important to know your enemy, it is equally important to

know your allies—and I am not confident we know who our allies are.

To illustrate that point, I refer my colleagues to press reports that moderate Syrian opposition forces sold American journalist Steven Sotloff to ISIS, who beheaded him and put the video on the Internet. Are those people our allies?

Who are our other allies in this fight? As of today, we have only hints of military support from Arab countries that themselves face a greater threat from ISIS than any one of us.

Syria's neighbors have the technical ability and the financial resources to support and train the Syrian opposition forces. If that is the correct course of action we should take, they have the wherewithal to do it.

In the 1991 Iraq war, we had commitments from our allies around the world, but most importantly from the Arab community. We had a total buy-in. I know Secretary of State Kerry has been working tirelessly to build a similar coalition and to recruit support from Iraq's neighbors, because it is their neighborhood and theirs to defend. I hope it is successful because, as our intelligence community has said repeatedly, ISIS could soon become a direct threat to the United States of America. But I strongly believe that if our military arms and trains Syrian rebels, we will be involving ourselves in a ground conflict that we cannot resolve where potentially everyone involved is our enemy.

To my mind, the reasons not to arm Syrian rebels today are very clear. No. 1, first, the weapons we give to moderate opposition may not remain in their hands. If my colleagues have seen the videos of ISIS shipping U.S. Army humvees and MRAPs out of Iraq that we gave to the Iraqi Army, they will understand what I mean.

No. 2, I have seen no evidence that the Syrian rebels we plan to train and arm will remain committed to American goals or our interests. The vast majority of national level Syrian rebel groups are Islamist, none of whom are interested in allying with the United States. This is not to their best interests—and not in their interest—and none of whom we should be associating with.

Further, the opposition fighters we will train care more about overthrowing Assad's regime than they do about defeating ISIS. Assad is evil, make no mistake about it, but he is not a threat to America. If the moderate opposition has to choose between defeating Assad and defeating ISIS, why do we believe—think about this—they will choose our priority over their own? Why would we even think that? How do we know they won't join forces with ISIS if it helps them overthrow Assad, their main objective?

No. 3, authorizing military support for Syrian rebels will inextricably draw

us into a civil war we have no way to end—and we have seen this picture unfold before. Our fight is against ISIS and the Islamist terrorist groups that threaten the United States. A limit of that fight should be doing what we need to do to protect Americans and to prevent genocide. Every further step we take from that basic principle of protecting Americans and preventing genocide takes us back down the road of Middle Eastern nation-building. That means we should support others with counterterrorism forces, intelligence gathering, air power, and diplomatic efforts—and it means stopping the flow of illicit oil, money, and fighters across Syria's borders. We do not need to arm and train Syrian rebels to protect Americans.

I would ask my colleagues to consider America's history of intervention in the Middle East. It has not been a successful one. Interventions have failed in Lebanon, Somalia, Libya, Iraq, and Afghanistan is on the brink of failure.

What did we learn from our actions? Certainly not that going into Muslim countries to restore order or restore democracy is a winning strategy for us.

I have been very clear: We have every right to and we must—we must—defend ourselves and protect American citizens and interests against terrorists anywhere in the world. I again voice my strong support for the counterterrorism efforts already ongoing to protect Americans, but we have proven by blood and treasure already spent that we have not made a difference with American boots on the ground in this part of the world.

Some have used the examples of our garrisons in Germany, Japan, Korea, and the Balkans as examples of where the United States successfully established the rule of law with residual military forces, but such comparisons have little basis in history. Once our mission was achieved and occupation began, our troops did not face the threat of violence from the same people we had just defended and liberated.

Others have said if we had kept a residual force in Iraq that ISIS would never have taken hold, and I respectfully disagree. How can I fault a President for pulling troops out after 8 years, billions spent, and thousands of lives lost, with no end in sight? Again we trained in Iraq a military of 280,000 persons at a cost of \$20 billion, and when they faced their first test, they folded. That was a fraction of the total cost of our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I wish to give a rundown of where we stand today. In Iraq, conservatively, we have spent \$818 billion. In Afghanistan, we have spent \$747 billion, and that is continuing to grow. The total cost of our recent wars: \$1.6 trillion, and that is growing. That doesn't include the cost of long-term care of wounded veterans, over 50,000.

But the cost in money is nothing compared to the cost of lives. In Iraq, 4,400 dead, 36,000 wounded. In Afghanistan and still counting, 2,200 dead and 21,000 wounded.

I know my vote comes with a price. I know that. It is my understanding that the same vote we make to train and fund the Syrian opposition forces will also be one to pass a CR to fund our government. I do not believe we should be forced to decide between funding our government and arming Syrian rebels in the same vote.

We should be ashamed for failing to pass appropriations bills to finance government operations for the fiscal year that starts 2 weeks from now, and more ashamed that for the sake of expediency—expediency because of an election coming up—that we are using a stopgap continuing resolution as a vehicle for authorizing major military activity that will have repercussions for generations to come.

Asking us to make this choice is a disservice to the American people. But if that is a decision I am forced to make—and I will say if that is a decision I am forced to make—it is one I am committed to making. I understand my vote will likely not be the deciding vote, but even if it were, I would still cast the same vote. I believe these votes should be separate and debated. We owe that to the American people. We have this time to do it. I believe with all my heart we have more than enough time to do this. I am prepared, as some of my colleagues, to stay in session so we can give the American people the debate and transparent transition they deserve.

We must learn from our past mistakes and we must not repeat them. I believe our country deserves this debate. Let me make it clear, I believe ISIS is a grave threat to the region and could become a direct threat to the United States. We must confront and defeat them. I just do not believe that arming the Syrian opposition forces is the correct approach, because I can foresee a Senate debate a few years from now—not that far off—I can see this coming about how to defeat the next group of Islamist terrorists we helped to train and install.

I have not come to this decision easily, and I know it comes with consequences, but I believe the people of West Virginia sent me to the Senate to make tough decisions and vote to do what is best for not only all West Virginians but for every American.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EROSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, it brings me no pleasure to make the remarks I feel compelled to make today. I think it is important for us to understand how we, the Senate of the United States, are operating.

The Senate—the legislative body heralded by the late Senator Robert C. Byrd as the second great senate in history, the first being the Roman Senate—is being eroded beyond recognition by the tactics utilized by Senate Majority Leader REID and those who support him in that process.

Today is Constitution Day. It was Senator Byrd who moved legislation to declare today Constitution Day. Under that Constitution, there are two bodies in the Congress, the House and the Senate, and the Senate has always been known as the body where great debates are held, with an open ability to amend and discuss, and the great issues of the day are laid out. That is what we are about.

But the Senate has changed dramatically since I have been in the Senate, some 18 years, and not for the better—not for the better of the American people. It might be good for politicians, but it is not good for the American people and it is not good for the public interest, in my view.

As has been happening time and again, we are once again today, at night on the eleventh hour, being asked to vote for a spending bill before we recess. We have to recess, you see. Why? So Senators can go home to campaign, but we are being paid, whether we are here or back home or vacationing or whatever. Why don't we stay a few days longer if necessary? Oh, no. We have to get out of Washington and go back home and campaign.

This continuing resolution, covering a massive amount of spending that no Member can fully comprehend at this late hour and nobody can meaningfully analyze, scrutinize or investigate—once again, we are being asked to fund the entire government of the United States in one catch-all bill, with no opportunity for a single amendment. There is no way to improve the legislation or to engage in meaningful consideration of our financial status.

Aren't we facing a crisis financially? Hasn't the Congressional Budget Office told us we are on an unsustainable financial path? Yes. Are we going to discuss that at all? No. We are going to bring up this bill, vote it through, and go home and campaign.

This denies the American people the opportunity to know what is being passed and to analyze and hold their elected representatives accountable for their actions. So the American people can't comprehend or study what is behind this massive bill either.

Once again, as a tactic, this bill is being rushed through under the threat of a government shutdown. Without a

funding mechanism, the government would shut down October 1 if we don't pass an appropriations bill to fund it because the Government of the United States cannot operate and spend a dime Congress hasn't appropriated. That is a fundamental constitutional power.

Yes, there is a problem out there. How did it happen that we are getting toward the end of the session and nothing has been done? I will talk about that.

Why is this happening? Is it because we don't have time? No, it is not because we don't have time. The reality—and I will say this, and I have not been contradicted on it by any Member of this Senate, to my knowledge. It is not a lack of time. We haven't done anything this week or last week, and we have next week and the next week if need be. We can vote 20 times a day. It doesn't take a lot of time to vote. People can have their ideas to improve legislation and bring them up and argue for them and get an up-or-down vote, yes or no.

So why is this happening? The purpose is to protect Members from having to cast votes that their constituents might disagree with, to protect them from being placed on record one way or the other on important issues facing the Nation. That is the problem. It is politics first, sad to say. It just is.

We have not voted on a single appropriations bill in the Senate this year, not one. Not 1 of the 12 appropriations bills that are required to fund our government each year has come before the Senate. Committees are being bypassed, secret deals rule the day, and millions of Americans are thereby robbed of their ability to observe and participate in the legislative process. They are denied the ability to write their Senators and say: I hear you have an amendment coming up on thus and so. Vote for it or vote against it. That is all being eliminated in this process.

It has been so long since we followed the regular order, I think it is necessary for me to share with the people and our colleagues what is supposed to happen and what is not happening.

Each year Congress is supposed to pass a budget resolution which outlines the spending goals and limits for the upcoming year. Then, based on the spending levels contained in the budget resolution, the individual authorization committees are to report out authorization bills. For example, they are to review the Defense Department. We don't do that anymore. They are to review the Defense Department. We normally do a Defense authorization bill—but it hasn't been done this year—to authorize certain spending and policy changes, utilizing the expertise of the members of the committees to shape where the spending is supposed to go, laying out priorities, setting and making decisions about what we can afford

and what we can't afford, evaluating whether programs are effective, to serve the citizens of the United States.

Isn't that what we are supposed to do? This is the way we eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse. This is the way we stop it.

After the authorization committees do their work, the Appropriations Committee actually is the one to fund the government. The subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee are tasked with producing appropriations bills for each area of the budget, which are to be individually brought to the floor of the Senate, debated, and amended on the floor in the light of day before the American people. Each year the Senate is supposed to consider individually 12 appropriations bills. This gives each Member and their constituents a chance to review and analyze every line of the bill and to offer suggestions for saving money, improving efficiency, and better serving taxpayers—which we are failing to do and we need to do. We don't have a dime to waste, and we are wasting money regularly throughout our government, as anybody who has studied it knows.

Under the tenure of Senator REID, the budgeting process has been dismantled. We have only passed one budget in the last 5 years, although the Budget Act says we should pass a budget by April 15 every year. Our committees stand idle, and the floor is one run not for the high purpose of legislative debate but frankly as an extension of a Democratic political campaign committee.

So the Senate has ceased consideration of appropriations bills altogether, relying more and more on autopilot resolutions and catch-all continuing resolutions and omnibus spending packages.

When I first came to the Senate, almost every single Senate spending bill was debated. It was brought to the floor. A Senator was embarrassed if they didn't bring every bill to the floor. Sometimes they had two or three that couldn't be completed. They would be completed at the end and passed as an omnibus bill, and people would complain. Now none of them are passed—zero. We go year by year without debating a single stand-alone spending bill on the Senate floor. So a Senator has to ask, what are we here for?

One of the worst tactics the majority leader has used to suppress Senators' rights and block open debate is a technique called filling the tree. Under that tactic he uses his majority rights to keep Senators from offering amendments as representatives of their States and the American people.

Senator, a bill is coming on the floor, and you can't stand and give an amendment? Right, you cannot. He fills the amendment tree, we can't file another amendment, and he refuses to allow

amendments to occur. His majority, having written the bill with President Obama—they move the legislation, and there is no real ability to challenge it.

It is not the way the Senate was supposed to be set up. The Senate was always to be set up to allow individual Senators and the minority rights to be able to influence legislation and to highlight what is in it.

Blocking amendments prevents this body from working its will, prohibits legislation from being improved, and protects Senators from being held accountable by the voters on the great issues of the day. I don't think there is any doubt about that. And that is the reason it is being done.

But we can do things the right way. It absolutely can be done. Members ought to be able to offer amendments. It just turns into a real debate, and people get to push for the agendas they believe in and advocate for their position. Who knows, 10 years from today an agenda not popular today will be popular then. That is the way we are supposed to do it. Senators being prohibited from offering amendments keeps the Senate from being a critical sounding board for the issues of the day.

Our majority leader has used this tactic, filling the tree, 90 times during his tenure. To put this in perspective, the 6 previous majority leaders filled the tree only 49 times, all total. Mr. REID has filled the tree on 40 more occasions than all 6 previous majority leaders. This stops amendments from being voted on, from being offered, and that is what is happening.

The majority leader has shut down one of the most important functions that Senators exercise to defend and advance the interests of their constituents.

It doesn't stop there. The Senate is supposed to be Washington's cooling saucer. That is why on many important and controversial matters 60 votes are required to adopt a measure or to confirm a nominee, and, importantly, to change the rules of the Senate requires a two-thirds vote to move such a question towards final passage.

That is, a two-thirds vote is required to change the rules of the Senate. Thus the two-thirds vote threshold is critical because it ensures the rules have meaning, they have power, they apply, and in years to come will not be likely changed, and protect minority rights in the Senate. The rules will apply when parties are in power and when they are out of power. To change Senate rules requires a broad consensus across the body. This protects the rights of individual Senators to be heard on the issues of the day. It is a key component of the Senate's heritage of discussion and debate and openness.

Yet Mr. REID, in an exercise of brute political force, last year changed the

Senate rules by a simple majority vote. He ignored the counsel of the Senate Parliamentarian who ruled his tactic was contrary to the rules of the Senate. The Parliamentarian is our pre-eminent protector of Senate practices, and over the years different Parliamentarians have done a good job. In one stroke the majority leader changed the nature of this august body, perhaps forever.

So today the Democratic Senators who empower Mr. REID and the Senators who give him power and support him are not even allowed to consider important legislation either, effectively. Republicans or Democrats cannot offer amendments. They cannot even fully debate the issues. Huge bills are rushed through in the waning hours of a session. Systematically the rights of Senators to provide equal representation to each State are being dismantled.

But it gets worse still. As we know, President Obama has promised that after the midterms he would issue executive amnesty to 5 to 6 million people—immigrants who are unlawfully here, unlawfully entering the United States. This Executive order, Presidential order—fiat—amnesty—would include work permits for millions of illegal workers along with photo IDs and Social Security numbers, and it would include more guest workers. So businesses can bring in even more guest workers at a time of high unemployment and falling wages.

The President and the immigration lobbyists and business groups and activist groups are meeting secretly in the White House trying to implement through executive action the same disastrous, wrong policies that were rejected by Congress through the House of Representatives. The House said no to this. Once the public learned what was in the Senate amnesty and guest worker bill, they declared, no, no, no, and the House heard it. So the President is now conspiring to go around the Congress.

What did Mr. REID say? His duty is to represent the Congress, and we are a coequal branch with the executive branch and the executive branch doesn't have the power to change the immigration law that is in a law, in effect. The United States law says you cannot work in the United States—flat out, you cannot be hired if you are in the country illegally.

The President doesn't have any power to change that. The President can come back to the Senate and advocate it and see if he can pass that. But the Senate hasn't changed the law. You shouldn't be able to work in America if you are not lawfully here. Taking a job from a lawful immigrant? This is fundamentally wrong.

What does Mr. REID say about this? Does he defend the prerogative of Congress, the Senate? No, he doesn't. Instead, he has told the President to "go

real big" and bypass Congress. Do the biggest amnesty you can do.

Majority Leader REID has blocked this Senate from considering the House-passed legislation that is sitting at the desk in this Senate that would stop the President from doing this. He would use legitimate congressional power to deny funding to execute any such bogus, unlawful amnesty plan. The Constitution and the American people's interests are at stake here. But Mr. REID is determined completely to ensure this executive amnesty happens anyway, and he is determined to do whatever he can to see that it does happen. The principles that govern our political system, separation of powers, and public debate are not important here at this time.

But, colleagues, I would note that we have to recognize Mr. REID does not operate all on his own. He operates with the support and empowerment of a Democratic Caucus that allows this to occur. We saw this vividly when I made a motion some weeks ago that would allow us to take action to stop the executive amnesty. I moved that we strike his filling the tree, remove it, clear the amendment tree, and allow new amendments to be brought up to stop executive amnesty. That would have been to bar the executive action, and every Senate Democrat voted with Mr. REID—except the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN—that would enable the President to go forward with his unlawful amnesty decree. It is unbelievable.

The posture we are in is the House has passed a bill that would stop the President from going forward, clearly. It has already passed the House of Representatives. It is sitting on our desk and the majority leader will not allow it to be brought up. Why?

He has the votes. Why doesn't he bring it up and vote it down? The reason is he wants to protect his Members. He believes in this policy. He is advocating this policy. But he thinks if he brings it up for a vote, his Members might find out that the people back home are not happy.

More than three-fourths of the American people believe the President is exceeding his authority if he goes forward with this executive amnesty. So why can't we have a vote on it? Because of politics. Protect our Members. They don't need to take tough votes. Let's get out of Washington and go home and play politics in our home State.

Nobody in the Senate Democratic Congress has spoken up to support the House bill. Some pretend or hope the President won't do it. What does that mean? Nothing.

But a vote means something. So let's vote. You are either for it or not.

Every Member who supports Mr. REID—and we will have another vote on this—is as much a supporter of Presi-

dent Obama's unlawful amnesty as if they were sitting in a room helping him sign the order.

This is the time. It is either stop now or it may never be stopped. We need to vote on it. People need to be held accountable. Every American needs to know where their Senator stands on the President's unlawful assumption of power to violate plain law of the United States to carry out a political agenda he has that the American people reject. It is that simple. It is about power and it is about politics and it is not about what is best for America.

All of us owe our constituents a full, open, and deliberative process where the great issues of the day are debated with their scrutiny and the people's scrutiny. We receive their input with our rights respected, our responsibilities honored, and our Senate strengthened in the process and respected in the process. The democratic process is messy sometimes, sometimes contentious, and often difficult, but it is precisely this legislative tug of war, this back-and-forth, which forges a national consensus. People have to stick their necks out and say what they believe on important issues facing America.

It is a process our Founders utilized, men of the Enlightenment they were, to find what truth is. Truth, they believe and I believe, is an objective reality. Words have meaning. Principles are valid. Things are true and things are false. Their theory was you have a full and open, robust debate and everybody says more through that process. It is the best way for you to tell what the truth is, and based on what the truth is you can make a good judgment for what is best for America. It is the same theory we use in jury trials: cross-examination of witnesses, bring in evidence, 12 good men and women judge the evidence in an attempt to find what the truth is.

Some of this crowd today, this post-modern group, they don't even believe in truth, if you want to know the truth. While secret deals may appear to keep the trains running on time, they also keep them running too often in the wrong direction. Only through a renewed, open legislative process carried out in the full light of day can we clean up this government, forge a real national consensus, confront the difficult choices we face, achieve accountability in Washington, allow our Senators and Congressmen to be there on the front lines and sink or swim on how they perform.

We are not guaranteed office. The American people don't work for us, we work for them, and to act as we have in the past returns power thereby to the everyday citizen.

It is time for us to restore once again the great Senate of the United States.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, some of my colleagues will be coming to the floor later today to speak about the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and I am sorry I am not going to be able to join them, but LWCF is very important, especially to Montana, and so I want to make my voice heard this morning.

LWCF turned 50 earlier this month. Passed during the Johnson administration, LWCF harkens back to the time when folks reached across the aisle to conserve our treasured lands—treasured lands that exist in all corners of our Nation.

LWCF has contributed to the protection of well-known places such as Rocky Mountain National Park and the Appalachian Trail, but it has also supported lesser known but equally spectacular places such as Cherokee National Forest in Tennessee, Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho, and the Flathead National Forest in my State of Montana.

America is filled with amazing lands that make us stand in awe of their beauty, make us want to go out and explore, make us want to hunt, fish, and camp. We must make sure they are preserved for our future generations to enjoy just as we have been able to enjoy it.

From hunters and anglers to ranchers and sporting goods store owners, LWCF is a program that simply works. It uses the funds from offshore oil and gas receipts for a wide array of conservation programs. Some of these programs increase access to public lands, others preserve natural resources.

LWCF is also good for the economy. When people want to get out and enjoy the outdoors, they buy fly rods, tents, and hiking boots. The list goes on and on. Simply put, LWCF is an economic driver. America's outdoor economy generates nearly \$650 billion each year and supports nearly 6 million direct jobs in many of this Nation's smallest communities.

In Montana, a State with only 1 million people, outdoor recreation contributes nearly \$6 billion each year to our economic output and supports some 64,000 jobs in Montana. Outdoor recreation is a part of who we are as Montanans, and when I drive across the State, I often see vehicles with stickers in the back window that say, "Get Lost," but what those stickers are really saying is: I am headed to a trailhead and I am going to get lost in some

of the wild places in Big Sky Country. This way of life is passed down from generation to generation and the LWCF helps us keep our outdoor heritage alive.

We have come to expect a vibrant outdoor economy and amazing places to explore, but we need to remember this didn't happen by accident. It isn't by chance that we get to enjoy water and breathtaking landscapes.

As one of my many heroes Teddy Roosevelt said: "We are prone to speak of the resources of this country as inexhaustible, this is not so."

We invest in our majestic national park system, preserve lands from Alaska to Florida, and we have millions of people dedicated to conservation nationwide. LWCF is a critical part of our conservation effort, and if it is not authorized, it will run out at the end of the next fiscal year. As of right now, LWCF will stop strengthening our economy as of October 1, 2015. We must fund and reauthorize LWCF so our treasured places can be preserved for another 50 years and well beyond.

There is still time to make sure this critical initiative continues and receives the full funding it needs. Full funding for LWCF is supported by both Republicans and Democrats.

I wish to commend Senators RICHARD BURR and LINDSEY GRAHAM for their work on LWCF, and I look forward to working with them on full funding for this issue.

I will also push my legislation that requires 1.5 percent of LWCF funds to go to increased public access to our public lands. Making public lands public is a smart bill, and I will continue to fight for it.

There is a strong coalition behind LWCF, and I believe we can get this done by working together. Along with leaders in both the House and the Senate, we will show the American people we are still capable of working across the aisle to preserve our treasured lands and support our local economies.

Montanans have favorite places to camp and fish and hike. It may be the Bitterroot, it may be the Crazies or it may be the Bob Marshall Wilderness, but we all love the outdoors. We all want to make sure our sons and daughters can enjoy the same beautiful outdoor places that we do today. This is our legacy.

LWCF is a critical part of making sure all Americans can continue their outdoor traditions. It must be around for another 50 years and beyond.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN R. BASS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

NOMINATION OF ERIC T. SCHULTZ, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA

NOMINATION OF THOMAS FREDERICK DAUGHTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

NOMINATION OF DAVID PRESSMAN TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR

NOMINATION OF DAVID PRESSMAN TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

NOMINATION OF DEBRA S. WADA TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

NOMINATION OF LAURA S. WERTHEIMER TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

NOMINATION OF BRADFORD RAYMOND HUTHER TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nominations of John R. Bass, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey; Eric T. Schultz, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia; Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia; David Pressman, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador; David Pressman, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations; Debra S. Wada, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army; Laura S. Wertheimer, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency; and Bradford Raymond Huther, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

VOTE ON BASS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John R. Bass, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey?

There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we yield back the remaining time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Heller	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Risch
Boxer	Hoeben	Roberts
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SCHULTZ NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this nomination be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Eric T. Schultz, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON DAUGHTON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON PRESSMAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Pressman, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON PRESSMAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Pressman, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WADA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Debra S. Wada, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WERTHEIMER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Laura S. Wertheimer, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HUTHER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Bradford Raymond Huther, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BANK ON STUDENTS EMERGENCY LOAN REFINANCING ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 503

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, last month we marked the 24th anniversary of the beginning of the gulf war. In August 1990 Iraq invaded Kuwait. Shortly

after this development the United States launched Operation Desert Shield, which led to Operation Desert Storm to drive Iraqi forces out of Kuwait.

Arkansas made a huge sacrifice during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The Arkansas Army National Guard had 13 units called to serve during these operations, and 10 units of the Arkansas Air National Guard were called up. More than 3,400 Arkansas Guard soldiers were called up altogether—the second highest percentage of any State. Of those Arkansans called to serve, nine of the Army Guard units served in combat, including the 142nd Field Artillery Brigade—the only National Guard artillery brigade called to Active Duty during the gulf war.

I thank all of the men and women—more than 600,000 Americans from across the United States—who served and sacrificed in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

These servicemembers deserve a place of honor and recognition in our Nation's Capital. My friend and colleague Senator DONNELLY and I have been working toward that goal. I am proud of my colleagues in the House who unanimously passed H.R. 503, the National Desert Storm War Memorial Act in May. I ask that we bring this bill up for final passage here in the Senate.

In a time where we are facing budget constraints, this bill is budget neutral. Private funds for construction of the memorial will be raised by the National Desert Storm War Memorial Association. This bill simply authorizes the establishment of a monument on Federal lands here in our Nation's Capital, which is what Congress needs to act on to honor all of those men and women of the Armed Forces and their families. Passing this bill will be a great step in honoring our gulf war veterans. I am grateful to have the support of the full Senate and look forward to a swift ultimate passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 403, H.R. 503. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, with a great deal of respect and deference to my good friend and an extraordinary Senator from Arkansas, I actually do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 1033 AND H.R. 503

Mr. BOOKER. What I would like to do, because I fully support what an extraordinary and very important piece of legislation this is, honoring those

who served and fought and fell in Desert Storm—what I object to is the decoupling of the two bills, both of which honor our veterans.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 398, H.R. 1033, the American Battlefield Protection Program Amendments Act, and Calendar No. 403, H.R. 503, the Desert Storm Memorial en bloc, that the committee-reported amendment to H.R. 1033 be agreed to, that the bills, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and passed en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me explain to the people watching what is happening here. We have a bill that everybody agrees to that is not going to get passed because everybody does not agree to another bill that is linked to it. We have offered multiple compromises on the battlefield protection act. We just have a \$17.8 trillion deficit. We are going to have a \$599 billion debt this year. Yet this program they want to authorize that will keep this program that the Senator from Arkansas would like to honor our Desert Storm from happening—they refuse to take yes for an answer.

There are 26 critical sites that need to be protected that we know of. We said: Do that. We have said: Do not authorize more than we can afford. We will not do that. We have made compromises so that we can do what the intent of the battlefield protection act is and accomplish the leverage against the bill honoring our Desert Storm veterans. But that is not good enough. So what we have asked for is to quit allowing States and localities to game the system with any kind of pay-fors and do not have the Federal Government pay for the State's share or the local community's share plus the Federal Government's share. We have said some good government stuff.

You can pass this bill today if, in fact, they will take some adjustments to the bill. So what I would offer is rather than object, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey modify his request so that my substitute amendment to H.R. 1033, which is at the desk, be agreed to.

If you agree to these simple, straight-forward, good government, financially secure items, you do not get the full basket, but you get the things that are critical to this country in terms of protecting battlefield sites and we will honor our Desert Storm veterans.

I ask that we have that modification be agreed to which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey so modify his request?

Mr. BOOKER. There is no more eloquent a person when it comes to good government than Senator COBURN, but I do not modify my request. I object. I ask unanimous consent that the previous request I made be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. COBURN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the sad thing is the people who were involved in Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield are in the middle of this. We have this other bill that there are some concerns about. That is fine. That is what this place is all about. But the idea of holding the Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield bill hostage in this situation is not good. We live in an era of gridlock, and we have problems getting things done.

This bill passed the House unanimously and would pass the Senate unanimously. So I would hope that we can again get together and get things worked out. The reality is and the problem is that there is no reason to couple these two together. If the other bill has problems, it needs to be worked out. That is what it is all about. Let's have that discussion.

But the Operation Desert Storm and Desert Shield bill has nothing to do with that. So I would hope that in the near future we can move forward and honor these 600,000 people who participated, so that one day their children can come and visit Washington and be able to look at the monument about which the committee will decide as to what is appropriate so that we can honor these individuals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—CALENDAR NO. 12

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, 24 years ago, on July 26, 1990, President George Herbert Walker Bush, in a glorious sun-filled day on the White House lawn, attended by more people than had ever attended a bill signing in the history of our country—President Bush signed into law the Americans with Disabilities Act, a bill broadly supported by Democrats and Republicans here in the Senate and in the House.

It was a momentous occasion. You see, most people thought of civil rights as pertaining to people of color, religion, national origin, sex—that type of thing. But up until July 26, 1990, people with disabilities had no civil rights. I remember when President Bush signed that law, he uttered these words. He said: “Let the shameful walls of discrimination come tumbling down.” It was a wonderful day.

Looking back over those 24 years, can anyone deny that our country has

made great progress in expanding our concepts of the rights of people with disabilities: the right to be educated and well educated; the right of people with disabilities to have independent living, to live on their own, not to be institutionalized; the right of people with disabilities to associate freely with others; the right of people with disabilities, children with disabilities, to go to school with other kids who are not disabled; the right of people with disabilities to travel freely with barriers broken down, ramps not stairs, buses that are fully accessible now, trains, everything accessible, every building designed in America. Think about that. Every building designed and built in America today is fully accessible.

We have gone a great way in making older buildings—even some of our national monuments—totally accessible to people with disabilities. People with disabilities are finding more and more employment. They are working—not at some minimum-wage job—but working alongside others, showing that they too can contribute to our society and be fully functioning members of our society.

That is what the Americans with Disabilities Act did for our country. In 1991 the United Nations decided that what we had done in America could be an example for the world. So a commission was established to draw up a convention, a treaty on the rights of persons with disabilities. I might point out, it was negotiated under the George W. Bush administration. It took several years, but it was hammered out with the concurrence—get this—with the concurrence and the approval of the George W. Bush administration.

That U.N. treaty has been sent out to nations to be ratified. Over 150 nations have now ratified it. Think about that. Of 196 members of the United Nations, 150 have already ratified it. One country is singularly absent—the United States—from whence it all started. If you look at the treaty—if you just read it—it just echoes the Americans with Disabilities Act language in what it does.

So I will have more to say about this later. But I just want to give that background. We brought it up 2 years ago for a vote. Now, under our Constitution, a treaty requires a two-thirds vote—two-thirds of those present and voting. It was brought up 2 years ago in December of 2012. We did not get a two-thirds vote. It failed. Well, that Congress ended and a new Congress started, so the President had to resubmit it. It had to go back to the committee, now under the leadership of Senator MENENDEZ.

As requested, the committee has reported out the bill again with new reservations, understandings, and declarations. Now it is incumbent upon the

Senate to debate and vote again on this treaty.

I am hopeful we would have the votes this time—after due consideration over the past couple of years, that we would have the votes necessary.

The unanimous consent request I am about to proffer is the mirror image of the same one 2 years ago. I want everyone to understand that this unanimous consent request was not denied 2 years ago. We went ahead, debated, and we had a vote.

That is what this unanimous consent request would do, provide us with, again, 2 hours of debate, evenly divided in the usual form, and then an up-or-down vote. We have the time to do it.

I mean, what are we doing around here, one quorum call after another? People want to leave here tomorrow night. Two hours of debate, a vote, that is nothing to pass this momentous piece of legislation.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—TREATY
NO. 112-7

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 12, the disabilities treaty document No. 112-7 (disability); that the treaty be considered as having advanced through the various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification; that any committee declarations be agreed to as applicable; that there be no amendments in order to the treaty or the resolution of ratification; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution; that any statements be printed in the RECORD; that if the resolution of ratification is adopted, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that if the resolution is not adopted, the treaty be returned to the calendar, and that there be no motions or points of order in order other than a motion to reconsider; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to note that this is a treaty that has attracted a fair amount of controversy. It is a treaty that was voted on in 2012 and failed to receive the requisite two-thirds majority vote in order to be ratified in this body.

This treaty received additional consideration this year in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 22 and received a 12-to-6 vote. There are a number of our colleagues, both on and off the committee, who have concerns with this treaty, who would like the opportunity to propose amendments,

along with our consideration of this document. Under the proposed unanimous consent request, we would not be allowed to propose any amendments, and we would be given 2 hours—only 2 hours—to debate it.

Given the significance of treaties, and the fact that they carry the effect of the law of the land once ratified, I think this body deserves more, certainly, than the opportunity to debate it for only 2 hours. To be precluded here from the ability to present any amendments would not be an appropriate thing for us to do.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this is another sad, irresponsible day in the Senate. I say to my friend from Utah, he was here 2 years ago when we proposed the same exact unanimous consent request, and the Senator did not object.

It also did not allow for any amendments. That is usual when we have treaties and it comes through the committee. So why is the Senator from Utah objecting today to even doing what we did 2 years ago? Maybe he has the votes to defeat it. I don't know. We won't know until we vote on it. But 2 years ago, the Senator from Utah did not object to the very same unanimous consent request.

He says there has been a lot of controversy about it. Well, that is not so. The only controversy has been raised by the tea party and some whom I call the black helicopter crowd, people who just don't like the United Nations. I don't care if they like the United Nations; that is up to them. But it seems to me we ought to at least bring it up again, debate it, and see if anyone has changed their minds. We have new people in the Senate who were not here 2 years ago—new Senators who have not had the opportunity to express themselves on this treaty.

I disagree with my friend from Utah. There is no controversy over this, basically. Controversy? This is a treaty supported by former President George H.W. Bush. Former President George W. Bush, former President Carter, and former President Clinton all support it. All the veterans groups support it. The American Legion, VFW, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and Vietnam war veterans all strongly support ratification of this treaty.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has supported it strongly—and I don't just mean leaning back. Tom Donohue, the head of the Chamber of Commerce, has written, has called people about how important it is to the business community that we ratify it.

Former Governor John Engler, who is now the head of the Business Roundtable, brought this up to the Business Roundtable and they unanimously supported our ratification of this treaty.

I spoke to the Business Roundtable group last evening, and they all—the ones I talked to individually—couldn't understand why we would block this treaty because it is good for business, and they understand it.

It is supported by the Information Technology Industry Council—that is AT&T. I just spoke with the CEO of AT&T last evening who strongly supports it; Sprint, Adobe, Microsoft—all the high-tech people—because they understand we need strong, accessible standards for their products and their software across the globe.

All disability groups, every single disability group in America supports the treaty. Faith-based groups across the spectrum support it.

Senator Bob Dole has worked his heart out on getting votes to ratify this treaty. He has been on the phone, he has made appearances, and we have Republicans on it. Senator McCain has been a strong supporter for this treaty from the very beginning. Senator MARK KIRK is a supporter. Mr. KIRK is a veteran himself.

We had a press conference with all the veterans groups here not too long ago and I thought Mr. KIRK said something very poignant. He said: A lot of disabled American veterans fought in places around the world to secure our freedom. They should have the right to travel freely in other parts of the world, even though they have a disability.

Think about that.

Senator BARRASSO is a strong supporter, and Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator COLLINS, Senator AYOTTE have all worked hard on this subject. But for a couple of people who have raised an objection, we can't bring up the treaty.

The Senator from Utah just objected to bringing it up for, what, 2 hours of debate and an up-or-down vote. I say: Hey, look around the Chamber. There is nobody here. There won't be anybody here all afternoon. We could have a little debate on this, 2 hours; they could make their case, we could make our case and have a vote for 15 minutes—and yet the Senator from Utah will not let it be brought up, even though he let it be brought up 2 years ago. He said: Well, we can't offer amendments. That was the same 2 years ago, but they didn't object to bringing it up.

When we see all of the support this has—and I might address an issue that has come up, and it seems to have its genesis in the tea party. They have raised objections on the basis that somehow, by ratifying this treaty, we give up our sovereignty as a nation, that it erodes our sovereignty. That is based upon the fact that there is a commission under this treaty. There is a U.N. commission set up, a 16-member commission of experts, to draft standards and advise countries on what they need to do to meet their obligations.

Again, if we are a signatory to the treaty, I have no doubt we would get a

seat on that commission, and the high-tech industry council and the business groups know that. That is where we have our input to making sure that accessibility standards, software standards, and other things are adaptable for us, our business community, our software, and our hardware.

The tea party, some of these people, have objected to this commission, saying that the commission can issue findings and such that take away our sovereignty.

We have operated, at least for the past 20 years, under two other treaties that have the same kind of commission of experts, and it hasn't eroded our sovereignty. Do you know why? Because it is advisory. That commission has no authority to assess penalties or anything else on the United States or any other country. All they can say is: Well, you should do this, you should do that—but it is only advisory. How does that erode our sovereignty?

Yet the very same people who make the argument that somehow this erodes our sovereignty will rush to the front to vote on a trade agreement—a trade agreement such as NAFTA or other trade agreements we have, which do erode our sovereignty, because it turns over to the World Trade Organization the ability to fine America, to tell us what we have to do in order to make trade right. They have the ability to tell America what to do. Yet my friends who are objecting to this probably support those trade agreements.

Yet when it comes to people with disabilities, why is it they are so adamant that we cannot join 150 other nations of the world to advance the rights of people with disabilities globally? Why is it just people with disabilities they focused on?

They didn't focus on torture, they didn't focus on the worst forms of child labor, they haven't focused on any of our trade agreements. Why people with disabilities? It makes us wonder, is this another blatant form of discrimination against people with disabilities?

Maybe some in that tea party would like to undo the Americans with Disabilities Act. I don't know. But we can't say honestly that, yes, the Americans with Disabilities Act is good, it has done a lot of good for our country, for our business community, for people with disabilities, everyone, and say but we don't want to be involved in helping other countries advance the cause of people with disabilities so people with disabilities in other countries have the same kind of rights, accessibilities, and standards we enjoy in this country for people with disabilities.

Some people may say we are the best in the world on disability law and policy—and that is true, we are—so why don't we shine our light around the world?

President Reagan always referred to America as the "shining city on the

hill." If we are a shining city on the hill and no one can get there and we are not willing to help other countries, what does it mean to be a shining city on the hill? Is that some kind of an idea that only we can have? We are a shining city on the hill when it comes to disability rights, and we ought to be involved in spreading it globally. This is our opportunity to do so.

Some people say: We can work with other countries. If they want our advice, we can go to other countries to help them with disability policy. Think about that for a second. We don't have the personnel or the wherewithal to go to 150 separate different countries to help them in terms of changing policy. It takes a kind of collective action where we can join with other countries that have done pretty darned well. There are a lot of other countries that have done very well in disability policy. To join with them, we are much better and much stronger that way than us just going to another country.

I was in China earlier this summer meeting with people about this treaty, which China has adopted. They have signed on. We talked about the United States working with China, not only in China but with other countries, to help advance the rights of people with disabilities.

China is doing some interesting things. They are starting to move ahead.

One person said to me: What is so important about America being a part of the treaty is that when we speak to one another, we speak in a common language of the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. It seems to me that if the United States is not a part of it, they speak to us in a different manner. It is: The United States, here is what we do; here is what you ought to do. That doesn't get us very far in diplomacy.

But if we work with the Chinese and other countries to say: Here is what we ought to do, here is what other countries have done, here are the standards we ought to abide by, there is much more force and effect than if we try to go it alone.

I assume there are military analogies to this. Think about the present situation. Should we go it alone simply because we are the most powerful, we have the biggest military, the best weapons, and everything else? Should we just go it alone because we are the best militarily in the world? I don't think the American people would want that.

We have to join with other countries and sometimes ask other countries to take the lead and we will provide that strong backbone. That is how I see the disabilities treaty. We have to join with other countries.

How can we give up the moral leadership we have had on this issue, both here and abroad, the moral leadership

we have had on advancing the rights of people with disabilities?

How can we abdicate that because a handful of people are afraid of giving up our sovereignty—which is a bogus argument because that committee is advisory only. It makes recommendations, but it has no enforcement authority whatsoever.

By not ratifying this treaty, we are left behind. Think about that. We, the United States, are left behind in a field in which we have carved out leadership, and we are just going to give it up: No, we don't want to lead the world.

Why wouldn't we want to lead the world in disability policies? To not join 150 other countries, to not provide the leadership, to not provide the expertise we have developed over 24 years or more relinquishes our responsibility to people with disabilities, both in America and around the world. Why on Earth would we want to do that?

In Ghana, a great young advocate named Emmanuel Ofori Yeboah, a man born with no left leg but determined as a child to play soccer, turned his obsession for this sport into an obsession advocating for the rights of people with disabilities in Ghana.

Earlier this year in Malawi, 21 African nations met on this issue of changing their policies, advancing the rights of people with disabilities. I was asked to go and meet with them. I couldn't because we were in session in the Senate. But that is why they are reaching out to us. They want us to be involved with them to help move this issue forward.

In Nepal parents of children with autism banded together to start their own school to educate their children. They want their kids with disabilities to be fully included in society and have opportunities for work and for life. They want us to be joined together with them. It is conspicuous.

I was privileged to join Senator CARDIN earlier this summer in Baku, Azerbaijan, for a meeting of the committee for security and economic development in Europe. I offered an amendment putting all the nations of Europe that are in that OECD, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD countries—that we supported ratification of this treaty. It was adopted unanimously. They want the United States to be a partner in this effort.

Talk to a disabled veteran who would like to travel overseas maybe with his or her spouse and their children.

I recently talked to a mother whose family immigrated from Italy. She wanted to go over for a big family reunion, but she has a child with a disability, and where they were going they had no accessibility. She could have gone and left her son at home, but she couldn't do that. So she missed that big family reunion because of the lack of accessibility in Italy.

It is a sad day that one individual on the Senate floor would object to bringing this up when it has such broad support.

I will say one last thing about the issue of sovereignty. I have heard a couple Senators on the Republican side talk about the fact that with this Commission, we give up our sovereignty, which I have said is a bogus argument.

Of my friends on the other side, the few who have objected to this on the grounds that we would lose our sovereignty, let me ask this question.

Former President George H.W. Bush supports this treaty wholeheartedly. Does he not understand about sovereignty or does he not care about sovereignty?

Former President George W. Bush, under whose administration this treaty was hammered out, supports it. Does former President George W. Bush not understand this or does he just not care about our sovereignty?

Bob Dole knows this treaty backward and forward—a World War II hero, Presidential candidate, Republican leader of the Senate, disabled American veteran.

Are those few people over there who say this would erode our sovereignty saying they know more than Senator Dole or are they saying Senator Dole doesn't care about our sovereignty—which is it—or those few who raise the issue of sovereignty, that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce doesn't care about our sovereignty? I don't think we would like to say that to Tom Donohue or to John Engler at the Business Roundtable. Of course they care about our sovereignty. Tell that to the American Legion. Tell the American Legion they don't care about our sovereignty or they don't understand this or they are too stupid to understand it. Is that what they are saying or are they saying they are the arbiters—those few, they are the arbiters of what is and is not our sovereignty. They rise above all former Presidents. They rise above Republican leaders. They rise above JOHN MCCAIN, a war hero. Believe me, I think JOHN MCCAIN understands about our sovereignty. He knows this treaty. He supports it wholeheartedly. Are those few who raise this issue of sovereignty saying JOHN MCCAIN doesn't get it or he doesn't care about our sovereignty? Which is it? The fact is, JOHN MCCAIN does care about our sovereignty, he does get it, and he knows this doesn't erode our sovereignty one single iota.

But I wish to make that point because those few keep raising this issue of sovereignty as though they are the guardians, they alone know what distinguishes our sovereignty and what erodes it—not former Presidents, former Republican leaders. In fact, every former Republican leader of this Senate still alive supports this treaty.

My, how far we have gotten off track since the adoption of the Americans

with Disabilities Act that was strongly bipartisan and the Americans with Disabilities Act amendments we put through in 2008, strongly supported by both sides. I dare say, we have strong Republican support for this treaty but for a few on the Republican side who just want to adhere to that tea party nostrum that somehow this erodes our sovereignty and we can't join.

I will close where I started. The unanimous consent I offered today that was objected to by the Senator from Utah is the same as what we had 2 years ago and no one objected to it. The Senator from Utah was here 2 years ago, and he didn't object then to the same unanimous consent request. He did not object. So it goes back on the calendar. It goes back on the Executive Calendar and it will be there.

I guess I would say the action by a few on the Republican side blocking ratification of the convention on the rights of people with disabilities will not be the end. I may be retiring from the Senate, but I am not retiring from this fight. I will never retire in the fight for justice, fairness, and equality for people with disabilities both here and around the world. I will never retire from the fight to refute those absolutely unfounded and bogus objections to this crucial treaty.

I will continue to work with former Senator Bob Dole, with former Presidents, with veterans, with business leaders, with Republicans on the other side who support this treaty, with the national disabilities community, with our disabilities community. I will continue to work to advance this and to get it over the hurdle.

The false claims—the false claims—of those who object to this treaty will be overcome. We will succeed in ratifying this treaty. We will restore America's stature as the world leader on disability rights and we will continue to fight for justice and a fair shake for people with disabilities not just here in America but around the world.

It is a sad day, another sad and irresponsible day in the history of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. DONNELLY. I rise today in recognition of Suicide Prevention Month to once again bring attention to an issue that weighs heavy on many of our hearts and minds.

Last month the world paused to mourn the loss of a man who brought laughter and joy to countless lives, a

man whose internal suffering didn't stop him from improving the lives of so many he touched, including our heroic men and women serving overseas. Robin Williams said the best audience he ever had was with the troops he entertained on USO tours. His death showed us that we may not always know who among us is living the life of unbearable pain and suffering. Even the strongest among us sometimes needs a helping hand, including the brave men and women in uniform who protect our country each and every day.

Today I wish to once again shine the light on the scourge of military suicide. Earlier this month the Department of Defense released a report which detailed the number of suicides among servicemembers during the first quarter of 2014. The Department of Defense reported that a total of 120 servicemembers committed suicide from January through March, including 74 active component servicemembers, 24 Reserve members, and 22 National Guard members. In 2013, 475 servicemembers took their own lives. In 2012, we lost 522 to suicide. We have seen 2 straight years of more deaths as a result of suicide than of combat in Afghanistan.

These men and women are giving their all to support our way of life and they risk making the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedoms. At a minimum we should honor this service and sacrifice by doing all we can to support them.

We all understand this is not a simple issue. There is no one solution to the problem, no cure-all that ends it tomorrow. I do believe, though, there are commonsense steps we can take now to make meaningful progress.

In May I introduced the bipartisan Jacob Sexton Military Suicide Prevention Act of 2014. This legislation is named after Jacob Sexton, an Indiana National Guardsman from Farmland, IN, who took his own life while home on a 15-day leave from Afghanistan. Building upon legislation I introduced last year, the Sexton act ensures that mental health is evaluated regularly and is a central element of a servicemember's overall readiness in four key ways.

First, it requires annual mental health assessments for all servicemembers, including active duty, the Guard, and the Reserves. Right now the military provides the most effective mental health care only for those who are preparing for or returning from deployment, despite research that shows the majority of military suicides occur among servicemembers who have never been deployed.

Second, it establishes a working group between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services to find innovative ways to improve access to mental

health care for members of the Guard and Reserve. Where servicemembers often rely on civilian health insurance and providers, as the Guard and Reserve do, we want to team up to be able to provide care right in their own communities. Suicide among Guard members hit a record high in 2013, and we are committed to bringing that number down to zero.

Third, the bill requires an inter-agency report to evaluate existing military mental health practices and to provide recommendations for improvement, including peer-to-peer programs I have proposed in the past.

Finally, the bill ensures that seeking help remains a sign of strength. It protects the privacy of the servicemember coming forward, because no one should be punished for seeking help. No one should be kept from their next promotion for seeking help.

I introduced the bipartisan Sexton act with my Republican colleague ROGER WICKER of Mississippi. Since then it has received the endorsement of numerous national organizations, including the National Guard Association of the United States, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, and the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. This bill is a step in the right direction in the fight against military suicide.

I was encouraged when the Senate Armed Services Committee passed this legislation as part of the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act this past May. This is important progress, but we need to get this legislation signed into law. As the Senate prepares to recess, I call on the Senate to take up the NDAA as soon as we return to Washington. There is no reason why this bipartisan legislation should not be passed, and passed quickly, just as we have for the last 52 years.

Our country, as we all know, is faced with many serious issues, some of which we don't have good answers to yet; but the Sexton act is a good start to address the pressing issue of military suicide. This legislation helps save lives—helps save soldiers' lives. So let's pass the NDAA and with it the Jacob Sexton Act to show our service men and women that we are all in on supporting them the same way they support us.

This legislation is just the beginning. Combating suicide both in our military and elsewhere is an issue that continues to demand Congress's attention. We must continually evaluate what we are doing, take a second and third look at the resources we are offering, and ask ourselves every day: Can we do better? Is there more we can do before it is too late? The answer more often than not is yes.

That is why we must be vigilant in the effort to let people know they are not alone. There is somewhere they can go, someone to talk to, and someone to

help carry the load. We need to continue the conversation about what we can do to help our brothers and sisters, our sons and daughters, our husbands and wives, who may feel like they are struggling with seemingly insurmountable challenges all by themselves. These challenges can be overcome.

Suicide Prevention Month is a reminder of that fact. There are many resources available to those who struggle with suicidal thoughts. For our servicemembers, trained mental health specialists are available 24 hours a day through the military and Veterans Crisis Line. All you have to do is call 1-800-273-8255, and press 1. You will get immediate, confidential assistance 24 hours a day. For additional help, militarymentalhealth.org offers a free, 100-percent anonymous mental health assessment. This is a valuable tool for servicemembers unsure of where they stand.

I hope all of our servicemembers struggling with mental health concerns and with challenges know that we are here for them and that we are working nonstop to ensure they receive the care and support they deserve. Let's continue to spread that message throughout the rest of Suicide Prevention Month, and every month thereafter.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2839 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANGELS IN ADOPTION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, it is my pleasure today to come to the floor of the Senate to honor some very special constituents from all of our States who are here for 3 days, and they are very special because they actually have wings. We call them angels, and I think the Presiding Officer has met her angels who are here this week. They are Members who have been honored or constituents of ours who have been honored by Members of the Senate and Members of the House for the extraordinary work these individual citizens and sometimes entities and organizations have done on behalf of orphans here in the United States and around the world. There are happily over 124 angels here with us, 124 Mem-

bers of Congress—70 Members of the House and 54 Members of the Senate—who took the time to identify someone in their district or State who has really stepped up for orphans through either the domestic adoption and foster care system or our international adoption world.

I am proud of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption. I am one of the founders of the organization. About 16 years ago a group of about 20 of us came together to begin really focused work on educating ourselves first and then our colleagues across the aisle and in both Houses of Congress on the barriers that were keeping children from families, the barriers that were causing children to be left and abandoned, never to be reunited with their birth families or ever placed with new families who could adopt them. We struggled to learn and educate ourselves about why families break up and disintegrate and what is the proper approach after that happens to try to pull that family back together and if not, how we can place children in homes where they can be raised and nurtured and cared for.

You heard me say this many times: Governments do some things very well—some things not so well—but raising children is not one of them. Parents, responsible adults, raise children. It is the way we are wired. It is the way we are created. It is the only real way that ever works well. I believe our job at the Federal, State, and local level, both here in the United States and around the world, is for the government to get out of the way and let this happen or start leading and helping with the kinds of policies that help children reunite with birth families and if that is not possible, to move quickly—because time is of the essence in a child's development—to make sure that child and sibling groups are placed in a loving, supportive family and not in an institution—not necessarily with people who are paid to be parents, not necessarily in group homes, but in real families. Sometimes governments, nonprofits, and charitable individuals want to help with stipends to support that effort. We perfectly understand that. It is perfectly legal. But we really love children to be in homes where they feel they are being loved out of a gift of love, and that is our goal.

There is so much gridlock and arguing going on. This is one issue about which there is no gridlock and no argument. Republicans and Democrats have come together. JIM INHOFE and I are proud to serve as the leaders in the Senate with many Members who have been very active. The Presiding Officer has been extremely active. I wish to say thank you to the Senator from Wisconsin for her leadership on several pieces of important legislation. I would like to give a special shout-out to the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, who has been remarkable in

her leadership; Senator GILLIBRAND, who has been extremely helpful; Senator SHAHEEN; Senator BLUNT; Senator BOOZMAN; and I could go on. There have been 20 or 25 real champions this year in the Senate on issues that affect orphans and children in foster care. Senator GRASSLEY, who leads the foster care caucus, has also been a very reliable advocate on behalf of these children.

To frame the challenge, there are about 500,000 children in the United States who are in foster care. About 100,000 have been deemed to be adoptable. Parental rights have been terminated due to gross neglect, abuse, et cetera. The courts have stepped in and said these children need a new home, new parents. That is a big number, 500,000, but it represents about one-half of 1 percent of all the children in America. From that standpoint, you can say America is doing pretty well with keeping all of our children in families, keeping them loved and supported. When families fail, the community, the government, and churches and places of worship need to step in and help and be supportive.

But we still have many problems. Some children are waiting too long. Some children are born in this country without birth certificates—I just met one in my office today, if you can imagine that—so their legal status has been compromised. There are millions of orphans around the world who don't have any advocacy and don't have the kinds of systems we have in the United States to help with their identification, their rescue, their placement, et cetera, so that is the work we do.

The Congressional Coalition on Adoption educates Members of Congress. We hold seminars for ourselves, educational opportunities. We hold an annual gala, and this year the Angels In Adoption gala is happening tonight in Washington. Angels are visiting Senate offices, telling their stories of adoption to our Members. Tonight we will be at the Ronald Reagan International Trade Center celebrating with almost 1000 people the work our angels are doing.

I wish to congratulate our three very special national award winners: adoptive parents Bill Klein and Dr. Jennifer Arnold, the stars of the TLC reality show "The Little Couple." They are very famous in America and well-known around the world. People have watched them overcome the great challenges they face. They are very tiny but have great hearts and great minds, and by being on television, they have an extraordinary reach. We are all very familiar with their show. They are married and have proceeded to build a family through adoption. They adopted a little, little child from India and another little child from China and are building their family. They have just been remarkable models for all adoptive parents, of which I am one. They

share the joys and challenges of being adoptive parents of children with very special physical needs.

It has just been remarkable. We will be so touched by their story tonight. They just left my office and they will share their story with us tonight. I just wanted to thank them for their leadership.

Shonda Rhimes is not with us in Washington. She will be receiving an award. She is the executive producer of the hit shows "Scandal," "Private Practice," and "Grey's Anatomy." She has been a tremendous advocate for adoption. She has written about some issues regarding adoption into her shows and has helped to educate the United States of America and the world about the needs of orphans and the great privilege of being adoptive parents.

Finally, our third national award winner is our Paul Singer awardee. Paul Singer is deceased, but he was a great leader in our corporate world and our organization gives an award every year to a corporate executive. This year our winner is Debra Steigerwaldt Waller, CEO of Jockey International. She founded an organization that really helps provide support with postadoption services because many of our adoptive families have adopted children with special needs and some have adopted teenagers or older children. There are all sorts of challenges that come with those adoptions, just as there are with infant adoptions, and those families need someplace to turn. She stepped up as a corporate leader and adoptee herself, and we are thankful for her leadership.

I wish to mention two other angels.

I see my colleague is on the floor ready to speak.

I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I was proud to nominate Pastor Chad Hardbarger and his wife Marsha. They served as foster parents in Louisiana for over 9 years. Amazingly, the couple has cared for 14 children from the foster care system and have adopted 6 of those children out of foster care. They have a 19-year-old, a 14-year-old, an 11-year-old, a 9-year-old, an 8-year-old, and a 7-year-old. They are in the process of adopting a special infant named Amber. All of them are here in Washington and have had a great tour of the city today.

Monique, Chris, Bryce, Jordan, Bailey, Gavyn, and Amber are a wonderful family that was brought together and into the loving home of Pastor Chad and his wife Marcia. They are now working with their local church in Shreveport—in the northwest Louisiana area—to help advocate and get other churches and other families involved in fostering and adopting.

I was so pleased to present the award to the senior pastor of Emmanuel Baptist Church. He has established his own ministry, Fashioned for a Home, and he does so many great things to help our children.

These children don't have any fancy lobbyists or PR firms fighting for them. The pastors at home, their wives, and advocates are the ones who are doing a beautiful job. Congratulations to Chad Harbinger and his wife Marsha. I was so moved when I met Senator WICKER's angel at the pinning ceremony, and he was such an interesting angel that I wanted to put his story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Senator WICKER nominated Mendell L. Thompson, who has been president of America's Christian Credit Union in Glendora, CA, serving more than 48,000 members and has more than \$500 million in managed assets.

He serves as trustee and director of several different organizations. He received his award from Senator WICKER for designing a loan package at the credit union that would provide low-interest loans to families that were adopting, because sometimes the expenses can be overwhelming, particularly if you are adopting internationally but even if you adopt out of foster care. The foster care costs are minimal, but there are other costs when you adopt a child. Sometimes they have to add a room to the house or get a special vehicle if they have adopted a special-needs child. He has made over 1,000 loans to families that have adopted children.

I wanted to give a shout-out to Senator WICKER's angel, Mr. Mendell L. Thompson, and his board of directors at America's Christian Credit Union in California and thank them for believing that every child deserves a forever family and for taking an active role in crafting an affordable solution for America's adoptive parents. He has a passion at heart for the miracle of adoption and continues to promote this in California and around the country.

I thank the members for their participation. It is going to be one of our biggest events.

Before I take my seat, Madam President, I wish to speak on one more topic.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND SAMUEL R. BLAKES

Madam President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Rev. Samuel Raymond Blakes, pastor of New Home Family Worship Center in New Orleans, LA on his 19th pastoral anniversary. I was honored to participate in the recent anniversary celebration and worship alongside members of the congregation and friends.

Reverend Blakes is a graduate of St. Augustine High School. He attended Southern University at New Orleans and earned both a bachelors and master's degree in theology from Christian Bible College in Louisiana.

Rev. Blakes has devoted himself to New Home Family Worship Center where he has served as pastor since 1995. Through his leadership, the congregation of New Home has expanded to a membership of over 10,000 worshippers. Reverend Blakes remains committed to making a positive impact on the lives of all people through his weekly televised spiritual broadcasts, live radio show and ongoing community outreach.

Rev. Samuel R. Blakes is the youngest son of the late Prophet Robert C. Blakes, Sr. and Minister Lois R. Blakes, both residents of New Orleans for decades. Prophet Blakes was an outstanding community leader, spreading his ministry across Louisiana and into Texas.

I commend Reverend Blakes and his congregation for remaining vigilant, faithful and steadfast in his service to his community. I join his wife Stacey, daughter Sariah and the entire New Home Family Worship Center congregation in celebrating his 19th pastoral anniversary. I pray that Rev. Samuel R. Blakes will continue to be blessed with many more years as a spiritual leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3522

Mr. VITTER. Recently the House of Representatives passed, on a bipartisan basis, H.R. 3522, the Employee Health Care Protection Act by Congressman BILL CASSIDY. This bipartisan act that passed the House would keep the President's core promise throughout the ObamaCare debate when he told every American: If you like the health care coverage you have, you can keep it—period, end of story. I am bringing this up in the Senate because it is vital that the President, and everyone who made that pledge, keep that promise, and the bill that was enacted into law would do that.

Again, the bill is limited, focused, and straightforward. It lets small businesses and workers keep their health care coverage if they like it. It provides more affordable health care options for American workers who don't want or can't afford the other ObamaCare mandated plans.

Again, the President and every Democrat who voted for ObamaCare promised that explicitly again and again and again. When that didn't happen—when millions of Americans were kicked off the plan they had and liked and wanted to keep—Americans rightly felt misled. In fact, that led to the President's promise and commitment “if you like your plan, you can keep it” being labeled by nonpartisan sources in 2013 as the “lie of the year.” This bill would fix that and make it good. It would not repeal ObamaCare. It would fix that part of ObamaCare. It would make that promise good.

The keep your plan bill would let insurers continue to sell those plans that people want to keep that are less expensive and cover basic but crucial needs. At least 2 million people would likely sign up for these plans.

Last fall nearly 5 million Americans all across the country had their health plans canceled even though they wanted to keep them—even though the President told them they could keep them. In Louisiana, 93,000 received cancellation notices after getting that clear pledge and promise from the President and other supporters of ObamaCare.

Sadly, that hurt isn't over because the employer mandate for businesses that employ 100 or more workers is still coming. When that mandate kicks in in just a few months, we are going to see the same thing happen all over again with millions upon millions of Americans in Louisiana and in every single State getting pushed off the plan they had, they liked, and they wanted to keep. Small businesses are losing the plans they had, they liked, and they wanted to keep.

The bill passed the House, as I said, on a bipartisan basis, 247 to 167, and over 2 dozen Democrats voted to support this bill by Congressman BILL CASSIDY. Even Democrats on the House side see the importance of the legislation.

I ask all of us to recognize this is a crucial element of ObamaCare that needs to be fixed. It absolutely needs to be fixed. Thirty-nine Democrats in the House had previously voted for a similar bill to let Americans keep their plan in the individual market. Senate Democrats scrambled with the administration last year to find some way to let individuals who faced cancellations on the individual market keep their plan, but those cancellations are happening to a lot of folks. It has not been fixed for all those folks by a long shot, and more of those sorts of cancellations are on the way when the employer mandate finally hits.

I urge all of us to come together to pass this bill in the Senate as it has been passed on a bipartisan basis in the House.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3522, which was received from the House. I further ask consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Reserving the right to object, just bear with me. As the Senator knows, the President set forth a policy to let States, such as Louisiana, take advantage of this opportunity—through the work of the insurance commissioner—to allow those individuals to stay on their plans.

This bill would allow new plans to be offered that do not comply with the ACA—plans that would include the kind of discriminatory treatments that the ACA seeks to cure, such as higher costs for women than men and treatments that are discriminatory against individuals with preexisting conditions. For that reason, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reclaiming the floor—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I think this is very unfortunate. My distinguished colleague alluded to what I know. Let me tell you what I know. I know 93,000 Louisianians were forced off a plan they had, they liked, and they wanted to keep. I know the President of the United States promised them exactly the opposite. I know my Louisiana colleague in the Senate promised them exactly the opposite, and I know thousands of more cancellations are on their way when the employer mandate is enforced. That is what I know.

I hold hundreds of townhall meetings in Louisiana, and that is what I know from talking to Louisianians, and that is why I know this is the central problem of ObamaCare and it needs to be fixed.

The bill passed the House on a bipartisan basis. I find it very unfortunate that we can't bring it up in the Senate on the same basis and pass it expeditiously.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WILDERNESS ACT AND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this month America celebrates the 50th anniversary of both the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I am going to spend a few minutes today—and I believe I am going to be joined at various times by a number of colleagues—to talk about the important role these two storied pieces of legislation have played in creating a legacy of protection and access to America's treasures.

First, people may not remember, perhaps given the way some in Congress talk about wilderness these days, but the Wilderness Act had an extraordinary bipartisan push behind it. It passed 73 to 12 in the Senate and 373 to 1 in the other body. Then congressional champions included leading Democrats

and Republicans of that time. To celebrate the success of this landmark piece of legislation today—and it is the middle of Wilderness Week—I introduced a Senate Resolution, along with our colleague on the other side of the aisle, Senator SESSIONS, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Wilderness Act.

Just like the original bill, our bipartisan resolution has numerous cosponsors and the support of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle. Part of the beauty of the Wilderness Act lies in the balance that was forged between immediately designating some places as wilderness in 1964 as part of the enactment, while providing a pathway for future designation.

It is that balance that has helped to make the Wilderness Act one of our country's most democratic pieces of legislation in our rich history. By requiring future legislation, it compelled citizen activists to go out at the grass roots level to involve their friends and neighbors to seek permanent protection for the special places that were important to them.

While passing wilderness designations through Congress has been far from easy, the reward has been extraordinary.

Since the act was signed, Congress has designated more than 110 million acres of Federal lands as wilderness and each acre a gift to our future from our past selves.

Next to me a few of those acres are in a photo of Mirror Lake and Mount Hood, part of the Mount Hood Wilderness within the Mount Hood National Forest in my home State of Oregon.

Mount Hood is an Oregon icon. Ava and William Wyden, our twins, 6 years old—pictures available on my iPhone after this discussion—ski there. They have already recognized, at a very young age, that Mount Hood is an icon.

Wilderness, there and across America, has been called the gold standard of conservation, keeping areas under the strongest level of protection the law provides and ensuring that they remain wild for future generations to appreciate and enjoy. By identifying what places deserve wilderness protection in an open, inclusive fashion, the country ensures full public debate, opportunities to bring people together to build a consensus, sensitivity to rural traditions and local economic needs, with an end product being wilderness areas that all Americans can be proud of.

Creating wilderness is not only important for preservationists, it is also crucial for conservationists, outdoor enthusiasts everywhere, and for all those who make a recreation economy hum—the outfitters, the guides, the lodges, and the mom-and-pop diners. The fact is that the recreation economy supports hundreds of thousands of jobs in rural America and generates

billions of dollars of economic activity across our country.

That is also where the Land and Water Conservation Fund comes in because it helps to secure and maintain public access to the country's public lands and wilderness areas for recreation and enjoyment.

Also celebrating its 50th anniversary this month is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This exceptionally important program is responsible for protecting areas in all 50 States and our territories. This includes such special places, iconic places, as the Grand Canyon National Park, many of our storied Civil War battlefields, and numerous national wildlife refuges.

In my home State of Oregon the fund has helped protect many of our most precious outdoor treasures, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Crater Lake National Park, the Pacific Crest Trail, and the Oregon Dunes. Equally important, the Land and Water Conservation Fund feeds States critical funds that help create and maintain the local parks, the trails, and the recreational facilities.

Every year the Treasury collects billions of dollars of revenue, from offshore oil drilling and other sources of energy production. Out of that total, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is authorized to receive up to \$900 million a year.

It is in my view a balanced approach, it is a simple approach, and it is a constructive approach to managing public lands with some of the money the country makes from extracting resources, taking that money and turning it around, and reinvesting it in the country's unique, open spaces.

There are tremendous economic benefits to the investment the fund makes. Nationwide, 98 percent of our counties contain land protected by the fund, and in these places America's outdoor recreation economy generates \$646 billion in consumer spending and supports more than 6 million jobs.

Few States enjoy the outdoors more than Oregonians. It is almost as if the outdoors is a part of our gene pool.

We see ourselves as outdoors people, and outdoor recreation accounts for nearly \$13 billion in consumer spending in our State, and it supports 141,000 Oregon jobs.

As I mentioned before, in addition to its Federal role, the Land and Water Conservation Fund helps the States. It provides matching grants so that State and local governments can use those funds to build new parks that are going to help struggling cities or towns develop. Or, they can maintain natural spaces that are critical to the quality of life in those local communities.

But the bottom line is, those investments—Federal, State, and local investments—lead to job creation. We know that recreation opportunities drive tourism, especially in our coun-

ties where there is a significant amount of protected lands.

Those who are recreating go to the local restaurants, go to the local shops, and they stay in the hotels. Often they look for outfitters and guides.

Economists note that job growth in rural western counties, where there is a significant amount of federally protected land, is four times faster than in areas where we do not have that measure of Federal protection.

These are just some of the many reasons why failing to give the Land and Water Conservation Fund the resources it needs, in my view, would be nothing short of legislative malpractice.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that 80 percent of Americans approve of the program's mission, it has been consistently underutilized, underappreciated and, yes, underfunded. As a result, jobs, growth, and protection—needed protection for these treasures—are left behind.

I plan to introduce two bills that would help to secure the future of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The first bill would provide a 1-year extension of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and the second bill—that I hope to be able to introduce very shortly—would make it permanent because I believe that dedicated, stable funding will ensure our public lands continue to be preserved and accessible to support those recreationists of the future, the conservationists of the future, and the local economic leaders of the future who will prosper as a result of those investments.

In closing I will simply note that we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund as millions of families across the country return from summer vacations to the parks and wilderness areas that these great laws have helped to preserve and enrich.

Children everywhere are sharing stories in their schools about how they went fishing, hiking, and camping in their Nation's backyards.

If realized to their greatest potential, the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund are sure-fire ways to help guarantee that the next generation of Americans will continue to have access to beautiful recreation areas, captivating historic sites, and pristine wilderness. Strong, robust funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund will help grow economies and create jobs in every State nationwide.

Finally, let me note that until recently I had the honor of chairing the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. As chair, I had the opportunity to work particularly with two colleagues who are on the floor now, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. UDALL, and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH. It makes me feel very good that they are

here because, as Westerners, they see day in and day out what we are talking about with respect to the importance of this program and this extraordinary contribution it has made to the country.

These two great Western leaders, with respect to natural resources, understand it is not only about the past. It is not just about the wonderful half century that I have taken the time to note. These are two leaders—Senator UDALL of Colorado and Senator HEINRICH of New Mexico—who I think are going to be part of the leadership, the leadership that works to protect these two great programs for years to come.

I am very grateful to have the opportunity to be on the floor with them.

I had a chance particularly to see some of the treasures in Colorado recently. I can see why Senator UDALL feels so strongly.

New Mexico is one of the few States I have not visited, so I hope I will be able to wrangle an invitation to join Senator HEINRICH.

But I want to leave the floor knowing that as we make this commitment to do all we can to make the protection part of our extraordinary outdoor spaces part of the legacy we leave for our children and grandchildren, the case for these two programs—and advocating for them—is in very good hands with Senator UDALL and Senator HEINRICH.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to begin by thanking the Senator from Oregon. He has been a true leader in the Senate for many years and I know the Senator from New Mexico joins me in thanking him for his leadership and for his partnership.

I rise—as Senator WYDEN has to celebrate the public lands of his State of Oregon—to celebrate the public lands of Colorado. I make the point right out of the gate that our public lands support thousands of jobs across Colorado and they strengthen our special way of life.

This month marks the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Wilderness Act. Both of these incredibly successful laws have been instrumental in protecting our public lands for future generations, growing our outdoor recreation economy, and ensuring access to public lands in Colorado and all across the country.

In sum, what I am saying is these landmark laws have touched every corner of Colorado over the past 50 years.

I am very pleased in that spirit to join Senator WYDEN and Senator SESSIONS in submitting a resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act.

From the snowcapped peaks of the Eagles Nest Wilderness and the desert

arches of the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness, to James Peak—which I worked hard to establish—the Wilderness Act has protected more than 3.6 million acres in Colorado alone. These places have inspired generations of Coloradans and remind us that we don't inherit the Earth from our parents, we borrow it from our children.

Let me turn to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In 1964, some 50 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson worked with the Congress to establish LWCF—the acronym for the Land and Water Conservation Fund—to fulfill a basic promise to the American people.

That promise is, as we develop our oil and gas resources, we will also conserve other special places throughout our country for the next generations.

As we mark 50 years of the program, we can tangibly see, feel, and breathe its success in the 3 million acres LWCF has helped us to preserve as part of 40,000 local park and recreation development projects across all 50 States, as well as over 4 million acres of public lands managed by the Federal Government.

In Colorado we have seen firsthand how LWCF dollars have helped protect access to the public lands that help define us as a State.

From my position as chairman of the national parks subcommittee, I have seen how these funds have been particularly useful to our parks.

After all, there is no better example than the creation of Great Sand Dunes National Park in Colorado. This magnificent place was protected by LWCF appropriations that were obtained with very strong local support. Great Sand Dunes National Park protects one of our Nation's great landmarks and is also a critical source of tourist dollars for the surrounding rural communities, and this economic boost is something we have seen all across our State and our Nation.

It is noteworthy that for every dollar coming out of the LWCF fund, we see four times that much created in economic value—\$1 equals \$4 in economic value—and this investment through the LWCF program is part of the reason we have seen strong growth in America's outdoor recreation industry. When I say the outdoor recreation industry, that is activities such as hunting, fishing, camping, skiing, biking—you name it—and those activities have generated over \$13 billion. That supports over 124,000 jobs in Colorado alone.

In another vein, LWCF resources have helped States such as ours become more resilient when it comes to national disasters. Last weekend I was in Lyons, CO, one of the towns hardest hit by Colorado's historic 2013 floods. This photograph is one of numerous examples of what we faced for about 3 days last fall a year ago.

Trout Unlimited has shared a story of how LWCF funds were used to help

recover from a similar flood in the neighboring Big Thompson Canyon 30 years ago. Back in 1976 local officials had the foresight to make an LWCF purchase of 80 flooded properties and to replace the damaged homes with new parkland which then provided fishing access to the community and critical floodplain protection. That \$1 million investment in 1976 helped families who had lost their homes then and avoided an estimated \$16 million in property damages in 2013 that would have happened without those preservation efforts.

The Big Thompson Canyon flooded in a similar fashion last year as it did in 1976, but because of the LWCF moneys and the fact that 80 flooded properties were purchased, there weren't buildings and there wasn't human activity in those areas, and we saw the result. It was a way to rebuild smarter and better in 1976, and we are going to do that going forward from 2013's flood.

As a part of that, I was really excited and pleased to hear that the town of Lyons recently received \$350,000 of LWCF funding to repair and rebuild the spectacular St. Vrain River corridor trail. Before that trail was destroyed last fall in the flood, it had been used as a regional connector for anglers, cyclists, kayakers, mountain bikers, and many others. This project will now help restore a vital economic asset for the community, and it will ensure access to the river and the river corridor for many generations to come. That is a success story, pure and simple.

LWCF has helped in many other less obvious ways. As we fight to get our kids—and ourselves—to spend less time in front of the television, outdoor recreation is still the best way to stay physically fit and active and emotionally healthy.

This past July I rafted the Browns Canyon Wilderness Study Area of the Arkansas River. You can see here what a spectacular and unique place Browns Canyon is—an area I have proposed to preserve permanently as the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness. Along on that rafting trip we had a group of veterans, and several of them are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, as we know it. They told me how they use their time outdoors as a part of their healing—again, a success story.

How do we keep LWCF strong? Even though LWCF has been successful by any measure, while enjoying strong bipartisan support, the program has only been fully funded two times since its enacting law in 1964 promised \$900 million in annual funding. That is right—only two times out of the last 50 years. LWCF is a victim of the uncertainty of the annual appropriations cycle, which leaves a huge unmet need in Colorado and across our country. That is why I have been fighting—joined by many of my colleagues on both sides of the

aisle—for full, permanent funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I am very pleased to be working with Senator WYDEN, Senator HEINRICH, and others on a fix that would fulfill the LWCF promise. This is a promise to our kids, our grandkids, and all generations down the line, and we have an obligation to keep it.

The good news is that this potential fix would also reauthorize and fund two other programs that are critical to our rural communities: the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program, which is also known as PILT, and Secure Rural Schools. I will talk briefly about both of those programs.

For decades the PILT Program has provided critical funding to nearly 1,900 rural counties to make up for diminished tax revenues stemming from Federal land ownership within those county boundaries. PILT helps ensure rural communities have access to basic services such as law enforcement, education, and health services.

Let me share an example. Ouray County in southwestern Colorado is still recovering from the recent economic downturn and the corresponding 36 percent drop in property tax collection. The county has already cut staff time significantly by reducing county operations to only 4 days a week. Without PILT, that would drop to just 3 days a week. PILT also ensures that the county can hire a sheriff and that students can get to school.

Unfortunately, permanent funding for this program expired, and PILT now experiences the uncertainty of short-term fixes, creating significant planning challenges for Colorado and rural Americans. I was proud to lead the effort last year to extend PILT funding through the farm bill, which delivered \$34.5 million to Colorado communities. But here in the Congress we have to do more. We have to confront this annual uncertainty over the future of the PILT Program. That is why I have championed a separate bill to permanently fund PILT. This is also a bipartisan effort, and it is why I have worked with Senator WYDEN to include such certainty in this comprehensive bill today.

I mentioned the Secure Rural Schools Program, and the same could be said of it. Rural Colorado communities rely on the Secure Rural Schools Program to hire teachers and strengthen our education system. In 2013 alone Colorado communities—where one teacher can make or break a school—received \$9.5 million through this vital program. So this important bill for our Secure Rural Schools Program would ensure that the Federal Government keeps its commitment to our rural counties to help offset the costs of public education, roads, and other essential services.

We have a dynamic trio of very important programs: LWCF, PILT, and

Secure Rural Schools. They help support Colorado's rural communities and our special way of life.

I will conclude with this theme. We are a nation of risk-takers and explorers, always searching for the next challenge to overcome or the next mountain to climb. Our public lands are a reminder of that heritage, and finding the right balance for how to use our public lands is the next challenge to overcome. As we tackle problems such as growing our economy, disaster response, and taking care of our wounded warriors, let's not forget the important role of our public lands and the opportunities they provide for outdoor recreation, our economy, and our health. This year, let's reflect on what President Kennedy called "intelligent use of natural resources." Let's celebrate 50 years of the Land and Water Conservation Fund with bipartisan action for full and permanent funding for LWCF, PILT, and Secure Rural Schools.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, let me start out by righting a wrong. I hadn't realized Chairman WYDEN, our chairman from Oregon, had not had a chance to visit the great State of New Mexico. I will fix that right now and make sure he is not only invited, but we might seek to show him some of the incredible places the two programs we are talking about today have helped preserve, protect, and make as assets to our local economy in the State of New Mexico.

As we heard from our colleague Senator UDALL and our colleague Chairman WYDEN of Oregon as well, this month we celebrate two incredible milestones in our country's conservation history. We celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act and the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Both of these programs have been etched into the history of my home State by New Mexico conservationists with names such as Aldo Leopold, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall.

When Senator Anderson steered the passage of the Wilderness Act here on the floor of the Senate, he said on August 20, 1964:

In no area has this Congress more decisively served the future well-being of the Nation than in passing legislation to conserve natural resources and to provide the means by which our people could enjoy them. . . . While we stretch out the highways to carry ever-expanding traffic, while we build whole new communities to house a growing population, and while we consume more acreage for a burgeoning industry, we have set aside part of our land as it was when human eye first saw it—unscarred by man, primeval, a memorial to the Creator who molded it.

Senator Anderson was also unquestionably one of the principal architects of the Land and Water Conservation

Fund, and the 88th Congress, where so much of this work was done, was coined as the "Conservation Congress."

LWCF is the primary tool our Nation uses to fund the protection of our natural and cultural heritage, and I have worked diligently with my colleagues—including Senator UDALL, his cousin Senator UDALL of New Mexico, Senator WYDEN of Oregon, and others—to secure full and permanent funding for this program.

But even 40 years before the enactment of the Wilderness Act or LWCF, conservationist Aldo Leopold had the vision and influence to help protect 500,000 acres of mountains, rivers, and mesas in New Mexico—which eventually became the Gila Wilderness—in order to ensure a roadless and backcountry experience free of what Aldo Leopold called "Ford dust" for those hearty enough to saddle up or hike into the heart of this wild country. With the passage of the Wilderness Act, it became the National Forest System's very first designated wilderness area. New Mexico is also where the idea of tribally administered wilderness became a reality when Blue Lake was returned to Taos Pueblo.

Former Senator Jeff Bingaman's leadership was absolutely invaluable in conserving important public lands in New Mexico, such as the Rio Grande del Norte and Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks regions, both of which were designated national monuments within the last 2 years.

But the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund is not just about the past, as we have heard from my colleagues. The future of public lands conservation will depend on the continued collaborative efforts of our elected officials, our business owners, tribal leaders, sportsmen, conservation organizations, outdoor retailers, and others to work together to protect America's most treasured natural landscapes.

Our efforts should continue our proud bipartisan history. After all, it was Representative John Saylor, a Republican from Pennsylvania, who was the lead sponsor and champion in the House of Representatives for the Wilderness Act. And it was former Republican Senator Pete Domenici of my home State who championed legislation to designate the Sandia Wilderness, a place I look upon every time I go home to Albuquerque, and who said at the time that the area "forms a beautiful natural backdrop for the city which all the residents can enjoy."

In New Mexico, hunters and anglers, campers and *acequia* parciantes, chili farmers and urban dwellers, all have a deep connection to the outdoors and benefit from the recreation, wildlife, and the water that wilderness provides. Many of my own most formative moments, decisions, memories, and turning points have occurred in these public wildlands.

I remember a trip with my wife Julie to the Irish Wilderness in Missouri, a trip that we made as we were leaving our college days behind in the Midwest and heading back west to New Mexico to start our new life together. In 2001, shortly after 9/11, I backpacked through 53 miles of the Gila Wilderness and decided on that trip to run for a seat on the Albuquerque City Council.

I have many cherished memories from the trips my wife and I have made over the years along the spines of the American Rockies, the Sangre de Cristos, the Tetons, in places with names like the Pecos Wilderness, the South San Juan, Jedediah Smith, and canyons with names like Dark Canyon, Desolation Canyon, Gray, Grand Gulch, the Goosenecks, the San Juan, and of course the Chama River Canyon near my home.

Wilderness is in my blood, and I make no apologies for believing that some places are so very special that we will never improve upon them. These are the places worth fighting for.

I am committed to carry on my State's rich conservation history. Senator TOM UDALL and I have introduced legislation to designate special places such as the Columbine-Hondo in Taos County, the San Antonio River and Ute Mountain in the new Rio Grande del Norte National Monument as new wilderness areas. It is clear that conservation and growing our economy are inextricably linked. Protected wild places contribute to the New Mexico economy in a robust and sustainable outdoor recreation community which generates \$6.1 billion in consumer spending every year in the State, gives us 68,000 New Mexico jobs, and \$1.7 billion in wages and salaries, according to the Outdoor Industry Association.

The new Rio Grande del Norte National Monument in northern New Mexico has already yielded economic benefits since its designation. After less than 1 year since it was designated a national monument, the local community saw a 40-percent increase in visitors.

As we look back on the last 50 years since the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund both became law, let us also look to the future. My children love wild places as much as I do. My son Carter will be backpack hunting for elk with me later this fall. My son Michael will join me on BLM land to chase mule deer. They have hiked the Columbine Hondo Wilderness Study Area and fished in Cruces Basin Wilderness.

It is up to all of us to ensure that their children have the same opportunities we had and that we have shared with their generation.

I close with a quote from Aldo Leopold's book, "A Sand County Almanac":

When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to commemorate its 50th anniversary this month.

Fifty years ago, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, the House and Senate passed and President Johnson signed into law the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. And for 50 years now, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped protect and preserve our Nation's outdoor heritage all around my home State of Washington and across the country for our children and grandchildren.

The LWCF contains a set of unique tools that empower local communities to increase public access to open space, conserve forests, and protect wilderness areas. These funds help secure permanent, public access to lands and waterways for hikers, bikers, campers, hunters, anglers, and other outdoor enthusiasts. Senator Henry Jackson, from my home State of Washington, was one of the drafters of the original legislation. During debate of the bill on this very floor, he reminded his colleagues of the importance of open space to Americans, that these public lands are "the places they go to hunt, fish, camp, picnic, swim, for boating or driving for pleasure, or perhaps simply for relaxation or solitude." And that description still rings true today.

There are many examples of the LWCF at work in my home State of Washington. LWCF support flowing through its State and local assistance grants, Forest Legacy Program, Federal Land Management Agency projects, and Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund have helped protect over 120,000 acres of land and create or enhance hundreds of recreational facilities. These funds have gone to a wide variety of projects, from Federal wilderness to private working farms and forests, from scenic rivers to urban water parks. From the Straits of Juan de Fuca to the crest of the Cascades, from the Columbia River Gorge to the Little Spokane River, the LWCF has made my State a better place for future generations.

But a common thread through all these projects has been the way LWCF funding has brought together local public officials, conservationists, farmers, business leaders, forest owners, and engaged citizens to create and enhance public access to open space and natural areas and help keep sprawl in check, all while allowing for sustained economic growth and development. Funding from the LWCF were key in allowing for many of the individual acquisitions needed to achieve this, and I am proud to have supported many of these projects which have helped make these communities' visions a reality.

It is important to remember that it isn't just rural areas in Washington

that have been enhanced with resources from the fund. Dozens of projects in the hearts of our cities have given children access to much needed parks, sports fields, and swimming facilities. Families can now enjoy time together picnicking, biking, and even hiking in forests and other habitats, right outside their doorsteps. And we all benefit from the cleaner air and cleaner water that results from these high quality protected lands. Land and water conservation is good for our health, good for our families, and good for our souls.

But we also know it is good for our economy. In 2012, Americans spent over \$640 billion on outdoor recreation, and in Washington alone outdoor pursuits supported 227,000 direct jobs.

Our Nation has been blessed with an abundance of natural resources. That is why it makes perfect sense that when we develop some of those energy resources to fuel our economy, we set aside a portion of the royalties generated from that development to protect those other natural resources. But these conservation dollars are more than just outlays, they are also good investments. Studies have estimated that each dollar invested in land conservation returns between \$4 and \$10 in economic benefits to the economy, and we will see this return on investment for generation after generation.

Even with all the good that we see as a result of the LWCF, there is so much more that we could be doing. That is because in spite of all the benefits that we receive from LWCF spending, Congress has diverted the bulk of these conservation dollars to unrelated programs. We ought to fix that. Next year, the funding authority for the LWCF will expire. We need to permanently reauthorize this program, and create an independent, dedicated stream of funding for it. Doing so will benefit all Americans, both now and for generations to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 7 minutes, followed by Senator CORNYN for up to 10 minutes, and Senator BLUMENTHAL for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIL STRATEGY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to talk about the President's strategies on combating the threat of ISIL, or ISIS. I applaud the President's recognition that ISIL is a barbaric terrorist group that beheaded Americans. It murders, kidnaps, and tortures civilian populations. It sells women into slavery. It has the stated purpose of attacking America and its allies. It poses a threat, and the President is right that it calls for appropriate action by the international community.

I support and congratulate the President on the selective military strikes that have been done at the request of the Iraqi Government against ISIL's advances, which have held them back, and being able to regain territory that was held by ISIL, protecting civilian populations. I strongly support the President's commitment that there will be no combat ground troops interjected into this combat, and I think the President has done a good job in engaging the international community to work with us so that this is truly an international effort.

Let me comment for a moment, if I might, about military action and that it needs to be restricted. I oppose authorizing military use of force that is open-ended, that could result in the use of ground troops or where we could be asked to carry through or have our military do what the countries where these terrorist groups are located should be doing with their own military. In Iraq, it should be the Iraqi security forces that take on the ground responsibilities.

Let me remind my colleagues, when we went into Iraq—and it was done without my support. I voted against the authorization to go into Iraq. We were told that was going to be a short campaign, that the might of the military of the United States would make that a very quick operation. As we see years later, it took a long time and we are still in Iraq. It must be done with the help of the international community, particularly the countries that are in the region.

I think we have a strong responsibility as Members of the Senate and Members of Congress to revisit the 2001 authorization that was passed by Congress shortly after the attack on our country on September 11, and the 2002 authorization that was used for Americans going into Iraq. I don't think either one of those resolutions is relevant for additional military action today in either Syria or Iraq.

Let me read into the RECORD the appropriate language that was included in the 2001 authorization:

The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attack that occurred on Sept. 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons . . .

It is a real stretch to say that authority applies to actions against ISIL today. Therefore, I think it is incumbent. I think we have a constitutional responsibility to act, and I think we must act and make it very clear that there will be no ground combat troops authorized in any action taken by Congress.

In regard to Iraq, the Iraq resolution was passed at a time when the information supplied to Congress was not accurate. It is certainly not relevant to the

fact that now there is an independent Iraqi Government. That authorization also needs to be revisited.

Let me remind you, if this administration can use the authority of 2001 and 2002 for using aircraft and military operations by air, what is to say that the next administration—because we know this is going to take a long time—couldn't use that authorization for introducing ground troops in these countries?

So I think it is important that we revisit these authorizations, eliminate the previous authorizations, and make it relevant to the current need. It has to be limited to strategic air missions requested by the Iraqi Government, targeted at protecting civilian populations.

In regard to Syria, I have serious doubt about authorizing military operations. I think we need to have clarification from the administration as to the clear objectives they are seeking to accomplish in Syria. We have to be very careful about the authorization of the use of our military in a country where we are not invited.

Now let me talk 1 minute about timing. The President has article II powers. I don't deny that. So if something were to happen, he has the right to defend our country and use our military to defend our country. He can do that for a period of 60 days. Sixty days from now we will soon be returning for a lameduck session of Congress, so I don't think there is any immediate rush for us to try to get an authorization bill done. But I think we should be working on an authorization bill so we can take it up when Congress reconvenes, and if something happens in the interim, we are certainly available and we can come back in and be ready to act.

America is always stronger when Congress and the administration work together on these issues, and I would hope we could come together with the appropriate authorization, making clear we will not allow authorization for combat ground troops and that we are very restricted on the use of our air power.

Let me lastly comment about the continuing resolution we will be voting on tomorrow, as I understand it, that gives title 10 power for the arming and equipping of the Syrian opposition. Clearly in that authorization there is no authorization for use of U.S. military force. It is consistent with the action taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on which I serve and the resolution I supported that talked about arming and training the vetted Syrian opposition. We did that over a year ago. It was for a different mission; it was for dealing with Assad. This in a way is comparable to dealing with ISIL but also deals with the capacities against Assad. It is limited, to expire on December 11, and I think it is con-

sistent with our mission to deal with our policies in Syria.

As I said earlier, I voted against the Iraq authorization in 2002. I see that we have to be very careful that we do not allow authorization to exist that could be used for a long and costly involvement of the United States.

It is also clear to me that we cannot win the campaign against ISIL by military action alone. We have to have diplomatic support. We have to deal with cutting off the financial aid. We have to deal with cutting off the political support in Iraq. In Iraq we have a representative government. The seeds have been planted. That is what we need to do. That cuts off the support ISIL will need for long-term survival. The international community needs to stay resolved and the United States needs to stay in leadership.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized.

SENATE PROCEDURE

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, it has been more than a decade since I first came to this Chamber of the United States Senate. It has become unrecognizable—what has traditionally been a forum for thoughtful debate, amendments, and discussion based frequently on different perspectives that we come to based on our experience or the parts of the country we represent. Unfortunately this Chamber has devolved into one where not much gets done, and when there are votes, they are frequently show votes with the election clearly in mind.

Look no farther than our September agenda. Amid high unemployment, stagnant wages, widespread frustration over the consequences of ObamaCare, and genuine humanitarian and security crises abroad and here at home, our colleagues who control the agenda in the Chamber decided the most urgent order of business was to amend the Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution and gut the First Amendment.

As I said at the time, when I went home during the August recess to talk to my constituents, not one of them said: I want you to go back to Congress and I want you to gut the First Amendment guarantee to freedom of speech. This clearly is not at the top of the American people's agenda.

Despite all the challenges facing our country, the majority leader, who controls the agenda on the Senate floor, continues to prioritize election year votes—show votes—over serious legislation.

Back in March, when our Democratic friends decided to promote their so-called "fair shot" agenda, the New York Times noted that the exercise was completely political in nature. The New York Times—hardly hostile to our Democratic friends and their policy agenda—put it:

Democrats can see that making new laws is really not the point. Rather they are trying to force Republicans to vote against them.

Meanwhile, the majority leader has prevented millions and millions of Americans from having a real voice in this Chamber. Since he became the majority leader, he has blocked legislation more than twice as often as the majority leaders Bill Frist, Tom Daschle, Trent Lott, Bob Dole, George Mitchell, and I should add Robert Byrd, combined. But he hasn't just blocked Republican amendments, not just those in the minority; he has blocked amendments from the majority party—his own party.

Since July of last year we have had rollcall votes on only 14 Republican amendments and only 8 Democratic amendments. I have to tell you that if my party was in the majority and we ended up getting less votes than the party in the minority, I would be pretty hot about it, and I would have some explaining to do to my constituents. Indeed, the majority leader has allowed so few amendments that one of his fellow Senate Democrats, the junior Senator from Connecticut, recently told Politico: I got more substance on the floor of the House of Representatives in the minority than I have as a Member of the Senate majority.

Our colleagues in the House have sent over scores and scores of bills relating to job creation, taxes, health care, immigration, and other issues only to have Senator REID declare them dead on arrival. No wonder Congress has a 14-percent approval rating. When people see the dysfunction here—primarily in the Senate, since the House is passing legislation and then it dies here because the majority leader refuses to take it up—it is understandable why they are frustrated, just as we are frustrated.

I know it is not just those of us in the minority. Many Democratic colleagues privately expressed their own frustrations about the Senate becoming so dysfunctional. If the majority leader was serious about solving the problems that confront our country, they would not need to look far beyond positive progrowth ideas to address our Nation's most pressing challenges. They would see that Senate Republicans have joined our House colleagues in offering a bevy of thoughtful proposals.

First and foremost we have long stressed the need to pass a progrowth fiscally responsible budget. The Senate—under Democratic control—has not passed a budget since 2009. That is malpractice. We should leave the next generation with more economic opportunity, not more debt. Somebody is going to have to pay that money back. Maybe the young folks who are sitting in the front row—the young pages and their children will have to pay the

money back. Americans and small businesses across the country budget responsibly every month and so should their government.

In addition, we pushed sensible progrowth energy policies that enjoy bipartisan support, such as approving the Keystone XL Pipeline and boosting the U.S. exports of liquefied natural gas. We need energy policies that enhance our energy security, reduce prices, encourage investment, and create jobs at home. We also need a regulatory system that fosters economic growth and prosperity, not one that furthers Washington's overreach. Republicans believe we must continue aggressive oversight of the Obama administration's out-of-control regulatory agenda, which is hitting hard-working Americans and their wages while empowering Federal bureaucrats.

Senate Republicans also believe the President's health care law was absolutely the wrong way to expand affordable, accessible, quality health care to more Americans. We believe families and patients should be free to purchase whatever kind of insurance they prefer without having to worry about the government meddling.

We believe future reform should guarantee that health care decisions will be made by patients and their doctors, not by Washington. We believe those reforms should make quality health insurance and quality care more accessible for more people. Here is the greatest irony of ObamaCare—instead of making health care more affordable, it made it more expensive, thus limiting access to care.

On tax reform, we believe our overriding goal should be to lower tax rates for all taxpayers, broaden the base, and simplify the entire system in order to restore America's global competitiveness. We also favor ending “too big to fail,” thereby, ending the implicit government backstop and subsidy currently enjoyed by America's largest banks. There are a number of ways to achieve that goal, but we all agree Dodd-Frank did not solve that problem.

Immigration continues to be among the most pressing issues we face, especially given this year's record surge of unaccompanied children coming from Central America and pouring across our southwest border. We understand that one of America's top priorities is to make sure our laws are being enforced and our border is secure. We share that priority and we will keep advocating the necessary reforms, along with other reforms, to fix our broken immigration system.

We believe there are a lot of good ideas, and they are not the purview of either political party. In fact, we have been sent by our constituents to work in a bipartisan way to try and solve some of America's most pressing challenges, and we view our intellectual di-

versity as a sign of strength, but we remain united on the core principles and ideas that define our party.

We have had an experiment in big government over the last 6 years and, you know what, it hasn't worked very well. Unemployment rates remain high, the labor participation rate is at a 30-year low, and people have simply given up. The economy should be bounding back rather than knocking along the bottom. We remain committed to tackling our Nation's biggest challenges of promoting greater prosperity for all Americans, and we do that by growing the economy and creating jobs and letting people work hard, as they always have in America, and pursuing their dreams.

Proposals such as the ones I mentioned, many of which enjoy bipartisan support—they certainly have in the House of Representatives—will never see the light of day here as long as the majority leader continues to operate this Chamber like an incumbent protection program.

The American people sent us to take tough votes and solve problems. Indeed, I don't know anyone who would want to be a Senator if we are not allowed to vote and solve problems. The American people certainly deserve a Senate that operates that way.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, recently the Nation has been shocked and horrified by a video showing Ray Rice, a professional football player, knocking out his then fiancée who is now his wife, Janay Rice, and dragging her like a sack of potatoes out of an elevator as it almost closed on her. The Nation was shocked by the callous indifference and disregard for the issue of domestic violence not only by Ray Rice but by the NFL itself, which has fumbled and failed in its reaction from the very beginning.

Indeed, I wrote to the NFL asking for stronger measures after it suspended Ray Rice for a mere two games. Since then it has received the now infamous and notorious video, and he has been suspended indefinitely.

Ray Rice is only 1 of 85 players since the year 2000 who has been charged or cited for domestic violence, and many more were arrested for sexual assault, drunk driving, and other crimes.

This poster shows how the league could field an entire lineup of players who have been arrested for domestic violence and who remain active in the NFL. There are others who are not shown here. Ray Rice is on the field, though he may be suspended indefinitely.

These incidents, and literally thousands of others, are the ugly, brutal, bloody face of domestic violence in this Nation. Not only is it bigger and broader and more painful and serious than

Ray and Janay Rice, it affects our entire society. Its victims are throughout the country, and what they need most desperately are more services to bolster their courage and strength to come forward and break the cycle.

I know domestic violence is an issue in Connecticut because I worked to fight child abuse and neglect and related kinds of domestic violence when I served as attorney general. Not only have I worked in courts but also in schools to speak to young men and women.

I have worked with shelters such as Interval House, the largest shelter in Connecticut, which helped to form an organization called Men Make a Difference, Men Against Domestic Violence, which is composed of men as role models. Coaches, former athletes, successful businesspeople, law enforcement types, and broadcasters provide role models and take a stand and speak out against this scourge.

I know the brutal and terrible toll taken by domestic violence in Connecticut and in this country. The economic consequences run into the billions and the searing pain, savage emotional harm, and physical wounds are incalculable. The tentacles of domestic violence reach into every aspect of American life—homes, workplaces, hospitals, and athletic fields.

In Connecticut, the demand for victim support services has steadily increased over the years, and in Connecticut and around the country the need for services has spiked as a result of the Ray Rice video because more women and men have gained the courage and strength to come forward as a result of the national conversation that video has spurred.

As I have continued my work in Congress as a Member of the Senate, I have been deeply troubled, in fact, outraged on occasion, that we authorized barely a pittance of what is necessary to deal with that problem and support those services that are so vital to providing counseling, support, and advocacy.

Just in the past couple of days, I have learned that 30 percent of calls to the National Domestic Violence Hotline go unanswered. Congress bears a majority of the responsibility for this lack of resources.

There are heroes in this fight against domestic violence. Some of the advocates, service providers, and people such as Karen Jarmoc, CEO of the Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and Kim Gandy, president and CEO of the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and most important, the survivors and victims who have come forward and are telling their stories and speaking truth to the power and brutality they faced and confronted and conquered.

In fact, one of the challenges on this issue has always been the secrecy that surrounds it. The video of Ray Rice as-

saulting and knocking out his wife is the exception that proves the rule. It is the exception because most instances of domestic violence occur behind closed doors in secrecy and often at night and they go unrecorded because in most instances of domestic violence, women are disbelieved, embarrassed, shamed, and stigmatized when they come forward.

The Ray Rice video is the exception that proves the rule. It is the exception of this brutality being shown, but it is the rule that the response is almost always slow and inadequate. Even after Ray Rice was indicted for third-degree assault, Janay virtually apologized for her role in a stage-managed press conference orchestrated by the team—the Ravens—for whom Ray Rice played.

Only after the second video was circulated did the league even approach real action. The prosecutor in this instance said he would not treat Ray Rice more leniently or harshly simply because of his celebrity, which is understandable.

The routine in most courts in America is failure to treat domestic violence as seriously and severely as the crime it is and provide the punishment it deserves. The Ray Rice case was routine and it was done routinely, but that doesn't make it right. So the courts bear a measure of responsibility, along with the Congress.

The NFL is not alone here, but the NFL has a special position of trust. It is one of the most massively influential organizations in America. It employs players who have a massive impact on the attitudes and feelings of young men and women—in fact, Americans of all ages.

The NFL has a position of public trust because of its prominence and power, but it also has a position of public trust because of the special benefits it is accorded under the law. And it is like the NBA, the MLB, and the NHL, which all receive tremendous assistance in putting their brands and their messages before the American people. So it is our responsibility to call on these leagues to ensure that their messages which they can spread so widely because of the benefits they are accorded under our law—to ensure and require them to keep faith with their public trust and public obligation.

The public assistance these leagues receive take a number of very exceptional forms: tax benefits, public subsidies, and local assistance. But chief among them is the antitrust exemption enjoyed by the four major sports leagues. Although large corporations and similar organizations that have the potential to dominate a particular marketplace are generally prevented from coordinating their activities under our antitrust laws, Congress permits this kind of coordination by professional sports teams, particularly in the area of pooling their broadcast

rights and television contracts—the very means that enable them to spread their message and create that public image.

Teams in smaller media markets are able to remain competitive with their larger counterparts because of those benefits and the fact that the governing national leagues can evenly distribute resources—again, through coordination, agreements, combinations that would violate the law for any other corporation.

This exemption was the product of significant debate and analysis in Congress and around the country when it was granted. It was first established in 1961, and the Judiciary Committee noted even then that it was not intended to be absolute and that it was not to be used for unfair competition and that there was a public trust and obligation.

In 1976 the House of Representatives convened what it called a “Select Committee on Professional Sports” which prepared detailed reports on “the large number of off-the-field problems that affected all four of the professional sports,” including “both violence that involves participants in the sports as well as violence involving spectators of the sports.” We know the problems in these leagues include not only domestic violence but also the failure to address injuries such as concussions, drug abuse, and other problems that have been reported.

If anything, in the more than 50 years since the exemption was first granted, the prominence of the four professional sporting leagues in the American media landscape has only increased. The leagues have a tremendous effect, again, reaching into every aspect of American life, on programming, pricing, advertising, and more.

A lot has changed over the past 50 years, not least of which is our understanding of the harms of domestic violence and the importance of workplace policies that protect women, minorities, and other members of society. Yet the NFL's response to the Ray Rice incident came right out of the 1960s—right out of an episode of “Mad Men.”

Our laws and our practices and our culture must change. Most leagues, most athletes, most managers, and most teams play by the rules on and off the field. But, unfortunately, these deep-seated problems are not new. This special status can no longer be a blank check. It can no longer be granted permanently. It must be reviewable and the teams and the league held accountable. The era of the blank check for sports teams must end. The special benefits must be dependent on the leagues' fulfilling their positions of trust and special responsibility.

I will be proposing legislation to sunset the leagues' special antitrust treatment, ending the blanket antitrust exemption and making it renewable

every 5 years. The exemption should depend on the leagues' acting consistently with their public trust and complying with ethical and legal standards that both protect and oversee players and that keep the teams accountable to their fans. Their fans deserve better.

To ensure that Congress has accurate information, my legislation will establish a commission, like many that have existed in the past, to monitor the leagues' record of corporate citizenship. The commission would include representatives with special knowledge of issues that were proven to be a problem for the leagues, such as the heads of the Department of Justice's Office of Violence Against Women, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Surgeon General, and the commission would be responsible for submitting a report to Congress in advance of the vote to reauthorize and renew the anti-trust exemption.

Other groups would have an opportunity to be heard and to submit their views, and there would be hearings, meetings, and other exchanges that would give all an opportunity to be heard on this vital topic. I hope the Congress will have hearings as soon as possible on this issue.

I believe the professional sports leagues, and in particular the NFL, have an obligation to adopt policies that train players on domestic violence—more than lip service, more than check-the-box orientation settings—and, most important, to punish acts of abuse and promote awareness of this terrible crime. They have an obligation to act in accordance with due process and establish rules that treat more stringently and strictly this crime of domestic violence, in accordance with standards that give the players the right and opportunity to be heard.

But maybe more importantly than all else, these leagues should be accountable to help the survivors and victims, to provide funds out of the tens of billions in their profits to support these services that are more necessary than ever. They should support the survivors—most of them women—who come forward and have the incredible courage, bravery, and strength to break with a situation of domestic violence. It is at that point of maximum danger and turmoil in their lives that they most need to reach someone and have someone reach them to provide the counseling and advocacy they need and deserve at that moment of turmoil and pain.

Congress, the courts, all of us, have a responsibility to do more and to do better and to demand of professional sports leagues that they do more and do better.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at some point today or tomorrow the Senate will hastily consider, and likely pass, a massive, hodgepodge spending bill to fund every last Department and program within our Federal Government—even those programs and those Departments we know don't work, even those programs and those Departments where we know there is a lot of abuse and misuse of sacred Federal funds. The alternative, if we can call it even an alternative at all—and the only alternative—is to deny funding for every last Department and every last program within the Federal Government—even those programs and those Departments we know are absolutely essential.

All or nothing—those are our only options, the only options we are given. We have no other choice made available to us. This is government on autopilot or, alternatively, government without an engine.

The problem is that by funding the Federal Government with a massive patchwork spending bill, we force the American people to choose between two equally bad, two equally unacceptable options: Pay for everything in government or pay for nothing at all; either fund the entire Federal Government tomorrow at exactly the same level we are funding it today or fund nothing within the Federal Government, not even to pay our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, our marines, our judges, or not even to provide care for our veterans or support for the most vulnerable among us.

This kind of all-or-nothing proposition is dysfunctional, it is antidemocratic, and it prevents Congress from doing its job, which, I remind my colleagues, is to represent the American people and to be faithful stewards of their money—of the taxpayers' money—with which they have entrusted their Congress.

During the month of August, I held a long series of townhall meetings across my State, the great State of Utah. Whether I was in Cache County in the northern end of the State or in Washington County in the opposite direction or somewhere in between, the people of Utah, Democrats and Republicans alike, were clear about what they wanted. They were clear about the fact that they were demanding action. They wanted action in Washington. Their concerns weren't always the same. Some worried most about the public lands. Others were anxious about the economy. Many, of course, were troubled by the growing crisis along our southern border.

They were all looking for answers. They were all looking for solutions from someone. Everywhere I went they asked me: What are you going to do? What are you going to do to get our economy back on track? What are you

going to do to deal with many of the problems within our Federal Government that seem to go unaddressed for far too long? I would tell them: As a matter of law and by operation of our Constitution, Members of Congress have certain tools to address all of these concerns, but none of these powers is greater than the power of the purse. This is the power to allocate money, to fund the government, to fund its operations. It is what enables Congress, and only Congress, to reform dysfunctional government.

Encompassed within the power to give money is the power, necessarily, to withhold money. In this case the power of the purse is the most potent and the most effective instrument Congress can use to hold the executive branch accountable.

So when the administration fails to follow the law, as our current administration has done so freely and so frequently, Congress can demand answers and accountability by using the power of the purse as leverage.

As several of these townhall conversations continued, in the course of those townhall conversations, I began to notice that at this point in my answer, many people began to look hopeful—hoping that perhaps something could actually get done in Washington; hoping that perhaps some of the problems within our Federal Government could be corrected, could be reined in, could be turned around and set on a better course—but then I would have to break the bad news, and here is the bad news.

I would have to tell them all those things their representatives should be able to do and have an obligation to do—such as fixing broken government programs and ensuring the solvency of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and impeding lawless actions by the executive branch—but simply cannot get done because the Democratic leadership in the Senate insists that our Federal Government operate on autopilot.

This is the problem with the continuing resolution. When Congress has only one opportunity to exercise its power of the purse by voting for or against an all-or-nothing spending package and an all-inclusive, all-or-nothing spending bill, Congress has essentially no opportunity to exercise its power of the purse—at least not in a meaningful way, at least not in a way that enables Congress to demand accountability from Government.

In the continuing resolution we will consider tomorrow, there are several provisions that deserve their own consideration and debate, such as reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, extending the Internet Tax Freedom Act, and authorizing military action in Syria. None of these measures—and certainly not something that could put American lives at risk—should be hurried through on an all-or-nothing vote.

This is why the continuing resolution matters for everyone in this country. It is the principal reason our government is so dysfunctional and so unaccountable. A government on autopilot leaves Congress effectively paralyzed—powerless to implement meaningful government reforms and powerless to hold the President and the President's administration accountable for their actions.

This is not how government is supposed to operate. This is not how this government is ever supposed to be allowed to operate. It doesn't have to be this way. There is a better way. Indeed, as you can see on this chart, until just a few years ago, the better way was the only way. The House has done this and it is still doing it today.

Let me explain what this demonstrates right here. Freestanding appropriations bills that were passed by the Congress for fiscal year 2006—we had 11 separate individualized freestanding appropriations bills. To put that in context, that is more freestanding independent appropriations bills than Congress has enacted in all of the fiscal years ever since then—just in one year. That, of course, used to be the norm. It no longer is. In fact, lately, we are not doing any of these things.

It is important to point out that the House of Representatives still routinely passes freestanding appropriations measures. For fiscal year 2015, the upcoming fiscal year, the House of Representatives has passed seven such bills. The Senate has passed zero. Not only has the Senate passed none of its own free-standing appropriations bills, it has refused even to vote on any of the seven appropriations bills passed by the House of Representatives.

The fact is that before the Democratic leadership took control of the Senate, Congress would spend most of its time during the spring and summer of each year discussing, debating, amending, and eventually figuring out how much taxpayer money to spend and on what. Congress would consider separate spending bills, one by one, individually. Each of these bills would allocate a certain amount of money to fund the Departments, the agencies, and the programs within a certain area of government, organized by government functions such as defense, transportation, homeland security or health care.

Each spending bill originated in one of the corresponding subcommittees in the House and in the Senate. This is what we call the appropriations process. It makes sense that it would take up most of our time because as Members of Congress we have a solemn obligation to represent the people and to be faithful stewards of taxpayer money—of the money that many Americans spend many months of their lives each year just to earn so that they can send it to Washington, DC.

The American taxpayer deserves better. The American taxpayer should be able to expect more out of Congress. Instead, they have come to expect so much less.

That is how Congress used to operate, according to its own rules, according to historic precedent, and—more to the point—according to basic principles of common sense. Alas, times have changed. What Congress used to deliberate on for months, we now rush through in a single afternoon without opportunity for amendment, without opportunity for a full debate.

What used to be the subject of open and robust debate is now trivialized and treated as a mere formality, as a mere technical requirement to be dispensed with and discarded as quickly as it arrives.

The American people deserve better. Indeed, as I discovered while visiting with the people from one corner of Utah to the other, the American people demand that we do better. I think we can do better. In fact, I know we can. We have in the past. We will in the future, but we have to get the regular order appropriations process back on track.

We need to dispense, once and for all, with this mindset that says we are going to fund the government with one bill. You are going to have one opportunity to vote on any and all matters relating to the funding of the Federal Government. It is a binary choice. We fund everything at current levels or we fund nothing. We keep it running just the way it is with no opportunity for meaningful reform or we don't fund anything at all and we accept all of the heartache and all of the difficulty that goes along with this. This is wrong. It violates our laws and violates our procedures and it violates common sense.

We as a Congress have asked the American people over and over to expect less. I am here to tell each of my colleagues that it is time for the American people not to expect less. It is time for the American people to expect more. They are expecting more. They are expecting freedom. They are expecting for us to honor them by debating and discussing and voting on how we are going to spend their money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Montana.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I was born during the baby boom in Butte, MT. It was a boom time for our economy. Millions of kids such as me grew up expecting the boom years to go on forever. Things weren't always easy, especially in a tough blue-collar town like Butte. But it was still easier in those days to believe that the American dream was within your grasp. Put in your time and you can earn a good living. Work hard and you can play hard.

Unfortunately, I am less confident in the American dream for today's young people unless politicians can put their partisanship aside and put the interests of this country ahead of their own. I am hopeful that this Congress can once again behave like statesmen from half a century ago, when the boom times of the 1960s also produced restraint. I grew up in the morning shadow of the continental divide. Butte was surrounded by some of the best fly fishing in North America and huge areas of land known as primitive areas.

Some of those blue-ribbon streams were separated by the smallest of divides from the most polluted waters in America. Some of those primitive areas shared borders with the most valuable hard rock mines and timber cuts in the country. Those same resources continue to support thousands of jobs in Montana. But the boom times of the 1960s proved how wasteful and damaging unlimited production can be.

Today I applaud the lessons of restraint. This month is the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Wilderness Act. Senators on this same floor in 1964 turned the primitive areas and administrative wilderness areas of Montana and 12 other States into permanent protected areas.

That same year they also passed the visionary Land and Water Conservation Fund. Several of the original wilderness areas are in Montana, including one of the largest, the Bob Marshall Wilderness. In Montana we just call it the Bob. Imagine a Congress with the foresight to create a whole category of restraint. Anyone that says the American dream is gone for good has never visited the Bob.

Last month I had the opportunity to hike with a local group of Montanans up 2,000 feet to Headquarters Pass on the Rocky Mountain Front. On the trail, we met a herd of mountain goats. When we got to the pass, we stood under the windy shoulder of Rocky Mountain peaks and looked into the Bob.

Today I am the proud sponsor of an important made-in-Montana bill that would keep this land the way it is and add to the legacy of 1964. The Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act, first introduced three years ago, would protect almost 300,000 acres of public land. Today I urge my colleagues to move a public lands package forward this year in order to reward the collective efforts of so many Americans who work so hard on bills like the Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act.

The American dream today has a new challenge because of the Wilderness Act. A small portion of our public lands has been set aside and made available forever for all Americans to enjoy in Montana. We call this our outdoor heritage. Despite news stories about the perennial and terrible idea of giving away this heritage, support for

public lands in Montana remains deep and wide. The reason goes to the heart of what it means to be American. The American dream isn't just about having a job. It is about where we live and how we live.

In Montana, our public lands to support trout or elk or whatever adventure Montanans seek are part of that dream, whether they are a boiler-maker, a teacher or an outfitter.

It doesn't hurt that tourism has become a huge part of our economy in Montana. Today outdoor recreation supports 64,000 jobs in our State and almost \$6 billion in revenue each and every year. Like many Montanans, I am frustrated with how long it takes to conduct a timber sale or complete an environmental analysis on potential projects.

We need to get our forests healthy and working again, creating good jobs and making our forests more resilient to wildfires. Even simple projects get tied up in redtape and our rural communities and the land itself suffer for it. But this frustration should not blind us to our incredible heritage of untrampled public land owned by you and me and every American.

Rather than government shutdowns and public land selloffs, I urge this Congress to find the same wisdom to look ahead 50 years from today. We need to support local collaboration and fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Bills such as the Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act, the North Fork Watershed Protection Act, the East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Forest Jobs and Recreation Act deserve every Senator's support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding the leader is on his way down. I have a unanimous consent request that I would like to offer. I know that he wants to say a word. I will preliminary make some comments. When he gets here, out of respect for his time, I will ask that unanimous consent request.

Let me move on by saying that the President gave a speech a week ago. We have a hearing today in the Foreign Relations Committee. Secretary Kerry and others will assess our strategy in Iraq and Syria related to ISIL.

I just want to say these obviously are very important decisions. One of the pieces of this strategy is that instead of the President coming and asking for an authorization for the use of military force—which, in my opinion, is the sound judgment, to come and ask us for that support so the American people are behind this effort, by virtue of the House and Senate taking that up. They are not going to do that. Instead they are asking for the authority to do a very, very small piece of that, which

is to train and equip some members of the moderate, vetted Syrian opposition and to do so in the country of Saudi Arabia.

So they are asking for an authorization to do that overtly. It is something about which many people have questions. It is something that for many years, for some time, I have supported and actually been disappointed that the administration has left hanging the people of Syria whom we encourage now to take on Assad.

So that is a very important vote, a vote that all of us should take as a freestanding vote. But instead what is getting ready to happen is coming over from the House is a continuing resolution bill that funds the government. So instead of voting on the continuing resolution, which is a totally separate matter, and voting on arming the vetted moderate opposition the way the President has requested, as a separate vote so, No. 1, we have the opportunity individually to weigh in on those two measures separately, as the House is doing right now—instead, what is going to happen, as I understand from the majority leader, is we are going to take up that vote in a combined way. I think that is a poor way to run the Senate. It is a poor way for the people of the United States to understand where we are on important issues.

Just to give an example, I do not support the funding levels in the CR. I voted against the Murray-Ryan budget. I couldn't believe that in such a short amount of time we were willing to do away with the budget caps we thought so important to the fiscal well-being of this Nation. So I do not support the funding levels for the continuing resolution and had planned to vote against it.

Now there is a piece in it that is an important foreign policy piece that I think needs further debate, where we are authorizing the arming and training of the moderate opposition through December 11 as a part of this bill. That, to me, is an inappropriate way for us to do business. I think every Member of this body ought to have the opportunity to vote on each of those.

So the request I am going to make when the leader gets here is not to change any of the wordage—I realize time is of the essence. We have two bodies that sometimes do not act in concert in appropriate ways. But my unanimous consent request is to ask that properly these be separated, the language be identically the same.

So what I have done is I have at the desk a bill that lays out the authorization for arming and training the vetted moderate opposition in Saudi Arabia and other places. I have that exact language that is coming over from the House so that the Presiding Officer, myself, and others can weigh in on that issue. Once that issue is dealt with—again, it would take 15 or 20 or 30 min-

utes for that to occur—we could then move over to the continuing resolution, which, again, has a different set of supporters, generally speaking.

So I do wish this body would debate the issues of great importance to our Nation. I know that in this hearing with Secretary Kerry, on both sides of the aisle there are numerous questions about how this strategy is going to work in Syria and how, with no ground force on the ground and us planning to train people in a very short amount of time, a very small amount of people—we are not going to give them very sophisticated equipment—how that ground game, that ground effort is going to be effective. I wish this body would take that up and debate it. To me, it is an important issue. It is an issue that I have supported for some time. At the same time, the efficacy of it has changed.

One of the things that is fascinating to me—General Dempsey yesterday: All of a sudden, we are going to train them.

By the way, they have been organized because they want Assad out. They have been fighting against Assad in Syria. But we are going to train them to fight ISIS or ISIL, which has not been the rallying entity for the Free Syrian Army to organize.

So, look, I plan to support publicly, as I am right now, this first phase of arming and training them because I have been pushing for it for so long. I worry about its efficacy. It seems as if the goals of it now are very different. But I am OK authorizing that until December 11 and we can hear more about it. But I do not support the funding levels in the CR. This is not an appropriate way for us to do business.

I am going to ask unanimous consent—I hope the majority leader is going to be here in a minute. I would like to get back to the hearing on Syria that we are having in foreign relations. I understand he may well be on the way.

With that—as a matter of fact, I may pause for a minute. Let me just make a point I made earlier with Secretary Kerry at the hearing. I do not want to debate whether the President has the legal authority to conduct a war, a multiyear war, a war that many people say may take up to a decade in another country against another enemy. I do not want to debate whether he legally can do that. I know he is tying himself to the 2001 authorization, which I assure you no one was contemplating. But I do not want to debate that. I know there are all kinds of article II people—all kinds of people who believe the President can do almost anything he wishes relative to military engagement.

I just want to talk about how lacking in judgment it is for three people—the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State—to attempt to do

this over a multiyear period, in a different country, with a different enemy, and not come to us. That lacks in judgment. That lacks in judgment because bad things are going to happen. Mistakes are going to be made. Five hundred thirty-five Monday-morning quartermasters make no sense. Holding the country together is what is important. So selling that plan, selling the details, having us have the opportunity to tease out and understand how this is going to work is an important part of the process that they are skipping.

I see the majority leader is here. I know he is busy. I thank him for coming to the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the two leaders prior to the consideration of H.J. Res. 124, the CR, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my bill—the exact same language as coming over from the House—which is at the desk—that is the same language as included in the CR regarding Syria; that there be up to 4 hours of debate followed by a vote on passage of my bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my friend from Tennessee is a fine Senator. He has the interests of the State of Tennessee every step of the way and, of course, our country. So my statement here has nothing to do with the kind of man he is and the kind of Senator he is.

I have just left my office, where I watched the second of three votes in the House. The House has voted on the continuing resolution. It passed by an overwhelming margin over there. The purpose of that is to stop another government shutdown. The continuing resolution includes language on training and equipping the Syrian opposition. That bill will come over here in a matter of an hour or two. The House has chosen how it wishes to address these two matters; that is, the CR and arming and training the Syrian rebels.

As my colleagues know, in order to make a law, you need the Senate to pass something and the House to pass something or vice versa. Then, of course, it is signed by the President. They have to be identical. If we wish to prevent a government shutdown, we have to pass this continuing resolution the House will send us. I have had conversations with the Speaker, and he has been very strong in stating what they are going to do over there.

Senate committees are in the process—one of the committees the Senator from Tennessee is the ranking member of—in the process of holding hearings on whether an authorization to use force is necessary and if so, how it should be crafted. So I look forward to Foreign Relations deciding what legislative action to take on this matter. But in the meantime, we should pass the House-passed continuing resolution

which includes the language on training and equipping the Syrian opposition and present the people here an up-or-down vote on what we get from the House of Representatives.

We cannot have another government shutdown. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the leader for coming down and thank him for agreeing to a time when we both can be here.

I do want to say that we could deal with it exactly in the way that I laid out and keep the government from shutting down because we would be passing exactly the same language.

But I understand. I talked privately with the majority leader about this. I understand people do not want to do that over in this body. They do not want to separate the two. I know that the majority leader—that is his right, to object to dealing with these issues in the same language that I laid out. I do appreciate him coming down. I disagree very strongly with this approach.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I believe under the regular order that I will be recognized for up to 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIL THREAT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, with all the things that are going on right now, I am particularly interested in the hearing we had yesterday on ISIS. It was a big deal. I applaud General Dempsey for his honesty in talking about how serious this war is that we are embarking on right now. The fact is that we have a mess, and ISIS has tripled in the last 3 months, up to now well over 30,000 troops, with tanks, heavy artillery.

This is not—I know the President has tried to make people believe this is just another rag-tag terrorist operation like Al Qaeda or the Taliban. It is not. This is war. This is a real serious thing that we are in the middle of.

I do applaud General Dempsey and also Secretary Hagel for their honesty in the committee hearing. It was difficult for them when the President talks about no troops on the ground, no troops on the ground. We know we already have troops on the ground.

I think the American people have had a wake-up call. I believe they understand how serious it is. In fact, there were two polls out last week. One of them was a poll that 70 percent of the American people know how serious this is and that ISIS could affect and would affect and is affecting our homeland. That was a big thing, that 70 percent of the people in America understand that. Just yesterday the Wall Street Journal

poll came out, along with ABC, and they said the same thing: 70 percent of the people know this is something that affects our homeland.

When they talk about troops on the ground—I remember asking the question during the hearing yesterday. I said to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey: If the President said no troops on the ground, what if your airstrikes—if something happens to one of those planes and we have the problem that one of the pilots is bailing out. Are you saying that we do not have troops on the ground to ensure his or her safety?

He said: Absolutely we will.

So the point is that has been a question that people have to understand, that this is war. We have to win it. We can't take another chance.

THE ECONOMY AND OVERREGULATION

But that is not why I am here. I think because of the distraction of ISIS and all of these other things, a lot of people have forgotten the serious problems that are hampering our economy; that is, what this President has done through the overregulation that takes place. Since he first took office and failed to achieve his signature cap-and-trade legislation, he has been working tirelessly to try to do what he couldn't do through legislation with regulation. The regulations received most of the attention because they are the most expensive.

I first started in 2003, and I remember so much in the Senate. In 2003, at that time Republicans had a majority. I was the chair of the committee that had the jurisdiction. They started off in 2003 with the first cap-and-trade legislation, and we defeated it. We defeated it ever since that time. One reason we defeated it was I was able to find out—and I didn't know this in the beginning—that people said: Global warming is real, there are all these bad things, and we are all going to die.

Yet from the costs we determined—and this came not just from me but from others who were interested, but universities such as MIT came out with a study, the Wharton School of Economics came out with one, and Charles River Associates. They all had the cost of this cap-and-trade somewhere between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year.

Every time I hear a large figure, I look at the population in my State of Oklahoma and see what that cost means to a family. In my State of Oklahoma, \$300 billion to \$400 billion a year would be a permanent tax increase for the average family in Oklahoma—that files a Federal income tax—of \$3,000 a year.

When we get to these numbers, we look and we realize this is going to be very expensive and no one wants anything to do with greenhouse regulations when the cost is so high.

I will show later on that it wouldn't accomplish anything, anyway. That is

probably why the recent polls, such as the Gallup poll on global warming, have it on the bottom of the national priority list. Their last poll is a poll of 15 things to be most concerned about, and global warming and climate change registered No. 14 out of 15.

The people have understood—it is as if they understand now what is going on with ISIS. They know what the truth is.

The Pew Research Center showed that 53 percent of Americans either don't believe that global warming and climate change are occurring or they say if it is, it is natural causes.

This has been going on. This is what has bothered me. I can remember—and I am going from memory now—but I used to use the example, back when we first started looking at this subject, as to how this is a cyclone that has been going on for recorded history.

In 1895, we were in a cooling period, basically. They were referring to it as the little ice age at that time—I could be wrong. But, anyway, that endured until 1918. Then in 1918, it turned into a warming time and that went all the way up through 1945.

This is what is significant. In 1945, we started another cooling period. It happened that 1945 was the year that was recorded as the year when it had the highest amount of CO₂ emissions, and that precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Of course, that went on up to about 1975 when we went to the other side, where we have actually entered into a cooling area. Everybody knows that.

God is still up there. We have always had these seasons. People would like to think somehow it is man who is doing it. They don't want any progress. They don't want people to be able to generate electricity and energy to take care of our needs.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle act as though public debate has been settled on the issue, obviously it is just the opposite of that. It probably explains why it has been difficult for Tom Steyer to raise the full \$100 million he promised to help Democrats win elections this fall.

We remember in February that he announced he would put up \$50 million of his own money—and then he did—and that he would raise another \$50 million. It would be \$100 million that he would put in campaigns for incumbents who would agree to try to resurrect the global warming issue—because it has died in the eyes of the American people—and try to stop the pipeline.

He did this, and the trouble is he is not able to raise the other \$50 million. The last count was it is only \$1.7 million he has been able to raise from outside donors. Nonetheless, of course, he has his own \$50 million. Regardless, we know he is spending the money he has, even though he hasn't raised other money.

We can see on this chart a quote where he said—that is a picture of Tom Steyer. He is not a bad guy and all of that, he is just far left, and he has a lot of money. He said:

It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in the midterm elections. . . . we are looking at a bunch of . . . races. . . . My guess is that we'll end up being involved in eight or more races.

So Tom Steyer's goal is, as I said, to try to resurrect the global warming issue and try to stop the Keystone Pipeline.

I think it is an appropriate time to talk about the hypocrisy on the left over political spending. We spent all of last week debating a constitutional amendment to limit political speech that is currently protected under the First Amendment. Democrats are talking about the Koch brothers, and people are not aware that this type of activity was from a man named Tom Steyer, by his own admission.

Someone asked me the other day—I think we were on the floor. I was the only Republican to come down. It was kind of fun. They were having their all-night session. I made the statement: If there is anyone with insomnia at home who is not asleep yet, this is a good way to do it. I made the comment that this is something we know is going on.

I stated that with all these races that are out there, they are trying to do something in order to elect people to try to go back to what they failed to be able to get. I think it is an appropriate time to get through that hypocrisy.

Recent news reports have surfaced and described the Democracy Alliance. That is an organization that aims to organize the policy objectives and funding streams of the leftwing liberal establishment.

According to an internal memo that was leaked to the press a few weeks ago, the Democracy Alliance for the past 9 years "has aligned donors, leaders in the progressive movement, [that is liberal] and political infrastructure in order to achieve victories at the ballot box and in policy fights including those for comprehensive health care reform, Supreme Court confirmations . . ."

This influence is estimated to be between \$600 million and \$700 million.

The Washington Post recently had this chart. It is kind of hard to read, but in the Post it was obvious because each one of those dots is a liberal political organization. They all joined together and that is called the Democracy Alliance.

Again, this was 161 plus 21—182 organizations are part of this alliance. It details all of their agendas and how they are being coordinated by the political Democratic agenda by the Democracy Alliance. We will recognize most of the names on the list. It includes the Center for American Progress, Media Matters for America,

America Votes, and even Organizing for Action which, incidentally, is President Obama's political campaign arm.

In April, this group convened a secret meeting in Chicago to huddle with its deep-pocketed donors to craft a strategy in messaging for this coming year's elections. It was shrouded in secrecy, and the memo prepared for attendees—all the people on this list who were coming in to meet in Chicago—warned them of interacting with political reporters. In fact, it included a pages-long list of reporters who are expected to try to crash the conference, along with the photos, so folks could be on the watch for these people.

The names of the people attending and involved were not going to be disclosed to the public, nor would any details be released about the discussions that were taking place.

Tom Steyer and the Democracy Alliance are acting like a cult, even as the Democratic left pushes for the institution of a new constitutional amendment. We now know that initiative was nothing more than a political sham.

At the end of the day, the liberal left wants an aggressive, secretive, political machine operating on its behalf, and it looks as though they have what they need in the Democracy Alliance.

The key selling point for the Democracy Alliance pitch to its contributors is the inseparable link to the deep connections with the Obama White House administration. The Democracy Alliance firmly believes it is in the driver's seat when it comes to setting policy for liberals in Washington, and it wants its donors to know it.

There is nothing wrong with this. We have had differences of opinion and philosophy, and that is why we have political parties. This is more extreme than anything I have seen and more organized.

One of the key goals of the Democracy Alliance is to promote "an environment that keeps our kids safe." This explains why the administration continues to push an extremist agenda of environmental mandates that will crush our economy.

This is where Tom Steyer has really succeeded in being part of the Democracy Alliance. He has managed to convince Democrats in the Senate to hold more than one all-night vigil on global warming, and these have come as the United States has been enduring one of its coldest years yet.

Just this month so far, NOAA, of the Commerce Department, has reported 246 record cold temperatures. Wyoming already has right now 20 inches of snow in some places, and it is unseasonably cold in Washington, DC.

One of these colder areas, my city of Tulsa, OK, on Saturday set a record cool high temperature. It only reached 65 degrees. It has never happened before, so it is not cooperating very well with trying to convince people the

world is coming to an end because of global warming.

It also explains why the President is continuing to aggressively try to implement greenhouse regulations after failing to accomplish this goal legislatively. These regulations will effectively prevent any coal-fired powerplant from being constructed and force our Nation into relying substantially on expensive renewable resources.

Regulations such as these would take us in the direction of Europe, which in many instances has experienced electricity prices three times as high as they are in the United States. They have been ahead of us in trying to stop fossil fuels and in trying to stop nuclear energy. The rates their people are paying are now three times higher than ours.

If anyone doubts these rules will have a negative impact on our economy, just look at Australia. Australia imposed a carbon tax on their economy a few years ago and it caused horrendous damage. It caused \$9 billion in lost economic activity per year and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. This is in Australia. This just happened. It was so bad that the government in Australia recently voted to repeal the carbon tax. Remember all the talk about the fact: Oh, Australians are leading the way and they are going to have a carbon tax, we should be following them. Now they have repealed that by an overwhelming vote and their economy is now better for it. In fact, it was announced last week that Australia experienced record job growth last month of 121,000 jobs. They said this is because they have repealed this carbon tax they had passed. They credit this success to the repeal of the carbon tax in addition to these greenhouse regulations.

I think it is important for us to recall the many other regulations this Obama administration has already imposed on the American people and discuss all of the new regulations that have not yet come out, but they are working on it. Some of these regulations they are holding off until after the elections so the people would not know the cost of the regulations and how many jobs are going to be lost.

The first we need to remember is Utility MACT. By the way, MACT means maximum achievable controlled technology. In other words, what technology has told us we could do to try to control these releases.

Utility MACT was the first one they successfully passed. In this case, the EPA established a standard that was impossible for utilities to actually meet.

This regulation is inappropriate under the Clean Air Act, and it is having a \$100 billion annual impact on the economy and destroying 1.65 million jobs. They have already done it. They were able to pass it along party lines.

The EPA has already finalized similar regulations for industrial boilers and cement kilns. Together, those regulations are having an impact of more than \$63 billion on the economy and they have destroyed 800,000 jobs and may result in the shutdown of 18 cement plants around the country. No one has refuted these figures.

In another section of the law, the EPA put a rule together, knowing it would increase the cost of gas. The rule is known as the Tier 3 rule, and it regulates the amount of sulfur that can be in gasoline when it leaves the refinery.

Tier 2 standards were put in place back in the early 2000s. That resulted in a 90-percent decline in the sulfur content of gasoline by 2010. That is already behind us, and it had a positive, measurable impact on the environment.

The need for a Tier 3 standard is not articulated very well. In fact, EPA did not have any unique scientific data to support the key benefits of this rule, and the EPA ignored the fact that it would actually increase greenhouse gas emissions. So they are going to increase greenhouse gas emissions with the rule they are still putting forth and be counterproductive. Talking about the Tier 3 rule, EPA stated that "this rule will increase the cost of gasoline."

Furthermore, the EPA recently finalized a rule called the 316(b) water rule. This rule regulates the cooling water systems used by powerplants and other major industrial facilities to prevent their operations from overheating. So they use water. The EPA and the Fish and Wildlife Service were worried about the impact these facilities were having on fish, and so they put out a rule to help. In the rulemaking, EPA again states that "the final rule will increase electricity costs."

Worse is the fact that EPA could not even fudge its numbers enough to present a positive cost-benefit ratio. In its final rule, the stated costs are \$300 million, which is about 10 times the estimated benefits of the rule, which are only \$28.6 million. This violates the President's own Executive Order 13563, which states that agencies must "propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that its benefits justify its costs."

That is another problem we have with this administration. They will add rules, they will add laws, and they violate these laws—just like when he turned loose the five terrorists from Gitmo. We had passed, in fact, knowing he was going to try to get rid of people in Gitmo—and he took the five who were the very worst—we had passed a law saying he can't do that until he gives the Senate Armed Services Committee 30 days' notice and gives us a chance to respond and stop him from doing it. He totally ignored it, just as he ignored these regulations.

Worse yet, this rule has no human health benefits. Its only beneficiaries

are fish. So EPA is putting out a rule that will increase electricity costs, including for those who live on fixed incomes, all for the sake of saving a few fish.

Another rule EPA has done since President Obama began his administration is the regional haze rule. These regulations were established to improve the visibility of national parks, and States were instructed to develop their own plans—known as State implementation plans—in order to comply. My State of Oklahoma did this, but EPA overturned it because of a technicality associated with its economic analysis. When EPA did this, it instituted a Federal implementation plan, and in this case it cost over \$1 billion to execute or nearly 10 times the amount of the State-based plan that had been developed cooperatively with our utility companies. This is the kind of uncooperative relationship we have come to expect when working with the EPA.

Beyond the greenhouse gas regulations, the one receiving the most attention is the waters of the United States rule. Nearly every group from Oklahoma is talking about this rule because it would extend the powers of the Federal Government over millions of new acres of land.

Just last week I was in Guymon, OK; El Reno, OK; and Boise City, OK. Boise City is the farthest west, largest city out in the panhandle. It is kind of sandwiched between Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, and Texas. They are all in western Oklahoma. This is an arid part of the country. They are in their third year of their drought right now, but the new rule would declare much of this area as a Federal waterway subject to the onerous Federal regulations. This would impact every industry—farming, ranching, oil and gas, construction, transportation—everything.

Tom Buchanan happens to be the president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau. I asked him a question in a kind of townhall setting that we had not too long ago.

I said: What is the biggest problem we have in agriculture in Oklahoma?

He said: The biggest problem has nothing to do with the farm bill. The biggest problem we are facing right now is the overregulation by the EPA and what they are doing with endangered species, what they are doing with the containment of fuel on farms, what they are doing with the water rules they have. That is the biggest problem.

I was with Terry Detrick, president of the American Farmers and Ranchers, and he agrees that the biggest problem farmers in America are having right now is the overregulation of the EPA.

The EPA has said it will work with industries to make sure it works for them, but we know from experience

this won't be possible. It is not going to happen. Their goal is to take over, to control and leave no room for negotiation.

Another devastating regulation being developed by the EPA is the ozone NAAQS standard. NAAQS means national ambient air quality standard. It was last set at the end of the Bush administration at 75 parts per billion. The EPA has been working since President Obama took over the White House to lower this standard.

In 2011 the President cancelled EPA's plans to lower the ozone standard because it was going to hurt his reelection chances. But now that he has secured that reelection, he is ready to start it up again.

The EPA staff and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee—CASAC—recently recommended that the Administrator propose to lower the NAAQS level to between 60 and 70 parts per billion.

This chart shows how much of the Nation would be out of attainment if EPA lowers the standard to 60 parts per billion. In Oklahoma, all 77 counties would be out of attainment. What does that mean? I was mayor of the city of Tulsa once when it was out of attainment. We were not able to increase populations in many of our businesses.

It essentially means the EPA will have to issue a regulatory permit for any business expansion plans that could increase emission levels. It would make business expansion enormously expensive and would dramatically increase the power of the EPA. All told, this rule would put nearly 94 percent of the counties' populations of the United States of America out of attainment zones and would cede our economic superiority to the likes of China and India.

Zooming in to more industry-focused regulations, the EPA has been the main culprit in the President's war on fossil fuels. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have opened up dramatic new oil and natural gas resources in this country that no one thought we would ever be able to profitably extract.

By the way, hydraulic fracturing was actually developed in my State of Oklahoma, in Duncan, OK, in 1949. So this is something that is going on. In spite of this, they are trying to use hydraulic fracturing to stop the successful increases we have been able to have in the wells.

Lisa Jackson was the first EPA Administrator under Barack Obama. I remember asking her the question: If we were to do something with hydraulic fracturing, has there ever been a documented case in the United States that hydraulic fracturing is damaging to groundwater?

She said: No, it is not. There has never been—her actual exact words—any proven case where the fracking process itself has affected water.

So if we eliminate this, it is not going to save anything because it is not going to create any problems. And this doesn't come from me; it comes from the Administrator of the EPA, appointed by President Obama. Regardless, the EPA is moving full force to regulate hydraulic fracturing. At one point during the administration, there were a total of 13 different agencies working to do this. The Bureau of Land Management is one of them. It is my understanding that their regulations are being finalized, and it could cost producers as much as \$100,000 per well. Keep in mind that every time they talk about what it is going to cost industry or business, that is passed on to the public.

The EPA is also working to regulate methane emissions from across the oil and natural gas industry. Whether it is the upstream producers during the drilling and completion process, the midstream pipeline operators, or the downstream retail distributors, EPA is convinced that the industry is willingly allowing their valuable product to seep into the atmosphere without any concern or awareness of where it is.

EPA's methane strategy is part of the President's overall climate change action plan, and the Agency recently published white papers outlining its understanding of methane leaks in the industry, and they were not very impressive.

I recently wrote EPA and the White House to express my concern with these papers. I was shocked that the papers seemed to lack any comprehensive understanding of the industry's operational practices. I was also disappointed that EPA didn't consider many of the regulatory hurdles in place which actually prevent producers from installing the technology and infrastructure that would reduce methane emissions. I am hopeful that EPA will take my recommendations seriously before moving forward.

So we have two problems. Right now we could be totally independent of any other country. All we have to do is do what every other country in the world does; that is, exploit our own resources. This President has made it impossible for us to get into public lands and to get this done.

Then, of course, we have the problem of overregulation. In all, the administration's regulatory agenda is intended to shut down the engine of America's economy. They have already shut down coal. Now they are working on oil and natural gas.

What they have done so far is just a preview. But the liberal environmentalists—Tom Steyer, Bill McKibben, Democracy Alliance—must all be frustrated by what is going on right now. Temperatures are not going up, they are going down. Nobody seems to care. No one has any desire to imple-

ment the policies they want. Polling is all showing they have lost this battle. That is exactly why they are willing to spend between \$600 million and \$700 million on this year's elections—to convince the American people to elect Members who will support the President's regulations, which will shut down the economy.

One more thing, going back to global warming. Earlier I said that back in 2002 when we discussed the costs of it, being between \$300 billion and \$400 billion, as the largest tax increase in history, a permanent tax increase, I asked the question to Lisa Jackson—again, she was the Administrator of the EPA, appointed by Barack Obama—I said: If we were to pass these cap-and-trade regulations or bills or do it by regulation, would this have the result of lowering CO₂ emissions?

She said: No, because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China, it is in India, it is in Mexico, it is in other places.

In fact, one could use the argument that it would actually have the effect of increasing emissions because as we chase away our base, the manufacturing base will go to countries like China and India, where they don't have any restrictions on emissions at all.

I think it is important to remind the people that even though that era is almost gone and people realize that is something that was very popular at one time, now the polls show that people have caught on. But keep in mind that what the President could not do through legislation he is now doing through regulations, and regulations, as we pointed out, are the greatest problem our economy is facing today, and this is something we are going to have to change.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington State.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank and the legislation that we are soon going to be seeing on a continuing resolution that was just voted on by the House of Representatives. While I am happy that there is a CR—a continuing resolution—that keeps our government open, I am very distressed with the fact that the House is sending us a simple 9-month extension of the Export-Import Bank to expire June 30 of next year.

The reason why that is so frustrating to me and many of my colleagues over here is because this is a jobs issue. It is about our economy, and we have heard today at various venues throughout the Capitol how people are actually losing jobs right now because of the uncertainty of the Export-Import Bank. So I know that some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives—Republicans—are proud they have helped to

reauthorize the bank for 9 months. Make no mistake about it; this will cost us jobs in the United States of America during that time period.

We had a press conference today. I was proud to be joined by my colleagues Senator KIRK, Senator GRAM, Senator MANCHIN, and various leaders in the energy industry—the Nuclear Energy Institute; Combustion Associates, Inc.; Itron, which is a company in the Northwest; Westinghouse; and FirmGreen—to talk about how many energy jobs are dependent upon the Export-Import Bank. You can see from this chart: 46,000 U.S. energy jobs and \$7.7 billion in energy exports.

Just last year these transactions helped these energy jobs in the United States of America by putting investments in projects overseas. That is why we want to see a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. While this uncertainty exists in the continuing resolution, all you are going to do is to exclude U.S. companies from closing deals. That is because a credit agency is critical to U.S. companies actually being at the table.

We heard from one firm today, FirmGreen, that they were actually excluded from participating and getting a deal simply because of the uncertainty of the Ex-Im Bank: A credit agency guaranteeing financing the deal was not at the table and we lost out to an Asian competitor. So during these 9 months of uncertainty, that is exactly what is going to happen to more U.S. companies. They are going to lose out on these energy jobs that we are looking for overseas.

I am talking about things that are part of our energy strategy—everything from Sub-Saharan Africa, wind turbines in Central America, and powerplants in Africa to various investments in the nuclear facilities. A short-term 9-month extension doesn't provide a large enough window for companies to build a pipeline, to construct a wind turbine or to develop a nuclear facility. So it will hurt us by slowing down on these energy projects just at a time when we are trying to fund the training of troops to combat ISIS. We are going to be creating uncertainty in places such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iraq on water projects, construction projects, and road projects that might not get done because U.S. companies won't be able to get the financing of a credit agency. So this is a national security issue, and we are already hearing from exporters about this.

Mr. President, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of 30 different newspapers with editorials supporting the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPERS ENDORSING EX-IM REAUTHORIZATION

1. New York Times
2. USA Today
3. Los Angeles Times
4. Chicago Tribune
5. Boston Globe
6. Miami Herald
7. Houston Chronicle
8. Seattle Times
9. Columbus Dispatch
10. Akron Beacon-Journal
11. Milwaukee Journal-Constitution
12. Wichita Eagle
13. Winfield Daily Courier (KS)
14. The Hartford Courant
15. The Fort Myers News-Press (FL)
16. Crain's Detroit Business
17. Scranton Times-Tribune
18. Lancaster Intelligencer Journal (PA)
19. Rock Hill Herald (SC)
20. Greenville News (SC)
21. Orangeburg Times and Democrat (SC)
22. Beaumont Enterprise (TX)
23. San Antonio Express-News (TX)
24. Roanoke Times
25. The Columbian (WA)
26. Tacoma News Tribune
27. The Spokesman-Review
28. The Olympian
29. The Puget Sound Business Journal
30. Bellingham Herald

Ms. CANTWELL. The Roanoke Times was one of those newspapers. It typifies what companies are saying, that “to really increase manufacturing jobs, you need to increase exports.”

That is why we feel so strongly about this. The Roanoke Times also said:

It's a global economy. Policymakers need to put U.S. manufacturers on an even playing field with foreign competitors in emerging markets, not take them out of the game.

That is exactly what happens when we give a short-term reauthorization for 9 months. No deal of this size and magnitude with energy companies gets done in a 9-month period of time. It takes the bank basically 3 months just for the processing. The discussion of being at the table, closing the deal, and competing with your competitors takes much longer, and no one is going to be interested in closing a deal when they don't know whether the bank is going to continue to exist.

That is why other newspapers such as the Times-Picayune has said that one of their companies—basically a CEO of Reliable Industries of New Orleans—said: “The Export-Import Bank is a major reason his firm has built an export business with 600 customers in 60 countries.”

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the other side of the Capitol who don't understand business: The notion that you don't get it is that the export opportunities for our economy are the biggest chances to grow GDP in America, and you are foreclosing on that for the next 9 months because you are creating uncertainty and unpredictability.

Well, you know what I say to that? You are basically shipping jobs overseas. That is exactly what you are doing. You are participating in ship-

ping jobs overseas because you don't want to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the United States right now in manufacturing has a supply chain of small businesses all throughout the United States that help in the farm economy in building farm equipment, help in the aerospace industry building airplanes and airplane-related products, and in the energy economy, as we focused on today at our press conference. All of these suppliers, when they cannot get financing for their products, are going to look to overseas suppliers who can get support from the credit agencies in their country, whether that is China, whether that is in France or whether its in Germany or other countries. So people who don't support giving predictability on the Export-Import Bank are supporting shipping jobs overseas.

Our economy is struggling too much and our national security interests are at stake to be shipping jobs overseas and not having the investments in these countries such as Iraq and Egypt and other places where we want to build security. I believe in the long-term interest of fighting our challenges with extremism around the globe with economic power. I know people are going to talk about military power and people are going to talk about soft power. I believe in economic power. Having an Export-Import Bank that is doing business like building roads and building water and building energy facilities actually helps to stabilize these areas of the world.

I am glad to see that General Petraeus also agrees. General Petraeus basically said that the Ex-Im Bank “is integral to our country's security interests.” Integral—he has watched this on the ground and he knows and understands what the Export-Import Bank is, and he is asking us to give it more certainty and predictability than what a 9-month extension does, because, as I said, business deals cannot get done in that short a period of time. Here is a person who understands these issues both from a military perspective and an economic perspective. I wish more of my colleagues would understand that they are basically just shipping jobs overseas.

Newspapers around the country are continuing to try to help echo this issue. The Charlotte Business Journal said: “Executives say the Ex-Im Bank is a key to a competitive U.S. nuclear industry.” They have been trying to focus on this issue.

The Boston Globe said: “Billions will be lost unless Congress reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank.” It also went on to call exactly what this game is that is happening right here and now in Washington, DC. The Boston Globe in their editorial in support of a longer reauthorization said: “Conservative hardliners rallying to shut down the

agency are risking a serious, self-inflicted economic wound."

That is because we don't have to be at this point. If you want to talk about reforms for the Ex-Im Bank, we have a lot of opportunity to do that, but hardliners don't want to reauthorize the bank.

Having been in business, I am somebody who believes in trend lines. I would ask my colleagues who are going home and thinking they are going to campaign about jobs to ask themselves what kind of message are they sending to the global community about the Export-Import Bank when just a few years ago an agency that should have a 5-year reauthorization was only reauthorized for 2 years—just 2 years. Now you are going to go into the international community and say, wait a minute, we only believe in this bank for 9 months. So the trend line is it used to be 5 years. For basically about 80 years it used to be 5 years, but because the conservative tea party people are having their way—not the majority of the people in the House but the tea party conservatives are having their way—this has gone from a 5-year reauthorization to a 2-year reauthorization to now a 9-month reauthorization. Who knows what they will propose next. We know they don't support the bank. We know they want to get rid of it.

I think the Charlotte Business Journal, again, characterized this issue very well because they know this industry: "The United States will lose its lead in nuclear technology if it is not involved in the construction boom overseas."

You are not going to be very involved in the construction boom over the next 9 months because you are not going to be able to get people to close long-term deals when they think the other side of the aisle just wants to kill the Export-Import Bank.

I think the Columbian in my State said it best. They said: "While complaining about the Ex-Im Bank might make for sound bites that pander to conservatives, in the end it amounts to legislative negligence."

They are talking in general about those who want to kill the Export-Import Bank, but the very day that the House proposed a 9-month extension, the Republican study group also proposed killing the Export-Import Bank. So make no mistake about it, there are those who are pandering to very conservative views who basically just want to end the Export-Import Bank.

Thank God we have other businesses in this country. The Louisville Courier-Journal said: "When a small company is attempting to navigate the international marketplace, it can be difficult to manage the risks related to financing and growth and securing payment."

That is a local company in Louisville, KY, that knows what it takes to

compete in an international marketplace. That industry leader also said that the Ex-Im Bank has helped them manage the risk and as a result their export business has grown strong in recent years. That is what is at stake for these small businesses and supply chains to getting this business done.

I think for us right now the challenge is to try to get people to understand that a 9-month extension is not going to solve this problem. It is going to exacerbate the lack of confidence in our ability to get this bank reauthorized for a long period of time.

The Wichita Eagle editorial also added a this great comment: "Failure of Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank would be a philosophical victory for some—but a badly timed blow to Kansas companies trying to compete in the global marketplace." They went on to say to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

So, while I know the House is sending us 9 months, and I know that some people are trying to take comfort that they have dodged this issue instead of taking a really hard vote on it or improving the bank, all they have done is left the marketplace with a great deal of uncertainty.

It will cost us jobs; it will shift jobs overseas, and Congress—here in the Senate we need to act to get a long-term reauthorization for the Ex-Im Bank.

The Wichita paper had it right. Reauthorize this bank—not a short-term Band-Aid, but give the certainty that businesses need to compete in the global economy and help our economy at home by growing jobs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, over the last hour or so I had the good fortune to hear the junior Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, describe what is happening with the Ex-Im Bank, and it is not good for the country.

The Ex-Im Bank is so very important to the Presiding Officer's State. The State of Connecticut benefits tremendously from the Ex-Im Bank, as do the small manufacturing businesses in the State of Nevada.

As Senator CANTWELL said, it is a shame we are shipping more jobs overseas, and by not extending the Ex-Im Bank long term, that is what we are doing. She is such an advocate for this program which is so important to our country. I underline and underscore everything she said this afternoon. I am so disappointed we are not able to have

a long-term extension of the Ex-Im Bank. It is very important, and it is too bad we are not going to do that.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 124

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 124, which was received from the House and is at the desk, at 1 p.m. on Thursday, September 18; that following the reporting of the joint resolution, the majority leader be recognized; that there be up to 4½ hours equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, there be no other motions or points of order in order to the joint resolution other than a Sessions or designee motion to table or a budget point of order and the applicable motion to waive; that Senator SESSIONS or designee be recognized for a motion to table an amendment to the joint resolution; that if the motion to table is agreed to, the majority leader be recognized; that if the motion to table is not agreed to, and notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 124; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired, the pending amendments be withdrawn, the joint resolution be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVANCING WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Mr. LEAHY. Next year, the Nation will celebrate the 95th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which gave women, at long last, the right to vote. The result of more than four decades of advocacy from such giants of the women's equality movement as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the amendment was merely a first step in advancing women's rights.

Since the ratification of the 19th Amendment, there has been considerable progress in the march for gender equality. The President's Commission on the Status of Women, established by President Kennedy and directed by First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, in part led to formation of the National Organization for Women. NOW's core issues include two on which this Congress has been rightly focused: ending violence against women, and promoting economic justice.

The country last week celebrated the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act. This landmark law shined a light on the scourge of domestic violence and improved the criminal justice system's response to these cases. Last year, Congress again came together to reauthorize and strengthen VAWA to address the evolving needs of domestic and sexual violence victims, and to ensure that those protections are available to all victims, regardless of sexual orientation, ethnicity, race or gender. The VAWA reauthorization law, which I was proud to author, was just one example of how we must continue to build on the historic work of past years in advancing equal rights and opportunities for American women.

And earlier this week, the Senate yet again tried to move forward with legislation to address pay equality. Building on more than 50 years of progress, starting with the Civil Rights Act, which barred employment discrimination based on race and gender, and on the heels of the 2009 Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the Paycheck Fairness Act would take a significant step toward ensuring a balanced and equal environment for women in the workplace. Unfortunately, for the fourth time, partisan objections have prevented the Senate from advancing this legislation to hold employers accountable and to protect employees from retaliation for discussing their salaries with colleagues. Vermont has adopted its own Equal Pay Act, making it illegal for employers to offer anything less than equal pay for equal work. Still, in Vermont, where 22,000 households are headed by women, the yearly gender pay gap is nearly \$6,000. More needs to be done, and we can do better.

This year, Vermont will mark two important anniversaries. Thirty years ago, Vermont voters sent the first woman in our history to the State House to serve as Governor. Madeleine Kunin, a trailblazer in Vermont, served for 6 years as Governor, before becoming a Deputy Secretary of Education in the Clinton Administration. As a child, she fled the threat of the Holocaust, leaving Switzerland with her family for the hope and promise of America. She returned to the country that she had been forced to flee when President Clinton appointed her to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland. She continues to lead and inspire as an author, educator, mentor to women in politics, and tireless advocate for women's rights.

Later this year, the Vermont Women's Fund will celebrate 20 years of supporting women, both in the workplace and at home. The Fund helps women overcome economic hardships to live secure and successful lives. The Fund guides young women to opportunities in nontraditional career paths and propels future leaders to reach

their goals. As we well know, when women are given an equal opportunity, their achievements are elevated. When women are given equal opportunities, they thrive and often rise to the top. When women are given a fair shot, their contributions at home, in the workplace and in our communities make us all better. The Vermont Women's Fund, with its diverse and representative council, works to establish and preserve that progress for Vermonters.

In the nearly 95 years since the Nation came together to belatedly extend the right to vote to women, we have made considerable strides in advancing gender equality. More than two dozen women lead Fortune 500 companies, an achievement once viewed as unattainable to young women entering the workforce. Women have risen to some of the highest ranks in our government. Women now comprise a majority of students enrolled in college. In Vermont, we are proud of our history in advancing women's rights. Leaders like Madeleine Kunin, and programs like the Vermont Women's Fund, are shining examples of why Vermont is a leader in this social progress for women and our entire society. And we are proud to be a national leader in the advancement of women. Congress, and the country, can learn and benefit from Vermont's trailblazing example.

RECOGNIZING THE CHRISTIAN APPALACHIAN PROJECT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Christian Appalachian Project, CAP, an organization that is celebrating 50 years of dedicated service to the people of Appalachia.

CAP was started by the Reverend Ralph Beiting in Eastern Kentucky. Reverend Beiting was a Catholic priest assigned to an area of Kentucky that had no Catholic church, and the organization grew out of his ability to help those in need without the organizational structure of an established church. In 1964, he started a summer camp for boys on Herrington Lake in Garrard County, thus launching the Christian Appalachian Project's now 50-year legacy.

Since that summer of 1964, CAP has grown into the Nation's 16th-largest human services charity. Among the services CAP provides are home repair and reconstruction, disaster relief, clothing drives, food relief, and—a sure sign that some things never change—summer camps.

CAP employs 160 people and has around 50 long-term volunteers. This is in addition to the host of volunteers that are drawn to community service projects like Grateful Bread, Grateful Threadz, and WorkFest.

CAP has touched the lives of thousands in Appalachia and is a model for

how organizations can serve their communities. I therefore I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in honoring the Christian Appalachian Project.

Kentucky Living published an article in their September 2014 issue profiling the Christian Appalachian Project. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Kentucky Living, Sept. 2014]

BRINGING HELP AND HOPE: HUNDREDS OF VOLUNTEERS WORKING WITH THE CHRISTIAN APPALACHIAN PROJECT—NOW CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF SERVICE—BRING RESIDENTS OF APPALACHIA DIGNITY, SELF-WORTH, AND RENOVATED HOMES.

(By Debra Gibson Isaacs)

It wasn't supposed to snow. After all, it was spring break for the college students who had wound their way into rural eastern Kentucky from across the nation. But the snow was just one of many surprises this week, and like the others, it was easily, joyfully accepted.

The students were in Kentucky for WorkFest, one of an array of programs serving the most basic needs of the region's most vulnerable residents—children and families, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities—conducted by the Christian Appalachian Project, or CAP as the nonprofit organization is affectionately known. CAP provides home repair and reconstruction, food, disaster relief, crisis intervention, child development, summer camps, family advocacy, domestic violence shelters, in-home respite, clothing, and programs for the elderly.

With help from hundreds of volunteers, CAP has renovated 362 homes in Floyd, Jackson, Rockcastle, Clay, Owsley, McCreary, Martin, Lawrence, and other counties during WorkFest since the annual event began in 1992. On this day in March, CAP volunteers were in Rockcastle County working on four homes.

One was the home of Vincent, a member of Jackson Energy Cooperative. Vincent had returned to Kentucky from 11 years working for the military to find his home in need of far more work than he could accomplish alone and with little money.

"I am like the Beverly Hillbillies," 48-year-old Vincent joked, his green eyes smiling above his mustache, a bandana on his head and two earrings piercing his left ear. "I packed up everything I owned in my truck and came home. This is home. I always come back home."

But home had a bathroom floor that had rotted out. The living room floor was also gone. The roof leaked. Windows had to be replaced. Plumbing needed repair. The front porch was close to falling down. The modest home was barely habitable. Still, no one seemed to see the problems; they were focused on the solutions.

Seeing the solution rather than the problem is standard fare for CAP, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary all year from now until August 2015. Started by the Rev. Ralph Beiting, a Catholic priest assigned to a slice of eastern Kentucky without a single Catholic church at the time, CAP grew from Beiting's ingenuity in helping those around him. At first Beiting would travel to northern Kentucky, where friends and church families would donate all kinds of goods and clothes, and he would distribute them to those in need. His outsized personality soon

led him into the hearts of the people, and that led him to try to meet the many needs he found.

The first official CAP project came in 1964—a summer camp for boys on Herrington Lake in Garrard County. Beiting went on to develop the concept for finding ways to help people help themselves. He named his ministry the Christian Appalachian Project and declared it would be “a group that would roll up our sleeves and get the job done.”

That same work ethic and dedication continues today, 50 years later, as the Christian Appalachian Project goes about improving the lives of those in Appalachia.

“Cut it like this,” instructs Jay G. Dresser, a CAP volunteer for 15 years, as he takes a power saw from one of the students to demonstrate how to notch a 2x4. A few feet away, students are in the bathroom ripping up rotted flooring while another group works in the bedroom. It is dark and nippy inside the modest home, but no one seems to notice as a happy cacophony of saws, hammers, and laughter fills the house.

“That’s better,” Dresser encourages. “Push this. Now pull the plate all the way out. Now stand it up and let me reset the blade.”

A few miles away, a similar scene unfolds at the home of Betty, also a Jackson Energy Cooperative member, and the daughter and her fiancé, cousin, and four grandchildren who live with her in a mobile home that has been added to over the years. New windows are already in place and two volunteers are at work on the roof.

“The kids now have a warm bedroom,” says Betty. A fire in the kitchen earlier had done extensive damage to another part of the house, but she did not have the ability to repair it. “I just did the best I could,” she says. “My sister-in-law fell through the porch and the refrigerator almost landed on her.”

“My son passed with leukemia when he was 32,” Betty says, her long brown hair now streaked with gray. “He always told me if he won the lottery he would bulldoze down this house and build me a new home. I wish he was here to see this. They have done miracles.”

Everyday miracles are what CAP has come to be known for as it has grown into the 16th-largest human services charity in the country with 160 employees and as many as 50 long-term volunteers.

CAP’s Housing Program, which coordinates WorkFest and YouthFest, a spring-break alternative program for high school students, provides home repair and reconstruction services year-round. Permanent crews, including an experienced, industry-trained crew leader and several long-term volunteers, perform all types of home repairs.

Families requesting help fill out an application, which is reviewed by a caseworker who then schedules a home visit to assess the applicant’s needs. The families go through a budgeting process and in monthly installments pay back one-half of the material costs (up to a maximum of 5 percent of their income). They also donate sweat equity. All the labor is donated for the homes that CAP builds or repairs.

Across Appalachia, similar projects are under way. A CAP-operated food pantry called Grateful Bread ward off hunger for 800 families last year, and Grateful Threadz, a store accepting donations of gently used clothing, helped thousands of individuals and families. Prescription assistance helped 709, family advocacy served 4,980, elderly services 267, and domestic violence shelters 2,640. It is

the same with numerous other programs. In all, the organization reached more than 50,000 people last year. Each represents a need met, a better life.

“We exist to serve God,” says CAP President Guy Adams. “That is a high calling. How we do that is helping people in need in Appalachia.”

TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. STEM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, I want to talk about an incredible champion of America’s railroads. James A. Stem, Jr., has been a tireless advocate for the men and women who keep our Nation’s railroads operating for nearly 50 years. He has done just about every job in the industry and will soon be retiring as the national legislative director of the Transportation Division of the Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, Transportation Workers, formerly the United Transportation Union, UTU.

James began his career in 1966 as a trainman for the Seaboard Air Line Railroad in his native Raleigh, NC. He joined the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and worked in numerous capacities including as a trainman, switchman, hostler helper, hostler, fireman, and locomotive engineer. He even holds seniority as a locomotive engineer on a CSX line.

In the 1970s, James became much more involved in rail labor in North Carolina for the United Transportation Union. He was a delegate to five UTU International conventions and was eventually elected as the North Carolina State legislative director in 1984. He would go on to become the UTU alternate national legislative director in 1998, serving alongside a legend, James Brunkenhoefer—also known as “Brokenrail.” James was elevated to national legislative director in 2009. In 2011, United Transportation Union and Sheet Metal Workers International Association merged to become the International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers. James continued his work with an even larger membership, now more than 216,000 strong.

James has frequently testified before Congress, always advocating for the betterment of working men and women in the railroad industry. He was part of the original 1997 Positive Train Control Working Group sponsored by the Federal Railroad Administration.

James has been a great defender of Amtrak and commuter rail and a strong proponent of high speed rail. When cuts threatened the effectiveness of passenger rail, James fought to block them on Capitol Hill. When railroad workers needed improved health and safety benefits, James was there. He has tirelessly advocated for the working men and women on the railroads, making sure they have good paying jobs, proper health care, and a solid retirement.

James’ influence can be felt at almost every level of government, within

the industry, and inside rail labor. Two of his former UTU colleagues currently serve as Federal Railroad Administrator and Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board. Both will tell you that without James’s leadership and friendship, they would not be where they are today.

It is with great pride that I congratulate James A. Stem, Jr. for his long career in the railroad industry and for the incalculable contributions he made there. I wish James and his wife Bonnie well in their retirement and hope they are able to enjoy extended family time with their children and grandchildren.

H.R. 3043 AND S. 1507

Mr. MORAN. I wish to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, and with Senator HEITKAMP, to clarify several questions that have arisen since H.R. 3043 and S. 1507 were introduced.

I say to the chairman, the term general welfare is found in the Preamble to the Constitution, and the power and duty of governments to promote the general welfare is at the core of our service to the people. Indian Tribes, through treaties, agreements, and statutes, reserved their original, inherent right to self-government, and Tribal governments are in the best position to determine the general welfare interests of the Indian people. H.R. 3043 and S. 1507 are intended to respect the right of Indian Tribes to provide for the general welfare of Tribal members.

I ask the chairman, is it your understanding that in interpreting the meaning of the requirement under the bill that Indian Tribal government programs be “for the promotion of the general welfare,” it is intended that the IRS will apply this requirement in a manner no less favorable than the safe harbor approach provided for in Revenue Procedure 2014-35, and in no event will the IRS require an individualized determination of financial need where a Tribal program meets all other requirements of new section 139E as added by the bill?

Mr. WYDEN. The Senator is correct. I want to express my full support for the administrative guidance issued by the IRS in Rev. Proc. 2014-35. I would also point out to the Senator that the bill requires under its “Statutory Construction” provision of section 2(c), that any ambiguities in new Code section 139E shall be resolved by the IRS in favor of Indian Tribal governments and deference shall be given to Indian Tribal governments for programs administered and authorized by the Tribe to benefit the general welfare of the Tribal community.

Ms. HEITKAMP. As the chairman knows, there have been concerns expressed in Indian Country that the IRS may take the occasion of passage of H.R. 3043 or S. 1507 to retrench, narrow

or possibly withdraw the administrative guidance provided in Rev. Proc. 2014-35 after enactment of the bill. As the sponsor of this legislation, I would like to say that would be contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. WYDEN. I fully share the Senator's concern and want to assure her as well as Tribal interests that the Congressional intent, as well as mine as chairman of the Finance Committee, is to expand rather than restrict the safe harbor provisions in Rev. Proc. 2014-35. The purpose of this legislation is to further empower Tribal self-determination. Tribes, and not the IRS, are in the best position to determine the needs of their members and provide for the general welfare of their Tribal citizens and communities.

TRIBAL GENERAL WELFARE EXCLUSION ACT OF 2014

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to strongly support the Senate's passage of an important tax bill, H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act of 2014. This bill will improve the application of the Federal income tax in Indian Country and in doing so will reflect appropriate respect for the sovereignty of tribal governments.

By way of background, the Federal Tax Code treats most payments that individuals receive, and the value of some services they receive, as taxable income. There is an exclusion, though, for payments and services received under programs conducted by State and local governments. It's called the general welfare exclusion, and it covers things like housing assistance, emergency medical care, and education assistance. These are traditionally treated as nontaxable.

Unfortunately, the IRS has had difficulty applying the general welfare exclusion when it comes to benefits provided by tribal governments to tribal members. In order to determine which benefits were excluded from taxation, the IRS began conducting aggressive audits, leaving the tax treatment of many tribe-provided benefits in doubt. As Delores Pigsley, chairman of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians Tribal Council, put it in a letter to me, "for several years, the IRS has sought to tax tribal government programs and services." This, in turn, has undermined tribal sovereignty and hindered economic and social development.

I am pleased to report that there has been some significant progress. In June, the IRS issued a revenue procedure clarifying the application of the exclusion, and the procedure was a good step in the right direction, clearing up some questions and reflecting an improved dialogue between the IRS and tribes. However, IRS guidance is not a congressional statute; we need to lock these improvements into statutory

law, as well as expand on them such as by establishing a Tribal Advisory Committee to help the Treasury Department and the IRS understand about how best to address tax issues affecting Indian Country.

The bill we are considering today would accomplish these goals. It codifies and expands IRS regulations, draws clear lines, and gives greater respect to tribal institutions and programs.

I would like to acknowledge the principal sponsors of the Senate version of the bill, Senators MORAN and HEITKAMP, for their leadership. I also would like to thank Senators STABENOW, THUNE, and other members of the Finance Committee, who have urged the committee to move forward on this issue.

Tribal governments have a long history of providing critical benefits to tribal members, and these programs are fundamental to the sovereignty and cultural integrity of tribes. Tribes, and not the IRS, are in the best position to determine the needs of their members and provide for the general welfare of their tribal citizens and communities. I know this bill has the support of tribes in my home State of Oregon and will benefit tribes and tribal members across the Nation. I urge all Senators to support the bill.

AMENDING THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the pension community approached me with their concerns that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation was interpreting section 4062(e) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 too broadly. That provision was intended to protect pension plan participants in the event of a cessation of operations at a facility. However, the pension community was able to provide substantial evidence that the corporation's enforcement efforts were out of line with congressional intent to such an extent that section 4062(e) had become a major impediment to businesses' efforts to restructure. After a thorough review of the situation and consultation with employers, employees, retirees, and the Obama administration, it became abundantly clear that enforcement efforts under section 4062(e) were failing to protect either pensions or the corporation.

Consequently, I worked with the ranking member, Senator ALEXANDER, on a new approach that we introduced as S. 2511. That legislation, which passed out of committee on a unanimous vote, will restore the original intent of section 4062(e) by clarifying the types of cessations of operations that trigger downsizing liability. The legis-

lation will give plan sponsors certainty with respect to their obligations, and it will also ensure that participants are protected when workforce reductions signal that the ongoing viability of a plan sponsor is in question.

Overall, S. 2511 represents a significant compromise between the needs of employers, employees, and retirees, and I think it will give everyone a lot more clarity with regard to their obligations under section 4062(e). However, there are a few points about the bill that I would like to clarify.

First, there may be questions as to how the terms "facility" and "location" should be interpreted. They are not explicitly defined in S. 2511 because we intend for them to be interpreted according to their natural usage. For example, if an employer maintains several buildings that are physically adjacent to each other, that would be a single facility at a single location. However, if the employer maintains a building in one part of a city and another building in another part of the city, those buildings would be separate facilities at separate locations.

Second, S. 2511 is intended to allow employers to make conditional elections. The legislation allows employers that have a substantial cessation under section 4062(e) to elect a new, alternative means of satisfying their liability. The election must be made not later than 30 days after the earlier of the date that the employer notifies the corporation of a substantial cessation of operations or the date that the corporation makes a final administrative determination both that a substantial cessation of operations has occurred and of the amount of the alternative liability. Of course, there may be instances in which it is uncertain as to whether such a cessation has occurred or the amount of the alternative liability, if any, even after a final administrative determination has been made by the corporation. In those cases, the employer would certainly not be required to make a binding election to pay amounts that may later be determined not to be due. Thus, in all cases, an election by the employer would become inapplicable to the extent that a court subsequently rules or the corporation later agrees that a cessation has not occurred or that the alternative liability amount is lower than the amount determined by the corporation.

To the extent that an election becomes inapplicable, any contributions previously made by the employer to satisfy such inapplicable liability amount should be treated as additional funding contributions that are not subject to the provisions of the bill. Consequently, such additional funding contributions could be treated as increasing the employer's prefunding balance. In addition, we fully intend for the corporation and the courts to have the

power to stay, in whole or in part, an employer's obligation to make alternative liability payments until the court has determined whether there has been a substantial cessation and/or the alternative liability amount.

In other cases, a substantial cessation may have occurred, but there is no liability of any kind due to the corporation's enforcement policy. We expect that some employers may want to make an election of the alternative liability amount in case the employer's financial condition changes and the corporation asserts a liability under section 4062(e). In such cases, the annual amount due under the alternative liability method would be zero until the corporation makes a final administrative determination that the corporation's enforcement policy no longer applies to such employer. To ensure that a substantial cessation in one year cannot cause liabilities 10 or 20 years later, for example, the 7-year payment period for the alternative liability amount would include years in which the amount due is zero.

In order to ensure that any reporting requirement that may later be determined to apply is satisfied, an employer may notify the corporation of an event that the employer does not believe constitutes a substantial cessation of operations. If the employer informs the corporation in writing, the notification will not trigger the 30-day period for making an election, and the 30-day period will begin when the employer agrees that the event constitutes a substantial cessation of operations or when the corporation makes a final administrative determination to that effect and similarly determines the amount of the alternative liability.

Third, S. 2511 is intended to prevent employers from being subject to retroactive liability and to other unreasonable payment deadlines. The legislation generally requires the first contribution under the alternative liability method to be paid not later than the earlier of (1) the due date for the minimum required contribution for the year in which the substantial cessation occurred and (2) in the case of the first contribution, the date that is 1 year after the later of (a) the date that the employer notifies the corporation of the substantial cessation or (b) the date that the corporation makes a final administrative determination that a substantial cessation has occurred and of the amount of the alternative liability, with subsequent contributions due on the same date in the following years. The intent is to ensure that in all cases the employer has at least 1 year's advance notice of the need to make the first contribution.

Thus, clause (2) controls where otherwise an employer could have less than a year's advance notice of the liability. That is especially important where there is uncertainty as to whether a

substantial cessation has occurred or regarding the alternative liability amount because the corporation's final determination might not even be made until after the due date for contributions for the year of the substantial cessation. Similarly, the substantial cessation could occur in a year when the employer is not subject to section 4062(e) liability pursuant to the corporation's enforcement policy, but in a later year, the employer becomes subject to section 4062(e) liability with respect to that earlier cessation. To prevent retroactive liability and other problems, clause (2) is controlling regarding the timing of the first contribution in all cases where the employer would otherwise have less than a year's advance notice of the liability. Where clause (2) is controlling, the seven annual payments would start with the first one required by clause (2).

In some cases, an employer may have notified the corporation of a substantial cessation and elected the alternative liability method in a specific amount. We intend for the same timing rules to apply in determining the due date of the first payment of such amount. However, the corporation may later challenge the amount of the alternative liability and seek a higher amount. In such cases, the higher amount would become due pursuant to the timing rules so that there may be separate 7-year periods, one for the originally elected amount and one for the higher amount determined by the corporation.

Fourth, if an employer fails to pay the amount due for any year by the due date, the employer will be liable for the balance of all amounts due for subsequent years under the alternative liability method, though the corporation may waive or settle such accelerated liability in its discretion. Of course, any such acceleration should be stayed during the pendency of any administrative or judicial proceeding to determine whether there has been a substantial cessation and/or the amount of the alternative liability amount. In addition, if the corporation or a court finds that the employer had a reasonable basis to contest any material portion of the corporation's determination, then the acceleration provision shall not apply, but the employer would owe past due payments plus interest.

S. 2511 is a commonsense solution to the concerns of the pension community, and I appreciate the work of Senator ALEXANDER, the members of the HELP Committee and the Obama administration in getting this important legislation across the finish line.

BURNS AND BARAN NOMINATIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, yesterday I cast votes against the nominations of Stephen Burns and Jeffrey

Baran to be Commissioners on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I hope I am wrong in my conclusion. The NRC is an incredibly important body at this time in the history of civilian nuclear generation. While low natural gas prices put economic strain on our fleet of nuclear generators, the NRC has to carefully evaluate the costs and benefits that its regulations provide. In the past the NRC has had talented scientists and nuclear experts compose the Commission. But for these two vacancies the President has nominated lawyers with legal and policy experience. Neither Stephen Burns nor Jeffrey Baran has the technical experience, I believe, that will enable them to effectively serve on the NRC.

Moreover, Stephen Burns—during his service with the NRC as General Counsel—authored several important legal memoranda that enabled then-NRC Chairman Gregory Jaczko to improperly undermine the licensing of Yucca Mountain resulting in severe criticism by a Federal court. He also provided a legal opinion that improperly advised Chairman Jaczko that he, alone, could use emergency powers to conduct the business of the Commission in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster. This was not a close question, in my opinion. Mr. Burns should not have issued such an opinion. While Mr. Burns is familiar with the Commission's procedures, he has no technical nuclear power experience and I am not convinced that he will resist interpreting the law with a political bent. For Mr. Baran—a House Committee staffer who has worked for many years for an opponent of Yucca Mountain—there is not evidence that he can impartially consider highly political Commission decisions.

This critically important Commission must be led by persons who are able to be competent and independent persons of strength. Reluctantly, I have concluded that I must oppose the nominations.

COMMENDING DON EDWARDS

Mrs. BOXER. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 100th birthday and extraordinary contributions of former Congressman Don Edwards.

Don was born on January 6, 1915, in San Jose, CA, where he attended public schools and graduated from the San Jose High Academy. He then attended Stanford University, where he was a star on the golf team, winning a State medal for match play along with several amateur titles. After graduating in 1936, Don earned his LL.B. at Stanford Law School.

In 1940, Don was hired as a special agent by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When World War II broke out, he was activated from the Navy Reserve and served for 4 years as a naval

intelligence officer and gunnery officer in the South Pacific, attaining the rank of lieutenant.

In the 1950s, Don founded the Valley Title Company and built it into one of the Nation's leading title insurance companies. In 1962, he was elected to Congress.

During his 32 years in the House of Representatives, Don Edwards became known as "the Congressman from the Constitution," the leading congressional defender of civil liberties and chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights. I was lucky enough to serve with Don for 10 years and see firsthand his steadfast dedication to his home State of California and the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans.

In the 1960s, he helped guide landmark civil rights and voting rights legislation through Congress. In the 1970s, he led the efforts to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. A master consensus-builder, he helped forge large bipartisan majorities to pass the Voting Rights Act extension of 1982, Fair Housing Amendments of 1988, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Civil Rights Act of 1991.

One of Don's proudest achievements was the creation of the Nation's first urban national wildlife refuge on the southern end of San Francisco Bay. Established in 1974, it was renamed the "Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge" in 1995.

In 1981, Don married his longtime partner, Edith "Eddie" Wilkie, director of Congress's Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, and even after they retired, she remained active in arms control and international peace for the rest of her life.

Today Don lives in beautiful Carmel among a tight circle of friends and family, including his sons, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. They will join him in January to celebrate his 100th birthday. As he reaches this milestone, I send him my best wishes, deep affection, and abiding gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO LETITIA A. LONG

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and pay tribute to Letitia—Tish—A. Long, who will retire on October 3, 2014, as Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, or NGA.

It gives me great pleasure to speak publicly about Director Long, who has not only had an exemplary and distinguished career spanning 36 years in the Intelligence Community and the Department of Defense, but who is someone I have gotten to know on a personal level.

As the Director of the NGA, Ms. Long was the first woman to head a major U.S. intelligence agency, and she will therefore always have a place in his-

tory as one of the Nation's most important figures in military and national intelligence. She is also a leading figure among women engineers.

I am grateful that in retirement, Tish will continue to advocate and find ways to encourage young women to go into the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

After studying electrical engineering as an undergraduate at Virginia Tech, and then earning a master's degree in mechanical engineering at Catholic University, Tish began her government service as a civilian electrical engineer at the Office of Naval Intelligence, where she was often the only woman in a room full of male engineers.

In 1994, she was promoted to the ranks of the Senior Executive Service, where she eventually served in a dual role at the Naval Intelligence Staff as director for Requirements, Plans, Policy and Programs; and director of Resource Management.

Looking back at her career, it should come as no surprise that Ms. Long reached great heights within the Intelligence Community. In 1995, she participated in the planning for the creation of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency, the predecessor agency of NGA, which she would later lead as Director. From 1998 to 2000, Tish served on the staff of the Director of Central Intelligence as the executive director for Intelligence Community Affairs on the community management staff, the predecessor organization to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Director Long's previous positions included service as Director of the Military Intelligence Staff at DIA and Deputy Director of Naval Intelligence. Tish was instrumental in the creation of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, where she served as the first Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence for Policy, Requirements and Resources. In 2006, she returned to the DIA as its Deputy Director.

Then, in August of 2010, Ms. Long became the fifth Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. As its director, Tish expertly managed the multibillion-dollar NGA budget and a workforce of nearly 10,000 government employees during a challenging period that included two wars, budget sequestration, and a government shutdown.

Under Director Long's skillful leadership, NGA provided extensive support to our Nation's highest priority security concerns, from counterterrorism missions across the globe—including critical support to the raid that killed Osama bin Laden—to monitoring and providing advanced warning on crises in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

I have appreciated Director Long's candor with the Senate Intelligence Committee and her willingness to address the committee's concerns. Ms.

Long's leadership on intelligence integration, advanced analytic tradecraft, and technology initiatives significantly improved intelligence production for the Defense Department, the Intelligence Community, and our allied partners. These efforts also provided greater insight into national security issues for policymakers in both the executive branch and Congress.

Let me close by saying that those of us who are fortunate enough to know Tish personally can attest to her dedication to the mission, personal integrity, and unwavering loyalty to our Nation.

As she leaves government service, Tish will have more time to spend with her husband John Skibinski, stepdaughters Jordan, Lindsay, and Katherine, and granddaughter Hanna.

It is with great pride and honor that I personally recognize Director Tish Long as an innovator, leader, and friend.

We wish Tish all the best in the future. I yield the floor.

OBSERVING POW/MIA DAY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize National POW/MIA Recognition Day. As we acknowledge the important role of American servicemembers and veterans, we must keep at the forefront of our thoughts and prayers the safe return of those who have gone missing in action or are prisoners of war. National POW/MIA Recognition Day, which is observed the third Friday of September, provides a time to honor prisoners of war, POW, and those who became missing in action, MIA.

As the brave men and women who serve our Nation commit themselves to protecting America and our freedoms, our Nation must be resolute in bringing them home should they go missing or be taken prisoner when serving our Nation in a time of war. Standing by our servicemembers includes utilizing every reasonable means of bringing them home.

POW/MIA families and veterans have remained committed to keeping the pursuit of facts at the forefront in the years since the Vietnam war. This effort and the perseverance of the POW/MIA families have been instrumental in accounting for missing military and civilian personnel from not only the Vietnam war but also World War II, the Korean war and the Cold War. Finding resolution for the families must remain a central focus as America has since engaged in subsequent wars to halt terrorism.

On National POW/MIA Recognition Day, we honor those Americans who have thankfully returned home, the families and loved ones who stood by awaiting their return, and we remain committed to finding answers for the families who continue to await the return of their missing and unaccounted-

for loved ones. Each day, as we see the reminder of those Americans and their families through the POW/MIA flags that are posted at many places across our Nation, including the Halls of Congress, military sites, war memorials, national cemeteries, and U.S. postal service offices, let us not lose sight of this enduring commitment to accounting for those missing.

I look forward to the day when we can welcome all our servicemembers home. Thank you to the many servicemembers and their families for all they have done and continue to do for our country and to all those who work to ensure their return home.

THE EBOLA CRISIS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee hearing yesterday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EBOLA IN WEST AFRICA: A GLOBAL CHALLENGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH THREAT

We must take the dangerous, deadly threat of Ebola as seriously as we take ISIS. Let me say that again: We must take the dangerous, deadly threat of the Ebola epidemic as seriously as we take ISIS. I think I have a reputation as a senator who's not given to overstatement; I don't believe that's an overstatement.

The spread of this disease deserves a more urgent response from our country and other countries around the world than it's now getting. This is one of the most explosive, deadly epidemics in modern time but we know what to do to reduce the spread. It will require a huge and immediate response.

There is no known cure; there's no vaccine. Half of those who get sick die. Each sick person, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, could infect up to 20 others, including caregivers, friends and family. Samantha Power, the U.N. Ambassador, said to me earlier this week in a briefing she's trying to get other countries to view this with the same urgency that we do.

This is an instance, she said, when we should be running toward the burning flames with our fireproof suits on. Ebola is killing people in West Africa at alarming rates and picking up speed. It's hard to say exactly what the number of cases is. There is an official number, a little less than 5,000 of Ebola cases in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, but the worry is that one-half of those cases were reported in the last three weeks. You don't have to know very much about mathematics to know that if—whatever the number—if it doubles every three weeks that very soon we have an out-of-control epidemic. And we can see easily what would happen if a single infected traveler reaches another country and begins to infect others in that country.

I said earlier, and we'll learn more today, about what we know how to do. We'll hear from a doctor who has contracted Ebola and who has recovered from it and who is here to talk about it. It's not like the flu. It can only be spread by bodily fluids, often contracted by caring for someone who's sick or through burial practices.

But with global travel, we're only one airplane ride away from a person exposed to Ebola getting on a plane to the United States and then becoming sick once they arrive. And then the mathematics of that infection could begin to develop in this country.

There's human tragedy in Africa, but it affects the rest of the world and it affects the United States. Our state is known as the Volunteer State. And Dr. Brantly is an Ebola patient. He was working for Samaritan's Purse. He's not a Tennessean, but his parents are graduates of Lipscomb University, which is in Nashville. He, like many Americans, goes on mission trips around the world to help people who need help.

I will support the administration's request for the \$30 million Senator HARKIN talked about, and the \$58 million for the biomedical advanced research and development. That's for vaccines and cures and treatments. That should pass this week.

There's a request to address \$500 million of reprogramming in the Defense Department. Some have asked, why should our military be involved? Because they have to be involved if we want to deal with the problem. There's no way for the doctors and the nurses and the health care workers to deal with it.

So I'm pleased that on both sides of the aisle, we have leaders who are beginning to recognize the severity of this epidemic. Dr. Frieden and U.N. Ambassador Power are taking the lead. We look forward to learning all we can about the severity of the epidemic and what we must do to control it.

But I'll end where I started. We must take the deadly, dangerous threat of the Ebola epidemic as seriously as we take ISIS.

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter dated September 17, 2014, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 17, 2014.

MR. PRESIDENT, Effective immediately, I hereby resign my position as Commissioner to the Eisenhower Memorial Commission.

Sincerely,

JERRY MORAN.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DEAN STONE

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, next Tuesday, September 23, is an important day in my hometown of Maryville, TN. It is the 90th birthday of Dean Stone.

It would be hard to imagine Blount County without Dean Stone. For most of his 90 years, he has been our historian-in-chief, our storyteller-in-chief, and our editor-in-chief. His photographs of the Great Smoky Mountains and his eight books about our county's history line the libraries of most of Blount Countians. In fact, taken altogether they constitute a library of their own.

Dean is a longtime journalist and native of Maryville, TN, where he served as editor of the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times and still serves as opinion editor today. In each Sunday's edition, he writes his "Bits of Stone" about the history and happenings around Blount County. Dean earned his degree in journalism from the University of Oklahoma in 1949 after serving in World War II, where he originated the idea of raising the American flag over Yugoslavia. After college, he decided to return to Maryville and began his career with the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times as a Sunday editor.

Dean became managing editor of the newspaper—known now as the Daily Times—later that year and has been employed with the newspaper for the last 66 years. His journalistic skills and energy have helped to make the Daily Times one of the best smaller daily newspapers in our country. Under his direction, the Daily Times has received more than 30 first-place awards from Tennessee journalism associations. In 2013, Dean was inducted into the Tennessee Journalism Hall of Fame.

Dean is known for his contributions to tourism in Maryville and Blount County, including founding the Times Townsend Traveler in the early 1950s, a tourism journal that was one of the first publications of its type in the Nation. He has received numerous awards in recognition of his service to tourism in the area, including recognition as the "one person in Blount County and Townsend who has contributed the most to tourism during the 20th century" at the Tennessee Governor's Conference on Tourism. He also served as president of the Blount County Chamber of Commerce, on numerous education and school boards, Leadership Blount, the Maryville-Alcoa Jaycees, the Alcoa Kiwanis, and the United Way of Blount County.

Dean is a longtime supporter of our national parks and for many years has served on and chaired the Great Smoky Mountains National Park Commission. He was instrumental in founding Beautiful Blount, which still seeks to preserve the beauty in the foothills of the Smoky Mountains. He also started Stonecraft in 1954, a postcard company he founded to share the beauty of the Smokies.

Gregg Jones, current president of Blount County Publishers, said:

For the past several decades it has been Dean Stone's joy to reveal in word and picture every dimension of his beloved Blount County. As he has done so over the years, it has become apparent that Dean, himself, is one of Blount County's greatest treasures. I am honored to claim Dean as my colleague and friend, and wish him the very best on this special day and every day to come.

Another colleague of Dean's, Carl Esposito, current publisher of the Daily Times, said, "Dean Stone is not only the elder statesman of the Daily Times, but a virtual repository of

Blount County history and knowledge. It is a pleasure and privilege to work alongside him."

Many Blount Countians have their own stories about Dean's impact on their lives, and I have mine. Other than lawn mowing and paper routes, Dean gave me my first real job. When I was a student at Maryville High School during the 1950s, Dean began a feature in the Daily Times reporting the news in Blount County high schools. He named me the school page editor for Maryville High. As I remember, the pay was one penny for each inch of copy that I wrote. I remember turning in so many inches of copy that after the first edition, Dean limited the number of words each school editor could write.

Ever since, Dean Stone and his family have been close friends of the Alexander family. There is no one from whom I have learned more about my home county than Dean Stone.

So Dean, from one of your many students, admirers, former employees and fellow Blount Countians, Happy 90th Birthday, and thank you for all you have done to celebrate the beautiful place we call home.●

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SWORDS TO PLOWSHARES

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize the 40th anniversary of Swords to Plowshares, one of the preeminent organizations providing quality, compassionate care and services to veterans in the San Francisco Bay area.

In 1974, six veterans concerned about the challenges facing soldiers returning home from Vietnam established a program to help ease their transition to civilian life by providing education, job training, and employment assistance. Swords to Plowshares quickly earned a reputation as a trusted resource for veterans, and over the years it has grown to meet the needs of each new generation of veterans.

As veterans came home from Vietnam, Swords to Plowshares created extensive health, social services, legal services, and housing programs to support them. Following the gulf war, Swords began offering programs to address mental health and substance abuse among veterans. As veterans returned from Iraq and Afghanistan, Swords worked with vets and their families to identify gaps in VA services and established the Institute for Veteran Policy to make recommendations to the military and VA to better address the needs of our newest veterans.

Today, with the help of more than 100 dedicated staff, Swords provides employment and job training, legal services, and housing assistance to more than 2,000 veterans in the San Francisco Bay area each year.

I want to extend my special thanks to Michael Blecker, a U.S. Army vet-

eran who joined Swords in 1976 and has served as its executive director since 1980. I am lucky to have known Michael for more than two decades, and there is no one who has been more dedicated to ensuring that veterans are treated with the dignity they deserve.

Our service men and women and their families who have made tremendous sacrifices in service to America deserve not only our deepest gratitude but also our commitment to help them lead healthy and productive lives. As Swords to Plowshares celebrates its 40th anniversary, I offer my profound thanks for all it does to fulfill our sacred obligation to our Nation's veterans.●

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND CECIL WILLIAMS

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 85th birthday and extraordinary contributions of my dear friend, the Reverend Cecil Williams.

For more than half a century, Reverend Williams has served as the founder and minister of Liberation at Glide Memorial United Methodist Church in San Francisco, CA. As a minister, community leader, author, lecturer, and champion of the poor and marginalized, Reverend Williams is widely recognized and revered as a national leader in the struggle for civil rights, human rights, and social change.

Cecil Williams was born in San Angelo, TX, and from a very young age, this caring and sensitive boy was fondly known as "the Rev" by his close-knit family. Cecil grew up in the segregated South, but his strong, loving mother always told her son, "You are going to be somebody."

After graduating from Huston-Tillotson University and the Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, Cecil Williams became the pastor of Glide Memorial United Methodist Church at a time when its congregation was dwindling. Reverend Williams embarked on his life's work: to make this church the center of a vibrant community that would reach out to all, particularly the poor, oppressed, and marginalized.

Reverend Williams welcomed worshippers of all backgrounds, races, and sexual orientations. In 1964, he helped establish the Council on Religion and Homosexuality, an organization dedicated to educating religious communities about gay and lesbian issues and stood up to police who attempted to shut down a dance benefit to raise funds for the new organization. Reverend Williams was also one of the first clergymen to take a stand for same-sex couples by presiding over their weddings four decades before today's struggle to legalize gay marriage.

Under his leadership, Glide Memorial thrived and became a cornerstone of

the community. He hosted poets, jazz musicians, and political activists at the church and launched a free meals program that serves 750,000 meals a year, feeding more than 3,500 hungry people daily. Today more than 17,000 people participate in Glide programs, volunteering in its community clinic, childcare, and afterschool programs, housing services, and Daily Free Meals program.

Reverend Williams is married to Janice Mirikitani, Founding President of the Glide Foundation, and together they direct Glide's many innovative social and cultural programs.

In his life and work, Rev. Cecil Williams has embodied Glide Memorial's revolutionary mission: "to create a radically inclusive, just and loving community mobilized to alleviate suffering and break the cycles of poverty and marginalization."

I am proud to join his family, friends, and many admirers in celebrating the 85th birthday and extraordinary contributions of Rev. Cecil Williams.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN HOGANSON

● Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I wish to honor John Hoganson who retired at the end of July after 33 years of dedicated service to the State of North Dakota with the North Dakota Geologic Survey.

John traces his love for discovery and earth science back to his childhood in eastern North Dakota. As a child, John could be found with his father's claw hammer breaking open rocks in an attempt to discover the mysteries that lay inside. As a young adult, his passion and curiosity helped him graduate from North Dakota State University and eventually to earn a doctorate in geology with an emphasis in paleontology from the University of North Dakota.

He began his career in public service as a geologist with the Geologic Survey. The position later transitioned when he was tasked with formulating a fossil resource management plan for the State. John would later go on to serve as our State's first paleontologist, a position he held for 25 years.

John was instrumental in securing passage of two landmark pieces of legislation in the North Dakota State legislature that helped to protect our State's fossil resources and created a state fossil collection. Under John's leadership, North Dakota's fossil collection has grown from a small collection of bones to one that now numbers in the hundreds of thousands. One of the top finds includes a 67-million-year-old *Edmontosaurus*, a duck-billed dinosaur, with intact fossilized skin, who has been affectionately named Dakota. Dakota is one of only a handful of dinosaurs in existence to have preserved skin. Dakota has been regarded

by experts as one of the more important discoveries in recent times because he may be the best-preserved *Edmontosaurus* found to date. He also created a public dig program which has brought in volunteers from across the country and around the world to assist with digs.

In addition to his work for the State, John has also been a valuable teacher and mentor, spending countless hours engaging students of all ages and the general public around the State in hands-on educational experiences. Without John's passion and commitment, many North Dakotans would have never been aware of our State's rich paleontological history. He has been pivotal in the creation of curriculum for the North Dakota Studies project, and the 24 fossil exhibits in museums and visitors centers across the State.

In evidence to his lifelong commitment to discovery, John will be continuing his work with fossils by completing some research projects and writing papers for scientific journals. I want to thank John for his years of dedication and service as an advocate for paleontology and as a teacher to the people of North Dakota. I wish him the best in his new endeavors and a happy and full retirement.●

CONGRATULATING DAVID SOUSA

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate David Sousa on his being elected the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, Nevada Department Commander for 2015. I am proud to honor a Nevadan who has dedicated his life to serving our country and is committed to ensuring that our Nation's heroes receive the care that they deserve.

Commander Sousa has had a long and decorated military career in the United States Army for over 25 years. During his service, he has served missions in Kenya and Somalia and went on to serve in "Operation Iraqi Freedom" in Abu Ghraib, Iraq, as a member of the 72nd Military Police Company. He also went on to serve in "Operation Enduring Freedom" in Kandahar, Afghanistan, as a member of the 422nd Expeditionary Signal Battalion. I want to extend my deepest gratitude to Commander Sousa for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I recognize the important role the Veterans of Foreign Wars plays for combat veterans and military servicemembers from the active, Guard, and Reserve forces. This distinguished national group of veterans has been a constant influence,

furthering the voice of all of our Nation's heroes. On July 22, 2014, at the 115th National Convention, David Sousa was elected Nevada Department Commander. Commander Sousa has served and held many roles within the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization for the past 10 years and has previously been named the VFW Outstanding Veteran for 2006. His work for the VFW is exemplary, and I expect great things from him as he assumes his role as Nevada's Department Commander.

Commander Sousa's focus of his work for this year is suicide prevention and awareness for veterans, as well as working towards a safer community for veterans. I commend Commander Sousa on this important goal and look forward to working with him to achieve this. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I am concerned about the needs of Nevada's veterans, especially those suffering one of the most common injuries from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars—post-traumatic stress. I believe Congress has a responsibility to enact policies that will help veterans overcome these difficulties and ensure that the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs have the resources necessary to meet the growing needs of Nevada and our Nation's veteran communities. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

I am both humbled and honored by Commander Sousa's service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Commander Sousa for all of his accomplishments and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT'S AIR NATIONAL GUARD

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate the Washoe County School District's Air National Guard for receiving the Secretary of Defense Freedom Award.

Former Secretary of Defense, William Perry, developed the Secretary of Defense Freedom Award under the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve office in 1996. Each year, up to 15 awards are presented to employers in three categories: large business, small business, and the public sector. The award honors employers who have shown exceptional support to their Guard and Reserve employees and have gone above and beyond what is federally mandated to ensure that their military employees are well taken care of. This esteemed award is the highest

in a series of Department of Defense employer awards, and I congratulate Washoe County School District's Air National Guard on being selected as one of only 190 employers to receive this award.

Washoe County School District's Air National Guard's extraordinary level of support they provide to their servicemembers is admirable, and I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge Washoe County School District's Air National Guard here today. During deployment, the school district takes the time to send emails and care packages to our brave men and women. Its support services also extend to the members' families. Washoe County teachers volunteer their own time to help children and spouses who are in need of assistance by babysitting, housecleaning, and running errands. The school district has also been commended for the support it showed after a fellow Guardsman and teacher, Michael Landsberry, was killed defending students during a shooting at Sparks Middle School last year.

Each and every day, our troops are serving the United States to protect the freedoms we enjoy today. They dedicate their lives to serve this great Nation and constantly make grave sacrifices to ensure the safety of our country. Our servicemembers and their families deserve our gratitude and thanks, and as a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am committed to keeping our Nation's promise to care for them. There is no way to adequately thank the men and women that lay down their lives for our freedoms, but Washoe County School District's Air National Guard has shown an unwavering dedication and commitment to ensuring that our servicemembers and their families are getting the support that they deserve.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in congratulating Washoe County School District's Air National Guard and know that they serve as an example for the rest of the Silver State.●

RECOGNIZING VETERAN'S VILLAGE

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Veteran's Village in Las Vegas, NV, for its commitment and dedication to providing our veterans with transitional and permanent housing. Veteran's Village is the only 24-hour, 7-day-a-week social service facility for veterans in Las Vegas.

The brave men and women who served the United States and fought to protect our freedom have often come home to a struggling economy. A number of veterans are unable to find a job or afford to buy or rent a home. As the demographics of our Armed Forces have changed throughout the years, so

too have the needs of homeless veterans. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, this is an issue I have been personally involved with and have introduced legislation to address. Organizations like the Veteran's Village serve to help those in need in an environment of respect and dignity within the Las Vegas community. This organization is a shining example of the kind of initiatives that will help get our veterans back on their feet.

There is no way to adequately thank the men and women that lay down their lives for our freedoms, but the Founders and volunteers at the Veteran's Village are working to assist our Nation's veterans by giving them shelter while they try to rebuild their lives. The organization was founded by Dr. Arnold Stalk, who envisioned turning the old Econo Lodge into a facility to house our homeless veterans. With the help of public and private collaborative partnerships, Veteran's Village has created a home environment for our Nation's heroes who need a helping hand. This organization's continued dedication to serving veterans through providing skills training, nutrition, employment training and referrals, continuing education and degree programs, medical services, mental health counseling and much more is commendable, and I am proud to honor this organization here today.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know the struggles that our veterans face after returning home from the battlefield. Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals, but to ensure they receive the quality care they have earned and deserve. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. I am very pleased that veterans' service organizations like the Veteran's Village are committed to ensuring that the needs of our veterans are being met.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing the Veteran's Village, an organization whose mission is both noble and charitable. I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge the Veteran's Village and its work to end homelessness for veterans throughout the United States, and I wish it the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAURIUM MANOR INN

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I acknowledge the 25th anniversary of the Laurium Manor Inn in Houghton County, MI, which was celebrated on September 14, 2014. I extend my heartiest congratulations to Dave and Julie Sprenger, who purchased a vacant historic mansion 25

years ago with the intention of opening a bed and breakfast. The Sprenger's vision resulted in a small business success building on the rich history of Michigan's Copper Country to attract today's travelers.

Nestled in the heart of the Keweenaw Peninsula's copper country in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and built for Thomas H. Hoatson, Jr., owner of the Calumet and Arizona Mining Company, this mansion started off as a 13,000-square-foot home for the Hoatson family. It remains the largest mansion in the western portion of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The extravagance of the structure was by far its best known feature. From the embossed elephant leather on the walls, to the grand staircase which spans three floors, to the hand-painted wall mural, stained glass windows, and giant Corinthian columns, the Hoatson mansion was the epitome of opulence. Mr. Hoatson, Jr., a Houghton County native of Scottish descent, made his fortune in the copper mining and banking industries. He spent \$50,000 building the mansion at a time when miners were making 25 cents an hour.

Undaunted by the prospect of restoring this enormous and ornate structure, Dave and Julie Sprenger bought the mansion in September of 1989, opened it as a bed and breakfast, listed it as the Laurium Manor Inn on the National Register of Historic Places, and established it as a heritage site within the Keweenaw National Historical Park. This has been no easy task. In addition to the constant renovations and repairs, the remote location of the village of Laurium, the harsh winters of the Upper Peninsula, and the changeable nature of tourism have all challenged the Sprenger's small business. However, throughout all of this, the Sprengers have persevered and continue to provide quality service to the local community and visitors from around the world.

As a senior member of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, I recognize the important role small businesses play in creating jobs and growing the economy, and this bed and breakfast is no exception. I am delighted to congratulate Dave and Julie Sprenger on the 25th anniversary of their flourishing small business, which contributes to the local economy and enriches historical experiences for tourists and residents alike. I wish them many more decades of success.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEEP SUBMERGENCE VEHICLE "ALVIN"

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, WHOI, on the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the deep-sea, human-occupied submersible *Alvin*.

Alvin was commissioned on June 5, 1964, at the Woods Hole Oceanographic

Institution, in Woods Hole, MA. It is owned by the U.S. Navy and operated by WHOI. In one of its first missions, it responded to a national emergency in 1966, locating and helping to recover a hydrogen bomb that had accidentally dropped into the Mediterranean Sea.

In 1974, *Alvin* brought scientists for the first time to the mid-ocean ridge during Project FAMOUS, the French-American Mid-Ocean Undersea Study, and revealed a seafloor that scientists had not imagined. Project FAMOUS proved that submersibles could effectively explore the deep seafloor and marked the beginning a new era of exploration.

Alvin discovered and explored previously unknown and unexpected communities of deep-sea organisms that thrive in the absence of sunlight, sustained not by photosynthesis but by chemosynthesis. This discovery was one of the most profound of the 20th century, because it completely transformed our conceptions of where and how life can exist on this planet; reconfigured our search today for life on other planetary bodies; and opened entirely new lines of microbiological and biogeochemical research, including those that have led to commercial and pharmaceutical applications.

Over the following decades, *Alvin* discovered several previously unknown seafloor environments harboring a diversity of chemosynthetic communities, including high-temperature black-smoker chimneys that spew like undersea geysers in the Pacific, 1979; cold-seep habitats sustained by hydrogen sulfide, methane, and other hydrocarbon-rich fluids seeping from the seafloor Guaymas Basin, Gulf of California, 1982, and in the Gulf of Mexico, 1983; and "Lost City" environments, where seawater reacts with mantle rock, peridotite, to produce methane and hydrogen in the Atlantic, 2000.

Alvin has also explored another type of seafloor habitat—seamounts, or ancient undersea volcanoes—with their diverse communities of deep-sea corals, fish, and other organisms, in the Gulf of Alaska, the Pacific, and the Atlantic. Scientists aboard *Alvin* have discovered many hundreds of previously unknown marine species.

Alvin has contributed to other events of historical significance, exploring and bringing back images of the wreck of the Titanic in 1986 and responding to the Deepwater Horizon disaster, by investigating impacts to deep-sea habitats in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010.

Alvin inspired scientists and engineers to develop new generations of deep-submergence technology; including remotely operated vehicles, ROVs, tethered by fiber-optic cables and free-swimming autonomous underwater vehicles, AUVs. These vehicles are now routinely used for naval activities and national security, oil exploration, maritime, and other industries, environmental and fisheries monitoring, and

disaster response, and are now being developed for use under ice in polar regions and to explore other planetary bodies.

Alvin resumed operations in 2014 after a major upgrade, funded by the National Science Foundation, Office of Naval Research, and WHOI, which dramatically enhanced its capabilities. An anticipated second phase of this *Alvin* upgrade will increase the submersible's diving capacity from 4,500 to 6,500 meters, 14,000 to 21,000 feet, allowing it to reach 98 percent of the seafloor.

Alvin has been a workhorse for U.S. scientists, safely taking nearly 2,600 individual researchers on more than 4,700 dives to the ocean depths and is the only deep-sea human-occupied vehicle in the National Deep Submergence Facility for the U.S. oceanographic community. *Alvin* has thrilled and inspired generations of schoolchildren around the world with its adventures and discoveries and become an icon for exploration and a symbol of American ingenuity.

The accomplishments and discoveries achieved by this single submersible and the scientists, engineers and ship's crew who built, use, and operate it during its first 50 years demonstrate the importance of continued support for the development of deep-submergence technology and exploration of the largest portion of Earth's surface and its last frontier the ocean.

Alvin is a national scientific treasure and we are proud that it calls Massachusetts and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution home.●

RECOGNIZING SEEKINS PRECISION

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, America depends on the ingenuity of small business owners to propel the country forward in innovation. Seekins Precision demonstrates this originality by continuously improving their products for a unique industry. I rise today to honor Seekins Precision of Lewiston, ID, a small business whose commitment to manufacturing products for those who enjoy exercising their second-amendment rights honors both Idaho and the Nation.

Founded in 2004, Seekins Precision builds innovative products for precision shooters. As the result of an unsuccessful deer hunt, founder Glen Seekins identified a need for hunting equipment able to endure the natural elements of the Idaho mountains products that were durable, yet lightweight. The combination of Mr. Seekins' background in mechanical design and his entrepreneurial spirit sparked the design for Seekins Precision's flagship scope rings. After training himself on a computer numerical control machine to build scope rings, Mr. Seekins and his wife, Katie, set up shop in their garage. In November 2005, their scope rings became so

popular in the local shooting community that the business developed into a full-time operation.

Over the past 10 years, Seekins Precision has achieved an outstanding reputation for quality, as well as that of a unique Idaho gem. Since its inception, Seekins Precision has expanded from only making scope rings with just a handful of employees, to developing over ten major upper-end rifle lines and creating more than 25 new jobs in the local Idaho community. Today, the business has expanded to manufacture a full line of automatic rifle products, including rifles, complete uppers, and other parts and accessories. All of Seekins Precision's products are proudly invented, sourced, and made in the USA in their new 25,000 square foot facility, a \$4 million investment back into the community.

At the beginning of this year, Seekins Precision participated in the Shooting Hunting Outdoor Trade, SHOT, Show and Conference in Las Vegas, NV, the largest annual trade show for recreational technology professionals, and the world's premier exposition of combined firearms. Participation in the SHOT Show exposed Seekins Precision to buyers from all 50 States and more than 100 countries, expanding the business' exposure to international markets. Located in the Port of Lewiston since 2010, Idaho's only seaport and the farthest inland port east of the west coast, Seekins Precision relocated to a 25,000 square foot facility in order to accommodate further product demand this past May. The small business received support from Idaho's own Governor, Butch Otter, who attended the grand-opening ribbon-cutting ceremony. Seekins Precision's astonishing success emulates that of the American Dream, reaching beyond the local community and loyal customers.

I congratulate everyone at Seekins Precision on their success, continued growth and exemplary reputation for quality. Seekins Precision represents the best aspects of American craftsmanship and is a credit to both Idaho and the Nation.●

GEAR UP HAWAII

● Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, September 22nd marks the beginning of National Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, GEAR UP, Week and I would like to take a moment to recognize the invaluable work of GEAR UP in Hawaii.

For more than a decade, GEAR UP has provided low-income students all over the country with the support and resources they need to go to college. GEAR UP helps these students, many of which are the first in their family to go to college, to overcome the challenges they face in their communities.

GEAR UP Hawaii serves over 16,000 students each year from low-income and underserved communities throughout the State in grades 7 through 12 and in their first year in college. The program provides a number of services to these students including: supporting academic preparation in high school; providing opportunities for early college options; increasing college access and financial aid information to students and families; and supporting students in their first year in college. GEAR UP Hawaii has gained national recognition for its success in closing the achievement gap and helping low-income students prepare for college.

Through its collaborative partnerships between Hawaii's State Department of Education, K-12 schools, the University of Hawaii, businesses, and community organizations, GEAR UP Hawaii inspires students to see post-secondary education as something they can achieve. It also gives students the tools they need to succeed in college and their careers.

The program's results demonstrate that GEAR UP Hawaii is making significant strides towards increasing the number of low-income students who are prepared for and enroll in college. The first class of Step Up Scholars, a GEAR UP Hawaii program, graduated from high school in June 2013 and earned the college-ready Board of Education Recognition Diploma, BOERD, at nearly twice the rate of the statewide average and three times the rate of non-Step Up Scholars. In addition, across GEAR UP Hawaii schools this past year, there was a 14 percent increase in the number of students participating in dual enrollment programs who graduated high school with six or more college credits. Thanks to these programs, Hawaii's students graduate from high school better prepared for college and for their futures.

A college education is a path to opportunity for our students. GEAR UP Hawaii plays a vital role in fulfilling our responsibility to ensure that every student has access to that path.●

TRIBUTE TO WENDY LEWIS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize LT Wendy Lewis of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps on her upcoming promotion to lieutenant commander.

Lieutenant Lewis is currently serving as a Congressional Fellow on the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. A ship driver by training, Lieutenant Lewis, has ably lent herself to the committee's work. I would like to thank her for the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and other members of the committee.

This well-deserved promotion recognizes her leadership and dedication to serving others.●

ADOPTING CHILDREN FROM
NEPAL

• Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I comment today on an issue of tremendous concern to a number of Pennsylvania families who in recent years adopted children from Nepal.

In August of 2010, the State Department suspended the authorization for American families to adopt children from that nation with the exception of those families, some from Pennsylvania, who were already in the process of adopting Nepali orphans. The State Department and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services told these “pipeline” families that their cases would be processed to completion, but that they should anticipate significant delays and possibly negative outcomes, since their cases were suspected of being heavily tainted by fraud, corruption, and illegal or unethical practices. In response to U.S. government requests for additional evidence substantiating the legality and morality of these adoptions, these families had to undertake extensive investigations on their own to provide such evidence.

Since these families were already completely bonded with their adoptive children, each of them eagerly undertook its investigation, at great financial and emotional expense. Meanwhile, most of the children were forced to languish for an additional 6 months in orphanages. While due diligence is appropriate for all adoptions, I am deeply troubled that in this case not a single instance of fraud or corruption was ever found. In fact, the State Department and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ultimately allowed all these American pipeline families bring their children home to the United States. Despite this ultimately successful outcome, the State Department continues to suspend adoption of desperate Nepali children by American families. I ask that the Department reevaluate its policy with the recent experience of the pipeline families as a major consideration.

With an eye towards the future of the children who were adopted by the pipeline families, I am concerned that the public record on these adoptions from Nepal is still replete with references to fraud and trafficking. We need to set the record straight and to make it clear that each of the Nepali pipeline adoption cases in progress at the time of the suspension was ultimately approved and was devoid of any findings of malfeasance. Every child deserves a family and no child deserves to be needlessly haunted by clouds of doubt about his or her origin. These American families deserve to have a positive public record created showing that their adoptions were completely legal and ethical. I wish to personally begin that record today. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION
OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY
WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS
WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO
COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TER-
RORISM THAT WAS ESTAB-
LISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER
13224 ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2001—PM
53

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2014.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with re-

spect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 2014.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 5134. An act to extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 3:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1603. An act to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatami Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 2154. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program.

S. 2258. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2014, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3043. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

H.R. 3593. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4137. An act to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale.

H.R. 4276. An act to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury.

H.R. 4994. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for standardized post-acute care assessment data for quality, payment, and discharge planning, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5169. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5170. An act to improve Federal employee compliance with the Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5404. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5405. An act to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5418. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business.

H.R. 5419. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

H.R. 5420. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations.

H.R. 5461. An act to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes.

At 6:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3593. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the construction of major medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4137. An act to prohibit assistance provided under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families from being accessed through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card at any store that offers marijuana for sale; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4276. An act to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5169. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5170. An act to improve Federal employee compliance with the Federal and Presidential recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5405. An act to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5418. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to con-

duct official business; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5419. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5420. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5461. An act to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7007. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 52nd Annual Report of the activities of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7008. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expanding public-private collaboration on infrastructure development and financing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7009. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Final 2014-2015 Spiny Dogfish Specifications" (RIN0648-BE17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7010. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's 2014 Report to Congress on the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7011. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "National Airspace System Capital Investment Plan Fiscal Years 2015-2019"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7012. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of Communications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Disclosure of Records Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)" (RIN2700-AE04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7013. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska: Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Program" (RIN0648-BC62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7014. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications" (RIN0648-XD252) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7015. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2014 Winter II Quota" (RIN0648-XD392) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7016. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Amendment 3" (RIN0648-BC77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7017. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations" (RIN0648-BC90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7018. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations" (RIN0648-BC90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7019. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; the Highly Migratory Species Fishery; Closure" (RIN0648-XD238) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7020. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Framework Adjustment 8" (RIN0648-BD56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7021. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Closure for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XD441) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7022. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2014 Commercial and Recreational Accountability Measures and Closures for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack" (RIN0648-XD422) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7023. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan; Northern Red Hake Quota Harvested" (RIN0648-XD336) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7024. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trip Limit Adjustment and Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XD357) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7025. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery and Possession Limit Adjustment" (RIN0648-XD418) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7026. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reapportionment of the 2014 Gulf of Alaska Pacific Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Limits for the Trawl Deep-Water and Shallow-Water Fishery Categories" (RIN0648-XD361) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7027. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD375) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7028. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD379) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7029. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); Commercial Blacknose Sharks and Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks (SCS) in the Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XD369) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7030. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD447) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7031. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD449) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7032. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7033. A communication from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Foreign Policy Report entitled "Report to the Congress: Sanctions on Exports and Reexports of Commodities That are Used to Support Oil and Gas Operations in Russia"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7034. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Positive Train Control Systems (RRR)" (RIN2130-AC32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7035. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Make Inoperative Exemptions; Vehicle Modifications To Accommodate People With Disabilities; Ejection Mitigation; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment" (RIN2127-AL17) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7036. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registered Importers of Vehicles Not Originally Manufactured To Conform to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards" (RIN2127-AL43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7037. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Early Warning Reporting, Foreign Defect Reporting, and Motor Vehicle and Equipment Recall Regulations" (RIN2127-AK72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7038. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Updates to Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument Regulations" (RIN0648-BE02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7039. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary Regulations and Management Plan" (RIN0648-BD60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7040. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Transportation of Lithium Batteries" (RIN2137-AE44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7041. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Hazardous Materials: Failure to Pay Civil Penalties" (RIN2137-AE97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2583. A bill to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2799. A bill to extend the authority of satellite carriers to retransmit certain television broadcast station signals, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Lisa Afua Serwah Mensah, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

*Manson K. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Sharon Block, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2019.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COATS, Mr. JOHANNES, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2833. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2834. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect employment and training services for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 2835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for certain storm shelters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2836. A bill to provide for an integrated plan for the space launch activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2837. A bill to count revenues from military and veteran education programs toward the limit on Federal revenues that certain proprietary institutions of higher education are allowed to receive for purposes of section 487 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2838. A bill to provide for duty-free treatment of certain recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2839. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2840. A bill to authorize funding for, and increase accessibility to, the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System, to facilitate data sharing between such system and the National Crime Information Center database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide incentive grants to help facilitate reporting to such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2841. A bill to provide for a study by the Institute of Medicine on health disparities, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidelines on reducing health disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2842. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Caregiver Corps program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2843. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are victims of sex-related offenses with access to a special victims' counsel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHA-

HEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2844. A bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2845. A bill to establish the Southern Prairie Potholes National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2846. A bill to express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of State should use his existing authority to revoke the passports of United States citizens who have provided material support to ISIS and to require the Secretary to submit a quarterly report to Congress on the use of such authority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2847. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2848. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2849. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare youth for postsecondary education at institutions of higher education, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 551. A resolution recognizing September 2014 as "National Campus Safety Awareness Month" and supporting the goals and ideals of National Campus Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. Res. 552. A resolution supporting Lights on Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 23, 2014; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 553. A resolution recognizing the 250th anniversary of the Hartford Courant newspaper; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 554. A resolution recognizing the month of October 2014 as "National Principals Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 555. A resolution designating the week of September 15 through September 19, 2014, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the health care system for all individuals in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 556. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 12, 2014, as National Wildlife Refuge Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. Res. 557. A resolution designating the week beginning October 19, 2014, as "National Character Counts Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 558. A resolution designating the week of September 22 through 28, 2014, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 559. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 19, 2014, as "National Chemistry Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 560. A resolution designating September 2014 as "School Bus Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Con. Res. 43. A concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a "National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 223

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to establish a commission for the purpose of coordinating efforts to reduce prescription drug abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

KIRK) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the types of wines taxed as hard cider.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2092

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2092, a bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2192

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2192, a bill to amend the National Alzheimer's Project Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to prepare and submit, directly to the President for review and transmittal to Congress, an annual budget estimate (including an estimate of the number and type of personnel needs for the Institutes) for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to such an Act.

S. 2348

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 2366

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2538

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2538, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from chronic liver disease and liver cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 2587

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2587, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to protect and conserve species and the lawful possession of certain ivory in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, *supra*.

S. 2622

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2622, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2646, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2653

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2653, a bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 2655

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2655, a bill to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

S. 2687

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2687, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2689

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2689, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2689, *supra*.

S. 2693

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2693, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2706

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2706, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 2746

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2746, a bill to amend the Public

Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 2758

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2758, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to modernize C-130 aircraft using alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program kits and to ensure that such aircraft meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S. 2782

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2782, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to improve the Federal charter for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2793

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2793, a bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson.

S. 2809

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2809, a bill to require the Environmental Protection Agency to obtain a court order to garnish wages to pay a nontax debt.

S. 2814

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2814, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 353

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 353, a resolution designating

September 2014 as “National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month”.

S. RES. 529

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 529, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and commending its members for their courage and sacrifice in service to the United States.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 541, a resolution recognizing the severe threat that the Ebola outbreak in West Africa poses to populations, governments, and economies across Africa and, if not properly contained, to regions across the globe, and expressing support for those affected by this epidemic.

S. RES. 543

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 543, a resolution designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day.

S. RES. 545

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 545, a resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States.

S. RES. 546

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 546, a resolution congratulating Indonesia's President-elect Joko Widodo on his electoral victory and commending the people of Indonesia on their commitment to democracy and free and fair elections.

S. RES. 548

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 548, a resolution designating November 29, 2014, as “Small Business Saturday” and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses.

AMENDMENT NO. 3420

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3420 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3744

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3744 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Startup Opportunity Accelerator Act or SOAR Act, which provides funding for accelerator programs and organizations that support small business startups.

The importance of small businesses to the economy and job creation is well documented. In fact, data has shown the innovative, smallest companies represent a significant majority of all new businesses, reaffirming the importance of young, small firms to driving small business and economic growth.

To be sure, we see the impact of these high growth startups daily in the technology we rely on for communication and access to information. Many of the startups developing these innovative technologies have thrived in regions, such as Silicon Valley and Silicon Alley, where there are high concentrations of other entrepreneurs and startups. Specifically, these regions have benefited from the presence of growth accelerators and other organi-

zations that connect startups with the resources necessary for growth. These resources can provide critical opportunities for entrepreneurs to access the venture capital, mentorship, and industry networks vital to success.

That is why I am introducing the SOAR Act. The SOAR Act would authorize the Small Business Administration's SBA, Growth Accelerator Fund, which offers funding to growth accelerators and other organizations supporting startups through a competitive prize program. The SOAR Act would broaden the reach of these organizations to new communities by specifically encouraging applicants that fill both geographic and demographic gaps in the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

After launching in the spring of 2014, the SBA saw tremendous interest in the Fund and received more than 800 applications from organizations across the country. The SBA was able to grant awards to 50 organizations, including a New Jersey-based innovation center that plans to develop a new growth accelerator focused on the food industry.

The SOAR Act will authorize the Growth Accelerator Fund for 5 years and provide a needed funding boost to help meet high demand from small businesses and entrepreneurs in the program.

I am proud to introduce this legislation that provides increased resources to help startups succeed. This relatively small, targeted investment would deliver big returns for communities across the country, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2839. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Rhode Island to talk a little bit about a very important piece of legislation we are introducing. It is called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2014. I think it is fair to say that Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island and I do not agree on everything in this body that comes up—all the policy issues. But on this one we agree that it is necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to deal with this heroin epidemic that is sweeping across our country.

He has been an unwavering ally in trying to find common ground on this legislation. I appreciate him. Again, I think this is an area where we can find common ground on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol to move legislation forward that can help

to deal with this growing issue in our States.

I do not think we can afford to wait. Every day, unfortunately, the number of people who die from heroin overdoses grows. Every day more mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters are lost to this horrible scourge. By the time this year is out, I am told that more than 19,000 Ohioans will have overdosed on heroin or other opiates. The deaths from heroin overdoses this year will be the No. 1 cause of death in the State of Ohio, exceeding traffic accidents.

Elected officials around the country, medical professionals, and grass roots volunteers are dealing with this issue. They are fighting back. They are doing everything in their power to try to save lives and to try to stem this epidemic. But they need help. The challenge we all face is serious. To address it we need a comprehensive effort, marshaling the resources of communities, grass roots organizations, local, State, and, yes, the Federal Government. That is where we come in here, in the Congress.

I think only together can we make progress here and prevent new victims from falling into the grips of addiction. Only together can we help those who are already struggling with heroin to rebuild their lives. I think this bipartisan legislation we have introduced today is the important first step in that. It lays out a broad spectrum response to the epidemic of heroin and opiate addiction.

It starts with prevention and education. Why? Because we know that approach can work. Obviously, it is the most effective way to deal with this, to keep you from getting into the addiction in the first place. Nearly 20 years ago I joined with leaders around southwest Ohio to form what is called the Coalition for a Drug Free Greater Cincinnati. I was here in the Congress on the House side. A constituent came to me and said her son had just died from an overdose of smoking marijuana and huffing gasoline. I was ready for her. I had all the statistics as to what we were doing at the Federal level in terms of eradicating crops in places like Colombia, interdicting drugs, prosecuting people, trying to stop the flow of drugs into this country.

She kind of looked at me and said: How is that going to help me and my community? How would that have helped my kid? How does that help me deal with our church, where people are in denial and will not even talk about it, or our school, where the principal said: It is not a problem here.

So we came up with this notion of these community coalitions. There were a few around the country, and they seemed to be working. Ours in greater Cincinnati has worked well. It is still working well. By working together with grass roots organizations

across the spectrum—teachers and parents, law enforcement, religious leaders, the media, business—we pulled together a group. That coalition led to this greater effort that we started in the House, and there is legislation that I authored called the Drug-Free Communities Act, which has now provided funding, by the way, and therefore helped to create thousands of other community coalitions. It has provided funding to over 2,000 community coalitions around the country. There are now about 5,000, I think, around the country. Those have worked. But they are not adequate to deal with this heroin epidemic.

But we start there. We start with this notion that there is a way, through a grass roots program, for more focus on prevention and education to be able to help stem this growing problem; that is, stopping addiction before it even starts. That, of course, again, is the most effective way. It saves money, saves lives. We also, though, have to do more to incentivize new innovative treatment programs for those who have become addicted to try to break the cycle and break the addiction.

We do that in this legislation by encouraging diversion programs like drug courts that provide treatment alternatives to incarceration. We do it by funding evidence-based heroin treatment pilot programs. There are some exciting new medications out there that we think are worth a try, including some new medications that actually block the urge, the craving. We are funding evidence-based treatment programs, but at the same time encouraging the use of emergency medications to stop overdoses.

This is something we have seen in all of our States. It expands the availability of Naloxone, which is an overdose inhibitor that the law enforcement agencies and other first responders have access to in order to be able to keep people not from overdosing—which is happening—but from dying from that overdose.

We know that there have been many lives saved, even over the last couple of years through the use of that medication. We offer more resources to promptly identify and treat incarcerated individuals suffering from addiction disorders by collaborating with criminal justice stakeholders and, again, providing evidence-based treatment. This revolving door in the criminal justice system of people who are drug users getting into prison, getting out again—and within 2 or 3 years over two-thirds of them are back in the system—we are all paying for that. The communities are paying for it with increased crime. The families are paying for it. The taxpayers are also paying for it—\$25,000, \$30,000 a year for incarcerating individuals, who, if you can get them into a drug treatment pro-

gram, in part through these drug courts, in part through other programs that are proven to work, they can then not just get over their addiction and not be committing crimes but become productive citizens and taxpayers themselves.

We have seen this lap around the country. We have to be encouraging that and supporting that at the Federal level. I saw a model of this kind of approach when I visited the CompDrug treatment center recently in Columbus, OH. I met with several nurses and counselors who are there on the front lines in the battle against addiction. They used medication-assisted treatment, but they also use a lot of counseling to help men and women get on this path to recovery. So it is not just the medication, but it has to be a more comprehensive plan. They do this in both a public health capacity but also in connection with a prisoner reentry program.

So, again, it is people coming out of the criminal justice system who have a history of addiction and to get them into this program so they can get not just the treatment they need to get over their addiction but the job training they also need to be able to get back into the workforce to become productive citizens.

We do not stop here in this legislation. If there is one thing I have learned over the last couple of decades working in this area, it is that the best solutions on this are not going to come from Washington. They are going to be developed at the grass roots, on the ground.

What we can do is support those efforts on the ground and provide States with more flexibility to be able to use these resources that are already coming from Washington, so our legislation does that as well.

Our bill offers States that are proactive at enacting proven policies the ability to benefit from support under State incentive grants. These grants will reward States such as Ohio that are improving access to drug-abuse services for specific at-risk individuals and that are working to reach 100-percent compliance with programs such as the prescription drug monitoring program that tracks prescription drugs.

Some States such as Ohio—where we have a big prescription drug problem—there is also southern Ohio with adjoining States West Virginia and Kentucky that have this issue and without a sufficient monitoring program. Some people are getting prescription drugs filled in Ohio and then going across the river to Kentucky and getting them filled. There is no way to monitor that without an effective program. We want to encourage all States to adopt this kind of a program so we know who is getting prescription drugs, who needs them and who is abusing the process.

We also talk about this issue in the abstract. I have done that today talking about numbers—19,000 overdoses. But what does that mean? It is a shockingly high number. We sometimes forget that every one of those overdoses represents a person, a family member, someone who has hopes and dreams, someone who at some point made a mistake, and now that mistake threatens those dreams and often devastates their family, as I have seen and I am sure you have seen. Sometimes it can even result in that person's death. As we talk about overdoses this year, it will be the No. 1 cause of death in my State of Ohio.

I want to share a couple stories briefly before I close, people I have met in Ohio, people in communities in my State who are struggling with the weight of addiction.

I recently met a guy about my age. His name is Paul. Paul came to a roundtable discussion and has been engaged in this issue because his son died of a heroin overdose. He was 19 years old. He died of an overdose 2 days after getting out of rehab. Sadly, that is not an uncommon story. People go into rehab to turn their lives around and many are successful, but many aren't. For some of them when they get out, the temptation is too great and unfortunately their body no longer has the tolerance for the drug it once did and sometimes they overdose. His son was one of those.

This man has been in a lot of pain, I could tell. He is still in a lot of pain. But where he has channeled his grief and his pain is helping others to overcome addiction and to bring this discussion out of the dark, to talk about it.

It is not a comfortable topic for a lot of people to talk about, but he has been willing to do it, to talk about his family situation and talk about the fact that every family around the kitchen table ought to be talking about this subject. We ought to be talking about it in the classrooms. We ought to be sure that people understand the incredible risk and danger our young people face today.

Earlier this year I met a young woman named Sarah. Sarah has been struggling to overcome her own addiction. She has been successful, and I applaud her. She told me: Addiction starts in treatment, ROB, but it also happens in the community. You have to have a surrounding that supports you and encourages you.

She is fighting her own battle, but she is also doing something interesting at Ohio State University. She has started a student-led recovery program, kind of a support network among students.

Again, often this is in the shadows. She has been the one to step forward and say: Hey, I have an issue. I am a recovering addict, and I want other re-

covering addicts to come and join me and feel support so they don't do what Paul's son did.

Then there is Bill. Bill is in recovery from a heroin addiction that he told me used to cost him \$2,000 a week at its height. It cost him his freedom too. He ended up in prison. When he got out of prison, he was able to take advantage of some of these programs we talked about today, some of these prisoner re-entry programs and treatment options. Bill turned his life around. Interestingly, he now works at the very corrections facility where he once served.

As he joked with me, he said: I used to be behind bars. Now I hold the keys to the cells and I am spreading a message.

I imagine he is a very credible spokesperson for that message. He is working with inmates to help build relationships and re-entry programs, not just in the prison behind the walls, but also in his community in Canton, OH.

He encourages employers to give people a second chance, to give them a shot. His quote to me was: Don't give them the keys to the safe on the first day, but give them a shot. It worked for me. It can work for others.

This battle against addiction will not be an easy one, we know that, but we also know it is well worth the fight. We have to take the fight.

When we see the number of overdoses drop, and we see statistics showing that fewer kids are using drugs and more people are breaking free of the addiction that once held them, we will know it paid off. It is not only about dollars and cents. Yes, we can save taxpayer money, we can be sure that more people are productively employed, and that our society is more efficient and communities are safer, but ultimately this is about our young people and what kind of future they are going to have.

It is about our children and our grandchildren. Will they have a better shot at their dream, a better shot at getting through school, getting an education, a better shot at getting a decent job and being able to hold it, and a better shot at being able to take care of their own families and having the dignity and self-respect that comes with that? That is ultimately what this legislation is about.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for joining with me to craft this legislation. I also thank Senator LEAHY, who I understand has recently agreed to become an original cosponsor of this bill.

I encourage other Members to take a look at it. It is a good way for us to come together as Republicans and Democrats to focus on an issue that is affecting every single State represented in this body.

Sometimes people are in denial about this subject, but the reality is it affects all of us as Americans.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am introducing a resolution to provide President Obama with authority in the multinational mission to defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, ISIL, which is meant to reinforce the President's strategy, as well as set key limitations that I hope will be included in final authorizing language for broader Congressional consideration.

President Obama laid out a strong case for the need to defeat ISIL, and asked for Congressional support for this effort. Now is the time for Congress to act to support the President and reestablish balance between the Executive and Legislature on whether or not to engage in significant military action.

I was heartened when Foreign Relations Committee Chairman MENENDEZ answered the President's call by saying the committee would soon craft authorizing language for the U.S. military mission. It is my hope that the proposal I am introducing today will help move the process forward on what a specific and narrow authorization for limited military action against ISIL should look like.

This authorization is specific to ISIL and supports President Obama's key pillars: a multinational effort to degrade and destroy ISIL, the use of necessary and appropriate force in a campaign of air strikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria and the provision of military equipment to appropriately vetted forces in Iraq and Syria, including the Iraqi security forces, Kurdish fighters, and other legitimate, appropriately vetted, non-terrorist opposition groups in Syria. It also includes four key limitations: no U.S. ground troops; repeal of the 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force; sunset after 1 year; and narrow definition of associated forces. I have also included reporting requirements that require the President to update Congress on progress of the mission.

I believe this authorization is needed for two reasons. First, we need to comply with constitutional war powers provisions—Congress declares war and the President, as Commander-in-Chief, executes the mission. Second, and perhaps more importantly, Congressional buy-in represents a core value of our Nation—that the political leadership is willing to do the hard work to reach consensus in support of our servicemembers. If Congress is not willing to do the hard work to debate and vote on an authorization, we should not be asking our servicemembers to go into harm's way.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 551—RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS “NATIONAL CAMPUS SAFETY AWARENESS MONTH” AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CAMPUS SAFETY AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 551

Whereas people on college and university campuses are not immune from the potential acts of crime that the rest of society in the United States faces;

Whereas men and women deserve to learn in a positive and safe environment free from sexual assault;

Whereas experts estimate that 1 in 5 female undergraduate students will experience sexual assault or attempted sexual assault;

Whereas the aggressor in a sexual assault is usually an acquaintance or friend of the victim;

Whereas a majority of sexual assaults are not reported to law enforcement;

Whereas the majority of stalking victims are between the ages of 18 and 24 years old;

Whereas approximately 3 in 10 women are injured emotionally or psychologically from being stalked;

Whereas the Clery Center for Security on Campus, a nonprofit group dedicated to preventing violence, substance abuse, and other crimes on college and university campuses, has designated September as “National Campus Safety Awareness Month”; and

Whereas National Campus Safety Awareness Month provides an opportunity for campus communities to become engaged in efforts to improve campus safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Campus Safety Awareness Month; and

(2) encourages colleges and universities throughout the United States to provide campus safety and other crime awareness and prevention programs to students throughout the year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 552—SUPPORTING LIGHTS ON AFTERSCHOOL, A NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS HELD ON OCTOBER 23, 2014

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 552

Whereas more than 28,000,000 children in the United States have parents who work outside the home and approximately 15,100,000 children in the United States have no place to go after school;

Whereas high-quality programs that expand learning opportunities for children, such as afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning programs, provide

safe, challenging, engaging, and fun learning experiences, including many that emphasize science, technology, engineering, and math, that help children and youth develop social, emotional, physical, cultural, and academic skills;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs and high-quality expanded learning programs provide students with hands-on, engaging lessons that are aligned with the school day;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs complement regular and expanded school days, and support working families by ensuring that the children of those families are safe and productive during the hours parents are working;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs engage families, schools, and diverse community partners in advancing the well-being of children and youth in the United States;

Whereas high-quality afterschool programs that partner with high-quality community-based organizations build stronger communities by integrating the school with the larger community;

Whereas Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool, before-school, summer, and expanded learning programs held on October 23, 2014, highlights the critical importance of these high-quality programs in the lives of children, their families, and their communities; and

Whereas nearly 2 in 5 afterschool programs report that their budgets are in worse condition today than at the height of the recession in 2008, and more than 3 in 5 afterschool programs report that their level of funding is lower than it was 3 years ago, making it difficult for afterschool programs across the United States to keep their doors open and their lights on: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports Lights On Afterschool, a national celebration of afterschool programs held on October 23, 2014.

SENATE RESOLUTION 553—RECOGNIZING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HARTFORD COURANT NEWSPAPER

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 553

Whereas the first edition of the Hartford Courant was printed on October 29, 1764;

Whereas the Hartford Courant is the oldest continuously published newspaper in the United States;

Whereas the Hartford Courant gave voice to a newfound yearning for freedom as the most circulated newspaper in the colonies during the throes of the Revolutionary War;

Whereas the Hartford Courant demonstrated leadership in actively supporting the presidential efforts of President Abraham Lincoln and his attempts to end slavery during the Civil War; and

Whereas the Hartford Courant is a 5-time finalist and 2-time winner of the Pulitzer Prize for journalistic excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significant and positive impact of the Hartford Courant throughout the history of the United States; and

(2) acknowledges the importance of a vibrant free press to democracy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 554—RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2014 AS “NATIONAL PRINCIPALS MONTH”

Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 554

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared the month of October 2014 to be “National Principals Month”;

Whereas principals are educational visionaries, instructional and assessment leaders, disciplinarians, community builders, budget analysts, facilities managers, and administrators of legal and contractual obligations;

Whereas principals work collaboratively with teachers and parents to develop and implement a clear mission, high curriculum standards, and performance goals;

Whereas principals create school environments that facilitate great teaching and learning and continuous school improvement;

Whereas the vision, actions, and dedication of principals provide the mobilizing force behind any school reform effort; and

Whereas the celebration of National Principals Month would honor elementary school, middle school, and high school principals, and recognize the importance of principals in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the month of October 2014 as “National Principals Month”; and

(2) honors the contribution of principals in the elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools of the United States by supporting the goals and ideals of National Principals Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 555—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 15 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 19, 2014, AS “NATIONAL HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN TRANSFORMING AND IMPROVING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM FOR ALL INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 555

Whereas health information technology is recognized as an essential tool for improving patient care, ensuring patient safety, stopping duplicative tests and paperwork, and reducing health care costs;

Whereas the Center for Information Technology Leadership estimates that a fully-realized implementation of national standards for interoperability and the exchange of health information can produce significant savings in health care costs;

Whereas the use of health information technology is essential to providing coordinated care, expanding access to care, and improving the quality and safety of mental and

physical health care for all individuals in the United States;

Whereas Congress has a vision for a national technology-enabled health care system that—

(1) provides access to care that is available at anytime and anywhere;

(2) recognizes modern, multimodal health care delivery models;

(3) establishes open standards for connectivity to core patient information between health information technology systems, devices, and emerging technologies; and

(4) leverages technology solutions to analyze and improve treatment trends and highlight cost transparency to help combat fraud, waste, and abuse within Federal health programs;

Whereas portable health information, such as cloud-based computing and storage systems that can process vast amounts of patient information for personalized care, integrated consumer devices, and mobile medical applications, are critical technologies for improving the health of all individuals in the United States, creating high-demand jobs, and stimulating market innovation;

Whereas it is necessary to continue improving the exchange of health information confidently and securely between different providers, systems, and insurers, a task that is foundational to transforming the health care delivery system in the United States;

Whereas aligning the use of electronic health records with other reporting efforts is critical to improving clinical outcomes for patients, controlling costs, and expanding access to care through the use of technology; and

Whereas since 2006, organizations across the United States have united to support National Health Information Technology Week to improve public awareness of implementing health information technology to achieve the benefits of improved quality and cost efficiency in the health care system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 15 through September 19, 2014, as “National Health Information Technology Week”;

(2) recognizes the value of information technology and management systems in transforming health care for individuals in the United States;

(3) encourages all interested parties to promote the use of information technology and management systems to transform the health care system of the United States; and

(4) calls on all individuals in the United States to be engaged in their mental and physical health by using health information technology.

SENATE RESOLUTION 556—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 12, 2014, AS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 556

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas, in 2014, the National Wildlife Refuge System, administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, is the premier system of lands and waters to conserve wildlife in the world, and has grown to approximately 150,000,000 acres, 562 national wildlife refuges, and 38 wetland management districts in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States, and these protected lands offer a variety of recreational opportunities, including 6 wildlife-dependent uses that the National Wildlife Refuge System manages: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas, in 2014, 335 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs and 271 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have fishing programs, averaging approximately 2,500,000 hunting visits and nearly 7,000,000 fishing visits each year;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experienced nearly 31,000,000 wildlife observation visits during fiscal year 2013;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas, for every \$1 appropriated, national wildlife refuges generate nearly \$5 in economic activity;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experiences over 47,000,000 visits each year, which generated more than \$2,400,000,000 and more than 35,000 jobs in local economies during fiscal year 2011;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses every kind of ecosystem in the United States, including temperate, tropical, and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, and remote islands, and spans 12 time zones from the Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are home to more than 700 species of birds, 220 species of mammals, 250 species of reptiles and amphibians, and more than 1,000 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal lands that foster production, migration, and wintering habitat for waterfowl;

Whereas, since 1934, the sale of the Federal Duck Stamp to outdoor enthusiasts has generated more than \$850,000,000 in funds, which has enabled the purchase or lease of more than 5,600,000 acres of wetland habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas the recovery of 386 threatened and endangered species is supported on refuge lands;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are cores of conservation for larger landscapes and resources for other agencies of the Federal Government and State governments, private landowners, and organizations in their efforts to secure the wildlife heritage of the United States;

Whereas more than 38,000 volunteers and approximately 220 national wildlife refuge “Friends” organizations contribute more than 1,400,000 hours annually, the equivalent of more than 700 full-time employees, and provide an important link to local communities;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to dis-

cover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas, because there are national wildlife refuges located in several urban and suburban areas and one refuge located within an hour drive of every metropolitan area in the United States, national wildlife refuges employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to seek stakeholder input on the implementation of “Conserving the Future: Wildlife Refuges and the Next Generation”, an update to the strategic plan of the Fish and Wildlife Service for the future of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas the week beginning on October 12, 2014, has been designated as “National Wildlife Refuge Week” by the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available to enjoy this network of protected lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 12, 2014, as “National Wildlife Refuge Week”;

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(4) pronounces that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

(6) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation and the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, as well as compatible uses;

(7) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 755, chapter 128);

(8) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(9) expresses the intent of the Senate—

(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to manage the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 557—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 19, 2014, AS “NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the

following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 557

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas, more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of "National Character Counts Week", during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 19, 2014, as "National Character Counts Week"; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 558—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 22 THROUGH 28, 2014, AS "NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK"

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 558

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development reports that approximately 36,000,000 adults in the United States lack the basic literacy and numeracy necessary to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas the literacy of the people of the United States is essential for the economic and societal well-being of the United States;

Whereas the United States reaps the economic benefits of individuals who improve their literacy, numeracy, and English-language skills;

Whereas literacy and educational skills are necessary for individuals to fully benefit from the range of opportunities available in the United States;

Whereas the economy and position of the United States in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the unemployment rate in the United States is highest among those without a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, demonstrating that education is important to economic recovery;

Whereas the educational skills of a child's parents and the practice of reading to a child have a direct impact on the educational success of the child;

Whereas parental involvement in a child's education is a key predictor of a child's success, and the level of parental involvement in a child's education increases as the educational level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents who participate in family literacy programs become more involved in their children's education and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas as a result of family literacy programs, the lives of children become more stable, and their success in the classroom and in future endeavors becomes more likely;

Whereas adults need to be part of a long-term solution to the educational challenges faced by the people of the United States;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English skills necessary to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, which endangers their lives and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills necessary to obtain and keep a job to provide for their families, to continue their education, or to participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills necessary to complete their education, transition to postsec-

ondary education or career and technical training, or obtain a job;

Whereas a large portion of individuals in prison have low educational skills, and prisoners without educational skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many immigrants in the United States do not have the literacy skills necessary to succeed in the United States; and

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week highlights the need to ensure that each individual in the United States has the literacy skills necessary to succeed at home, at work, and in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 22 through 28, 2014, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week" to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist individuals in need of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs;

(3) recognizes the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs; and

(4) calls upon public, private, and nonprofit entities to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 559—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 19, 2014, AS "NATIONAL CHEMISTRY WEEK"

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 559

Whereas chemistry is the science of basic units of matter and, consequently, plays a role in every aspect of human life;

Whereas chemistry has broad applications, including food science, water quality, energy, sustainability, medicine, and electronics;

Whereas the science of chemistry is vital to improving the quality of human life and plays an important role in addressing critical global challenges;

Whereas innovations in chemistry continue to spur economic growth and job creation and have applications for a range of industries;

Whereas National Chemistry Week is part of a broader vision to improve human life through chemistry and to advance the chemistry enterprise and the practitioners of such enterprise for the benefit of communities and the environment;

Whereas the purpose of National Chemistry Week is to reach the public with educational messages about chemistry in order to foster greater understanding and appreciation for the applications and benefits of chemistry;

Whereas National Chemistry Week strives to stimulate the interest of young people, including women and underrepresented groups, in enthusiastically studying science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and in pursuing science-related careers that lead to innovations and major scientific breakthroughs; and

Whereas students who participate in National Chemistry Week deserve recognition and support for their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 19, 2014, as “National Chemistry Week”;

(2) supports the goals of and welcomes the participants in the 27th annual National Chemistry Week;

(3) recognizes the need to promote the fields of science (including chemistry), technology, engineering, and mathematics and encourage youth to pursue careers in such fields; and

(4) commends the American Chemical Society and the partners of such society for organizing and convening events and activities surrounding National Chemistry Week each year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 560—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2014 AS “SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH”

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 560

Whereas approximately 480,000 public and private school buses carry 26,000,000 children to and from school every weekday in the United States;

Whereas America’s 480,000 public and private school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the Nation;

Whereas during the school year, school buses make more than 55,000,000 passenger trips daily and students ride these school buses 10,000,000,000 times per year as the Nation’s fleet travels over 5,600,000,000 miles per school year;

Whereas school buses are designed to be safer than passenger vehicles and are 13 times safer than other modes of school transportation, and 44 times safer than vehicles driven by teenagers;

Whereas in an average year, about 25 school children are killed in school bus accidents, with one-third of these children struck by their own school buses in loading/unloading zones, one-third struck by motorists who fail to stop for school buses, and one-third killed as they approach or depart a school bus stop;

Whereas The Child Safety Network, celebrating 26 years of national public service, has collaborated with the National PTA and the school bus industry to create public service announcements to reduce distracted driving near school buses, increase ridership, and provide free resources to school districts in order to increase driver safety training, provide free technology for tracking school buses, reduce on-board bullying, and educate students; and

Whereas the adoption of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to make commitments to disseminate public service announcements designed to save children’s lives by making motorists aware of school bus safety issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2014 as “School Bus Safety Month”.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DESIGNATION OF A “NATIONAL LAO-HMONG RECOGNITION DAY”

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following

concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas the Lao-Hmong, which means “free people”, are Laotian members of the Hmong tribe and are noted for their warrior tradition, loyalty, and bravery;

Whereas beginning in 1960, the United States recruited thousands of the Lao-Hmong to fight against the Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese Army regulars in Laos;

Whereas the United States relied heavily on the Lao-Hmong Special Guerrilla Units to engage in direct combat with North Vietnamese troops from 1960 to 1975;

Whereas the Lao-Hmong conducted tactical guerrilla actions, flew thousands of deadly combat missions in support of the Armed Forces and the Central Intelligence Agency, and fought in conventional and guerrilla combat clashes with extreme casualties;

Whereas the Lao-Hmong, although outnumbered, fought against enemy forces to disrupt the flow of troops and war supplies along the Ho Chi Minh Trail;

Whereas the Lao-Hmong protected United States personnel, guarded United States Air Force radar installations, gathered critical intelligence about enemy operations, and undertook rescue missions to save the lives of downed American pilots;

Whereas more than 35,000 of the Lao-Hmong lost their lives, and many more were seriously injured and disabled;

Whereas thousands of Lao-Hmong suffered grievous injuries and permanent disabilities, and thousands more were captured and sent to concentration camps;

Whereas after the conclusion of the war, many Lao-Hmong soldiers were the victims of acts of retribution and atrocities by the Pathet Lao, causing many of the Lao-Hmong to flee to neighboring Thailand and become refugees; and

Whereas beginning with the City Council of Golden, Colorado, in 1995, various State and local governments have issued proclamations declaring July 22 as “Lao-Hmong Recognition Day”, and the establishment of a “National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day” would recognize the bravery, sacrifice, and loyalty to the United States exhibited by the Lao-Hmong in Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) expresses support for the designation of “National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day”; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe “National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day” with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3823. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3824. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amend-

ment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3825. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3826. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3827. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3828. Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3829. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3830. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3831. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3832. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3833. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3834. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3835. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3836. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3837. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3838. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3839. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3840. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3842. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3823. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of

the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1647. PLAN FOR EDUCATION OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON CYBER MATTERS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the education of officers and enlisted members of the Armed Forces relating to cyber security and cyber activities of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A framework for provision of basic cyber education for all members of the Armed Forces.

(2) A framework for undergraduate and postgraduate education, joint professional military education, and strategic war gaming for cyber strategic and operational leadership.

(3) Definitions of required positions, including military occupational specialties and rating specialties for each military department, along with the corresponding level of cyber training, education, qualifications, or certifications required for each specialty.

SA 3824. Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 606, line 5, strike “SUPPLIES” and insert “ASSEMBLIES”.

On page 606, line 12, strike “supplies critical” and insert “critical assemblies, such as rocket engines.”.

On page 607, line 1, strike “supplies critical” and insert “critical assemblies”.

On page 607, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the placement of orders or the exercise of options under a contract that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

On page 607, line 3, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

On page 607, lines 5 and 6, strike “or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation”.

On page 609, line 4, insert “certified under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program” after “providers”.

On page 612, strike lines 19 through 22, and insert the following:

(3) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan required by paragraph (1) not later than December 31, 2014.

(B) **EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.**—The Secretary may submit the plan required by paragraph (1) to the congressional defense

committees at a date later than the date specified in subparagraph (A) if the Secretary—

(i) determines that it is not practicable to submit the plan by the date specified in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the determination under clause (i) and the reasons for the termination.

SA 3825. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

“(1) fully and accurately counted; and

“(2) properly attributed to the State in which their residence at their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.”.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

SA 3826. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 535. TROOPS-TO-TEACHERS PROGRAM.

Section 1154 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

“(i) **GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO FACILITATE MEMBERS BECOMING TEACHERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal years 2015 through 2018, the Secretary may, using funds available under paragraph (8), make grants to eligible institutions of higher education

to be used by such institutions to assist members of the armed forces in becoming elementary school and secondary school teachers in schools described in subsection (b)(2).

“(2) **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, an eligible institution of higher education is an institution of higher education that—

“(A) has a main campus physically located not more than 30 miles from a major military installation that serves a very large number of members of the armed forces;

“(B) has an accredited college of education;

“(C) has a strong tradition of working with the armed forces;

“(D) has an undergraduate student body that includes not less than 1,000 students who are members of the armed forces, veterans, and members of the immediate families of members of the armed forces or veterans; and

“(E) has a consistent graduation rate of students in teacher education of 65 percent, as measured from the time a student is formally admitted into the teacher education program.

“(3) **USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each institution of higher educational awarded a grant under this section shall use grant amounts for purposes as follows:

“(i) To provide each eligible member of the armed forces participating in the Program under this subsection a stipend not in excess of \$5,000 each academic year.

“(ii) To provide each eligible member of the armed forces participating in the Program under this subsection other services (often called “wraparound services”) to assist the member in becoming a teacher, including scholarships, internship support, mentoring, child-care services, transportation expenses, undergraduate research opportunities, professional development, proprietary instructional supplies, expenses directly related to ease the burden of student teaching, academic tutoring, individualized counseling services, and in the case of members transferring from community colleges, bridge programs to assist in that transition.

“(B) **CONSTRUCTION WITH STIPEND LIMITATION.**—Any stipend provided under this paragraph shall not be treated as a stipend subject to the limitation in subsection (e)(3)(C).

“(4) **ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for purposes of this subsection, an eligible member of the armed forces is any member of the armed forces who—

“(i) before commencing participation in the Program under this subsection—

“(I) has served satisfactorily on active duty in the armed forces for four or more years;

“(II) has successfully completed all the education foundation courses required by the institution of higher education concerned for pursuit of a degree as an elementary school or secondary school teacher; and

“(III) possesses the academic or other qualifications required by the institution of higher education concerned for pursuit of a degree as an elementary school or secondary school teacher; and

“(ii) agrees to obtain any security clearance required for an elementary school or secondary school teacher in the State in which the member intends to obtain employment as a teacher after receipt of an education degree through support pursuant to the Program under this subsection.

“(B) **SELECTION.**—The Secretary may delegate to an institution of higher education

awarded a grant under this subsection the authority to select eligible members for participation in the Program under this subsection at such institution of higher education.

“(C) CONTINUATION AFTER SEPARATION FROM MILITARY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (D), an eligible member participating in the Program under this subsection may continue to participate in the Program under this subsection after the retirement, separation, or release of the member from the armed forces if the member’s last period of service in the armed forces is characterized as honorable by the Secretary concerned.

“(D) LIMITATION.—A veteran eligible for benefits under chapter 33 of title 38 may not participate in the Program under this subsection.

“(5) REPORTS BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—Each institution of higher education awarded a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary each year a report summarizing the participation of eligible members of the armed forces in the Program under this subsection through such institution of higher education from the commencement of the participation of members in the Program until three years after the receipt by members of education degrees through support pursuant to the Program. Each report shall summarize the following:

“(A) The amounts provided eligible members under paragraph (3).

“(B) The progress of eligible members after receipt of education degrees in obtaining and discharging employment as elementary school or secondary school teachers.

“(6) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 31, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of activities under the Program under this subsection in meeting the objectives set forth in subsection (b). The Secretary may submit to such committees such other reports on activities under the Program under this subsection as the Secretary considers appropriate to keep such committees informed of such activities.

“(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (10 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

“(B) The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38.

“(8) FUNDS.—Of the amount available for the Program in each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, up to amount equal to 25 percent of such amount may be used for grants under this subsection.”.

SA 3827. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. RECOMMENDATION OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU IN THE SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10506(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “upon the recommendation of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau” after “by the Secretary of the Army”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “upon the recommendation of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau” after “by the Secretary of the Air Force”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to assignments to the National Guard Bureau under section 10506 of title 10, United States Code, that occur after that date.

SA 3828. Mr. KAINÉ (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 123 and insert the following:

SEC. 123. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER CERTAIN FUNDS FOR REFUELING OF AIRCRAFT CARRIER AND CONSTRUCTION OF AMPHIBIOUS SHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent provided in appropriations Acts, upon a determination described in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer funds available in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy or any other Navy procurement account for either or both of the following purposes:

(1) Up to \$800,000,000 to conduct a refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. George Washington (CVN-73).

(2) Up to \$800,000,000 for the ship construction of a San Antonio class amphibious ship.

(b) DETERMINATION.—A determination described in this subsection is a determination by the Secretary of the Navy that—

(1) unobligated balances are available in the program or programs from which funds will be transferred pursuant to subsection (a) due to slower than expected program execution; and

(2) the transfer of funds will fill a high priority military need and is in the best interest of the Department of the Navy.

(c) CONTINGENT AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract for the procurement of one San Antonio class amphibious ship beginning in fiscal year 2015, and to use incremental funding for the procurement of that ship, if additional funds are made available for such purpose in fiscal year 2015 and the Secretary determines that such procurement will fill a high priority military need and is in the best interests of the Department of the Navy.

(d) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(e) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority under this section is in

addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

SA 3829. Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1247. INF TREATY INSPECTION AND VERIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the “INF Treaty”) not to possess, produce, or flight-test ground-launched missiles with range capabilities of 500 to 5,500 kilometers, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles.

(2) The United States Government has raised INF compliance concerns with the Russian Federation on repeated occasions in an effort to resolve United States concerns. The United States Government continues to attempt to address these very serious matters with the Government of the Russian Federation.

(3) On April 2, 2014, General Philip Breedlove, Commander of the United States European Command and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, stated, “A weapon capability that violates the INF Treaty, that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with . . . It cannot go unanswered.”

(4) The July 31, 2014, annual Department of State Report on Arms Control Compliance stated, “The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missiles with range capabilities of 500 km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles.”

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the responsibility for violating the terms and the spirit of the INF Treaty lies solely with Russian Federation President Vladimir Putin;

(2) the President should hold the Government of the Russian Federation accountable for these breaches of its obligations under the INF Treaty and obtain the complete and verifiable elimination of any military capabilities acquired as a result of flight testing ground launched missiles with ranges prohibited by the INF Treaty; and

(3) bringing the Russian Federation back into compliance with the INF Treaty will require a new verification and inspection regime that includes vigorous onsite inspections and interviews.

(c) REPORT ON INSPECTION AND VERIFICATION REGIME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, in classified and unclassified form, that includes a new INF inspection and verification regime that will ensure compliance of the Russian Federation with the INF Treaty.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum, include the following elements:

(A) A complete list of facilities that will require onsite inspections to ensure INF-noncompliant missiles and launchers are destroyed and that additional INF-noncompliant systems are not being developed tested, manufactured, or deployed.

(B) A list of individuals who could be interviewed to determine the extent of INF violations.

(C) A mechanism for sharing this and other relevant information with countries whose borders are within 5,500 kilometers of the Russian Federation.

(D) A cost estimate of the inspection regime.

(d) REPORT ON LEGAL ANALYSIS FOR COMPLIANCE JUDGMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the legal analysis underpinning any compliance judgment for any ground launched missile system where the assessed deployed range is between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.

(e) NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DEPLOYMENTS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall promptly notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing of any deployment by the Russian Federation of ground launched missile systems with assessed deployed ranges between 500 and 5500 kilometers. The notification shall include the system, deployment site, numbers, and other relevant information.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SA 3830. Mr. McCain submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 1067, insert the following:

SEC. 1067A. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) INFORMATION TO ACCOMPANY FUNDING REQUESTS FOR CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—Section 113 is amended by striking subsection (m).

(2) REPORT ON PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT CONSTRAINTS.—Section 129 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(3) ANNUAL REPORT ON COMBATANT COMMAND ACTIVITIES.—Section 153 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(4) OVERSIGHT OF PROCUREMENT, TEST, AND OPERATIONAL PLANS FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—Section 223a is amended by striking subsection (d).

(5) ANNUAL REPORT ON COMBATING TERRORISM.—

(A) REPEAL.—Chapter 9 is amended by striking section 229.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 9 is amended by striking the item relating to section 229.

(6) REPORT ON MILITARY FAMILY READINESS.—Section 1781b is amended by striking subsection (d).

(7) NOTIFICATION OF EQUIPMENT SCHEDULED FOR RETIREMENT OR DISPOSAL.—Section 2244a(c) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(8) REPORT ON PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH ENTITIES THAT COMPLY WITH THE SECONDARY ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL.—Section 2410i(c) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(9) ANNUAL REPORT ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION.—

(A) REPEAL.—Chapter 146 is amended by striking section 2462.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 146 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2462.

(10) STRATEGIC SOURCING PLAN OF ACTION AND REPORT ON SAVINGS, CONSOLIDATION, RESTRUCTURING, OR REENGINEERING.—

(A) REPEAL.—Chapter 146 is further amended by striking section 2475.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 146 is further amended by striking the item relating to section 2475.

(11) REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE GUIDANCE.—

(A) REPEAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 148 is amended by striking section 2504.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 148 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2504.

(12) NOTIFICATION OF AWARD OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS TO ENTITIES CONTROLLED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.—Section 2536(b) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1) The Secretary concerned” and inserting “The Secretary concerned”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(13) REPORT ON RELOCATION OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.—Section 2827 is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(14) ANNUAL REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING FUNDS.—Section 2884 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b);

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (2) as subsections (b);

(ii) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(iii) by striking “REPORTS.—” and all that follows through “(1) The Secretary” and inserting “REPORTS.—The Secretary”; and

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(C) in subsection (b), as redesignated by subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) by inserting “ELEMENTS.—” before “For each proposed contract”;

(ii) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(D) in subsection (b), as redesignated by subparagraph (B)(iv)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2);

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(iii) by striking “(A) In the case” and inserting “CONTRACTS WITH PRIVATE PARTIES.—(1) In the case”;

(iv) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(v) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

(15) NOTIFICATION OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT CONDUCTED USING PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF ELECTRICITY FROM ALTERNATE ENERGY AND COGENERATION PRODUCTION FACILITIES.—Section 2916 is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACTS.—

(1) REPORT ON PRICE TREND ANALYSIS FOR SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURCHASED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011.—Section 892 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(2) DISPLAY OF ANNUAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR SOVEREIGNTY ALERT MISSION UNDER DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—Section 354 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) is hereby repealed.

(3) REPORT ON GRANTS OF EXCEPTION TO COSTS OR PRICING DATA CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS AND WAIVERS OF COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS UNDER BOB STUMP NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.—Section 817 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d);

(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(C) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking “this section:” and all that follows through “(1) The term” and inserting “this section, the term”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and moving such paragraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left.

(4) REPORT ON ENHANCEMENT OF ACTIVITIES OF DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR

FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Section 1409 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 22 U.S.C. 2778 note) is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than” and inserting “Not later than”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(5) REPORT ON EXPERIMENTAL PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—Section 1101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261; 5 U.S.C. 3104 note) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(c) REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION AND OVERSIGHT UNDER ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME ACT OF 1991.—Section 1511 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 411) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (h); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

(d) AUDITS OF UNDEFINITE CONTRACTS UNDER DEFENSE ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1986.—Section 908(b) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act of 1986 (as enacted pursuant to section 101(c) of Public Law 99-500 (100 Stat. 1783-140) and identically enacted pursuant to section 101(c) of Public Law 99-591 (100 Stat. 3341-140) and Public Law 99-661 (100 Stat. 3919; 10 U.S.C. 2326 note)) is amended—

(1) by striking “shall—” and all that follows through “(1) periodically conduct an audit” and inserting “shall periodically conduct an audit”; and

(2) by striking “departments; and” and inserting “departments.”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(e) REPORTS UNDER OTHER ACTS.—

(1) COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—Section 9(y)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(y)(6)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(2) REPORT ON MERITORIOUS SECURITY WAIVERS UNDER INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 3002(c) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3343c(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

SA 3831. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 354. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO PROVISION OF INSTALLATION-SUPPORT SERVICES THROUGH INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT AGREEMENTS.

(a) TRANSFER OF SECTION 2336 TO CHAPTER 159.—

(1) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 2336 of title 10, United States Code, is transferred to chapter 159 of such title, inserted after section 2678, and redesignated as section 2679.

(2) REVISED SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section, as so transferred and redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2679. Installation-support services: intergovernmental support agreements”.

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Such section, as so transferred and redesignated, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary concerned” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an” and inserting “An”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B) respectively; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘intergovernmental support agreement’ means a legal instrument reflecting a relationship between the Secretary concerned and a State or local government that contains such terms and conditions as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate for the purposes of this section and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2336.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2678 the following new item:

“2679. Installation-support services: intergovernmental support agreements.”.

SA 3832. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1034 and insert the following:

SEC. 1034. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TRANSFER OR RELEASE INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no funds may be obligated or expended to transfer or release any covered detainee at Guantanamo to the custody or control of such individual’s country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), until the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 90 days after the date of submittal to Congress of the report required by subsection (d); or

(B) the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) in the case of a transfer or release to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen, until January 1, 2016.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the obligation or expenditure of

funds to transfer any covered detainee at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of such individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the appropriate committees of Congress of the issuance of any order described in paragraph (1).

(3) DELAY IN DISCHARGE.—An order described in paragraph (1) may not be carried out until the date that is 5 days after the date on which the appropriate committees of Congress are notified of the order pursuant to paragraph (2).

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of the United States shall be liable in his or her individual capacity for a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each covered detainee at Guantanamo transferred or released in violation of subsection (a) pursuant to an action or order of the officer or employee of the United States.

(2) NO REPRESENTATION BY UNITED STATES.—Notwithstanding section 50.15 or 50.16 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any other provision of law, the United States Government may not provide representation to, or retain or reimburse private counsel for the representation of, an officer or employee in an action under paragraph (1).

(3) QUI TAM ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A person may bring a civil action for a violation of subsection (a) for the person and for the United States Government, seeking a civil penalty under paragraph (1). The action shall be brought in the name of the Government. The action may be dismissed only if the court and the Attorney General give written consent to the dismissal and their reasons for consenting.

(B) COMPLAINT.—A copy of the complaint and written disclosure of substantially all material evidence and information the person possesses shall be served on the Government pursuant to rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Government may elect to intervene and proceed with the action within 30 days after it receives both the complaint and the material evidence and information.

(C) DETERMINATION BY GOVERNMENT.—Before the expiration of the 30-day period under subparagraph (B), the Government shall—

(i) proceed with the action, in which case the action shall be conducted by the Government; or

(ii) notify the court that it declines to take over the action, in which case the person bringing the action shall have the right to conduct the action.

(D) INDIVIDUAL CONDUCTING ACTION.—If the Government elects not to proceed with the action, and upon request and at the Government’s expense, the Government shall be served with copies of all pleadings filed in the action and shall be supplied with copies of all deposition transcripts.

(E) AWARD TO QUI TAM PLAINTIFF.—A person bringing an action under subparagraph (A) shall receive 50 percent of the amount of the civil penalty imposed on the officer or employee of the United States and the court shall award the person reasonable expenses which the court finds to have been necessarily incurred, plus reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, to be paid by the defendant.

(F) EXPEDITED APPEAL OF DISMISSAL.—It shall be the duty of the courts of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any appeal by a person bringing a

civil action under subparagraph (A) of the dismissal of the civil action with the consent of the Attorney General.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A detailed description of the previous assessments by Joint Task Force Guantanamo regarding the risk that the 5 detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Qatar on May 31, 2014, would reengage in terrorist activity after transfer.

(B) A detailed description of any changes between the assessments described in subparagraph (A) and the assessments as of May 31, 2014, of the risk that the detainees described in that subparagraph would reengage in terrorist activity after transfer as described in that subparagraph, including the reasons for such changes.

(C) A detailed description of the prior instances, if any, in which Qatar did not fully honor its commitments to monitor, detain, or control the travel of individuals formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

(D) A detailed assessment of the likelihood that the 5 detainees described in subparagraph (A) will return to Afghanistan or reengage in terrorism.

(E) A detailed assessment of whether the transfer of the 5 detainees as described in subparagraph (A) will increase the likelihood that the Taliban and terrorist groups around the world will try to capture United States individuals or personnel in order to obtain concessions from the United States.

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, WITHOUT EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION OF THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—No detainee described in paragraph (2) may be transferred or released from United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to a foreign country without the express written authorization of the President.

(2) COVERED DETAINEES.—A detainee described in this paragraph is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(A) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States;

(B) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense; and

(C) is held as of the date of the enactment of this Act at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify, limit, or supersede the requirements under section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (10 U.S.C. 801 note) relating to the transfer or release of an individual detained at Guantanamo (as defined in subsection (e)(2) of such section).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Com-

mittee on Appropriations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “covered detainee at Guantanamo” means each individual who—

(A) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is or was held on January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

(3) The term “officer or employee of the United States”—

(A) includes—

(i) the President;

(ii) the head and any officer or employee of any Executive agency or military department (as those terms are defined in chapter 1 of title 5, United States Code); and

(iii) any other officer or employee of the United States; and

(B) does not include—

(i) a member of the Armed Forces; or

(ii) an officer or employee of an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)).

SA 3833. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 737. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE REHABILITATION AND VOCATIONAL BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH SEVERE INJURIES OR ILLNESSES.

Section 1631(b)(2) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 458; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SA 3834. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON EMPLOYMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUALS AND CONTRACTORS WITH SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—An individual or contractor with a seriously delinquent tax debt may not be appointed to, or continue serving in, a position within or funded by the Department of Defense.

(b) SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “seriously delinquent tax debt” means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of such Code, except that such term does not include—

(1) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code; and

(2) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code, or relief under subsection (a), (b), or (f) of section 6015 of such Code, is requested or pending.

SA 3835. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON BALANCES CARRIED FORWARD BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AT THE END OF EACH FISCAL YEAR.

Not later March 1 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress, and publish on the Internet website of the Department of Defense available to the public, the following:

(1) The total dollar amount of all balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of the previous fiscal year by account.

(2) The total dollar amount of all unobligated balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of the previous fiscal year by account.

(3) The total dollar amount of any balances (both obligated and unobligated) that have been carried forward by the Department of Defense for five years or more as of the end of the previous fiscal year by account.

SA 3836. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING AGENCIES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government—

(1) use available administrative authority to eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in Government Accountability Office reports on duplication and overlap in Government programs;

(2) identify and submit to Congress a report setting the legislative action required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in the reports referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) determine the total cost savings that—
(A) will accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (1) as a result of the actions taken under that paragraph; and

(B) could accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (2) as a result of the actions proposed to be taken under that paragraph using the legislative authority set forth under that paragraph.

SA 3837. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 830. ENHANCED WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON PREVENTION OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.—

(1) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Section 2409(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not be discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing” and inserting “may not be prohibited in any way from, or discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for, disclosing”.

(2) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Section 4705(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not be discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing” and inserting “may not be prohibited in any way from, or discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for, disclosing”.

(b) CONTRACT CLAUSE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to require that any contract entered into after such date by an executive agency, and any subcontract at any tier, include the following clause: “The contractor shall not enter into any agreement with an employee performing work under this contract that would prohibit that employee from disclosing information as described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 2409(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code or section 4705(b) of title 41, United States Code, to officials described in such sections.”.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SA 3838. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction,

and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT AGENCY EXPENDITURES ON CONFERENCES.

(a) CONFERENCE LIMITATIONS.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT EXPENDED ON A CONFERENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No agency may expend more than \$500,000 to support a single conference, unless the head of the agency and the Chief Financial Officer of the agency submits to Congress before the conference a written certification that the conference is in the national interest, which shall include—

(i) an estimate of the total cost of the conference;

(ii) the dates of the conference;

(iii) an estimate of the number of full-time equivalent employees attending the conference;

(iv) any costs associated with planning for the conference; and

(v) an explanation of how the conference advances the mission of the agency.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude an agency from receiving financial support or other assistance from a foundation or other non-Federal source to pay or defray the costs of a conference.

(2) LIMITATION ON CONFERENCE POLICIES.—

An agency may not establish or implement a policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a location for travel, an event, a meeting, or a conference because the location is perceived to be a resort or vacation destination.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given that term under section 5701(1) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term “conference” means a meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, or event that involves attendee travel.

SA 3839. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DATABASE ON PATIENT SAFETY, QUALITY OF CARE, AND OUTCOME MEASURES REGARDING HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop and make available to the public a comprehensive database containing all applicable patient safety, quality of care, and outcome measures for health care provided by the Department of Defense that are tracked by the Secretary.

(2) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall update the database required by paragraph (1) not less frequently than once every six months.

(3) UNAVAILABLE MEASURES.—For any measure that the Secretary would otherwise publish in the database required by paragraph (1) but has not done so because such measure is not available, the Secretary shall publish notice in the database of the reason for such unavailability and a timeline for making such measure available in the database.

(4) ACCESSIBILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the database required by paragraph (1) is accessible to the public through the primary Internet website of the Department and through each primary Internet website of a Department medical center.

(b) SHARING OF INFORMATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT MEDICAL CENTERS AND DEFENSE HEALTH AGENCY.—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to facilitate and enhance sharing between the medical centers of the Department of Defense and the Defense Health Agency on information on patient safety, quality of care, and outcomes for health care provided by such medical centers, including information obtained through the measures developed pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) HOSPITAL COMPARE WEBSITE OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—

(1) AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the provision by the Secretary of Defense of such information as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may require to report and make publicly available patient quality and outcome information concerning Department of Defense medical centers through the Hospital Compare Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services or any successor Internet website.

(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED.—The information provided by the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Measures of timely and effective health care.

(B) Measures of readmissions, complications of death, including with respect to 30-day mortality rates and 30-day readmission rates, surgical complication measures, and health care related infection measures.

(C) Survey data of patient experiences, including the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems or any similar successor survey developed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) Any other measures required of or reported with respect to hospitals participating in the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(3) UNAVAILABLE INFORMATION.—For any applicable metric collected by the Department of Defense or required to be provided under paragraph (2) and withheld from or unavailable in the Hospital Compare Internet website or successor Internet website, the Secretary of Defense shall publish a notice on such Internet website stating the reason why such metric was withheld from public disclosure and a timeline for making such metric available, if applicable.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE SAFETY AND QUALITY METRICS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the safety and quality metrics made publicly available by the Secretary of Defense under this section to assess

the degree to which the Secretary is complying with the provisions of this section.

SA 3840. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

SEC. 215. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PLANS FOR SOFTWARE FOR F-35 AIRCRAFT.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that software in weapon systems of the United States has become more complex and a larger portion of the acquisition and sustainment costs of such systems.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should—

(1) submit to the congressional defense committees executable timelines and sustainment plans for each section of the report submitted to the congressional defense committees under section 218(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 707; Public Law 113-66);

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees executable timelines and sustainment plans for the source of repair or sustainment decisions for the totality of the software for the F-35 aircraft program that was recommended in such report; and

(3) establish the baseline for software sustainment for the F-35 aircraft program at the earlier of the date—

(A) of the first initial operating capability (IOC) of such program;

(B) on which the F-35 aircraft is fielded or tasked; or

(C) when combatant commanders start integrating the F-35 aircraft into training, operations, or planning.

SA 3841. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2842. REDESIGNATION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER IN JONESBORO, ARKANSAS, AS PFC HAROLD EUGENE "GENE" SELLERS-UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The United States Armed Forces Reserve Center located at 6109 C W Post Road, Jonesboro, Arkansas, is hereby renamed the "PFC Harold Eugene 'Gene' Sellers-United States Armed Forces Reserve Center".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference to the United States Armed Forces Reserve Center located at 6109 C W Post Road, Jonesboro, Arkansas, in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the PFC Harold Eugene "Gene" Sellers-United States Armed Forces Reserve Center.

SA 3842. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2835. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER LYNN HAVEN FUEL DEPOT, LYNN HAVEN, FLORIDA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of Lynn Haven, Florida (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 144 acres at the former Lynn Haven Fuel Depot in Bay County, Florida.

(2) **EXCLUDED PROPERTY.**—The real property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall not include the portion of the former Lynn Haven Fuel Depot authorized to be conveyed by the Secretary to Florida State University by section 2843 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 553).

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—

(1) **CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.**—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a)(1), the City shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **TREATMENT OF CASH PAYMENTS RECEIVED.**—Cash payment received by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1) shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary under subsection (e) of section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, and shall be available to the Secretary for the same uses and subject to the same limitations as provided in that section.

(c) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a)(1) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Reforming America's Outdated Energy Tax Code."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "United States Strategy to Defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 17, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on September 17, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Why Net Neutrality Matters: Protecting Consumers and Competition Through Meaningful Open Internet Rules."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, in room S-216 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Who Is The Economy Working For? The Impact of Rising Inequality on the American Economy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the privileges of the floor be granted to Chikulupi Kasaka.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that K.C. Courtland, who has been a military fellow in our office, be granted the privileges of the floor for today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Scott Robertson, a fellow with the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session, and that Brent Becker and Ben Strube, interns with the committee also be granted floor privileges for today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privi-

leges be granted to Maj. David James Wilson, a U.S. Air Force officer who is currently serving as a defense legislative fellow in my office, for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1009 through and including 1026 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gustave F. Perna

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kathleen M. Creighton

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Todd J. Squire

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Brian B. Brown
Rear Adm. (lh) Sean R. Filipowski
Rear Adm. (lh) Brett C. Heimbigner

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven L. Kwast

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the

Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Scott G. Perry

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph J. Heck

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Mark S. Inch

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Philip S. Davidson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Dixon R. Smith

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Tod D. Wolters

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Veralinn Jamieson

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John W. Nicholson, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Paul M. Benenati

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael A. Calhoun

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Bret D. Daugherty

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United

States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Raul E. Escribano
Colonel Timothy J. McAteer
Colonel Jeffrey L. Milhorn

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1950 AIR FORCE nomination of Lisa L. Adams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1951 AIR FORCE nomination of Richard D. Mink, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1953 AIR FORCE nominations (11) beginning DAVID L. ALLISON, and ending KWANI D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

PN1604 ARMY nominations (417) beginning STEPHEN R. ABRAMS, and ending G010257, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 10, 2014.

PN1605 ARMY nominations (420) beginning ISAIAH C. ABBOTT, and ending D012187, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 10, 2014.

PN1606 ARMY nominations (862) beginning JASON K. ABBOTT, and ending D012084, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 10, 2014.

PN1954 ARMY nomination of Claudia D. Henderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1955 ARMY nominations (265) beginning JESSE ABREU, and ending D011533, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1956 ARMY nomination of Sun S. Macupa, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1957 ARMY nominations (450) beginning BRIAN S. ADAMS, and ending G010266, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1958 ARMY nominations (280) beginning CLARK C.K. ADAMS, II, and ending G010269, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN2009 ARMY nominations (3) beginning HERBERT J. BROCK, IV, and ending GREGORY S. PHIPPS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

PN2010 ARMY nominations (125) beginning SYED AHMED, and ending AMY ZINGALIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

PN2011 ARMY nominations (26) beginning BRADLEY AEBI, and ending KEVIN WETZEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appear in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

IN THE NAVY

PN1959 NAVY nomination of Edward J. Eder which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1960 NAVY nomination of William A. Burns, which was received by the Senate and

appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1961 NAVY nomination of Kevin L. Bell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1962 NAVY nomination of Clayton M. Pendergrass, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1963 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CASEY D. FERGUSON, and ending ANTHONY K. TOBIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1964 NAVY nominations (71) beginning CRYSTAL R. AANDAHL, and ending LINA M. YECOPOT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1965 NAVY nominations (73) beginning CYNTHIA N. ABELLA, and ending YU ZHENG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1966 NAVY nominations (34) beginning CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS, and ending MARLIN WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1967 NAVY nominations (35) beginning JESSE D. ADAMS, and ending NICHOLAS B. STAMPFLI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1968 NAVY nominations (30) beginning JON A. ANGLE, and ending KHALID J. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1969 NAVY nominations (67) beginning TODD A. ANDERSON, and ending SHEVONNE K. WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1970 NAVY nominations (73) beginning AUSTIN G. ALDRIDGE, and ending NATHAN T. WOODWARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN1971 NAVY nominations (182) beginning ALWIN L. ALBERT, and ending JACK M. ZUCKERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 31, 2014.

PN2012 NAVY nomination of Gregory E. Oxford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

PN2013 NAVY nomination of Benjamin I. Abney, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

PN2014 NAVY nomination of Joel N. Peterson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

PN2015 NAVY nominations (8) beginning GREGORY C. CATHCART, and ending MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2014.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on H.J. Res.

124, the Senate consider Executive Calendar Nos. 893, 524, 959, 702, 1002, 997, 708, 996, and PN 1917; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any roll-call votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DHS OIG MANDATES REVISION
ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 567, S. 2651.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2651) to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 2651

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CARGO INSPECTION TARGETING SYSTEM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Subsections (g) and (h) of section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–293; 46 U.S.C. 70101 note) are repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–293; 118 Stat. 1085), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "and (j)" and inserting "and (h)"; and

(B) by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(b) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF COAST GUARD PERFORMANCE.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 888(f) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468(f)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 888 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

(c) ANNUAL REVIEW OF GRANTS TO STATES AND HIGH-RISK URBAN AREAS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 2022(a)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)(3)) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 2022(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (4), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and

(ii) by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2651), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SUNSCREEN INNOVATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 568, S. 2141.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2141) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 2141

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sunscreen Innovation Act”.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF NONPRESCRIPTION SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subchapter I—Nonprescription Sunscreen and Other Active Ingredients

“SEC. 586. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subchapter—

“(1) the term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the Nonprescription Drug Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration or any successor to such Committee;

“(2) the term ‘final sunscreen order’ means an order published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information stating that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

“(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order; or

“(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded;

“(3) the term ‘GRASE’ means generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling of a drug as described in section 201(p);

“(4) the term ‘GRASE determination’ means, with respect to a nonprescription active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription active ingredients, a determination of whether such ingredient or combination of ingredients is GRASE;

“(5) the term ‘nonprescription’ means not subject to section 503(b)(1);

“(6) the term ‘pending request’ means each request with respect to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient submitted under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act) for consideration for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system—

“(A) that was determined to be eligible for such review by publication of a notice of eligibility in the Federal Register prior to the date of enactment of such Act; and

“(B) for which safety and effectiveness data have been submitted to the Secretary prior to such date of enactment;

“(7) the term ‘proposed sunscreen order’ means an order containing a tentative determination published by the Secretary in the Federal Register containing information proposing that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients—

“(A) is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order;

“(B) is not GRASE and is misbranded; or

“(C) is not GRASE and is misbranded because the data are insufficient to classify such ingredient or combination of ingredients as GRASE and not misbranded and additional information is necessary to allow the Secretary to determine otherwise;

“(8) the term ‘sponsor’ means the person that submitted—

“(A) a request under section 586A;

“(B) a pending request; or

“(C) any other application subject to this subchapter;

“(9) the term ‘sunscreen’ means a drug containing one or more sunscreen active ingredients; and

“(10) the term ‘sunscreen active ingredient’ means an active ingredient that is intended for application to the skin of humans for purposes of absorbing, reflecting, or scattering ultraviolet radiation.

“SEC. 586A. SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS.

“Any person may submit a request to the Secretary for a determination of whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or a combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof (including dosage form, dosage strength, and route of administration) is GRASE and should be included in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen.

“SEC. 586B. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS; DATA SUBMISSION; FILING.

“(a) **ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 calendar days after the date of receipt of a request under section 586A, the Secretary shall—

“(A) determine, in accordance with paragraph (2), whether the request is eligible for further review under subsection (b) and section 586C;

“(B) notify the sponsor of the determination of the Secretary; and

“(C) make such determination publicly available in accordance with paragraph (3) and subsection (b)(1).

“(2) **CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible for review under subsection (b) and section 586C, a request shall be for a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, for use under specified conditions, to be prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, that—

“(i) is not included in part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen; and

“(ii) has been used to a material extent and for a material time under such conditions, as described in section 201(p)(2).

“(B) **ESTABLISHMENT OF TIME AND EXTENT.**—A sponsor shall include in a request under section 586A the information required under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) to meet the standard described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

“(A) **REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.**—If a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is determined under paragraph (1)(A) to be eligible for further review, the Secretary shall make the request publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

“(B) **IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.**—At the time that a request is made under section 586A, the sponsor of such request shall identify any information that such sponsor considers to be confidential information described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) **CONFIDENTIALITY DURING ELIGIBILITY REVIEW.**—The information contained in a request under section 586A shall remain confidential during the Secretary’s consideration under this section of whether the request is eligible for further review consistent with section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(b) **DATA SUBMISSION AND FILING OF REQUESTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a request under section 586A that is determined to be eligible under subsection (a) for further review under this section and section 586C, the Secretary shall, in notifying the public under subsection (a)(1)(C) of such eligibility determination, post the eligibility determination on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration, invite the sponsor of such request and any other interested party to submit comments, and provide a period of not less than 45 calendar days for comments in support of or otherwise relating to a GRASE determination, including published and unpublished data and other information related to the safety and efficacy of such request.

“(2) **FILING DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 60 calendar days after the submission of data and other information described in paragraph (1) by the sponsor, the Secretary shall determine whether the data and other information submitted by the sponsor under this section are sufficiently complete, including being formatted in a manner that enables the Secretary to determine the completeness of such data and information, to enable the Secretary to conduct a substantive review under section 586C with respect to such request. Not later than 60 calendar days after the submission of data and other information described in paragraph (1) by the sponsor, if the Secretary determines—

“(A) that such data and other information are sufficiently complete, the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue a written notification to the sponsor of the determination to file such request, and make such notification publicly available; and

“(ii) file such request made under section 586A; or

“(B) that such data and other information are not sufficiently complete, the Secretary shall issue a written notification to the sponsor of the determination to refuse to file the request, which shall include the reasons for the refusal, including why such data and other information are not sufficiently complete, and make such notification publicly available.

“(3) REFUSAL TO FILE A REQUEST.—

“(A) REQUEST FOR MEETINGS; SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION.—If the Secretary refuses to file a request made under section 586A, the sponsor may—

“(i) within 30 calendar days of receipt of written notification of such refusal, request, in writing, a meeting with the Secretary regarding the filing determination; and

“(ii) submit additional data or other information.

“(B) MEETINGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a sponsor seeks a meeting under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall convene the meeting within 30 calendar days of the request for such meeting.

“(ii) ACTIONS AFTER MEETING.—Following any meeting held under clause (i)—

“(I) the Secretary may file the request within 60 calendar days;

“(II) the sponsor may submit additional data or other information; or

“(III) if the sponsor elects, within 120 calendar days, to have the Secretary file the request (with or without amendments to correct any purported deficiencies to the request)—

“(aa) the Secretary shall file the request over protest, not later than 30 calendar days after the sponsor makes such election;

“(bb) at the time of filing, the Secretary shall provide written notification of such filing to the sponsor; and

“(cc) the Secretary shall make such notification publicly available.

“(iii) REQUESTS FILED OVER PROTEST.—The Secretary shall not require the sponsor to resubmit a copy of the request for purposes of filing a request filed over protest, as described in clause (ii)(III).

“(C) SUBMISSIONS OF ADDITIONAL DATA OR OTHER INFORMATION.—Within 60 calendar days of any submission of additional data or other information under subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B)(ii)(II), the Secretary shall reconsider the previous determination made under paragraph (2) with respect to the applicable request and make a new determination in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

“(A) REDACTIONS FOR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—After the period of confidentiality described in subsection (a)(3)(C), the Secretary shall make data and other information submitted in connection with a request under section 586A publicly available, with redactions for information that is treated as confidential under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, or section 301(j) of this Act.

“(B) IDENTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BY SPONSOR.—A person submitting information under this section shall identify at the time of such submission the portions of such information that the person considers to be confidential information described in subparagraph (A).

“SEC. 586C. GRASE DETERMINATION.

“(a) REVIEW OF NEW REQUEST.—

“(1) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a request under section 586A, not later

than 300 calendar days after the date on which such request is filed under subsection (b)(2)(A) or (b)(3)(B)(ii)(III) of section 586B, the Secretary—

“(A) may convene a meeting of the Advisory Committee to review such request; and

“(B) shall complete the review of such request and issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

“(2) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—If the Secretary does not issue a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (1)(B) within such 300-day period, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner. If such sponsor so notifies the Office of the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall, not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under this paragraph, issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

“(3) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed sunscreen order issued under paragraph (1)(B) or (2) with respect to a request shall provide for a period of 45 calendar days for public comment.

“(4) MEETING.—A sponsor may request, in writing, a meeting with respect to a proposed sunscreen order issued under this subsection and described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 586(7), not later than 30 calendar days after the Secretary issues such order. The Secretary shall convene a meeting with such sponsor not later than 45 calendar days after such request for a meeting.

“(5) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—With respect to a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (1)(B) or (2)—

“(A) the Secretary shall issue a final sunscreen order—

“(i) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 586(7), not later than 90 calendar days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3); or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (C) of section 586(7), not later than 210 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed sunscreen order; or

“(B) if the Secretary does not issue such final sunscreen order within such 90- or 210-calendar-day period, as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner.

“(6) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to a proposed sunscreen order subject to paragraph (5)(B) not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under such paragraph.

“(b) REVIEW OF PENDING REQUESTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The review of a pending request shall be carried out by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF SECTIONS 586A AND 586B.—Sections 586A and 586B shall not apply with respect to any pending request.

“(3) FEEDBACK LETTERS AS PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 586(7), a letter issued pursuant to section 330.14(g) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, with respect to a pending request, shall be deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order and displayed on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration. Notification of the availability of such letter shall be published in the Federal Register not later than 45 calendar days after the date of enactment of such Act.

“(4) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a pending request for which the Sec-

retary has not issued a letter pursuant to section 330.14(g) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations before the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall complete review of such request and, not later than 90 calendar days after the date of enactment of such Act, issue a proposed sunscreen order with respect to such request.

“(5) PROPOSED SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—If the Secretary does not issue a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (4), or the Secretary does not publish a notification of the availability of a letter under paragraph (3), as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner of such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall, not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under this paragraph, issue a proposed order with respect to such request.

“(6) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—A proposed sunscreen order issued under paragraph (4) or (5), or a notification of the availability of a letter under paragraph (3), with respect to a pending request shall provide for a period of 45 calendar days for public comment.

“(7) MEETING.—A sponsor may request, in writing, a meeting with respect to a proposed sunscreen order issued under this subsection, including a letter deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), not later than 30 calendar days after the Secretary issues such order or the date upon which such feedback letter is deemed to be a proposed sunscreen order, as applicable. The Secretary shall convene a meeting with such sponsor not later than 45 calendar days after the date of such request for a meeting.

“(8) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In the case of a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), (4), or (5), an Advisory Committee meeting may be convened for the purpose of reviewing and providing recommendations regarding the pending request.

“(9) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—In the case of a proposed sunscreen order under paragraph (3), (4), or (5)—

“(A) the Secretary shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to the request—

“(i) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 586(7), not later than 90 calendar days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (6); or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed sunscreen order described in subparagraph (C) of section 586(7)—

“(I) if the Advisory Committee is not convened under paragraph (8), not later than 210 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits the additional information requested pursuant to such proposed sunscreen order, which shall include a rationale for not convening such Advisory Committee; or

“(II) if the Advisory Committee is convened under paragraph (8), not later than 270 calendar days after the date on which the sponsor submits such additional information; or

“(B) if the Secretary does not issue such final sunscreen order within such 90-, 210-, or 270-calendar-day period, as applicable, the sponsor of such request may notify the Office of the Commissioner about such request and request review by the Office of the Commissioner.

“(10) FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER BY COMMISSIONER.—The Commissioner shall issue a final sunscreen order with respect to a proposed sunscreen order subject to paragraph (9)(B) not later than 60 calendar days after the date of notification under such paragraph.

“(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall not be required to—

“(1) convene the Advisory Committee—

“(A) more than once with respect to any request under section 586A or any pending request; or

“(B) more than twice in any calendar year with respect to the review under this section; or

“(2) submit more than a total of 3 requests under section 586A or pending requests to the Advisory Committee per meeting.

“(d) NO DELEGATION.—Any responsibility vested in the Commissioner by subsection (a)(2), (a)(6), (b)(5), or (b)(10) shall not be delegated.

“(e) EFFECT OF FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final sunscreen order determining that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded, a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients shall be permitted to be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce for use under the conditions described in such final sunscreen order, in accordance with all requirements applicable to drugs not subject to section 503(b)(1), for so long as such final sunscreen order remains in effect.

“(B) SUNSCREEN ACTIVE INGREDIENTS DETERMINED NOT TO BE GRASE.—Upon issuance of a final sunscreen order determining that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded, a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients shall not be introduced or delivered into interstate commerce, for use under the conditions described in such final sunscreen order, unless an application is approved pursuant to section 505 with respect to a sunscreen containing such ingredient or combination of ingredients, or unless conditions are later established under which such ingredient or combination of ingredients is later determined to be GRASE and not misbranded under the over-the-counter drug monograph system.

“(2) AMENDMENTS TO FINAL SUNSCREEN ORDERS.—

“(A) AMENDMENTS AT INITIATIVE OF SECRETARY.—In the event that information relevant to a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients becomes available to the Secretary after issuance of a final sunscreen order, the Secretary may amend such final sunscreen order by issuing a new proposed sunscreen order under subsection (a)(1) and following the procedures set forth in this section.

“(B) PETITION TO AMEND FINAL ORDER.—Any interested person may petition the Secretary to amend a final sunscreen order under section 10.30, title 21 Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations). If the Secretary grants any petition under such section, the Secretary shall initiate the process for amending a final sunscreen order by issuing a new proposed sunscreen order under subsection (a)(1) and following the procedures set forth in this section.

“(C) APPLICABILITY OF FINAL ORDERS.—Once the Secretary issues a new proposed sunscreen order to amend a final sunscreen order under subparagraph (A) or (B), such final sunscreen order shall remain in effect and paragraph (3) shall not apply to such final sunscreen order until the Secretary has issued a new final sunscreen order or has determined not to amend the final sunscreen order.

“(3) INCLUSION OF INGREDIENTS THAT ARE SUBJECTS OF FINAL ORDERS IN THE SUNSCREEN MONOGRAPH.—

“(A) AMENDING REGULATIONS.—

“(i) REQUIREMENT.—At any time that the Secretary proposes to amend part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) concerning nonprescription sunscreen, including pursuant to section 586E, except as provided in clause (iv), the Secretary shall include in such part 352 (or any successor

regulations) any nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that is the subject of an effective final sunscreen order of the type described in section 586(2)(A) and issued since the time that the Secretary last amended such regulations. Such regulation shall set forth conditions of use under which each such ingredient or combination of ingredients is GRASE and not misbranded. If these conditions differ from, or are in addition to, those previously set forth in the applicable final sunscreen order, the Secretary shall provide notice and opportunity for comment on such conditions in the rulemaking, and the applicable final sunscreen order shall continue in effect until the effective date of a final regulation, as set forth in clause (iii).

“(ii) INCLUSION OF ORDERS.—In proposing to amend the regulations as described in clause (i), the Secretary shall include in the proposed regulations a list of final sunscreen orders that shall cease to be effective on the effective date of a resulting final regulation. Such list shall include all final sunscreen orders of the type described in section 586(2)(A) that are in effect on the date that such regulations are proposed, with the exception that such list shall not include any final sunscreen orders that, on the date that the regulations are proposed, the Secretary is in the process of amending under paragraph (2).

“(iii) ORDERS NO LONGER EFFECTIVE.—Any final sunscreen order included by the Secretary in a list described in clause (ii) and in a list included in resulting final regulations shall cease to be effective on the date that such final regulations including such order in such list become effective.

“(iv) INGREDIENTS NOT GRASE.—If, notwithstanding a final sunscreen order stating that a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded if marketed in accordance with such order, while amending the regulations as described in clause (i), the Secretary concludes that such ingredient or combination of ingredients is no longer GRASE for use in nonprescription sunscreen, the Secretary shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, either initiate the process for amending the final sunscreen order set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection or include in a proposed regulation an explanation and information supporting the determination of the Secretary that such ingredient or combination of ingredients is no longer GRASE for use in nonprescription sunscreen.

“(B) PROCEDURE FOR UPDATING REGULATIONS.—After the Secretary amends and finalizes the regulations under part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations under section 586E and such regulations become effective, the Secretary may use direct final rulemaking to include in such regulations any nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that are the subject of effective final sunscreen orders.

“SEC. 586D. GUIDANCE; OTHER PROVISIONS.

“(a) GUIDANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DRAFT GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall issue draft guidance on the implementation of, and compliance with, the requirements with respect to sunscreen under this subchapter, including guidance on—

“(i) the format and content of information submitted by a sponsor in support of a request under section 586A or a pending request;

“(ii) the data required to meet the safety and efficacy standard for determining whether a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded;

“(iii) the process by which a request under section 586A or a pending request is withdrawn; and

“(iv) the process by which the Secretary will carry out section 586C(c), including with respect to how the Secretary will address the total number of requests received under section 586A and pending requests.

“(B) FINAL GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall finalize the guidance described in subparagraph (A) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.

“(C) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code shall not apply to collections of information made for purposes of guidance under this subsection.

“(2) SUBMISSIONS PENDING ISSUANCE OF FINAL GUIDANCE.—Irrespective of whether final guidance under paragraph (1) has been issued—

“(A) persons may, beginning on the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, make submissions under this subchapter; and

“(B) the Secretary shall review and act upon such submissions in accordance with this subchapter.

“(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(1) CURRENTLY MARKETED SUNSCREENS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the marketing of sunscreens that are marketed in interstate commerce on or before the date of enactment of this subchapter, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter.

“(2) ENSURING SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to alter the authority of the Secretary with respect to prohibiting the marketing of a sunscreen that is not safe and effective or is misbranded, or with respect to imposing restrictions on the marketing of a sunscreen to ensure safety and effectiveness, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, including section 586C(e).

“(3) OTHER DRUGS.—Except as otherwise provided in section 586F, nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary under this Act or the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) with respect to a drug other than a nonprescription sunscreen.

“(4) EFFECT ON DRUGS OTHERWISE APPROVED.—Nothing in this subchapter shall affect the marketing of a drug approved under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

“(c) TIMELINES.—The timelines for the processes and procedures under paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (6) of section 586C(a) shall not apply to any requests submitted to the Secretary under section 586A after the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.

“SEC. 586E. SUNSCREEN MONOGRAPH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall amend and finalize regulations under part 352 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations concerning nonprescription sunscreen that are effective not later than 5 years after such date of enactment. The Secretary shall publish such regulations not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of such regulations.

“(b) REPORTS.—If the regulations promulgated under subsection (a) do not include provisions related to the effectiveness of various sun protection factor levels, and do not address all dosage forms known to the Secretary to be used in sunscreens marketed in the United States without a new drug approval under section 505, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on the rationale for such provisions not

being included in such regulations, and a plan and timeline to compile any information necessary to address such provisions through final regulations.”.

(b) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in the amendment made by this section shall be construed to—

(1) limit the right of a sponsor (as defined in section 586(8) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a)) to request that the Secretary of Health and Human Services convene an advisory committee; or

(2) limit the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to meet with a sponsor (as defined in section 586(8) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 3. NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.

Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 586F. NON-SUNSCREEN TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.

“(a) **PENDING TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **REQUEST FOR FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW.**—If, prior to the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, an application was submitted pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations for a GRASE determination for a drug other than a nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and such drug was found to be eligible to be considered for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, the sponsor of such application may request that the Secretary provide a framework under paragraph (2) for the review of such application.

“(B) **REQUEST REQUIREMENTS.**—A request for a framework for review of an application made under subparagraph (A) shall be made within 180 calendar days of the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act and shall include the preference of such sponsor as to whether such application is reviewed by the Secretary in accordance with—

“(i) the processes and procedures set forth for pending requests under section 586C(b), except that specific timelines shall be determined in accordance with other applicable requirements under this section;

“(ii) the processes and procedures set forth under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

“(iii) an initial filing determination under the processes and procedures described in section 586B(b) and the processes and procedures set forth for pending requests under section 586C(b), except that specific timelines shall be determined in accordance with other applicable requirements under this section; or

“(iv) an initial filing determination under the processes and procedures described in section 586B(b) and the processes and procedures set forth under part 330 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

“(C) **NO REQUEST.**—If a sponsor described in subparagraph (A) does not make such request within 180 calendar days of the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, such application shall be reviewed by the Secretary in accordance with the timelines of the applicable regulations when such regulations are finalized under subsection (b).

“(2) **FRAMEWORK.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall provide, in writing, a framework to each sponsor that submitted a

request under paragraph (1). Such framework shall set forth the various timelines, in calendar days, with respect to the processes and procedures for review under clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (1)(B) and—

“(A) such timelines shall account for the considerations under paragraph (5); and

“(B) the timelines for the various processes and procedures shall not be shorter than the timelines set forth for pending requests under sections 586B(b) and 586C(b), as applicable.

“(3) **GOVERNING PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW.**—

“(A) **ELECTION.**—Not later than 60 calendar days after the Secretary provides a framework to a sponsor under paragraph (2), such sponsor may provide an election to the Secretary regarding the processes and procedures for review under clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B). If such sponsor makes such election, the Secretary shall review the application that is the subject of such election pursuant to the processes and procedures elected by such sponsor and the applicable timelines in calendar days set forth under such framework, which the Secretary shall confirm in writing to the sponsor not later than the date upon which the Secretary provides a report under paragraph (4). If such sponsor does not make such election, such application shall be reviewed by the Secretary in accordance with the timelines of the applicable regulations when such regulations are finalized under subsection (b).

“(B) **DIFFERENT PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES.**—At any time during review of an application, the Secretary may review such application under different processes and procedures under clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of paragraph (1)(B) than the processes and procedures the sponsor elected in accordance with subparagraph (A), so long as the Secretary proposes, in writing, the change and the sponsor agrees, in writing, to such change.

“(C) **INCLUSION OF INGREDIENTS IN MONOGRAPHS.**—If the sponsor elects to use the processes and procedures for review in accordance with clause (i) or (iii) of paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may incorporate any resulting final order into a regulation addressing the conditions under which other drugs in the same therapeutic category are GRASE and not misbranded, including through direct final rulemaking, and the final order so incorporated shall cease to be effective on the effective date of the final regulation that addresses such drug.

“(4) **LETTER REGARDING PENDING APPLICATIONS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, in writing, regarding all pending applications subject to paragraph (1). In such letter, the Secretary shall provide a report on the review of such applications, including the timelines, in calendar days, for the review and GRASE determination for each application. Such timelines shall account for the considerations under paragraph (5).

“(5) **TIMELINES.**—The timelines in calendar days established by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection—

“(A) may vary based on the content, complexity, and format of the application submitted to the Secretary; and

“(B) shall—

“(i) reflect the public health priorities of the Food and Drug Administration, including the potential public health benefits posed by the inclusion of additional drugs in the over-the-counter drug monograph system;

“(ii) take into consideration the resources available to the Secretary for carrying out such

priorities and the processes and procedures described in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2); and

“(iii) be reasonable, taking into consideration the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(b) **NEW TIME AND EXTENT APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, the Secretary shall issue proposed regulations establishing timelines for the review of applications for GRASE determinations for drugs other than nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients or combinations of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients that are submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), and that are found to be eligible to be considered for inclusion in the over-the-counter drug monograph system pursuant to section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations), or that are subject to this subsection pursuant to paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a), as applicable, providing—

“(A) timely and efficient completion of evaluations of applications under section 330.14 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) for drugs other than sunscreens; and

“(B) timely and efficient completion of the review of the safety and effectiveness submissions pursuant to such applications, including establishing—

“(i) reasonable timelines, in calendar days, for the applicable proposed and final regulations for applications of various content, complexity, and format, and timelines for internal procedures related to such processes; and

“(ii) measurable metrics for tracking the extent to which the timelines set forth in the regulations are met.

“(2) **TIMELINES.**—The timelines in calendar days established in the regulations under paragraph (1)—

“(A) may vary based on the content, complexity, and format of the application submitted to the Secretary; and

“(B) shall—

“(i) reflect the public health priorities of the Food and Drug Administration, including the potential public health benefits posed by the inclusion of additional drugs in the over-the-counter drug monograph system;

“(ii) take into consideration the resources available to the Secretary for carrying out such priorities and the processes and procedures described in paragraph (1); and

“(iii) be reasonable, taking into consideration the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(3) **PROCEDURE.**—In promulgating regulations under this subsection, the Secretary shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that includes a copy of the proposed regulation, provide a period of not less than 60 calendar days for comments on the proposed regulation, and publish the final regulation not less than 30 calendar days before the effective date of the regulation.

“(4) **RESTRICTIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations implementing this section only as described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

“(5) **FINAL REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall finalize the regulations under this section not later than 27 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act.”.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

(a) **INITIAL GAO REPORT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report reviewing the

overall progress of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in carrying out subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by section 2 and amended by section 3 and subsection (c)), including findings on and recommendations with respect to—

(1) the progress made in completing the review of requests under subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including pending requests, and the feasibility of the timelines associated with such subchapter;

(2) the role of the Office of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs in issuing determinations with respect to requests reviewed under such subchapter, including the number of requests transferred to the Office of the Commissioner under section 586C of such Act;

(3) the extent to which advisory committees were convened by the Secretary regarding requests under subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including pending requests; and

(4) the types of metrics that have been, or should be, established for the review of time and extent applications.

(b) **SUBSEQUENT GAO REPORT.**—Not later than 5½ years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report reviewing the overall progress of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in carrying out subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by section 2 and amended by section 3 and subsection (c)) and the regulation of over-the-counter drug products, including findings on and recommendations with respect to—

(1) updates on the matters reported on by the Comptroller General under subsection (a);

(2) significant factors impacting the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to fulfill the mission of the agency with regard to the regulation of over-the-counter drug products, including finalizing outstanding monographs and responding to emerging and novel safety issues;

(3) the performance of the Secretary in carrying out section 586E of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

(4) the types of metrics that have been, or should be, established for the review and regulation of over-the-counter drug products; and

(5) timeliness, efficiency, and accountability in reviewing time and extent applications and safety and effectiveness reviews for over-the-counter drug products.

(c) **FDA REPORT.**—Subchapter I of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 586G. REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act, and on the dates that are 2 and 4 years thereafter, the Secretary shall issue a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives describing actions taken under this subchapter.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The reports under this subsection shall include—

“(A) a review of the progress made in issuing GRASE determinations for pending requests, including the number of pending requests—

“(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request, measured from the date of the original request for an eligibility determination submitted by the sponsor;

“(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or

combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is GRASE and is not misbranded;

“(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient or combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

“(iv) for which a determination has not been made, and an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

“(B) a review of the progress made in issuing GRASE determinations for requests not included in the reporting under subparagraph (A), including the number of such requests—

“(i) reviewed and the decision times for each request;

“(ii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient, combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, or other ingredient is GRASE and is not misbranded;

“(iii) resulting in a determination that the nonprescription sunscreen active ingredient, combination of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients, or other ingredient is not GRASE and is misbranded and the reasons for such determinations; and

“(iv) for which a determination has not been made, and an explanation for the delay, a description of the current status of each such request, and the length of time each such request has been pending, measured from the date of original request for an eligibility determination by the sponsor;

“(C) an annual accounting (including information from years prior to the date of enactment of the Sunscreen Innovation Act where such information is available) of the total number of requests submitted, pending, or completed under this subchapter, including whether such requests were the subject of an advisory committee convened by the Secretary;

“(D) a description of the staffing and resources relating to the costs associated with the review and decisionmaking pertaining to requests under this subchapter;

“(E) a review of the progress made in meeting the deadlines with respect to processing requests under this subchapter; and

“(F) to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, recommendations for process improvements in the handling of requests under this subchapter, including the advisory committee review process.

“(b) METHOD.—The Secretary shall publish the reports under subsection (a) in the manner the Secretary determines to be the most effective for efficiently disseminating the report, including publication of the report on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration.”.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2141), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO PUBLIC LAW 110-229

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4751.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4751) to make technical corrections to Public Law 110-229 to reflect the re-naming of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4751) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4809.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4809) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act, to improve the Defense Production Act Committee, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4809) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 545 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 545) recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 545) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 15, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL BISON DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 543 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 543) designating November 1, 2014, as National Bison Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 543) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 11, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration, en bloc, of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 552; S. Res. 553; S. Res. 554; S. Res. 555; S. Res. 556; S. Res. 557; S. Res. 558; S. Res. 559; and S. Res. 560.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 113-6

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate, signed September 17, 2014, by the President of the United States: Extradition Treaty with the Republic of Chile (Treaty Document No. 113-6).

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Chile (the "Treaty"), signed at Washington on June 5, 2013. I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty would replace the outdated extradition treaty between the United States and Chile, signed at Santiago on April 17, 1900 (the "1900 Treaty"). The Treaty follows generally the form and content of other extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States. It would replace an outmoded list of extraditable offenses with a modern "dual criminality" approach, which would enable extradition for such offenses as money laundering and other newer offenses not appearing on the list from the 1900 Treaty. The Treaty also contains a modernized "political offense" clause and provides that extradition shall not be refused based on the nationality of the person sought. Finally, the Treaty incorporates a series of procedural improvements to streamline and speed the extradition process.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and give its advice and consent to its ratification.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 17, 2014.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 18, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved

to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following the prayer and pledge, the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair; that when the Senate reconvenes, following any leader remarks, there be a period of morning business until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, and with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; and finally, at 1 p.m., the Senate proceed to consideration of H.J. Res. 124, the continuing resolution, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 10 a.m. tomorrow, His Excellency Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine, will address a joint meeting of Congress from the Hall of the House of Representatives in the U.S. Capitol. Senators should begin to gather in the Senate Chamber at 9:30 a.m. to depart at 9:40 a.m. for the procession to the Hall of the House.

Senators should expect a series of rollcall votes at approximately 5:30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 18, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DEREK P. RYDHOLM

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LARRY D. WYCHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LAWRENCE F. THOMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

PATRICK M. MCGRATH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PEGGY E. D. MCGILL
ANDY J. PRICE
ELENA M. SCARBROUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DELROY A. BROWN
JOSEPH L. COPAS
DAVID W. DOUGLAS
PAUL G. HAINES
STEVEN C. KLASSON
JEROLD T. KOUCHI
RICHARD G. SCHMID

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRIAN R. COLEMAN
MARC H. DAHMAN
JOSEPH A. DANGELO
TOMMY C. LEEPER
ROBERT C. MANCINI
SPENCER T. PRICE
DANIEL D. PRIMM, JR.
ROBERT E. RIDOUT
TRACY L. RINGO
DAVID A. STEVENSON
RICK L. STRICKROOT
ROBERT W. THOMPSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

VANCE J. ARGO
JOHN E. EHRRHART
ALAN J. FEHR
MICHAEL O. HULSEY
ALOMA A. JESS
KEVIN J. KRUSE
JOANNE W. MORRITT
ANTHONY S. RANDALL
STEVEN R. SANSON
PATRICIA A. STEINOCHEER
TYRA J. SWANSON
GREGORY W. TEISAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SCOTT A. ARCAND
STEPHANIE B. BATTEN
WILLIAM M. HADY
SCOTT J. HOPKINS
GEORGE J. JICHA
JAMES J. KERBY
WILLIAM D. WEAVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAWN M. FLYNN
SANDRA J. HETZEL
PAUL V. RAHM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SCOTT B. BYERS
KIM J. HILLIARD
JOSEPH V. IGNAZZITTO II
LOREN W. KLEMP
JANIE M. MARTIN
KHANH T. PHAM
MICHELE M. SPENCER
CHARLENE A. WEINGARTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONNA K. AYERS
STEPHANIE A. BALL
RICHARD B. BARRENTINE
GLORIA J. BEARCE
NANCY M. BECKER
MARY L. BORCHARDT
STEVEN D. DONNAN
MARGARET M. FRUTTITTA
PATRICIA A. GOODYEAR
JAMES A. GRAY
RANDALL G. HOEPPNER
ESTHER D. KING
LINDA J. LEPPPELL
JACQUELINE D. MARTIN
MARTIN J. MCNALLY
EULALIA J. MONTERO
HELEN A. MORETTI
CATHERINE A. NADAL
LINDA A. REID

MICHELLE A. RICETROTTER
MICHAEL RIVERAQUILES
LYNETTE D. SHORT
ROSE M. SONTYO
CAROL S. TAYLOR
FELIZA UNGERCAVINS
PATTI J. URBANEC
JANICE A. VANALSTINE
LESLEY A. WATTS
ROY WILMS
MARY E. WOODARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

FELIX J. E. ANDUJAR
EVAN D. BENDER
KEVIN M. BRADY
JOSE M. CHAVEZCACHO
TIMOTHY G. COOK
PETER D. CROSS
PETER G. DEVEAUX
MARTIN A. DOCHERTY
PETER T. EGAN
STANLEY M. FEERO
JAMES M. FITTS
MICHELLE P. FOOTE
GERRY F. FUNK
YVES A. GAUVIN
GREGORY A. HAMON
BRADLEY B. HAWKINS
SHELLA M. HODGSON
ROBERTO HUERTAS
JODEL G. JAMPAYAS
RICHARD L. S. JENNELLE
JOHN A. JOHNSON
DARA A. JOSIAHHOWZE
RONALD E. KRAMER
RAYMOND S. LANCE
MATTHEW J. LINDGREN
JAMES M. MALONE III
SUSAN K. MANTELL
MICHAEL C. MORRIS
SUSAN F. MULERO
JONATHAN P. OLINE
FRANK M. PARKER
PAUL S. PORTER, JR.
NICHOLAS D. POULOS
FREDERICK G. ROBBE III
JAIME R. RONCANCIO
JAMES E. SCHMIDT
KARY J. SCHROYER
SEAN M. SILER
SAHBRENNAH W. SMITH
RICKY A. THOMAS
JERRY L. TOLBERT
THOMAS D. WELLS
TERENCE R. WOODS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BRYAN D. BROWN
MARY F. CHESNUT
RICHARD T. CHOJNACKI
WILLIE D. DADE
FELICIA D. DELOATCH
TIMOTHY A. DOHERTY
WILLIAM R. ELLIOTT
MICHAEL L. GOLDSBOROUGH
GREGORY B. HOLLAND
DANIEL B. HUBBARD
RALPH R. JUDKINS
GEORGE E. KATSOS
SUKCHAN KIM
VERONICA A. KOUASSI
BRYAN J. LAYTON
JEFFREY B. MCCARTER
NANCY L. MILLER
GUY W. MILLNER, JR.
JOHNNY D. NIEDZWIEDZKI
AMY K. NINNEMAN
LYNNELL D. PEACE
RAVEN E. D. REITSTETTER
JACK E. ROGERS
JANET SANZZIADIE
JERROLD J. SCHARNINGHAUSEN
JAMES G. SHIRLEY
THOMAS J. STOKES
RICHARD C. TOYE
NICHOLAS D. YOUNG
CRAIG A. YUNKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ANTHONY J. LABADIA
TANYA F. MOORE
NANCY PEKAR
WILLIAM D. THOMPSON III
JOSEPH F. TOMMASINO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARTA E. ACHA

JACOB A. JOHNSON
DOYLE W. REAVES
RICORD W. TORGERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ZENAIDA M. COFIE
STEVEN J. KEIR
MARCIA L. LEWIS
VU V. MAI
JOHN J. OTTEN
MONICA J. STAFFORD
TODD L. STEWART

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ERIC T. SCHULTZ, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA.

THOMAS FREDERICK DAUGHTON, OF ARIZONA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEBRA S. WADA, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

BRADFORD RAYMOND HUTHER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

LAURA S. WERTHEIMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN R. BASS, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

DAVID PRESSMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

DAVID PRESSMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GUSTAVE F. PERNA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KATHLEEN M. CREIGHTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TODD J. SQUIRE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN B. BROWN
REAR ADM. (LH) SEAN R. FILIPOWSKI
REAR ADM. (LH) BRETT C. HEIMBIGNER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN L. KWAST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TERRENCE J. O'SHAUGHNESSY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. SCOTT G. PERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH J. HECK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK S. INCH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. PHILIP S. DAVIDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DIXON R. SMITH

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. TOD D. WOLTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. VERALINN JAMIESON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN W. NICHOLSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PAUL M. BENENATI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. CALHOUN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BRET D. DAUGHERTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL RAUL E. ESCRIBANO

COLONEL TIMOTHY J. MCATEER

COLONEL JEFFREY L. MILHORN

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LISA L. ADAMS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RICHARD D. MINK, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. ALLISON AND ENDING WITH KWANI D. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN R. ABRAMS AND ENDING WITH G010257, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 10, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ISAIAH C. ABOTT AND ENDING WITH D012187, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 10, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON K. ABOTT AND ENDING WITH D012084, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 10, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CLAUDIA D. HENDERSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSE ABREU AND ENDING WITH D011533, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SUN S. MACUPA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH G010266, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CLARK C. K. ADAMS II AND ENDING WITH G010269, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HERBERT J. BROCK IV AND ENDING WITH GREGORY S. PHIPPS, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SYED AHMED AND ENDING WITH AMY ZINGALIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2014.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY AEBI AND ENDING WITH KEVYN WETZEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2014.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF EDWARD J. EDER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. BURNS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVIN L. BELL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CLAYTON M. PENDERGRASS, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CASEY D. FERGUSON AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY K. TOBIAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRYSTAL R. AANDAHLL AND ENDING WITH LINA M. YECBOT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CYNTHIA N. ABELLA AND ENDING WITH YU ZHENG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH MARLIN WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSE D. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS B. STAMPFLI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JON A. ANGLE AND ENDING WITH KHALID J. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD A. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH SHEVONNE K. WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AUSTIN G. ALDRIDGE AND ENDING WITH NATHAN T. WOODWARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALWIN L. ALBERT AND ENDING WITH JACK M. ZUCKERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 31, 2014.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY E. OXFORD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN I. ABNEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOEL N. PETERSON, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY C. CATHCART AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2014.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS PERMIAN BASIN HONOR FLIGHT

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 85 Veterans from West Texas who will be visiting our Washington DC this week, sponsored by the Permian Basin Honor Flight. On behalf of a grateful state and nation, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The Veterans on this Honor Flight are: Daniel L. Acosta, United States Marine Corps (ret.); Daniel G. Acosta, United States Navy; Clinton H. Adams, United States Navy; Philip H. Altman, United States Coast Guard; Mike A. Barker, United States Army; Jack R. Barnes, United States Navy (ret.); Billy E. Barnhill, United States Navy; Emil F. Beck, United States Army; Harvey L. Benad, United States Marine Corps; Kendall L. Benad, United States Marine Corps; William B. Bowlin, United States Army Air Corps; John Brenner, United States Navy; Donald W. Byrne, United States Air Force (ret.); Miguel B. Calderon, United States Army; Herbert L. Cartwright, United States Army; Nat E. Clardy, United States Marine Corps; James S. Cosper, United States Navy; John E. Crosby, Jr., United States Army Air Corps; Stanley W. Cuba, United States Navy; Robert E. Davis, United States Navy.

Roy F. Draper, United States Army; Tharen H. Elcher, United States Army Air Corps; Michael L. Elcher, United States Air Force; Claude C. Firth, United States Navy; Thomas O. Flournoy, United States Army; Daniel R. Frizzell, United States Navy; Joyce O. Funderburk, United States Army Air Corps; Richard W. Galloway, United States Army; Willard B. Gaston, United States Navy; Francisco A. Gonzales, United States Army; Alfred Guardino, United States Air Force (ret.); Manuel Herrera, United States Army; Trisha K. Hildreth, United States Air Force; Walter P. Hildreth, Jr., United States Army Air Corps; Lawrence E. Hill, United States Army; Theodore W. Hogan, United States Army Air Corps; Thomas C. Hogan, Jr., United States Army; Bobbie J. Jackson, United States Army; Joseph E. Johnson, United States Army.

Clay M. Keaton, United States Marine Corps; James M. Kelley, United States Army Air Corps; Tom B. Lewis, United States Army; D.H. Livingston, United States Navy; Russell A. Livingston, United States Navy; Grady D. Lobley, United States Army Air Corps; Malcolm R. Manns, United States Navy; Leonard C. Martinez, United States Army; Raymond G. Martinez, Jr., United States Army; Forest H. Mathews, United States Army Air Corps; John E. May, United States Army (ret.); Joe W. Meek, United States Navy (ret.); Max O. Meek, United States Navy; Michael V. Meek,

United States Navy; Tommy S. Mills, United States Army; Travis J. Mills, United States Air Force; Jerry B. Morgan, United States Army; Ricky W. Odom, United States Air Force; Cecil R. Odom, United States Navy; John D. Oliver, United States Navy.

Douglas R. Peacock, United States Army Air Corps; Leroy W. Pelzel, United States Army; Walter L. Pierce, United States Army Air Corps; Robert R. Pryor, United States Army; David E. Reed, United States Army; Michael E. Rejon, United States Air Force; Joe R. Rickey, United States Air Force (ret.); Curtis C. Rister, United States Air Force; Johnny W. Rister, United States Air Force; Rogelio Robles, United States Army; Heriberto Rubio, United States Army Air Corps; Jonathan H. Ruiz, United States Army; Commodore C. Ryan, United States Navy; Darrell E. Sanders, United States Army; Walter F. Schluter, United States Air Force; James E. Sever, United States Army; Dennis W. Sever, United States Army; Wendell Short, United States Air Force; Vincent T. Sternjacob, United States Army; Steven C. Stone, United States Army.

John P. Stroup, United States Air Force (ret.); Fred J. Stubbs, United States Army; Jack Tarter, United States Air Force; Marion L. Thompson, United States Army; Gilberto R. Torres, United States Army; Herbert O. Walker, United States Army; Joe B. White, United States Navy; Louis C. White, United States Marine Corps; Jobert Williams, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to have the opportunity to meet these brave men and women who exemplify the best of our country. Their sacrifice and commitment to duty to our nation can never be fully repaid, and I hope that when they visit our nation's monuments in Washington DC, the gratitude and respect we have for them will truly be reflected.

Colleagues, please join me in thanking these in thanking these veterans and their families for their exemplary dedication and service to this great nation. I would also like to extend a special thank you to the local communities, all of the volunteers, and Mr. Jack Barnes for their extensive work in organizing this Honor Flight. This trip would not have been possible without all the financial and emotional support of the people who have put in so much hard work and personal time to make sure this trip could be possible.

COMMEMORATING CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, we celebrate Constitution Day—a holiday that falls 227 years

after our founding fathers George Washington, James Madison, and their colleagues signed the original Constitution and sent it to the states for ratification. We should all use this important holiday as an opportunity to reflect on the achievements of the Founding generation—who wrote the most durable and successful charter of government in world history—but we should also remember that the Framers only wrote the opening chapter in a much longer constitutional story. And this is precisely what the Framers themselves intended—leaving it up to future generations to use the Article V amendment process to improve upon their handiwork and “form a more perfect Union.”

Perhaps the most important set of constitutional changes occurred after the Civil War, when President Lincoln and his generation ratified a series of transformational Amendments that many scholars have rightly described as our nation's “Second Founding.” As we approach the 150th anniversaries of these key Second Founding Amendments—the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth—it's worth pausing for a moment on this Constitution Day to consider their centrality to America's constitutional story.

The Thirteenth Amendment banned slavery and forced labor—redeeming us from the Founding generation's original sin. Following his reelection in November 1864, President Lincoln worked furiously to convince members of Congress to support the Thirteenth Amendment, eventually securing congressional approval on January 31, 1865. The following day, Lincoln took the unusual step of signing the Thirteenth Amendment before sending it to the states for ratification, calling it a “King's cure” for the evil of slavery.

The Fourteenth Amendment is arguably the most important constitutional provision ratified after the Bill of Rights, enshrining a host of new constitutional guarantees in our nation's charter. It granted U.S. citizenship to everyone born on American soil—a guarantee worthy of special reflection on a day also set aside as Citizenship Day. It protected fundamental rights like free speech from state abuses and ensured due process of law for everyone. Finally, it wrote Jefferson's famous Declaration into the Constitution and perfected it by changing “all men” to “any person.” This universal language guarantees equality for everyone—whether black or white, woman or man, gay or heterosexual.

Finally, the Fifteenth Amendment guaranteed the right to vote free of racial discrimination—beginning the most sustained project of constitutional improvement in American history. This project produced a total of six Voting Rights Amendments that established the right to vote as the most fundamental of all rights in our constitutional system.

Beginning this Constitution Day, we should use the 150th anniversary of the Second Founding to begin a national conversation

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

about its enduring meaning and our nation's unfinished project of living up to the constitutional principles enshrined in its transformatioal Amendments. While our country has made tremendous progress since that day 227 years ago, our nation's story is not over and together we must continue building on our strong foundation to improve upon our more perfect union.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SCHERERVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I recognize the Schererville Fire Department, as the organization celebrates its 100th anniversary. In honor of this momentous occasion, the Schererville Fire Department is hosting a celebratory event on Friday, September 26, 2014, at the Patrician Banquet Center in Schererville, Indiana.

The Schererville Volunteer Fire Department was established on June 25, 1914, under the direction of Fire Chief Fred Henderlong, and was made up of twenty-five volunteer members. In the early days, the firefighters did not receive compensation for their work. This changed in 1953, when one dollar was given to the members for attending a monthly meeting, responding to a call, or working for one hour. Today, the Schererville Fire Department is a fully paid organization consisting of sixty-one employees. Throughout the years, the department has changed its standards to fit the needs of the community. From purchasing the department's first motorized piece of fire equipment in 1922, to upgrading their ambulance service from basic life support to advanced life support in 2006, the Schererville Fire Department has upheld their mission statement of "serving the needs of its people."

The leaders and members of the Schererville Fire Department continue to touch lives through their outstanding community service, especially to those most in need. Every year, the organization lends its support to a variety of charitable organizations, including Hoosier Burn Camp, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the American Heart Association, Northwest Indiana Cancer Kids, "Bump Out Cancer," Tri-Town Safety Village, Schererville Baseball League, and the Down Syndrome Association of Northwest Indiana.

At this time, I would like to acknowledge several individuals who, in conjunction with the Schererville Fire Department, have worked diligently to support this outstanding organization. In addition to the firefighters and all of the employees of the department, I would like to recognize Fire Chief Joseph M. Kruzan, Jr., Deputy Fire Chief Robert Patterson, Town Council President Mike Troxell, and Board of Safety Chairman Pete Sormaz.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating the Schererville Fire Department on its 100th anniversary. Northwest Indiana is both

grateful and proud to have had the organization's support during the past 100 years, and for their selfless service, the leadership and members of the Schererville Fire Department are worthy of the highest praise.

HONORING WWII VETERANS OF THE 485TH BOMB GROUP DURING 50TH AND FINAL REUNION IN DALLAS, TEXAS

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize veterans of the 485th Bomb Group as they celebrate their 50th and final reunion this week in Dallas, Texas.

The 485th Bomb Group was one of four heavy bomb groups assigned to the 55th Bomb Wing during World War II. The 485th began conducting combat operations on May 10, 1944 with a mission to bomb the marshalling yard at what is now Knin, Croatia (formerly Yugoslavia). Their final mission was flown to the Linz, Austria marshalling yard on April 25, 1945. The group received a Distinguished Unit Citation for the June 26, 1944 mission to the Florisdorf Oil Refinery in Vienna, Austria. Despite encountering heavy flak and intense fighter opposition, the Group was able to inflict considerable damage to the refinery, crippling the enemy's vital fuel production during a crucial period of the war.

As we honor these heroes today, I am reminded of what President Calvin Coolidge once said, "A nation which forgets its defenders, will itself soon be forgotten." I for one am committed to ensuring this nation never forgets the sacrifices that so many endured in order that we may enjoy the freedoms that have made our country so great.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and to acknowledge its continued efforts to safeguard our nation's land, water resources and cultural heritage.

Since its creation, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has preserved land in every state across America. The fund has supported more than 41,000 state and local park projects at no cost to hard-working taxpayers.

In Pennsylvania alone, the self-sustaining LWCF has provided more than \$315 million in funding over the past five decades, benefiting restoration projects at national historic sites such as the Valley Forge National Historic Park and the Gettysburg National Military Park. In addition, the LWCF played a critical role in the creation of the Flight 93 National Memorial in Somerset, PA.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also spurs outdoor and recreational economic activity in and around preserved lands, accounting for jobs and a strong tax base for our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped to preserve and protect our nation's most precious lands and waters for the past 50 years. I celebrate the Fund and look forward to the excellent work the LWCF will do in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ARMANDO RAMÍREZ

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Armando Ramírez. Mr. Ramírez was born and raised in Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, and educated in the public school system. After graduating from high school, he joined the U.S. Army and served during the Korean War.

After serving in the military, Mr. Ramírez moved to New York City where he worked while continuing his education during the evenings. Mr. Ramírez attended John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, NY, and graduated from Saint Francis College, Brooklyn, NY in 1980, with a degree in Criminal Justice and Political Science. He took several civil service examinations and became a police officer in New York City. Mr. Ramírez believes now, as he did then, that working as a police officer was a mission, not just a career in public service.

During Mr. Ramírez's 30-year career as a law enforcement officer in New York City, he served in rackets and fraud investigations while assigned to the District Attorney's office in New York City. He worked in the organized crime, homicide, narcotics, major cases, political corruption, economic crime, and sex crimes bureaus.

Mr. Ramírez is currently the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Osceola County. He was elected on November 6, 2012 by an overwhelming majority. He is the first Hispanic to hold this position in the state of Florida.

In his capacity as Clerk, Mr. Ramírez responds to constituent concerns of wrongdoing. Currently, he is conducting a forensic examination of alleged fraudulent foreclosure documents submitted by banks to Osceola County courts.

I am happy to recognize Armando Ramírez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his service to the United States and the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING DR. BINDUKUMAR KANSUPADA

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Bindukumar Kansupada of

Yardley, Bucks County and a resident of Pennsylvania's 8th Congressional District. As a cardiologist, successful business man and faithful community servant, Dr. Kansupada has been an incredible asset for the health and well-being to the families that call the Delaware Valley home. As a member on both of my physician's advisory and Indian American committees, Dr. Kansupada's talents and experience have been a vital part of my legislative and outreach efforts as we work together to provide Bucks County families with the type of patient centered healthcare solutions that keep our communities happy and healthy. I am honored to call Dr. Kansupada a personal friend and I look forward to partnering with him in the future so that Bucks County continues to be a great place to live, work and raise a family.

HONORING TAMMIE SCHNITZER

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a courageous American who took a stand against hate and intolerance in her hometown of Billings, Montana.

On a cold winter night in December a little more than 20 years ago, members of a local hate group threw a brick through the window of her young son's room. It was just the latest, but one of the most brazen and ominous, acts of hate committed against not just the local Jewish community but other minority groups as well, including Native Americans. Fortunately, Schnitzer's son, Isaac, was not injured, but Tammie knew this attack on her family—and on her community—required a very public response.

Her first step was to go to the editor of the local newspaper and ask that the attack on her family and her faith be a front page story. It was, and it led to the paper and the entire community rallying around the Schnitzer's, with paper menorah's soon festooning some 10,000 homes and businesses in Billings. The response of the people of Billings to this and other acts of hate didn't simply stymie the purveyors of such hate in and around Billings—it started a national movement that has spawned the "Not In Our Town" nonprofit group that fights acts of hate all across America.

I'm pleased that Hadassah and several of its New Jersey chapters, including the Alissa and Monroe Township Hadassah chapters in my Congressional district, will be honoring Tammie Schnitzer on September 21st. My best wishes to them and my deepest thanks to Tammie Schnitzer for her courage to public service.

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RANDOLPH YMCA

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Randolph YMCA, located in Randolph, Morris County, New Jersey, as it celebrates its 125th Anniversary.

The Randolph YMCA was founded in 1889 in Dover. The First Methodist Episcopal Church in Dover served as the first home of the YMCA, reaching beyond the Dover area and attracting nearly 200 people per day. In 1908, the YMCA expanded its territory to include Chester, Long Valley, Rockaway, Succasunna, Wharton, and Whippany.

From 1908–1950 the YMCA occupied various locations around Blackwell Street in Dover. In 1951, the need for a more permanent facility was recognized. And, as membership had drastically increased since the end of World War II, so did the need for a headquarters facility. The YMCA then opened a new facility on the corner of Route 46 and North Bergen Street.

In 1976 the name West Morris Area YMCA was established. The name was chosen to reflect the expanding service area, including Randolph Township. Due to the vast increase in membership, the Dover building would require an addition, but there was not enough property for both an expansion and parking. In 1977, the Y decided to build a new facility in Randolph Township.

The new facility on Dover Chester Road, Randolph, was officially opened in 1979. The building included a gymnasium, racquetball courts, a pool, fitness equipment, and program space. A childcare center was added in March 1999, which now serves as a shared space with the Randolph School District. In 2009 the late Mr. Clyde Utz donated a second pool, along with 7,500 sq. ft. of additional program space. In 2011, the YMCA received the "Best of Aquatics Award" from Aquatics International.

Now known as the Randolph YMCA, the organization offers a variety of health and wellness programs for all ages. The Randolph YMCA also offers numerous Youth Programs, including: Summer Day Camp, Progressive Swim Lessons, After School Child Care, and Youth Fitness and Conditioning.

The Randolph YMCA continues as a charitable non-profit organization that provides social, physical, and education programs to the community in order to help develop the mind, body, and spirit of all ages. The employees and volunteers at the Randolph YMCA remain focused on growing and improving the foundation to meet the needs of the community, today, and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Randolph YMCA, its members, trustees, and many supporters, as it celebrates its 125th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE DUMFRIES-TRIANGLE-QUANTICO LITTLE LEAGUE ALL-STAR TEAMS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the tremendous performance and accomplishments of local players in the Dumfries-Triangle-Quantico (DTQ) Little League. During this past summer, the Junior, Senior, and Big League All-Star Teams won both the District 9 and Virginia State championships.

The Big League All-Stars have won the District 9 title for three years running, and this marked their third overall state title. The Senior All-Stars have won the District 9 title seven years-in-a-row and the state title four years-in-a-row. The Seniors went on to win the Southeast Regional Championship, securing a spot in the Senior League World Series. They advanced to the semifinal game, where they came up just short in a 3–2 loss to Latin America. The Junior All-Stars have now won four consecutive District 9 titles and their second state title during that period. The Juniors, many of whom have been playing together since they were 10 years old, advanced to the Southeast Regional semifinal game, where they were narrowly edged out in a 9–8 loss to Florida.

My office is proud to support little leagues throughout the community. The friendships and experiences these athletes gain from participating in little league—learning the value of playing fair, working hard, making friends, showing good sportsmanship, and most of all, having fun—will benefit them throughout their lives. In addition to commending the players and coaches, I also want to recognize the efforts of Mel Barlow, who has been the DTQ Little League president for the past 13 years. It is thanks to the commitment of parents and volunteers like Mel that little leagues across our community and the country continue to thrive.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the players, coaches, and their families on these wonderful achievements. It is my pleasure to submit the names of the players and coaches of the Junior, Senior, and Big League All-Star Teams from the DTQ Little League into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DTQ JUNIOR LEAGUE ALL STAR TEAM

Team Manager—Tim Jabs; Coaches—Rick Gatewood and Perry Peloquin; Daniel Hupart, #20; Robbie Stoss, #22; Anthony Stehlin, #12; Ethan Semones, #2; Carson Arguin, #9; Blake Gatewood, #5; Tommy Wells, #14; Tristan Thorgersen, #17; Darien Porter, #11; Jack Dumoulin, #18; Bennet Peloquin, #25; Connor Pedersen, #29; Jeremiah Rodriguez, #7.

DTQ SENIOR LEAGUE ALL STAR TEAM

Team Manager—Brendon Hanafin; Coaches—Bob Morrissey and Brian Blanton; Christian Colangelo, #9; Fox Semones, #2; Chris Redmon, #14; Thomas Thorgersen, #20; David Kelsey, #1; Liam Kelly, #11; Michael Morrissey, #00; Jared Bhatti, #8; Matthew Nickles, #18; Michael Nickles, #29; Patrick Hanafin, #12; Braxton Boone, #16; Daniel

Shookster, #4; Riley O'Buck, #24; Ben Marotske, #10.

DTQ BIG LEAGUE ALL STAR TEAM

Team Manager—Shawn Boyce; Coaches—Ted Bridis and Jim Spellman; Kyle Adams, #23; Corbin Attreed, #12; Tyler Bailey, #29; Trey Bridis, #3; Tyler Feldman, #15; Sam Fuson, #10; Michael Hanafin, #20; Luke Harmon, #7; Chris Kennelly, #1; Stephen Laitinen, #11; Jake Moore, #34; Danny Morrissey, #2; Shawn Nickles, #18; Jacob Spellman, #14; Jake Blevins, #24.

HONORING THE 227TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DRAFTING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 227th anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention.

It is fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this magnificent document and this memorable anniversary; and to the patriotic celebrations commemorating the occasion.

Within its very body is the framework that has allowed our great nation to prosper. The Constitution has guided us through both challenging and prosperous times as a nation, and has united us in defining the values of America.

I urge all citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787 by vigilantly protecting the freedoms guaranteed to us through this guardian of our liberties, remembering that lost rights may never be regained.

HONORING KARL BRITTON ON HIS 30TH ANNIVERSARY AS A U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF MEMBER

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Karl Britton who today, September 17, 2014, celebrates his 30th anniversary as a staff member in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As an incoming freshman Member at the beginning of the 113th Congress, I, like all freshman Members, was faced with the challenge of setting up offices while also learning the workings of Congress and my role as a Member. I was extremely fortunate that Karl Britton joined my DC office staff, where his 28 years of experience and knowledge of working on the Hill were invaluable assets.

Karl Britton, a native of West Virginia, began working on the Hill on September 17, 1984, as a staff member for his Congressman, Harley Staggers, Jr., from the West Virginia 2nd Congressional District. Karl would serve on Congressman Staggers' staff until June of 1990

when he went to work for Congressman Jerry Costello, who was in his first full term representing the Illinois 21st District. Karl would work for Congressman Costello until the end of the 112th Congress when Costello decided not to run for re-election. Karl joined my staff at the beginning of the 113th Congress.

Karl has worked for three Members of Congress in his 30 years but has served during the terms of five Presidents, starting with Ronald Reagan, and seven Speakers of the House, starting with Tip O'Neill.

To understand the scope of Karl's popularity on the Hill, one only needs to walk with him anywhere within the crowded corridors of the Capitol complex. You cannot go more than 10 feet without someone calling out to Karl and everyone seems to be his friend. Karl knows someone in just about every office. He knows how to get things done and who to ask for any information. Karl has conducted countless tours for constituents and has provided assistance for dignitaries, all with the same professional courtesy.

Karl has two children, a son, Andrew, 24, and a daughter Aliyah, 14.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Karl Britton on his 30th anniversary of congressional service and wishing him all the best for many more years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ADULT CARE OF CHESTER COUNTY

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Adult Care of Chester County on its 30th anniversary of exemplary service in providing exceptional adult day services to the community. This is a great milestone and a considerable accomplishment and I take great pleasure in being able to honor the men and women of Adult Care of Chester County for their dedication and outstanding service.

For 30 years, the men and women of Adult Care of Chester County have dedicated themselves to serving dependent adults, having provided services to over 2,000 individuals and their families during that time. In recognition of their outstanding efforts, Adult Care of Chester County was named 2012 Outstanding Adult Day Center by the National Adult Day Services Association. For three decades, they have admirably pursued their mission to support and empower families in their caregiving experience by providing state-of-the-art care from a highly trained and compassionate staff.

Mr. Speaker, in light of its 30 years of outstanding service, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Adult Care of Chester County for its invaluable contributions to the quality of life of the citizens of Chester County, Pennsylvania.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SAMUEL C. LOPEZ

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Samuel C. Lopez. Samuel was born in Brooklyn, New York and graduated from the Bronx Vocational High School. Samuel went on to attend New York State School of Industrial & Labor Relations at Cornell University. After graduating, Samuel worked as a Journeyman Electrician Craftsman with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union Number 3 for over 30 years.

Samuel has always been involved with politics and helping his community. First getting involved in electoral campaigns in New York in the 1970s, he has remained active in politics since moving to Florida in the 1990s. Samuel has participated in numerous national, state, and local elections.

Samuel has taken the lead as Founder, Chairman, and President of numerous organizations including U.T.B., United Third Bridge, Inc. (U.T.B.), the Florida Puerto Rican/Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Inc. (FPRHCC), the Florida Puerto Rican/Hispanic and Minority Empowerment Committee, Brevard County's Annual Puerto Rican Day Parade, and the Royal Order of Juan Ponce de Leon Historical V Centennial Celebration Committee.

Samuel is currently a member of the Brevard County School System's Minority Advisory Committee, the Eastern Florida State College Police Advisory Council, the Brevard Community College Minority Partnership, and is a past member of the Brevard County Historical Commission.

Samuel partnered with the Equal Opportunity Commission in bringing 19 successful discrimination lawsuits against the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union Number 3, which resulted in a hiring practice that promotes hiring minorities. Through his work with U.T.B. and the FPRHCC, Samuel spearheaded the effort for the installation of a Juan Ponce de Leon statue and sponsorship wall at the Ponce de Leon Historical Landing Site at Melbourne Beach.

I am happy to honor Samuel C. Lopez, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his leadership and contributions to the Central Florida community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,760,739,788,762.62. We've added \$7,133,862,739,849.54 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.1 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could

have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

URGING A STRONG FUNDING COMMITMENT TO THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support of this welcome bipartisan reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act—an act first championed by my friend and mentor Senator Chris Dodd. But I also think we need to go further as an institution to support families with the high costs of this critical care.

We all know that, given the realities of today's workforce, quality child care is both a necessity in today's economy, and very expensive. It is often a family's biggest expense, bigger even than their mortgage. Families living in poverty pay almost a third of their income—30 percent—on this care.

The Child Care and Development block grant—CCDBG for short—is the only federal support available to offset the high costs of child care for low-income families. It helps children in working families have access to the quality care they need to learn and thrive in life later on.

But if anything, we are moving in the wrong direction in terms of covering eligible children. In the poorest families in the United States, only one in six eligible children receives child care assistance. And, at a time when nearly one in five working mothers with very young children are working low-wage jobs, our commitment to these families has dwindled.

Since 2006, over 250,000 eligible children have lost access to CCDBG-funded child care. The monthly average of children receiving this aid has fallen to its lowest levels since 1998. And because of budget cuts, many states have seen waiting lists grow and rates for providers plummet. That means less quality care.

I support the new requirements in this reauthorization—They include conforming to state health and safety standards, unannounced on-site monitoring visits, and criminal background checks for providers. But these requirements will cost money. And according to the states, without additional funding, the number of families who receive this aid could be cut by as much as 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, time and again families all across this nation have told us that we can make a positive difference for them by facilitating access to quality child care.

Countless educational studies have stressed the importance of good care at an early age for children. And countless economic studies have told us that the return on these sorts of investments, in our kids and our future, are amazing.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan reauthorization today. And I also urge them to match this vote with a strong budgetary commitment to CCDBG, and other critical child care investments, in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week we marked the 13th anniversary of the September 11th terrorist attack. It is a day to remember and mourn those we lost, to comfort those who suffer still, and to honor those who responded on that day with courage and determination.

Whenever we talk about 9/11, we have to acknowledge the heroes and heroines of 9/11, both those who lost their lives that day and those who are still sick and dying from the injuries and illnesses related to 9/11. As a Congress, we stood together on the steps of the U.S. Capitol and vowed to never forget.

That vow of never forget comes with an obligation on the part of Congress to ensure that we as a country remember, honor, and care for those who risked their lives to save others that day and those who were caught in the devastation that occurred at Ground Zero, at the U.S. Pentagon, and at Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

A major piece of that promise to never forget was the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act that became law in 2011. This legislation established the World Trade Center Health Program to provide medical monitoring and treatment for 9/11-related illnesses as well as a national health program to serve those who were at the Pentagon, in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and those who came from around the country to aid in our country's recovery. It also reopened the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide for economic losses and harm incurred from the aftermath of the attacks.

Today, there are more than 60,000 responders or survivors who got sick from exposure to the deadly toxins at 9/11, mixes of fuel, glass, asbestos, and all kinds of chemicals that were in the air that day. These thousands are now receiving treatment and monitoring from the Health Program. This also includes over 2,900 people in the World Trade Center Health Program who have been diagnosed with cancer.

Since 9/11 more than 800 New York Fire Department members and more than 550 New York Police Department personnel are struggling with serious 9/11-related illnesses.

We have already lost over 70 firefighters and 60 New York Police Department officers who have died from their 9/11-related illnesses over the past 13 years. These are people who got sick while working on rescue and recovery, and they have died because of their exposure.

These individuals with 9/11-related illnesses need continued specialized medical monitoring and care. It is unfair to cut them out of medical care and economic compensation simply because they did not get sick soon enough.

As it stands, the Zadroga Act is set to expire in October 2015, yet the medical and economic crises of sick 9/11 responders and suffering survivors will not end in 2 years. They will only get worse over time. Research shows

significantly higher rates of cancer among the 9/11 population, a disease with a long latency period.

That is why I have introduced, along with PETER KING and JERRY NADLER, the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act. This legislation would reauthorize the programs for 25 years and fulfill that promise to never forget.

We are joined in support by a bipartisan group of 37 Members from all over the country. First responders and volunteers came from every corner of America to help and aid in the recovery. Others who were present on 9/11 have since moved to other areas of the country. The World Trade Center Health Program includes participants from 429 of the 435 congressional districts. This means that in almost every Member's district, there are constituents who are being monitored or who are being treated under the World Trade Center Health Program.

We must continue these Zadroga Act programs that are vital to the sick and dying, those whom we said we will never forget.

SUPPORTING AFFORDABLE, QUALITY, FLEXIBLE CHILD CARE

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the expansion of resources for the Child Care Development Block Grant program.

As a mother of a 5-year old, I understand the need for affordable, quality, and accessible child care. The Child Care Development Block Grant of 2014 extends the program's original intent of supporting low-income working families by ensuring that children are in a setting that will keep them safe and encourage healthy development.

This reauthorization is a solid step to help families meet the expense of child care as it includes ambitious new changes that are important for a high quality child care system. However, the sweeping new requirements called for under this Act are not adequately funded. As states implement the new requirements envisioned in this legislation without additional resources, I fear the result will be that eligible children and families may lose access to child care assistance.

To successfully implement the much-needed improvements included in this legislation, we must re-double our efforts to increase mandatory and discretionary funding in order to meet the new standards set out under this program. As the federal government continues to increase expectations for child care providers and programs without new funding, I am concerned that already high turnover may be exacerbated and poverty wages for child care providers will remain the norm.

Families in poverty are spending 30% or more of their income on child care. Child care costs are simply unaffordable for many workers in low-wage jobs. With stagnant wages, this leaves many low-income working families struggling to find a safe place to care for their

children. The average annual cost of full-time care for one child can be nearly \$4,000 to over \$16,000, especially in areas with high costs of living, like Los Angeles County.

A new National Women's Law Center analysis of state and national data shows that more than half of mothers who have very young children and work in low-wage jobs are raising children on their own; half are working full time; and over one-third are poor. They are disproportionately African-American or Hispanic.

I urge the Administration, in its implementation of this Act, to balance the requirements placed on states, child care providers, and an already under-resourced and stressed child care system with a realistic assessment of the new resources made available for implementation.

Expanding access to affordable quality child care is about the safety, economic development, and services that working families everywhere in the U.S. deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and congratulate my friends and colleagues at the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) on the occasion of the Commission's 50th anniversary. When it was first created, the Commission's primary task was to develop and manage a transportation system for Northern Virginia, but over the years, it has evolved and accomplished so much more than that.

NVTC has become a champion for commuters across the region, an advocate for sustainable transit funding, and a leading voice on transportation policy throughout the Commonwealth. One shudders to think what Northern Virginia might look like if not for the persistent efforts of the Commission to bring local, state, and federal leaders together to promote transit solutions that have made commuting more convenient and removed cars from our roads. Just as important, NVTC has become a training ground for staff and elected leaders, helping to inform policy makers and the public about the value of and urgent need for investing in transit choices. For example, the ranks of the Commission's past chairmen include our colleague, Representative JIM MORAN, who served on NVTC during his tenure as the Mayor of Alexandria, my predecessor, Tom Davis, who served as chair during his tenure on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and, yes, me. I was pleased to serve on the Commission throughout my tenure on the Fairfax Board of Supervisors.

Let me take just a few moments to recount some of the major milestones that have shaped the success of the NVTC and the growth of our region. Two major actions in 1964 laid the groundwork for NVTC to flourish. First, Congress and President Lyndon John-

son passed the Urban Mass Transit Act, which pumped \$375 million over three years into public transit projects across the nation. The Virginia General Assembly followed by creating the Northern Virginia Transportation District to plan and construct a transportation network that promoted safety, convenience, and economic growth.

The Commission did not waste time, starting work on a rapid transit system that first year. Two years later, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (or Metro) compact, a partnership among the regional jurisdictions, was created, and planning began for bus and future rail routes. Momentum increased during the 1970s. NVTC received a federal grant to build the nation's first transit way, the Shirley Highway Bus Project. Metro broke ground with Blue, Orange and Yellow Line service to Virginia starting in the late '70s. NVTC launched a new program known then as Computeride, which later became Commuter Connections, to help commuters plan their trips to work and establish carpools.

NVTC secured a major victory in the early 1980s when it worked with the Virginia General Assembly to pass a 2 percent regional gas tax to support Metro bus and rail service. Planning also began for a new commuter rail service extending to Prince William and Stafford counties. Transit service continued to expand during the 1990s with the new Virginia Railway Express (VRE). In 1996, NVTC was awarded the American Public Transportation Association's Outstanding Government Agency Award. During the past decade, NVTC has been actively planning the next generation transportation network to meet the challenges of Northern Virginia's growth and working with elected leaders at all levels to provide the dedicated funding that will be necessary to deliver those improvements.

It is fitting that NVTC marks its 50th anniversary with one of the largest expansions of the Metro system with the opening of the new Silver Line with service to Tysons and Reston earlier this year. There are now 156 million transit trips in Northern Virginia. Metro, with 91 stations across the region, including 25 in Virginia with six more under construction with phase 2 of the Silver Line, serves more than 750,000 rider trips a day. Metro bus now has 335 routes and 15,000 bus stops throughout the region. VRE, which now operates 30 trains from 18 stations, carries 20,000 passengers daily. Of course, all of that is supplemented by the cities and counties with their own transit services. Demonstrating the tremendous reach and success of NVTC's collective efforts, transit and ridesharing now carry nearly 50 percent of the region's peak travelers.

Mr. Speaker, the success of NVTC has fueled the success of not only Northern Virginia, but also the National Capital Region. The tradition of collaboration and shared investment that has characterized NVTC will serve our communities for generations to come. NVTC's collaborative success gives witness to the fact that our politics can work to serve our constituents. I was proud to be a part of it for 14 years, and I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the staff and leadership, both past and present, of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission for their commitment to providing a world-class trans-

portation system and improving the quality of life for those who live and work in the National Capital Region.

A TRIBUTE TO BISHOP-ELECT PASTOR WALTER F. HARVEY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on October 31–November 2, 2014, Parklawn Assembly of God Church will celebrate the Installation of Pastor Walter F. Harvey to the Episcopal Assignment of Bishop. Also, during this special and historic weekend when Pastor Harvey will be installed, Parklawn Assembly of God Church will celebrate its 105th Anniversary.

Bishop-Elect Walter F. Harvey has been the Senior Pastor of Parklawn Assembly of God Church since 1993. He is the devoted husband of Judy Martin Harvey, the father of Nicholas J. Harvey and grandfather of Autumn Marie Harvey. Since assuming the role of Senior Pastor, he has not only led the worship facility in the renovation of the building but also instituted a new church constitution and bylaws which has brought a spirit of renewal to the church and the community. Bishop-Elect Harvey is an author, mentor, and life coach. He is the President of Walter Harvey Ministries, Inc., an international media communications and consulting firm and can be heard daily on the "Light for the World" and "Light for Today" radio broadcasts. Further, he founded the Parklawn Christian Leadership Academy in 1998.

Bishop-Elect Harvey is in great demand as a speaker around his community, city, nationally and internationally. He serves the Assemblies of God statewide and at the national level as a General Presbyter and vice president of the National Black Fellowship of the Assemblies of God, as an Executive Presbyter of the Wisconsin/Northern Michigan Ministry Network and as an Ethnic/Language Presbyter. He also serves pastors as an overseer of the Outpouring Ministry Network Group; a group of seven Milwaukee area pastors/ministries. Bishop-Elect Harvey serves on the boards of various social, economic, educational and philanthropic organizations. He is a man of God who not only serves the members of his congregation, but reaches out to make community a better place.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I rise to praise Bishop-Elect Walter F. Harvey, a man I am proud to call a friend. I honor Bishop-Elect Walter F. Harvey's many accomplishments and life time commitment to the entire Milwaukee Community and 4th Congressional District.

HONORING LIBERTY COMMON HIGH SCHOOL

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention to Liberty Common

High School's (LCHS) outstanding performance on the ACT college readiness assessment. Liberty Common High School is a relatively new public high school located in Fort Collins, Colorado, and its students performed exceptionally on this year's exam. Liberty's achievement not only shows the intellectual strength of the Class of 2015, but also demonstrates the overall success of the charter school's educational program.

The ACT is a college readiness assessment that all Colorado high school students are required to take in their junior year. In both 2012 and 2013, Liberty Common High School achieved the highest composite ACT score in the state of Colorado. This year, Liberty Common High School's composite score of 28.63 was not only the highest of all the high schools in Colorado, but was also the highest in the history of our great state. LCHS also now holds the record for every subject category on the ACT. These feats are particularly impressive given the fact that LCHS only opened in 2010 and is such a young school. It has obtained the highest ACT score in the state in every year that its students have taken the test.

Academic achievement at this level not only shows the success of a charter school built on parental involvement, but also the strength of the curriculum taught at Liberty Common High School. The principal of Liberty Common High School, former Congressman Bob Schaffer said, "These scores are a reflection of a solid classical, college-preparatory curriculum we've built atop the powerful Core Knowledge curriculum we use in grades K through eight." This Core Knowledge curriculum, along with the character education in both elementary and high school, is structured in a way so that students' knowledge builds upon what they learned in the previous year. The foundational skills learned in the elementary grades allow students to reach a higher level of education in high school.

While in high school, LCHS students are not only challenged by their classes and teachers, but also by their peers. Members of Liberty Common High School's Class of 2015, who have just recently set the ACT composite score record for the state of Colorado, attribute their success, in part, to the class which preceded them. The Class of 2014 not only set the bar high for the class below them, but held sessions that helped juniors prepare for the ACT early. They challenged the Class of 2015 to beat their score while helping them to do so. A student community like the one at Liberty allows students to invite others to try their best while offering help to one another in the process.

This score is outstanding, but what is more outstanding is what this score symbolizes—a school run by parents, chosen by parents, and supported by parents preparing their children to achieve in college and in life. Successes like these should not go unnoticed, but instead should be highlighted as an example for what a great public education can achieve.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MELBA LUCIANO

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Melba Luciano. Mrs. Luciano earned her bachelor's degree in Health Education from Hunter College in New York and a master's degree in Educational Leadership from Nova University.

A dedicated educator, she has over 30 years of experience in education, through a variety of positions including Classroom Assistant, Teacher, Elementary Resource Specialist, Assistant Principal, Principal, and Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. She began her career with the Osceola School District in 1986, and was named Superintendent in 2012. Mrs. Luciano is the first Latina superintendent in the Florida public school system.

As Superintendent, Mrs. Luciano provides leadership for the district and school administration, as well as facilitates continuous improvement, educational accountability, and community support through partnerships with stakeholders. She works collaboratively with students, parents, faculty and staff, administrators, community residents, and School Board Members to annually develop an annual strategic plan focused on the district's vision for student success.

In June 2014, the Florida Department of Education recognized the Osceola School District as one of only five Florida counties to improve in all seven assessment areas in reading, mathematics, and science.

Mrs. Luciano has a strong sense of leadership, an unrivaled sense of professionalism, and a passion for community involvement and collaboration. In March 2013, she was awarded the National Association for Bilingual Education's Citizen Award.

I am happy to recognize Melba Luciano, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her passion for education and commitment to improving the Central Florida community.

HONORING JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE'S TUTORING AND LEARNING CENTER

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ribbon cutting of Joliet Junior College's Tutoring and Learning Center in Joliet, Illinois.

Joliet Junior College was the first public community college in the nation, and since its founding in 1901 it has provided students with excellent educational opportunities. This tradition will continue with the opening of the Tutoring and Learning Center.

The Tutoring and Learning Center will provide students with free access to tutoring serv-

ices such as drop-in math assistance, presentation training, online tutoring, and writing assistance, all under one roof. These services will give Joliet Junior College students the skills they need to succeed not only in their education, but after graduation as well.

Again, I would like to congratulate Joliet Junior College on the opening of the Tutoring and Learning Center and thank the college for its hard work on behalf of our students.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE NFL'S ACTIONS

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter regarding domestic violence and the NFL's actions:

SEPTEMBER 9, 2014.

ROGER GOODELL,
*Commissioner, National Football League,
New York, NY.*

DEAR COMMISSIONER GOODELL: Today I called for the NFL to take immediate action in announcing a major effort on fighting national domestic violence. It would be appropriate for the NFL to initiate major funding effort to stop domestic violence now. Domestic violence hits every sector of the Nation without respect to race, religion, wealth and/or gender. Many Americans have lost their lives at the hands of domestic violence. The NFL can collaborate with other professional sports organizations and produce a major gift to provide resources to anti domestic violence groups, health clinics, law enforcement and faith organizations to stop the crisis of domestic violence.

As a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee and the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus who helped reauthorize the most recent Violence Against Women's Act (VAWA), I think it's imperative that we deal with this situation now. Statistics show that one in every four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime. An estimated 1.3 million women are victims of physical assault by an intimate partner each year. 85% of domestic violence victims are women.

It is imperative that we come together in strong support of a national, broad and comprehensive strategy to address the causes and effects of domestic violence. Weighing heavily on our conscience is the fact that an estimated 46 million children in our country are exposed to violence each year through crime, abuse and trauma. The gravity of the current situation with Ray Rice and the NFL cannot be overstated.

Domestic violence is the willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, and/or other abusive behavior perpetrated by an intimate partner against another. It is an epidemic affecting individuals in Houston, regardless of age, economic status, race, religion, nationality or educational background. Violence against women is often accompanied by emotionally abusive and controlling behavior, and thus is part of a systematic pattern of dominance and control. Domestic violence results in physical injury, psychological trauma sometimes death. The consequences of domestic violence can cross generations and truly last a lifetime.

Since coming to Congress I have spearheaded efforts to ensure women have equal

opportunity and are treated fairly. I have fought year after year for adequate funding to make shelters and supportive services more accessible to victims of family and domestic violence. It is now time for the NFL to place some of their resources into these shelters and programs that work to alleviate domestic violence in our society. The scourge of domestic violence cannot be silenced or covered up. It is real and the NFL, after all the talk is done, can have a visible, constant and long term impact by providing this major funding initiative. We must take on this challenge with the recognition that changing the pervasive culture of domestic violence will not happen overnight. While we can act now and pass legislation to ameliorate some of causes of the domestic violence epidemic, this problem is larger than our laws. That is why we must make an enduring commitment to our families and children suffering from domestic violence.

To respond or ask any questions about this letter, please contact my Chief of Staff Glenn Rushing at 202-225-3816. A prompt response to this letter would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

IN RECOGNITION OF NAROPA UNIVERSITY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Boulder, Colorado's own Naropa University, in celebration of its 40th anniversary. Naropa University is this nation's leader in contemplative education and is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

40 years ago, a Tibetan-born Buddhist leader named Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche, who as a young man led hundreds of Tibetans on foot from a besieged homeland, assembled a collection of students and guest faculty for the first summer session in Boulder at what is now called Naropa University. Trungpa's vision was to create a university that would combine contemplative studies with traditional Western scholastic and artistic disciplines.

The first classes at Naropa University (then called the Naropa Institute) were held in a summer session in a vacated bus garage, now the site of the Alfalfa's supermarket. The organizers expected around three hundred people to show up. Instead, more than 1,300 students flocked to Boulder, and in the process, transformed Boulder into an energetic center of learning, culture, and the performing arts.

As the leader in contemplative education, an approach to learning and teaching that integrates Eastern wisdom studies with traditional Western scholarship, Naropa has always been a magnet for great minds, intellectual curiosity, and those who search for greater meaning. Indeed, Naropa is renowned for its ability to attract spiritual leaders, such as His Holiness the Dalai Lama, political and business leaders, and global thought leaders. And through Naropa's vaunted Summer Writing Program, generations of writers, performers, and activists have come of age and worked side-by-side with some of our nation's greatest poets, authors, and performers.

Naropa is now firmly embedded in the cultural, academic, and economic fabric of Boulder. Each year, 1000 undergraduate and graduate students seek degrees that will enable them to transform the world around them. Programs in counseling psychology, performing arts, art therapy, writing and poetics, early childhood and K-12 education, environmental leadership, peace studies, religious studies and pastoral counseling and traditional eastern arts are training a new generation of leaders. Thousands of Naropa alumni are changing the world for the better through work in nonprofits, small business and social enterprise start-ups, therapy, counseling, teaching and writing. They studied with a distinguished faculty who are nationally and internationally recognized for their scholarship and contemplative teaching techniques. And finally, Naropa was recently named both a "College of Distinction" and one of the "8 Greenest Colleges" in the United States.

Naropa University is truly a Colorado treasure. I'm so proud to join my fellow Boulderites, as well as the thousands of Naropa alumni around the world, in congratulating Naropa University on its 40th Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING WALTER FURNACE ON RECEIVING NAFCU'S PAUL REVERE AWARD

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Walter R. Furnace on receiving the National Association of Federal Credit Union's Paul Revere Award. Walter received this award because he excels at promoting the credit union industry's most pressing concerns. In his work with the American Airlines Federal Credit Union (AAFCU), Walter has demonstrated great passion for supporting credit unions and their mission to provide members an opportunity to have a hand in the services they use for the financial wellbeing of their families. Walter's relationship building and strong work ethic over the years continues to prove successful. He works to build relationships not only with Members of Congress from his home state, but where AAFCU has fields of membership as well. His strong grasp of issues affecting credit unions and their members allows him to be an effective member of NAFCU's operations. I've had the pleasure of working with Walter for many years.

Walter uses his experience in public service as a former State Representative of Alaska to benefit those whom he serves by effectively advancing the priorities of credit unions in the public sphere. His past public service catalyzed his success in his current role, caring and doing what he can for his members.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Walter Furnace as a recipient of the National Association of Federal Credit Union's Paul Revere Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH AN- NIVERSARY OF MARS CHOCO- LATE IN ALBANY, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to extend my heartfelt congratulations to the associates and leadership of the Mars Chocolate manufacturing facility in Albany, Georgia as they celebrate 50 years of operation. The Mars Chocolate plant will commemorate this milestone with a celebration to be held on Friday, October 10, 2014.

Family owned since 1911, Mars, Incorporated has 44 manufacturing facilities in the United States and employs more than 26,500 associates. It has diverse consumer businesses in chocolate, gum and confections, food, drinks and pet care. Mars strives to create a mutuality of benefits among all stakeholders through its Five Principles: Quality, Efficiency, Responsibility, Mutuality and Freedom.

The Mars plant in Albany opened in 1964 as "Peanut Masters" and operated primarily as a peanut roasting facility. This plant has a long history and a strong connection to the Georgia peanut industry and today roasts all the peanuts for Snickers®, Snickers® Ice Cream, Snickers® Peanut Butter Squared, M&M's® Peanut Butter, and Twix® PB Bars in the United States. The plant employs 172 of my constituents and now manufactures Combos® and Marathon® bars, in addition to the roasting operation.

For the past 50 years, Mars has had a tremendous impact on the Albany, Georgia community. Not only does it offer economic benefits by providing jobs, the company also encourages its associates to give back to the community through various community engagement programs.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask that my colleagues join me and the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in congratulating the Mars Chocolate manufacturing facility in Albany, Georgia for 50 years of operation. I am so glad to have this iconic American company in my District and I look forward to 50 more years of continued success in Southwest Georgia.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVID STARR AND HIS DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN JOURNALISM

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal satisfaction that I pay tribute to a remarkable individual who has spent more than 70 years working in the only profession that ever mattered to him: journalism. David Starr knew he wanted to be in the newspaper business when he was in the fifth grade, and since then, he has gone on to have a long and distinguished career with the Newhouse publications. He has been a reporter, an editor, a

publisher and a president; performing each task with enthusiasm and great skill. To me, he is the quintessential newspaperman, bringing passion, integrity and devotion to his beloved craft. More importantly, I am proud to call him my friend.

As much as David Starr enjoys his day job, he has another keen interest, and that is making western Massachusetts a better place to live, work and raise a family. Since I first met him in 1977, few people have done more to improve the quality of life in the Pioneer Valley. Under his leadership, downtown Springfield experienced an unprecedented rebirth. He encouraged the public and private sectors to work together to bring economic development and jobs to the region. The Monarch Building, the Sheraton Hotel, the Bank of Boston Building and a new state-of-the-art high speed color press are all living proof of his tireless efforts. He had a vision for our community and it was realized. But knowing David Starr, I am certain that he believes his work is far from complete.

It should not come as a surprise that he used to read 13 New York newspapers every day in his youth. A born journalist with a curious mind, David got his start with the Long Island Press in 1940. That is where his lifelong partnership with the Newhouse family began. They recognized his talents and he quickly rose through the ranks. Following his service in the Army, he returned to the paper where he would eventually become its senior editor. His hard work was rewarded once again when the Newhouse family sent him to Massachusetts to run the Springfield Republican. He has been in his corner office at 1860 Main Street ever since.

Besides his fondness for the newspaper business, the other constant in David's life has been his wife Peggy. For more than a half century they have been a formidable team. Their philanthropic efforts and willingness to give back to our community is legendary. If you have heard the Springfield Symphony Orchestra, visited our extraordinary museums, listed to public radio or watched WGBY, you can thank David and Peggy Starr. They have continually invested in our cultural institutions and helped make a difference in the place we call home.

As his friends and colleagues gather together in Springfield this week, I want to join them in thanking David for many years of friendship. For eight decades, you have been a fixture in the newsrooms of America. You have encouraged your writers and informed your readers. Both you and Peggy have generously given your time and resources for the betterment of others. And the lasting contributions you have made to our community will never be forgotten. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, let me congratulate you on a job well done.

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE 2014 BEST OF BRADDOCK AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2014 Best of Brad-

dock Awards, presented by the Braddock District Council of Community Associations. These awards are given annually to deserving individuals, organizations, and companies in the Braddock Magisterial District of Fairfax County, Virginia, who have demonstrated an outstanding commitment to the community.

The goal of the Braddock District Council is to promote the civic, community, and general welfare of the citizens of the Braddock District. The Council represents the interests of community associations, facilitates cooperation and coordination between associations, and provides a path of communications between associations and officials or elected representatives of the Braddock District.

I am pleased to join the Braddock District Council of Community Associations in recognizing the following Recipients of the 2014 Best of Braddock Awards:

Citizen of the Year—Norma Heck, founding member and immediate past president of the North Springfield Civic Association, for nearly 40 years of extensive involvement in the community. Norma is well known for her dedicated service and although she has reached an age at which most people decide to slow down a bit, she plans to become even more active on the NSCA board and in Braddock District Council programs.

Young Person of the Year—Elizabeth Banks, who is a student at Robinson Secondary School, for her many efforts on behalf of others including working with children, volunteering for Second Chance Employment Services, which assists victims of domestic violence, assisting in the renovation of an orphanage in the Dominican Republic, and organizing a Special Olympics basketball game at Robinson. As a volunteer at the medical neurology lab at Georgetown University, she participated in efforts to create a protein that could be used by others to test its role in Parkinson's disease. She will no doubt continue to remain involved and engaged in her community at the University of Virginia next year.

Most "Can-Do" Public Employee—Julie Tahan, Lake Accotink Park Supervisor, for her management that has allowed Lake Accotink to be one of the most outstanding parks in Fairfax County, and for her outstanding leadership capabilities demonstrated through her coordination of the efforts to recover from tropical storms and organization of the annual Cardboard Boat Regatta.

Neighborhood Enhancement or Beautification by a Homeowner—Paula and David McKinley, for their beautiful and extensive rose garden that has included more than 75 varieties of roses. Their spectacular garden has enhanced the aesthetics of the neighborhood since the early 1990s.

Neighborhood Enhancement or Beautification by a Community—Greg Sykes of Kings Park West for his commitment to the environment through teaching volunteers about the impacts of non-native invasive species, replanting native vegetation, giving nature walks around Royals Lake, and contributing to the Kings Park West Herald, other publications, and his website.

Organizations Making a Difference in the Community—The David R. Pinn Center for creating a welcoming environment and dynamic programs for all members of the com-

munity, including senior citizens and students. Sarah Tinsley is receiving special recognition for her work with teens and the establishment of the "Stand Up, Step Up, Speak Up (S3UP) program which focuses on leadership training, citizenship and job-readiness, and is the only community center based S3UP program in the county.

Special Recognition—Rohil Bhinge, student at Mosby Woods Elementary School, for leading efforts to complete a fully accessible playground in the Braddock District. Rohil organized fun runs in 2012, 2013, and 2014 to raise funds and community support for a regional facility where children of all abilities can play.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these outstanding residents and organizations and also in thanking them for their service to our community. Their efforts and leadership have been a great benefit to the Braddock District and the rest of Northern Virginia and truly merit our highest praise.

COMMENDING THE 2014 FIESTA HISPANA

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Centro Hispano of Dane County as it hosts Fiesta Hispana, an annual celebration of the Latino community in Madison, Wisconsin.

The festival is an important community event that showcases Latino heritage and culture. Fiesta Hispana offers traditional cuisine and features wonderful dance and music performances as well as fun activities for all family members to enjoy.

The impact of Centro Hispano is felt every day throughout the community, not just through today's event. The center engages with the community and connects residents with vital education, career and general support resources.

I commend the mission and tireless work of Centro Hispano of Dane County to serve and empower local Latino youth and families.

It is an honor to celebrate Fiesta Hispana 2014 as we come together to celebrate the diverse Latino cultures that enrich our community and make it stronger.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MARIBEL GOMEZ-CORDERO

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Maribel Gomez-Cordero. Maribel was born and raised in Puerto Rico. She has been living in Orlando, Florida for the past eighteen years. She and her husband, Henry Cordero, have been married for 27 years and have

three children, Marian, Henry, and Erik. Maribel is also an active member and leader of The Potter's House Assembly of God Church.

Maribel earned a Master's Degree in Clinical Mental Health Counseling specializing in Marriage and Family, from Webster University. Throughout her career as a Social Worker, she has worked for Children's Home Society of Florida, and as a Clinical Therapist for Life & Work Soulutions counseling clinic. Maribel has always dedicated herself to work for those who experience crisis, and provides support to individuals, families and groups within her community. In 2002, the Educational Foundation for the Advancement of Child Welfare honored her with the "A Person That Makes A Difference" Award from the Florida Coalition for Children of Central Florida.

Maribel is also the Vice President for WE Hispanic Women Chamber of Commerce and a Volunteer and Advisor for the Victim of Domestic Violence Program at Nuevo Sendero. Besides her career in social work, Maribel managed her husband and brother-in-law's photography, videos, and public relations company. She was also the editor of the newspaper OJO which dealt with news in the photography and art industry. Maribel currently manages her own private practice in which she is also a psychotherapist.

Maribel was a candidate for Orange County Commissioner for District 4 in the Primary Elections on August 26, 2014. She continues to follow her passion for working with families in the community.

I am happy to recognize Maribel Gomez-Cordero, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her commitment to working with Central Florida's families.

WASHINGTON "REDSKINS" DEBATE: YOU CAN USE CAPS, CHANGE WILL PREVAIL

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, in an ignorant display of defiance, NFL owner Dan Snyder vowed to continue his racist use of the offensive term "redskins" for his Washington team when he stated, "We'll never change the name. NEVER—you can use caps."

For historical purposes and in response to Mr. Snyder's unceasing, racist rants which disrespect Native Americans across this land who oppose the use of this derogatory term, I rise today to share with my colleagues and submit an editorial I recently co-authored with Suzan Harjo, a noted Native American rights advocate, entitled "Change Will Prevail".

[From The Hill, Sept. 9, 2014]

CHANGE WILL PREVAIL

(By Eni F. H. Faleomavaega and Suzan Shown Harjo)

In 1933 George Preston Marshall renamed his team the Washington Redskins, previously known as the Washington Braves, to avoid confusion with the Boston Braves. He did not seek federal trademark protection for the name until 1967, when students were

trying to rid Oklahoma, Dartmouth, Stanford and other schools of their race-based stereotypes and were using the example of the Washington team name as the worst in the country. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) wrongly granted him and later owners six trademark licenses for this racial slur.

Some suggest this action was in violation of the Trademark Act of 1946, or the Lanham Act, which directs the USPTO to refuse to register trademarks that "may disparage . . . persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute." In 1999 and again this year, the USPTO's trademark judges canceled the existing federal trademarks, pending appeal, and its examining attorneys have denied a dozen requests for new trademarks.

While pundits on both sides of the argument dispute its origins, the term "redskins" is reminiscent of colonial times when, by governmental decree, Native Americans were hunted, killed, and scalped for bounty. The struggle to rid the sports world of this disgusting term is about that heinous history of commodifying native skins.

In June of this year, the USPTO responded favorably to a petition filed by five young Native Americans, holding that the offending trademarks, owned by Pro-Football, Inc. (the entity that owns and operates the Washington franchise) were "disparaging to Native Americans at the respective times they were registered." We applaud the USPTO's cancellation of the six federal trademark registrations that use this disparaging term.

Foreseeing that current owner Dan Snyder would appeal the USPTO decision just like he did in 1999, historic legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives that would permanently clarify the Lanham Act to ensure that the derogatory term will never receive federal trademark protection again. H.R. 1278, the Non-Disparagement of Native American Persons or Peoples in Trademark Registration Act of 2013, now has more than 20 co-sponsors.

As early as May 13, 2013, 10 members of the House also sent a joint letter to Snyder and NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell expressing the necessity for H.R. 1278 and urging a name change for the Washington franchise. Members of the Senate later solidified support by sending a similar letter to the NFL on May 24, 2014.

The clarion call by Native American tribal leaders and organizations to end the shameful legacy of this despicable term can no longer be ignored. Members of the House and Senate have spoken. President Obama thinks the name should be changed. So does U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder. U.S. District Judge Peter J. Messitte held: "the Court will refrain from using the team name unless reference is made to a direct quote where the name appears." Bob Costas, Christine Brennan and other notable journalists, athletes and political figures have joined the effort to rid the NFL of this denigrating word. The Washington Post will no longer use the offensive word in its editorials. The New York Daily News refuses to acknowledge the word in its publications. Even an entire network—CBS—has decided not to dictate the use of this term on the air, allowing its announcers to stop using the term during NFL broadcasts this season.

You can use caps. Change will prevail. Until it does, we call upon the NFL to stop perpetuating racism against Native Americans.

RE-DESIGNATING THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE INTO A NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the National Park Service's continuous effort to protect the legacy of my dear friend and brother, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In particular, the NPS's current effort to re-designate the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site into a National Historic Park is of great significance.

Dr. King helped lead a nonviolent revolution, a revolution of values, a revolution of ideas. He inspired an entire generation to find a way to get in the way, to find a way to get in trouble—good trouble, necessary trouble. Through his actions, speeches, and writings, he helped create the climate for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Re-categorizing this site as a park better reflects the truly monumental spirit of the area and its complexity. The area not only includes Dr. King's gravesite and birth home, which the National Park Service preserves, maintains and educates visitors about via tours, but it also stretches to contain the Historic Ebenezer Baptist Church where Dr. King, his father and his grandfather served as pastors. It also includes the entire block where Dr. King's birth home is located and contains the first integrated and longest active fire station in Atlanta, which Dr. King frequently visited as a boy. The block also consists of more than 20 historic properties, including Victorian homes, apartments and shotgun houses that were all restored to their 1930 appearances.

Last year, over 700,000 people traveled worldwide to visit the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site. Re-designating it as a National Historic Park would better reflect the complexity of the area and would have minimal associated costs, only changing signage and printed materials. I applaud the National Park Service for making this a priority, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation to preserve Dr King's life and legacy.

HONORING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CRAIG BROOK NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Craig Brook National Fish Hatchery as it celebrates its 125th anniversary.

Craig Brook National Fish Hatchery, in East Orland, Maine, is one of two Maine facilities in the National Fish Hatchery System of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I am pleased to celebrate the great contributions the hatchery has made to preserving and restoring Atlantic salmon populations in the Northeast.

Craig Brook was established in 1889 to raise Atlantic salmon for stocking Maine waters. Today, the hatchery supports two Atlantic salmon programs. The facility receives adult salmon from the Penobscot River for breeding purposes and produces up to three million eggs per year, transferring about one million to Green Lake National Fish Hatchery in Ellsworth, while the rest are raised at Craig Brook and released as fry. Craig Brook also rears salmon caught from six Maine rivers with endangered populations and releases spawn back into these same rivers.

Craig Brook National Fish Hatchery, like all of our nation's fish hatcheries, does indispensable work in the preservation and restoration of endangered aquatic species. This is why I have been proud to support legislation to ensure that our nation's fish hatcheries continue to serve the public for years to come.

Craig Brook's important scientific work to preserve our region's fish embodies the environmentally conscious spirit of Maine. I am delighted to recognize the accomplishments of Craig Brook and its dedicated team and look forward to their continued success well into the future.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Craig Brook National Fish Hatchery on 125 years of exceptional research and conservation work.

HONORING A.B.A.T.E.'S 34TH
ANNUAL MOTORCYCLE TOY RUN

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pennsylvania chapter of the Alliance of Bikers Aimed Toward Education (A.B.A.T.E.) 34th Annual Motorcycle Toy Run.

The Toy Run was formed by A.B.A.T.E. in 1980 with a simple goal: to bring Christmas joy and smiles to the faces of underprivileged children throughout the Greater Philadelphia region, many of whom live in Pennsylvania's 1st Congressional district. The run began with 30 motorcyclists in its first year. Since then, it has grown tremendously, with an expected 10,000 motorcyclists expected to participate in this year's ride. The Toy Run is open to motorcyclists and spectators alike, all in support for the cause.

The motorcyclists will depart from the Delaware River waterfront and head west through the city led by Santa Claus and Justice Seamus McCaffery, a Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. At the finish line, the procession will deliver toys to the United States Marine Corps for their "Toys for Tots" program.

I invite you and all of my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 34th Annual Motorcycle Toy Run of the Pennsylvania chapter of A.B.A.T.E. May its philanthropy and dedication to bringing joy to the underprivileged children of the Philadelphia region be an inspiration to all of us in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF INSIGHT MEMORY CARE CENTER

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Insight Memory Care Center (IMCC) of Fairfax, Virginia, on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary and to recognize the extraordinary work this non-profit organization has done to provide services to people with memory related impairments as well as education and support to their families.

Formerly known as Alzheimer's Family Day Center, IMCC was established in 1984 to benefit people who were not being served by existing community services—specifically people in the middle to late stages of dementia or those with behavior challenges. The organization recently changed its name to better reflect the variety of services offered since it does far more than serve as a center for people afflicted by Alzheimer's disease.

What began as an adult day health center with just three participants on its opening day will soon move to a new location where it can serve 50 people per day. Moreover, IMCC has become a comprehensive health and resource provider that offers a spectrum of holistic care, with a vision of a community where those affected by memory impairments can achieve the highest quality of life and their families and caregivers can receive counseling, education, and support.

IMCC's adult day health center provides a safe, engaging, and therapeutic environment for individuals with memory impairment. It is the only dementia-specific day center in the D.C. metro area and remains the only adult day health center in Northern Virginia with programs for people in the later stages of an Alzheimer's disease. IMCC's innovative education and support programs provide caregiver classes, community trainings, professional seminars, support groups, individual consultations, and home visits. These programs help family members remain confident and effective in their caregiving roles and increases awareness and understanding of the disease in the community.

These efforts have garnered well-deserved recognition. Among other accolades, IMCC has been named one of the "Best Small Charities in the Washington Region" by the Catalogue for Philanthropy three times and was honored to be recognized as Adult Day Center of the Year from the National Adult Day Services Association in 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating IMCC for 30 years of success and in thanking its staff, volunteers, and supporters for their service to our community.

SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE'S NATIONAL TRADEMARK EXPO

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the United States Patent and Trademark Office's (USPTO) National Trademark Expo, an important educational event that advances the USPTO's mission to deliver intellectual property information and education to the public. In a time of ongoing challenges for the American and global economy, I want to join the USPTO in its efforts to recognize the vital role that trademarks play in the economy.

The USPTO disseminates trademark information at the Expo to educate the public about the important role that trademarks play in our society and the global marketplace. This year's two-day event will be held on Friday, October 17th, from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Saturday, October 18th, from 10:00 a.m. to 4 p.m., at the USPTO headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. Attendees learn about trademarks from exhibitors, displays, seminars, children's workshops and activities. Seminars cover topics such as intellectual property for business, the trademark registration process, and the importance of buying authentic goods.

A broad cross-section of America's large corporations, small businesses, governmental agencies, and non-profit organizations will highlight valuable information about trademarks, from the various types of trademarks available to their benefits. Exhibitors at the National Trademark Expo will include: 5-hour ENERGY; 1000 Cranes, LLC; American Bar Association; American Girl, LLC; American Intellectual Property Law Association; BERG USA; Canon U.S.A., Inc.; Caterpillar Inc.; City of Falls Church (Virginia) Economic Development Authority; Girl Scouts of the USA; Hershey Chocolate & Confectionery Corporation (the Hershey Company); Hooray for Books!; Idaho Potato Commission; Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U.S. Department of the Interior; International AntiCounterfeiting Coalition (IACC); International Trademark Association—Unreal Campaign; Looshes Labs LLC; Microsoft; NASA Goddard Space Flight Center's Innovative Technology Partnerships Office; National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center (IPR Center); NumbersAlive!; Rita's Ice, Custard, Happiness; Smithsonian Institution; Sweet Frog Premium Frozen Yogurt; The LEGO Group; The National Institute on Deafness and Other Communications Disorders; The Pepsom Group, Inc.; The United States Foundation for Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (FIRST); The University of Notre Dame du Lac; Uber Technologies; United Parcel Service Inc.; United States Air Force; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Valvoline; Volcom, Inc.; YMCA of Metropolitan Washington; and Zoomph. Anson Williams, who starred in the television show Happy Days and now is an entrepreneur and director, will speak about the importance of trademarks to business at the opening ceremony.

On average, people encounter 1,500 trademarks each day. In a time of globalization, counterfeit goods pose an increasing threat to American businesses and jobs, and trademarks assist the public in discerning between authentic and counterfeit merchandise. Counterfeit goods cost the United States billions of dollars and countless jobs annually, as well as undermine consumer confidence in brand integrity when purchasers encounter knock-off goods of inferior quality.

The first National Trademark Expo took place over 25 years ago in Washington, DC. Since then, the Expo has educated thousands of people on the importance of trademarks. I applaud the USPTO for its continued efforts to educate the public on the important role of trademarks and the benefits of federal registration through the Expo. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the USPTO, at this time when trademark protection and intellectual property rights play an increasingly important role in our global economy. And, I encourage the public and my fellow Members of Congress and staff to bring their family and friends to this free, family-friendly event.

IN RECOGNITION OF M. L. HARRIS
UNITED METHODIST CHURCH'S
142ND ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation and leadership of M. L. Harris United Methodist Church in Columbus, Georgia, as the church observes its 142nd anniversary. The members of this parish will come together in a day of worship and celebration of this occasion on Sunday, October 26, 2014.

The origins of M. L. Harris can be traced back to 1872, when a group of like-minded individuals met regularly under grape arbors and anywhere else they could to praise and worship the Lord. These individuals met for an entire decade before being granted a plot of land which they could call their own by the Georgia General Assembly. The church was built at 640 6th Avenue in Columbus, Georgia and was named "Simpson Chapel Methodist Episcopal Church" after Bishop Matthew Simpson, a prominent bishop of the time.

The Simpson Chapel continued to operate for nearly a century, until the congregation's leaders decided it was time to make a change if the Church was going to continue to grow and prosper. Through the faith, effort and charitable donations of many dedicated souls, a new church building was erected within three years at Bedford St. and Old Cusseta Road in Columbus. The church was renamed to "M. L. Harris Methodist Church," in honor of the wonderfully generous contributions made by Bishop Marquis L. Harris over the course of the church's construction.

At the time M. L. Harris was built, African-American congregations were not recognized as part of the general conference, and thus were grouped together in the Central Jurisdic-

tion. M. L. Harris remained in the separate conference until 1967, at the culmination of the Civil Rights Movement, when the Evangelical United Brethren and the Methodist Church merged into the United Methodist Church. One of the terms of the merger ordered the end of segregation within the denomination, and M. L. Harris subsequently became M. L. Harris United Methodist Church.

M. L. Harris would see many great pastors over the years, but perhaps the most notable was Reverend William B. Howell, whose strong leadership enabled tremendous growth within the congregation, reaching a record 373 members. During his tenure, many changes were made to the church, including structural renovations and the implementation of youth programs. Today, the church continues to grow under the spiritual guidance of Reverend Walter C. Lundy, Sr.

The story of M. L. Harris United Methodist Church, which began as a small group of people worshipping in the shade of a grape arbor 142 years ago and has grown into a modest, yet successful congregation, stands out as an exemplary display of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful and united group of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to M. L. Harris United Methodist Church in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The congregation may be small in number, but it is great in spirit and truly lives up to the church's motto that declares M. L. Harris as "The Church Where Everybody is Somebody and God is ALL."

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP
OF SENATOR EDUARDO BHATIA

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize Eduardo Bhatia. Mr. Bhatia is a Puerto Rican politician and Senator.

Bhatia obtained his Bachelor's degree in Government and Public Policy from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs in 1986. In May 1986, Bhatia was awarded a Fulbright scholarship to study law, economics and politics in Santiago, Chile for one year. He graduated from Stanford Law School in June 1990 where he founded and edited the "Stanford Journal of Law and Policy", an academic publication with an emphasis on the development of new laws and public policy. He is admitted to practice law in Florida, Washington D.C. and The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

After graduating, Bhatia worked for a year as a Judicial Officer for Judge Levin H. Campbell, at the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Boston, Massachusetts. From 1991 to 1992, he was the Chief of Staff for the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Jaime Fuster, in Washington, D.C. Bhatia is also the former Executive Director of the Puer-

to Rico Federal Affairs Administration in Washington D.C. As the Executive Director, he officially represented the Governor of Puerto Rico on important issues affecting the Commonwealth.

Bhatia was elected as an official Senate candidate in the Popular Democratic Party (Partido Popular Democrático or PPD) primary on March 9, 2008. At the 2008 general elections, Bhatia won one of only five Senate seats obtained by his party.

At the 2012 primaries, Bhatia won the most votes, securing his spot for the general elections. He then won the most votes of all the PPD candidates to the Senate. After the win, Bhatia was elected by his colleagues as the fifteenth President of the Senate of Puerto Rico.

In 2013, Bhatia served as Co-Chair of the Eastern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments (CSG-ERC). Later that year, he was elected as President of the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators (NHCSL), becoming the first Senate President to hold the title. Bhatia is also a board member of several organizations, including the Council of State Governments (CSG) and the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO).

I am honored to recognize Senator Eduardo Bhatia, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his leadership and commitment to serving the Puerto Rican and Hispanic-American communities.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUFFOLK COUNTY SOIL AND WATER
CONSERVATION DISTRICT

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District. Since 1964, the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District has actively developed and implemented specialized projects and educational programs to improve, protect, and preserve Suffolk County's most treasured natural resources.

Suffolk County's thriving agriculture has been assisted by the conservation efforts of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District in partnership with the local communities and landowners, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Long Island Farm Bureau, the Cornell Cooperative Extension and Research Lab, the New York State Soil and Water Conservation Committee, the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and the New York Association of Conservation Districts.

As a result of this collaboration, Suffolk County leads the rest of our great state in market value of crop production, including sod, grapes, nursery stock, aquaculture, and specialty crops. The County can also be proud of flourishing agricultural tourism, known for attracting thousands of visitors to wineries, greenhouses, and seasonal pumpkin picking.

Consisting of over 600 farms spanning 35,000 acres, Suffolk County farms form the pillar of the East End economy and contribute millions of dollars to the Long Island and New York state economies, supporting local jobs and igniting economic growth across the region. This success is sustainable with the help of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District and can help further propel Long Island's continuing economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, helping local farmers secure federal aid and educating them about building green infrastructure are just some of the many critically important functions of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District, which remains dedicated to the success of Long Island farmers and small businesses, and why it is an honor to offer my congratulations on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BRENDAN
BERNARD FRANCIS MCKAY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I share this obituary of an outstanding young American, Mr. Brendan Bernard Francis McKay.

Brendan, 30, passed away Monday, September 8, 2014, in Rome, Italy, following a tragic accident.

An AmeriCorps volunteer, artist, multi-instrumentalist, snowboarder, world traveler, counselor, historian, Ph.D. candidate, and Seanchai in the Irish storytelling tradition, Brendan was born June 30, 1984 in Summit, New Jersey, the second of Bernard and Mazy McKay's four children. He grew up in Alexandria and McLean, Virginia, where he graduated from McLean High School in 2002.

Brendan began undergraduate studies at Virginia Commonwealth University, later attended Western Connecticut State University and John Cabot University in Rome, and in 2012 graduated magna cum laude from Rhode Island College with a Bachelor's in History. Most recently, Brendan completed his Master's degree in International Relations at St. John's University in Rome, Italy in June 2014.

Throughout his teens and early twenties, Brendan struggled with addiction issues. With the support of loved ones, he participated in therapeutic and rehabilitation programs in Utah, New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Kansas. In 2008, Brendan emerged from this period secure in his recovery, and with a renewed passion for education, adventure, and experience which would come to define the rest of his life.

From 2008–2010, Brendan served with AmeriCorps as a volunteer with Big Brothers, Big Sisters in Worland, Wyoming. Within a matter of months he was promoted to Vice President of Development, going on to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars on behalf of at-risk youth, before leaving to accept a position as an AmeriCorps Program Manager in Rhode Island. Before leaving Wyoming he was urged by locals in Worland to stay and

run for mayor. He was flattered and seriously considered it.

Brendan is remembered fondly by his loved ones in the U.S. and around the world for his legendary sense of humor, a classic Irish storyteller vividly sharing his many adventures. He ran with the bulls in Pamplona, Spain. He rode a hot air balloon through the Atlas Mountains of Morocco. He skied across the Swiss-French border in the Alps, not entirely on purpose. Completing an Asian journey that included Malaysia, Cambodia and Nepal, he returned to Rome over the Himalayas and Mt. Everest. He crisscrossed the United States by car, camped in the badlands of North Dakota, and lived on a mountain in Southern California. During academic travel to North Korea he became one of only a small number of Americans to have seen the demilitarized zone from the north side.

Brendan was also intellectually brilliant. He was an enthusiastic reader, with particular interest in philosophy, history, physics, and comparative religion. His collection of unusual tattoos included the Fibonacci sequence on his arm. His creativity and humor led to unique inventions; on one occasion, Brendan created what he called a "Scrabbanjelo," a playable banjo which he constructed from the wooden box of a Scrabble set—a game at which he was renowned as unbeatable.

At the time of his passing, he was looking forward to his doctoral work at King's College in London. His studies were to focus on the little-told story of the town of Fiumi on the Italy-Croatia border, which formed its own independent state in World War I in defiance of the warring countries around it.

Brendan's 6'6" physical presence was the outer manifestation of an unusually humble, sensitive, self-deprecating person, whose generosity, kindness, and compassion for friends and family alike will never be forgotten. His beloved dog, Anastasia, is the physical embodiment of that kindness. Brendan had encountered a group of drug dealers about to shoot a young puppy for which they had no use. He persuaded them to let him adopt her in exchange for what little money he had in his pocket, a meager five dollars. For more than a decade, Anastasia has been a cherished member of the McKay family, displaying a level of emotional intelligence that is extraordinary to find in an animal.

Brendan was not immune to accidents, and indeed had scars going back to toddlerhood. But he always stood up, brushed himself off, and went at life again, charging boldly at every experience the world could offer. His enthusiasm for adventure inspired all who knew him.

Brendan is survived by his parents, Bernard and Mary, his two brothers, Patrick and Conor, his sister, Rosemary, sister-in-law Nora, and his beloved, Camilla Valeriano. He will be sorely missed.

HONORING WORLD WAR II
VETERAN ARTHUR NAGLER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a decorated World War II veteran, Mr. Arthur Nagler, who lives in my Congressional district, and to point out a serious flaw in the ability of veterans to obtain medals they deserve for the service they gave to our country.

Arthur served our country in some of the fiercest battles of World War II. After his arrival in France following the Normandy invasion, he was a medic with the 170th General Hospital where he saved the lives of many of his fellow soldiers. In recognition of his service, he was awarded several medals, including the Legion of Honor by the Republic of France.

I am so very proud of Arthur, as we all should be. I want to highlight a point of supreme irony in his case, however. During one battle, as Mr. Nagler worked in his hospital tent saving the lives of wounded soldiers, an enemy bomb landed nearby, seriously wounding him from shrapnel and knocking him unconscious.

Because of the critical need for doctors, Mr. Nagler was revived, his wounds were "stitched up," as he puts it, and he was sent on with his fellow medics to continue saving other soldiers' lives. Unfortunately, any records of his wounds apparently do not exist. He concedes that, in the confusion, the records of his injuries may not have been recorded or the records may have been lost as the hospital was hurriedly moved to the next battlefield. However, there is a distinct possibility that a record was made of his injury and it was destroyed in the great fire that swept through a section of the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis in 1973. The fire destroyed nearly 50 years worth of records of those who served our nation in uniform from 1912–1959.

That is why I rise today, Mr. Speaker. In my 21 years in Congress, I have been contacted many times by veterans seeking not just medals, but the records they need to prove their eligibility for disability benefits and pensions. I do not fault the army, as they must work with what records they have to give veterans everything they deserve. Still, after sacrificing so much for our nation and its freedoms, I feel there must be some way to correct this situation. After 60 years of trying, Arthur Nagler has given up hope of ever getting the Purple Heart that he rightly deserves. Everyone should consider the supreme irony of a man who spent World War II saving the lives of other wounded American soldiers, is then wounded himself, and has not been awarded a Purple Heart.

I respectfully ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle work together to fix this absurd situation, not just for Arthur Nagler, but for all veterans in similar situations. Let us give these brave men and women the respect they deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE 2014 HONOREES
OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY
BRANCH OF THE NAACP

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2014 Honorees of the Fairfax County Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The Fairfax Branch is recognized as the NAACP's first rural chapter. In 1915, a few brave African American citizens in Falls Church, Virginia, fought a proposed ordinance that would have segregated housing. They called themselves the Colored Citizens Protective League (CCPL) and the group evolved to become the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP.

Each year, the Fairfax County NAACP honors several deserving individuals and organizations that have shown extraordinary support of the Branch or the community. I am honored to submit the names of the following 2014 Community Service Award winners:

Fairfax County Democratic Committee Election Law and Voter Protection Committee. The Election Law and Voter Protection (ELVP) Committee strives to make sure every vote is counted and that proposed legislation and procedures affecting voting rights are fair and appropriate. Every election, ELVP members monitor voting precincts and help make sure each citizen can fully and fairly exercise his or her right to vote, regardless of political preferences.

Jill Turner—Program Manager, Intel Computer Clubhouse, Gum Springs Community Center. Ms. Turner works to change the mindset of young people who come from economically disadvantaged families. She teaches creative writing, computer skills, etiquette, poetry writing, and has formed a book club. Through her leadership, some teens have become leaders and have formed additional clubs, specializing in their own interests. Ms. Turner recently established a mentoring program. Participants discuss issues such as domestic violence, HIV/AIDS, homelessness, drugs, and other issues facing our youth.

Danielle Blunt—Girls Inspired and Ready to Lead, Inc. (GIRL). Founded by Ms. Blunt in 2010, GIRL is a nonprofit organization dedicated to mentoring and empowering today's girls for future success through academic excellence, leadership skills, community service, a healthy lifestyle, and self-esteem. In 2014, Ms. Blunt partnered with George Mason University's College of Science STEM Accelerator Program to create a STEM summer camp for middle school girls of color and one for elementary school boys and girls. It also gives me great pleasure to recognize the following recipients of this year's President's Awards: Supervisor John Cook, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (Braddock District); Captain Everett A. Lewis, U.S. Air Force (Ret.), Executive Committee, Alexandria NAACP; Colonel Ed Roessler, Chief, Fairfax County Police Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2014 honorees of the

Fairfax County NAACP and thanking them for their tremendous contributions to our youth and our community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ELECTRIC
CHARGING ADVANCEMENT RE-
FORM ACT

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, my home of Los Angeles unfortunately is the nation's smoggiest region of the country. We are surrounded by mountains and have the highest per capita ownership of cars. The Los Angeles region has made great improvements in our air quality. In the last 15 years, the number of dirty air days has dropped by 38 percent. Still—we have the worst air quality in the nation. The American Lung Association ranks the Los Angeles region as number one in the nation for ozone pollution and in the top five for particulate matter pollution.

This results in many health issues including higher numbers of children with asthma and significant lung function problems in normal, healthy people.

We do love our cars in Los Angeles, and the pollution from these cars is a key cause of our air quality problems. Los Angeles could drastically improve its air quality if more of those cars were plug in vehicles. However there are simply not enough charging stations available for this to be feasible.

As an owner of an all-electric Nissan Leaf, I know all too well that there is a lack of charging stations. I have personally experienced range anxiety. There have been times when driving home I have had to turn off the lights, radio, and air conditioning to ensure that I can make it home because there were no charging stations nearby. Los Angeles is one of the largest consumers of electric vehicles in the country. But, I believe people would buy more electric vehicles if charging stations were readily available.

Today, I am introducing the Electric Charging Advancement Reform Act to encourage more electric vehicles on our roads, which will result in clean air improvements and energy independence. This is an act integral to revolutionizing the accessibility of plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) to potential drivers. My bill would reauthorize the electric vehicle recharging property credit and make available to both consumers and businesses a tax credit of up to \$100,000 for the installation of charging stations.

No one driving a gas-powered car has to worry about finding a gas station before they get to their destination. Let us make sure that electric charging stations are just as easily accessible and convenient as the gas stations that are at every major intersection in our cities and off our major freeways.

HONORING MARY BETTY MINERO

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of New Mexico resident Mary Betty Minero, who passed away on July 15, 2014.

Betty was a lifelong resident of Barelás and a regular at Barelás Coffee House, which is where I first met her during my campaign for Congress in 2012. Betty had an outsized personality and an exuberant joy for life. She and I made a connection the instant she approached me, clutching her Betty Boop lunch pail, for a hug. Betty made me feel special, the same way she treated dozens of New Mexicans she embraced with equal enthusiasm each day. Neighbors, business leaders and government workers were always greeted by Betty as she worked the crowd before settling in at table 9A with a spoon in hand and half-and-half ready for her coffee.

Betty loved to dance. When she wasn't dancing with customers in the tight entryway at the coffee house, Betty could be found each Tuesday at Ned's, where her daughter, Geri Lucero, would take her for a night of dancing and local music.

Betty loved her close-knit family that included her husband, Ambrosio Minero, and their three daughters: Geri Lucero, Gloria Gutierrez and Betty Jo Martin. She also treasured her encounters with everyone she met. Her daughter said Betty never considered anyone a stranger, and if you talked to her long enough, she concluded you were probably related. She liked to tell people she thought she was 21 years old—before looking into the mirror and realizing she was really a young 89.

She was a parishioner at Sacred Heart Catholic Church in Barelás and she was known to pray for the people she met, particularly those who were sick. Shortly before her death, Betty mourned the untimely death of her great-grandson, Jacob Gutierrez, a football star at Del Norte High School.

Betty's sincerity and genuine appreciation for others has had a profound effect on everyone who was fortunate enough to enjoy Betty's company and her spirit lives on in our community. My thoughts and prayers are with her family and friends. May the memory of Betty live on in our hearts.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVER-
SARIES OF THE SHIDOGAKUIN
MARTIAL ARTS DOJO AND THE
SHIDOGAKUIN WASHINGTON
KENDO DOJO

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Shidogakuin Martial Arts Dojo on the occasion of its 30th anniversary and the Shidogakuin Washington Kendo Dojo (Washinkan) on its 20th Anniversary.

Kendo, meaning "Way of the sword," is a Japanese martial art derived from 16th Century traditional swordsmanship, using bamboo swords and protective armor for training. This sport is widely practiced throughout Japan, the United States, and many other nations around the world. Kendo is a physically and mentally challenging activity that combines martial arts practices and values with strenuous physical activity. It is great exercise, but it also is much more than a sport. The purpose of practicing Kendo is to mold the mind and body, to cultivate a vigorous spirit, and, through correct and rigid training, to strive for improvement in both technique and personal development.

In 1984, Mr. Shozo Kato established the Shidogakuin Kendo training school in New York City where both students and teachers were taught to learn and grow. In 1993 James Yan and Hiroaki Suzuki, with guidance from Shozo Kato, expanded Shidogakuin to the Washington, DC region by establishing a Kendo dojo at the National Institutes of Health to teach adults and children. The Shidogakuin Washington Kendo Dojo (Washinkan) is now based in Herndon, Virginia, in the 11th Congressional District.

The goal of the Washinkan Dojo is to provide teachers with necessary technical skills and teaching strategies; to implement the protocols to create an environment of professional courtesy, honor, and mutual respect; to provide the facilities necessary to learn and practice; to create a safe, friendly, family-oriented atmosphere; to inform the community that there is an opportunity to learn and practice the sword martial arts; to prepare students for practice, competition and advancement testing; and to prepare students for leadership in the dojo and the larger community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Shidogakuin Kendo Dojo and Shozo Kato on its 30th anniversary and the Washinkan Dojo and James Yan on its 20th anniversary and in thanking them for their service to the youth in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WILLIAM J. DIAZ HERMANDEZ

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, to recognize William J. Diaz. A native of Cumana, Venezuela, William was raised in Caracas. From a young age, William naturally cultivated friendships and supported humanitarian causes. As a young leader, he was active in student council throughout his schooling. William was the recipient of a scholarship which allowed him to attend the University of Texas at Austin, where he received his Master's Degree in Mass Communications in 1976.

William previously served as an Educational Attaché to the Venezuelan Embassy in Paris, France and the General Coordinator of the G.M.A. Foundation. William was also the founder and president of several community organizations in Venezuela.

In 1989, William moved to Orlando, Florida, where he lives with his wife and four children. Since then, he has been very active within the Latino community, advising and counseling nonprofit organizations. An active community leader and incisive journalist, William has a passion to help his fellow citizens through life's struggles.

William has been an on-air personality for decades and a columnist with several publications. He is always available to individuals or community organizations in need of media support, especially those who seek support for social justice issues.

William's activism to promote Latin-American political development has won him recognition within the Latino community. He currently has a daily radio show, "Cara a Cara con William Diaz," which reaches eighteen counties. He is also the founder of Casa de Venezuela and the Made in Venezuela Business Club.

I am honored to recognize William Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for his contributions to the Central Florida community.

HONORING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR THEIR SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the following law enforcement personnel who have recently been honored by the Horseshoe Curve Benevolent Association for their tireless service and continued willingness to put their lives on the line to protect our communities. This year's honorees are Sergeant Jonathan E. Smith, Clarke County Director of Emergency Communications Pam Hess, Deputy Bryan Smith, Corporal Bradley W. Davidson, Officer Terry W. Fritts, Sergeant Frank Myrtle, Officer Brock Justice, Officer Tommy Gardner, Lieutenant Wally Stotlemeyer, K-9 Officer Kota and his partner Corporal Brittney Kotynski-Neer.

Sergeant Jonathan E. Smith has played a pivotal role in the implementation of the Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP-2), a joint federal, state and local jurisdiction effort to better train first responders as well as traffic incident and management support staff. As the lead instructor for Northwestern Virginia, Region 2, Sgt. Smith has conducted more than 30 sessions of the program, instructing more than 900 people, in addition to continuing his supervisory responsibilities as a Virginia State Police officer. His efforts have brought nationwide praise to the quality of Virginia law enforcement.

Director of Emergency Communications Pam Hess has been with the Clarke County Sheriff's office since 1986. Today, she plays a crucial role as supervisor of the county's 911 center and de facto project manager for monitoring and upgrading the county's sophisticated communications equipment. In addition to these responsibilities, Director Hess still works shifts as an emergency operator and is on-call every hour of every day.

Deputy Bryan Smith has been a real asset to the Frederick County Sheriff's Office. Earlier this year, Deputy Smith played a critical role in resuscitating a motorist who was thought to have died in order to transport him to the Winchester Medical Center. Although the crash victim was beyond medical help, Deputy Smith's efforts gave him the chance to live.

Corporal Bradley W. Davidson has served in the Winchester Sheriffs Office since 2006 and was recently promoted to Corporal in January. Bradley has trained many of his colleagues on responding to active shooter situations. He also manages the Sheriffs office's external functions. He is known around town as a family man as well as a man of integrity.

Officer Terry Fritts has filled many roles in the Berryville Police Department, including providing technology expertise to investigating a bank robbery earlier this year, organizing Berryville's National Night Out and voluntarily handling difficult situations with citizens experiencing emotional crises. Throughout all this, he has been a great resource to Berryville and his colleagues in the police department.

Sergeant Frank Myrtle of the Winchester Police Department has played a critical role in investigating and seeking successful indictments for two recent felony murder cases involving child victims. He has also taken the lead in the effort to address prostitution in Winchester by leading countless sting operations.

Officer Brock Justice has been an indispensable part of the Mount Weather Police Department. Officer Justice was trained in active shooter response tactics at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and has extensively studied past incidents, such as the Navy Yard shooting last year. He has designed and implemented active shooter practice scenarios for Mount Weather police, fire and EMS services to hone their skills and identify areas for improvement.

Officer Tommy Gardner serves the Northwestern Regional Jail. On the night of April 24, Officer Gardner, while off-duty, stepped above and beyond his call to duty and successfully negotiated the de-escalation of a dangerous domestic dispute in his neighborhood involving a firearm. He did his community a great service by his heroic actions.

Lieutenant Wally Stotlemeyer serves with the Winchester Police Department and has been working with the Northwestern Virginia Regional Drug and Gang Task Force. He has exhibited tremendous leadership in overseeing the North End team as it manages the recent spike in regional heroin overdoses—part of the drug epidemic that threatens communities across the United States.

Finally, K-9 Officer Kota was injured during the brave pursuit of two suspects in an attic. I join his partner, Winchester Police Department Corporal Brittney Kotynski-Neer in honoring Kota for his good work and welcome him back to duty at the Winchester Police Department.

I am proud to join with the Horseshoe Benevolent Association—which has been honoring local law enforcement since 2004—to recognize these officers for their bravery, dedication and strength. We owe them a sincere debt of gratitude for their service to the 10th District and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I respectfully submit a speech given by Mr. Jim Wink at the Horseshoe Curve Benevolent Association's September 13th Law Enforcement Appreciation Dinner.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION, DINNER 13
SEPTEMBER 2014

Good evening: My name is Jim Wink. On behalf of the Horse Shoe Curve Benevolent Association—I want to welcome everybody and thank you for coming out to recognize those who put their lives on the line to protect us.

Before we begin to serve dinner, please stand for a short prayer by Rev. Canon Dwight L. Brown, Grace Episcopal Church, Berryville.

Please join me in the Pledge of Alligence to our Flag.

The purpose of tonight's gathering is to enjoy the company, the food, the music, and—most important—to recognize local police and security officers who's dedication to serve their community—that's us—has been outstanding.

First: Let us recognize our guests. With us tonight are:

Each of the officers recognized tonight will get not only our respect and thanks, but also a plaque from the HSC Benevolent Association, a certificate of appreciation from the VA House of Delegates—compliments of Del. Randy Minchew, and U.S. Congressional Recognition—compliments of Congressman Frank Wolf. They will also get outstanding photos of tonight activities compliments of Matt Baker.

VIRGINIA STATE POLICE

Sergeant Jonathan E. Smith

Sergeant Smith is devoted to the implementation of the SHRP-2—which is the strategic highway research program in the Commonwealth of Virginia. In conjunction with the VA Department Of Transportation, VA Department of Fire Programs, US Federal Highway Administration and multiple local partners involved in traffic operations, this curriculum was implemented in the Commonwealth of VA as a pilot "Train-the-Trainer" program for all First Responders.

The four hour course is nationally recognized traffic incident management responder training that is offered to all emergency responders and also those personnel who support traffic incident management operations. An important goal of the program is to reduce congestion through incident reduction, management, and response in order to improve travel times for both commuters and freight throughout VA.

SGT. Smith was tasked with being the lead instructor for the Northwestern portion of VA (Region 2). He has coordinated and jointly conducted 34 sessions of this training program to over 900 attendees in various locations across his assigned region. The work involved in the coordination of these classes include, but not limited to, arrangement of the training locations, advertisement of all classes, registration of each attendee, and following up with personalized certificates of completion.

SGT. Smith has forged relationships and gained the support and respect of many federal, state, and local agencies thought the development of this program, which has greatly enhanced the department's image by all cooperating agencies. Although he has dedicated numerous hours (both duty and personal) to this program, he has maintained all supervisory responsibilities.

SGT. Smith, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

CLARKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Pam Hess

Pam Hess is the director of emergency communications for Clarke County. She has been employed by the County Sheriff's Office since 1986. She is responsible for supervising the 911 Center, which includes the dispatching of all emergency services in Clarke County. This responsibility requires that Pam sometimes assumes the role of communications operator and work a shift, a duty that she takes on without complaint. Pam has become, by default, the project manager for all communications upgrades with our 911 center. She takes care of purchasing of complicated telephone equipment, and oversees the installation of this equipment in addition to all of the radio systems. She is really on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to answer questions from staff, and routinely act as a mechanic in keeping communications going. Pam, sounds like you are doing it all!

Pam: Congratulations, and thank you for being there for us.

FREDERICK COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Deputy Bryan Smith

On April 17, 2014, Trooper Joshua Myers of the VA State Police and Deputy Bryan Smith were involved in an incident where an apparent deceased motorist was resuscitated thanks to their quick actions after a single vehicle crash on the interstate. Upon VA state trooper Myers arrival no fire or rescue personnel were on the scene. Trooper Myers attempted to make contact with the driver of the tractor but he was unconscious and partially on the floor board. There was no breathing or pulse. Trooper Myers began to administer chest compressions and rescue breathing on the subject. Deputy Smith also stopped to provide assistance. He immediately relieved Trooper Myers of performing CPR and continue to sustain the subject while EMS was placing monitoring devices on him to include an AED. He continued for several minutes. The subject was transported to the Winchester Medical Center where he passed away next day. If not for Trooper Myers and Deputy Smith, he would have died in the truck. Deputy Smith excels in his every day job with the Sheriff's Office. He sets the bar high for fellow officers to follow.

Deputy Smith, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

WINCHESTER SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Corporal Bradley W. Davidson (Harley)

Corporal Davidson has been with the Sheriff's Office since January 2006. He was promoted to Corporal in January 2014. Corporal Bradley is in charge of all outside Sheriff's Office functions such as evictions, levy's, distress warrants and paper service. Bradley has played a very important role within the Sheriff's Office to ensure that the office continues to move forward in a positive way. Bradley is a true professional in dealing with the public with delicate situations. Bradley is a person that can be counted on to answer the call when situations arise that extra help is needed.

Bradley attended active Shooter Instructor School, then came back and prepared lesson plans and started training the Sheriff's Office. He is currently working on mass training and drills for the Joint Judicial Building. Corporal Bradley is married with one little girl. Bradley, in his off time is a large supporter of WVU football and he spends a lot of his time in the Fall hunting. His other interest is Harley Davidson Motorcycles. He is a good family man as demonstrated by his

desk area full of family pictures. Corporal Davidson is a person that the City of Winchester can be as proud of as we in the office are. Bradley is a true professional and friend that we in the office all enjoy coming to work with.

Corporal Davidson, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

BERRYVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Officer Terry W. Fritts

Officer Fritts has served with Berryville since 2007 and holds a variety of certifications including defensive tactics and Speed Measurement Instructor, field training officer, police cyclist, and intoxilyzer operator. Terry is always willing to assist his fellow officers with assignments and has advanced skills in dealing with technology issues that has proven to be a tremendous asset to the department. He constantly looks for ways to develop and refine procedures within the department so they are more user-friendly and efficient. There does not seem to be any problem associated with technology that Terry is not equipped to tackle.

Officer Fritts proved to be instrumental in the investigation associated with a bank robbery that occurred in Berryville this year. While he was not the initial officer involved, he asserted himself as part of the Berryville Police Department team and worked diligently to collect and compile information that ultimately led to the apprehension of four suspects that are currently awaiting trial. This is an example of the type of dedication and drive that Terry routinely displays.

Another attribute is his willingness to be involved with the community that he serves. For the past several years he has coordinated the National Night Out event. The event is a showcase of community resources dedicated to public safety. Each year Terry makes it bigger and better. This past August Terry again pulled off a fantastic event that displayed how community policing in a small town can bring us all together for a safer community. In addition to this event, Terry often spends time listening and educating local business owners and members of the community while patrolling the downtown district. By having a rapport with those in the community he is often the officer that people ask for by name when they have issues or questions. He also takes a special interest in handling situations where a person finds themselves in an emotional crisis and is in need of assistance. Officer Fritts is very aware of the resources that are available for those in a mental crisis and those who could benefit from community resources that are not directly supplied by law enforcement. He works very closely with representatives from Social Services and often takes part in Family Team Meetings with a multidisciplinary team that works with a family to identify problems and offer solutions in order to improve quality of life issues. According to his boss, Officer Terry Fritts has done a tremendous job representing the Berryville Police Department in a professional manner.

Officer Fritts, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

WINCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

Sergeant Frank Myrtle

Sergeant Myrtle has been instrumental in leading two felonious death investigations within the past year. Both of these investigations involved very young children. One was a high profile case involving a child who was the victim of a house fire that was intentionally set by his mother. The other

case, which has yet to go to trial, involved a child who was allegedly assaulted by her mother and who subsequently died of those injuries. Sgt. Myrtle took the lead in both investigations and successfully sought indictments for felony murder in both cases. The first mother was convicted and received a 36 year sentence for her crimes. Sgt. Myrtle invested countless hours of investigation in both cases. He did this while taking on other cases and maintaining his administrative duties as a supervisor in the Criminal Investigations Division.

In addition, Sgt. Myrtle has made eradicating the crime of prostitution in Winchester a priority. He has recognized that prostitution leads to the more serious offenses and has spent untold hours conducting sting operations to arrest both Johns and Prostitutes operating in the city. According to his superiors, Sgt. Frank Myrtle's hard work and dedication to the citizens of Winchester and to his co-workers should be recognized.

Sergeant Myrtle, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

MOUNT WEATHER POLICE DEPARTMENT

Officer Brock Justice

According to Brock's superiors, he has continually shown himself as a professional police officer displaying the highest degree of competence and dedication to the mission at Mount Weather. As one of the department's officers that have completed the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center's Active Shooter Instructor Course, Brock has worked tirelessly to improve the department's capability for effectively responding to and mitigating the impacts of an active shooter incident. He spends countless hours reviewing after action reports of shooting incidents such as the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard last year capturing ways for improving the department's training, equipment, tactics and procedures for such incidents.

Early in fiscal year 2014 Officer Justice developed a challenging, reality-based training exercise to assess Mount Weather Police, Fire and EMS responses to an active shooter incident. The exercise utilized evaluators from outside agencies and allowed the department to identify areas for improvement starting with individual officer skills all the way through incident management. He has also conducted several classes for FEMA headquarters personnel and other tenant organizations at Mount Weather. These classes focused on teaching personnel on how to react to a shooting incident in their respective work areas.

Officer Justice, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

NORTHWESTERN REGIONAL JAIL

Officer Tommy Gardner

On April 24, 2014 Officer Tommy Gardner was headed home after completing his Tour of Duty. It was approximately 1830 hours when he arrived at his residence. As he was getting ready to enter his home he noticed a crowd of people gathered at a nearby residence. Tommy walked over to see if he could be of assistance. When he arrived at the nearby residence there was a woman on the porch. She had called 911 on her cell phone. The woman informed Officer Gardner that the male had been involved in a domestic and that he had a gun in his back pocket. Officer Gardner noticed the outline of what appeared to be a gun. He started talking to the male. He instructed the male individual to put down the gun. After several commands the male complied and laid the weapon on

the trunk of a vehicle he was standing beside. Officer Gardner quickly approached the male, ordered him to lay face down on the ground. He then placed his knee in the center of the male's back detaining him until WPD arrived on scene approximately 30 seconds later. The male was arrested.

Officer Tommy Gardner's handling of this situation is remarkable for several reasons. First, he went above and beyond his Call to Duty. He is employed as a Correctional Officer at Northwestern. He was also off duty at the time. He was under no obligation to become involved in the situation. His strong character and desire to help those in his community propelled his actions. Second, Officer Gardner showed exceptional courage. When he walked over to the crowd of people he was informed that the individual was under extreme duress and had a handgun in his possession. He could have simply done nothing and waited for the police to arrive.

Instead, Officer Gardner chose to establish a dialogue and de-escalate the situation even though he knew he would be in harm's way. Officer Gardner's actions on the date personify those of the law enforcement community who chose to put the safety of the citizens above their own.

Officer Tommy Gardner, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

NW DRUG TASK FORCE

Lt. Wally Stotlemeyer

Wally Stotlemeyer is a Lt. with the Winchester Police Department currently assigned duty with the NW Virginia Regional Drug and Gang Task Force. The recent spike in heroin overdoses has put a tremendous strain on the resources of the task force. A large number of the deaths have occurred in the Region Wally and the North End Team is responsible for. Wally is the supervisor of the team and he has exhibited tremendous leadership skills in managing the increase in their cases. Practicing leadership from the front, Wally regularly appears on the scene of the tragic events and makes sure that these cases receive the proper attention to insure our valley is safe. In addition, Wally is always present at meetings where his opinion matters. He is truly working this epidemic from both ends and deserves to be recognized for his efforts.

Lt. Wally Stotlemeyer, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

WINCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

K-9 Officer Kota

Cpl. Brittney Kotynski-Neer

Officer Kota has been with the Winchester Police Department since May, 2009. On January 3rd of this year, Kota was injured while helping apprehend two suspects hiding an attic crawl space during a burglary. He fell eight feet through the ceiling to the floor below and broke his right front leg and injured his "wrist". Despite his injuries, he climbed up a flight of stairs to return to Cpl. Brittney's side in the attic. Kota returned to work last week.

Officer Kota, congratulations and thank you for being there for us.

That, ladies and gentlemen, highlights how lucky we citizens of Northern Virginia are given the outstanding people we have protecting us. Thank you for coming and don't forget them.

RECOGNIZING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 225th anniversary since the creation of the United States Customs Service, the oldest legacy agency consolidated into the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), within the Department of Homeland Security.

The history of the U.S. Customs Service is in many ways the history of the nation. In the years after the American Revolution, our young Nation needed to generate funds to power its economy and rebuild its infrastructure. On July 31, 1789, the First United States Congress, in its fifth act, created the U.S. Customs Service, staffed by official Customs collectors. In this role, a Customs collector had the responsibility to supervise the collection of custom duties on imported goods in a particular city or region to enforce the newly passed Tariff Act.

Customs collectors also oversaw the building of revenue cutters, to patrol our coasts, and lighthouses to guide ships to our ports, which was essential to the Nation's maritime security and trade activities. For over 100 years after its birth, before the passage of the Sixteenth Amendment, the tariffs collected by the Customs Service were the primary source of funds for the entire government, which paid for the nation's early growth, infrastructure and land purchases such as the Louisiana and Oregon territories.

The responsibilities of the U.S. Customs Service would be reshaped and refocused following the attacks of 9/11. The Homeland Security Act of 2002 transferred the U.S. Customs Service in its entirety from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Homeland Security.

Today, CBP manages the Nation's 328 air, land, and sea ports of entry. CBP officers, like their predecessor Customs inspectors, serve on the frontlines, securing our homeland from transnational threats, including terrorists, terrorist weapons, drugs and other contraband, while simultaneously facilitating the legitimate flow travel and trade across our borders.

While the responsibilities of a CBP Officer have grown since 9/11, Officers continue to perform essential revenue-collecting services as when established by the founders of the Republic, and enforce hundreds of immigration, agriculture, and trade laws.

The men and women of CBP are still making history. They continue to fuel our Nation's economy and support American jobs by facilitating legitimate trade and travel while keeping our borders secure.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I want to commend the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection for their many years of service and wish them a happy 225th anniversary.

CONGRATULATING YE OLDE
YARDLEY FLORIST ON ITS 100TH
YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a small business in Yardley, Bucks County, Pennsylvania has provided plants and flowers to local and regional customers for over 100 years. On September 27, 2014 its doors will open for a special anniversary celebration. Ye Olde Yardley Florist on South Main Street is truly an example of "small business," the very backbone of our economy. Due to their experience, effort and knowledge, the Yardley floral and gift shop has thrived. Community leaders and citizens will join owner Susan Gorka for a celebration to acknowledge the quality and service the store has provided, while retaining the tradition of good business they have come to expect. Congratulations on this milestone and may Ye Olde Yardley Florist have many more years of continued success, bringing beauty and joy to its friends and customers.

HONORING JOLIET JUNIOR COL-
LEGE'S VETERANS RESOURCE
CENTER

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ribbon cutting of the Veterans Resource Center at Joliet Junior College.

The Veterans Resource Center will benefit approximately 300 students that use GI education benefits every semester at Joliet Junior College. The dedicated space will provide veterans with an area to socialize, study, access computers, and attend counseling sessions.

I applaud Joliet Junior College for providing our veterans with services like the Veterans Resource Center and for its dedication to ensuring that the men and women who serve our country have access to a great education in a supportive environment.

I congratulate Joliet Junior College on opening the Veterans Resource Center and thank the college for its hard work on behalf of our veterans.

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE
2014 GREATER RESTON CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE AWARDS FOR
CHAMBER EXCELLENCE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize recipients of the 2014 Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce Awards for Chamber Excellence.

The Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1982 as a business roundtable

in the growing community of Reston, Virginia. For more than 30 years, the Reston Chamber has facilitated business growth and entrepreneurship through its programming, advocacy, and engagement throughout the region. The Reston Chamber currently has more than 600 member businesses that together employ more than 10,000 people. It is the 6th largest chamber of commerce in the Washington, DC-metropolitan region and is deeply embedded in the community.

The Reston Chamber hosts annual events such as Taste of Reston, Oktoberfest Reston, and Best of Reston, and it has received national recognition for its Ethics Day, a workshop for high school students on ethical decision making. Members use the INC.spire Education Foundation and free SCORE business coaching programs to help create and grow their enterprises. INC.spire has assisted more than four dozen entrepreneurs create 500 jobs and \$45 million of business investment.

Each year, through the Awards for Chamber Excellence, the Chamber recognizes member companies, individuals, and volunteers who have demonstrated excellence, innovation, and exceptional dedication to the Reston community. I am pleased to join the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce in recognizing the following Awards for Chamber Excellence (ACE) recipients:

Committee of the Year: Charles Kapur, EagleBank, Membership Committee.

Committee of the Year: Sam Cousins, SBIS, Membership Committee.

Small Business of the Year: Silver Spoon Catering.

Medium Business of the Year: Business Engineering, Inc.

Large Business of the Year: Sheraton Reston Hotel.

Member of the Year: Lisa Nicholls, Tira! Strategies.

New Member of the Year: Ellen Moyer, Re/Max Allegiance.

Volunteer of the Year: Andy Klaff, Colliers. Joe Ritchie Pinnacle Award: Casey Veatch, Veatch Commercial Real Estate.

President's Award: Tonia Chagnon, Red Thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating this year's award recipients and in thanking them for their contributions to the local economy and outstanding service to our community. I also commend the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce for its role as an invaluable partner to local businesses, nonprofits and schools. The efforts of the Chamber, the member businesses, and volunteers have helped make Reston a truly special place to live, work, and raise a family.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL
DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT
AWARENESS MONTH

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize this upcoming month of October as National Disability Employment

Awareness Month (NDEAM). As part of a national campaign, NDEAM raises awareness about employment issues facing individuals with disabilities and celebrates the vast contributions made by American workers with disabilities. This year's theme is "Expect. Employ. Empower."

NDEAM's origins can be traced back to 1945, when Congress first passed a resolution declaring the first week of October as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week." In 1988, Congress expanded this week to an entire month and changed the name to "National Disability Employment Awareness Month" to reflect the wide variety of disabilities, physical or nonphysical, that an individual may have.

This month serves to remind us all that a strong, thriving workforce is an inclusive workforce. As a nation, we must work together to increase meaningful employment opportunities for those with disabilities and utilize their many talents.

I would like to especially recognize the great work of the Georgia Industries for the Blind (GIB), a facet of the Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (GVRA). The GIB was established in 1937 and subsequently opened its first manufacturing plant in 1949. Since then, it has grown to include three manufacturing sites located in Albany, Bainbridge and Griffin, as well as two service sites located in Bainbridge and Warner Robins. The GIB employs nearly 100 blind persons and boasts over \$12 million in annual sales.

The GIB is a leader in the fight against the marginalization of the disabled worker and I applaud their resounding efforts to expand employment opportunities to those with disabilities throughout Georgia. By offering competitive wages and a full benefits package, Georgia Industries for the Blind stands as a shining example for other employers across the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing National Disability Employment Awareness Month by acknowledging the positive impact those with disabilities have on the American workforce, as well as understanding the need to increase meaningful employment opportunities for our disabled citizens. In addition, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the strides made by Georgia Industries for the Blind and other employers leading the effort to implement a more inclusive employee culture.

IN HONOR OF JUDGE ANN
OSBORNE

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Judge Ann Osborne of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania. She is retiring after many years of serving her community.

Judge Osborne has been a beacon for justice on the bench in Delaware County for the last 16 years. Before the bench, Judge

Osborne served as Sheriff of Delaware County from 1991 to 1998. Additionally, she taught comparative government, international law and criminal law at Temple University, Villanova University and Immaculata College. She left her mark on the Delaware County community and her contribution will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge Ann Osborne for her long and honorable service. I applaud her successes and wish her the best of luck in her retirement.

ON THE PASSING OF MR. JOSEPH
NADEAU

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart and deep sympathy to commemorate the life of Mr. Joseph Nadeau. Mr. Nadeau was a dedicated husband, father, and tireless advocate for Rhode Island veterans, who himself honorably served his country as a Senior Master Sergeant in the U.S. Air Force. Like many Rhode Islanders, I am deeply saddened by Mr. Nadeau's passing and send my condolences to his five children, entire family and friends.

During his military service in the Korean and Vietnam Wars, Joseph Nadeau earned the Air Force Commendation Medal for outstanding service, the Meritorious Service Medal, Missile Maintenance awards with the 4751st in 1967 and 1968, the National Defense Service medal, the Good Conduct medal, and the United Nations Service medal. Despite traveling the world with his loving wife Dorothy as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, Mr. Nadeau returned to Rhode Island to raise his five children. At home, in Woonsocket, Mr. Nadeau was also recognized for his outstanding service to the local veterans' community and named the 2002 Veteran of the Year by the United Veterans Council of Woonsocket.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my deepest sympathies to the Nadeau family and express my gratitude for Mr. Nadeau's service to our country and local community. He truly enriched the lives of those around him and made the world a better place to live. Rhode Island will miss him.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 103RD
NATIONAL DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the upcoming 103rd National Day of the Republic of China on October 10, 2014. On this special day each year, we commemorate the establishment of Taiwan.

Officially known as the Republic of China, Taiwan is not only an outstanding example of a free economy and vibrant representative de-

mocracy in the Asia-Pacific region, but also a long-term strategic ally and trading partner of the United States. I recently had the pleasure of meeting with many Taiwanese-American members of the World Taiwanese Chamber of Commerce, and was pleased to hear of their willingness to come forward and improve our mutual trading relationship. I am proud to once again express my support for strengthening the partnership between the United States and Taiwan.

On the eve of Taiwan's 103rd anniversary, I congratulate President Ma Ying-jeou, Taiwan Representative to the United States Ambassador Lyushun Shen, and all of the Taiwanese people for their unwavering pursuit of freedom.

RECOGNIZING DAVID HALE ON
THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC WORKS AT FORT
BELVOIR

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of my constituent, David Hale. After 50 years of service in the United States federal government, Mr. Hale is retiring as the Deputy Director of Public Works for the U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Belvoir.

His career started August 10, 1964 as a Clerk Typist, GS-2 for the Director of Facilities, Road, and Grounds Division. Mr. Hale served in the Army for a year and then returned to the Department of Defense where he worked as an Electrical Technician. Later in his career, Mr. Hale became the Deputy Director of Public Works.

Mr. Hale's work has had direct and significant positive impact on the quality of life at Fort Belvoir. Having been the Deputy Director for DPW, Fort Belvoir, for decades, he has shown himself to be a technically superior facilities engineer, outstanding leader and executive, and a tireless worker. Under his leadership and guidance, Fort Belvoir has done an exceptional job upgrading its master plan and implementing residential communities while emphasizing environmental stewardship and maintaining excellent community relations. Mr. Hale has played a central role in the development of the Fort Belvoir strategic plan and provision of outstanding customer support.

His efforts resulted in improved overall facilities and mission readiness and living and working conditions of soldiers, their families, and the civilian workforce at the fort. He has also distinguished himself as a caring individual willing to do everything to the best of his considerable abilities to take care of soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Hale on his retirement and in thanking him for his 50 years of distinguished service to the people of the United States of America and to the men and women who serve in uniform and their families.

HONORING BEST BUY'S E-
RECYCLING INITIATIVE

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Best Buy's extraordinary commitment to electronics recycling, and their leadership in zero-waste initiatives in the retail industry.

Starting with a goal of recycling one billion pounds of electronics by the end of 2014, Best Buy opened collection points for e-waste at all of its 1,300 retail locations through the United States. Through aggressive awareness and marketing campaigns, they increased collections by 20 percent to nearly 100 million pounds in 2012. Every minute they are open, the company collects more than 400 pounds of electronics waste, without regard to the product's initial retailer. As of September 12, 2014 Best Buy has recycled over 966 million pounds of electronics.

I applaud Best Buy's dedication to electronics recycling. Their recycling strategies should serve as a model to other major retailers. On behalf of the residents of the Fifth Congressional District, I commend Best Buy for their commitment to our environment; their e-waste collection sets the bar for other companies and goes beyond any level mandated by government.

RECOGNIZING THE 103RD
NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. SCOTT DESJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 103rd national day of the Republic of China (ROC), which is known by most Americans as Taiwan.

Double Ten Day, which as the name implies falls on October 10, commemorates the Wuchang Uprising, an event that triggered a revolution leading to the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty and the establishment of the ROC on January 1, 1912.

The United States has since stood by the ROC as we faced common enemies over the course of World War II and through the Cold War. With the creation and enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979, Congress guaranteed the continuing importance of the special U.S.-Taiwan relationship. Through the hard work and determination of its people, Taiwan has built a democracy that has witnessed direct presidential elections every four years since 1966 and has twice seen the peaceful passage of power from one political party to another.

Taiwan is a shining example to other countries who aspire to democracy both in the Asia-Pacific region and around the world. It is a regional and global economic and cultural force as a major innovator in high-technology and contributor to art and fashion. Through our shared security partnership, Taiwan also

contributes to the security of the Asia-Pacific region.

With the rise of tensions over the Diaoyutai/Senkaku Islands and other areas of the East China Sea two years ago—tensions that remain prevalent today—Taiwan under the leadership of President Ma Ying-jeou proposed an East China Sea peace initiative. It calls for dialogue and diplomacy to reduce tensions among the claimants to promote mutual benefit from the natural-bounties of the disputed waters. This kind of vision is sorely needed in these types of global disputes, and it should be given due consideration by the international community.

At a House Foreign Affairs hearing this past March, the State Department's Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs responded positively to President Ma's proposal. I hope my colleagues will study it and consider its proposals. And in appreciation of Taiwan's many contributions to the global community, I hope that they will join me in wishing the people of Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day.

RECOGNIZING SOLDIERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY IN LEESBURG, FLORIDA

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the soldiers of the National Guard Armory in Leesburg, Florida.

Alpha Company of the Leesburg National Guard Armory has bravely served both on American soil and overseas. In March 2005, soldiers of the 124th Infantry Regiment were deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. After conducting missions in Oman and Pakistan in 2008, Alpha Company deployed to Kuwait and conducted missions throughout Iraq, assisting the transition from Operation Iraqi Freedom to Operation New Dawn.

In Florida, Alpha Company has provided critical support in times of natural disaster. In 2004, service men and women aided victims of hurricanes that caused catastrophic damage around the state. Alpha Company also assisted Central Florida residents in 2007 when a series of tornadoes damaged thousands of homes and claimed several lives.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to the soldiers of Alpha Company for their brave and selfless service in Central Florida and abroad. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in the United States' armed forces.

THE RUSSIANS KEEP MOVING WEST

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Russian bear is back, seeking to devour his neigh-

bors and reclaim his kingdom. Mr. Putin, or the Napoleon of Siberia as I like to call him, yearns for the glory days of the Soviet Union when the great communist empire extended from Latvia in the north to Tajikistan in the south. Putin is systematically reestablishing the Soviet Empire, but this time with Putin as king.

In November 2013, Putin bribed the then President of Ukraine with a payment of \$15 billion in exchange for cutting off negotiations with the European Union that would have integrated Ukraine more into the West.

When then President Yanukovich accepted the bribe, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians took to the streets in peaceful protest. With the loss of the support of the people, in February 2014 the corrupt President left his gilded palace, resigned his position, and retreated back to Russia.

The people of Ukraine elected a new government who would represent their desire to be free and move closer to the West.

Putin did not like this one bit. So, he sent in his henchmen, first in Crimea and then in towns in eastern Ukraine, to stir unrest. Then in came the Russian troops to "protect" the ethnic Russians from the crisis that Putin created.

We have seen this movie before. The Russians are doing the same thing to the Ukrainians in 2014 as they did to the Georgians in 2008.

In 2008, I was in Georgia just after the Russians invaded. Georgia was moving closer and closer to the West. Russia did not like this, so it decided to create instability. It sent in its henchmen to cause trouble. Then Putin sent in Russian troops and tanks to stop the trouble it created. Six years later, the Russians are still there.

This winter, the Russian bear is not going to go into hibernation. Mr. Putin is going to dial up the pressure. He knows how reliant much of Europe is on Russian energy. When the weather gets colder, much of Europe will be at the mercy of Putin in order to stay warm. Putin is not afraid to use energy as leverage. I know because I was in Ukraine when Russia turned off the gas in 2006. It was cold. Unless Europe diversifies, it is only going to become more reliant on Russian gas.

We have an easy solution to this. The United States is in the midst of an energy revolution. We have more natural gas than we can use. In fact, natural gas is being left in the ground and burnt off at the well head because producers have no domestic buyers. There is a glut in the market. But the government, that institution that always seems to get in the way, says producers cannot sell the gas abroad without permission first from the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy is like any government bureaucracy—slow as molasses. Meanwhile, the Europeans are months away from being subject to Russian blackmail.

That's why I introduced H.R. 4155, the Fight Russian Energy Exploitation (FREE) Act. The bill would free up our gas to go to the former Soviet states like Ukraine and countries in the European Union. Our allies want our gas and are willing to pay for it. If we sell our gas to them, it means more money injected into our economy and more American jobs. It is so simple you wonder why it has not been done already.

Putin is in this for the long-term. Russian troops are still in Ukraine and just like in Georgia, they have no plans on leaving. If the Ukrainian government is not going to move towards Russia, then Putin has decided he is going to make them as weak and unstable as possible so they cannot move towards the West in any meaningful way.

The Russians cannot be trusted. Back in 1994, in exchange for Ukraine giving up its nuclear weapons, Russia promised to respect the territorial integrity of Ukraine. The Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances was just a piece of paper to the Russians. So much for diplomacy and trusting the Russia bear not to eat more territory.

Appeasement is not the answer. Russia will keep taking as much as the West is willing to let them. Who knows who could be next—Latvia, Estonia, Moldova? What then? When will the West decide enough is enough?

The United States and Europe must come together. It is together that we can offer tough sanctions that will deal a big blow to Putin. As we tighten the economic noose around the Russia bear, we should loosen our ban on the export of crude oil and cut the red tape so we can export more natural gas to our European partners. We should also stand behind President Poroshenko with meaningful economic and military aid. He is doing all he can to prevent the Russians from taking over more of his country, but he cannot do it alone.

Winter is coming. Free people that want to remain free, better take heed.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HEALTH IT WEEK

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 15–19, 2014 as the 9th annual National Health IT Week. This is an important opportunity to reflect upon the importance of health information technology in stimulating the U.S. economy and improving health care in our country. My own district, which includes Silicon Valley, is home to a growing number of innovative digital health startups and companies making an impact in health care. These companies are addressing some of health care's most pressing challenges with breakthrough technologies and services, all the while creating valuable jobs.

Health IT supports workforce development in the U.S. and exports opportunities abroad. The Bureau of Labor Statistics expects a need for thousands of new health IT jobs over the next decade. Health IT workforce development programs need visibility and connection to the Administration's programs for job creation. Congressional support is needed for funding to expand community college, university-based, and non-profit programs to train health IT workers. Policymakers need to work with non-profit associations and the business community to launch and support internships, apprenticeships, and fellowships that give students and transitioning professionals real-

world experience. Federal agencies should work with U.S. companies, health care organizations, and non-profit associations to document lessons learned and best practices from the Meaningful Use Program and apply them to overseas markets.

In order to continue on this path, we need to provide incentives and frameworks to guide and reward these health care innovators. That is why I introduced H.R. 2363, the Health Care Innovation and Marketplace Technologies Act, which would create a new office of wireless health under the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and offer incentives for health care innovators. This legislation would not only create jobs, but also provide a regulatory framework for innovators who seek to grow companies and develop products to transform health care. It is imperative that we support these innovators, as it is clear that health IT supports workforce development in the U.S. We must also continue to prepare students and our workforce for the 21st century demands of the technology industry. The growth of health IT undoubtedly has the potential to stimulate the economy and bring much-needed innovation to our nation's healthcare sector.

Health information technology is essential to the transformation of health care in America, and so I am happy to commemorate National Health IT Week.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOTH THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AND THE WILDERNESS ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of both the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Wilderness Act, two momentous accomplishments for the environmental movement at both the time of their signing and today.

The technology sector in my district is booming. People come to Seattle not just because of our vibrant technology ecosystem or our business- and worker-friendly environment. They also come because smart, forward-thinking people for the past 50 years have set aside open space—preserving farmland, building parks, and conserving habitat.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund helped conserve iconic natural treasures in all fifty states, including Mount Rainier National Park in the great state of Washington. I am a frequent visitor to the beautiful San Juan Islands, another Washington gem protected by the LWCF. The Wilderness Act enabled the highest levels of protection for the stunning Alpine Lakes Wilderness, a natural landscape Seattleites are fortunate to have in their backyard.

Programs like the Land and Water Conservation Act and the Wilderness Act are not just good for the environment; they are good for people and the economy. I commend those who enacted these programs half a century ago and those working to promote this work

today. It is imperative that we continue the legacy of preserving America's rich and diverse natural heritage.

CELEBRATING WILDERNESS WEEK 2014

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of our nation's public lands and wilderness and in honor of Wilderness Week, observed September 13–18, 2014.

This year, Wilderness Week takes on special meaning, as this September marks the 50th anniversary of two enduring tools for American conservation: the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Passed by Congress in 1964, these two acts remain vital to our efforts of conserving the best of America's natural lands.

On September 3, 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, landmark legislation that established a dedicated and permanent funding stream for the purpose of protecting and conserving our nation's irreplaceable outdoor recreational, natural, historic and cultural landmarks.

Paid for by royalties collected from oil and gas companies, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) has financed generations of projects to bring parks and clean, green spaces to the hearts of our urban areas. The suite of LWCF programs is critical for protecting natural lands, outdoor recreation opportunities, and working forests at the local, state and federal levels. Since its creation, the LWCF program has conserved more than 5 million acres of parks, recreation, forests, and other lands through the federal program and more than 2.6 million acres in communities throughout every state in the nation.

But LWCF does more than simply add to our public lands. Investing in LWCF is also an important way to grow our economy. The Outdoor Industry Association states that outdoor recreation contributes more than \$1.06 trillion annually to the U.S. economy, supports more than 9.4 million jobs, and stimulates 8 percent of all consumer spending. And The Trust for Public Land found that every \$1 invested in LWCF returns \$4 in economic value. Without LWCF funding to stimulate matching investments from state, local and private entities, this crucial economic driver will be lost.

These numbers prove the program's success, and I am pleased that the program is also extremely popular. In recent polls, more than 80 percent of voters expressed support for continuing to deposit fees from offshore oil and gas drilling into LWCF—this broad support extends from every geographic region of the country and every political persuasion. Supporters include governors, mayors, sportsmen, industry leaders, conservationists, Civil War enthusiasts, historians, recreationists, small businesses, forest owners, and the many Americans who see firsthand the tangible benefits this program has had on their communities and families.

Although LWCF has a dedicated revenue stream from offshore drilling royalties and takes no taxpayer money from the general fund, large portions of this funding have been diverted over the years to non-conservation purposes. Even at last year's appropriated level of \$306 million, we were a far cry from the \$900 million that is annually authorized for conservation work. In addition, LWCF's authorizing legislation is set to expire in September 2015, and it is imperative that we reauthorize this successful program before that date. I believe Congress should uphold its decades long commitment to land and water conservation and reinvigorate LWCF, thereby expanding opportunities for all Americans to have access to parks and natural areas for outdoor recreation.

Along with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, President Johnson also signed into law the Wilderness Act. The Wilderness Act allows Congress to designate some public lands as "wilderness." These wilderness areas are designed to remain unchanged by humans—to allow ecological and evolutionary processes could be carried out without human intervention and give future generations a "glimpse of the world as it was in the beginning." As such, these areas are off-limits to commercial ventures, such as logging and mining, and permanent structures (roads and lodges), but they remain available for public exploration.

Just as our government had established the first national parks in the world almost a century earlier, the Wilderness Act made the United States the first country in the world to designate and protect wilderness. When it was first signed, the Wilderness Act designated 54 wilderness areas, protecting about 9.1 million acres in 13 states. Since that time, the number of wilderness areas has increased to more than 750, covering about 110 million acres of wilderness in 44 states. Our wilderness areas include some of the highest points of the Rockies to places like Linville Gorge in my home state of North Carolina's mountains. Sadly, some opponents of conservation in Congress would like to see this hard work undone. In 2012, for the first time, Congress actually took 222 acres out of the wilderness designation.

John Muir, founder of the Sierra Club, once said, "Wilderness is a necessity . . . There must be places for human beings to satisfy their souls." Today, in an increasingly urban nation, wilderness areas are ever more important as we need a place to get away, to enjoy and restore ourselves. Wilderness areas also serve to provide biological diversity, clean air and water, and baseline data for research as we deal with issues like climate change. We need to protect connected landscapes to sustain our fish and wildlife and other natural resources for the future.

So, while the 50th anniversary of each of these landmark bills is an occasion for celebration, it must also serve as a reminder of the work we have to do. I once heard it said that "America's public lands are like unfinished works of art; incomplete masterpieces." LWCF and the Wilderness Act will help to complete this work. In fact, that was the promise made to the American people 50 years ago when

these bills were enacted. President Johnson wisely observed, "True leadership must provide for the next decade and not merely the next day." So, let us celebrate wilderness week and honor the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act and LWCF by renewing our commitment to protect our nation's wild places.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 18, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 23

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lourdes Maria Castro Ramirez, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Therese W. McMillan, of California, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation.

SD-538

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine The FANS Act, focusing on if sports blackouts and antitrust exemptions are harming fans, consumers, and the games themselves.

SD-226